

MAYNOOTH MONOGRAPHS 1

THE EARLY IRISH VERB

by

Kim McCone

Revised second edition with index verborum

AN SAGART.MAYNOOTH
1997

MAYNOOTH MONOGRAPHS

1. The Early Irish Verb
2. Sages, Saints and Storytellers
3. Pagan Past and Christian Present
4. A Guide to Ogam
5. Patronage, Politics and Prose
6. The Celebrated Antiquary
7. Church and Polity in Pre-Norman Ireland

© An Sagart 1997

First published 1987
Second edition 1997

ISBN 1 870684 76 1
ISSN 0790 8806

Printed by The Leinster Leader, Naas.

Table of Contents

Foreword	xvii
Chapter I <i>The Verbal Complex</i>	1
1.1. Preverbs, simple and compound verbs.	1
1.2. Conjunct particles, dependent and independent forms.	1
1.3. The verbal complex:	2
Absolute and conjunct inflections.	
Deuterotonic and prototonic forms.	
1.4. Exceptional independent prototonic forms:	3
Prevocalic <i>to</i> , <i>fo</i> or <i>ro</i> as first preverb.	
Imperatives without concrete infix.	
2.1. Formal differences between deuterotonic and prototonic:	4
2.2. Cancellation of 'juncture' features:	4
(a) Elision of vowels (<i>fo:ácaib</i> , (-) <i>fácaib</i>).	
(b) Simplification of consonant groups (<i>ad:gair</i> , <i>-acair</i>).	
(c) Lenition (<i>fo:fera</i> , <i>-foírea</i>) or nasalization (<i>con:certa</i> , <i>-coicerta</i>).	
2.3. Effects of proclisis:	4
(a) Voicing of dentals (<i>do:claid</i> , <i>-tochlaid</i>).	
(b) Depalatalization of consonants (<i>ad:,géuin</i> , <i>-aithgéuin</i>).	
(c) Retraction of vowels (<i>as:beir</i> , <i>-epir</i>).	
(d) <i>Con</i> for <i>cum</i> and <i>do</i> for <i>de/dí</i> .	
2.4. Stress shift and vocalism:	5
(a) Modification of unstressed vowels (<i>do:beir</i> , <i>-tabair</i>).	
(b) Shortening of unstressed vowels (<i>fo:dáil</i> , <i>-fodail</i>).	
(c) Lengthening of stressed final vowels (<i>as:luí</i> , <i>-élai</i>).	
2.5. Syncope (<i>for:cenna</i> , <i>-foirc^tnea</i>) and concomitant effects:	5
(a) Assimilation of consonant quality (<i>fo:gaibet</i> , <i>-fog^tbat</i>).	
(b) Delenition of homorganic consonants (<i>do:róscai</i> , <i>-der^tscaigi</i>).	
(c) Support vowels before interconsonantal <i>r</i> , <i>l</i> or <i>n</i> (<i>con:ránic</i> , <i>-comarnic</i>).	
2.6. Preverbs and corresponding prepositions (<i>as</i> , <i>a</i>).	7

2.7. Orthographic considerations.	7
2.8. Devoicing effect of lenited <i>s</i> (<i>im:soí, -impai</i>).	7
2.9. Morphophonemic anomalies:	7
(a) Vowel fluctuations.	
(b) Interaction between deuterotonic and prototonic.	
(c) Suppletive dependent forms (<i>fo:ceird, -cuirethar</i>).	
(d) Deletion of pretonic preverb (<i>ad:ágathar, -ágathar</i>).	
(e) Confusion between pretonic <i>in, ad, as</i> .	
3.1. The minimal (<i>beirid</i>) and binary (<i>ní:beir, do:beir, ní:tabair</i>) complex.	9
3.2. Infixes and suffixes:	9
3.3. The basic object pronouns:	10
Effects of suffixing pronouns to independent simple verbs:	
(a) Retained <i>th</i> (<i>ain[†]gid, ain[†]gith-i</i>).	
(b) Syncope (<i>beirid, beir[†]th-i</i>).	
(c) Delenition (<i>benaid, ben[†]t-ai</i>).	
(d) Peculiarities of <i>a.tá</i> (<i>táth-um, boíth-us</i> etc.)	
and the <i>a</i> -subjunctive (<i>snáidid, snáid[†]s-innn</i>).	
(e) Loss of deponent inflection (<i>bertaigidir, bertaig[†]th-ius</i>).	
3sg. m. /n. <i>-(a)it</i> for <i>-(a)i</i> with 3pl. verbs (<i>gébait, géb[†]t-ait</i>).	11
Infixes and suffixes:	11
3.4. The 'empty' particle <i>no</i> for conversion of a minimal to a binary	
complex compatible with infixed pronouns (e.g. <i>no-s:nguid</i> for <i>guit[†]t-ius</i>).	12
3.5. Composite infixed pronouns:	12
Non-mutated ('class B') forms (e.g. <i>a-tam:grennat</i> from <i>in:grennat</i>).	
Nasalized ('class C') forms (e.g. <i>i-ndam:erbainn</i>).	
Peculiar forms with negative <i>na</i> (e.g. <i>na-cham:dermainte</i>).	
3.6. Relative markers:	14
The binary complex and infixed lenition (<i>fo:ceird, rel. fo:cheird</i>).	
The minimal complex and relative suffixes (<i>caraid, rel. caras</i>)	
or transformation to <i>no</i> plus infixed lenition (<i>caraim, rel. no:charaim</i>).	
Object pronouns in relative clauses and lenited ('class C')	
composite forms (e.g. <i>f-a:ruar, rel. fo-d:ruar</i> or <i>ní:beir, rel. nach:beir</i>).	15
3.7. The nasalizing relative clause (<i>as:mbeir, in tan mberes</i> etc.).	15

4. Emphasizing particles (<i>no-s:n, guid-som</i> etc.).	16
Lack of stressed or independent subject and object pronouns in Old Irish.	
5. Basic shapes of the verbal complex.	17
Clause-initial verbs and clefting for emphasis.	17
Some remarks on the copula.	18

Chapter II *Weak, Strong and Hiatus Verbs.* 21

1. The central tense or mood categories and stems of the verb.	21
The periphrastic 'progressive' forms (<i>biuu-sa oc irbáig</i>).	22
2.1. Weak, strong and hiatus verbs.	23
2.2. Weak verbs:	23
Derivation (factitive, denominative, causative and primary).	
Basic inflectional characteristics.	
2.3. Strong verbs (primary):	24
Basic, if somewhat diverse, inflectional characteristics.	
2.4. Hiatus verbs:	24
Apparently 'strong' and 'weak' attributes.	
Peculiar present hiatus.	
3. Concordance of classificatory notations (<i>EIV, GOI</i> and <i>OIPG</i>).	25

Chapter III *The Present Stem.* 27

1. Preliminaries.	27
2. Weak presents: W1, 2a and 2b.	27
3. Hiatus presents:	28
H1, 2 and 3 with radical <i>a</i> (<i>baid</i>), <i>i</i> (<i>gniid</i>) and <i>e/o/u</i> (<i>sceid, soid, as:luí</i>).	
4.1. Strong S1 presents with variable quality of the root-final consonant:	29
(a) Basically 2sg., 3sg. and pl. palatal, otherwise non-palatal:	
S1a types <i>-beir, -berat; -laig, -legat; -ib, -ebat</i>	29
(b) S1b type stressed <i>-reith</i> , unstressed <i>-ret/-rat</i> in 3sg. conj.	29
(c) Palatal in 3sg. conj. only, S1c type <i>-oirc, -orcat</i>	30
(d) Nasal plus consonant in present only, S1d type <i>con:utain, g, -mairn</i>	30

4.2. Strong S2 presents with palatal final throughout (-gaib, -gaibet).	31
4.3. S3 types with non-fluctuating stem-final <i>n</i> in pres. only (-ben, -benat). . .	31

Chapter IV *The Subjunctive Stem*. 33

1. Basic types.	33
-------------------------	----

2.1. The <i>s</i> -subjunctive:	33
---	----

Distribution.

Basic formation (pres. *téit*, *tiagait*, subj. *téis*, *tíasait*).

The stressed 3sg. conj. (-*té*) and syncope (3pl. *fo:losat*, -*ful^tsat*).

2.2. The unstressed 3sg. conj. (<i>at:ré</i> , - <i>éir</i> but <i>con:í</i> , - <i>cumai</i>).	34
---	----

2.3. <i>S</i> -subjunctive stems in - <i>rr</i> (-) or - <i>ll</i> (-) (<i>fris:orr</i> , <i>fris:orrat</i>).	34
---	----

2.4. Relationship between present and <i>s</i> -subjunctive vocalism.	34
---	----

3. The stressed <i>e</i> -subjunctive of most H2 verbs (<i>do:gné</i> , <i>do:gnet</i>).	35
--	----

4.1. The <i>a</i> -subjunctive:	36
---	----

Distribution.

Final consonance

(pres. W1 -*marba*, W2a -*léici*, S2 -*gaib* vs subj. -*marba*, -*léicea*, -*gaba*).

4.2. Exceptional divergences from vocalism of present.	37
--	----

(pres. *do:lugi*, *at:baill* vs. subj. *do:loga*, *at:bela*).

4.3. The <i>a</i> -subj. of roots with final vowel (most S3, H1 and H3).	38
--	----

Chapter V *The Future Stem*. 41

1. Basic types.	41
-------------------------	----

2.1. The <i>f</i> -future:	41
--------------------------------------	----

Underlying suffix -*if*(-).

Voicing of *f* to *b* where vowel of suffix is retained (3pl. -*prid^tchahat*).

Forms with syncope of suffixal vowel before *f* (3sg. *do:luich^tfea*).

Fluctuations between palatal and non-palatal *f/b* (*do:lug^tfa*).

2.2. Occasional spread of <i>f</i> -future beyond weak and H3 verbs.	42
--	----

3.1. The <i>s</i> -future:	43
--------------------------------------	----

Almost invariable correlation with *s*-subjunctive.

Unreduplicated type identical with corresponding <i>s</i> -subjunctives.	
3.2. Reduplicated type (3sg. rel. subj. <i>ges</i> , fut. <i>giges</i>).	44
3.3. Occasional surrogates of reduplication.	44
(<i>ro:fiastar</i> , <i>ís</i> - inflected like <i>a</i> -fut.).	
3.4. The 3sg. conj. of the <i>s</i> -future.	45
4. The reduplicated (or surrogate) <i>i</i> -future (most H2 and S3, <i>as:riri</i>).	45
5.1. The reduplicated <i>a</i> -future (<i>-did[†]ma</i> , <i>bebaid</i> , <i>-ebla</i>).	46
5.2. Long vowel surrogates of reduplication, notably <i>é</i> (<i>-béra</i> , <i>do:géna</i>).	47
5.3. Suppletive <i>a</i> -futures of <i>agid</i> , <i>téit</i> and their compounds.	48
6. Loss of unstressed reduplicators:	49
(a) By syncope (<i>do:for-(m*)ma</i>).	
(b) By dissimilation plus diphthongization (<i>fo:cicher</i> but <i>-foícher</i>).	

Chapter VI *The Preterite Active Stem*. 51

1. Basic types.	51
2.1. The suffixless preterite:	51
2.2. Reduplicated formations (pres. <i>-maid</i> , <i>-ren</i> , pret. <i>(-)memaid</i> , <i>(-)rir</i>):	51
Loss of reduplicator by syncope (<i>con:bobaig</i> , <i>-cum(b[†])baig</i>).	
Effects of extra reduplicating syllable (3pl. <i>(-)cech[†]natar</i>).	
2.3. Long vowel surrogates of reduplication (<i>fích</i> , <i>ad:géuin</i>).	53
2.4. The suffixless <i>á</i> -preterite (pres. <i>-reith</i> , pret. <i>(-)ráith</i>).	53
2.5. The suffixless <i>a</i> -preterite (pres. <i>fo:ceird</i> , pret. <i>fo:caird</i>).	54
2.6. Irregular reduplication of <i>-ic</i> compounds (<i>-ánaic</i>).	54
2.7. Suppletive suffixless <i>fo:fúair</i> , <i>luid</i> etc., <i>do:cer</i> , <i>at:bath</i> .	54
3.1. The <i>t</i> -preterite (pres. <i>-ceil</i> , <i>-sern</i> , <i>-aig</i> , pret. <i>-celt</i> , <i>-sert</i> , <i>-acht</i>).	54
3.2. Reduplicated <i>t</i> -pret. (<i>-siacht</i> , from <i>-saig</i> and cpds. only).	55
4.1. The <i>s</i> -preterite (most weak and hiatus verbs):	56
4.2. The basic <i>s</i> -preterite (weak, strong in <i>-b</i> , H3; <i>marbais</i> , <i>-marb</i>):	56
3sg. conj. <i>-i</i> (some W2a) versus zero (elsewhere).	
4.3. The reduplicated <i>s</i> -preterite, including long vowel surrogates	57
(H1, many H2; pres. <i>baid</i> , <i>gniid</i> , pret. <i>bebais</i> , <i>génais</i>).	

Chapter VII The Preterite Passive Stem.	59
1. Phonetically conditioned variants of underlying <i>t</i> suffix	59
2. Realized as <i>th</i> after a vowel (but unstressed <i>-Vth</i> usually to <i>-Vd</i>).	59
Basic type correlating with basic <i>s</i> -pret. act. (<i>marb^tthae</i> , <i>-marbad</i>).	
Addition to vowel-final roots, (H1, H2, most S3; <i>-gníth</i> , <i>-bíth</i>).	
After inverted <i>-er</i> , <i>-el</i> of some S1a and S3 (<i>-breth</i> , <i>-cleth</i> , <i>-sreth</i>).	
3. Realized as voiceless or voiced <i>t</i> :	60
Voiceless /t/ after <i>l</i> or <i>ch</i> (pres. <i>-ail</i> , <i>-anaig</i> , pret. pass. <i>-alt</i> , <i>-anacht</i>).	
Voiced /d/ by merger with <i>m</i> or <i>n</i> (pres. <i>-daim</i> , <i>-cain</i> , pret. pass. <i>-dét</i> , <i>-cét</i>).	
4. Realized as <i>s(s)</i> in combination with a dental	60
(pres. <i>-claid</i> , pret. pass. <i>-class</i>).	
5. Peculiarities in vocalism of some preterite passives.	61
6. Suppletive <i>fo:fríth</i> (<i>fo:gaib</i>) and <i>-eth</i> (<i>téit</i> and cpds.).	61
Chapter VIII The Personal Inflections.	63
1. Indispensability as mostly unambiguous indicators of person and number.	63
Classificatory and notational preliminaries.	64
2.1. The basic active set and its range:	65
2.2. The basic active plural.	65
2.3. The third person singular:	66
(a) 3sg. absolute forms.	
(b) 3sg. relative forms.	
(c) 3sg. conjunct forms.	
2.4. The first person singular:	67
The various formations.	
Spread of <i>-(a)im(m)</i> in the present.	
2.5. The second person singular:	69
The various formations.	
Some ambiguities and the spread of <i>-(a)i</i> in the present.	
3.1. The imperative active set added to the present stem.	70

3.2. Exceptional 2sg. imperative resembling <i>e-</i> or <i>s-</i> subjunctives.	71
4. The suffixless preterite active set:	72
The earliest system undifferentiated for absolute and conjunct.	
New distinct 1 and 3pl. absolutes.	
Personal inflections of the <i>t</i> -preterite.	73
5.1. The deponent endings:	74
Overall distribution.	74
Beginnings of the erosion of a distinct deponent inflection.	75
5.2. The basic deponent set and its range.	75
Some divergent syncope patterns (e.g. <i>s</i> -pret. 3sg. <i>-astar</i> , 3pl. <i>-se/atar</i>).	
5.3. The imperative deponent.	77
5.4. The suffixless preterite deponent:	78
The standard type.	
<i>Ro:ftir</i> .	
Compounds of <i>-sissedar</i> and <i>saidid</i> .	
Deponent suffixless preterite of some non-deponent verbs.	
6.1. The basic (non-preterite) passive endings (third person only):	79
6.2. 3sg. plus infixed pronoun to express 1/2sg./pl.	80
6.3. Passive and deponent 3pl. syncope patterns.	80
6.4. Distribution of 3sg. passive <i>-(a)ir</i> , <i>-ar</i> and <i>-(a)ithir</i> , <i>-(a)ither</i>	81
6.5. Further to passive and deponent syncope patterns (3sg. and 3pl.).	82
6.6. The preterite passive endings.	85
7.1. The imperfect endings, their range and functions:	85
Invariably conjunct with prefixed <i>no</i> in the absence of another proclitic.	
Table of endings and further examples.	
7.2. Quality of the stem-final consonant in the imperfect especially.	87
 Chapter IX <i>Composition and the Augment</i>	 89
1.1. The positional hierarchy of preverbs in primary composition.	89
1.2. Secondary composition (prim. <i>fo:daim</i> , sec. <i>con:fodaim</i>).	90
2.1. Grammaticalization of certain preverbs (<i>ro</i> etc.) as augments.	91
2.2. A preliminary sketch of augment morphology.	92

3.1. Syntax of the augment, potential and resultative usage:	93
3.2.1. Augmented preterite referring to the moment of utterance:	93
Frequent broad correspondence to English 'have' perfects.	93
Numerous instances where this semantic correlation breaks down.	94
Discrepancies in use of the augm. pret. between narrative and dialogue in the OIr. <i>Bethu Brigte</i>	96
Conclusions.	98
3.2.2. Augmented preterite referring to a truly present verbal action.	98
Augmented preterite referring to a past verbal action and roughly equivalent to an English 'had' pluperfect.	99
Replacement of augm. pret. by augm. past subj. in this environment.	100
3.2.3. Resultative augm. present or subjunctive to denote anterior completion of a subordinate-clause action dependent on a main-clause general present. . .	101
The shift to augm. imperfect indicat or subj. to mark habitual or repeated completion of an action subordinated to a main clause imperfect.	103
3.2.4. Lack of a distinction in OIr. between potential 'would' and unreal 'would have' conditionals by augment or other means.	104
Augm. subjunctive of completed subordinate action referring to a main-clause future or conditional.	105
Apparent immunity of future and conditional to resultative augmentation. . .	105
3.2.5. Summary of resultative usage.	106
<i>Acht</i> 'provided that' and <i>resú</i> 'before' plus augmented subjunctive	106
3.3.1. The potential augment:	107
Possible incompatibility with a preterite.	107
Potential augm. imperfect.	107
Potential augm. present and subjunctive.	108
Potential augm. future and conditional.	109
3.3.2. Potential augm. subj. of wish:	109
In main clauses.	109
In subordinate clauses of purpose introduced by <i>co</i> , <i>ara</i> etc.	110
4.1. Excursus on the origins of resultative/potential augmentation:	111
Perfective and imperfective aspect.	111
Mode of action ('Aktionsart'), e.g. iterative, durative.	112

Inherently punctual (and non-contemporary) telic mode.	112
Telicizing preverbs and telic verbs.	113
Telic OIr. verbs incompatible with augmentation (e.g. <i>-ic</i> cpds.).	114
<i>Beirid</i> , <i>do:beir</i> and telic augm. <i>r(o:)uccai</i> , <i>do.uccai/(-) tuccai</i>	115
OIr. resultative/potential and the telic effects of certain preverbs.	116
Acquisition of telic counterparts by atelic verbs	116
Shift from telicity or perfectivity to resultativity	117
The commensurate shift to potentiality (cf. <i>ad.cota</i> , <i>-éta</i>).	118
Insular Celtic date of this shift on British evidence.	119
Recapitulation.	120
Compatibility of many telic OIr. verbs with augmentation demonstrates lack of a synchronic connection between augment and telicity.	120
4.2. Terminology and survey of previous work on OIr. augment syntax. . . .	121
 Chapter X <i>The Augment and Simple Verbs</i>.	127
1. Suppletive augm. <i>do:ella</i> (<i>gataid</i>), <i>r(o:)uccai</i> (<i>beirid</i>), <i>do:coat</i> (<i>téit</i>)	127
2. Augments other than <i>ro</i> with <i>ibid</i> , <i>ithid</i> , <i>saidid</i> , <i>laigid</i> , <i>mligid</i> , <i>tongid</i> . . .	128
3.1. <i>Ro</i> as augment of remaining simple verbs.	128
Alternation between preverb (<i>ní:r'an</i>) and conjunct particle (<i>ní-ro:an</i>) status. . .	128
3.2. Shift of augment <i>ro</i> from preverb to conjunct particle behaviour.	129
3.3. <i>Ro</i> and dissimilatory diphthongization (<i>ro:mmemaid</i> but <i>-róemaid</i>). . . .	130
 Chapter XI <i>The Augment and Compound Verbs</i>.	133
1. Suppletive types:	133
<i>Do:beir</i> , augm. <i>do:uccai</i> , <i>do:ratai</i> . Several <i>téit</i> compounds, e.g. <i>do:tét</i> , augm. <i>do:dichet</i> . <i>Fo:ceird</i> , <i>-cuirethar</i> (and cpds.), augm. <i>ro:lá(a)</i> , <i>-ralae</i> .	
2.1. The preverbal augments <i>ad</i> , <i>cum</i> and <i>ro</i> :	134
2.2. <i>Ad</i> augmenting verbs of shape <i>cum-C-</i> (<i>con:boing</i> , <i>con:abbaing</i>).	135
2.3. <i>Cum</i> augmenting about twenty strong verbs (<i>fris:ort</i> , <i>fris:com-art</i>). . . .	136
2.4. <i>Ro</i> as otherwise general augment (<i>as:bert/-epert</i> vs. <i>as:rubart/-érbart</i>). . .	138

Preverbal <i>ro</i> augmenting weak as well as strong verbs.	139
Disappearance or obscuring of syncopated <i>ro</i> in the vicinity of <i>r</i> (augm. pret. <i>do:etar(r^t)rid</i>) and <i>fo-ro-r-</i> for <i>for-ro-</i>	139
2.5. Interaction between independent and dependent augmented forms (e.g. augm. pret. <i>-torsat</i> generating <i>do:forsat</i> alongside <i>do:rósat</i>).	140
Complex fourfold opposition between prot. and deut., unaugm. (pret. <i>do:géni, -digni</i>) and augm. (<i>do:rigni, -deirgéni</i>):	140
Resultant pressures and confusions (e.g. <i>do:rigéni, -der(g)ni</i>).	142
2.6. Stressed <i>roí-</i> surrogate of <i>ro</i> plus reduplicator (<i>for:roíchan</i>):	143
Interchange of <i>ro</i> (<i>for:rochan</i>) and <i>roí</i> (<i>ad:róethach</i>).	144
Triggering of <i>com/coím</i> (<i>do:comarraig</i> or <i>do:coímarraig</i>).	144
3.1. Roots immune to meaningful augmentation:	144
No augment whatever (<i>-ic</i> and <i>-gni(n)</i> cpds., <i>do:futhracair</i>).	144
Non-functional augment in independent forms only (<i>(ro)-finnathar, (ro)-cluínethar, (ro)-laimethar, ad:cota/-éta</i>).	145
3.2. Unaugmentable <i>ro-</i> and other compounds (<i>do:rochoíni, fo:gaib</i>):	145
Defective development of a meaningful augment by <i>ad:cí</i>	146
4.1. Frequent deviation of augment <i>ro</i> from preverbal position:	147
Problems confronting Thurneysen's doctrine of 'fixed' vs. 'movable' <i>ro</i>	148
4.2. Prevocalic <i>ro</i> (augm. pret. 3pl. <i>as:r'ingabsat, -r'esngabsat</i>):	149
Innovatory nature of this pattern (<i>do:r'intai</i> vs. <i>do:intarraí</i>).	150
Hitherto lacking augment for some <i>ro</i> -cpds. (<i>-r'érhoil</i>).	150
Explains some apparent instances of 'movable' <i>ro</i>	151
Augm. pret. <i>ar:roít</i> (unaugm. pres. <i>ar:foím</i>) probably analogical.	152
Unusual type <i>-fár^tcaib</i> analogical to normal <i>fo:r'ácaib</i> etc.	153
Overall conclusion.	154
4.3. Limitations of prevocalic and rise of proclitic <i>ro</i>:	154
Attached to a conjunct particle (<i>ní-ro:héla</i> vs. <i>-érle, in-ru:etarscar</i> vs. <i>in:r'etarscar</i>).	154
Shift of preverbal <i>ro</i> to proclitic in some deuterotonic compounds (e.g. <i>do:rolluind</i> to <i>do-ro:sluind</i>).	155
Exceptional <i>con:toróe</i> to <i>co-ru:thoí</i>	156
Further explanatory advantages over 'movable' <i>ro</i>	156

Provision of hitherto lacking augm. for some <i>ro</i> -cpds. (<i>ní-ru:derchoín</i>). . . .	157
4.4. Recapitulation of <i>ro</i> 's evolving positional behaviour in Old Irish. . . .	157
Synopsis of the basic synchronic possibilities for augm. <i>ro</i> 's position.	160
 Chapter XII Key 'Middle Irish' Developments.	163
 1. Old, Middle and Modern Irish - practicalities and definitions.	163
2.1. Changes in the system of suffixed and infixed pronouns:	169
(a) <i>a/o</i> alternations (<i>ro:</i> or <i>ra:gab</i> , <i>r-a:</i> or <i>ro:ngab</i> etc.).	
(b) 1pl. <i>ar</i> , 2pl. <i>b/far</i> for OIr. <i>n(n)</i> , <i>b</i> (e.g. <i>do-for:ficba</i>).	
(c) Interchange of basic ('class A') and lenited composite ('class C') infix pronouns even in the 3sg.	
(d) Composite 3sg. m. <i>(n)d/ta</i> , 3sg. f. and 3pl. <i>(n)d/tas</i> for OIr. <i>(n)d/t</i> and <i>(n)d/ta</i> respectively.	
(e) Confusion between m. and f. forms in 3sg. (<i>no-s:geib</i> 'seizes him').	
2.2. Loss of distinct neuter and petrification of 3sg. n. pronouns.	171
(a) Composite ('class B') type <i>at:beir</i> , <i>at:chí</i> for OIr. <i>as:beir</i> , <i>ad:cí</i>	172
(b) Main-clause lenition, <i>fo:cheird</i> (OIr. <i>f-a:cheird</i>) for OIr. <i>fo:ceird</i>	173
(c) Petrified suffixed pronouns (e.g. <i>gaibhi</i> , <i>bértait</i>).	174
1pl. abs. <i>-m(a)it</i> for <i>-m(a)i</i> , 1sg. fut. <i>-(a)it</i> or <i>-et/-at</i> .	
(d) Relative <i>d</i> , e.g. <i>du-d:uic</i> 'which he has cited'.	175
(c) Occasional petrification of <i>s</i>	175
2.3. Rise of independent stressed pronouns:	175
As object (e.g. <i>ro:sáraig... hé</i> , mixed <i>no-s:beir... íat</i>).	176
As subject (e.g. <i>tucad... hí</i> , <i>ra:chuibrig sé</i>).	177
2.4. Lengthening of vowel in certain personal endings, e.g. 3pl. pret. <i>-tár</i> , ipf. <i>-tís</i>	178
3.1. Convergence of non-rel. and rel. deuterotonic forms of compounds. . . .	179
3.2. Expanding use of relative lenition:	180
(a) Leniting for nasalizing relatives (e.g. <i>resíu ad:cheth</i>).	
(b) Rel. for non-rel. in cleft sentences (e.g. <i>is orot rirfes</i>).	
(c) Lenited initial of rel. simple verbs (e.g. <i>charas</i>).	
3.3. Changes in rules of relative and copular concord:	181

Sg. antecedent/predicate with 3sg., pl. with 3pl. verb.	
Early examples of 1 or 2pl. with 3sg. verb (<i>ní sní du-d:rigni</i>).	
Sporadic 3pl. pron. or pl. noun with 3sg. verb (<i>is íat do-d:róni</i>).	
Implications for relative morphology.	
3.4. Abs. endings for rel. forms outside the 3sg.	182
Fluctuation between originally rel. broad and originally abs. slender -r	
in the passive (e.g. rel. <i>ármthir</i> , non-rel. <i>cladar</i>).	183
Rare literary 3pl. rel. -th(a)e etc.	183
4.1. Modification of the augmented vs. unaugmented dichotomy:	183
Loss of semantic distinctions between augm. and unaugm.	184
Loss of augm. forms in Mod. Ir. apart from vestiges in subj.	
and generalized augm. in pret.	184
Middle Irish trends in this direction.	185
4.2. Where augment survived, tendency to generalize proclitic <i>ro</i>	187
(a) Final stage of <i>ro</i> 's progress to an invariably proclitic conjunct particle	
(<i>ro:thepi</i> for <i>do:érbai</i> or <i>do:r'epi</i>).	187
Apocope of C- <i>ro</i> : to C- <i>r</i> : (e.g. <i>ní-r:léicsetar</i>).	188
(b) <i>Ro</i> replacing other augments (<i>ra:chotail</i> for <i>con:a-tail</i>).	188
(c) Encroachment of <i>ro</i> on some hitherto unaugmentable verbs	
(e.g. <i>ru:thánic</i> , <i>do:r'ánic</i>).	189
4.3. <i>Do</i> for <i>ro</i> (<i>do:chachain</i>) and hypercorrect <i>ro</i> for <i>do</i> (<i>ro:chúaid</i>).	189
<i>Do:ri(n)gni</i> , - <i>derna</i> and <i>at:(r)ubairt</i>	190
5.1. Decline of compound verbs between Old and Mod. Ir.:	191
5.2. New simple verbs based upon:	191
(a) prototonic stem of compounds (<i>díltaid</i> for <i>do:sluindi</i> vs. - <i>díltai</i>).	192
(b) verbal nouns (<i>díglaid</i> , from vn. <i>dígal</i> , for <i>do:fich</i> , - <i>dích</i>).	193
(c) either (<i>togaid</i> for <i>do:goa</i> from prot. - <i>toga</i> or vn. <i>togu</i>).	194
-Ø and (denominative) - <i>aig</i> - doublets (<i>aithnid</i> or <i>aithnigid</i>).	
5.3. 'Dummy' reiterated first preverb in independent forms	194
(<i>con:compred</i> for <i>con:breth</i> , <i>do:thaitni</i> for <i>do:aitni</i> vs. dep. - <i>compred</i> , - <i>taitni</i>).	
Fluctuations between new simple <i>ro:thidnacht</i> and 'dummy' preverb type	
<i>do:thidnacht</i> as starting point for replacement of <i>ro</i> by <i>do</i>	196
Similarly <i>do</i> for <i>no</i> (ipf. simple <i>no:thimthired</i> , 'dummy' <i>do:thimthired</i>). ...	197

Interchangeable <i>ro</i> = <i>do</i> = <i>no</i> leading to <i>ro</i> for <i>no</i> , especially to infix pronouns (<i>ra-t:meliub</i> etc.).	197
5.4. Confusion of pretonic preverbs in moribund deuterotonic forms.	197
5.5.1. Spread of prosthetic <i>f</i> (<i>do:fuc</i> for <i>do:uc</i> , <i>fostaíd</i> from <i>-astai</i>).	199
5.5.2. Occasional hypercorrect compounds (1sg. <i>do:thung</i>).	200
5.5.3. Pressure on suppletive forms (e.g. <i>ro:thuit</i> for <i>do:rochair</i>).	201
New skewed paradigms (e.g. 1sg. subj. <i>-torchror</i>).	202
5.5.4. Interaction between syncopated and unsyncopated alternants (e.g. <i>con:ís^ttais</i> , <i>-cóem^tsaitis</i> or analogical <i>-cóemstais</i>).	202
6.1.1. Towards a homogeneous present indicative inflection:	203
6.1.2. Near generalization of 1sg. <i>-im(m)</i>	203
6.1.3. Near generalization of 2sg. <i>-(a)i</i> , <i>-(a)e</i>	204
Contraction of stressed hiatus groups (3pl. <i>a-tát</i> for <i>a-taat</i> etc.).	
6.1.4. Pressure towards remodelling the weak 3sg. conj. <i>-e (-i)</i> , <i>-a</i> :	205
Introduction of endingless 'strong' 3sg. (e.g. <i>ní-m:léic</i>).	205
Development and spread of 3sg. conj. <i>-enn/-ann</i>	205
6.1.5. Conspectus of the new homogenized and simplified inflection.	208
6.2. Spread of weak stem formations (<i>a</i> -subj., <i>f</i> -fut., <i>s</i> -pret., <i>th</i> -pret. pass.) from pres. stem of old strong verbs (<i>-bena</i> , <i>-benfa</i> , <i>-ben</i> , <i>-benad</i>).	209
Tendencies towards homogenization of root-final consonant quality (e.g. OIr. pres. <i>gaibid</i> , pret. <i>(ro)-gab</i> , later also <i>gabaid</i> , <i>(ro)-gaib</i>).	212
6.3. Hybrids between old strong and new weak formations	213
(e.g. <i>ro:lin</i> vs. old <i>ro:lil</i> /new <i>ro:len</i> , fut <i>-cechlabat</i> for <i>-cechlatar</i>).	
6.4.1. Formal merger of non-deponent and deponent active inflections, generally in favour of former (e.g. <i>-lesaigend</i> for <i>-lesaigethar</i>).	216
6.4.2. Survival and spread of originally deponent endings at two points: (a) 3sg. <i>s</i> -pret. <i>-estar/-astar</i> (e.g. <i>ro:chruthaigestar</i> or <i>ro:chruthaig</i> , whence <i>ro:char</i> or <i>ro:charastar</i> etc.).	216
(b) 1 sg. <i>a</i> -subj. <i>-er/-ar</i> or <i>-(i)ur</i> (e.g. <i>-érbalur</i>).	217
6.4.3. Innovatory deponent formations: (a) Subj. 2 and 3sg. <i>-ara</i> , 3pl. <i>-arat</i> , back-formations from 1sg. <i>-ar</i>	218
(b) Suffixless pret. 3pl. deponent <i>-artar</i> , <i>-ratar</i> for <i>-atar</i>	218
6.5. Developments in subjunctive inflection, including vestigial 2sg. <i>-(a)ir</i>	219

6.6.1. Spread of <i>f</i> - and <i>é</i> -futures over other types:	220
6.6.2. <i>F</i> -fut. dominant with stressed monosyllabic bases (type <i>léic^tfid</i>).	221
Limited competition from the <i>é</i> -fut. (- <i>déma</i> , OIr. redup. - <i>did^tma</i>).	221
Rare shortening of latter to <i>e</i> -fut. (1sg. <i>ní:chel</i> , OIr. <i>ní:cél</i>).	222
6.6.3. Spread of <i>é</i> -fut. in disyllabic bases, esp. with - <i>r</i> or - <i>l</i> (<i>im^trid</i> , pret. <i>ro:immir</i> , fut. <i>imméraid</i>), even at expense of <i>f</i> -fut. (W1 <i>lomraid</i> , <i>loméraid</i>).	222
Syncope of fut. <i>é</i> in a few common verbs (e.g. - <i>tibred</i> , OIr. - <i>tibérad</i>).	223
Tendency to replace unstressed vowels before a liquid, nasal or <i>b</i> in the fut. by <i>é</i> (pass. <i>ebéltair</i> , 1sg. - <i>didém</i> , - <i>anéb</i>).	223
<i>F</i> -fut. in - <i>Vb</i> - to - <i>éb</i> - (- <i>aidléba</i> , OIr. - <i>aid^tlibea</i>) prone to spread (<i>ailébthair</i>).	223
The - <i>áb</i> -/- <i>ób</i> - fut. and <i>á</i> / <i>ó</i> alternances originating in some H3 verbs.	224
6.6.4. Development of unstressed - <i>eó</i> - alongside - <i>é</i> - in the future.	225
Beginnings of the - <i>ég</i> -/- <i>eóg</i> - or - <i>éch</i> -/- <i>eóch</i> - fut. of -(<i>a</i>) <i>ig</i> - verbs with original <i>f</i> -fut. (<i>deléchaid</i> etc. for <i>deiligfid(ir)</i>).	226
Variant <i>rech</i> -/- <i>rach</i> - alongside <i>reg</i> -/- <i>rag</i> - in suppletive fut. of <i>téit</i>	227
6.6.5. Development of the fut. 1 sg. abs. in - <i>et</i> -/- <i>at</i> (<i>bérat</i> , <i>foídfet</i> etc.).	227
Discrepant treatment of predesinential vowels in <i>f</i> - (1pl. <i>an^tfamit</i>) and <i>é</i> -futures (1pl. <i>géb^tmait</i>).	227
6.7. Changes in passive-impersonal inflection:	228
(a) Interchange of palatal and non-palatal - <i>r</i> .	
(b) Occasional confusion between - <i>a(i)r</i> and -(<i>a</i>) <i>ithir/er</i> .	
(c) Passive for third person deponent.	
(d) Pressures in preterite passive inflection and 3sg. conj. - <i>the</i> -/- <i>tha</i>	228
(e) Further pressures, and the new 3pl. conj. pret. pass. -(<i>a</i>) <i>it</i>	229
Possible influence from the copula (<i>is-am</i> , <i>is-at</i> etc.).	231
(f) Limited spread of - <i>s</i> pret. pass. (e.g. - <i>fúaross</i> for - <i>fríth</i>).	232
6.8. Formal convergence of pret. act. and pass. stems	232
(e.g. <i>do:ri(n)gne</i> , pass. <i>do:rónad</i> , later also <i>do:róne</i> , pass. <i>do:ri(n)gned</i>).	
6.9.1. (a) Old conjunct endings even with unaugm. <i>s</i> -prets. of indep. simple verbs outside the 3sg. (e.g. 1sg. <i>gabús</i> , 3pl. <i>gabsat</i>).	234
Rare 3pl. abs. type <i>lotair</i> alongside old <i>lotar</i>	235
Conj. for abs. even in 3sg. of indep. simple <i>t</i> -pret. (e.g. <i>ort</i> , <i>bert</i>).	
(b) New pret. 2pl. -(<i>a</i>) <i>bair</i> (e.g. <i>táncabair</i>).	235

(c) 3sg. conj. <i>s</i> -pret. in <i>-a(i)</i> , <i>-i/-e</i> (e.g. W1 <i>ro:scrútai</i> , W2a <i>ro:léice</i>).	236
6.9.2. Continuing importance of distinctive personal inflections:	236
(a) Identical 1 and 2sg. of OIr. suffixless pret. resolved by taking over	
2sg. <i>-(a)is</i> and often 1sg. <i>-(i)us</i> from <i>s</i> -pret.	237
Development of variant 2sg. <i>-adais</i> etc. in some verbs.	237
Homogenized sg. triggers all-purpose pl. paradigm with interchangeable	
variants, e.g. 3pl. <i>-atar</i> , <i>-sat</i> or hybrid <i>-satar</i>	238
(b) Identical <i>t</i> -pret. 1 and 3sg. (<i>at:rubart</i>) triggers pal. 3sg. (<i>at:rubairt</i>). . . .	240
2 and 3sg. <i>at:rubairt</i> etc. trigger 2sg. <i>at:rubartais</i> etc.,	
whence sometimes 1sg. <i>at:rubartus</i> etc.	240
Optional <i>s</i> -plurals (e.g. <i>do:bertsat</i> , <i>ra:bertsatar</i>).	240
Strong tendency to lose <i>t</i> -suffix (e.g. <i>ro:sern</i> for <i>ro:sert</i> , 3pl. <i>at:rubratar</i>). .	240
7. Concluding remarks.	241
Appendix on Old Irish orthography and pronunciation.	243
List of abbreviations.	249
Index Verborum	251

Foreword

Now that the first edition of this work has sold out, something more than a mere reprint seems to be in order after ten years. Revision of the text itself has been fairly slight overall, the most substantial expansions being more detailed comments on the quality of the stem-final consonant of W2 presents (plus W1 *pridchid*) in III.2 and the extra section (XII.2.4) on the lengthening of the vowel in various Middle Irish endings. Having on occasion myself found difficulty in locating forms that I remembered discussing in the first edition, I have felt bound to acknowledge the justice of one reviewer's regret at the absence of an index and to attempt to realize his hope 'that this omission will be rectified in future editions' (Ruairí Ó hUiginn, *Éigse* 24, 191). The result, in double columns on pages 251-91, is what is intended to be a comprehensive index of the finite Old and Middle Irish verbal forms (excluding such Modern Irish and non-finite forms as figure from time to time) treated in the main body of the book. I have, however, persisted in my opinion that a detailed table of contents would be more useful than a subject index and that fully referenced discussions of scholarly debate on various topics would be more likely to encumber than to enhance the presentation in most cases.

The central aims of this book also remain the same as those enunciated on page xxvi of the introduction to the first edition, namely to present a description of the Old and Middle Irish verbal systems geared to 'the internal dynamics of the system, to pressures favouring change and to many changes that in fact took place within and between Old and Middle Irish' while generally eschewing 'the reconstruction of unattested prehistoric forms by comparative or other means on the grounds that those, including the present writer, interested in this dimension are well served elsewhere, while those unversed in such matters are more likely to be confused than enlightened by explanations geared to Celtic and Indo-European prehistory'.

In a remarkably irrelevant review of *The Early Irish Verb* in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 19 (1990), 69-75, Karl Horst Schmidt repeatedly urged the indispensability of the prehistoric, i.e. comparative Celtic and Indo-European, dimension to a proper understanding of Old Irish (a notion that would presumably have come as something of a surprise to the medieval Irish themselves) and claimed

on the strength of the above aims that ‘as to diachrony, the book lacks a clear conception’ (p. 69). It is, however, Schmidt who appears to lack clarity on this most basic of issues. Diachronic analysis does not necessarily entail an attempt to reconstruct the unattested prehistoric stages of a language but can be and frequently has been applied to a specific segment of a language’s attested history. The segment selected in the present work was justified on page xxvii of the introduction to the first edition on the straightforward grounds that ‘hitherto a good deal more attention has been devoted to the reconstruction of the prehistoric antecedents of Old Irish than to examining its more or less adequately documented development into Middle and thence Early Modern Irish’.

Concentration upon the verb was dictated by its generally conceded status as the most difficult and interesting area of Old and Middle Irish morphology and few would deny that an understanding of the Old Irish system’s workings and development into and through Middle Irish is a prerequisite for being able to deal with the abundance of Old and Middle Irish texts effectively. However interesting in its own right, the prehistoric dimension has little to contribute to this particular aspect. Accordingly it has been allowed to intrude only in the excursus on the origins of the augment’s basic functions in IX.4.1 as a necessary prelude to the attempt in IX.4.2 to disentangle the conceptual and terminological confusion that has bedevilled this vital corner of Old Irish grammar for the last half century or more.

It remains for me to reiterate my thanks to those who helped the first edition to see the light of day, namely Liam Breatnach, Pádraig Ó Fiannachta and my wife Katharine Simms, as well as to my revered mentor the late Professor David Greene of the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, whose unrivalled understanding of the ‘seamless garment’ of Old, Middle and Modern Irish was and continues to be a source of inspiration to me.

That garment, of course, extends to the present and it was with great sorrow that I heard of the untimely recent death of Tomás Ó Conaire of Ros Muc in the Conamara Gaeltacht. He and his wife Tríosa gave unstintingly of their friendship, hospitality and rich store of Irish over a number of summers and easters that I enjoyed in their house. I gratefully dedicate this second edition to Tom’s memory.

Kim McCone,

August, 1997.

I gcuimhne ar

Thomás Ó Conaire

Ar dheis Dé go raibh a anam

CHAPTER I

The Verbal Complex

1.1. The distinction between **simple** and **compound** verbs is fundamental to the grammar of Old Irish. Although the use of certain prefixes or **preverbs** to modify the lexical meaning of the verbal root in various ways is a widespread phenomenon in Indo-European languages and is still found, albeit on a restricted scale, in Modern English (e.g. simple *shine*, *tell* versus compound *outshine*, *foretell*), the prodigality with which this device is exploited in Old Irish is quite exceptional. There anything up to three preverbs may be freely compounded with the verbal root and sequences of four are not unknown, typical enough examples being simple *gar-* ‘call’ versus compound *to-gar-* ‘summon’, *for-cum-gar-* ‘command’, *to-ar(e)-in-gar-* ‘promise’ and so on. Not surprisingly, the proportion of compound to simple verbs in Old Irish is unusually high.

1.2. A further category of verbal prefixes comprises the so-called **conjunct particles** listed in *GOI* 28. The principal members are the various negatives, whether alone (*ní*, *na*, *nad* etc.) or in combination (*ma-ni* ‘if not’, *ce-ni* ‘although not’, *ar-na* ‘that not’ etc.), interrogative *in*, prepositional relatives (*ar-a* ‘for which’, *for-(s)a* ‘on which’, *la-sa* ‘with which’ etc.) and certain conjunctions such as nasalizing *co* ‘so that’. Whether simple or compound, a verb is deemed to be **dependent** when preceded by a conjunct particle and to be **independent** otherwise. The shift from independent to dependent position generally entails certain modifications in the verb’s form. A handful of irregular verbs still have distinct independent and dependent forms in present-day Irish (e.g. *chuaigh* ‘went’, *tá* ‘is’, but *ní dheachaigh* ‘did not go’, *an bhfuil* ‘is?’ etc.), and such alternations survive extensively in current Scots Gaelic speech and writing (e.g. *beiridh* ‘will bear’, *bheir* ‘will bring’ versus *cha bheir* ‘will not bear’ and *cha tabhair* ‘will not bring’, etc.) as well as being widespread in early Modern Irish literature. The workings of this system in Old Irish must now be examined.

1.3. The verbal expression in Old Irish consists at its simplest of the verb itself (V), but this may be further compounded with a preverb or preverbs (P) and/or preceded by a simple or composite conjunct particle (C). Accordingly it seems appropriate to speak of an Old Irish **verbal complex** that is, like the verb in all subsequent stages of Irish and Scots Gaelic, basically clause-initial and can consist of V or CV in the case of a simple verb, P(P₂₋₄)V or CP(P₂₋₄)V in the case of a compound. The descending order C, P, V governs not only claims on initial position within the verbal complex but also liability to proclisis (marked off by a following colon hereafter) or loss of accent before a following stressed element. Thus C invariably stands at the head of the complex and also invariably precedes the main stress, whereas such proclisis only affects the sole or first preverb (P) of a compound in the absence of a preceding conjunct particle and never affects V itself. The main stress (affecting the vowel in bold italics below) falls on the initial non-proclitic syllable of the verb or verbal complex. The concrete implications of this can be illustrated from the 3sg. present indicative active of *gar-* and some of its compounds mentioned in 1.1.

	INDEPENDENT	DEPENDENT
SIMPLE	<i>gairid</i> (V)	<i>ní:gair</i> (C:V)
COMPOUND	<i>do:gair</i> (P:V)	<i>ní:to-gair</i> (C:PV)
	<i>for:con-gair</i> (P:PV)	<i>ní:for-n-gair</i> (C:PPV)
	<i>do:air-n-gir</i> (P:PPV)	<i>ní:t-air-n-gir</i> (C:PPPV)

The proclitic preverb (e.g. *do:* and *for:* above) of independent compound verbs is usually termed **pretonic**. It is to be noted that two different types of inflection appear in the above table, one peculiar to independent simple verbs and another occurring in conjunction with proclitics (conjunct particle or pretonic preverb). These are known as the **absolute** and **conjunct** inflections respectively, and will be discussed more fully in chapter VIII.

Both simple and compound verbs normally have distinct independent and dependent forms but realize the difference in diametrically opposed ways. The simple verb, whether on its own or preceded by a conjunct particle, always has initial stress in accordance with the normal pattern for Old Irish words, but typically

uses the absolute endings in the former environment and the conjunct in the latter. The compound verb by contrast always has conjunct inflection but changes its stress pattern according as it is independent or dependent: in the former case the first preverb must fill the proclitic slot, leaving the stress to fall on the following element (P_2 or V), but in the latter the conjunct particle functions as proclitic and thus relegates the first preverb to stressed position. The stress pattern of the verbal complex as a whole thus remains unaltered (proclitic followed by initially stressed group), but the change from proclitic P to C has a knock-on effect, causing P to replace P_2 or V as the stressed syllable and so on. As far as the compound verb itself is concerned, it is stressed on the second element when independent ($P:[P_{2-4}]V$) and hence called **deuterotonic** but receives stress on the first element when dependent ($C:P[P_{2-4}]V$) to earn the tag **prototonic**. It will be seen that deuterotonic (*do:gair* etc.) and prototonic (*-togair* etc.) forms of compound verbs basically correlate with the absolute (*gairid* etc.) and conjunct (*-gair* etc.) inflections respectively of simple verbs as far as grammatical environment is concerned.

1.4. Some significant exceptions to the norm of distinctive absolute and conjunct inflections for simple verbs will be treated in VIII. The rule that independent compound verbs are deuterotonic is contravened by two major categories, namely the imperative of all such verbs and any tense or mood of those with prevocalic *to*, *fo* or *ro* as first preverb. Where no concrete infix (see 3.2-7) is present, the former are and the latter may be prototonic in independent position. In the case of the *to*, *fo* and *ro* compounds it seems likely that the final vowel of the pretonic preverb tended to be elided before the initial vowel of the stressed part of the verb to produce these anomalous independent prototonic forms. At any rate, the basic system may be illustrated by comparing the 3sg. present indicative of *to-ber-* 'bring' (preconsonantal *to*) with the same verb's 2sg. imperative as well as the 3sg. present indicative of *to-ar(e)-in-gar-* 'promise' (prevocalic *to*).

	DEPENDENT	INDEPENDENT	INDEP.+INFIX
2sg. ipv.	<i>na:ta-bir</i>	<i>ta-bir</i>	<i>do-s:beir</i>
3sg. pres.	<i>ní:ta-bir</i>	<i>do:beir</i>	<i>do-s:beir</i>
	<i>ní:t-air-n-gir</i>	<i>t-air-n-gir/</i>	<i>do-s:air-n-gir</i>
		<i>do:air-n-gir</i>	

2.1. Although the differentiation of prototonic from deuterotonic forms can ultimately be traced to the shift in stress, this very often acts as a catalyst for further changes that not infrequently cause the two sets to diverge considerably. Indeed, the fact that nearly all Old Irish compound verbs have two separate sets of rather different forms according as they are independent or dependent constitutes perhaps the greatest difficulty to be overcome in mastering a language that is not without other complexities. Consequently it may be useful to summarise and illustrate the chief of these concomitant changes below.

The basic point is that in a deuterotonic compound verb the first preverb, being pretonic, behaves virtually as a separate entity, whereas in a prototonic compound the same preverb comes under the stress and is fully incorporated into the rest of the verb.

2.2. The virtual independence of the pretonic preverb creates a kind of barrier or juncture across which certain otherwise normal processes do not occur, but this juncture and its effects are cancelled when the preverb in question combines with the rest of the verb in the prototonic form. The juncture impedes:

(a) elision of vowels, but only on an optional basis, e.g. independent deut. *fo:ácaib* or prot. *fácaib* 'leaves' (see 1.4) but dependent *-fácaib* invariably prot.

(b) assimilation or loss of the first of various contiguous consonants, a process that may (especially before *r*, *l* or *n*) give rise to compensatory lengthening of a preceding vowel, e.g. deut. *ad:gair* 'sues', *ad:roi-lli* 'earns' but prot. *-acair*, *-áirilli* respectively.

(c) the lenition or, more rarely, nasalization otherwise appropriate after certain preverbs, e.g. deut. *fo:fera* 'causes', *ar:sissedar* 'remains', *con:certa* 'corrects' but prot. *-foírea*, *-airissedar*, *-coicerta* respectively.

2.3. Proclitics in Old Irish are liable to certain peculiar modifications, which will thus apply to a pretonic preverb when relevant but not to the same preverb when it acquires stress in the corresponding prototonic form. The chief of these changes are:

(a) voicing of an initial or final dental in contact with a proclitic vowel, e.g. deut. *do:claid* 'uproots', *do:a-cair* 'pleads', *ad:géuin* 'recognised' but unaffected prot. *-tochlaid*, *(-)tacair* (see 1.4), *-aithgéuin* respectively.

(b) a tendency to depalatalize consonants in proclitics seen in deut. *ar:sissedar*

and *ad:géuin* above (2.2c, 2.3a resp.).

(c) a corresponding tendency to retract the articulation of proclitic vowels, notably that of *e* to *a* and *u* to *o*, as in deut. *as:beir* 'says', *as:luí* 'escapes', *con:di-eig* 'asks' versus the corresponding prot. *-e-pir*, *-é-lai*, *-cuin-d-ig*.

(d) isolated changes of *de* (or *di/dí*) and *cum* (assimilated to *cun* before a following dental as in *-cuindig* in (c) above) to pretonic *do* and *con*, e.g. deut. *do:gní* 'does', *do:fich* 'punishes', *con:ic* 'can' versus unaffected prot. *-dé-ni*, *-dích*, *-cum-aing* respectively.

2.4. The shift from deuterotonic to prototonic not only causes the first preverb to shift from pretonic to stressed position but pushes everything else down one as a result, and in particular causes the stressed syllable of the deuterotonic form, whether *P₂* or *V*, to move into unstressed position in the prototonic form. This loss of stress can then entail further modifications:

(a) whereas stressed vowels have an inherent quality of their own, unstressed vowels are generally coloured by the quality of the flanking consonants: *a* between two broad or non-palatal consonants, *i* between two slender or palatal ones, *(a)i* between broad and slender, *e* between slender and broad (see *GOI* 63-6). Thus *for:beir* vs. *-forb(a)ir* 'increases', *do:beir* vs. *-tab(a)ir* 'brings', *do:bert* vs. *-tubart* 'brought', *fo:loing* vs. *-ful(a)ing* 'suffers', *as:beir* vs. *-epir* 'says' and so on.

(b) inherently long vowels are usually shortened in unstressed syllables, e.g. deut. *in:fét* 'relates', *fo:dáil* 'distributed' but prot. *-indet*, *-fod(a)il* respectively.

(c) conversely, inherently short vowels in absolute final position (i.e. not followed by a consonant) are lengthened under stress to give, for example, deut. *do:gní*, *as:luí* as against prot. *-déni*, *-élai* (see 2.3c & d).

2.5. Because of its extra preverb, the stressed part of the verb has a higher underlying syllable count in the prototonic than in the corresponding deuterotonic form as a rule, and this frequently leads to a divergence of **syncope** patterns between the two. Taking the stressed syllable as its starting point, syncope (*GOI* 67-9) basically eliminates (†) the vowel of every second syllable, providing it is non-final. The commonest sufferer is thus the second syllable of basically three- or four-syllable words, while in the far rarer case of words with an underlying five or six syllables both the second and fourth are liable to disappear through syncope. Disyllables are not, of course, affected by syncope since their second syllable is

always final. The following selection is intended to illustrate the not inconsiderable effects the extra preverb can have upon syncope patterns in the prototonic form:

BASIC	DEUTEROTONIC	PROTOTONIC
<i>for-cenn-</i>	<i>for:cenna</i>	<i>-foir-c[†]nea</i> 'finishes'
<i>to-léic-</i>	<i>do:léici</i>	<i>-tei-l[†]ci</i> 'casts'
<i>to-sreng-</i>	<i>do:srenga</i>	<i>-tai-r[†]ngea</i> 'draws'
<i>ad-gud-</i>	<i>ad:guidiu</i>	<i>-ai-c[†]diu</i> 'I invoke'
<i>fo-gab-</i>	<i>fo:gaibet</i>	<i>-fo-g[†]bat</i> 'they find'
<i>cum-uss-an-</i>	<i>con:os-[†]na</i>	<i>-cum-[†]s-ana</i> 'rests'
<i>ess-uss-léic-</i>	<i>as:oi-l[†]ci</i>	<i>-os-[†]-laici</i> 'opens'
<i>de-ro-uss-scuch-</i>	<i>do:ró-sc[†](c)ai</i>	<i>-de-r[†]-scaigi</i> 'excels'
	<i>do: ró-sc[†](c)aifet</i>	<i>-de-r[†]-scaig[†]fet</i>
		'they will excel'

(a) If consonants of different qualities are brought together by syncope, assimilation of quality occurs, since contiguous consonants of divergent quality within a word are tolerated neither in Old nor Modern Irish as a rule: hence the principle *caol le caol agus leathan le leathan* 'slender with slender and broad with broad' in Modern Irish grammar, but equally valid for earlier periods. This assimilation usually favours the first member of the new group, so that palatal *rc* plus non-palatal *nn* produces palatal throughout in *-foircnea* above, whereas non-palatal *g* plus palatal *b* yields non-palatal *gb* in *-fogbat* and so on.

(b) When two dental or two guttural consonants are brought together by syncope, any lenited consonant involved undergoes delenition. Devoicing also occurs if one of the consonants in question is voiceless (*GOI* 86-8). Thus, say, *do:róscai* < *do:rósc[†]cai* < **de:rósc[†]chi* < **de:róscuichi* in the above table or deut. *ad:suidi* 'detains' but prot. *-as[†]tai* with depalatization, delenition and devoicing of *d* (followed by metathesis of *-ts-* to *-st-*) in accordance with rules already enunciated in this section.

(c) If *r*, *l* or *n* is left alone between two consonants through the effects of syncope it develops, with certain exceptions (*GOI* 70), a supporting vowel in front, whence deut. *ad:gládathar* 'addresses' but prot. *-accaldathar* < **-accl[†]dathar* or

deut. 3sg. *con:ránic*, 3pl. *con:rán^tcatar* ‘met’ but prot. *-comarnic*, *-comarnactar* < **-comr^tnic*, **-comr^tnac^ttar* respectively.

Syncope and its concomitant effects enumerated above are vital processes in Old Irish and will come into play repeatedly in what follows, wherever forms acquire extra syllables through inflection or the like. Consequently it is important to pay particular attention to these factors at this point.

2.6. As in many Indo-European languages, a good many preverbs compounded with verbs in Old Irish are basically the same as prepositions used with nouns, e.g. *fo*, *for*, *ar*, *im(m)* occurring in both environments. However, a number of these preverbs have a final consonant in pretonic position that does not appear in the corresponding proclitic non-leniting preposition, e.g. *as-* vs. *a* ‘out of’, *con-* vs. *co* (nasalizing) ‘with’, *in(d)-* vs. *i* (nas.) ‘in(to)’.

2.7. Some apparent changes between deuterotonic and prototonic are purely orthographical: e.g., in prot. *-acair* vs. deut. *ad:gair* in 2.2b postvocalic *c* is phonetically /g/. Conversely the quirks of Old Irish spelling not infrequently obscure phonetic differences, as in *do:beir* vs. *-tabair* where orthographic *b* is unlenited and lenited (i.e. /v/) respectively, a difference clearly brought out in the case of *do:claid* vs. *-tochclaid* in 2.3a. Anyone unfamiliar with the spelling rules of Old Irish should consult the appendix at this point.

2.8. As in Modern Irish, word-initial *s-* was lenited to /h/ in Old Irish, although this was not consistently indicated in spelling (see appendix). This value applies to lenited *s* within the word for the purposes of syncope, since it has a devoicing effect upon consonants with which it thus comes into contact, but subsequently this internal /h/ disappeared. The preverbs *imb^t-* and *ind^t-* (GOI 516-22) normally became *im(m)* and *in* pretonically, whence deut. *im:soi* ‘turns’, *in:samlathar* ‘imitates’, but the corresponding prototonic forms *-impai*, *-intamlathar* < **imb^thoi*, **-ind^tham^tlathar* show the devoicing effect just described. Similarly one finds 3sg. deut. *ro:saig* ‘reaches’, prot. *-roig* (< unsyncopated **-rohaig*) but 3pl. deut. *ro:segat* vs. prot. *-roichet* < **roiht^tgat*, or the striking deut. *do:sluindi* ‘denies’ vs. prot. *-díltai* < **dihl^t(n)di* (see GOI 112 on early loss of *n* here), where the devoicing of /d/ to /t/ takes place over an intervening *l* and is guaranteed by the Modern Irish descendant *diúltaíonn* ‘denies’.

2.9. The foregoing has attempted to highlight the main factors tending to

differentiate deuterotonic and prototonic forms from one another. As will be all too clear from various examples given, several of these factors are often involved at once and it is by no means uncommon for the two sets of forms to bear disturbingly little outward resemblance to each other. Application of morphophonemic rules such as those just outlined in 2.2-8 usually makes it possible to reduce both sets, however dissimilar on the surface, to a common prototype with two divergent stress patterns ultimately responsible for further differences. Nevertheless, a grey area remains for various reasons.

(a) Some Old Irish vowel fluctuations are as yet ill understood, e.g. expected *do:boing* vs. *-tobuing* 'exacts' but *do:beir* vs. *-tabair* 'brings' or *do:léici* vs. *-teil^tci* 'casts' (apparently with assimilation of the preverb's *o* to following pre-syncope *é*).

(b) Deuterotonic and prototonic forms sometimes interact so that, for example, regular deut. *do:fich*, prot. *-dích* (contracted from **-di-ich*) 'punishes' may generate strictly irregular *do:fich*, *-dich* respectively. Similarly *do:for-maig*, *-tórmaig* (contracted *-to-or-maig*) 'increases' but deut. 3pl. *do:fór-m^tgat* (Sg. 53a11) with a long vowel taken over from the prot.

(c) Two common verbs actually constitute their dependent forms by a change of root within the paradigm, a process known as **suppletion**. *Fo:ceird* 'puts' (S1a) uses the appropriate forms of the deponent (VIII.5) simple verb (W2b) *-cuirethar* in dependent position (plus the imperative, cf. 1 4) outside the future tense (GOI 470, cf. V.6b). The substantive verb *a:tá*, which is confined to the non-consuetudinal present tense and otherwise replaced by forms of H2 *bi-* (GOI 476-83), behaves like a simple verb in conjunction with clitic object pronouns denoting possession (see 3.3d, 3.4 and 3.6 below), e.g. *táth-um* 'there is to me, I have', *ní-m:thá* 'I have not', *no-b:tá* 'which you have'. Otherwise, however, its dependent form is the impersonal *f(e)il*, which also supplies the relative *fil(e)* 'who/which is' and is very occasionally attested independently with an object pronoun betraying its origin in an expression akin to French *voilà* 'there is' (originally 'see there!') as in *fil-us* 'they are, les voilà' (Thes. II 246.27). This use of an accusative 'subject' persists in the more usual *-f(e)il* as dependent counterpart of *a:tá* in non-possessive constructions, e.g. *nicon:fil nach rainn* 'there is no part' (nom. *rann*), *ní-s:fil* 'they are not', *ceni-n:fil* 'although we are not'.

(d) A handful of verbs have an initial pretonic preverb in independent position

that is not found in the corresponding dependent forms, (see *GOI* 351) notably *ad:ágathar* 'fears' but *ní:ágathar* 'does not fear' etc. (cf. *a:tá* for **ad:tá* by 2.5b vs. *-tá* in possessive constructions in (c) above), *fo:fúasna* vs. *-fúasna* 'disturbs', *im:imgaib* vs. *-imgaib* 'avoids', *do:tuit* vs. *-tuit* 'falls', *do:dúthraccair* vs. *-dúthraccair* 'desires'. In the last two verbs a more normal looking morphophonemic relationship is sometimes introduced in the form of independent *do:fuit*, *do:fúthraccair* (cf. XI.3.1 and XII.5.5.1). Further examples of a similar phenomenon, *(fo)-fúair* 'found', *(ro)-cluineithar* 'hears', *(ro)-finnathar* 'finds out' and *(ro)-laimethar* 'dares', will be discussed later (XI.3.1-2).

(e) Since they all appear as *a-* before infixed pronouns in main clauses (see 3.5 below), the preverbs *in-*, *as-* and *ad-* are not infrequently confused pretonically (*GOI* 496, 509, 520), the original preverb being preserved in the prototonic forms. Pretonic *in-* is particularly liable to replacement by *ad-*, e.g. prototonic ipv. 1sg. *indiad* 'let me relate' vs. deut. 3sg. pres. *in:fét* and innovatory *ad:fét* 'relates', prot. 3sg. subj. *-ingre* 'may persecute' vs. deut. pres. 3pl. *in:grennat* but innovatory 3sg. *ad:greinn* 'persecute(s)' and 3pl. *as-id:grennat* 'who persecute it'. Examples of original *ad-* compounds are prot. *-áirilli*, deut. *ad:roilli* alongside innovatory *as:roilli* 'earns', 1pl. prot. *-accam*, deut. *ad:ciam* 'we see', alongside innovatory *as-id:ciam*. Augmented (see IX) pret. prot. 3sg. *-érbart* 'has said', deut. 1pl. *as:rubartmar* but innovatory *ad:rubartmar* 'we have said' is a rarer instance from an *as-* compound.

3.1. It has been seen that the Old Irish verbal complex has a **minimal** form consisting of an unaccompanied simple verb with normal initial stress and, as a rule, absolute inflection, but that this framework can be extended by the addition of one or more preverbs and/or a conjunct particle, processes which entail a shift to conjunct inflection. Since such extension almost always introduces a quasi-independent proclitic element, C by preference but P otherwise, these forms of the complex may conveniently be termed **binary**.

3.2. Various unstressed or clitic **adjuncts** (A) may be attached to the above framework. The binary complex contains a socket, so to speak, at the end of the proclitic for the insertion of what are then termed **infixes**, but the minimal complex has two devices at its disposal: either it can attach such elements at the end of the

verb itself as **suffixes** in the absence of a proclitic or it can acquire a proclitic (*no*, see 3.4 below) solely for the purpose of inserting them as infixes. At any rate, there are the following basic patterns for infixing and suffixing:

SIMPLE :	VA (minimal - suffixing)	CA:V (binary - infixing)
COMPOUND:	PA:(P ₂₋₄)V	CA:P(P ₂₋₄)V
	(both binary - infixing)	

The adjuncts in question are direct or, more rarely, indirect **object pronouns** (*GOI* 255-71, *OIPG* 25-8) and subject or object **relative markers** (*GOI* 313-7). Here the broad outlines will suffice.

3.3. The **basic set** of object pronouns (plus, in superscript brackets, any mutations caused by them) is as follows:

	Sg.	P1.
1.	<i>m(m)</i> ^(+LEN)	<i>n(n)</i>
2.	<i>t</i> ^(+LEN)	<i>b</i>
3.f.	<i>s</i> ^(±NAS)	
m.	<i>i/a/-</i> ^(+NAS)	<i>s</i> ^(±NAS)
n.	<i>i/a/-</i> ^(+LEN)	

The mutations noted above are irrelevant to the **suffixed pronouns**. These are attached to the absolute endings of independent simple verbs, which are in practice almost invariably 3sg. in this construction. The *i*-form of the 3sg. m. and n. pronouns is used and a glide vowel *u* is inserted between the final consonant of the verbal ending and the remaining pronominal forms consisting of consonants. In practice, however, only the third person suffixed pronouns are at all common in standard prose.

A 3sg. verb with suffixed pronoun may differ somewhat from the corresponding form without it for the following principal reasons.

(a) Final *-th* tends to be voiced to *-d* after an unstressed vowel (cf. 2.3a), as in *ain^tgid* (conj. *-anaig*) 'protects' rather than *ain^tgith*, but a suffix protects *th* from this change by masking it from final position, whence regularly *ain^tgith-i* 'protects

him'.

(b) Addition of the suffix often adds a third syllable and so brings about syncope (2.5), e.g. *gabais* 'seized' but *gab^ts-us* 'seized it (f.)', *be(i)rid* 'carries' but *beir^tth-i* 'carries it'.

(c) After syncope depalatalization, delenition, devoicing and/or a support vowel may arise in the appropriate circumstances (see 2.5a-c), e.g. *benaid* 'strikes' but *ben^tt-ai* (< **ben^tthi*) 'strikes him', *maidid* 'breaks' but *mait^tt-i* (< **maid^tthi*) 'breaks it', *ithid* 'eats' but *it-ius* (< **ith^tthius*) 'eats it (f.)', *damnaid* 'subdues', but *damant-i* (< **damn^tthi*) 'subdues him'.

(d) The petrified compound *a:tá* 'is' is treated as a simple verb with indirect object pronouns of all persons to denote possession, whence *táth-um* 'there is to me = I have', *táth-ut* 'thou hast', *táth-(a)i* 'he has', *táth-us* 'she has', *táth-unn* 'we have', *táthuib* 'ye have', and this gives rise to an 'intrusive, -th- before the suffixed pronouns with pret. *boí* 'was', e.g. *baíth-um* 'I had', *baíth-i* 'he had', *boíth-us* 'they had'. Contamination with the *s*-subjunctive type *ain^ts-ium* 'may he protect me' from *anis* 'may he protect' can lead to an *a*-subjunctive like *snádid* 'may he protect' developing a type *snáids-iunn* 'may he protect us' instead of expected **snáit^tt-iunn*.

(e) Deponent verbs (see VIII.5) switch from their special *r*-endings to normal active inflection before suffixed pronouns, e.g. *bert^taigidir* 'shakes' but *bert^taig^tth-ius* 'shakes them'.

Finally, it may be noted that the 3sg. m. or n. suffixed pronoun is occasionally used with a 3pl. verb, where it becomes *-it* under the influence of the 3pl. abs. ending, e.g. *gébait* 'they will take' vs. *géb^tt-it* 'they will take him'.

In a binary complex the basic forms listed at the beginning of this section are inserted as **infix pronouns** by attachment to non-leniting and non-nasalizing proclitics that end in a vowel either invariably (conjunct particle *ní* and its compounds such as *ma-ni*, particle *no* and preverbs *ro*, *fo*, *do*) or at least in a relative clause (*im(m)*, *ar* but rel. *imme/a*, *ara*). Like the consonant-final verb endings with suffixed pronouns above, *im(m)* and *ar* require a glide vowel (usually *u* but sometimes *a*, *o* or *i*) before consonantal forms of the pronouns, e.g. *imm-us:(n)dích* 'protects them' and *ar-ut:neithius* 'I awaited thee'. The remaining proclitics in question already have a final vowel in main clauses and so do not need a glide here, e.g. *ní-s:(n)imdich* 'does not protect them', *do-s:claid* 'uproots it (f.)',

ro-n:saig 'reaches us', *ní-m:roig* 'does not reach me'. The usual proclitic form of the 3sg. m. and n. pronoun is *a*, which elides a preceding vowel, but the zero form is used with *ní* and its compounds, e.g. *imm-a:ndích* 'protects him', *d-a:chlaid* 'uproots it', *r-a:saig* 'reaches him', *f-a:n-ácaib* 'leaves him', but *ní:n-imdich* 'does not protect him', *ní:thochlaid* 'does not uproot it'. It will be seen that the associated mutations, although not always indicated in the spelling (see appendix), are highly relevant to infixed pronouns and are the crucial distinguishing factor between 3sg. m. and n. or, in the case of *ní* and compounds, between presence (+NAS., +LEN. respectively) and absence (non-mutation of a following consonant, e.g. *ní:tochlaid* 'does not uproot') of a pronoun.

3.4. The meaningless conjunct particle (1.2) *no* can only be used with simple verbs that are accompanied by no other conjunct particle. Its most important function is to convert a minimal form of the verbal complex compatible only with the morphophonemically intricate process of suffixing into a binary one suitable for the less demanding device of infixing. In terms of the formulae in 3.2 above this entails a change from VA to a semantically identical CA:V, where C is *no*. This use of *no* as an 'empty' particle to attach infixes where this would otherwise be impossible is understandably prevalent where suffixing is either totally prohibited or generally avoided. It was seen in 3.3 that suffixed pronouns are common only in the third person in combination with 3sg. verbs. Elsewhere infixing by means of *no* is either compulsory or markedly preferred, as in *no-s:comalnamar* 'we fulfil them', *no-s:n-altatar* 'they reared her', *no-t:guidiu* 'I beseech thee', *no-n:soír* 'deliver (sg.) us!', *n-a:chomalnid* 'fulfil (pl.) it!', *no-b:soírfeá* 'he will deliver you' (cf. *sóer^tfud-ut* 'will deliver thee'). Even where suffixing of pronouns is common or normal, infixing with *no* is an optional possibility, e.g. *no-s:nguid* 'beseeches them' (suff. *guit^tt-ius*), *n-a:mbertaigedar* 'shakes himself' (suff. *bertaigh-i*), *no-s:mbertaigedar* 'shakes it (f.)' (cf. suff. *bertaigh-ius* 'shakes them'). It is to be noted that forms of the substantive verb beginning with *b* generally use *ro* instead of *no* to infix pronouns (GOI 476), e.g. *ro-m:bia*, *ro:pia* (delenited *ro-b:bia*) 'there will be to me/you' = 'I/you shall have' (but cf. rarer suffixing *beth-iumm*, *beth-ib* with the same meanings).

3.5. In addition to the basic set of object pronouns described in 3.3 and traditionally termed 'class A' when infixed there is a **composite** set of infixed

pronouns characterized by prefixed /d/. The so-called 'class B' base form of these occurs in non-leniting and non-nasalizing environments after pretonic preverbs that regularly end in a consonant, notably *for*, *etar*, *fris*, *as*, *ad*, *in*, *con*. With the exception of *-r*, the final consonant of the preverb is lost (*in* being further modified to *a-*) before this /d/, which is written *t* after a vowel but *t* or *d* after *r* (see appendix). A glide vowel, usually *a* or *o*, is inserted between *t/d* and consonantal forms of the basic pronoun, e.g. *a-tam:grennat* 'they persecute (*in:grennat*) me', *fri-tamm:orcat* 'they offend (*fris:orcat*) me', *a-tot:aig* 'impels (*ad:aig*) thee', *for-don:cain* 'teaches (*for:cain*) us'. However, the *s* of the 3sg. f. and 3pl. then disappears to leave *t/da* (non-mutating), e.g. *for-ta:comai* 'preserves (*for:comai*) it (f.)', *co-ta:uchbat* 'they raise (*con:ochbat*) them(selves)'. The zero form of the 3sg. m. and n. basic pronoun is used after *t/d*, e.g. *co-t:n-erba* 'will entrust (*con:erb(f)a*) him(self)', *a-t:comla* 'he joins (*ad:comla*) him(self)', *for-t:chomi* 'preserves it (*for:comai*)', *a-t:beir* 'says (*as:beir*) it'.

In leniting and nasalizing contexts the /d/ is liable to undergo lenition (when it is always written *d* - see appendix) and nasalization respectively to produce so-called 'class C' forms of the composite infixed pronoun. Final consonants of pretonic preverbs are not lost before these variants, while in the 3sg. m. and n. *-(n)d* is normal after vowels, *-i(n)d* with a glide after consonants and hybrid *-ndid* after *co* 'so that'. This type of pronoun is common after any pretonic preverb in the types of relative clause to be discussed in 3.6 and 3.7, where appropriate examples will be given, and is regularly used with nasalizing conjunct particles such as *co* 'so that', interrogative *in* and the prepositional relatives (see 1.2 and note that *nd* is occasionally simplified to *n*). Typical examples are *i-ndam:erbainn* 'in which I might trust (myself)', *i(n)-ndob:fochad* 'would he tempt you?', *ar-nda:beth* 'so that there might be to them', *fua-nd:ro-gab/ar-in:ro-gab* 'under/for which he had sung it', *co-ndid:chumscaiged* 'so that he should alter it', *co-nid:nderoimed* 'so that he should protect him'.

Negative *na*, which is used alone with the imperative and in composition with certain conjunctions (e.g. positive *ar-a*, *co* versus negative *ar-na*, *co-(n)na*) takes a peculiar form of this pronoun with lenited *ch-* instead of *d-* prefixed (see 3.6 for a similar usage with relative negative *nad*), e.g. *na-cham:dermainte* 'do not forget me!', *na-chib:erpid* 'do not entrust yourselves!', *as-na-cha:tucad* 'out of which he

would not have brought them', *co-nna-ch:n-ingéuin* 'so that he did not recognise him'.

3.6. The **relative markers** are suffixed or infix in virtually the same way as the object pronouns, and the **general** type does not formally differentiate subject and object relation (cf. Modern Irish *an fear a chonaic an bhean* 'the man who saw the woman' or 'the man whom the woman saw' etc.).

The binary complex attaches a zero infix (but *-e/a* after *im(m)* and *ar*) with following lenition to *no* or a pretonic preverb. This makes lenition versus non-mutation after these proclitics the major factor differentiating relative from non-relative forms, although this distinction is unfortunately often obscured by the vagaries of Old Irish orthography (see appendix). For example, to *fo:ceird* 'puts' there corresponds a relative *fo:cheird* 'who/which he puts', and similarly to *imm:tét* 'goes around' an *imme:thét* 'who/which he goes around'. Relative and non-relative *as:beir* '(who/which he) says' are orthographically identical but phonetically distinguished by /v/ and /b/ respectively. Since lenition does not affect vowels, verbs with prevocalic *to* etc. lack a concrete infix in independent relative contexts and so are often prototonic there in accordance with 1.4, e.g. *t-airngir* '(who/which he) promises'. The non-leniting negative *ní* is altered to leniting *nad* in relative clauses, e.g. *ní:ceil* 'does not conceal' but *nad:cheil* 'who/which he does not conceal'.

The alternative systems of suffixation on the one hand and infixation by means of *no* on the other are rigidly demarcated in the relative system of simple verbs, there being no grey area of the type noted in 3.4 for the object pronouns. In the 3sg., 1 and 3pl. unaccompanied simple verbs must use special relative endings, but in the other persons there are no such endings and proclitic *no* is required to infix lenition as illustrated below:

	NON-RELATIVE	RELATIVE
1sg.	<i>caraim</i> 'I love,	<i>no:charaim</i> 'which I love'
2sg.	<i>carai</i> 'thou lovest'	<i>no:charai</i> 'which thou lovest'
3sg.	<i>caraid</i> 'loves'	<i>caras</i> 'who/which he loves,
1pl.	<i>car^tmai</i> 'we love,	<i>car^tmae</i> 'which we love'
2pl.	<i>car^tthae</i> 'you love,	<i>no:charaid</i> 'which you love'
3pl.	<i>carait</i> 'they love'	<i>car^ttae</i> 'who/which they love'

Relative markers are incompatible with the basic set of object pronouns in 3.3 and may simply be cancelled in front of the first and second person forms of these, e.g. *imm-um:forling* (Wb. 13b6) ‘which has caused me’, *do-b:imchomart* (3b21) ‘which constrained you’. *Boíth-ium* (Blathm. 1013) ‘which I had’ may be a poetic survival of this system in the suffixing category, but here conversion to infixing with *no* is the norm in prose (see 3.4), e.g. *no-m:thá* (Wb. 13c10) ‘which I have’, *no-t:beir* (6c9) ‘which carries thee’. However, the relative construction may be clearly marked by conversion to the composite set of infixed pronouns with lenited initial *d* (‘class C’), and this process is compulsory for third person pronouns. Thus *no-dom:bera* (Wb. 1a8) ‘which would bring me’ (non-rel. *no-m:*), *fo-dan:segat* (Ml. 27c7) ‘who afflict us’ (non-rel. *fo-n:*), and obligatory *fo-d:ruar* (Wb. 15a15) ‘which has caused it’ (*f-a*), *imm-id:folngi* (Ml. 92a17) ‘who causes it’ (*imm-a:*), *do-da:aidlea* (Wb. 9d5) ‘who visits her’ (*do-s:*). Since the composite pronoun can only be infixed, suffixing patterns with unaccompanied simple verb must give way to infixing by means of *no*, e.g. rel. *caras* ‘who loves’, non-rel. + pron. *carthai* ‘loves him’ but rel. + pron. *no-d:cara* ‘who loves him’. Similarly *ní tú no-d:n-aíl* (Wb. 5b28) ‘it is not thou that nourishes(t) it (m.)’, which also illustrates the fact that first and second person pronominal antecedents govern a third person (sg. or pl. as they case may be) verb in a following subject relative clause. Hence the restriction of the relative forms of these persons in the table above to object relative meaning.

The change from base (‘class B’) to lenited (‘class C’) forms of the composite infixed pronoun is not compulsory for any person in the shift to relative usage, and 3sg. m. and n. *-id* with its convenient glide vowel to buffer the final consonant of the pretonic preverb (see 3.5) seems to be the only common lenited form. Thus *a-ttot:aig* (Wb. 6c16) ‘which impels thee’ and *fri-t:curethar céill* (Ml. 41d16) ‘who worships him’ are not distinctively relative, but *ad-id:géuin* (Wb. 12c13) ‘which has recognised it’ and *friss-id:n-oirctis* (Ml. 39a20) ‘who used to injure him’ are.

The relative negative *nad* usually takes the peculiar lenited form of the composite infixed pronoun noted at the end of 3.5, e.g. *ná-ch:beir* (Wb. 6c18) ‘who does not pass it’, *na-chid:chúalatar* (25d 14) ‘who did not hear it’. *Nad-id:chreti* (15b14) ‘who does not believe it’ is exceptional.

3.7. In addition to the above **leniting relative** used with the binary complex to

denote subject or object relation Old Irish has a **nasalizing relative** confined to, but by no means compulsory in, object relative clauses. This is realized formally by the straightforward replacement of lenition by nasalization, as in *as:mbeir* 'which he says', *imme:tét* 'which he goes round', *fo:ceird* 'which he puts' (*t* = /d/, *c* = /g/; see appendix), *do:n-airgnir* 'which he promises', *nad:ceil* 'which he does not conceal'. This nasalizing clause is about as common as the leniting type with a masculine or feminine object antecedent but is quite rare with neuters, particularly in the singular.

As a general rule (see *OIPG* 137, n.7), a relative clause only follows a subject or direct object antecedent, e.g. rel. *is oínfer gaibes búaid* (Wb. 11a4) 'it is one man who gets victory' but non-rel. *is do thabirt díglae berid in claideb sin* (6a 13) 'it is for inflicting punishment (that) he carries that sword' and *is airi ní:táet* (Sg. 159a3) 'it is for this (that) there does not come'. However, certain non-prepositional antecedents denoting time, manner or cause, as well as 'that' clauses used as object or predicate to some verbs, commonly condition a nasalizing relative as an optional variant of the non-relative construction, e.g. *in tan mberes claind* (Ml. 129c3) 'the time that/when she bears children', *amal for-nda:congair* (94b3), 'as he orders it (f.)', *amal as-ndon:berat* (Wb. 2a12) 'as they say of us', *amal as-ind:biur* (13a29) 'as I say it', *hóre no-ndob:molor* (14c18) 'because I praise you', and finally *na-nda:tibérad* (Ml. 97d10) 'that he would not give them' showing the special nasalized form of the third person pronouns with *nad* (see *GOI* 265-6). As *mberes* above illustrates, in this category nasalization is even prefixed to an unaccompanied simple verb with relative endings, and nasalized forms of the composite infixed object pronoun are well attested even beyond the 3sg. m. and n. In the strictly object relative, however, prefixed nasalization is generally avoided and the pronouns are, for obvious semantic reasons, restricted to a rather rare double object (or, in the passive, double subject) construction, the so-called *figura etymologica* involving a verbal noun as object of its own verb, e.g. *is cúrsagad ro-nd:cúrsagus* 'it is a reprimanding that I have reprimanded him'. *GOI* 316-20 should be consulted for a fuller treatment of the various types of nasalizing relative.

4. There remain only the **emphasizing particles** (*GOI* 252-3, *OIPG* 24-5) which are attached at the very end of the verbal complex, whether simple or binary, in order to highlight the subject expressed by the verb's personal ending or, less

frequently, a pronominal object present in the complex, e.g. *d-a:gníu-sa* (Wb. 14b26) '*I* do it', *ad:chobrai-siu* (Ml. 56b 31) 'which *thou* desirest', *do:beir-som* (Wb. 7d8) '*he* gives', *no-s:nguid-som* (25b 9) '*he* beseeches them' or 'he beseeches *them*', *tíagmi-ni* (15b28) '*we* go', *mani-n:sóerae-ni* (Ml. 77d6) 'unless thou deliver *us*', *fergaigthe-si* (20b13) '*you* are angry'.

It is to be noted that, unlike Modern Irish (*chonaic sé í* 'he saw her' etc.), Old Irish has no independent subject or object pronouns and expresses both of these within the verbal complex by means of personal endings and clitic adjuncts respectively (e.g. *a-ta:condairc* 'he has seen her'). That said, a set of stressed independent personal pronouns similar to those of Modern Irish does exist for distinctly restricted use in certain basically predicative functions (see *GOI* 253-5, *OIPG* 25). Due allowance being made for this, the form and function of the emphasising particles themselves is much the same in Old (*do:gníu-sa* '*I* do' etc.) and Modern (*deinim-se* '*I* do' etc.) Irish.

5. From the foregoing it has emerged that the Old Irish verbal complex has a **frame** consisting of V(erb) plus, optionally, P(reverb(s)) and/or C(onjunct particle), and that various clitic A(djuncts), notably object pronouns and relative markers, and E(mphatic particles) may be attached to this. The ordering of these elements is strictly regulated in accordance with the following scheme:

Independent simple:	V(A)(E)
Independent compound:	P(A):(P ₂₋₄)V(E)
Dependent:	C(A):(P ₁₋₄)V(E)

Like Modern Irish and Scots Gaelic, Old Irish is a basically verb-initial language in which the order verb-subject-object (VSO) predominates, except in the case of clitic pronominal infixes or suffixes. Various adverbs and prepositional phrases are usually placed after the independent object, if present. A classic example is *béoigidir in spirut in corp in fecht so* (Wb. 13d7) 'the spirit vivifies the body now'. Since the ordering of elements within the clause is rather inflexible, the principal device for emphasising a given constituent of the clause apart from the verb is the so-called 'cleft sentence' whereby the element in question is taken out

of the clause itself as an antecedent construed with the appropriate form of the copula, which may, however, on occasion be omitted. Hence the enormous frequency of the types *is oínfer gaibes búaid diib inna chomalnad* (Wb. 11a4) 'it is one man who gets victory of them for its accomplishment' (non-cleft unemphatic *gaibid oínfer búaid...*), *is gúforcell do:beram do Dia amal sodin* (13b15) 'it is false testimony that we bear God in that case' (non-cleft unemphatic *do:beram gúforcell do Dia amal sodin*), *is do thabirt díglae berid in claideb sin* (6a13) 'it is for inflicting punishment (that) he carries that sword' (non-cleft unemphatic *berid in claideb sin do thabirt díglae*) and so on. Clefting for emphasis is, of course, still a very prominent feature of Modern Irish and Scots Gaelic (e.g. Mod. Ir. *is aon fhear amháin a bheireas an bua* or *is ag dul abhaile a bhi sé*), and Old Irish word order is unlikely to present problems to anyone familiar with a present-day Gaelic vernacular.

In Modern Irish the **copula** is uninflected for person and simply opposes basically present-future *is* to past-conditional *ba*, although there is considerable diversity in combination with conjunct particles, as in *is* 'is', *an* 'is?', *ní* 'is not', *gur(b)* 'that is' etc. In Old Irish its verbal characteristics are more prominent and there is full inflection for person and number as well as for tense and mood (except that there is no separate imperfect form) in addition to the complexities of its combination with conjunct particles, which are even greater than in Modern Irish. The upshot is a bewildering array of forms most conveniently summarized in *OIPG* 72-3 and also discussed along with pertinent questions of syntax in *GOI* 483-94.

The key point about the copula is that it is proclitic and functions above all as a predicated element. It is directly followed by its predicate, as is still the case in Modern Irish expressions such as *is maith liom bia*, *is éigean dom imeacht*, *is fearr fíon ná beoir*, and the group Cop:Pred has considerable affinities with binary forms of the verbal complex, e.g. *is:deidbir ha áigthiu* (Wb. 6a13) 'it is proper to fear him' with a similar accentual pattern to *as:beir* 'says' etc. or the even more striking correlation between, say, *ní:imdegal in cú* 'the hound is not a defence' and *ní:imdich in cú* 'the hound does not defend'. Moreover, relative and pronominal adjuncts are infixed and emphasising particles suffixed just as in the binary verbal complex to give Cop(A):Pred(E), e.g. *is:écen* 'it is necessary' vs. *is-um:écen* 'it is necessary for me', *am:cimbid-se* 'I am a prisoner', *is:cimbid(-som)* 'he is a

prisoner' vs. *as:chimbid* 'who is a prisoner' and so on.

The skeletal information contained in this final section is intended to be strictly subordinate to the main aim of this book, which is to facilitate the analysis and recognition of the finite forms (thus excluding the verbal noun and participles, on which see *GOI* 441-55) of fully stressed verbs in early Irish sources. Now that the fundamental structure and workings of the verbal complex in Old Irish have been expounded, it is possible to turn to the system and formation of the various moods and tenses.

CHAPTER II

Weak, Strong and Hiatus Verbs

1. The central tense and mood categories of Old Irish are pretty much as in Modern Irish, due allowance being made for a decline in use of a formally distinct subjunctive in the current spoken language, and may be tabulated as follows:

(a)	(i) Present indicative	(ii) Imperfect	(iii) Imperative
(b)	(i) Present subjunctive	(ii) Past subjunctive	
(c)	(i) Future	(ii) Conditional	
(d)	Preterite		

On the vertical axis (a-d) above formal differentiation is centred upon the **stem**, although there is also considerable accessory variation in the endings used in the first column. On the horizontal axis (e.g. a(i-iii)), however, the stem remains constant and a homogeneous set of **imperfect endings** replaces the forms used in the first column to transform a present into an imperfect indicative (e.g. pres. *as:beir*, ipf. *as:beired*; cf. Mod. Ir. *deir*, *deireadh*, French *il parle*, *il parlait*), a present into a past subjunctive (e.g. pres. subj. *as:bera*, past subj. *as:berad*), and a future into a conditional (e.g. fut. *as:béra*, cond. *as:bérad*; cf. Mod. Ir. *déarfadh*, *déarfadh*, French *il parlera*, *il parlerait*). A further set of **imperative endings** transforms a present indicative into an imperative. Within each of the seven categories in (a), (b) and (c) above a semantic opposition between **active** and **passive** voice is formally realized by a change of endings only in the first instance (pass. pres. *as:berar*, ipf. *as:beirthe*, subj. *as:berthar*, past subj. *as:berthae*, fut. *as:bérthar*, cond. *as:bérthae*; cf. Mod. Ir. pass. pres. *deirtear*, ipf. *deirtí*, fut. *déarfai*, cond. *déarfai*), but in the preterite the shift from active to passive involves a change of stem as well as endings, e.g. *as:bert* 'said' but *as:breth* 'was said'.

Consequently it is necessary to distinguish five different inflectional stems

upon which the vertical variation of meaning in the above table is based, namely (a) **present**, (b) **subjunctive**, (c) **future**, (d) **preterite active** and **preterite passive**. A separate chapter (III-VII respectively) will be devoted hereafter to the formation of each of these stems, leaving a detailed discussion of the various endings to chapter VIII.

The substantive verb has a unique formal distinction (shared by the copula discussed briefly in I.5) between an actual present, suppletive *a:tá*, and a habitual present *biid* 'is wont to be' (Hiberno-English 'does be') with the same stem as in the other tenses and moods (e.g. subj. *beid* 'may be', pret. *boí* 'was'). This, of course, is still very much alive in Modern Irish, e.g. *tá sé tinn i gcónaí* 'he is still ill' but *bíonn sé tinn i gcónaí* 'he is always ill'.

In Modern Irish like Modern English there is a pervasive dichotomy between so-called 'progressive' and 'non-progressive' forms of verbs in the various tenses and moods, e.g. *buailéann sé a bhean (go minic)* 'he beats his wife (often)' but *tá sé ag bualadh a mhná (anois)* 'he is beating his wife (now)', *chuaigh sé abhaile* 'he went home' but *bhi sé ag dul abhaile* 'he was going home'. Progressive formations of this type with substantive verb, preposition *oc* (Mod. Ir. *ag*) and verbal noun are not unknown in Old Irish, e.g. *biuu-sa oc irbáig* (Wb. 16d 8) 'I am (always) boasting' or clefted *is oc precept soscéli attó* (21C19) 'it is preaching the gospel that I am (at present)'. However, they are uncommon and the formal distinction of progressive from non-progressive can hardly have been compulsory as it is in the present-day language. Thus, whereas the Modern Irish imperfect is exclusively habitual with a clear-cut opposition between, say, *théadh sé abhaile ('chuile oiche)* 'he used to go home (every night)', and *bhi sé ag dul abhaile (nuair a chonaic mé é)* 'he was going home (when I saw him)', Old Irish can still use the imperfect (and present) progressively, e.g. *fa:n-ópair in cú, no:fethed-som a cluiche colléic* (*Stories from the Táin* 8.15-6) 'the dog makes for him, he was attending to the game meanwhile'.

The optional status of the progressive in Old Irish may be compared with the 'used to' habitual of Modern English, which is likewise optional (e.g. 'he used to go home every evening' or 'he went home every evening'). These rather marginal Old Irish periphrastic progressives will be ignored hereafter.

2.1. The manner in which the five principal inflectional stems are realized formally depends above all on a further inflectional dichotomy between so-called **weak** and **strong** verbs, with a third category of **hiatus** verbs occupying a roughly intermediate position that will be defined more closely in 2.4.

2.2. The weak class consists chiefly of derived verbs (see *GOI* 335-8) and includes the following major types:

(a) factitives based on adjectives, e.g. *soíraid* 'frees', *glanaid* 'purifies', *béoigidir* 'makes alive' from *soír* 'free', *glan* 'pure', *béo* 'alive' respectively.

(b) denominatives based on nouns, e.g. *for:cenna* 'ends', *ad:rími* 'counts', *cruthaigidir* 'shapes' from *forcenn* 'end', *áram* 'amount', *cruth* 'shape' respectively.

(c) causatives with *o* or *u* vocalism corresponding to a few strong verbs with different root vowel, e.g. *roithid* 'makes to run', *ad:suidi* 'makes to sit, establishes, stops', *scuirid* 'makes to depart, separates, unyokes' versus *rethid* 'runs', *saidid* 'sits', *scaraid* 'departs'.

(d) a few non-derived or primary verbs, e.g. *léicid* 'leaves', *creitid* 'believes', *anaid* 'stays'.

It is to be noted that, whereas categories (a) and (b), particularly the *-(a)ig-* suffix type in both, are still productive and expanding through living processes of verb formation in Old Irish, the other two are strictly lexicalized and non-productive groups. Indeed, to term (c) a derived category of causatives is justified historically but hardly meaningful in the synchrony of Old Irish.

Although they are as liable as other verbs to the distorting effects of modifications to the verbal complex described in chapters I and IX-XI, the weak verbs in general constitute the 'regular' productive type of verbal inflection in Old Irish, and it is not surprising that loanwords tend to be adapted to their conjugational pattern (see *GOI* 575-6), e.g. *scríbaid*, *-scríba* 'writes' (Lat. *scribit*).

The major inflectional characteristics of weak verbs are a 3sg. pres. act. conj. with a final vowel that does not appear in the corresponding 2sg. ipv., an *s*-preterite active, *-th(-)* (or *-d* by I.3.3a) in the preterite passive, an *f*-future, an *a*-subjunctive, and a basic immutability of the root itself during these modifications. Thus (abs./conj.) 3sg. pres. *soíraid/-soíra* (2sg. ipv. *soír*), pret. act. *soírais/-soír*, pret. pass. *soírthae/-soírad*, fut. *soírf(a)id/-soírf(e)a*.

2.3. The vast majority of primary verbs belong to the strong class, which includes such familiar items as *aingid* 'protects', *beirid* 'carries', *benaid* 'strikes', *canaid* 'sings', *gaibid* 'seizes', *gairid* 'calls', *guidid* 'prays', *orcaid* 'slays' and their various compounds.

Strong verbs show considerable inflectional diversity and are best defined for present purposes as having a 3sg. pres. act. conj. that invariably ends in a consonant and is identical with the corresponding 2sg. ipv. (apart from a few anomalous imperatives to be mentioned in VIII.3.2), e.g. *-anaig*, *-beir*, *-ben*, *-cain*, *-gaib*, *-gair*, *-guid*, *-oirc*. With very few exceptions, moreover, strong verbs do not form an *f*-future or an *s*-preterite, and no individual strong verb conforms to the weak norm of having both of these types of future and preterite. The roots of strong verbs frequently undergo considerable alteration from one inflectional stem to another, as in 3sg. pres. *guidid*/*-guid*, pret. act. (-)*gáid*, pret. pass. *gessae*/*-gess*, fut. *gigis*/*-gig*, subj. *geis*/*-gé* or pres. *canaid*/*-cain*, pret. act. (-)*cechain*, pret. pass. *cétae*/*-cét*, fut. *cechnaid*/*-cechna*, subj. *canaid*/*-cana*.

Whereas weak verbs typically have just a single way of forming each of the principal non-present inflectional stems, the strong class as a whole always has at least two devices at its disposal, the shape of the root usually determining the choice in any given instance. This somewhat vague characterization will suffice for now, the details being left to the following chapters.

2.4. There remains a fairly small but, containing as it does some very common verbs, important group that does not fit entirely satisfactorily into either of the above major classes. The 3sg. pres. act. conj. ends in a vowel unlike that of the strong verbs, but this vowel differs from that of the corresponding weak-verb forms in also being found in the 2sg. ipv., as in *do:soí/-toí* 'turns to' (ipv *toí*), *do:gní/-déni* 'does' (ipv. *déne*, see VIII.3.2 on vocalism). Since this final vowel also differs from that in the 3sg. pres. act. conj. of weak verbs in being liable to stress under appropriate circumstances, as in the above examples or *im:rá/-imra*, *ad:cí/-acci* 'sees', *con:oí/-cumai* 'keeps', it obviously belongs to the root of the verbs in question, which all seem to be primary. As far as present inflection is concerned, they are best regarded as basically 'strong' but with a stem-final vowel instead of the commoner stem-final consonant in the present. Outside the present, however, 'weak' features are particularly apparent in what I term H3 (root vowel *o*, *u* or *e*), which usually

have *f*-futures and *s*-preterites. Most of H1 and H2 (root vowels *a* and *i* respectively) have typically 'strong' futures, but the commonest type of preterite there is a hybrid between the 'strong' reduplicated and 'weak' *s*-preterites, namely a reduplicated *s*-preterite found nowhere else in the system (see VI.4.3 and *GOI* 420-1).

Clearly there is little to be gained by trying to force these verbs into either a 'weak' or a 'strong' classificatory straitjacket, and they are best regarded as a somewhat mixed or indeterminate class in their own right. That being so, they are most appropriately named after their most distinctive feature in the present indicative, namely hiatus between the final vowel of the stressed root and the following vowel of certain personal endings in disyllabic forms like 3pl. conj. *a:taat* 'are', *-baat* 'die', *im:soat* 'turn', 3sg. abs. *biid* 'is wont to be', *gniid* 'does'.

3. The main Old Irish conjugational types are customarily classified according to the criterion of strong or weak inflectional pattern, further subdivisions then reflecting the type of present stem they have. This system will be continued here, but highly inconvenient notational discrepancies between *GOI* and *OIPG* make a replacement of A and B by the initials W(eak), H(iatus) and S(trong) desirable. A concordance of the notation to be used in the present work with those of *GOI* and *OIPG* will now be given, and it may be noted that *OIPG* does give examples of some prominent hiatus verbs at 68ff. (*a:tá, biid*), 82ff. (*do:gní*) and 87ff. (*ad:cí*), although no attempt is made there to incorporate them into a classification.

<i>Here</i>	<i>GOI</i>	<i>OIPG</i>
W1	AI	B(1)
W2	AII	B(2)
H1		-a-
H2	AIII	-i-
H3		-o/u/e-
S1	BI/III	A(1)
S2	BII	A(3)
S3	BIV/V	A(2)

CHAPTER III

The Present Stem

1. The various types of **present** stem are best described with reference to the non-deponent (see VIII.5 on deponent inflection) present (indicative) active. Additional details will be found in *GOI* 352-60, 375-9 and *OIPG* 34-8.

2. The weak class **W1** typically has non-palatal quality of the root-final consonant throughout and unstressed *-a* as the 3sg. conj. ending, e.g. 3sg. *marb(a)id/-marba* and 3pl. *marb(a)it/-marbat* 'kill'. By contrast **W2** displays 3sg. conj. *-i* regularly and palatal root final throughout frequently, e.g. 3sg. *lé(i)cí/-lé(i)cí* and 3pl. *lé(i)cít/-lé(i)cét* 'let'. Although the present inflection of this latter class is homogeneous, a different relationship between their present and non-present stems necessitates a distinction between a larger essentially unvarying **W2a** sub-class of verbs like *léicíd*, *fo:dáli* 'distributes' etc. and a smaller **W2b** sub-class of causative origin such as *ad:suidi* '(makes to sit,) detains' with *u* vocalism in the present stem as a rule versus *o* in the rest (see II.2.2c).

Needless to say, the progressive assimilation of consonant quality in groups arising from syncope (see I.2.5a and *GOI* 98) sometimes caused breaches of these rules, e.g. **W1** *for:cenna* but prot. *-foirc^tnea* 'ends' with palatal *n*, **W2a** *do:sluindi* 'denies' and **W2b** *ad:suidi* 'detains' but prot. *-dil^tt(a)i* and *-as^tt(a)i* with broad *t*. Since a front vowel lost by syncope regularly left palatalization of any preceding consonant(s) in its wake and the whole group then became palatal by progressive assimilation, the stem final of **W2** verbs was regularly palatal where *i* had been syncopated before an ending as in 3sg. pass. *fo:dáil^tter* 'is distributed' (Sg. 3b15; *fo:dáli*), *imm:rái(t^t)ter* 'is considered' (cf. Wb. 14c22; *imm:rádi*), *imm:lúai(t^t)ter* (cf. Ml. 135b9; *imm:lúadi*), 1pl. *báig^tmi* 'we boast' (Wb. 2d15; *bágid*), 3sg. + suff. pron. *eirb^tthi* '(entrusts himself,) trusts' (Ml. 51b12; *erbid*). However, the palatalizing effects of the unsyncopated vowel were a good deal more limited with

the result that a preceding consonant cluster (apart from *mb*, *nd*, *ng*), a labial/guttural preceded by *u* or any consonant preceded by *á/ó* ($> \acute{u}a$) were not palatalized. Hence forms with non-palatal final such as W2a pres. 3sg. *-erbai* '(en)trusts' (Ml. 65b6), W2b *du:lugai* 'forgives' (Ml. 51a15), W2a *fo:rrumai* 'puts' (LU 5320), rel. *rádas* 'which he speaks' (Ml. 42c4 & 10), 3pl. *-rádat* (Ml. 31a18; *rádiā*), 1sg. *-sádu* 'I place', *-bágu* 'I boast' (Fél. Jan. 23 & Nov. 30, both rhyming with *dánu*), 3sg. ipf. *im:lúadad* 'was tossing about' (Ml. 33b25; *imm:lúadi*).

In such cases the palatalization originally confined to forms with syncope before the ending was sometimes spread as early as Old Irish on the analogy of the mainstream W2a/b type (*léicid*, *-suidi* etc.) with palatal stem-final throughout, whence 3pl. *fo:dálet* 'divide' (Sg. 72a3 & 4), 1sg. *do:luigim* 'I forgive' (Wb. 14d25). Occasionally the reverse occurred and non-palatal consonance was spread to a syncopated form on the model of W1 as in the case of 3pl. ipf. *-erbtai* '(en)trusted' (Ml. 46d10 & 12). Although the syncopated front vowel of OIr. *prid^hchid* 'preaches' (W1, borrowed from Lat. *pr(a)edicat*; see II.2.2) clearly points to an original palatal cluster still seen in a few forms such as 3sg. rel. subj. *pridches* 'that (he) preach' (Wb. 23b24), a non-palatal cluster had mostly been introduced in line with W1 norms as early as the Glosses, e.g. 3sg. rel. pres. *pridchas* 'who preaches' (Wb. 12c23), 3sg. subj. *pridchaid* 'he preach' (Wb. 13a22).

3. The hiatus verbs can be subdivided into an H1 (*a-*), an H2 (*i-*) and an H3 (*e/o/u-*) class on the basis of the fundamental quality of their root vowels. When the root is stressed, this vowel appears short in hiatus before endings consisting of vowel plus consonant, e.g. in the 3sg. abs. and the 3pl. However, *a*, *i* and *e* are lengthened in an otherwise endingless 3sg. conj., while *o* and *u* add *-i* there to form a diphthong (*do:goa/-toga* 'chooses' adds a quite exceptional 3sg. *-a*; see IV.2.1). When the root is unstressed, both hiatus and vowel length/diphthongization disappear. The following forms (stressed/unstressed root) will serve by way of illustration:

	3sg. conj.	3pl. conj.
H1	<i>a:tá</i> 'is' / <i>ad:co-ta</i> 'gets'	<i>a:taat</i> / <i>ad:co-tat</i>
H2	<i>do:gni/-dé-ni</i> 'does'	<i>do:gniat/-dé-nat</i>
	<i>do:sliv</i> <i>ad:roi-lli</i> 'earns'	<i>do:sliat</i> / <i>ad:roi-llet</i>

H3	<i>con:oi/ for:com-ai</i> 'keeps'	<i>con:oot/ for:cum-at</i>
	<i>as:luí/-é-lai</i> 'escapes'	<i>as:luat/-é-lat</i>

Some further forms, mostly absolutes, may be added to complete the picture: *raid* 'rows', *im:rá* 'rows around', *-baat* '(they) die' (H1), *gniid* 'does', *biid* 'is wont to be' (H2), *soas* 'who turns', *sceid/-scé* 'vomits', 3pl. *-sceet* (H3). The suffixation of a third syllable merges like vowels in hiatus into the corresponding long vowel, e.g. *gniid* 'does' but *gníth-i* 'does it' (see I.3.3a), *gniit* 'they do' but *gníte* 'who do'.

4.1. The largest class of strong presents, **S1**, is also the most diverse inflectionally, and is best divided into several sub-types. Despite some variation in the details, however, these are all united by a common feature that distinguishes them from other classes: quite independently of the effects of syncope they display fluctuation within the paradigm between palatal and non-palatal quality of the root-final consonant.

(a) The usual pattern, which may be designated **S1a**, involves a basic alternation (sometimes disrupted by assimilation of quality after syncope as in 1pl. *as:beram* but *-ep^trem* 'we say') between palatal root final in the 2 and 3sg. plus 2pl. and non-palatal in the other person (1sg. and pl., 3pl.), both abs. and conj. in each case. The stressed root (see I.2.4a on destressing and I.2.5 on syncope) often has short *e*, which is liable to be raised to *i* in the 2sg. (see VIII.2.5): e.g., 3sg. *be(i)rid/-beir*, 3pl. *ber(a)it/-berat* 'carry', 3sg. *fo:ceird*, 3pl. *fo:cerdat* 'put', 3sg. *ad:greinn*, 3pl. *in:grennat* 'persecute', unstressed 3sg. *ain^tgid/-anaig* 'protects', *du:ind-^tnaig*, 3pl. *t-ind-^tnagat* 'bestow'. Some verbs change the short *e* of their root to *a* before palatal *g* or *d*, e.g. 3sg. *laigid/-laig*, 3pl. *legait/-legat* 'lie', 3sg. rel. *saides*, conj. *-said*, 3pl. abs. *sedait* 'sit'. Verbs with short *i* as their root vowel lower this to *e* before non-palatal consonants, e.g. 3sg. conj. *-ib*, 3pl. abs. *ebait* 'drink', 3sg. abs. *lingid*, 3pl. rel. *leng^ttae* 'leap', 3sg. *con:ic*, 3pl. *con:ecat* 'can', 3sg. *con:rig*, 3pl. *con:regat* 'bind'. Similar alternations can be inferred for other verbs like *nig-/neg-* 'wash' and *mlig-/mleg-* 'milk' from scattered attestations in later manuscripts.

(b) Verbal roots with short or long *e* and a final dental fricative (*th* or *d*) usually follow the scheme in (a) when the root is stressed, e.g. 3sg. *re(i)thid/-reith*,

3pl. *reth(a)it/-rethat* 'run', but do not show raising of *e* to *i* in the 2sg. Those with *é* typically change this to *ía* before a non-palatal consonant, e.g. 3sg. conj. *-réid*, 3pl. abs. *ríadait* 'ride'. The most striking feature of this S1b group emerges when the root is unstressed, in which case the 3sg. conj. ends in the non-palatal stop *-t* /*d*/ instead of the expected palatal fricative *-th* or *-d*, e.g. the *reth-* compounds *du:etar-rat* 'comprehends', *do:fúa-rat* 'remains', the *fed-* ('lead') compounds *ar:co-at* 'injures', *do:di-at* 'leads down' and the *féd-* ('points out') compounds *do:ad-bat* 'shows', *as:ind-et* 'relates'. A phenomenon first definitely attested in Ml. and Sg. is the spread of this *-t* to the 3sg. conj. of stressed roots, e.g. *-rét* 'rides', *ad:fét* 'relates' (the latter usual in Ml., although *ad:féit-som* at 111c4 may represent an otherwise unattested **ad:féid* with delenition and devoicing before *s*), and even to the 1 and 2sg., e.g. normal *ar:riuth* 'I attack, but *fo:t-imm-di-riut* 'I fumigate', *do:di-ut* 'I lead down', *do:ad-bit* 'thou showest' (Wb. 14a18 & 23b27 *ar:neut-sa* 'I await' may be due simply to delenition and devoicing of *d* before *s*; cf. I.2.5b). Finally the present of the highly anomalous *tég-* 'go' root may be mentioned here. Both simplex and compounds generally behave normally outside the 3sg., e.g. 2sg. *for:téig* 'thou helpest', 3pl. *tiagait/-tiagat* 'go', but the 3sg. abs. is always *téit* and the 3sg. conj. almost always *-tét*, *-téit* or their unstressed equivalents (GOI 376-7 for further details).

(c) A number of verbs, here designated S1c, have unvarying *a* or *o* in the root and seem to have a non-palatal final consonant throughout the absolute and in the conjunct apart from the 3sg. and sometimes (see VIII.2.5) the 2sg. with palatal final. Thus 3sg. *canaid* (rel. *canas*)/-*cain* 3pl. *canait/-canat* 'sing', 3sg. *gonaid/-goin* 'wounds', *maraid/-mair* 'lasts', *orcaid/-oirc*, 3pl. conj. *-orcat* 'slay'. Verbs like this were subsequently prone to develop an S1a pattern of alternances between palatal and non-palatal consonance or even an S2 pattern of palatal quality throughout, whence 3sg. abs. *mairid*, *oirgid* etc. Consequently forms like 3sg. abs. *aigid* in later manuscripts hardly provide good evidence that an S1b pattern did not originally underlie 3sg. conj. *-aig* 'drives' (3pl. *agait/-agat*), *-ail* 'rears', *-naisc* 'binds' and so on.

(d) A further group of verbs (basically GOI's BIII) in the S1 class have a nasal in the present stem that typically disappears elsewhere. These deserve a sub-group to themselves because of the peculiar relationship between the present and non-present, particularly preterite, stems that obtained among them and so will be

designated S1d here. *Dingid* 'presses' and its compounds conform to the S1a type -ling/-lengat 'leap(s)' in the present stem (3pl. -dengat) but belongs here by virtue of the non-occurrence of *n* in the non-present stems (e.g. 3sg. pret. *de-daig* as opposed to *leb-laing* 'leaped'). Remaining examples would be S1c presents if they did not lose their *n* in the other stems, e.g. 3sg. *fo:loing* 'suffers' (pret. -lolaig), -toing 'swears' (pret. -tethaig), -mairn 'betrays' (subj. -mera) with 3pl. *fo:longat*, -tongat, -marnat. 3sg. *a-t:baill* 'dies', 3pl. *a-t:ballat* can be included here on the assumption that assimilated *ln* underlies the *ll* of its present stem versus *l* in the rest (e.g. 3sg. subj. *a-t:bela*)

4.2. The rather small S2 present class simply has palatal quality of the root-final consonant throughout, allowing for the occasional distorting effects of post-syncope progressive assimilation of quality. The root vowel is usually *a*, occasionally *u*, e.g. 3sg. *gaibid/-gaib*, 3pl. *gaibit* 'grasp', *fo:gaibet* (but -fog[†]bat) 'find', 3sg. *fo:daim*, 3pl. *fo:daimet* (but -fod[†]mat) 'suffer', 3sg. *guidid/-guid* (but unstressed *ar:ne-get* 'prays' like S1b), 3pl. conj. -guidet 'entreat'.

4.3. The present stem of the small S3 class invariably ends with an *n* that disappears in the other stems (cf. S1d), and once again some common verbs are involved. This *n* never shows independent fluctuation of quality, and is basically non-palatal with a single notable exception. The vowel of the root is usually *e* (GOI's BIV), sometimes *i* and once *u* (GOF's BV). The exceptional *u*-vocalism and palatal *n* coincide in one of the two deponents (see VIII.5) in this group, *ro:cluine[†]thar* 'hears', and there is homogeneous inflection otherwise, e.g. 3sg. *benaid/-ben*, 3pl. conj. -benat 'strike', 3sg. *glenaid/-glen* 'sticks', conj. 3sg. -ren, 3pl. -renat 'sell', 3sg. *ar-a:ch[†]rin*, 3pl. *ar-a:ch[†]rinat* 'snuff it, perish', 3sg. *do:lin*, 3pl. *do:linat* 'flow'. As usual, assimilation of quality after syncope can affect the *n*, e.g. 1sg. *ben(a)im* 'I strike' but *do:fui-b[†]nim* 'I cut off'.

CHAPTER IV

The Subjunctive Stem

1. Use of the subjunctive in Old Irish main clauses is restricted largely to exhortation, but it is found extensively in various types of subordinate clause (*GOI* 329-31). From a purely formal point of view there are three different types, namely the *s-*, *e-* and *a-subjunctives*. Since the range of the first two can be quite precisely defined, they are best treated at the beginning, leaving the *a*-subjunctive to be dealt with as a large residual category.

2.1. With the exception of *agid* 'drives' and compounds, all strong verbs with roots ending in a dental or guttural stop, a fricative or double *n* (*th*, *d*, *t*, *nn*, *ch*, *g*, *c* in spelling) take an *s*-subjunctive. This formation is also vestigially attested alongside a more normal *a*-subjunctive in three hiatus verbs, *luid* 'drinks' (see X.2), *do:goa* 'chooses' and compounds of *-cí* 'sees' with subj. 3sg. act. *-lú*, *do:gó*, pass. *-accastar* (*ad:cí*), *do:écastar* (*do:é-ci*) etc., but is otherwise entirely confined to the types of root just mentioned (details in *GOI* 380 and 387-95, *OIPG* 49-50).

The basic pattern entails conversion of the root-final consonants in question (plus a preceding nasal, if present) into *s(s)*, as in pres. ind. 3sg. abs. *téit* 'goes', 3pl. *tlagait/-tlagat* 'go' versus pres. subj. 3sg. abs. *téis*, 3pl. *tlasait/-tlasat*. The *s*-marker, which is subject to fluctuation in quality like the stem final of S1a presents (III.4.1a), is visible as a distinguishing feature throughout the paradigm except for the 3sg. conj. of the present subjunctive, where it regularly disappears as in *-té*, *-gé* versus corresponding abs. *téis* 'let him go', *geis* 'let him entreat'.

When the 3sg. conj. is stressed, its final vowel is invariably long in accordance with I.2.4c, and its fundamental quantity can only be established on the strength of forms such as the 3sg. abs. with retained *s*. Thus the vowel of *-gé* is inherently short (3sg. abs. *geis*) while that of *-té* is basically long (3sg. abs. *téis*). Needless to say, where the syllable containing *s* is non-final, as is often the case outside the 3sg., its

vowel may be lost entirely through syncope in appropriate conditions, e.g. 3pl. *fo:lósat* vs. *-ful^tsat* 'may suffer' (*fo:loing*). Sometimes further factors such as support vowel and dislocation of the system of consonant quality apply (see I.2.5a-c), e.g. 1pl. *con:rísam* but *-comairsem* < **-comr^tsam* 'we may meet' (*con:ric*).

2.2. The question of whether the vowel of the verbal root in the *s*-subjunctive is basically long or short is of fundamental importance when the final vowel of the 3sg. conj. comes into unstressed position. In that case a basically short vowel simply disappears, e.g. stressed *fo:ré* 'let him help' but unstressed *for:di-uai-r* 'it should remain over' (*fo-* and *for-de-uss-* respectively plus *reth-* 'run', subj. stem *ress-*), 3sg. abs. *anais* but conj. *-ain* 'may protect' (pres. *ain^tgid/-anaig*, subj. stem *aness-*), 3sg. *at:ré* but *-éi-r* 'may arise' (pres. *at:reig*, *-érig*, 3sg. past subj. *at:ressed*) or *ath:eir-r*, *-aithir* 'may repeat' (pres. *ad:eir-rig*). A fundamentally long vowel by contrast may be merely shortened according to I.2.4b and then retained in unstressed position, e.g. 3sg. *con:im-the* 'may accompany' (pres. *con:im-thet*, a compound of *téit*), *con:í*, *-cum-ai* 'may be able' (pres. *con:ic*, *-cum-aing*, 2sg. subj. *con:íis* with long vowel), *ro:sá*, *-ro-a* 'may he reach' (pres. *ro:saig*, *-roig*, 2sg. subj. *ro:sáis*), unstressed *-in-gre* 'may persecute' (pres. *in:greinn*, cf. past subj. 3pl. *in:gríastais* for the long vowel). Since, however, the difference between short and long vowel types was regularly neutralized in the stressed 3sg. conj., as instanced by *-gé* and *-té* in 2.1 above, there was a tendency to merge the two in the unstressed 3sg. conj. as well. This process favoured the type without final unstressed vowel, whence *-cum* alongside *-cumai* (*con:ic*), *-fu-l* 'may suffer' and not expected **-fu-lo* (*fo:loing*, 1sg. subj. *fo:lós*), *con:éi-t* 'may yield' (*con:é-tet*) vs. *con:im-the* above, *-ecail* (< **-ecl* by vowel support) 'may investigate' (*in:gleinn*) but *-in-gre* above and so on.

2.3. In a handful of roots with internal *l* or *r* and a final guttural or dental, notably *fo:ceird* 'puts', *orgaid* 'slays' and *mligid* 'milks', replacement of the root-final *d* or *g* with *s* gave rise to the subjunctive stems **cers-*, **ors-* and **mels-* and these then underwent assimilation to *cerr-*, *orr-* and *mell-*. Unlike *s(s)* itself, this *r(r)* or *l(l)* was not lost in the 3sg. conj., whether stressed or unstressed. Thus subj. 2sg. *fo:ceirr*, 3sg. *fris:orr*, 3pl. *fris:orrat* (*fris:oig* 'offends'), 3sg. *du:in-mail* (*do:in-mlig* 'promulgates'), 3sg. pass. conj. *-meltar*.

2.4. The relationship between the vocalism of *s*-subjunctives and that of the

corresponding present indicatives is somewhat complex. Only in the relevant S1a/b formations does the basic vocalism of the present, whether short *e* or the rarer *é(i)/ia* alternation (before palatal and non-palatal consonants respectively) remain essentially unaltered in the *s*-subjunctive: thus conj. 1sg. *-tes* (pres. 3sg. *-teich* 'flees'), 3sg. *do:fé* or 3sg. past subj. *do:feissed* with basic short vowel (pres. 3sg. *do:feid* 'leads'), the subjunctive forms of *téit* 'goes' in 2.1 above and so on. An *s*-subjunctive with a basic short *e* also characterizes a number of verbs, notably a handful of relevant S1a and S2 forms, with different present vocalism, e.g. the subjunctive forms of *guid-* (S2) in 2.1 above, subj. *-meltar* (2.3 above) vs. pres. *mlig-/mleg-* (S1a), 2pl. conj. *ar:clessid* 'you may ward off' (*ar:clich*, S1a), 3sg. conj. dep. (see VIII.5) *-mestar* 'may judge' (*-midethar*, S2), *-estar* 'may eat' (*ith-*, S1a; cf. 3 below). However, most relevant S1a and S1c formations exchange present *i/e* for *é/ia* in the *s*-subjunctive, e.g. 1sg. conj. *con:rias*, 3sg. conj. *do:ré* and past subj. *do:réised* (*con:rig* 'binds', *do:rig* 'strips'), 3pl. rel. *cias'tae* (*cingid* 'steps'), 3pl. conj. pass. *for:díassatar* (*for:ding* 'crushes'). Otherwise presents with *e* before *nn* (S1a) or *o* and *a* (some S1c and S2) before dental or guttural, plus *-ic* compounds, tend to display the corresponding long vowel in the *s*-subjunctive, as in 2sg. *in:gléis* (*in:gleinn* 'investigates'), 1sg. *do:sés* (*do:seinn* 'pursues'), 3sg. *máis/-má* (*maidid* 'breaks'), 2sg. *ro:sáis*, 3sg. *ro:sá* (*ro:saig* 'reaches'), 1sg *fo:lós*, 3sg. *fo:ló* (*fo:loing* 'suffers'), 3pl. *(-)risat*, *-tísat* and 3sg. *(-)rí*, *-tí* (*ro:ic* 'arrives', *do:ic* 'comes'). Occasionally confusion between short- and long-vowel types goes beyond the cases discussed in 2.2, as in 3sg. conj. dep. *-festar* instead of expected but far less usual *-fiastar* (*ro:fitir* 'knows').

3. Most of the small H2 group forms an *e*-subjunctive by exchanging *e/é* for present *i/i* (see III.3). Unlike the present, the *e*-subjunctive with stressed root never displays hiatus. In unstressed position these subjunctive forms converge in the plural with the more widespread *a*-subjunctive (see 4 below) owing to I.2.4a, a coincidence then extended to the unstressed singular except for the substantive verb. In effect, then, a stressed *e*-subjunctive alternates with an unstressed *a*-subjunctive in most H2 verbs. Thus 3sg. *beith/-bé* (unstressed *-roi-b*), 3 pl. *beit/-bet* (unstressed *-ro-bat*) corresponding to habitual pres. 3sg. *biid/-bí*, 3pl. *biit/-biat* of the substantive verb, 3sg. *do:gné/-dé-na*, 3pl. *do:gnet* (*-dé-nat*), 3pl. rel. *gnete* corresponding to pres. *do:gní*, *do:gniat*, *gníte* 'do', unstressed 3sg. *as:roi-llea*, 3pl.

as:roi-llet 'may earn' corresponding to pres. *as:roi-lli*, *as:roi-llet*. Apart from vestiges of an *s*-subjunctive in the passive above all, compounds of *-cí* 'sees' have a subjunctive of this type but with anomalous deponent inflection, e.g. 3pl. *ad:ceter* (*-accatar*) 'may see' versus pres. *ad:ciat* (VIII.5 on deponents, and *ithid*, *-estar* in 2.4 above for a similar non-deponent pres./deponent subj. alternation).

4.1. All remaining Old Irish verbs form an *a*-subjunctive (GOI 380-7, OIPG 43-9), which is thus characteristic of all weak verbs, all hiatus verbs except for H2 (even *do:goa* basically has an *a*-subj. despite the vestige of a 3sg. *s*-subj. noted in 2.1), and strong verbs with root-final vowel (S3), *-b*, *-r*, *-l*, *-m* or single *-n* (some S1 and 2) as well as *ag-* and compounds (2.1).

Apart from the 1 and 2sg. with their distinctive endings, the active inflection is identical with that of W1 presents (III.2 and VIII.2) and so is typified by 3sg. conj. *-a*. The final consonant of the *a*-subjunctive is generally non-palatal throughout except that a palatal quality also occurring in a W2a present (III.2) is retained. In W2b and S2 a palatal final of the present becomes non-palatal in the subjunctive, W2b further changing pres. *u* to subj. *o* (see III.2). The *a*-subjunctive of S1a/c (S1b all have *s*-subj.) abandons alternations of consonant quality in the present for non-palatal throughout the paradigm and that of S3 eliminates the *n* of the present stem entirely (III.4.3).

The extent to which present and *a*-subjunctive stems are formally differentiated depends largely upon the degree of divergence in the quality of their respective final consonants. Thus there is a great deal of formal overlap in W1, somewhat less in W2a and S1c, less still in S1a, very little in W2b and S2, and none in S3 owing to $\pm n$. Examples from W2b are pres. *do:lugi*, *-dill^hgai* 'forgives' vs. subj. 2sg. *do:logae*, 3sg. *-dill^hga*, 3sg. pres. *con:tuili* 'sleeps' vs. subj. *con:tola*, 3sg. pres. dep. *do:cuirethar* 'puts' vs. subj. *do:corathar*. The relationship elsewhere can be most conveniently tabulated by confronting the 3sg. abs./conj. and 3pl. conj. of the present and the *a*-subjunctive respectively:

	PRESENT	SUBJUNCTIVE
W1	<i>marb(a)id/-marba, -marbat</i>	<i>marb(a)id/-marba, -marbat</i>
W2a	<i>lé(i)cí/-lé(i)cí, -lé(i)cet</i> <i>rád(a)id/-rád(a)i, -rádat</i>	<i>lé(i)cí/-lé(i)cea, -lé(i)cet</i> <i>rád(a)id/-ráda, -rádat</i>

S1a	<i>be(i)rid/-beir, -berat</i>	<i>ber(a)id/-bera, -berat</i>
S1c	<i>can(a)id/-cain, -canat</i>	<i>can(a)id/-cana, -canat</i>
S2	<i>ga(i)bid/-gaib, -ga(i)bet</i>	<i>gab(a)id/-gaba, -gabat</i>
S3	<i>cren(a)id/-cren, -crenat</i>	<i>crieid/-cria, -criat</i>

The above specimens show that formal differentiation of the two stems is far from complete but that in the all-important 3sg. conj. the ending *-a* serves to distinguish the subjunctives from all but W1 presents. Even where the two stems diverge throughout in basic consonant quality and/or vocalism, syncope and concomitant assimilations of consonant quality (I.2.5) can distort the system and eradicate these distinctions in appropriate circumstances, e.g. S2 pres. *fo:gaibet* 'they find', subj. *fo:gabat* but prototonic *-fog^tbat* in both or W2b pres. *con:tuilet* 'they sleep', subj. *con:tolat* but presumed prototonic *-cot^tlat* in both. Occasionally the vagaries of Old Irish orthography (see appendix) conspire to confuse in writing pairs that were distinct in pronunciation, as is shown by the possibility of writing *berid* in both present and subjunctive above despite palatal *r* in the former and non-palatal *r* in the latter. The S3 3sg. abs. type *crieid* has OIr. *e* for *a* in hiatus between *i* and a palatal consonant (GOI 66-7).

4.2. Comparison with certain types of nominal inflection such as nom. *éo*, gen. *iach* 'salmon', nom *guin*, gen. *gona* 'wounding' or nom. *cruth*, gen. *crotha* 'shape' place vocalic alternances such as S3 pres. 3sg. conj. *-glen* 'sticks', subj. 1sg. conj. *-gléu* but 3sg. *-glia*, W2b pres. 3sg. *do:lugi*, 3sg. subj. *do:loga* in a wider context suggesting that the vocalism of the two formations is best regarded as fundamentally the same. Elsewhere the identity of vocalism is for the most part complete on the surface too, as the table in 4.1 shows. Further examples are 3sg. conj. pres. *-gair*, subj. *-gara* (S2), pres. *-goin*, subj. *-gona* (S1b), pres. *-ceil*, subj. *-cela* (S1a), pres. *-ern*, subj. *-era* (S3), pres. *-meil*, subj. *-mela* (S1a), pres. *-ail*, subj. *-ala* (S1c), pres. and subj. *-ana* (W1), pres. *-creiti*, subj. *-creitea* (W2a).

However, a handful of strong verbs with *a*-vocalism (sometimes realized as *o* or *u* after a labial - cf. GOI 50) before root-final *n* (S2) or root-final *r* or *l* plus stem-forming *n* (S1d, with *ln* further assimilated to *ll*) in the present switch to *e*-vocalism in the *a*-subjunctive (see 2.4 for some roughly similar phenomena in the *s*-subjunctive): 3sg. conj. pres. *-mairn* (S1d) 'betrays' but subj. *-mera*, 3sg. pres. *at:baill* (for **-bailn*, S1d) 'kicks it, dies' but subj. *at:bela*, deponent (see VIII.5)

3sg. pres. *do:moinethar* (S2) 'thinks' but subj. *do:menathar*, 3sg. conj. pres. *-gainethar* (S2) 'is born' but subj. *-genathar*.

4.3. Roots with a final vowel, namely those forming hiatus presents and most of those with an S3 present, show some diversity of detail as regards their *a*-subjunctives, allowing for a certain paucity of reliable evidence in some cases.

To judge from forms like subj. 3pl. *-baat* and past subj. 3pl. *-batis* of *baid* 'dies', present and subjunctive stems were basically identical in H1 as in W1 and would only have been distinguished in the 1 and 2sg. by different endings (see VIII.2.4-5). Where the root was unstressed, a perfectly normal *a*-subjunctive would emerge, as in 1sg. *ad:co-t*, 3sg. *ad:co-ta*, *-é-ta*, 3pl. *-é-tat* versus pres. ind. *ad:co-ta*, *-éta* 'gets' with the same relationship between the two stems as in W1.

The best evidence for an H3 *o*-verb (see 3 above for H2) is provided by *soid/-soí* 'turns' and compounds, e.g. 2sg. *-soe*, *do:int-ae*, 3sg. *-soa*, *do:int-á* in the subjunctive, but 3pl. past subj. *-cloítis* to *cloid* 'repels' suggests that this is typical enough and that present and subjunctive stems were basically identical, being differentiated by endings only in the same persons as W2a (4.1 above). However, *foid* 'spends the night' preserves traces of a switch in vocalism in 3sg. subj. *-fia* alongside forms with more normal (and doubtless analogical) *o* vocalism in later manuscripts.

The two verbs with root-final *u* in the present, *as:luí* 'escapes' (H3) and deponent *ro:cluínethar* 'hears' (S3), change this to *o* in the subjunctive in a manner reminiscent of W2b (4.1-2 above), e.g. 3sg. *as:loa*, *(ro)-cloathar*. As in the case of *-soa*, *do:int-á* above, this *o* in hiatus is liable to disappear in unstressed position (cf. III.3 for similar phenomena in hiatus presents), as in 3sg. subj. *-é-la*. A curious *o*-vocalism is seen in 3sg. subj. passive *asa:gnoither* to *as(a):gnin* 'knows' (S3).

The remaining S3 verbs usually have *e* but sometimes *i* before the *n* of the present stem. In the subjunctive both vowels become *i* in hiatus before the *a* of monosyllabic endings when the root is under the stress, e.g. 3sg. conj. *-bia* (pres. *-ben* 'strikes'), *-cria* (*-cren* 'buys'), *-ria*, 3pl. *-riat* (*-ren* 'sells'), but this *ia* is changed to *e* when an additional syllable comes after it, e.g. 3pl. passive *betir*, 3sg. pass. *-rethar*, 3pl. rel. *glete* (*-glen* 'sticks'), or the root is unstressed, e.g. 3sg. *-ind-ar-be* (*ind:ár-ban* 'banishes'), 3pl. *etir:di-bet* (*etir:di-ben* 'destroys'). An apparent exception, 3pl. subj. *-aur-chriat* (*ar-a:chrin* 'perishes'), is probably due to scribal imitation of the stressed form but may reflect the influence of present *i*.

This type of subjunctive seems to be found in at least one H2 verb, *ciid* 'weeps' with 3sg. conj. *-cia*, past, subj. 3sg. *-ciad*, 3pl. *-cetis*, and the alternation between stressed hiatus *ia* and unstressed *e* has parallels in hiatus presents (III.3) like pl. *do:sliat*, *-tui-llet* 'earn'.

CHAPTER V

The Future Stem

1. The basic dividing line as regards types of future stem runs between the weak verbs plus H3 with their **f-future** on the one hand and the strong and remaining hiatus verbs with various other formations on the other, although there are a few exceptions on both sides. The principal inflectional types of what may be crudely termed the strong future are the **s-**, **i-** and **a-futures**, but a further classification geared to the shape of the root cuts across this by distinguishing **unreduplicated**, **reduplicated** and **long vowel** types. In view of this diversity of inflection and stem formation, it seems best to start with the more homogeneous *f*-future.

2.1. The basic suffix of the *f*-future (GOI 396-400, OIPG 52-5) is *-if-*, which tends to have a palatalizing effect upon a preceding consonant even in the case of the otherwise immutable roots of W1 (see II.2.2). Except for the 1sg. conj. (see VIII.2.4), the *f*-marker is accompanied by exactly the same endings as occur in the *a*-subjunctive.

After an unstressed vowel the *f* is often voiced to *b* /*v*/ (see appendix), particularly in final position in the 1sg. conj., e.g. (all conjunct) 3pl. *prid^tchabat* 'will preach' (W1 *prid^tchid*), 1sg. *-él^tub* 'I shall escape', 2sg. *-él^tafae* 'thou shalt escape' (H3 *as:luí*, *-élai*), deponent (see VIII.5) 3sg. *-comalnabadar* 'will fulfil' (< **-coml^tn-* by I.2.5c: W1 *comalnaithir*, factitive to *comlann*, cf. II.2a), 1pl. *-sam^tlafammar* 'we shall liken' (W1 *sam^tlaithir*, factitive to *samail*). Examples such as these indicate a basically non-palatal *f*, as the following *a*-inflection would lead one to expect. As the above examples suggest, the vowel of non-final *-if-* is only likely to be preserved if a preceding syllable has already been syncopated. Where progressive assimilation makes the resultant consonant cluster non-palatal by I.2.5a as in *sam^tl-* above, the vowel of the future suffix is realized as *a* by I.2.4a.

More often than not, however, the front vowel of *-if-*, having palatalized a preceding consonant, is syncopated in the second syllable before non-final *f* (i.e. outside the 1sg. conj.), which then tends to be palatalized by the progressive assimilation of quality just mentioned but remains unvoiced in the absence of a preceding unstressed vowel. Thus W2 1pl. abs. *léic^tfimmi* 'we shall leave' (*léicid*), 3sg. rel. *creit^tfes* 'who shall believe' (*creitid*), W1 conj. 2sg. *-mairb^tfe* 'thou shalt slay' (*marb(a)id*), *ar:troid^tfe* 'thou shalt restrain' (*ar:troítha*), 3sg. *-noib^tfea* 'will sanctify' (*noib(a)id*), *a:trefea* 'will dwell' (< *ad:tre(i)b^tfea* by a devoicing described in GOI 86-8 that is actually reflected in the spelling; *ad:treba*), *con:tifea* 'will mock' (< *con:tib^tfea*; *con:tibi*), *fo:fir^tfea* 'will cause' (*fo:fera*, see GOI 46-8 on the concomitant *e/i* fluctuation), W2b 3sg. conj. *do:luich^tfea* 'will forgive' (*do:lugi* but subj. *do:loga*), H3 2sg. conj. *-soífe* 'thou shalt turn', passive 3pl. abs. *soífitir* 'will be turned' (*soid*), 3sg. conj. *-cloífether* 'will be conquered' (*cloid*), both with underlying palatal **-w^tf-*.

Although palatalized root final seems to have been the norm even in the *f*-futures of W1 and W2b, there seems to have been some tendency to depalatalize here under pressure from the broad final consonant of all other (W1) or other non-present (W2b) stems. Thus 3sg. conj. *-soir^tfea* 'will deliver' but non-pal. 3sg. conditional *-soir^tfad* 'would deliver', or 1sg. abs. *ain^tfa* 'I shall remain' but non-pal. 3sg. conj. *-cum^t-s-an^tfa* 'will rest' (*an(a)id*, *con:os^tna* respectively), 3sg. non-pal. *do:lug^tfa* 'will forgive' with a telltale *u* that betrays the secondary nature of the broad consonance here in comparison with the regular *do:luich^tfea* of the previous paragraph.

On the other hand, there was a marked tendency to palatalize postvocalic *f/b*, perhaps on the model of the normally palatal post-consonantal form of the suffix, e.g. 3sg. conj. *do:aid^tleba* versus palatalized *do:aid^tlibea* 'will visit, (*do:aid^tlea*), 3pl. conj. *-cum^tgubat* 'will be able' versus 3sg. conditional *-cum^tcaibed* 'would be able' (*con:ic*), 3pl. conj. *táir^tcebat* 'will cause' versus 3sg. conditional *do:áir^tcibed* 'would cause' (*do:áir^tci*, see I.1.4). A similar fluctuation seems to occur in the *f*-future of *foid* 'spends the night', e.g. 3pl. abs. *fibait* versus 3sg. conj. *-fifea* with an anomalous shift in vocalism similar to that found in the subjunctive of this H3 verb (see IV.4.3).

2.2. The most consistent exceptions to the rule confining the *f*-future to weak and H3 verbs in Old Irish are the compounds of the S2 deponent *-moinethar*, e.g.

3pl. *ar-a:muin^tfetar feid* 'will honour him' and *do:roi-m^tnibetar* 'they will forget', and those of S1a -*ic*. Typical examples, in addition to the *con:ic* forms in 2.1 above, are 1sg. *r(o):icub* 'I shall come', 3sg. *ro:ic^tfea* 'will come' (*ro:ic*), 3sg. -*tic^tfea* or *do:ic^tfa* 'will come' (*do:ic*) with a fluctuation in quality of the type just discussed. The *f*-future is also the only type attested in Old Irish for the H2 -*slí* compound *ad:roi-lli* 'earns'. An original reduplicated future might be expected in such a verb and the syncope pattern in 3pl. *ad-id:roi-^tllifet* (Ml. 61a20) 'who shall deserve it' suggests that the *f*-suffix may simply have been added to such a stem (see VI.4.3 for a similar phenomenon in the preterite). However, a regularization of the pattern is seen in 2sg. *as:ro-ll^tfe* (Sg. 66b19) 'thou shalt deserve'.

A 3sg. conj. *do:emfea* (Ml. 128c8) alongside *du:éma* (Ml. 67c5, long vowel not marked in the ms. but to be inferred) 'will protect' (S1a *do:eim*) can be regarded as a sporadic prefiguration of the spread of the *f*-future in Middle Irish (see XII 6.2).

3.1. With the exception of -*ic* compounds, which have *f*-futures (2.2), and *téit* 'goes' plus a number of its compounds, which have a suppletive *a*-future (5.3), verbs with an *s*-subjunctive (IV.2.1) also form an *s*-future (see GOI 407-13, OIPG 59-60), which is thus characteristic of strong verbs with root-final guttural, dental or *nn* and survives vestigially (but more extensively than in the subjunctive) in compounds of H2 -*cí* 'sees'. Apart from the 1sg. abs. (VIII.2.4), the *s*-subjunctive and *s*-future are identical in inflection as well as stem suffix, so that they can only be differentiated consistently in the form of the presuffixal stem.

This differentiation is lacking in the case of verbs in S1a/b with basic short *e* preceded by a root consonant in both present and subjunctive stems, since such verbs have unreduplicated *s*-futures that are to all intents and purposes identical with the corresponding subjunctives. The principal roots involved are seen in S1a *a-t:reig* 'rises' (cf. French *il s'élève*), *teichid* 'flees', *ain^tgid* 'protects' (by syncope, conj. -*anaig* by I.2.4a but underlying **aneg*-), S1b *reithid* 'runs', *feidid* 'leads', S1a *laigid* (3pl. *legait*) 'lies', *saidid* 'sits' (3pl. *sedait*, but S1b in cpd. *ar:ne-at* 'awaits') with basic subjunctive/future stems *ress*-, *tess*-, *aness*-, *ress*-, *fess*-, *less*-, *sess*-. For example, conj. 3sg. (cf. IV.2.1-2) *ní-s:n-ain* 'will not protect them', *fu-m:ré* 'will help me' (*fo:reith*), *a-t:ré* 'will rise' (lit. 'raise himself'), 3pl. *a-ta:resat* lit. 'will raise themselves' (*a-t:reig*), abs. 3sg. *seiss* 'will sit', conditional 1sg. (VIII.7) *do:fessind* 'I would lead back'.

3.2. Most *s*-futures, however, are formally differentiated from corresponding *s*-subjunctives by **reduplication** of the root, a process whereby the root initial is simply doubled. A glide vowel is inserted in the case of the initial consonants typical of most roots, and in the future this is basically *i*. Since the reduplicator inevitably adds an extra leniting syllable to the form in question, its effects in comparison with unreduplicated subjunctives are not dissimilar to those documented in I.2.2-5 with reference to the additional preverb in the stressed part of the verb in prototonic as opposed to deuterotonic forms. The following pairs should make the relationship between *s*-subjunctive and reduplicated *s*-future stems clear, attention being drawn to phenomena such as lenition, syncope and modification of the unstressed root vowel: 3sg. rel. *ges/ gi-ges* (*guidid* 'entreats'), 3sg. abs. *céis/ ci-chis* (*cingid* 'steps'), *sléis/ si-lis* (*sligid* 'fells'), 3sg. conj. *fo:cerr/ fo:ci-cherr* (*fo:ceird* 'puts'), 3pl. conj. *-cíasat/ -ci-ch^tset* (*cingid*), *fo:lósat/ fo:li-l^tsat* (*fo:loing* 'suffers').

Where the root has a basic *a* vocalism that is retained in the *s*-subjunctive and future, the reduplicating vowel of the latter is lowered from *i* to *e* in partial assimilation to the back vowel *a*, as a comparison of subj. 3sg. *máis/-má* (*maidid* 'breaks'), *-ná* (*nascid* 'binds') with corresponding fut. *me-mais/-me-ma*, *-ne-na* shows. This development seems to be impeded by *u*-infection of the root in the 1sg. fut. conj. (see VIII.2.4), to judge from *ad:ci-chlus* 'I shall hunt' (*ad:claid*), and the *e* may have been borrowed from the other persons in *ar:ne-nas* 'I shall bind' (*ar:naisc*) in a later manuscript. In the case of *saigid* and compounds with subj. 3sg. *sáis/-sá* the *i*-reduplication of 3sg. fut. *-si-a* etc. is due to hiatus (cf. IV.4.2-3).

3.3. In roots with initial *f* reduplication disappears through regular loss by lenition, and in the case of deponent *midithir* 'judges' and compounds a similar loss apparently results from the dissimilation of the lenited second of two homorganic palatal labials separated by a vowel only. The upshot is an *s*-future stem with basic disyllabic *fias-*, *mias* respectively retained in closed syllables but reduced to *fes-*, *mes-* in open ones, i.e. when immediately followed by a vowel. Thus conj. 1sg. *do:fíus* (closed, with 1sg. *u*-infection of the *a*), 3sg. *du:fí* (regular after loss of *-as* by I.2.4c; both *do:fích* 'avenges'), 3pl. *as:ind-isét* (unstressed, *as:ind-(f)et* 'relates'), passive (VIII.6), 3sg. *du:fíastar* (closed) but 3pl. *du:fesatar* (open, both *do:fích*) and similarly deponent (VIII.5) 3sg. rel. *miastar*, conj. *ro:fíastar* but 1sg. conj. *-mesor*, *ro:fessur*, 1 pl. abs. *messimmir*, 3pl. conj. *ro:fessatar* (*midithir*, *ro:finnadar*).

Long vowel surrogates of reduplication are generally avoided in the *s*-future, and it is significant that the one stem of this type, the future *is-* of *ithid* 'eats' with a long vowel ascribable to reduplicated **i-es-* (cf. subj. *-es-tar*, IV.2.4), seems to have gone over to the *a*-inflection particularly early, to judge from 3sg. conj. *-ísa* rather than unattested **-í*, despite retaining its *s*-formans.

3.4. Because of the extra prefixed syllable the root is always unstressed in true reduplicated futures (3.2) unlike the corresponding subjunctives. Since unstressed vowels typically lose any length or independent quality possessed by their stressed counterparts (see 1.2.4), as various examples above demonstrate, the underlying vocalism of the root in the reduplicated *s*-future is difficult to determine with confidence. It emerged in 3.2 that roots with basic *a* vocalism retain the root syllable in unstressed position in the 3sg. conjunct of the *s*-future (*-mema*, *-nena*, *-sia*) just as in the corresponding subjunctive forms, and this points to underlying long *a* in both cases (see IV.2.2-4). Otherwise, however, this syllable seems to be lost in such future forms, e.g. 3sg. conj. *do:ci-ch* 'will advance' (*do:cing*), *fo:li-l* 'will suffer' (*fo:loing*), *ar:si-l* 'will smite' (*ar:slig*), *con:ci-chuil* 'will spring upon' (< **-ci-chl* by vowel support, cf. I.2.5c and GOI 70; *con:clich*). It is far from certain that the *-biba* claimed as an exception by GOI 413 is actually a 3sg. conj. of the reduplicated *s*-future of *bongid* or a compound.

Thus in the *s*-future, unlike the *s*-subjunctive (see IV.2.2-4), there is no definite evidence that basically long vocalism was found outside *a*-roots. For present purposes it hardly matters whether such discrepancies may be due to actual differences in vocalism between the two formations or rather to the analogical spread of the short-vowel type being even more extensive in the future than in the subjunctive (IV.2.2).

4. The *i*-future (GOI 405-6) is formed by primary (see II.2.2-4) verbs with an underlying root-final *i* (usually realized as *e* in S3 nasal presents, cf. III.4.3, rather as the *i* reduplicator of the future can become *e* in appropriate circumstances, cf. 3.2 and 5.1) that is not preceded by *n*. It thus characterizes H2 verbs apart from *-gní* and *-sní* (see 2.2 on *-slí*, where an original reduplicated *i*-future has apparently adopted *f*-inflection secondarily) and the majority S3 type with root-final *i/e* apart from *-gnin* compounds. These roots with initial consonant plus *n* form *a*-futures (see 5.2).

Apart from 2sg. *-e* instead of *-i*, the inflection of this future seems to be identical to that of the W2 or unstressed H2 presents. A full reduplicated type using *i* is the rule for roots with a single initial consonant, e.g. 1sg. *as:ri-riu*, 2sg. abs. *li-le*, 3sg. rel. *li-les*, conj. *as:ri-ri*, 3pl. abs. *li-lit*, conj. *-ri-ret* (S3 *as:ren* 'pays', *lenaid* 'sticks', *renaid* 'sells'), abs. 1sg. *ci-che* (for OIr. **ci-chiu*), 3pl. *ci-chit* (H2 *ciid* 'weeps'). Compounds of H2 *-cí* 'sees' have *s-* and *i-*formations side by side in the future (3.1) rather as *s-* and *e/a-*formations coexist in the subjunctive of the same verbs (IV.2.1 and IV.3), the *s-*formation being in both cases particularly resilient in the passive, e.g. *s-fut.* 3pl. *a-t:chi-ch[†]set*, 1sg. *do:é-cu-chus*, 3sg. pass. *a-tat:chi-gestar* 'thou shalt be seen' (note the tendency to change palatal *ch* to *g* after an unstressed vowel), *i-fut.* 3sg. *-a-cci-gi*, *du:é-ci-gi*, 3pl. *-ai-cci-chet* (*ad:cí*, *do:é-ci*).

In two S3 roots with initial labial the lenition of internal *f* and dissimilatory loss of internal palatal *b* respectively (cf 3.3) result in *i-*futures with a long vowel by contraction instead of overt reduplication: 3sg. pass. *ad:fíther* 'will be paid back' (*ad:fen*; Wb. 20b7 *ad:fether* is presumably subj. 'that might be required'), 1sg. *biu*, 3sg. *bíth-us* 'will smite them', rel. *bias*, conj. *du:fó-bi* 'will cut off' (*benaid* and cpd. *do:fui-ben*).

S3 roots beginning with stop plus liquid display a long vowel *íu* surrogate of reduplication through compensated loss of a lenited consonant between *i* and the liquid. 3sg. *ar-a:chíuri* 'will perish' is obviously *i-fut.* (< **-ci-chri*; *ar-a:chrin*), but the non-palatal consonance of the liquid means that forms like 3pl. *ar-a:chíurat* (cf. W2 pres. 3sg. *-rádi*, *-fod[†]l(a)i*, 3pl. *-rádat*, *-fod[†]lat* in III.2), 3sg. cond. *ar-a:chíurad*, *no:gíulad* 'would adhere', 3pl. abs. fut. *gíulait* (< **-gi-gli-*; *glenaid*), while phonetically regular by I.2.4a, look very much like *a-*futures, whence assimilation to the *a-fut.* pattern in a form like 1sg. conj. *-cíur* 'I shall buy' (< **-ci-chri-*; *crenaid*).

5.1. An *a-future* (GOI 401-5, OIPG 55-8) is formed by various types of verb not dealt with so far, notably strong verbs with root-final *b*, *r*, *l*, *m* or *n*, the pair of weak verbs *caraid* 'loves' and *ad:gládathar* 'calls', H1, H2 *-gní*, *-sní* and compounds, H3 *do:goa* 'chooses' and S3 *-gnin* and compounds plus deponent *ro:cluínethar*.

Like the *s-future*, the *a-future* is basically differentiated from an inflectionally

identical corresponding *a*-subjunctive by reduplication involving the vowel *i*. This remains unmodified in the futures of strong verbs with a root-initial consonant other than *s* and a root-final nasal, where these have underlying *e* vocalism in the future even if other tenses or moods have a different root vowel. Thus 1sg. conj. *-di-dem* 'I shall suffer' (S2 *daimid*), 3sg. cond. *f-a:di-d^tmed* 'would suffer it' (*fo:daim*), *no:gi-g^tned* 'would be born', 3sg. abs. *gi-g^tnithir* 'will be born' (S2 deponent *gainithir*), 3pl. conj. *-li-l^tmatar* (S2 deponent (*ro*)-*laimethar*), pass. 3sg. conj. *no-t:gi-g^tnether* 'thou shalt be slain' (S1c *gonaid*). Palatalization of the root-final consonant is regular here by I.2.5a, but *-daim* and compounds at least tend to restore the non-palatal consonance that is more typical of the *a*-future, e.g. conj. 1sg. *-di-dam*, 3sg. (nas. rel.) *ad:ndi-d^tma*, 3pl. *fo:di-d^tmat*.

However, just as a following *a* lowers the reduplicating vowel to *e* in some *s*-futures (see 3.2 above), so too the reduplicating vowel is often realized as *e* in the *a*-futures. Indeed, in view of the basic *a*-formans it is hardly surprising that *e* is actually far commoner than *i* in this category. This type of reduplication is the norm for the *a*-futures of all verbs that are neither strong nor contain internal *-n-* in their root. Thus conj. 3pl. *-ce-ch^trat* 'will love, (W1 *caraid*), 3sg. dep. *ad:ge-galldathar* 'will call' (*ad:gládathar* with *-gegalld-* from **-gegl^td-* by vowel support, see I.2.5c; prob. W2 pres. with non-pal. after *á* by III.2), 1sg. *for:ce-chan*, 3sg. *for:ce-ch^tna* 'will instruct' (*for:cain*, compound of S1c *canaid* which does not change root vocalism to *e* in the future), 3sg. abs. *be-baid* 'will die' (H1 *baid*), conj. 1pl. *-é-ta-tham*, 3sg. *-é-ta-da* 'will obtain' (H1 *ad:co-ta*, *-é-ta* with unstressed reduplicator *a* for *e* by I.2.4a), 3pl. *do:ge-gat* 'will choose' (H3 *do:goa*), 3sg. *ro:ce-chladar* 'will hear' (S3 deponent (*ro*)-*cluineithar*). Strong verbs with a root-initial vowel followed by *r* or *l* eliminate that vowel and display *e*-reduplication plus 'intrusive' *b* in the future, e.g. *ebarth-i* 'will grant it' (< **ebr^tth-i* < **ebraith-i*, 3sg. abs. plus suffixed pronoun, by vowel support; S3 *ernaid*), conj. 3sg. *-ebla* 'will nourish' (S1c *alid*; fut. pass. 3sg. abs. *ebaltair* 'will be reared' with vowel support), 3pl. *-ebrat* 'will plough' (S2 *airid*).

5.2. Long vowel surrogates of reduplication are a good deal commoner in the *a*-future than in the *s*- (3.3) and *i*- (4) futures. The type seen in 1sg. conj. *-ib* 'I shall drink' (S1a *ibid*) presumably reflects contraction of reduplicated **i-ib-*, but, since the *a*-future more often than not changes the reduplicating vowel from *i* to *e*, it is not surprising that the long vowel futures of this class typically have long *é* vocalism.

This *é*-future characterizes strong verbs whose roots begin with a consonant and end with *r*, *l* or *b* (in effect, *-gaib* and compounds) as well as *do:eim* 'protects', *do:fuis-sim* 'creates, and the H2 and S3 verbs with initial consonant plus *n*. Thus conj. 1pl. *-célam* 'we shall conceal' (S1a *ceilid*), 3sg. *tai-ccéra* 'will plead' (S2 *do:a-cair*), *-béra* 'will carry' (S1a *beirid*), *-méla* 'will grind' (S1a *meilid*), *-méra* 'will betray' (S1d *marnaid*), 3pl. *a-t:bélat* 'they will die' (S1d *a-t:baill*), 3sg. *gébaid* 'will seize' (S2 *gaibid*), *do:éma* 'will protect' (S1a *do:eim*), pass. *do:fuis-sémthar* 'will be begotten' (S1a *do:fuis-sim*), 3sg. *do:géna* 'will do' (H2 *do:gní*), *-coi-sséna* 'will contend' (H2 *con:sní*), 3pl. *etir:génat* 'they will understand' (S3 *etar:gnin*).

In some cases the compensated loss of a consonant before *r*, *l* or *n* seems to have been morphophonemically regular (cf. I.2.2b), e.g. fut. *gén-* < **gegn-* 'will do' (cf. pres. deut. *do:gní* but prot. *-déni* < **degni* 'does'), *cél-* < **cechl-* 'will conceal' (*ceilid*), *gér-* < **gegr-* 'will heat' (*fo:geir*), *gél-* < **gegl-* 'will graze' (*geilid*), and the type may have spread from such a nucleus. Alternatively, more roots may have been affected in the first instance if the process was partly dissimilatory, leading to the pre-syncope loss of the (lenited) second of two identical consonants in the same syllable. Be that as it may, the underlying reduplication of these forms is apparent, as is their original lack of a root vowel (**ge-gn-*, **ce-chl-* etc.). As various forms above, 3sg. cond. *-tibérad* 'would give, (*do:beir*) and so on show, the *é* of this formation was felt to be too indispensable as a future marker to be subjected to syncope. Later forms such as 3sg. cond. *-tib[†]red* 'would give' show just how vibrant syncope was as a living process in the grammar of early Irish.

Like the *f*-future (2.2), the *é*-future was prone to spread beyond its original range both during and particularly after the Old Irish period. Thus one finds forms like *gén-* 'will kill', *lém-* 'will dare' in place of older *gig[†]n-*, *lil[†]m-* and the *é*-future even encroaches occasionally upon the highly productive *f*-future, as the 1sg. conj. *-gét* 'I shall remove' of W1 *gataid* or 3sg. *con:scéra* 'will destroy' alongside 1sg. conj. *f*-fut. *-scairiub* 'I shall separate' (W1 *con:scara*, *scaraid*) in the Glosses show.

5.3. Two verbs, *agid* 'drives' and *téit* 'goes' with their respective compounds, form suppletive (cf. I.2.9c) *a*-futures based upon roots different from that appearing in the present. Thus 3sg. rel. *eblas*, conj. *a-tan:ebla* 'will drive us' (*agid*, *ad:aig* respectively), apparently an isolated survival of a root *el-* with *eb-* reduplication (see

5.1), 3sg. abs. *regaid* 'will go', rel. *rigas*, 2sg. conj. *for:regae* 'thou wilt help', 3sg. conj. *do:riga*, *do:rega*, *-ter^tga* 'will come' in the case of *téit* and compounds with a single preverb. However, compounds with more than one preverb seem to use the *s*-subjunctive form as a future (cf. 3.1), e.g. 3sg. *con:éi-t* 'will indulge' (*con:éi-tet*), 3pl. *ní:in-o-t^tsat* 'they will not enter' (*in:o-tat*, 1pl. subj. *in:o-t^tsam* with syncope pattern transferred to the prot. form: cf. I.2.9b), rather than suppletive *rig-/reg-*.

6. When the reduplicated syllable of a future stem is unstressed, it may be lost for one of two principal reasons (see *GOI* 409-10, 112).

(a) Occasionally it disappears in appropriate circumstances through syncope (I.2.5), as in 3sg. conj. *s*-fut. *do:for-ma* 'will increase', passive *do:for-mastar* 'will be increased' (*do:for-maig*), where *-ma(s)*-apparently arose from *-m^tma(s)-*, or 1sg. *-ninus* 'I shall wash' (*nigid*) but *do:fo-nus* 'I shall wash' (*do:fo-naig* and so presumably for *do:fo-n^tnus*, although one might rather have expected (b) to apply).

(b) A much commoner cause of loss is a rule which, when applicable, generally takes precedence over syncope. This involves the dissimilatory loss of a lenited consonant (X_1) between a stressed vowel (usually *o* in practice) and an unstressed front vowel (*e*, *i* or *u*) followed by a lenited or unlenited consonant (C_1) of the same class (labial, dental guttural, *n*, *r* or *l* respectively). Hence oX_1iC_1 (or oX_1eC_1) to oiC_1 , the resultant diphthong being written *oí*, *óe*, *aí* or *áe* (see appendix). Conditions for this reduction are sometimes met in unreduplicated formations, e.g. pres. 3sg. deut. *do:tét* 'comes' *con:im-thet* 'accompanies' versus prot. *-táet*, *-coímthet* respectively instead of unattested **-tothet*, **-comimmthet*. However, forms with reduplicated root-initial consonant are particularly susceptible to it because of their phonetic shape: e.g., *s*-fut. 3pl. deut. *fo:lil^tsat* but prot. *-fóel^tsat* 'they will sustain' (*fo:loing*), 3sg. deut. *fo:cicher* but prot. *-foícher* 'will put' (*fo:ceird*), 1sg. *-toíthus*, 3sg. *-taíth* 'will fall' (for **-tothith(us)*, pres. *(do)-tuit*), 1sg. *im:cáemros* 'I will ask' (*imm:com-airc* with expected fut. *ebr-* like *ar-* 'plough' etc. in 5.1, whence **-com-ibrus* reduced to **-coíbrus* and then slightly accommodated to the present with *-m-*).

CHAPTER VI

The Preterite Active Stem

1. The preterite active stem has three principal types of formation, the selection usually depending as in the case of the future upon whether the verb is weak or strong and further, if it is strong, upon the shape of the root. The polar types are the so-called **s-** and **suffixless preterites**, which differ in personal endings as well as stem formation (suffixation of vowel plus *s* versus reduplication or a long vowel surrogate thereof). The third main type, the **t-preterite**, has a distinctive stem suffix but mixed affinities in the personal endings, and a couple of hybrid stems occur, notably the reduplicated *s*-preterite attested with all H1 and most H2 verbs. Deponent formations will be reserved for VIII.5.

2.1. The suffixless preterite (*GOI* 424-37, *OIPG* 64-6) is found in a tiny handful of hiatus verbs, but is otherwise confined to the strong class, where it tends to correlate with an *s*-subjunctive and future and can be described as of general occurrence outside the limited categories of strong verbs to be discussed in 3 and 4 below, namely roots with final *-b*, *-l* or, with one exception, *-r* plus a few of those with final *-m* or *-g*. The suffixless category as a whole can be defined positively in terms of its peculiar set of personal endings (VIII.4) and negatively in terms of the absence of an *s-* or *t-*suffix, but positive classification of the rather diverse collection of stems comprised in it calls for further subdivision.

2.2. The most widespread of these is the **reduplicated** stem, which is at its most typical in a number of roots that begin and end with a consonant. The initial consonant or consonant group of the root itself is regularly non-palatal, regardless of its normal quality elsewhere (e.g. palatal in most S1a presents), and a palatal form of the first consonant plus *e* (or non-palatal plus *o* in a couple of roots themselves containing *o*) is prefixed to it as a reduplicator, e.g. (3sg. abs. or conj. of pres. and pret. respectively throughout) *-maid* 'breaks' / *-me-maid* 'broke', *-naisc*

'binds' /-*ne-naisc* 'bound', *gonaid* 'wounds' /*ge-guin* 'wounded', *cingid* 'steps' /*ce-chaing* 'stepped', -*nig* 'washes' /*ne-naig* 'washed', *lingid* 'leaps' /*leb-laing* 'leaped' (with exceptional 'intrusive' *b* before the liquid, cf. V.5.1). The *n* appearing in S1d presents disappears in the corresponding reduplicated preterites, e.g. *con:boing* 'breaks' /*con:bo-baig* 'broke', -*dloing* 'splits' /-*de-dlaig* 'split', *dingid* 'presses' /-*de-daig* 'pressed'.

The final vowel of a root, especially those which lose the stem-final *n* of their S3 presents in the other tense or mood stems, usually disappears in the reduplicated preterite. Since the root-initial consonant becomes stem-final by this process (cf. the 3sg. conj. of *s*-subj. and fut.; IV.2.2 and V.3.4), in the 3sg. it shows the palatal quality typical of a final consonant in this inflection (see VIII.4) and the reduplicating vowel is, moreover, liable to be raised to *i*, e.g. *denaid* 'sucks' /*di-d* 'sucked', *lenaid* 'adheres' /*li-l* 'adhered', -*ren* 'sells' /*ri-r* 'sold', *ciid* 'weeps' (H2) /*ci-ch* 'wept'. However, if the root vowel is not lost, the root-initial consonant in the 3sg. may be non-palatal as in *fris:ac-cai* 'expects' /*fris:ac-ca-chae* 'expected' (see I.2.4a on the vowel of the unstressed reduplicator).

In compound verbs with a single preverb the shift from deuterotonic to prototonic may cause loss of the reduplicated syllable by syncope and delenition (cf. V.6a and I.2.5), e.g. *con:bo-baig* 'broke' but *nad:chom-baig* 'which he did not break, (for -*com-b[†]-baig*). Where there are two preverbs, the same effect may be observed in deuterotonic forms, e.g. *con:o-taig* 'built' (-*o-d[†]-daig*), but this should not occur where the preceding vowel has already been syncopated as in the case of *du:air[†]-che-chain* 'prophesied'. Being S1d verbs, *con:boing* 'breaks' and *con:u-taing* 'builds' are distinguished from syncopated preterites without reduplication by present *n*. However, where loss of reduplication by syncope would have virtually eradicated any formal difference between present and preterite in the all-important 3sg. conj., there seems to have been some pressure towards retaining or restoring the reduplicator as in *fris:ac-ca-chae* above.

Since reduplication typically adds a stressed leniting syllable to the root, its effects often match those due to the shift from deuterotonic to prototonic forms (I.2.1-5) of verbs compounded with a single leniting preverb, e.g. *do:cuirethar/ -to-ch[†]rathar* 'puts', *do:slil/-tui-lli* 'earns', *do:seinn/-ta-fainn* 'pursues', as has been noted earlier with reference to future reduplication (V.3.2). Thus 3pl. *canait* 'they sing', *ce-ch[†]natar* 'they sang', 3sg. -*slig* 'fells', -*se-laig* 'felled', 3pl. -*se-l[†]gatar*

'they felled', 3sg. *do:seinn* 'pursues', *do:se-fainn*, *do:se-phainn* 'pursued', 3pl. *do:se-fⁿnatar* 'they pursued'.

2.3. The addition of a leniting preverb to the stressed part of the verb in prototonic forms can give rise to the total loss of certain following consonants under particular conditions (cf. I.2.2.-3). Thus the loss of *f* by lenition may leave identical vowels in hiatus to be contracted into the corresponding long vowel, e.g. *do:fích* but *-dích* (< **-di-(f)ich*) 'punishes', and the disappearance of lenited gutturals and various dentals before *r*, *l* or *n* accompanied by the compensatory lengthening of a preceding vowel has already been mentioned with reference to some originally reduplicated long-vowel futures (V.4 and V.5.2), e.g. *do:gní* but *-déni* (< **-de-(g)ni*). An *é* resulting from such compensatory lengthening is further liable to be diphthongized by developing a rounded vowel (written *o* or *u*) before palatal *r*, *l* or *n* (GOI 37), as in nom. sg. *én* 'bird', *cenél* 'kindred' versus gen. sg. *éoin* or *éuin*, *cenéuil* etc., and *í* or *ó* by compensation are liable to be diphthongized to *íu* (or *éo*) and *úa* respectively (cf. V.4 and GOI 40) even before non-palatals.

As in certain future formations, the reduplicated syllable of relevant preterites can have similar effects to produce a stem characterized by long *é*, *í* or *ó* and associated diphthongs instead of overt reduplication, e.g. *fích* 'fought' (for **fí-(f)ich*; pres. S1a *fíchid*), *in:fíd* 'related' (for **fí-(f)id*; S1b pres. *in:fét*), 1sg. *ad:gén* 'I recognized/know' but 3sg. *ad:géuin* 'recognized, knows' (for **-ge-(g)n*; S3 pres: *ad:gnin*), *gluíl* 'stuck' (**-gi-(g)l*; S3 pres. *-glen*), *-cíuir* 'bought' (**-ci-(ch)r*; S3 pres. *-cren*), *-cúalae* 'heard' (**-co-(ch)loe*; S3 pres. *-cluínethar*). In some instances the morphophonemic derivation of the long-vowel surrogate is less obvious, e.g. 3sg. *-bí*, 3pl. *-béotar* 'struck' (apparently < **-bi-bi-* by the same dissimilation as the similar future stem of S3 *-ben*; see V.3.3 and V.4), 3sg. *ír* 'granted, (presumably < **-i-ir*; S3 pres. *-ern*), 3sg. *-fiu* or *-flu* (< **fí-(f)u?*), 3pl. *-féotar* 'slept, (H3 pres. *fo(a)id*), 3sg. *-boí* (dissimilated *-bo-(b)w-?*), 3pl. *-bátar* 'were' (H2 pres. *-bí*).

2.4. The unreduplicated long *á*-preterite defies any straightforward morphophonemic derivation from a normal reduplicated prototype, but its formal relationship with the present stem could hardly be easier to state. This type of preterite characterizes strong verbs with roots consisting of an initial consonant, basic short *e* (visible in the stressed subjunctive at least, but usually in the present too) and final dental or guttural. The vowel of the present stem is simply replaced

by *á* to form a stem inflected like other suffixless preterites, e.g. *do:feid* 'leads' / *do:fáid* 'led', *rethid* 'runs' / *ráith* 'ran', *techid* 'flees' / *táich* 'fled', *scuchid* 'finishes' / *-scáich* 'finished', *-guid* 'entreats' / *-gáid* 'entreated' (IV.2.1-2 on subjunctive vocalism).

2.5. Only a couple of strong verbs with a root consisting of vowel plus liquid flanked by consonants actually have a suffixless preterite, but those that do are characterized by a **short a**-preterite similar to the one just described and apparently due to a shortening of *á* before a group of liquid plus consonant. Thus *fo:ceird* 'puts' / *fo:caird* 'put' and *sceirdid* 'strips' / *-scaird* 'stripped'.

2.6. Compounds of *-ic* (not found as a simplex - cf. XI.3.1) form a suffixless preterite stem *-án-aic* by **irregular** reduplication, e.g. *do:ic/(-)tic* 'comes', 3sg. *do:án(a)ic/(-)tán(a)ic*, 3pl. *do:án[†]catar/(-)tán[†]catar* 'came', *do:airic/(-)t-air-ic* 'comes upon', 3sg. *do:ar-[†]n(a)ic/(-)t-ar-[†]n(a)ic*, 3pl. *do:ar-[†]nac[†]tar/(-)t-ar-[†]nac[†]tar* 'came upon', or *con:r-ic/-com-r-aic* 'encounters', 3sg. *con:r-ánaic/-comarnic* (< **-comr[†]nic* by vowel support), 3pl. *con:r-án[†]catar/-comarnac[†]tar* 'encountered' (< **-comr[†]nac[†]tar*).

2.7. A couple of verbs, notably *fo:gaib* 'finds', *téit* 'goes' (plus compounds) and *do:tuit* 'falls', form a **suppletive** suffixless preterite based on a root different from that appearing in all or most of the other stems. Thus *fo:fúair* 'found', *luid* 'went' (3pl. *lotar* for **lod[†]tar* by I.2.5b, cf. I.3.2c) and *do:cer* 'fell'. Despite its lack of a *t*-suffix the last of these seems originally to have followed the inflection of the *t*-preterite (3.1 below and VIII.2 and 4), whence the non-palatal final of the 3sg. conj. and palatal final of the 2sg. *-to-r[†]-chair* 'thou hast fallen' in precise reversal of the normal suffixless preterite system. However, the Glosses already show a tendency towards a palatal-final 3sg. of the usual suffixless type at least where the root is unstressed, e.g. *do:ro-chair* 'has fallen'. Finally, there is the **defective** *a-t:bath* 'died' (preterite only), which, despite a preterite passive (VII) origin still manifest in 3pl. *a-t:batha* (VIII.6.6), was gradually being adapted to normal active inflection as in 3pl. *as-ind:bathatar* in a nasalizing relative clause (I.3.7).

3.1. The **t-preterite** (GOI 421-4, OIPG 63-4) is formed by all but one (*-ern*, see 2.3) strong verb with root-final *r* or *l*, about a dozen roots in all, the two strong roots (*em-*, *sem-*) with final *-m* and basic short *e*, and a minority of strong verbs ending in a voiced guttural stop or fricative usually written *g* (see 2.2 especially for

the majority suffixless preterite type in this category).

This preterite stem is formed simply by adding *t* direct to the root, e.g. 3sg. conj. pres. *-beir* 'carries', *-ceil* 'hides' (both S1a), *-ail* 'nourishes' (S1c), *-mairn* 'betrays' (S1d), *-sern* 'strews' (S3) versus pret. *-bert* 'carried', *-celt* 'hid', *-alt* 'nourished', *-mert* 'betrayed' (with a rare change of vocalism from pres. *a* to an *e* also found in the subj., on which see IV.4.2), *-sert* 'strewed'. Root-final *m* disappears with a voicing effect before the *t*-suffix (> /d/ but still written *t*; see appendix) and a compensatory lengthening effect upon the preceding (stressed) vowel, e.g. *do:eim* 'protects' but *do:ét* 'protected'. A root-final guttural becomes *ch* between a vowel and *t* but disappears between *r* and *t*, e.g. pres. *-aig* 'drives', *-anaig* 'protects', *-oirg* 'kills, versus pret. *-acht* 'drove', *-anacht* 'protected', *-ort* 'killed'.

A *t*-preterite is normal for strong roots with a voiced guttural final stop or fricative and an initial vowel, as the three examples just cited indicate (see 2.6 on *-ic*), and also typifies *a-t:raig* 'raises himself, rises', pret. *a-t:recht* 'rose' and *-dlig* 'is due', pret. *-dlecht* 'was due'. Moreover, where loss of reduplication in unstressed position through syncope would seriously impair or even obliterate the formal distinction between 3sg. present and reduplicated preterite (see 2.2), there was a marked tendency for unstressed strong roots with voiced guttural final and a present lacking the distinguishing nasal of S1d to form a distinctive *t*-preterite. Thus *do:for-maig* 'increases' versus *do:for-macht* 'increased' rather than expected but unattested **do:foir(m^t)mig* or *ad:er-rig* 'repeats, versus *-aith-er-racht* 'repeated' whereas the corresponding simplex *rigid* 'binds, stretches' has stressed preterite *re-raig* 'bound, stretched' as expected. One may therefore speak of a tendency to spread the *t*-preterite from a small core of roots with final *g* to others of this shape at the expense of the suffixless preterite.

3.2. In the case of *saigid/-saig* 'seeks' and compounds such as *ro:saig/-roig* 'attains' a presumed but unattested suffixless preterite **(-)siaig*, **ro:siaig/*-roig* would also be vulnerable to *t*-suffixation because of identity of 3sg. pret. and pres. in unstressed position, whence the actually attested distinctive pret. 3sg. *-roacht*, 3pl. *-roachtatar* 'attained' etc. Since even the stressed form of the 3sg. suffixless preterite was only weakly distinguished from the corresponding present on account of the disappearance of *s* by lenition after the reduplicator (see end of 2.2 and end of V.3.3 on *i* for *e* in hiatus), it too acquired a *t*-suffix to yield 3sg. *ro:siacht*

'attained' and give the root *sag-* the only hybrid **reduplicated t-preterite** in old Irish.

4.1. The s-preterite (*GOI* 416-21, *OIPG* 61-2) basically requires a root or stem with a final vowel that appears in the 3sg. pres. conj. Since this feature divides weak and hiatus verbs on the one hand from strong verbs on the other (II.2.2-4), it follows that the *s*-preterite is largely confined to the first two classes of this trio: it enjoys a complete monopoly among the weak verbs and is preponderant either in its plain or hybrid reduplicated form among hiatus verbs, the exceptions being four suffixless preterites found in H2 (*-cí* 'weeps' and compounds of *-cí* 'sees'; cf. 2.2) and H3 (*-foí* 'sleeps' and *do:goa* 'chooses'; cf. 2.3). In addition to this, the two strong roots ending in a labial, *gab-* 'grasp' and *ib-* 'drink', regularly insert a post-radical vowel in the preterite to take the *s*-suffix, but Old Irish attestations of *s*-preterites with a few other strong verbs are, with the exception of *ar:ne-at* 'expects' (on which see VIII.5.4), just sporadic prefigurations of the *s*-preterite's phenomenal spread in Middle Irish (XII.6.2 and 7; see *GOI* 416 for examples) and occur alongside older suffixless and *t*-formations still attested in the sources.

4.2. The basic s-preterite is formed by weak verbs, the two strong roots in *-b* and those H3 verbs that do not have a suffixless preterite (see 4.1). In W1 and *gab-* the root-final consonant is non-palatal throughout while in *ib-* it is palatal (ignoring, of course, secondary modifications after syncope; cf. III.2 etc.) and in W2a it is palatal or non-palatal according to the same rules as those applying to the present (III.2), e.g. 3sg. abs. *marbais* 'killed' (W1), *gabais* 'grasped' (S2), *léicis* 'let', *erpais* '(en)trusted' (W2a), *ibis* 'drank' (S1a) and *so(a)is* 'turned' (H3). In W2b present *u* plus palatal final consonant (but non-palatal *-m-*, *-g-*: III.2) is changed to *s*-preterite *o* plus non-palatal consonant (see IV.4.1 for a similar phenomenon in the *a*-subjunctive) except for a palatal final in the non-deponent 3sg. conj.: e.g., 1sg. *con:tolus* 'I slept' (*con:tuili*), 3sg. dep. *do:corastar* 'put' (*do:cuirethar*). In the non-deponent 3sg. conj. of all except W2a verbs the syllable containing the *s* disappears completely to give endingless forms like *-marb* 'killed', *-gab* 'grasped', *-ib* 'drank', and *do:loig* 'forgave' (*do:lugi*, W2b). In W2a there is fluctuation between forms which lose the *s* only and others that lose the whole syllable in accordance with the pattern prevalent elsewhere. The former system seems to prevail marginally in Wb. with *-creti* 'believed', *as:ro-choili* 'judged', *-foldi* 'sent' and *-rádi* 'said' versus

-creit 'believed', *-é-r^t-choil* 'judged' and unstressed *-dail* (stressed pres. *-dáli*), whereas the latter apparently had a virtual monopoly in Ml., e.g. the *léicid* compound 3sg. pret. *-com-air-leic* 'allowed'. It thus looks as though the 3sg. conj. in *-i* was the oldest in W2a *s*-preterites but was early beginning to give way to the endless type of W2b etc. (*du-d:uccai* at Ml. 27d23 hypercorrect?), which had the advantage of differing from the 3sg. pres. conj. Thus 3sg. conj. pres. *do:lugi*, pret. *do:loig* in W2b but *-creti* for both originally in W2a giving way to a distinction between pres. *-creti* and pret. *-creit* (see IV.2.2 for similar fluctuations and developments in the *s*-subjunctive). The *s*-preterite of H3 verbs merely loses the final *s* in the 3sg. conj. and retains the preceding root vowel, whether stressed or unstressed, e.g. *do:int-ai* 'returned, (to-in(de)-so-), *-cloi* 'conquered' (*cloid*).

Apart from the non-deponent 3sg. conj., the basic *s*-marker is retained throughout the *s*-preterite, with syncope of the preceding stem vowel where applicable, e.g. 3pl. conj. *-marb^tsat* 'killed', *-gab^tsat* 'grasped', *-léic^tset* 'let', *-eirp^tset* '(en)trusted', *-ib^tset* 'drank' and H3 *as:luiset* 'they escaped', *do:comlaiset* 'they departed' (*do:com-lai*, note the marked tendency to palatalize *s* between unstressed vowels and cf. end of V.2.1 for a similar phenomenon in the *f*-fut.). In essence the system here is basically identical to that obtaining in the *s*-subjunctive (IV.2.1-3) except that the intervening underlying vowel between root final and *s*-suffix prevents their fusion in the *s*-preterite. Thus the root-final consonant is always retained in the *s*-preterite whereas it is equally regularly lost in the *s*-subjunctive. Incidentally, the distribution of these formations is such that no Old Irish verb has both an *s*-preterite and an *s*-subjunctive.

4.3. All H1 verbs and those of H2 that do not make a suffixless preterite (see 4.1) form a hybrid **reduplicated s-preterite** characterized by reduplication of the root or a long-vowel surrogate (see 2.2-3) and the *s*-suffix plus appropriate endings. The 3sg. conj. (non-deponent) almost always has a final vowel, *-(a)e* in H1 and *-(a)i* in H2, but the *s* is apparent elsewhere (cf. 4.2 above). Thus 3sg. H1 *baid/-bá* 'dies' vs. pret. *bebais/-beb(a)e* 'died', *imm:rá* 'rows around' vs. *imm:rerae* 'rowed around', *ad:co-ta/-éta* 'gets' vs. pret. 3sg. *ad:co-tad(a)e/-é-tad(a)e*, 3pl. *ad:co-tat^tsat/-é-tat^tsat* 'got' (with irregular retention of unstressed reduplicator and correspondingly irregular syncope pattern; cf. 2.2), H2 *gniid/-gní* 'does' vs. pret. 3sg. *génais/-gén(a)i*, 3pl. *-gé(i)n^tset* 'did', *do:gní/-dén(a)i* 'does' vs. 3sg. *do:gén(a)i/-dig^tni*, 3pl. *do:gén^tsat* 'did' (*gén(a)is* < **ge(g)nis* etc.), *con:sní/-cosnai*

‘strives for’ versus 3sg. *con:senai/-coissenai* ‘strove for’ (< **se(s)nai*). In the case of the *-slí* compound *ad:roi-lli* ‘earns’, preterite 3sg. *ad:roi-[†]lli* ‘earned’ and 3pl. *ad:roi[†]lliset/-ár[†]ill[†]set* are compatible with underlying reduplicated **-se-llai*, but the beginnings of a move away from the reduplicated pattern towards an endless 3sg. conj. (cf. 4.1) are discernible in Ml. *ad:ro-chom-ul* ‘joined’ (H1 *ad:com-la* ‘joins’, with expected but unattested pret. **ad:com-l[†]l(a)e*); see IX.2.1-2 on *ro*).

CHAPTER VII

The Preterite Passive Stem

1. Whereas the shift from active to passive is usually realized by a change of personal endings only (see VIII.6) and leaves the basic inflectional stem unaltered, in the preterite there is a distinct passive stem as well as endings. This has no direct formal connection with the corresponding preterite active stem and is never characterized by features such as reduplication. The underlying preterite passive suffix is *t* throughout, but its actual realization is somewhat varied as a result of certain morphophonemic combinations with the final of the root or stem to which it is attached: lenited *th* after a vowel, unchanged *t* after a liquid or guttural, voiced *t* /d/ after a nasal, *s(s)* in combination with a dental. See GOI 437-40.

2. Verbs that form the basic unreduplicated *s*-preterite active (VI.4.2) retain their underlying presuffixal vowel in the preterite passive too. Consequently the suffix appears in the lenited *th* form, which is liable to be voiced to *-d* in absolute final position after the unstressed vowel in the 3sg. conj. by I.3.2a. W1, W2, H3 and the two strong roots with final *b* are, of course, the categories involved, e.g. 3sg. abs./conj. *marb[†]thae/-marbad* 'was killed' (W1), *gab[†]thae/-gabad* 'was grasped' (S2 with *-b*), *léic[†]the/-léiced* 'was let', *-erbad* 'was entrusted' (W2a), *for:corad* 'was overpowered' (W2b *for:cuirethar*), *-ibed* 'was drunk' (S1 with *-b*), *-soad* 'was turned', 3pl. conj. *-soíthea* 'were turned' (H3). Where there is divergence in consonant quality between present and *s*-preterite active, the preterite passive agrees with the latter as can be seen from pres. *gaibid*, pret. act. *gabais*, pret. pass. *-gabad* (S2), pres. *-cuirethar*, pret. act. *-corastar*, pret. pass. *-corad* (W2b with concomitant agreement in vocalism, cf. VI.4.2). At least one consonant-final strong root without an *s*-preterite, namely S2 *gar-* 'call', forms a preterite passive of this type, e.g. *ar:garad* 'was forbidden', *do:r-air[†]ngerad* 'has been prophesied' (*do:air[†]ngir*, see IX.2.1-2 on *ro*) or *do:r-air[†]ng[†]red* with analogical syncope pattern

(cf. *ar:ro-g^trad* 'has been forbidden').

The lenited *th* form of the suffix is added direct to roots with a final vowel that do not have an unreduplicated *s*-preterite active, namely H1, H2 and almost all S3 (after the loss of present *n*, cf. III.4.3), e.g. 3sg. *-gníth* 'was done' (H1), *ad:roi-lled* 'was earned' (H2), *ad:co-tad/-é-tad* 'was got' (H1), *ríthae* 'was sold' (S3 *ren-*), *-bíth* 'was struck', *-im^t-di-bed* 'was circumcised' (S3 *ben-*). This form of the suffix also characterizes strong roots with basic *-er* or *-el*, since these typically invert vowel and liquid in the passive preterite, e.g. *brethae* 'was carried', *do:breth/-tabrad* 'was brought' (S1 *ber-*), *-cleth* 'was hidden' (S1 *cel-*), *-sreth* 'was arrayed' (S3 *ser-n-*), *-rath* 'was granted' (S3 *er-n-*, with an unusual shift to *a* vocalism). This pattern can, however, be dislocated by syncope and vowel support (I.2.5c), e.g. 3pl. *du:arbartha* 'they were subdued' for **-ar-br^ttha*.

3. The unlenited *t* form of the suffix is found unvoiced in *-alt* 'was nourished' (S1c *al-* without inversion) and after strong verbs with root-final guttural, which behaves as it does before the *t*-suffix of the preterite active in a few such roots (see VI.3.1), being realized as *ch* after a vowel and lost after *r*, e.g. *-anacht* 'was protected' (S1a *-anaig*), *fechtae* 'was fought' (S1a *-fích*), *-slecht* 'was felled' (S1a *-slig*), *ortae/-ort* 'was killed' (S1c *-oirg*), *-bocht* 'was broken' (S1d *-boing*), *con:o-tacht* 'was built' (S1d *con:u-taing*).

In strong verbs with root-final *-n* or *-m* the *t* is voiced with concomitant loss of the preceding nasal and compensatory change of the root vowel to *é*, as happens in the *t*-preterite active of the couple of roots with *-m* concerned (VI.3.1), e.g. *-dét* 'was suffered' (S2 *-daim*), *do:es-set* 'was poured out' (S1a *do:es-sim*), *-cét* 'was sung', 3pl. *-céta* 'were sung', *do:air-chet* 'was prophesied' (S1c *-cain*). The *é* is shortened in unstressed position by I.2.4b, and the /d/ suffix remains *t* orthographically (see appendix). In *goítae*, *góetae/-gáet* 'was wounded' (S1c *-goin*) the rounded vowel apparently conditions an isolated compensation by diphthongization (see appendix).

4. Strong roots with a final dental stop or *nn* merge this with the *t*-suffix of the passive preterite to give *ss*, e.g. *gessae* 'was besought' (S2 *-guid*), *-mess* 'was judged' (S2 *-midethar*), *to: sessa* 'were hunted' (S1a *do:seinn*), *-airchós* 'was prevented' (S1a *ar:co-at*, root *fed-*), *-class* 'was dug' (S1c *-claid*), *-nas* 'was

bound' (S1c *-naisc*, but cf. verbal noun *naid-m* for basic shape of root). The anomalous H2 verb *ad:cí*, *-aicci* 'sees' agrees at least vestigially with strong roots with a final dental in forming an *s*-subjunctive and future (IV.2.1, IV.3, V.4), and likewise shows *s(s)* in preterite passive *ad:cess*, *-aiccess* 'was seen'. This formation is even spread to its semantic partner S3 *-cluine-thar* 'hears', where *-clos* 'was heard' has mostly replaced older *-cloth* etc (cf. 2 above).

5. The vocalism of the preterite passive presents no difficulty in the 'weak' type, where it correlates with an unreduplicated *s*-preterite active for the most part and shares the latter's presuffixal stem shape, which usually recurs without major change (except for W2b especially) throughout the various tenses and moods. Elsewhere (nearly all strong verbs plus H1 and 2), however, the underlying *t*-suffix is added directly to the root and significant changes of vocalism are not infrequent, as a number of examples in 2-4 above indicate. Radical *e* and rarer *a* or *o* generally remain unaltered in the preterite passive, as in *-sess*, *-gess* (cf. VI.2.4 on the basic *e* vocalism of *-guid*), *-class*, *-ort* above, but *i* and *u* become *e* and *o* respectively, as not infrequently happens in various other parts of the paradigm, e.g. *-slecht*, *-cloth* or *-clos* above. Roots with basic final *i*, which constitute H2 and most of S3, normally lengthen this without hiatus in the preterite passive, as in *-gníth*, *-bíth* above, and it has been seen that basic *a* or *e* are compensatorily lengthened to *é* in the passive preterite of nasal-final roots, e.g. *-cét* above and *do:ét* 'was protected' (*do:eim*). This vowel is, of course, only long in stressed position (see 3 above). To judge from the originally passive preterite *a-t:bath* 'snuffed it, died' (VI.2.7), H1 had short *a* without hiatus here. The remaining significant alteration of root shape is the inversion of vowel and liquid in cases of basic *er*, *el*, e.g. *-breth*, *-cleth* and *-sreth* above, to which may be added pret. pass. *fo:cress* 'was put' versus pres. *fo:ceird* 'puts' as a rare example of an internal sequence of this type.

The preterite passive has considerable formal affinities with the past participle passive and verbal of necessity (*GOI* 441-4, *OIPG* 67-8), non-finite categories that do not concern us here.

6. Finally there are two examples of suppletion in the preterite passive. *Fo:gaib* 'finds, takes' (*fo*)-*fríth* 'was found', which is obviously related to the same verb's suppletive preterite active (*fo*)-*fúair* 'found' (I.2.9d and VI.2.7). However,

téit and compounds have a preterite passive form *-eth* 'one went' etc. that occurs in no other stem (see *GOI* 473-4).

CHAPTER VIII

The Personal Inflections

1. This category comprises various endings and other modifications whose primary and, in view of the total lack of independent subject pronouns in old Irish (see I.4), indispensable function is to express person and number in the verb. Since Old Irish, like the later language, distinguishes the familiar sextet of first, second and third persons, singular and plural, six different personal inflections within a given paradigm (say, present active absolute, present active conjunct, suffixless preterite active, imperfect active and so on) are generally required in order to avoid all ambiguity. With a handful of notable exceptions this requirement is actually met in Old Irish verbal paradigms. Whereas the same inflectional form of the verb may be used in several persons without ambiguity in present-day Irish owing to the availability of independent subject pronouns (e.g. *beireann sé* 'he carries', *beireann sibh* 'you carry', *beireann siad* 'they carry'), this does not apply to Old Irish, which thus tends strongly towards inflectional differentiation in such cases (e.g. *beirid*, *beirthe*, *berait* corresponding to the three modern forms). Where separate absolute and conjunct inflections exist (see below), distinct forms for each person and number are only necessary within one set or the other, and identity of forms across that divide is of no consequence because the two sets occur in mutually exclusive environments (absolute with independent simple verbs, conjunct elsewhere; see I.1.2-3). Thus no problem arises in a case like 2sg. abs. *marbai*, conj. *ní:marbai* 'thou killest, dost not kill' or 3sg. abs. *beirid* 'he/she carries', 2pl. conj. *ní:beirid* 'you do not carry', *do:beirid* 'you bring'. In the latter instance the 2pl. abs. form used in the same environment as *beirid* would be distinct *beirthe* 'you carry', while the 3sg. conj. contextually compatible with *ní:beirid*, *do:beirid* would be the likewise distinct *ní:beir* 'he does not carry', *do:beir* 'he brings'. On the other hand, an uncommon type of coincidence such as suffixless preterite (no separate absolute and conjunct sets; see 4 below) 1 or 2sg. *(-)lod* 'I went, thou wentest' is genuinely

ambiguous.

In the third person singular and plural the verbal ending is also the sole marker of passive (6 below) versus active (2, 4-5 below) voice outside the preterite (see II.1 and VII.1), and here again formal ambiguity tends to be avoided, a notable exception being 3pl. imperfect act. or pass. (e.g. *do:bertis* 'they used to bring' or 'they used to be brought'). As the previous chapters (II-VII) have shown, major shifts of tense or mood are adequately expressed by alteration of the verbal stem, and the personal endings play no part. Some shifts, however, involve such endings and not the stem (see II.1). Thus the imperfect endings (7 below) used to change present indicative, present subjunctive and future into imperfect indicative, past subjunctive and conditional respectively simultaneously express person plus number in opposition to other forms within the paradigm, and tense in opposition to other sets of endings used with the same stem (e.g. imperfect vs. present indicative). This also applies to the imperative endings (3 below) added as a rule to the present stem.

Although some inflections to be dealt with in this chapter thus express more than mere person or number, the fact remains that all of them do make distinctions on this level, regardless of any additional levels that may or may not be involved.

In what follows, the personal inflections applicable to the various stems will be classified into six major groups termed **basic active**, **imperative active**, **suffixless preterite active**, **deponent**, **passive** and **imperfect** for convenience.

In the examples below a vowel in brackets denotes a glide due to the quality of a preceding consonant where appropriate: thus *i* and *e* may be preceded by *a* after a non-palatal consonant, while *u* is preceded by *i* and *-a* by *e* after a palatal consonant (see appendix). Consequently *-(a)it*, for example, stands for *-it* after a palatal, *-it* or *-ait* after a non-palatal consonant, and *-(e)a* for *-a* after non-palatal versus *-ea* after palatal consonants. Forms on either side of a diagonal stroke (/) before a non-palatal in an unstressed syllable are those written after a palatal and a non-palatal consonant (or a stressed vowel) respectively (see I.2.4a on such *e/a* alternances). A 'zero' ending, i.e. a personal inflection not involving an additional suffix, is denoted $-\emptyset$ where no further modification of the stem is involved, but $-\emptyset'$ if a final consonant is palatalized and $-\emptyset''$ if epenthetic *u* is inserted before it.

Complete paradigms of the personal inflections in the various stems, tenses and moods of selected Old Irish verbs will be found in the relevant sections of *GOI* and *OIPG* referred to in chapters III-VII, and it seems desirable to describe them

from a somewhat different standpoint here in order to complement rather than merely reiterate these valuable descriptions.

2.1. The most widespread and diverse class of personal inflections is the **basic active** used by non-deponent verbs in the active voice throughout the *present indicative, present subjunctive, future* and *s-preterite* as well as in the singular of the *t-preterite*. In any given person this set usually distinguishes a *conjunct* ending used by all compound and dependent simple verbs from an *absolute* one occurring only with independent simple verbs (see I.1.3), the latter also having distinct *relative* endings for the 3sg., 1 and 3pl. in the appropriate context (see I.3.6).

2.2. Being reasonably straightforward and homogeneous, the **plural** endings provide a suitable starting point in this category:

	CONJ.	ABS.	REL.
1.	-em/-am	-(a)immi	-(a)imme
2.	-(a)ith	-(a)ithe	-
3.	-et/-at	-(a)it	-(a)ite

The fundamentally disyllabic forms above are liable to syncope of the penultimate vowel where conditions for this are met, and delenition (especially of juxtaposed *t(h)* and *d* or of *th* after *l*, *n*, or *s*), devoicing or assimilation of consonant quality may then take place in the appropriate circumstances enumerated in I.2.5 (cf. I.3.3c). Thus 3pl. rel. *prid^tchite* 'who preach' (W1 pres.), *cáech^tsite* 'whom they blinded' (*s*-pret.) but *ber^ttae* 'which they carry' (S1a pres.), *gaib^tde* 'whom they grasp' (S2 pres.; see appendix on *t/d* spelling fluctuation after a consonant), *gute* 'who pray' (S2 pres., delenited **gu(i)d^tte*), 1pl. rel. *prid^tchimme* 'which we may preach' (*a*-subj.), abs. *léic^tfimmi* 'we shall let' (*f*-fut.) but *tíag^tmi* 'we go', *guid^tmi* 'we pray', rel. *tíag^tme* '(to) which we go', *guid^tme* '(when) we pray' (S1a and S2 pres. respectively), *ges^tme* 'that we pray (for)' (*s*-subj.), 2pl. abs. *giges^tte* 'you shall pray' (*s*-fut.; delenition, but also anomalous third-syllable syncope and non-palatal -*st*-).

The basically monosyllabic endings in the table, being final, are not liable to syncope but may cause syncope of a preceding syllable. The 2pl. conj. is generally realized as -(a)*id* by I.3.3a. Examples include conj. 1pl. *as:beram*, -*ep^trem* 'we say'

(S1a pres.), *-gab^tsam* 'we grasped' (s-pret.), *-guidem* 'we pray' (S2 pres.), 2pl. *as:berid* 'you say', 3pl. *ar:gairret* 'they forbid' (S2 pres.), *ar:gérat* 'they will forbid' (é-fut.), *do:léicet* 'they cast' (W2 pres.), *do:gniat* 'they do' (H2 pres.), *im:soat* 'they turn' (H3 pres.).

2.3. In view of the considerable diversity of singular forms in this set it seems most convenient to treat each person individually, beginning with the **third singular**. The full inflections of individual stems can easily be found in the relevant paradigms given in *GOI* and *OIPG*.

(a) There are two types of **3sg. abs.**, namely (i) $-\emptyset$ with mere palatalization of the stem-final consonant and (ii) addition of $-(a)ith$, usually realized as $-(a)id$ by I.3.3a, to the stem. The first type characterizes the irregular S1b present *téit* 'goes' (III.4.1b), the *t*-preterite with concomitant raising of stressed *e* and *o* to *i* and *u* respectively (e.g. *birt* 'carried', *uirt* 'slew', cf. *GOI* 47-9), the *s*-preterite (e.g. *gab(a)is* 'grasped'), *s*-subjunctive (e.g. *téis* '(though) he go') and *s*-future (e.g. *silis* 'will fell'). In all other present indicatives, present subjunctives and futures the second type prevails, e.g. pres. *caraid* 'loves' (W1), *berid* 'carries' (S1a), *gaibid* 'grasps' (S2), *benaid* 'strikes' (S3), *gniid* 'does' (H2), *a*-subj. *techtid* '(though) he possess', *a*-fut. *béraid* 'will carry'.

(b) In the **3sg. rel.** (i) $-e$ is added to non-rel. $-t$ as in the 3pl. above, e.g. *téte* '(to) which it goes', *berte* 'which he carried', *ortae* 'who killed' (note lack of the raising seen in 3sg. abs. above), (ii) abs. $-s'$ is simply depalatalized, e.g. *s*-pret. *foides* 'who sent', *s*-subj. *nges* '(that) he pray', *s*-fut. *giges* 'who shall pray', and (iii) $-(a)ith$ is replaced by $-es/-as$, e.g. pres. *beres* 'who carries', *gaibes* 'who grasps', pres. or *a*-subj. *techtas* 'who/which he possess(es)', *a*-fut. *béras* 'who shall carry', *i*-fut. *liles* 'which shall adhere'.

(c) The **3sg. conj.** forms corresponding to the above types show still greater diversity and require further subdivision:

(i) Abs. $-\emptyset$ becomes conj. $-\emptyset$ by depalatalization in the case of $-t$ (*téit* and *t*-pret., the latter with *e* and *o* for abs. *i* and *u*) or a final liquid (a handful of *s*-subjs. in IV.2.3 and corresponding *s*-futs., cf. V.3.2), e.g. $-\tét$, $-\bert$, $-\ort$, *fo:cerr*, *fo:cicherr* (*s*-subj. and fut. resp. of *fo:ceird* 'puts').

(ii) Abs. $-s'$ disappears with lengthening of a preceding stressed vowel by I.2.4c and with loss or, more rarely (and only if basically long), shortening of a preceding unstressed vowel, e.g. *s*-pret. $-\gab$, *s*-subj. $-\té$, *s*-fut. $-\sil$. Numerous

further examples and details of the relevant formations will be found in VI.4.2-3, IV.2.1-2 and V.3.4 respectively.

(iii) Abs. *-(a)ith* disappears, leaving a bare stem, in the S1-3 pres. and (with lengthening of the stem vowel by I.2.4c if stressed) the H1-2 pres. plus the H3 *e*-type (*sceid*, *-scé* 'vomits') and the *e*-subj., e.g. *-beir*, *-gaib*, *-ben*, *a:tá*, *-gní*, subj. *-gné*. Details and further examples in II.2.3-4, III.3-4 and IV.3.

(iv) Abs. *-(a)ith* gives way to a final vowel: to *-a* in the W1 pres., the irregular H3 pres. *do:goa* 'chooses', the *a*-subj., the *a*- and *f*-fut., and to *-i* in the W2 pres., the H3 *o/u*-type pres. (where it forms a diphthong with a preceding stressed vowel) and *i*-fut. Thus W1 pres. *-cara*, *a*-subj. *-techta*, *a*-fut. *-béra*, *f*-fut. *-léic^tfea*, W2 pres. *-léici*, H3 pres. *-soí*, *i*-fut. *-riri* and so on. See further III.2-3, IV.4 and V.2 and 4-5.

2.4. In the **first singular** there are three distinct absolute endings, namely *-im(m)*, *-u* and *-a*, the last two of which subdivide further according to the correlating conjunct endings. Their oldest attested distribution may be summarized as follows.

- (a) abs. and conj. *-im(m)*: W1, S3 pres.
- (b) abs. *-u*, (i) conj. *-u*: W2, S2, H1&3 pres.; *e-*, *ia*-subj.; *i*-fut.
(ii) conj. *-Ø^u*: S1, H2 pres.; *s-*, *t*-pret.; *s*-subj.
- (c) abs. *-a* (i) conj. *-Ø*: *a*-subj.; *a*-fut.
(ii) conj. *-Ø^u*: *f-*, *s*-fut.

See IV.3 and IV.4.3 respectively on the *e*- and *ia*-subjunctives of H2 and S3 where the root is stressed. In fact, the *ia*-type is here separated out as a subcategory of the more general *a*-subjunctive on simple grounds of convenience with reference to the 1sg. alone. In conjunct type (ii) *u*-affection applies generally to unstressed final syllables but is basically restricted to *i* in stressed root syllables. This *i* may be either original or due to the effects of raising upon *e*. Since the latter process only takes place before certain consonants, mostly voiced (details in GOI 47-9), and does not, for instance, operate before *s(s)*, *u*-affection of basic short stressed *e* occurs in many S1a presents but never in the *s*-subjunctive or unreduplicated *s*-future (V.3.1). At this point concrete examples seem appropriate.

- (a) pres. W1 *car(a)im*, *-car(a)im*, S3 *ben(a)im*, *-ben(a)im*, *do:fui-b^tnimm*.

(b) (i) pres. W2 *-bágu*, *-sluindiu*, S2 *guidiu*, *-guidiu*, H1 *(ol)dáu* or *dó*, *a-táu* or *-tó*, H3 *for:com-o*; subj. *e- beu* or *beo*, *-béo*, *du:gnéu*, *do:gnéo*, *ia- -gléu* (S3 *glenaid*); i-fut. *bíu* (*benaid*), *as:ririu*.

(b) (ii) pres. S1 *biru*, *-biur*, *-e-pur*, *tíagu*, *-tíag*, H2 *biuu*, *-bíu*, *do:gníu*; pret. *s- gab^tsu*, *-gabus*, *t- do:biurt*, *as:ru-burt*; s-subj. *tíasu*, *-tías*, *-ges*.

(c) (i) *a*-subj. *prid^tcha*, *-pridach*; *a*-fut. *-cechan*, *do:bér*.

(c) (ii) fut. *f- ain^tfa*, *-aniub*, *s- gig^tsea*, *-gigius*, *a-tam:res*, *ní-m:é-rus*, *fo:lilus*, *-fóelus*.

It will be seen from (b)(i) that *u* is particularly liable to become *o* in combination with *e* and that a diphthong such as *au* tends to become *ó*. The point made earlier about the importance of stress in relation to *u*-affection is well borne out by pairs such as subj. *-ges* vs. fut. *-gigius*, fut. *-res* vs. *-érus* in the above list.

Unlike the other inflectional forms, the ending *-(a)im(m)* was entirely confined to the present indicative and so tended to spread as an exclusive present marker at the expense of other endings, especially unstressed *-u*, in the Old Irish period. Thus, while the scheme given in the table accords fully with the evidence of *Félire Óengusso*, written about 800 A.D. in a somewhat archaising high poetic genre, it is already out of date for the Würzburg Glosses, probably written a little earlier but in the less conservative medium of standard prose. The clearest evidence of change comes from the considerable number of attestations for the W2 and S2 presents in both texts, the *Félire* invariably having the (b)(i) *-bágu*, *guidiu/-guidiu* types whereas Würzburg has (a) *-bágim* etc. invariably in W2 and *guidimm/-guidimm* almost as regularly in S2. In other categories Wb. shows internal evidence for similar trends in the (b)(ii) *-u* absolute with S1a *tíagu* 'I go' versus *dligim* 'I deserve', H2 *biuu* 'I am wont to be' versus *liim* 'I impute'. Where *-u* had coalesced with a preceeding stressed vowel in the H2 conjunct *do:gníu* 'I do' etc. it was highly resilient, but a good deal less so where it became unstressed as in prototonic *-dé-ccu* 'I see' vs. *-dé-nim* 'I do' (the latter also Ml., and cf. further Ml. *ad:roi-lliu* 'I earn' vs. Carlsruhe Priscian *fris:ai-ccim* 'I expect'). The *u*-affected conjunct type (b)(ii) was scarcely eroded in the Glosses, as in Wb. *as:biur*, *-e-pur* 'I say', *ar:ne-ut* 'I await', Sg. *for:tíag* 'I help', PCr. *fo:gliunn* 'I learn', *ar:riuth* 'I assail', but Wb. *for:chanim* alongside *for:chun* 'which I teach' shows the barest beginnings of this in S1c.

2.5. There are three basic sets of endings in the second singular.

- (a) abs. and conj. *-i*: W1&2, S2&3, H1&3 (*o/u*) pres.
- (b) abs. *-i*, conj. *-Ø'*: S1, H2 (&3*e*?) pres., *t-* & *s-*pret., *s-*subj. & fut.
- (c) abs. and conj. *-e*: other subj. and fut.

For the most part 2sg. (a) correlates with 1sg. (a) and (b)(i), 2sg. (b) with 1sg. (b)(ii), and 2sg. (c) with 1sg. (c), but in the *s-*fut. 2sg. (b) matches 1sg. (c)(ii) and in the *e-* and *ia-*subj. plus the *i-*fut. the pairing is between 2sg. (c) and 1sg. (b)(i). In the (b) conjunct stressed *e* is liable to raising under the limited conditions alluded to in 2.4, and is consequently unaffected in the *s-*subj. and unreduplicated *s-*fut. The following is a selection of relevant examples.

(a) pres. W1 *-car(a)i*, W2 *-rádi*, S2 *-gaibi*, S3 *benai*, *as:renai*, H1 (*in*)*daí*, *-tai*, H3 *imm:soí*.

(b) pres. S1 *biri*, *téigi*, *-bir*, *-téig*, H1 *cii*, *-cí*; pret. *t-* *do:birt*, *s-* *sóer^tsai*, *-mórais*; *s-*subj. *téisi*, *-téis*, *-geis*; *s-*fut. *fo:lilais*, *-fáelais*.

(c) subj. *e-* *do:gné*, *a-* *-dén(a)e*, *cri(a)e*, *-cri(a)e* (*crenaid*), *as:ber(a)e*, *du:logae*, *car(a)e*, *-car(a)e*; fut. *f-* *ar:troíd^tfe*, *a-* *cech^tnae*, *i-* *lile* (*lenaid*).

In S1 presents the (b) type 2sg. conj. was identical with the 3sg. conj. in many cases. There were two chief exceptions. The first consisted of S1b verbs with 3sg. conj. broad *-t*, usually confined to unstressed position (III.4.1b), opposed to the palatal final of the 2sg. conj. as in irregular 3sg. *-tét* versus 2sg. *-téig* 'go' or more normal 3sg. *do:ad-bat* versus 2sg. *do:ad-bit* 'show'. The second comprised those S1a verbs with the accessory feature of raising of short stressed *e* to *i* as in 2sg. *du:bir* 'thou givest', *as:bir* 'thou sayest' formally distinct from 3sg. *du:beir* 'he gives' and *as:beir* 'he says'. For reasons already discussed (2.4 and I.2.4a) both possibilities were quite limited. The latter type in particular only applied to roots with *e* followed by a voiced consonant, and then only when the root was stressed, as is clear from the identity of 2 and 3sg. prototonic *-ta-b(a)ir* 'thou givest, he gives', *-epir* 'thou sayest, he says'. Because of its lack of range and potential it seems to have been on the way out even in those cases where raising in the 2sg. might be expected, as Ml. forms like *do-n:eim-ni* 'thou protectest us' (3sg. *do:eim*)

and *a n-in-da:greinn-siu* 'while thou persecutest them' (3sg. *in:greinn*) indicate.

Given Old Irish dependence on the inflection of the verb itself to express person and number, identical forms such as these within the absolute or conjunct set gave rise to ambiguity, whereas identity across the absolute/conjunct divide presented no problems because of the mutually exclusive environments in which the two sets occurred. In S2, however, no such ambiguity existed because the (a) type 2sg. conj. *-gaibi* 'thou seizest' was quite distinct from 3sg. *-gaib* 'he seizes'. Some verbs originally in this class may have been attracted into the much larger S1 present class as part of S1a (see *GOI* 354), and a 2sg. conj. like *con:daigi* 'thou seekest' (*con:di-eig*, compound of probably originally S2 *sag-*) in S1a may be an S2 survival. Be that as it may, the spread of this distinctive conjunct form to and within S1 is well motivated and attested. It may already have ousted type (a) in the S1a type with *i/e* umlaut and in S1c by the time of Ml., to judge from *con:rigi* 'thou bindest together', *du:fichi* 'thou punishest' and *fris:orcai*, *fri-tam:oirci* 'thou repulseth (me)' there. In root-stressed S1b Wb. already has *ara:rethi* 'which thou assailest', while Ml. *ara:foími* 'which thou receivest' (*ar:fo-em*) even shows the beginnings of penetration into standard S1a. Overall it seems fair to say that the type (a) 2sg. conj. was supplanting type (b) in the present during the Old Irish period, although the process was still far from complete.

3.1. The imperative active endings are added to the *present stem* as a rule, and a single set is used in all environments without differentiation of absolute and conjunct inflections.

The basic endings outside the 2 and 3sg. are identical with the corresponding conjunct forms of the active set described in 2 above, the significant difference being that the imperative ones are not confined to conjunct position but are also used with independent simple verbs. Thus 1sg. *tíag* 'let me go', 1pl. *na:anam* 'let us not stay', 2pl. *léicid* 'let!', *canaid* 'sing!', *car(a)id* 'love!', *n-a:car(a)id* 'love him!', *gaibid* 'seize!', *gni(i)d* 'do!', *do-s:ngniith* 'do them!', 3pl. *berat*, *na:berat* 'let them (not) carry'.

The 3sg. has a distinctive ending *-eth/-ath* normally realized as *-ed/-ad* by I.3.3a, e.g. *gaibed* 'let him seize', *na:im-chomarcad* 'let him not ask'. The 2sg. imperative is characterized by a bare stem and is thus formally identical with the 3sg. conj. present indicative of strong and hiatus verbs while lacking the *-a* or *-i*

found in the corresponding weak forms (cf. II.2.2-4), e.g. *be(i)r* 'carry!' (S1a), *ca(i)n* 'sing!' (S1c), *gaib* 'seize!' (S2), *in-da:ár-ben* 'banish them!' (S3), *foi* 'sleep!' (H3), *an* 'stay!' (W1), *léic* 'let!' (W2a).

The identity of inflections just described only gave rise to ambiguity between present indicative and imperative when an infix pronoun (see I.3) was involved. The absolute endings used in the present of independent simple verbs (e.g. *léic^t* 'the you let') were quite different from the imperative endings of the same (e.g. *léicid* 'let!'), and compound verbs, despite extensive identity of their present conjunct and imperative endings, avoided ambiguity in independent position without an infix by being prototonic in the imperative contrary to the general rule (see I.1.4), e.g. 2sg. *tab(a)ir* 'give!' (3sg. pres. *do:beir*), *deich* 'avenge!' (*do:fich*), *eroím* 'receive!' (*ar:foím*), 2pl. *forcanid* 'teach!' (2pl. pres. *for:canid*), *taib^trid* 'give!' (*do:beirid*). For obvious semantic reasons the negative is the only conjunct particle used with the imperative, and a special main clause *na* then distinguishes it from an otherwise identical corresponding present with *ní*, e.g. *ní:berat* 'they do not carry' but imperative *na:berat*. Where, however, an infix pronoun was present, use of *no* with an otherwise unaccompanied simple verb (I.3.4) and the unavoidability of a deuterotonic form in the independent compound verb (cf. I.3.2) could result in total ambiguity between present indicative and imperative, so that, for example, *n-a:caraid*, *do-s:ngniith* and *in-da:ár-ben* cited above could just as easily be taken (out of context, at least) as pres. ind. 'you love him', 'you do them', 'he banishes them' respectively.

3.2. In a handful of verbs with an *s-* or *e-*subjunctive (IV.2-3) the 2sg. imperative inflection coincides with the 3sg. conj. of the present subjunctive rather than with that of the present indicative, e.g. *a-t:ré* 'rise!' (3sg. pres. *a-t:raig*, subj. *a-t:ré*), *no-m:ain* 'protect me!' (3sg. pres. *-anaig*, subj. *-ain*), *déne* 'do!', *d-a:gné* 'do it!' (3sg. pres. *do:gní*, *-dén(a)i*, subj. *do:gné*, *-déna*), *cungne* 'help' (3sg. pres. *con:gní*, subj. *con:gné*), *dé(i)cce* 'see!' (3sg. pres. *do:écci*, *-décci*). The lack of a perfect match between 2sg. ipv. and 3sg. subj. in the *e-* type with unstressed root (ipv. *déne*, subj. *-déna* etc.) might be ascribed to a secondary transfer from *e-* to *a-*subjunctive in the latter (see IV.3.).

By no means all verbs with *s-* or *e-*subjunctives form these anomalous imperatives, which are anyway confined to the 2sg. Otherwise the normal type formed from the present stem prevails, e.g. 2sg. *na:cuindig* 'do not seek!' (3sg.

pres. *con:dieig*, *-cuindig*, *s-subj. -cuintea*), *ipv. 2sg. tair* 'come!' vs. *3sg. tair^tced* 'let him come' (3sg. pres. *tairic*, *s-subj. tair(i)*), *2pl. do-s:nngniith* 'do them!' in 3.1 above.

4. The basic **suffixless preterite active** endings constitute a distinct category. The singular is characterized by a bare stem throughout, and the plural endings are 1. *-am(m)ar*, 2. *-(a)ith*, 3. *-atar*. A stem-final consonant is broad or non-palatal in the 1 and 2sg. but slender or palatal in the 3sg., whereas a stem-final vowel appears regularly as (stressed) *-á*/(unstressed) *-a* in the 1 and 2sg. versus a different and more 'palatal' or fronted vocalism in the 3sg., usually (stressed) *-oí* or *-aí*/(unstressed) *-(a)e* but *-í*/*-(a)i* in *ben-* (S3) plus compounds and *-u* (unstressed only attested) in the couple of H3 verbs with a preterite of this type.

In forms with a stem-final consonant syncope may affect the penultimate vowel of the 1 and 3pl. under appropriate conditions, although this is sometimes resisted in the interests of morphological clarity, and *u* or *i* before the 3sg. palatal final tend to alternate with *o* or *e* respectively before the non-palatal final consonant of the other persons. Examples include 3sg. *-memaid*, *-cechain*, *-lil*, 3pl. *-mem^tdatar*, *-cech^tnatar*, *-le^tdar* 'broke' (*mad-*), 'sang' (*can-*), 'stuck' (*le(n)-*); 1sg. *-gád*, 3sg. *-gáid*, 1pl. *-gádammar*, 3pl. *-gádatar* 'prayed' (*gu(i)d-*); (*do:/t-*) 1sg. *-ánac*, 2sg. *-ánac*, 3sg. *-án(a)ic*, 1pl. *-án^tcamar*, 2 pl. *-án^tcid*, 3pl. *-án^tcatar* 'came' (*do:ic*, *(-)tic*) but *do:ar^tnac^ttar* 'arrived' (*do:air-ic*); 1sg. *do:lod*, 2sg. *do:lod*, 3sg. *do:luid*, 1pl. *-lod^tmar*, 3pl. *do:lotar* (for **-lod^ttar*) but *-tu-l^ttatar* 'came' (*do:tét*, 1pl. from *tét*).

In forms with a stem-final vowel the penultimate *a* of the plural is liable to be absorbed by the preceding vowel. Examples include 1sg. *-bá* (unstressed *-ba*), 2sg. *-bá*, 3sg. *-boí*, *-baí* (unstressed *-bae*), 1pl. *-bámmar* (unstressed *-bamm*, 2pl. *-baid*), 3pl. *-bátar* (unstressed *-batar*, *-b^ttar*) 'were' (*bi-*); 2sg. *ro:cúala*, 3sg. *ro:cúal(a)e*, 1pl. *ro:cúal^tammar*, 2pl. *ro:cúal^t(a)id*, 3pl. *ro:cúal^tatar* 'heard' (*ro:cluine^thar*); 1sg. *-ba*, 2sg. *-ba* (both unstressed), 3sg. *-bí* (unstressed *-bai*), 3pl. *-béotar* (unstressed *-batar*) 'struck' (*be(n)-*); 2sg. *-(f)a* (unstressed), 3sg. *-fiu*, 3pl. *-féotar* 'passed the night' (H3 *fo-*), 1 and 2sg. *do:roíga*, 3sg. *do:roígu*, 3pl. *do:roíg^tatar* 'chose' (H3 *do:goa*, *ro-pret.* forms with *roíg-* for **rogeg-* by V.6b; see IX-XI on *ro* augment).

The absolute is poorly attested in early material, but 3sg. forms like *boí* 'was',

luid 'went' and *táich* 'fled' (*tech-*) in the glosses are identical with the corresponding conjuncts, and the same picture emerges among presumably old forms preserved in later manuscripts. Identity of the 3pl. abs. with the conj. in Old Irish is put beyond doubt by the unanimity of the later manuscripts of such early works as *Félire Óengusso* and *Fiacc's Hymn* (*Thes.* II 307-21) regarding *ráthatar* 'they ran' (*Fél* Sept. 18), *gádatar* 'they prayed' (*Thes.* II 313.1) and *lotar* 'they went' (*Thes.* II 316.5 - hardly a relative form). Accordingly further cases of abs. -*atar* in later material can be regarded as survivals of the original identity of absolute and conjunct in the suffixless preterite, as can forms like abs. 1sg. *lod*, 2sg. *lod*, 1pl. *lod^tmar*.

A 3sg. relative in -*e* is found in the early attestations *luide* 'who went', *gíulae* 'which stuck', *boíe* 'which was' and elsewhere, but the relative of the 1 and 3pl. *r*-forms was identical with the corresponding abs. and conj., to judge from *ML*. 123b5 *báatar* 'who were' (see final paragraph for further evidence from the *t*-pret.).

This identity of relative and absolute was a source of ambiguity, and pressure to resolve it almost inevitable. The deponent opposition between 3pl. conj. or rel. (mutually exclusive environments) -*etar*/-*atar* and abs. -(*a*)*itir* provided an obvious model for making suffixless pret. -*atar* distinctively relative by creating a new -(*a*)*itir* absolute. In the copula analogical 3pl. abs. *batir* is as old as *Wb.* 5c14 and *ML*. 90d17 alongside inherited 3pl. abs. or rel. *batar* (*ML*. 31a3, 23c16) with the non-palatal consonance phonetically inevitable in a proclitic (see *GOI* 105). The earliest attestations of this -(*a*)*itir* plural in stressed verbal forms are from the roughly ninth-century *Tripartite Life of Patrick* preserved in later manuscripts, e.g. *táchaitir* 'they fled' (765), *bátir* 'they were' (1917 - cf. rel. *báatar* 'who were' at 591). Forms like abs. 1pl. -(*a*)*im(m)ir*, 3pl. -(*a*)*itir* are otherwise confined to what is generally considered Middle Irish material, and it seems quite clear that the suffixless preterite originally used a single set of endings throughout without formal differentiation of absolute and conjunct.

As noted in 2.1 and 2.3-5, the *t*-preterite has a version of the basic active set of endings in the singular (e.g. conj. 1sg. -*biurt*, 2sg. -*birt*, 3sg. *birt*, -*bert* for *ber-* 'carry'). However, apart from a few possible survivals of the basic active 3pl. conj. such as unstressed -*bartat* (*ML* 91b1, 103d6, 131d12), the plural of the *t*-preterite has the same endings as the suffixless preterite, e.g. 1pl. unstressed conj. -*bart^tmar*, 3pl. conj. -*bertar* (for -*bert^ttar*) or -*bertatar*, 3pl. rel. *bertar* (for *bert^ttar*) or

bertatar, all attested in the Glosses.

5.1. Most active verbs in Old Irish take the endings described in the previous three sections, but a significant number have the so-called **deponent** endings, which are usually characterised by a final *-r*. The difference between basic active (2-4) and deponent inflection is purely lexical and has no semantic significance whatever. A given verb simply happens to use one set of endings or the other and the two never overlap by being found with one and the same verb except insofar as deponent inflection was on the wane in Old Irish generally and a handful of particular verbs alternated between basic active inflection in some moods or tenses and deponent inflection in others. Notable among these were mostly deponent *(ro)-cluine*thar ‘hears’ with basic active pret. *(ro)-cúalae*, basic active *ad:cí* ‘sees’ and *con:oi* ‘protects’ with deponent subjunctives *ad:cether*, *-accathar* (IV.3) and *con:oither*, *-comathar* plus, in the latter case, future *con:ófathar* and suppletive deponent preterite (*ro*-form only attested) *con:roíter*, the only example of a deponent *t*-pret. (from a presumed **con:eim*). Finally, a few verbs display a tendency to deponent inflection in the suffixless preterite (see 5.4 below), while *fo:ceird* ‘puts’ has a suppletive deponent dependent form *-cuirethar* etc. (I.2.9c) in all but the future stem. It must, however, be emphasized that such instances of fluctuation are rare and that the overwhelming norm is for a particular verb to display either basic active or deponent inflection throughout.

A comprehensive statement on the distribution of deponent inflection can only be made in lexical terms, i.e. by listing the verbs concerned item by item, apart from the useful generalization that deponent inflection characterized the highly productive denominative suffix *-(a)ig-* used to form verbs from nouns and adjectives in Old Irish (see GOI 337-8). Typical examples are 3sg. rel. *cruth^taigedar* ‘who shapes’ (*cruth* ‘shape’) and *fog^trai^tgedar* ‘which sounds’ (*fogur* ‘sound’). These *-(a)ig-* formations display the W2a inflectional pattern, never lose the vowel of their formative suffix through syncope, and account for the vast majority of Old Irish deponent verbs. W2a inflection is found in a couple of other deponents, notably *-sissedar* ‘stands’ (but with suffixless as well as *s-* preterite forms) and *se(i)chithir* ‘follows’, *-cuirethar* follows W2b, and there are a handful of W1 deponents exemplified by 3sg. conj. *-comalnathar* ‘fulfils’ (from **-coml^tn-* by I.2.5c), *-lab^trathar* ‘speaks’, *-sam^tlathar* ‘likens’, *-moladar* ‘praises’. The palatal

consonance of syncopated forms such as 3sg. pass. *-áig^tther* and 2sg. ipv. *a-tom:gláite* (< **-gláid^tthe*) indicates W2a status (III.2) for *(ad)-ágathar* 'fears' and *ad:gládathar* 'addresses', which shares with *caraid* 'loves' the distinction of being a weak verb with a reduplicated future (V.5.1).

Strong deponents are not numerous and never display the alternation between palatal and non-palatal final consonance that typifies the largest non-deponent present class, S1. In fact, since palatal final consonance preponderates here as in the weak (mostly W2a) examples, virtually all strong deponents inflect like S2, whence 3sg. abs. *midithir* 'judges', *gainithir* 'is born', 3sg. conj. *-muinethar* 'thinks', *-laimethar* 'dares'. Even the S3 deponent *(ro)-cluine^thar* 'hears' has a palatal *n* unique in that present class (III.4.3), leaving the other S3 deponent *(ro)-finnad^rar* 'finds out' as the sole strong form with non-palatal final consonance throughout.

Before proceeding to the distinctively deponent endings it should be pointed out that the 2pl. is exactly as in the corresponding basic active sets in 2-4 above, e.g. abs. pres. *ferg^taig^tthe* 'you are angry', *s*-pret. conj. *-comalnisid* (from **-coml^tn^tid*) 'you fulfilled', ipv. *intamlid* (from **ind^tham^tlith*) 'imitate!'. Deponent endings are incompatible with a suffixed pronoun and are replaced by the corresponding basic active form when such a pronoun is required (see I.3.3e), e.g. 3sg. rel. *firiánigedar* 'which he justifies', *n-óenaigedar* '(since) it unites' but *firiánich^tthi* 'justifies him', *óenich^tthi* 'unites himself' (Wb. 2b28, 32d8, and note avoidance of the problem by means of the alternative infixing syntagm with *no* in some examples in I.3.4). The semantically useless complication of a distinct deponent inflection was, in fact, beginning to be given up elsewhere too even as early as Wb. and Ml., which seem to retain deponent forms more or less intact in the third person conj. (e.g. 3sg. *-comalnathar*, 3pl. *-comallatar*), but to permit free competition between deponent and basic active in the statistically less frequent rel. (e.g. 3sg. *firiánigedar* vs. *comalnas*) and abs. (e.g. 3sg. *béoigidir* vs. *comallaid*, 3pl. *aidlignigitir* vs. *comalnit*) as well as in the other persons abs. and conj. (e.g. 1sg. *do:cuiriu^r* vs. *bruthnaigim*, *-frithalim*, 2sg. *in:samailter* vs. *-intamlae*, 1pl. rel. *labramar* vs. *labraimme*) a state of affairs prefiguring the rapid demise of the deponent in Middle Irish (XII.6.4).

As regards the deponent endings themselves, three divisions will be made corresponding to 2 (basic active), 3 (imperative) and 4 (suffixless preterite) above.

5.2. The **basic deponent** set is used with the relevant verbs in the same

categories as were enumerated in 2.1. In the 1 and 2sg. there is no differentiation of absolute and conjunct, and in the 3sg., 1pl. and 3pl. the conjunct and relative endings are formally identical but are distinct from the non-relative absolute (cf. penultimate paragraph of 4 above). The penultimate vowel of the ending is liable to syncope where appropriate in the 2sg. (and 2pl. abs. described in 5.1), but in the 1pl. such syncope is normal only in the *-(a)ig-* denominatives. In the 3sg. and pl. it may be syncopated under no circumstances whatever except in the singular of *s*-formations.

1sg. *-(i)ur* (or *-or*), but *-er/-ar* in *a*-subj., *a*- and *f*-fut.

2sg. *-(a)ither*, but *-er* in *s*-formations.

3sg. abs. *-(a)ithir*, rel. and conj. *-ethar/-athar*.

1pl. abs. *-(a)im(m)ir*, rel. and conj. *-em(m)ar/-am(m)ar*.

3pl. abs. *-(a)itir*, rel. and conj. *-etar/-atar*.

The 1sg. is exemplified by abs. *midiur* 'I judge' (pres.), *lab^trar* 'I should speak' (*a*-subj.), conj. *do:muiniur* 'I think', *-molor* 'I praise' (pres.), *mesur* or *-mesor* 'I shall judge' (*s*-fut.), *-suid^tig^t-siur* 'I placed' (*s*-pret.), *-mol^tfar* 'I shall praise' (*f*-fut), and the 1pl. by abs. *dech^tri^tgmir* 'we differ', rel. *cos^tmil^tig^tmmer* '(when) we compare', conj. *ro:clu^tin^temmar* 'we hear' (pres.), *-sam^tlafammar* 'we shall liken' (*f*-fut.), *-cruth^taig^tsemmar* 'we formed' (*s*-pret.). It should be clear from these instances that there was considerable potential for variation in the syllables lost by regular syncope of every second non-final syllable. This then opened the way to analogical interplay resulting in various historically irregular patterns, processes that recur in other parts of the Old Irish verbal system too.

In the 2 and 3sg. *-th-* is quite liable to be voiced to *-d-* when the vowel before it is not lost by syncope (cf. V.2.1 for a similar case of *flb* in the *f*-fut.). Sufficient examples of fluctuation between *-th-* and *-d-* after the unstressed vowel of the 3sg. have already been given in 5.1 above. An example of an unsyncopated 2sg. ending is *lab^traither* 'thou speakest' (pres.), whereas conj. *-ét^taig^tther* '(that) thou be jealous' (subj.) has regular syncope. This may then be accompanied by delenition (1.2.5b) after another dental, *r*, *l*, *n* or *s*, as in conj. *-mit^tter* 'thou judgest' (pres.). The *s*-formation's type can be seen in *-suid^tig^tser* 'thou placedst' (*s*-pret.) and *-feser* '(until) thou shouldst know' (*s*-subj.). 2sg. *ad:muin^tter* 'thou

commemoratest' (*Fél.* Oct. 2) versus 1pl. *ad:mun^temmar* 'we invoke' (*Thes.* II 349.5) in the pres. is a good example, guaranteed by the syllable count of an early poem in both cases, of the divergent syncope patterns normal here outside the *-(a)ig-* denominatives. Some 3pl. pres. forms are given in 5.1, and to these may be added *ro:finnatar* 'they find out' in illustration of the prohibition on syncope of the penultimate vowel of third person deponents even in defiance of the general rules. In the *s*-formations, however, this prohibition evidently did not apply on the evidence of 3sg. forms like conj. *-fes^ttar* 'might know' (*s*-subj.), *-fias^ttar* 'will know' (*s*-fut.), *-comalnas^ttar* 'fulfilled' (from **-coml^tnas^tthar* by delenition and vowel support). In syncopated forms such as these delenition of 3sg. *-th-* and devoicing of 3pl. */-d-/* to */-t-/* would have resulted in an intolerable identity of forms. In order to avoid this an unsyncopated plural type found regularly in forms like *(ad)-áig^tsetar* 'they feared' seems to have been generalized, whence 3pl. *-fes(s)atar* 'they might/will know' (*s*-subj. or fut.), *(in)-sam^tlasatar* 'they imitated' (*s*-pret.) and so on with invariable lack of expected syncope in the 3pl. The opposition 3sg. *-s^ttar*, 3pl. *-setar/-satar* apparently then became productive, whence numerous cases like 3sg. *-suid^tigestar* 'placed', *-sechestar* 'followed' where **-^tsethar* would be regular but is, in fact, never attested. This, of course, is an interesting case of the exploitation of divergent inherited syncope patterns by analogy for the maximization of morphological distinctions.

5.3. In the **imperative deponent** as in its basic active counterpart (3.1) a single set of endings is added to the present stem, and these are identical with the corresponding conjuncts of the previous set apart from in the 2 and 3sg., e.g. 3pl. *na:aimm^tdetar* 'let them not try' (*ad:midethar*), *na:laimetar* 'let them not dare', 1pl. *finnamar* 'let us know'. As pointed out earlier, the 2pl. basic active and deponent endings are identical as in 2pl. *midid* 'judge!', and the 1pl. deponent imperatives in the Glosses happen to reflect the spread of basic active inflection (cf. end of 5.1), e.g. *núallaigem* 'let us cry out', *na:seichem* 'let us not follow'. The 3sg. is *-eth/-ath* (in practice, mostly *-ed/-ad* by I.3.3a) just as in the basic active imperative, e.g. *aimm^tded* 'let him try', *na-chib:mided* 'let him not judge you'. The 2sg. deponent ending is basically *-(a)ithe*, as in *no-s:comalnithe* 'fulfil them!' (from **-coml^tnithe*), *laim^tthe* 'dare!', *cluin^tte* 'hear!', *fin^ttae* 'find out', *intamaltae* 'imitate!', *samaltae* 'liken!' (from **ind^tham^tlaithe*, **sam^tlaithe* by metathesis of liquid plus unstressed vowel in internal syllables before a dental or *s*, followed by

delenition, quality assimilation etc. where applicable; cf. 1sg. rel. *s*-pret. *celebirsimme* from *celebraid* 'bids farewell', gen. sg. *cotulto* to nom. sg. *cot^tlud* 'sleep').

5.4. Like its non-deponent counterpart the **suffixless preterite deponent** had only a single set of endings in Old Irish without distinction of absolute and conjunct. Since the 2pl. deponent is in any case identical with the basic active form and 1pl. *-am(m)ar*, 3pl. *-atar* in the non-deponent suffixless preterite of 4 above look just like deponent endings, it is no surprise that the inflection of deponent and non-deponent formations is identical throughout the plural of the suffixless preterite. In the singular the deponent has the same system as the non-deponent insofar as the final consonant is non-palatal in the 1 and 2sg. but palatal in the 3sg. However, whereas the consonant affected belongs to the stem in the active, in the deponent it is the final *-r* of an extra syllable, whence 1 and 2sg. *-ar*, 3sg. *-(a)ir* throughout.

Apart from *(ro)-cluine^thar* (see 5.1), strong deponent verbs regularly have a deponent suffixless preterite, e.g. 1sg. *-ménar*, 3sg. *-ménair*, 1pl. *-mén^tmar*, 2pl. *-ménid*, 3pl. *-ménatar* (*-moinethar*); 1sg. *-génar*, 3sg. abs. *génair*, conj. *-gén(a)ir*, 3pl. *-génatar* (*gainithir*); 1sg. *-mídar*, 3sg. *-mídair*, 3pl. *-mídatar* (*midithir*); 3sg. *-lá^tmair* (*-laimethar*). It is noticeable that deponent suffixless preterites never have standard reduplication of the stem (see VI.2.1), but instead display some form of surrogate, usually a long vowel (see VI.2.3-4). Moreover, the stem-final consonant (as opposed to desinential *-r* in the 3sg.) is regularly non-palatal throughout, as in the above examples. The one exception is the suffixless preterite of *(ro)-finnadar* 'finds out', which palatalizes both stem final and *-r* in the 3sg. *(ro)-fitir* but leaves them non-palatalized in 1 and 2sg. *(ro)-fetar* and shows fluctuation in the quality of the stem final in the plural: 1pl. *(ro)-fitemmar* or *-fetammar*, 2pl. *(ro)-fitid* or the extraordinary *-fitis* (both in Wb.), 3pl. *(ro)-fetar* (i.e. *-fet^ttar*), *-fetatar* or *-fitetar*. These forms are also remarkable because they lack any trace of reduplication or a surrogate and have a present meaning 'know (as a result of having found out)'. Another deponent suffixless present-preterite is *(do)-dúthracair* 'wishes', which has *s*-subj. and fut. forms fluctuating between deponent and non-deponent inflection but no normal present in Old Irish.

Although mostly conforming to a weak paradigm, compounds of *-sissedar* seem to be in transition from a strong inflection still manifest in suffixless preterites like 3sg. *-air^tsir* 'remained' (*ar:sissedar*), *tar^tra^tsair* 'stood fast' (*do:airissedar*,

plus *ro*) to a weak one already seen in Old Irish *s*-preterites like 3sg. *ar:roísestar* 'has remained' (plus *ro*: see IX-XI) and *-tar^tra^tstar* 'has stood fast'. The stressed form of this suffixless preterite, e.g. 3sg. *síasair*, 3pl. rel. *síasatar* 'sat', is attested as suppletive preterite of the semantically close *saidid* 'sits'. In view of the attested doublet *tarrasair/-tarrastar* the 3sg. dep. pret. forms *ad-ro:neestar* (Wb. 4c35) and *ar-ru:neestar* (Ml. 50b8) of the *said-* compounds *in:* (or *ad:*, see I.2.9e) and *ar:neat* 'awaits' presumably rest on a remodelling of an unattested suffixless **-ne^tsair*. *Saidid* and compounds thus present a special case of verbs with basic active inflection elsewhere but a deponent preterite. However, by the time of Ml. *in/ar:neat* had developed a perfectly normal active *s*-pret. seen in 3pl. *ar-ru:neith^tset*.

The quasi-deponent appearance of the basic active suffixless preterite plural (see first paragraph of this section) in general seems to have led to some spread of deponent inflection to the suffixless preterite singular of some otherwise basic active verbs. This affects compounds of *arc-*, e.g. 3sg. pres. *imm:com-airc* 'asks' vs. pret. *imm:com-arcair* 'asked' (presumably replacing a short *a*-pret. form identical with the pres, cf. VI 2.5), most compounds of *-ic* with directly preceding *cum*, e.g. 1sg. *co-t:aneccar* (Wb. 14c 20), 3sg. *con:anacuir* (Ml. 119d7) vs. older non-dep. *co-t:ánic* (Wb. 8a14), *-coim^tnacuir* (Wb. and Ml.: *con:ic* 'is able'), *t-e-ccom-^tnocuir* 'has happened' (irregular syncope on model of *-coim^tnacuir*?; *do:ec^tmaing* 'happens', and see VI.2.6 on non-deponent suffixless pret. of other *-ic* compounds), and finally *daimid* 'suffers' plus its compounds, e.g. 1sg. *-dámar*, 2sg. *-atamar* (*ad:daim* 'grants'), 3sg. *dámair* (presumably replacing an unattested non-dep. *á*-pret. **-dáim* indistinguishable from the pres. in unstressed position). The 3pl. forms range from the strange abs. *damdatar*, conj. *-damdatar* in *Fél.* to an even odder *-damnatar* in Ml.

Plenty of additional information about and examples of deponent inflection will be found in *GOI* and *OIPG*, which treat deponent forms piecemeal under the headings of the various stems referred to in chapters III-VI.

6.1. Except in the preterite, the Old Irish passive is formed by simply replacing the basic active or deponent endings of 2-3 and 5 above with the **passive** ones added to the stem in question. The passive is commonest in transitive verbs but, owing to a penchant for using it impersonally in Irish, is by no means confined to

them, e.g. Old Irish *bíthir* 'one is wont to be', rel. *tíagar* '(that) one goes'. Consequently almost any Old Irish verb can be expected to oppose active (whether with basic active or deponent inflection) and passive forms, the key difference outside the preterite lying in the personal endings themselves in the third person at least. For reasons to be given shortly the passive has third person endings only, the underlying forms differing from the corresponding deponents (see 5.2) only in the type (ii) 3sg. and type (i) 3sg. rel., conj. and ipv.

3sg. (i) abs. *-(a)ithir*; rel., conj. and ipv. *-(a)ither*.

(ii) abs. *-(a)ir*; rel., conj. and ipv. *-ar*.

3pl. abs. *-(a)itir*; rel., conj. and ipv. *-etar/-atar*.

Where the preceding vowel is syncopated, the *-th-* of the type (i) 3sg. is liable to delenition in the appropriate circumstances (cf. 5.2).

6.2. The reason for the lack of separate personal endings outside the third person passive is that the first and second persons singular and plural are expressed by the relevant infixed pronouns combined with the third singular passive (see *GOI* 349 for a complete paradigm and I.3.2-5 on the pronouns themselves). Thus *a-ddom:suiter* 'I am held fast' (< *-*suid^tther*), *a-tat:chigestar* 'thou shalt be seen', *for-dom:chom^taither* 'I am preserved', *co-ndan:samailter* 'so that we are likened', *na-chib:berar* 'do not be carried!' (2pl. ipv.). Like those of the deponent, passive endings are incompatible with a suffixed pronoun, but unlike them cannot switch to the corresponding basic active forms (cf. end of 5.1) for obvious semantic reasons. Otherwise unaccompanied simple verbs accordingly have recourse to the empty particle *no* (I.3.4) in order to infix these pronouns in the passive, as in 2pl. *no-b:cloifether* 'you will be conquered'. The difference between deponent and passive in the first two persons is accordingly a clear syntactic one: whereas the deponent expresses these in the normal way by means of distinct personal endings, e.g. 1pl. *ní:int^tam^tlammar* 'we do not imitate', in the corresponding passive the 3sg. of the verb is used with an infixed pronoun denoting the person, e.g. *ní-n:int^tamaltar* (see end of 5.3) 'we are not imitated'.

6.3. Syncope versus non-syncope of the penultimate vowel in the 3pl. passive seems to be regulated by the normal rules for the most part, e.g. pres. rel. *cruth^taig^tter* 'which are fashioned', *ber^ttar*, abs. *ber^ttair*, conj. *-ber^ttar* '(which)

are carried', *t-ind-^tnag^ttar* 'are bestowed' (*do:ind-^tnaig*), abs. *dleg^ttir* 'are due', ipv. *na:marb^ttar* 'let them not be killed' but pres. conj. *imme:chomarcatar* 'which are asked' (presumably from **-com^trcatar* by vowel support: *imm:com-airc*), *-cuin^tchetar* 'are sought' (*con:di-eig*), *-lécetar* 'are let', *con:gaib^tetar* 'are comprised', pres. and subj. *-dén^tatar* 'are/be done'. Almost inevitably, however, there is some analogical confusion, and this seems to have operated in both directions, to judge from *-epertar* 'are said' (influenced by deuterotonic *as:ber^ttar*), *con:air^t-leic^tter* 'are allowed', *-gaibter* 'are seized' and subj. *do:ind^tnasatar* 'be bestowed', pres. *ad:fiadatar* 'are related'.

In view of the total prohibition upon syncope of the penultimate vowel in the deponent third person, syncope there in the passive would be a valuable means of differentiating otherwise identical endings, and one duly finds the opposition 3pl. rel. pass. *cruthaigter*, dep. *cruthaigetar* and so on prevalent in the large W2a *-(a)ig-* class and attested in other verbs, as in conj. pres. pass. *-cuirter* 'are put' versus deponent *-cuiretar* 'they put'. However, pass. pres. abs. *miditir*, conj. *-midetar* 'are judged', *-finnatar* 'are found out' and even *-dirrudigeddar* 'are derived' (W2a *-(a)ig-*) prove that formal ambiguity with the 3pl. deponent was not always avoided by syncope, whether regular or not, in the passive.

6.4. In the 3sg. the distribution of the two types of ending (see 6.1) is broadly as follows. Type (i) occurs regularly in W1, W2a and H1-3 presents like W1 abs. *marb^tthair* 'is killed', W2a conj. *ara:léc^tther*, *-air^t-lic^tther* '(which) is lent', H1 conj. *-ráthar* 'is rowed', *ad:co-tar* 'is got' (< **-cot^tthar*), H2 *do:gníther* 'is done', H3 *imm:soíther* 'is turned', the *a*-subjunctive as in *ber^tth(a)ir* 'be carried', *con:air^t-leic^tther* 'be allowed', *do:gnether*, *-dén^ttar* 'be done', and all futures, e.g. *nert^tfidir* 'will be strengthened', *bér^tthar* 'which will be carried', *as:rír^tther* 'will be paid', *ebarthir* 'will be granted' (< **ebr^tthir*), *do:ind-^tnas^ttar* 'will be bestowed'. Type (ii), on the other hand, is the exclusive ending of S1 presents, e.g. *ber(a)ir* 'is carried', ipv. *berar* 'let be carried', pres. *do:ind-^tnagar* 'is bestowed', *fedir* 'is led', *dlegair*, *-dlegar* 'is owed', *segar* 'which is striven after', *con:degar* 'which is sought' in S1a, *ad:fiadar* 'is related' in S1b, ipv. *orgar* 'let him be slain', pres. *fris:orcar* 'is injured', *imme:chom-arcar* 'which is asked' in S1c, *for:dengar* 'is crushed' in S1d.

Elsewhere there is some competition between them. S3 presents with *e* (Thurneysen's BIV) have type (ii), e.g. *benar* 'which is struck', ipv. *benar* 'let him

be struck', *ad:fenar* 'is requited', *-sernar* 'is arrayed', but those with *i* or *u* (Thurneysen's BV) prefer type (i), to judge from *asa:gnin^ttar* 'is recognized', *-fo-r^t-chluin^tter* 'is overheard', *-fin^ttar* 'is found out'. S2 presents also show both types, as in (i) *gaib^tthir*, *-gaib^tther* 'is seized' and similar forms that are the overwhelming norm for *gaibid* and compounds versus (ii) *con:o-cabar* 'is raised' or the *gairid* compound *as:congarar* 'is proclaimed' attested as early as Ml. It is difficult to decide which is the older ending in this class. Similar fluctuation is found in W2b, where (ii) *-tochar* 'is put' (Tur. 14; for *-to-char^tr*, cf. *-berar*, *-ta-bar^tr* etc. below) and *im:fo-l^tngar* 'is produced' (Ml. 31d10) look like survivals in the face of preponderant (i) *-to-chuir^tther* 'is put' (Ml. 22c1, syncope pattern from deut. *do:cuir^tther*), *-imm^t-o-l^tngaither* 'is produced', (Sg. 3a2), *a-ddom:suiter* 'I am held fast' (Carlsr. Aug. 7d1, < **-suid^tther*), *ní:a-s^ttaider* 'is not held fast' (Sg. 3a4, both *ad:suidi*). Arguably there was an increasing tendency in the present towards polarization between (i) in weak and hiatus verbs on the one hand and (ii) in strong verbs on the other.

In the *s*-subjunctive type (ii) predominates when the root is stressed, e.g. *mesair*, *-mesar* 'be judged', *-fessar* 'might be known', abs. *gessir*, rel. *ngesar* '(that) be prayed', and (i) when it is unstressed, e.g. *do:ind-^tnas^ttar* 'be bestowed', *-accas^ttar* 'be seen', as well as occurring quite exceptionally in the stressed rel. *mes^ttar* 'that it be judged'. It could be argued that the spread of (i) in unstressed position was triggered by the reduplicated *s*-fut., which always had (i) and an unstressed root as in *a-tat:chigestar* 'thou shalt be seen'. In the future, however, the minority types with stressed root have or have acquired (i), e.g. *ru:fias^ttar* 'will be known', *mias^tt(a)ir* 'will be judged'.

Finally, it may be noted that a peculiar syncope affects the vowel of the type (ii) 3sg. pass. *-ar* after another *r* when the preceeding syllable is unstressed, whence *do:berar* but *-ta-bar^tr* 'is given', *as:berar* but *-e-per^tr* 'is said'. These syncopated forms may then spread by analogy to give the variants *do:ber(r)*, *as:ber(r)* etc.

6.5. It seems strange at first sight that more use was not made of the most consistently distinctive 3sg. passive ending, type (ii) *-(a)ir/-ar*, for maximal formal differentiation from the 3sg. deponent, but in fact there was no suitable trigger since no Old Irish deponent belonged to a present class characterized by it and only *(ro)-finnadar*, *midithir* and compounds had an *s*-subjunctive using it with stressed root at least.

Where syncope of the penultimate vowel occurs in the present or *a*-subjunctive of a weak verb, it should not occur in the *f*-future of the same and vice versa because of the effect of the *-if-* suffix (V.2.1) on the syllable count, whence two basic patterns illustrated by pres. 3sg. conj. *-léic^tther* 'is let' and fut. 3sg. abs. *léic^tfidir* 'will be let' (see 5.2 on *-th/-d* after unstressed vowels) as opposed to pres. 3sg. abs. *prid^tchidir* 'is preached' and fut. 3sg. conj. *pred^tchab^tthar* 'will be preached'. A similar dichotomy is also found in a number of weak deponents, e.g. 3sg. conj. pres. *-mol^ttar* 'is praised', fut. *-mol^tfaither* 'will be praised' versus 3sg. conj. *a*-subj. *-comalnither* 'be fulfilled', rel. fut. *comallaib^tther* 'that it will be fulfilled' (**coml^tn-* with vowel support in both cases). Ambiguity with the deponent active was avoided in such cases by the distinguishing feature of palatal *-th-* (or *-d-*) in the unsynocopated 3sg. conj. or rel. passives as against non-palatal in the deponents, whence pass. *-mol^tfaither*, *-comalnither* 'will be praised', 'is fulfilled' versus dep. act. *-mol^tfathar*, *-comalnathar* 'will praise', 'fulfils', but the absolutes of both will have been identical as *-(a)ithir*.

In all probability the type (i) 3sg. conj. passive was originally identical with the deponent as in the corresponding abs. and 3pl., and *-(a)ither* was developed by analogy precisely in order to differentiate passives with unsynocopated endings from deponents according to the following proportion:

abs. *gaib^tthir*: rel/conj. *(-)gaib^tther* = abs. *comaln(a)ithir*:

x (x = rel./conj. *(-)comaln(a)ither*).

This *-(a)ither* passive then spread to non-deponent verbs. e.g. conj. *-léic^tfider* 'will be let' and *co-tob:sech^tfider* 'you will be corrected' (*con:secha*). Having become the general unsynocopated 3sg. form, it then gave rise to occasional plural *-(a)iter* rather than commoner *-etar/-atar* (6.3) undifferentiated from the deponent, e.g. *ad:rímiter* 'are reckoned' (*Thes.* II 246.28), *-foir-c^tniter* 'are ended' (Sg. 162b1).

Of course, where the 3sg. passive underwent syncope of the penultimate vowel in type (i), as happened in the vast majority of cases, there was no question of ambiguity with deponents that never tolerated such syncope, e.g. rel. *suid^tig^tther* 'which is put' and *ní:rog^trai^tgther* 'cannot be pronounced' (*ro-fo-* but apparently with *rog-* rather than expected *róg-* under the influence of *ro-*less *fograig-*: see IX.3.3.1 on potential *ro*) versus *suid^tigethar* 'who puts, which he puts', *-fog^trai^tgethar* 'pronounces' (note the rationalization in W2a *-(a)ig-* deponents of

divergent syncope patterns depending upon the syllable count of the base word to give a consistent differentiation between passive and deponent active), conj. *-mol^ttar* 'is praised', *-samal^ttar* 'is likened' (see end of 5.3) versus *-molathar* 'praises', *-sam^tlathar* 'likens' (with irregular evasion of syncope and metathesis respectively for differentiation from the passives, both W1). Owing to assimilation of quality after syncope (I.2.5a), underlying *-ethar/-athar* or *-(a)ither* are equally adequate to explain the syncopated passives. Thus 3sg. conj. *-gaib^tther* could equally well be from **-gaibethar* or **-gaibither* while *-mol^ttar* would be equally compatible with **-molathar* or **-molaither*. It has already been indicated that *-ethar/-athar* is probably the correct historical derivation, but in purely synchronic terms the unsyncopated forms demand *-(a)ither*, duly given in 6.1, on grounds of economy.

In W2 and S2 presents, the two classes containing the vast majority of deponents, the penultimate vowel was usually syncopated under appropriate conditions in the passive 3sg. but not in the 3pl., whence the archaic *Cambrai Homily* forms 3sg. *ad:rim^tther* 'is reckoned' but 3pl. *ad:rimiter* 'are reckoned' and *con:gaibetar* 'are comprised' (*Thes.* II 246.26 & 28, 247.15 respectively). The unsyncopated plural is the rule for presents with a type (i) 3sg. in Wb. too and had presumably been spread somewhat beyond S2 and W2. Even in deponents, then, where the 3pl. passive is thus indistinguishable from the active one gets forms like *miditir* 'are judged' (Wb. 4c9) and *ro:finnatar* 'are found out' (29a28 & 30; 3sg. pass *-fin^ttar*), and in the *a*-subj. 3pl. pass. *-dénatar* (8a11; 3sg. *-dén^ttar*, H2 *do:gnî*) shows a similar pattern. In Ml. and Sg., however, unambiguous syncope begins to spread to some of these 3pl. present passives. e.g. *ad:rim^tter* (Ml. 99d9, Sg. 202a5) alongside *ad:rimetar* (Ml. 111a10) 'are reckoned', *con:gaib^tter* 'are comprised' (Ml. 27c14) or *as(a):gnin^ttar* 'are understood' (/dar/, Ml. 108b4, Sg. 209b13) versus 3sg. *asa:gnin^ttar* 'is understood' (/tar/, Sg. 197b4 etc.). In the *s*-subjunctive and future the syncope of 3pl. was abandoned in order to avoid identity with syncopated type (i) third singulars, since delentition of *th* and devoicing of /d/ after *s* would produce /t/ in both. Thus a regular opposition between 3sg. *-star* and 3pl. *-satar* arose in the same way and for the same reasons as have been given at the end of 5.2 regarding the deponent *s*-preterite, whence *s*-subj. and fut. pass. 3sg. *do:ind-^tnas^ttar*, 3pl. *do:ind-^tnasatar* '(will) be bestowed'. Since only two deponents formed an *s*-subj. or fut., ambiguity in the passive of these *s*-formations

was very limited.

6.6. The passive preterite is unique in having a stem quite separate from its active counterpart (see VII), and this precludes any possibility of ambiguity with deponent preterites quite regardless of syncope patterns and other such factors, e.g. *s*-pret. dep. 3sg. *do:corastar* 'put' but pret. pass. 3sg. *do:corad* 'was put', suffixless pret. dep. 3sg. *mídair* 'judged' but pret. pass. *-mess*. There is also a distinct set of **passive preterite** endings that resemble no others closely, whether passive, basic active or deponent, but do follow the general passive principle of being confined to the third person, leaving the other persons to be expressed by 3sg. verb plus appropriate infixed pronoun (6.2). These endings are 3sg. abs./rel. *-(a)e*, conj. *-Ø*; 3pl. abs./rel. *-(a)i* (?), conj. *-a* and are added direct to the stem, the final consonant of which can only become palatal as a result of progressive quality assimilation after syncope. A single example of the attested endings will suffice here as plenty more may be found in VII: 3sg. abs. *brethae* 'was carried', conj. *a-tam:r-oi-pred* 'I have been offered', 3pl. conj. *ad:opartha* 'were offered' (**-opr^htha* and vowel support, both *ad:o-pair*). In *GOI* and *OIPG* the passive endings are treated piecemeal in connection with the various principal stems.

7.1. The one remaining set of personal endings in Old Irish is best designated **imperfect** since it shares with the so-called 'imperfect' endings of French the property of combining with a present or a future stem to make an *imperfect* and a *conditional* respectively and can also be added to a subjunctive stem to form a *past subjunctive* (see II.1). There is only a single set of active endings indifferent as to basic active or deponent inflection in this category in addition to third person passive endings that conform to normal passive usage (6.1-2). There is no distinction between absolute and conjunct endings for the simple reason that an otherwise unaccompanied simple verb with imperfect endings must prefix the 'meaningless' particle *no* (1.3.4) in standard Old Irish, even where there is no pronoun or relative marker to be infixed, although *no* is occasionally omitted in the absence of an infix in poetry. Consequently these endings are invariably in conjunct position in standard prose and do not need a separate set of absolute endings even in the rare instances of *no*'s omission in poetry.

As already indicated, the imperfect endings replace the basic active set (2.2-5), the basic deponent set (5.1-2) or, where passive sense is required, the basic passive

endings (6.1-5) in the present stem (III) to make an imperfect (indicative), in the subjunctive stem (IV) to make a past subjunctive, and in the future stem (V) to make a conditional. The endings themselves are quite homogeneous.

1sg. <i>-(a)in(n)</i>	1pl. <i>-(a)im(m)is</i>
2sg. <i>-etha/-atha</i>	2pl. <i>-(a)ithe</i>
3sg. act. <i>-eth/-ath</i>	3pl. act. <i>-(a)itis</i>
pass. <i>-(a)ithe</i>	pass. <i>-(a)itis</i>

Penultimate vowels in the disyllabic forms above are, of course, liable to syncope under appropriate conditions. Both these and the vowels of the 1 and 3sg. are absorbed by a preceding hiatus vowel, a process particularly apparent in the stressed root forms of H2 presents. Assimilation of quality, delenition etc. may, of course, accompany syncope in the right environment, while final *-th* in the 3sg. is usually, and medial *-th-* elsewhere is quite often, voiced to *-d* after a retained unstressed vowel. All of these surface modifications should be quite familiar by now from the foregoing discussions. The identity of 3pl. act. and pass. above is remarkable and can cause ambiguity (e.g. in Tur. 110c = *OIPG* 112, no. 109), as might the lack of formal distinction between 3sg. pass. and 2pl. act. On the other hand, the lack of formal distinction between 2pl. imperfect *-(a)ithe* and 2pl. abs. basic active or deponent *-(a)ithe* was no problem because the former was confined to conjunct position.

Examples to illustrate the system with otherwise unaccompanied simple verbs are ipf. 1sg. *no:scrútain* 'I use to investigate', 3sg. *no:bíth* 'used to be', 3sg. pass. *no:léic^tthe* 'used to be let go', *no:oirc^tthe* 'used to be slain' versus cases like past subj. 2sg. *ní:scar^ttha* 'thou mightest not separate', cond. 3sg. *in-dam:soir^tfad* 'would he deliver me?' with a preceding conjunct particle. In cases like past subj. *no-s:berinn* 'I might bear them', ipf. 3pl. *no:chan^ttais* 'who used to sing' the *no* does double duty to infix the pronoun or relative marker and prefix otherwise unaccompanied simple verbs with imperfect endings.

In the doublets pres./ipf., pres. subj./past subj., fut./cond. the same stem is found in both members and it is the imperfect endings alone that distinguish the second from the first in each case, e.g. 3sg. pres. *as:beir* 'says'/ipf. *as:be(i)red* 'used to say', subj. *as:bera* 'may say'/past subj. *as:berad* 'might say', fut. *do:béra*

'will bring'/cond. *do:bérad* 'would bring'. On the other hand, in the threefold opposition ipf./past subj./cond. exactly the same imperfect endings are used in each case and the stem (pres., subj. and fut. respectively) to which they are added is the sole distinguishing feature, as in 3sg. ipf. *-ticed* 'used to come', past subj. *-tised* 'might come', cond. *-tic[†]fed* 'would come' (*do:ic*).

7.2. It seems that the imperfect endings were not originally compatible with such fluctuations in quality of the stem-final consonant as those observed in S1 presents (III.4.1) and the *s*-subjunctive and future (cf. IV.2.1), which accordingly show the same quality throughout in combination with those endings. In these cases a front stem vowel entailed palatal consonance throughout as in the S1a imperfects 3pl. *-ceil[†]tis* 'used to hide', 1pl. *at:beir[†]mis* 'we used to say it', 3pl. pass. *du:n-aidb[†]ditis* 'that they used to be shown' (*féd-* cpd. *do:adbat*), 3sg. *no:ithed*, 3pl. *no:it[†]tis* 'used to eat', and in past *s*-subjunctives like 3sg. *du:aidb[†]sed* 'that he might show' (*do:adbat*), *du-d:fessed* 'which might lead him' (*do:feid*). A back vowel, on the other hand, usually entailed non-palatal consonance throughout, as in the imperfects 3sg. *-cont[†]agad* 'used to ask for' (S1a *saig-* cpd. *con:di-eig*), *no:canad* 'used to sing' (S1c) and past *s*-subjunctives like 3sg. *co-ta(b):bósad* 'might crush you' (*con:boing*), *-sásad* 'might seek' (*saigid*).

The incomplete formal differentiation of present and *a*-subjunctive stems (IV.4.1) means that, where both stems coincide, the imperfect and past subjunctive are identical throughout given the absence of any divergence in personal endings. Thus W1 ipf. and past *a*-subj. 3sg. *-comallad* 'used to/might fulfil' (*comalnaithir*) and W2a ipf. and past *a*-subj. 3sg. *-léiced* versus the differentiated W2b type 3sg. ipf. *-cuired* 'used to put', past *a*-subj. *-corad* 'might put'. S1 present forms with palatal consonance were distinct from corresponding *a*-subjunctives, whereas those with non-palatal were not, and the same was true of the imperfect and past *a*-subjunctive in line with the distribution described in the previous paragraph. Thus 3sg. ipf. *as:bered* 'used to say' vs. past subj. *as:berad* 'might say' typical of S1a/b but 3sg. ipf. or past *a*-subj. *-canad* 'used to/might sing' typical of S1c/d.

Moreover, assimilation of quality after syncope could bring about confusion of the two even in categories that normally distinguished them, as in deut. 3sg. ipf. *as:bered*, past subj. *as:berad* above but prot. *-ep[†]red* in both or 3pl. ipf. *-gaib[†]tis* 'they used to seize', past *a*-subj. *-gab[†]t(a)is* 'they might seize' (S2) but prototonic compounds such as ipf. *-cong[†]baitis* 'they used to contain', subj. *-fag[†]baitis* 'they

might find'. Only in S3 was the distinction between imperfect and past *a*-subjunctive (the *s*-forms being, of course, invariably different) quite immune from eradication, e.g. 3pl. ipf. *etir:dib[†]nitis* 'used to destroy', past *a*-subj. *itar-dam:dib[†]itis* 'might destroy me'. Confusion arising from such fluctuations in consonant quality as the foregoing may have triggered the remarkable ipf. 3pl. *ara-s:celatais* 'they used to rob them' (Ml. 26b19) alongside normal *nu-da:ceil[†]tis* 'who used to hide themselves' (Ml. 61a2).

Paradigms of the imperfect endings will be found among the treatments of the various present, subjunctive and future stems in *GOI* and *OIPG*, but *GOI* 370-1 is particularly useful.

CHAPTER IX

Composition and the Augment

1.1. The importance of compounding between verbal root and one to four preverbs plus the attendant complications of independent deuterotonic versus dependent prototonic forms in such compounds has been discussed with appropriate illustrations at the beginning of this work (I.1.1-2.9). It is now time to consider some further aspects of composition.

On the whole, Old Irish preverbs seem to display a fairly rigid positional hierarchy in relation to each other in what will here be termed **primary composition**. The following selection of verbal compounds with two or more preverbs should give some idea of this: *ar:fócair* (*ar(e)-fo-uss-gar-*), *ar:díb[†]dai* (*ar(e)-dí-báid-*), *ar:fóem* (*ar(e)-fo-em-*), *ar:neat* (*ar(e)-ne-sed-*), *ar:neget* (*ar(e)-ne-gud-*) *as:rochoíli* (*ess-ro-coíl-*), *as:indet* (*ess-in(de)-féd-*), *as:ingaib* (*ess-in-gab-*), *as:comlai* (*ess-cum-lu-*), *ad:opair* (*ad-uss-ber-*), *ad:cosnai* (*ad-cum-sni-*), *con:os[†]na* (*cum-uss-an-*), *con:utaing* (*cum-uss-di(n)g-*), *do:écci* (*de-in-ci-*), *do:rochoíni* (*de-ro-coín-*), *do:ingaib* (*de-in-gab-*), *do:essuirg* (*de-ess-org-*), *do:róscai* (*de-ro-uss-scuch-*), *fo:ácaib* (*fo-ad-gab-*), *fo:cois[†]lea* (*fo-cum-uss-ell-*), *for:congair* (*for-cum-gar-*), *for:aith[†]minedar* (*for-ath(e)-men-*), *for:cumai* (*for-cum-o-*), *fris:ind[†]lea* (*fris-in(de)-ell-*), *imm:fol ngi* (*imb(e)-fo-long-*), *imm:fresnai* (*imb(e)-fris-sni-*), *ind:ár[†]ben* (*in(de)-ad-ro-uss-be(n)-*), *do:etarrat* (*to-eter-reth-*), *do:im[†]thiret* (*to-imb(e)-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(e)-cell-*), *do:aith[†]chren* (*to-ath(e)-cre(n)-*), *do:aid[†]lea* (*to-ad-ell-*), *do:ec[†]malla* (*to-in-cum-ell-*), *do:air[†]ngir* (*to-ar(e)-in-gar-*), *do:formaig* (*to-for-mag-*). The following lenition and the syncope or other phonological patterns associated with certain apparently consonant-final preverbs imply an underlying final *e*. The above examples and further ones not cited here point to the rough positional hierarchy below from left to right within the chain of preverbs in primary compounds, with the

proviso that preverbs in the same vertical column are not necessarily equal in this respect but rather cannot (yet) be securely ranked in relation to each other on account of inadequate or contradictory evidence, *eter* being particularly infrequent.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>to</i>	<i>for</i>	<i>ad</i>	<i>cum</i>	<i>uss</i>
	<i>fris</i>	<i>ath(e)</i>	<i>ro</i>	<i>ne</i>
	<i>eter</i>	<i>ar(e)</i>		
	<i>imb(e)</i>	<i>de/di</i>		
	<i>ess</i>			
	<i>fo</i>			
	<i>in(de)</i>			

1.2. The term **secondary composition** refers here to the prefixing of a preverb to a pre-existent compound treated as a single unit without regard to the above sequence. This type is especially apparent in obvious calques on Latin compound verbs whereby an Irish verb is taken as equivalent of the Latin simplex and an Irish preverb with appropriate sense, shape or both does duty for its Latin counterpart. Thus Old Irish *do:beir*, *-tabair* 'gives', once equated for the purpose with Latin *dat* 'gives', could become the base for calques on the latter's compounds, e.g. *fris:tabair* = *ob-dit*, *fo:tabair* = *sub-dit*, *imm:tabair* = *circum-dat*. Old Irish *con/cum* 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* = *vertit*), *con:túairc* = *con-terit* (*do:fúairc*, *-túairc* = *terit*), *con:foírea* = *com-parat* (*fo:fera*, *-foírea* = *parat*), *con:fodaim* = *com-patitur* (*fo:daim*, *-fodaim* = *patitur*). Further examples with other preverbs include *fris:tairissedar* = *ob-sistit* (*do:airissedar*, *-tairissedar* = *sistit*), *imm:díben* = *circum-cidit* (*do:ben*, *-díben* = *caedit*), *fris:tét* = *ob-it* (*téit*, *-tét* = *it*, with a simple verb as base in this case). There are also cases of Latin compounds without a corresponding simplex where the verb is nevertheless given an appropriate equivalent plus a suitable preverb in an Old Irish calque, e.g. *eter:díben* (*inter-imit* 'destroys', the Lat. simplex *emit* having a different sense), *fris:oírg* (*of-fendit*, again with an Old Irish simplex base), *eter:déccai* (*intro-spicit*, the Lat. simplex *specit* being confined to archaic usage).

This type of composition is not, however, confined to calques, but seems to occur in native compounds too, where it is inevitably harder to detect. Among likely

instances with a telltale deviation from the positional hierarchy of primary composition are *con:di-eig* 'requests' (apparently replacing an unattested **de-saig*, the verbal noun of which survives in the stereotype *indegaid* 'in quest of, after'), *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)' alongside *a-t:reig*, *-éi-rig* 'arises', *imm:tic* 'comes about, protects' alongside *do:ic*, *-tic* 'comes', and possibly *con:r-ic* 'joins' alongside *ro:ic*, *-ric* 'reaches'.

In historical terms primary composition presumably reflects an older stage at which the hierarchy in 1.1 was still operative and compounding with up to three or four preverbs was still an active process, whereas secondary composition belongs to a later stage in which one of a restricted range of preverbs could be prefixed where appropriate to inherited compounds now perceived as relatively inflexible units. In reality both of these stages might have comprised further diachronic layers, but these can hardly be determined at this remove. Synchronically, however, the secondary type need only be recognised where evidence of calquing or breaches of the primary ordering rules seem to demand it.

2.1. So far preverbs have been considered only in their role as semantic modifiers of the verb at the lexical level in the creation of new items of vocabulary by compounding. However, a few of the preverbs listed in 1.1 have acquired a modificatory function that belongs to the grammar of Old Irish and not to its lexicon. Under appropriate conditions to be specified in 3 below the preverbs in question supplement the lexical components of the verb, whether simple or already compounded with one or more preverbs. Insofar as an extra element is added to the simple or compound verb for purely grammatical purposes geared to the tense and mood system, it seems reasonable to borrow a familiar term from the grammar of Ancient Greek and speak of an **augment** while bearing in mind that structural and syntactic similarities between these Old Irish augments and their Greek counterpart do not extend beyond the vague definition just given. It appears that any tense or mood apart from the imperative could be augmented in this way in Old Irish, although the augment is in practice very rare outside the preterite, the present or past subjunctive and the present indicative in descending order of frequency in combination with it. Where form rather than function is at issue, it seems best to

refer to 'augmented preterite' (augm. pret.), 'augmented (present) subjunctive' (augm. subj.), 'augmented past subjunctive' (augm. past subj.), 'augmented present (indicative)' (augm. pres.) and so on.

2.2. Pending a far more detailed discussion of the various augmented types in chapters X and XI, it is desirable to present the bare bones of the system here before going on to questions of syntactic function in 3.

Apart from a few simple and rather more compound verbs in which the formal distinction is either entirely lacking or is only defectively present in certain tenses or moods (see XI.3.1-2), the vast majority of Old Irish verbs acquire an augment when the syntax so requires. In three simple verbs and about half a dozen compounds acquisition of an augment is accompanied by a change of verbal root technically known as suppletion (cf. I.2.9c), e.g. pret. *birt* 'carried', augm. pret. *ro:u(i)c* 'has carried', pret. *luid* 'went' (pres. *téit*, cf. VI.2.7), augm. pret. *do:co-id* 'has gone' (*de-cum-fed-*), pret. *.fo:caird* 'put' (VI.2.5), augm. pret. *ro:lae* 'has put'. In the unique case of *do:beir* suppletion alone differentiates the two sets and is accompanied by an equally unique split into two separate augmented stems, whence pret. *do:bert* 'brought/took, gave/imposed' but augm. pret. I *do:u(i)c* 'has brought/taken', II *do:rat* 'has given/imposed'. This group is numerically small but statistically important because some very common verbs are involved, and will be discussed in detail in X.1 and XI.1.

Apart from this minority of exceptions, the augmented form has the same verbal root as its unaugmented counterpart and the augment takes the form of an additional preverb (two in the case of a handful of simple verbs in X.2). Except for half a dozen verbs using a miscellany of one or two different preverbs (X.2), the augment of simple verbs is regularly *ro*, e.g. pret. *gabais*, *-gab* 'seized', augm. pret. *ro:gab*, *-rogab* 'has seized' (X.3). Twenty or so compound verbs use *cum* as an augment (XI.2.3), e.g. pret. pass. *do:ind-^tnacht* 'was bestowed', augm. pret. pass. *do:é-com^tnacht* 'has been bestowed, (*to-in(de)-cum-aneg-*, pres. *do:ind-^tnaig*), and compounds with *cum* as first preverb followed by a lexical element, whether verbal root or preverb, beginning with a consonant almost invariably use *ad* as augment (XI.2.2), e.g. pret. 3sg. *con:tuil*, 3pl. *-co-^tlaiset* 'slept', augm. pret. 3sg. *con:at-tail*, 3pl. *-com-^t-tal^tsat* 'has/have slept' (*cum-ad-tu(i)l-*). Except where specified in the foregoing (further details in XI.1, 2.1-3 and 3.1-2), compound verbs take *ro* as their augment, e.g. pret. *as:bert*, *-epert* 'said', pres. *a-t:beir* 'says it',

augm. pret. *as:ru-bart*, *-é-r^t-bart* 'has said', augm. pres. *a-t:ro-bair* 'can say it' (*ess-ro-ber-*).

It can thus be seen that *ro* is by far the most general augment in Old Irish, whether a verb is simple or compound, and it will emerge in XI.4.1-4 that its positional behaviour was in something of a state of flux in the Glosses and elsewhere.

See *GOI* 339-48 on the form, position and meaning of *ro* and the other isofunctional augments mentioned above.

3.1. The syntactic value of the augment is the same regardless of its formal realization, whether as common *ro*, restricted *cum* and *ad* or other still less usual variants. Fundamentally the augment characterizes a verbal action viewed from a non-contemporary standpoint, either the moment of speaking (or writing) or a further verbal action. The view from this standpoint 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. In the latter case the action of an augmented verb is taken to have been already completed and is viewed as a result, whence the designation **resultative**. When the semantic value of the augment can be established and is relevant to the point at issue, the practice below will be to indicate it in brackets after the formal characterization, e.g. 3sg. augm. pret. (res.) *as:rubart* 'has said', augm. pres. (pot.) *at:robair* 'can say it'. Resultative usage will be dealt with first.

3.2.1. When the point of reference is the moment of utterance, the augmented preterite designates a resultative that is semantically somewhat reminiscent of the 'have' perfect in Modern English. Hence an understandable tendency to term such Old Irish augmented preterites 'perfect' in contradistinction to an unaugmented 'preterite' simply denoting a past action without further connotations. This convention has, in fact, been followed in some of the English translations offered in 2.2 above, e.g. 3pl. pret. *-cotlaiset* '(they) slept' versus augm. pret. (res.) *-comtalsat* '(they) have slept' or 3sg. pret. *as:bert* 'said' versus augm. pret. (res.) *as:rubart* 'has said', but now requires further scrutiny.

To begin with, an Old Irish unaugmented preterite can almost always be

appropriately rendered into English as a simple past tense, as in the following 'mini-saga' in the Milan Glosses (Ml. 52): *Dia luid Dáuid for longais co Íadomdu í co Ammondu re Saul, brethae hó suidiu mór du sétaib do Abimelech hi terfochraic marbtha Dáuid. Con:ránaic-side laithe n-and iarsin fri Dáuid 7 ní-n:aithgéuin 7 léicsi húad, air du:corastar Dá deilb mordaige 7 fir boith forsinní Dáuid dia diamlad connach:n-ingéuin intí Abimelech cia du-d:fútharcair a bás.* This contains unaugmented preterites throughout and may be translated as: 'When David went into exile to the Edomites or the Ammonites before Saul, much treasure was borne from the latter to Abimelech as a reward for killing David. One day afterwards he encountered David and did not recognise him and let him go, for God had put the appearance of a *m.* (?) and a simpleton on David to disguise him, so that Abimelech did not recognise him, although he desired his death'. Such short stories are inevitably rare in the Glosses, but the preponderance of unaugmented preterites in Old Irish narrative is abundantly confirmed by the so-called *Additamenta* in the early ninth-century Book of Armagh (*Thes.* II, 238-43) and the Old Irish Life of Brigit, *Bethu Brigitte* (ed. D. Ó hAodha, 1978), the only surviving version of which in a fifteenth-century manuscript seems to be a remarkably faithful copy of a roughly ninth-century original.

Conversely contexts in which a 'have' perfect would be natural in English seem as a rule to entail a corresponding augmented preterite in Old Irish, e.g. *im:fo-r^t-ling hícc* 'it has caused salvation' (Wb. 5b21, *imb(e)-fo-ro-lo(i)ng-*), *do:roígu Dá i mmaccu dó* '(whom) God has chosen as sons of His' (4b31, *to-ro-(ge)go-*), *ní:to-r^t-mult far mbiad ífor n-étach* 'I have not consumed your food or your raiment' (18a10, *to-ro-mel-*), *ní:fetor-sa dim muintir act Fíacc Find di Laignib du:chooid húaim-sa hi tíre Connacht* 'I do not know (anyone) of my followers except Fíacc the Eair of Leinster, who has gone from me into the lands of Connacht' (*Thes.* II, 241.10-1, augm. *do:chooid* vs. unaugm. *luide*), *in maith ro:mberbais a mbiad?* 'is it well that thou hast boiled the food?' (*BBrig.* 71).

However, between these areas of reasonably close semantic correspondence there is a substantial gap where translation of an Old Irish augmented preterite by an English perfect rather than a simple past is at best unnatural, at worst impossible. With the exception of verbs that do not have a distinct augmented form (see 2.2 and XI.3.1-2), unaugmented preterites are extremely rare in the Glosses, being largely confined to occasional brief narrative stretches similar to Ml. 52 above. In the

overwhelmingly preponderant expository prose, preterite and, where available, augment almost invariably go hand in hand. This virtually consistent use of augmented preterites in non-narrative statements about past happenings means that these forms must have had a considerably wider semantic range than the English 'have' perfect, which one would not expect to occur anything like as frequently in such contexts.

Some specific examples of this lack of neat correlation may now be given. The 'mini-saga' in *MI*. 52 quoted above concludes with an explanatory statement to the effect that 'it is to give thanks to God after the deliverance wherewith he (had) delivered him that David sang this psalm below', *is du atlugud buide do DÍA íarsint soírad ro-nd:sóer ro:gab Dauid in salm-so sís*, where both preterites are suddenly augmented and *ro:gab* in particular cannot be rendered naturally into English as 'has sung'. Still more significantly, the *léicsi húad* 'he let him go' of the *MI*. 52 narrative recurs as an explanatory gloss on Latin *dimis(s)it eum* 'he let him go' at *MI*. 53b6 in the form *r-a:lléic húaid cen frithorcuin dó* 'he let him go without injuring him', where the simple *s*-preterite plus suffixed pronoun of the story has been transformed into the corresponding *ro*-augmented form accompanied by an infixed pronoun without, from an English point of view, any appreciable semantic change.

The famous passage in the *Additamenta* concerning the foundation and subsequent fate of Sletty (*Thes.* II, 241-2) is a narrative based, as one might expect, upon unaugmented preterites, but five augmented preterites do occur there. Three of these, *do:chooid* 'who has gone' (241.11), *co(n):torchartar* 'until there had fallen' (242.1) and *tucad* 'has been given' (242.15), are most naturally taken as straightforward resultatives, and it is worth noting that the first and third examples are the only preterite forms to occur in direct speech in this tale. A fourth instance relates to Fiacc's ordination and is sandwiched between unaugmented preterites: *Is di-sin didiu fu:rráith Fiacc Find Dubthach ,berrsi Pátricc , baitzisi. Du:bbert grád n-epscoip fair conic é epscoip insin cita-ru:oirtned la Laigniu , du:bbert Pátricc cumtach du Fiacc* (241.14-6), 'It is thereupon, then, that Fiacc the Fair took the place of Dubthach, and Patrick tonsured him and baptized him. He conferred the order of bishop upon him, so that he is the bishop who was first ordained among the Leinstermen, and Patrick gave a case to Fiacc' A narrative sequence of unaugmented preterites is here interrupted by a statement about Fiacc's status as

first bishop ordained among the Leinstermen that remained as relevant at the time of writing as it had been at the alleged time of happening and consequently called for an augmented preterite scarcely consonant with an English 'have' perfect. The fifth example is *ad:opart Crimthann in port-sin du Pátricc, ar ba Pátric du:bert baithis du Chrimthunn , i Slébtí ad:r-anact Crimthann* (242.9-10) 'Crimthann offered that place to Patrick, for it was Patrick who conferred baptism upon Crimthann, and (it is) in Sletty that Crimthann was/is buried'. In this particular case English would need to choose between representing Crimthann's burial as a past happening ('was buried') or a present condition ('is buried'), but Old Irish can express both facets simultaneously by means of an augmented preterite that serves to enhance the present import of a past action. Obviously the decision as to whether or not to apply this nuance in narrative would often lie within an author's own discretion. Thus it would presumably have been quite possible to employ unaugmented *ad:anacht* 'was buried' as straight narrative or conversely *ad:opart* might have been realized as *ad:rópart* with augment if the present possession resulting from a past bequest had been felt to need emphasis as in the non-narrative *ad:rópert flaith , aithech inso huile i tosuch iar tabuirt baithis dúaib* (238.12-3) 'lord and vassal offered all this at once after the conferring of baptism upon them'.

Bethu Brigte, which is written in Old Irish with a significant admixture of Latin, is a basically narrative text interspersed with occasional explanatory passages and a considerable amount of dialogue. The Old Irish parts contain over 130 examples of unaugmented preterites as against nearly 60 of the augmented type, about half of which are most plausibly translated into English as 'have' perfects or 'had' pluperfects (see 3.2.2). However, there is a striking statistical discrepancy between the dialogue and the rest of the Old Irish prose: unaugmented preterites dominate the latter, in which all but two of them occur, but the dialogue contains no less than 33 augmented as against a mere 2 unaugmented preterites, one of which, *mos:memdatar* 'will soon break' (158), is hardly relevant since it reflects an uncommon so-called 'modal' use. The remaining example is found in a short narrative put into a woman's mouth: '*Cindus ro:mbecht in so?*' *ar c(h)ách. 'Ní ansae', ar in ben. 'Do:dechod co Brón do sénad chailli form chend , edbairt m'ógi do Da. Iss ed aní do:géni mo c[h]lérech, mo chortan, co:rucus mac dó*', "'How has that been established?'" said everyone. "Not difficult", said the woman. "I came/had come to Brón for blessing of the veil upon my head and the offering of my

virginity to God. This is what my cleric did, my debauching, so that I bore/have borne him a son” (467-70). This passage seems to reflect some vacillation between the augmented preterite (*do:dechod*, *-rucus*) dominant in dialogue and the unaugmented preterite (*do:géni*) felt to be proper in non-resultative narrative contexts.

The overwhelming preponderance of augmented preterites in dialogue as against normal narrative is doubtless due in part to the resultative's more frequent suitability in the former, but the divergence is too marked for that to be the whole explanation, at least in terms of a semantic range similar to that of the English perfect. For instance, the sequence of augmented preterites in the following piece of speech is perhaps best rendered into English by a series of simple pasts and, although some of these could quite reasonably be translated as perfects, it would hardly be natural to treat the whole set in this way: *usci tucad issa tech, acht húairi ro:mbennachais-[s]iu do:rigni Dlá erat, statim ro:soad hi coirm , bolad fina fair , ní:rolad for descdu isin domun choirm ba ferr* ‘(it is) water that was brought into the house, but because you blessed (it), God acted on your behalf and it was immediately turned into ale with a fragrance of wine on it, and better ale was never set to brew anywhere’ (290-2). Compare further Brigit's statements *berar dund epscup ru:bendach cailli forar cenn* ‘let it be taken to the bishop who blessed the veil on our head’ (211) and *r-a:chúala ro:bátar dá apstal deac apud dominum* ‘I have heard that there were twelve apostles with the Lord’ (100-1), where the first and third augmented preterites could not be rendered idiomatically by an English perfect but are nevertheless resultative in that the past actions or situations in question condition present behaviour.

Finally, it may be noted that one or two cases of augmented preterites outside the dialogue probably belong in the expository category. For instance, an episode about Brigit's visit to a synod of bishops concludes with unaugmented *do:bertatar bennacht furi-si* ‘they bestowed a blessing upon her’ (87-8) before adding the non-narrative detail *is ann ro:boí in dál ubi nunc est Cell Dara* ‘it is there that the assembly was, where Kildare now is’ (88) with augmented preterite. *Is and ru:íc-si duas virgines paruliticas Fotharenses* ‘it is there that she cured two paralytic virgins of the Fothairt’ (272) is a mere notice, a truncated reference to a fuller narrative elsewhere rather than a narrative in its own right. That said, there remains a handful of augmented preterites that seem to anticipate the well known later

encroachment of such forms upon the unaugmented narrative preterite's range, e.g. *ro:erbad* 'was given' (39).

Although the whole matter requires a more thorough investigation than has been possible here, the evidence adduced above suffices to show that even in canonical Old Irish texts the augmented preterite had acquired a considerably wider range than the English type of perfect with which it has more often than not been equated. Whereas in English the simple past 'said' etc. constitutes the grammatically unmarked term of the opposition and the auxiliary perfect 'has said' etc. has an additional mark of resultativity, it seems that in Old Irish the resultative nuance of orientation towards the present had come to be applied so liberally as to invert the marking system, at least in main clauses. Thus the augmented preterite *as:ru-bart* '(has) said' etc. appears to have been in more or less general use, without regard for a dichotomy between simple past and perfect along English lines, in all but formal narrative, where an unaugmented preterite *as:bert* 'said' etc. was by and large still meaningfully opposed to a more or less standard perfect in the shape of augm. pret. *as:ru-bart* 'has said' etc. In other words, the augmented *as:ru-bart* '(has) said' etc. was the more general past tense and the unaugmented *as:bert* 'said' etc. was marked for narrative function in quasi-autonomous contexts where present implications were deliberately ignored or excluded as irrelevant. The broad outlines of this distribution may be tentatively compared with the standard Modern French retention of a distinction between simple past *il parla* 'he spoke' etc. and perfect *il a parlé* 'he has spoken' in formal writing, whereas the latter has been generalized in speech and informal correspondence. Inferences about actual speech in the Old Irish period are inevitably indirect, but there do seem to be some indications in the foregoing that unaugmented preterites were already largely defunct in ordinary conversation by then. Finally, *Bethu Brigte* (but not the *Additamenta*) shows the bare beginnings of the augmented forms' subsequent assault upon the unaugmented preterite's last bastion in formal narrative (see XII.4.1).

3.2.2. A variant of the above use of the augmented preterite as resultative past in relation to the moment of utterance is a similar use of the same in relation to a truly present verbal action typically expressed by the Old Irish present indicative, e.g. *ó ad:cu-aid rúin ícce in chenéli doíne et a ndo:ri-géni Día airriu de maid as:beir íarum...* 'when he has recounted the mystery of the salvation of the race of

men and what good God has done for them, he then says...' (Wb. 21d11), *im:folngi inducbáil dó in molad ro:mmolastar Día* 'the praise that he has praised God causes glory to him' (Ml. 126b16) and *a:tá tairmthechtas persan hic .i. is sain indí as-id:ru-bart , indí frisa:n-érbrath* 'there is a transition of persons here, i.e. the one who has said it and the one to whom it has been said are different' (Sg. 220a10).

Where one of two or more interrelated verbal actions is characterized by a basically resultative augment, the usual implication, as in the above examples, is that the action of the augmented verb is explicitly taken to have been completed by the time of the other actions. In English a similar effect can be obtained by means of the 'have' perfect, e.g. 'the man who has done this is a fool' versus slightly less specific 'the man who did this is a fool', 'I had left before he came in' or 'I left before he had come in' or less specific 'I left before he came in'. Whereas in English an anterior perfect or pluperfect can occur in the main or subordinate clause of such constructions, in Old Irish use of the resultative to express such anteriority appears to be confined to the subordinate clause. Moreover, whereas English, like Latin, formally differentiates a perfect (Eng. 'have') and a pluperfect (Eng. 'had') to denote completed anterior action in relation to present and past tenses respectively, Old Irish does not and simply adds the augment to the tense or mood required by its normal syntactic rules in order to connote anterior completion. For instance, preterite and present can easily be combined in the types of construction illustrated in the previous paragraph, as in unaugmented *ó chretsit ní-n:tá airli ar mban* (Wb. 31c7) 'since they believed (at a certain point in time), we do not have control of our women'. In the first example of this section, *ó ad:cu-aid (ad-cum-féd-, pres. ad:fét)... as:beir...*, the augment is applied to exactly the same tense sequence in order to denote completion of the first action before the second takes place.

A sequence of two past tenses may be transformed in precisely the same way in order to bring out the completion of one action before another begins, as in unaugmented *it é imme:lotar immuan eclis fu thrí co:n-epert int aingel...* (Thes. II, 242.15) 'it is they who went around the church three times until the angel said...' but *con:gab iar suidiu in Domnuch Féicc et baí and co(n):torchartar trí fichit fer dia muintir lais and* (242.1-2) 'thereafter he founded Domnach Féicc and was there until three score men of his community had fallen there beside him' with augmented *-to-r^t-char^ttar* in the *co* clause to assert that Fiacc stayed in the place until this process had been completed. An Old Irish augmented preterite corresponds to an

English 'have' perfect when anterior to a present tense and to a 'had' pluperfect when anterior to another (unaugmented or augmented) preterite. The tense is defined by its point of reference (present or past), and the augment denoting anterior completion suffices to locate the verb in time without further formal differentiation of perfect and pluperfect.

Further examples of this common usage follow. *Ní-s:rabae a ndu:r-airngred dóib* 'they did not have what had been promised to them' (Wb. 33b3) involves anteriority to another augmented preterite in an explanatory gloss. Resultative anteriority to narrative preterites can be seen in *co:n-accatar ro:las a tech dia n-éis* 'they saw that the house had caught fire behind them' (BBrig. 3) and *do:lluid alaile Cennensis genere, fora:tarat sua uxor miscuis, co Brigiti do chobair* 'there came a certain man of Kells, whose wife had taken an aversion to him, to Brigit for help' (BBrig. 537-8). The augment can be used to imply a similar relationship between coordinated main clauses in the past tense, e.g. *co:cúalatar guth mbec ina hingini hi leith in tigi, 7 ní:ragab-si labrath cidacht* 'they heard the low voice of the girl in the side of the house, and she had not yet begun to talk' (BBrig. 16-7). Historic presents, which are common in Old Irish narrative, are construed, where appropriate, with an anterior augmented preterite, e.g. *hó thuctha a mmíassa ara mbéulu, gaibid Brigit sír-décsin a mmíass* 'when their dishes had been ('have been') put in front of them, Brigit began (lit. 'begins') to watch their dishes intently' (BBrig. 347-8). In the final example an augmented preterite is anterior to an imperfect and a preterite respectively: *no:scrútain-se, in tan no:mbínn isnaib fochaidib dús in:r-etarscar cairde nDé 7 a remcaissiu 7 ní:tucus-sa in sin, in-ru:etarscar fa naic* 'I used to consider, when I used to be in tribulations, whether God's covenant and His providence had departed, and I did not understand that, (namely) whether it had departed or not' (Ml. 91c1).

A preterite may be replaced by a past subjunctive to give the subordinate clause a more indefinite nuance, as in *cid atob:aich cen dilgud cech ancrídi do:gnethe frib* 'what impels you not to forgive every injury that were done to you' (Wb. 9c20), *ní:boí nu-m:soírad-sa ar chumachtae nduini oc m'ingraimmim* 'there was no one who might save me from the power of man persecuting me, (Ml. 74b13) or *'fer do:rigni sin inna sechtmad bliadain', ol Fiachna mac Fir Febe, nípo machdad cia chon:bósad-side for écomlond* '“a man who did that in his seventh year” said F. mac F., “it was no wonder that he should crush a foe against the

odds” (*Táin* 822-4). When anterior completion of the subordinate action is given formal expressed the resultative augment is, needless to say, attached to the past subjunctive in such constructions, e.g. *toisc limm fer oinsétche duna:rructhae act óentuistiu* ‘I desire a man of one wife to whom should not have been borne more than one child’ (*Thes.* II, 241.9), *ar ní:fil ceneel ná bélre isin biuth dinad:r-ícthe nech t indli ad:chobrasom do hícc it hé ro:n-ícc tantum* ‘for there is neither race nor people in the world of whom someone would not have been saved (augm. past subj.) or those whom He desires to save, it is they only whom he has saved’ (augm. pret. as more definite, Wb 28b1), *níbu machdath do:rónta[e] día dind lia[i]c* ‘it was no wonder that a god should have been made of the stone’ (Sg. 65a1) and *fer do:rigni sin amdar lána a sé bliadna, nípu machdad ce do:rónad-side dagním ind inbuid-sea* ‘a man who did that when his sixth year was at an end, it was no wonder that he should have done a good deed on this occasion’ (*Táin* 605-6). Resultative augmentation can, of course, apply within past subjunctive sequences of this type, as in *combad notire ro-d:scribad co-sse* ‘so that it would be an amanuensis who had written it up to this’ (Wb. 27d1 6).

So much for resultative use of the augment with preterites or past subjunctive approximations thereto.

3.2.3. In addition to its use as a true present tense denoting an action or condition regarded as operating at the time of utterance, the Old Irish present indicative shares with corresponding forms in English, French, Latin and many other languages a capacity to express habitual happenings or general principles that are not anchored in relative time but are seen as valid for past, present and future indifferently. Modern Irish, like Modern English, makes a rigid distinction in most verbs between a ‘progressive’ true present like *tá sé ag dul abhaile (anois)* ‘he is going home (now)’ and a general (habitual) present like *téann se abhaile ar a cúig (‘chuile thráthnóna)* ‘he goes home at five (every evening)’, but the periphrastic progressive was only in an embryonic stage in Old Irish and at best an optional possibility in appropriate contexts (see II.1). Thus OIr. *téit dia thig* might be translated according to context as ‘he is going home’ (optional variant *a:tá oc techt dia thig*) or ‘he goes home’ rather like similar presents in French, German etc.

Subordinate clauses depending upon general or habitual presents in Old Irish typically contain a present indicative or subjunctive, rarely a past subjunctive (cf. *GOI* 334-5), e.g. (double pres. ind.) *is béss didu ind liacc benir il-béim friss, et inti*

do:thuit foir con:boing a chnámi, intí fora:tuit-som immurgu at:bail-side 'it is the habit of the stone that many a blow is struck against it, and he who falls upon it breaks his bones, he on whom it falls, however, that one dies' (Wb. 4d15), (pres. subj. and ind.) *má for:bera folud a thige combi folud mbóairech nó ní bes arddu, for:beir córus a thaurchrecce dó-som a suidiu co:mbí bés a thige and íarna miad mani:congla nach flaith aile fris* 'if the property rating of his house increase until it is the property rating of a cow-owning freeman or something higher, the due of his fief increases accordingly for him so that his food render is in accord with his rank, unless a second lord make a joint clientship arrangement concerning him' (Crith G. 80-4), *ci at:bela indala n-aí ní:epil alaill* 'though one of them perish, the other does not perish' (Sg. 30a3), (pres. ind. and past subj.) *ar is insae in ball do thinchosc neich as:berad cenn* 'for it is difficult (for) the member to correct what a head might say' (Wb. 13a19).

To denote anterior completion of the subordinate action in such sequences the augment is, as usual, added to the tense or mood predetermined by sense and syntax to generate augmented present indicative and present or past subjunctive resultatives. Clear augm. pres. (res.) examples include *is in núall do:ngniat hó ru:maith fora naimtea remib* 'it is the cry that they (are wont to) make when their enemies are/have been routed before them' (Ml. 51c9), *hó ru:deda ind féuil forsnaib cnámaib cita:biat íarum in chnámai in fochaid* 'when the flesh melts/has melted away on the bones, then the bones (are wont to) feel the suffering' (Ml. 22d7: subj. formally possible as this is a W1 verb, but syntactically unlikely), *ní hinfiadnaisi acht fri cach súaill re secht mbliadnai[b] .x. nad:ro-gaib seilb na comarbus ria sin* 'he is not capable of giving evidence except in any trivial matter before (the age of) seventeen years who does not take/has not taken ownership or inheritance before that' (Crith G. 35-7), *ar is in ailtas biid duine co:tuidchet omun Dé inna chride* 'for it is in sloth that a man is wont to be until fear of God comes/has come into his heart' (Ap. Chr. 16-7). *Cia beith ara:ro-gba bóairechas ríasiu ropo chúairddulcach ní:íca a luga[e] acht a llugu fir midboth(a)* 'though it be that he take/have taken up cow-owning freemanship before he be/have become fully bearded, his oath does not avail except according to the oath of a man of middle huts' (Crith G. 67-9) involves augm. subj. resultatives dependent on subj. *beith* in the concessive clause, which in turn depends upon pres. *ní:íca* in a general statement. *Ó chon:a-bboing inda tre fretech so isnaib téoraib tonnaib tíagde tairis,*

mani:tuidig tre drilind a frithissi, ní:cumaing do:coí i flaith Dé 'when he breaks/has broken these three renunciations in the three waves that (are wont to) pass over him, unless he (have) come through the triple pool again, he cannot go into the kingdom of God' (*Ap. Chr.* 143-5) contains an augm. pres. (res.) in the temporal and an augm. subj. (res.) in the conditional clause, both dependent on general pres. *ní:cumaing*, which then governs augm. subj. (pot.) *do:coí* (see 3.3 below on potential usage and X/XI.1 on suppletive augmented forms of *téit* 'goes', *do:tét* 'comes'). *Má eter:ro-scrá fria fer ní:tét co fer n-aile* 'if she separate/have separated from her husband, she does not go to another man' (*Wb.* 9d31) presumably entails an augm. subj. (res.) in this type of conditional, although an augm. pres. (res.) is formally possible in the case of *W1 eter:scara. Du:thluchetar ní nad:tardatis dó* 'who ask for something that they have not given him, (*Ml.* 85d5, glossing *per similitudinem eorum qui exigunt quod mutuo non dederunt*) is an example of the uncommon augm. past subj. (res.) usage in (on the evidence of the Latin glossed) general present statements.

Various translations above show that, whereas in English subordinate clauses of this type formal expression of present tense (e.g. 'are routed') and anterior completion ('have been routed') cannot be combined and a choice must be made, in Old Irish such combination is readily achieved by straightforward augmentation of a present or subjunctive already determined by semantic and syntactic factors (e.g. augm. pres. (res.) *ru:maith* distinct from augm. pret. (res.) *ru:memaid*).

When general statements or habitual happenings of this type are assumed to have applied only in the past, present indicative and subjunctive are transformed into imperfect indicative and past subjunctive respectively. Thus the description of an alleged past ritual to determine a king of Tara, the *tairbfeis* 'bull feast', uses imperfects to state *no:marbtha[e] tarb leo , no:ithed óenfer a sáith de , no:ibed a énbriuthi , no:canta[e] ór firinde fair ina ligiu* (*BDD* §11) 'a bull used to be killed by them and one man used to eat his fill of it and drink its broth and an incantation of truth used to be sung over him as he lay' (cf. further the sequence of imperfects in the gloss on the 'scapegoat' at *Tur.* 110c), but immediately switches to an augm. pret. in describing the result of a particular bull-feast, *at:chonnairc fer na tairbfeisi in tan sin ina chotlud fer lomnocht* 'on that occasion the man of the bull-feast saw as he slept a naked man' (*BDD* §12).

It is, of course, possible to augment a subordinate clause verb in such

sequences to denote habitual or repeated anterior completion of one action before another took place, as in a similar description of an alternative ritual for recognising a king of Tara in a text closely related to *BDD*: *baí carpat rí g hi Temair no:gabtais dá ech óendatha nad:rag(a)b-aitis ríam fon carpat* 'there was a king's chariot in Tara. Two horses of the same colour that had never been yoked before (scribal change of *-rag^tbaitis* formally and syntactically compatible with augm. ipf. or augm. past subj., cf. IV.4.1) used to be put under the chariot (for OIr. *no:gaitis*)' (*Ériu* 6, 134.5-6). Undoubted cases of augm. ipf. (res.) are *ó ro:sernad Noísi nár/fulocht for feda fianchlár/ ba millsiu cach bíud fo mil/ ara:rálad mac Uisnig* (*Lg.* 17, 13) 'whenever noble Noise had arrayed cooked food on the *fian*-board of wood, what the son of Uisnech had prepared (*ara:rálad* augm. ipf. of *ar:áli*) used to be sweeter than any food with honey' and *in tres nómaid do:bidced gelscotha di boc-sibnib dubaib ó ro:dubtis i tefi]n* (*CMT* §33) 'the third three-day period he kept casting white tufts from black bulrushes after they had been blackened in fire'. Such resultative imperfects are rare because the semantic conditions conducive to their use only arose occasionally.

3.2.4. The verb in a subordinate clause dependent upon a main clause with future verb is typically a present subjunctive, as in *mad ar lóg pridcha-sa, .i. ar m'etíuth et mo thoschid ní-m:bia fochric dar hési mo precepte* 'if it be for pay that I preach, i.e. for my clothing and sustenance, I shall not have a reward for my preaching' (*Wb.* 10d23) and *mani:pridag at:bél ar ócht et gorti* 'if I preach not, I shall die of cold and hunger' (10d24). A future prospect in the past is usually expressed by the conditional, which functions as a past tense of the future, and a dependent subjunctive then shifts from present to imperfect, as in *fu:lilsain-se .i. matis mu námaid du-da:gnetis ,maniptis mu charait du-da:gnetis* 'I would have endured if it had been my enemies that had done them and if it had not been my friends that had done them' (*ML.* 73d1) or *ní:tibérais píana foruib mani:esersitis* 'punishments would not be inflicted upon them if they did not rise again' (15c7, gl. *si non resurgerent, lucrificarent...*). The last two examples illustrate a major difference between use of the 'had' auxiliary in English and that of the augment in Old Irish. English, like Latin, distinguishes formally between potential conditions that are theoretically still capable of being fulfilled (Eng. 'would... were' etc., Lat. ipf. subjs.) and unreal ones that are not (Eng. 'would have... had been' etc., Lat. pluperf. subjs.), but Old Irish, like Modern Irish (e.g. *dá bhfeicfinn an fear sin arís,*

d'aithneoinn é = Eng. 'if I should see that man again, I would recognize him' or 'if I had seen that man again, I would have recognized him'), makes no such distinction by means either of the augment or of any other formal device.

However, anterior completion of a subordinate action before the main future or conditional action can be indicated in the normal way by resultative augmentation of the subjunctive in the above types of construction, as in augm. subj. (res.) *mani:ro(i)-ma for a cenn ní:mema forsna bullu* 'if it do not break/have not broken on the(ir) head, it will not break on the members', i.e. 'if the(ir) head be not (have not been) defeated, the members will not be defeated', (Ml. 89c11) and *dia:n-érbalam-ni (es-ro-bel-) ní:bia nech ru:n-íccae-siu a Dé* 'if we die/have died, there will be no one whom Thou mayest be able to save (augm. (pot.)), O God' (107d4).

The future and conditional themselves are to all intents and purposes immune to resultative augmentation. This may be connected with the fact that their primary locus of use in Old Irish was in main clauses, where resultative augmentation was eschewed except in the preterite (see 3.2.2), but it also applies to the not infrequent occurrence of future and conditional in subordinate clauses. For instance, there are a number of examples in the Glosses where an unaugmented Old Irish future corresponds to a Latin future perfect and might be expected to be characterized for anterior completion if this were possible, e.g. *lasse do:n-aithfoícherr .i. deus* 'when He, i.e. God, brings/shall have brought (them) back' (Ml. 34d8, gl. Lat. *cum populus... fuerit reversus...*) and *lasse nu-ndun:daingnichfe* 'when Thou shalt fortify/have fortified us' (78c6, gl. Lat. *cum... nos... munieris...*). A particularly striking example is *at:béra cách is tussu do:fáeth and* 'everyone will say that it is thou who hast fallen (lit. 'will fall') there' (CMM §12). If anterior completion is to be formally indicated in such cases, this can apparently be accomplished by switching to a subjunctive, as in *du:com-arr* '(when) he have crushed' (*to-cum-fo(?)*)-org-, pres. *do:fúairc*, unaugm. subj. *du:fuarr*; Ml. 85c3, gl. *cum... detriverit*).

The Milan Glosses do, however, contain two remarkable instances of arguably resultative augmented conditionals. *Air mad ed as:berad* 'usquequo domine oblivisceris me' *namma , ní:taibred* 'in finem' and *is ed ro:gigsed amal sodin airna:comarleicthe hi fochaid etir .i. cio fut dundam:roimnife-se a choimdiu* 'for if what he were to have said had been "how long, O Lord, wilt Thou forget me?" and he had not put "to the end" there what he would have prayed is that he be not

left in tribulation at all, i.e. "how long wilt Thou forget me, O Lord?" (Ml. 32d5) might be an isolated Latin-inspired attempt to use the augment for formal differentiation of an unreal conditional, but this seems unlikely as this long gloss resumes the argument with a normal unaugmented irrealis *is ed no:biad sin* 'that is what it would have been'. Rather *ro:gigsed* has a nuance of potentiality (see 3.3) and is to be translated 'could/might have prayed' in the sense that absence of *in finem* would result in ambiguity and a possible interpretation along these lines rather than an inevitable one, in which case *no:gigsed* would have been used. *Ro:feidligfitis.i. ara:robatis (sic leg.)* 'which would remain, i.e. which would be in store' (Ml. 108b5, gl. Lat. *praedicens ea quae populo erant in Babilone mansura*) might be a nonce response to the combination of imperfect auxiliary and future participle in the Latin, but anterior completion is certainly not involved and so a resultative augment seems most unlikely. Again, a potential augment seems the best explanation and could be taken to imply some uncertainty about the prospect roughly translatable as 'which could/might await, i.e. which could/might be in store'.

3.2.5. The foregoing by no means aspires to be an adequate description of the extremely flexible syntax of tenses, moods and sequences thereof in Old Irish. Rather examples of certain types of sequence have been given in order to make the basic point about the resultative augment that it could be added to any 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 as well as to main clause preterites for designation of completion before the moment of speaking. The conjunctions *acht* 'provided that' and *resú* 'before' plus subjunctive are intrinsically compatible with resultative action and invariably augment their verbs where these formally distinguish augmented forms. In accordance with a common Old Irish sequence the subordinate subjunctive is present in relation to a main-clause present or future but past in relation to a main-clause past, whether preterite, imperfect, conditional or another past subjunctive, e.g. *fo bésad cech dachpreceptoro molid et álgenigid resú ro:cúrsacha* 'after the fashion of every good teacher he praises and soothes before he reprimand/ have reprimanded' (Wb. 4a2), *a raptar budig .i. resú ro:gabtis tír tairngeri* 'when they were content, i.e. before they took/had taken the promised land' (Ml. 123a1), *a:tá comesséirge act ro:cretem oipred dé* 'there is joint resurrection provided that we believe/have

believed in God's working' (Wb. 27a15), *act ro:cretea deacht et doínecht Crist bit less ind huili dáni et na hu(ili) timn(e)* 'provided he believe/have believed in the godhead and manhood of Christ, all the gifts and all the testaments will be his' (27b15), *acht du:coístis oínecht cosin rí g co:mbetis i ndoíri semper* 'provided they should go/have gone once to the king, that they might be in captivity forever' (Ml. 34a9).

3.3.1. The potential augment is formally identical with its resultative counterpart, but can be combined with any tense (including future and conditional) or mood (apart from the imperative) and has no particular preference for subordinate over main clauses. In practice it is especially common with present or past subjunctives, fairly well attested with the present indicative but otherwise very rare. Basically speaking it converts verbal actions corresponding to English 'did', 'does', 'will do', 'would do' etc. into potential 'was able to do', 'can do', 'will be able to do', 'could do' etc. respectively and, like its resultative counterpart, is added to a tense or mood already determined grammatically, this time in order to lend it a nuance of potentiality. The illustrations below will be arranged according to tense and mood.

Since potentiality refers above all to a future prospect, this type of augment is not readily compatible with a preterite or imperfect indicative used non-prospectively with reference to past events. Since the unaugmented preterite simply located a punctually conceived action at some point in the past without further connotations, the most semantic effect possible for a potential augment would be a shift from 'did' etc. to 'was able to do' in the sense 'succeeded (on this particular occasion) in doing', a shift of nuance so slight as to be hard to detect in a dead language's written record. However, *ro* can be more or less plausibly interpreted thus in one or two passages, e.g. *laa chaidchi do Guaire oca thetarracht , ní:ru-bai fer dia muintir* 'Guaire had a whole day pursuing him and did not (manage to) smite one of his men' (*Ériu* 5, 132.24). Potential augmentation of preterites was at best extremely rare, at worst nonexistent. In the case of an imperfect such an augment could conceivably express repeated or habitual ability, but the only example I have come across of augm. ipf. (pot.) falls within 'progressive' usage (end of II.1): *in tan ba n-imthrascrad do:gnítis, do:ra-scrad-som na trí cóectu mac a óenur , ní:comraiced* (defective as regards augment - see XI.3.1) *imbi-seom lín a thrascartha. In tan dano ba n-imdírech do:gnitis, do:s:n-erged-som* (almost

certainly a slight corruption of *do-s:re-r[†]ged*) *uli combitis tornochta*, *nicon:ructais-seom cid a delg asa brot-som nammá* 'when it was wrestling that they were doing, he was able to throw the thrice fifty lads on his own and there could not gather about him the number (needed) to throw him. When, moreover, it was stripping one another that they were doing, he was able to strip them all until they were naked and they were not even able to take his brooch out of his mantle' (*Táin* 556-60). These actions are represented as taking place on a particular occasion in the presence of the king.

The semantic effect of potential augmentation upon a present indicative, particularly the general variety, is quite straightforward, as in *a-t:ro-bair cach cenél* (Sg. 190b4) 'every gender can say it', *cia ru:bé cen ni diib, ní:ru-bai cenaib huli* (Ml. 20d4) 'though it may be able to be without one of them, it cannot be without them all' (pot. subj. and pot. pres.), *air ní:ru:guigter gnímai Dé* (Ml. 51c14) 'for the works of God cannot be falsified', *húare nach:de-r[†]-ni a adamrugud ara méit, is ed du:gní iarum* (Ml. 128C3) 'since he cannot do it, (namely) admire Him for its greatness, what he does then is...', *forcraid... nad:fo-chom-laing* (non-pot. -*fu-laing*) *a thír fadeisin* (*Crith G.* 250-1) 'a surplus... which his own land cannot support'. *Amal mbís cométid la maccu nacha:rochlat* (non-pot. -*fochlat*, Wb. 19c15) 'as there is (wont to be) a guardian with children who cannot (may not be able to) take care of themselves' and *ní:irbágam ná:de-r[†]nam iar richte* (Wb. 17b6) 'we do not boast what we cannot (may not be able to) do after arrival' are formally and syntactically compatible with either augm. pres. (pot.) or augm. subj. (pot.) interpretations, while an augm. subj. seems more likely syntactically in the similar case of *is dúal dún mani:to-r[†]-gaíthat inda dúailchi i fail inna súalche* (*Ap. Chr.* 50) 'it is meet for us if the vices close to the virtues be not able to deceive, or *mani-ro:chosca-som a muntir* (Wb. 28b28, gl. Lat. *si quis autem domui suae bene praeesse nescit*) 'if he be not able to correct his household'. Formally unambiguous augm. subj. (pot.) can be seen in *ní:mbia adi ara:roi-b[†]rea bith* (*Thes.* I, 498.2) 'he shall not have that which he may be able to enjoy' and *ní:tabir Día forn-ni didiu fochith nád:fo-chom-olsam* (non-pot. -*fu-l[†]sam*, Wb. 14b15) 'God, then, does not impose on us suffering we could not endure', while *boí and ní ro:erthe* (Wb. 27a16 - cf. 31c18) 'there was there something that could be given' is likewise clearly an augm. past subj. (pot.). Syntactic considerations would favour such an interpretation over a formally possible imperfect indicative in *arnach:n-aurchois-som fri níi*

du:rónad nach aile (Wb. 8a4) 'so that he might not incommode himself in relation to something that someone else could (might be able to) do' and *connacon:rabae ní ro:scrútais* (Ml. 80b9) 'so that there was nothing that they could examine'.

Examples of future and conditional with potential augment include *ru-n:sluinfem-ni didiu cene fanisin* (Wb. 15a4) 'we ourselves, then, shall be able to name ourselves without it', *ní:de-r[†]génat mu bás cid accubur leu* (Ml. 80a9) 'they shall not be able to accomplish my death though they desire it', *mad áill dúib cid accaldam neich diib d-a:ri-génte* (Wb. 13b3) 'if you wished even to converse with one of them, you would be able to do it', *do-s:r-aithbéoigfed aitherruch* (LU 9520) 'he would be able to revive them again', and *duine do:soí a anmuin fadesin do betha, ce mét anman do:ro-afath* (Ap. Chr. 92-3) 'a person who converts his own soul to life, how many souls would he be able to convert?'.

A potential augment is prone to be applied to the verb of a subordinate clause dependent on a main clause expression that itself entails some sort of ability, e.g. *b'arafie dúib d-a:rigénte cene cen immormus nach mór* (Wb. 11d5) 'it was in your power that ye could do it (augm. cond. (pot.)) besides almost without sin' and *ní:cumaing do:coí i flaith De* (Ap. Chr. 144-5) 'he cannot go (augm. subj. (pot.)), lit. 'is incapable that he be able to go') into God's kingdom'.

3.3.2. Whereas commands or prohibitions intended for more or less immediate fulfilment are typically expressed by an imperative (see VIII.3, 5.3 and 6), 'future' imperatives not necessarily envisaging immediate action tend to be expressed by a subjunctive with so-called 'jussive' force (see GOI 329), e.g. 2pl. subj. *du:logaid do chách* (Ml. 65a10) '(you are to) forgive everyone' versus ipv. *dílgid* (Wb. 18a11, gl. Lat. *donate*) 'forgive!'. Jussive subjunctives can be furnished with a potential augment to bring about a shift from imperatival intent to a less determined wish, as in 2pl. augm. subj. (pot.) *d-a:ro-l[†]gid dom tra in frithorcuin sin* (*sic leg*, Wb. 18a12) 'may you forgive me, then, that offence' or 3sg. *d-a:ro-l[†]gea Día dóib* (31a2, gl. Lat. *non illis reputetur*) 'may God forgive them it'. Semantically this reduction in determination could be explained in terms of jussive 'let forgive' becoming something like 'let it be possible to forgive' roughly equivalent to 'may forgive' and so on by potential augmentation. Further augmented examples are *ní-ro:héla úait* (Wb. 30a10) 'may it not escape from thee', *to:ro-garthar .i. to:ra-la Día ar chéill do degnímu-su* (Ml. 43b15, gl. *hoc nunc in Dei revocetur memoriam*) 'may it be summoned, i.e. may God bring to mind thy good deeds', *ro:lína* (43c7,

gl. *impleat*) 'may he fill', and *ní:é-r̥-barid* (Wb. 13c13, gl. *nolite seduci*) 'do not wish to say'.

Transition towards subordination of such a wish can be seen in *is tacir deit ní:tái-r̥-le lat, imma:n-imcab* (Wb. 30d20) 'it is advisable for thee (that) he should not come along (lit. 'may he not come along') with thee, avoid him!' or *na-ru:etar-scara friu a caire* (Ml. 54d5) 'that their reproach may not part from them' barely shifted from main clause *ní-ru:etar-scara friu a caire* 'may their reproach not part from them'. Old Irish final clauses introduced by the conjunctions *ara, co* '(so) that' or their negative forms *arna, cona, coní* (see GOI 554-6) typically contain subjunctives with or without augment in more or less free variation. The origin of this dichotomy may plausibly be sought in the main clause opposition between unaugmented and augmented subjunctives on the assumption that choice in the purpose clause would have depended upon whether this was seen as primarily embodying a firm intention or a less definite wish. The line between intention and wish must always have been somewhat fuzzy, and was presumably particularly difficult to determine in a subordinate clause. Even in main clauses a certain amount of free variation seems to have been creeping in during the Old Irish period on the evidence of cases like *ní-m:de-r̥-saige* (augm.) *fri úathad, no-m:díusca[e]* (unaugm.) *immorro fri sochaide* (*Táin* 716) 'do not awaken me for a few, awaken me for a multitude' and *ní:berae-siu* (unaugm.)... *ní:malartae-siu* (unaugm.)... *ní:der̥-legae(-siu)* (augm., 3x)... (Ml. 74d13) 'thou art not to take... thou are not to destroy... thou art not to obliterate', where there seems to be no appreciable difference between unaugmented and augmented forms. It seems likely that this process would have been still more advanced in final clauses, thus rendering any attempt at systematic semantic differentiation between the two types there fruitless in all probability.

Final clauses account for the majority of augmented subjunctives in the Glosses and other early material, including old sagas preserved in later manuscripts. A small representative selection must suffice here, such clauses usually containing a present subjunctive when dependent on a present or future tense but a past subjunctive when dependent upon a past tense (cf. 3.2.5). Augm. subj. (pot.) may be exemplified by *ferid itge frissin deacht arna-ch:é-r̥-balam-ni* (Wb. 4b19) 'it pours forth prayer to the Godhead that we may not perish', *do:ad-bat cosmailius n-aile .i. amal do:n-emat éoin a suthu airn[d]:de-ro-íma-som Día samlaid* (Ml.

39c22) 'he shows a further likeness, i.e. as birds protect their offspring, that God may protect him thus', *a:taimet ind noib ata pecthaig .i. co:n-á-r^t-damat in pecthaig a pecthu són , co-nda:tardat i coibsin* (Ml. 131d16) 'the saints admit that they are sinners, i.e. in order that the sinners may admit their sins and that they may confess them', *ní:táet guth i sson arna:t-a-r^t-masca (to-ar(e)-ro-mesc-) in sacardd, ar iss ed a thechte arna:ra-sc^tra a menme contra deum* (*Thes.* II, 253.7-8) 'for a voice is not sounded lest it disturb the priest, for this is the right of it in order that his mind should not separate from God', and 'raga' ar Brigit 'conid:n-acar (defective, see XI.3.1-2) , conid:n-á-r^t-ladar , co:tarda bennacht form' (BBrig. 434-5) "'I shall go", said Brigit "so that I may see him and so that I may address him and so that he may bestow a blessing on me"'. Augm. past subj. (pot.) can be seen in *ba and sin do:lotar dí ingin óga co Brigti co:ndig^tsed leu do c[h]osecrad a luic , a tige leu* (BBrig. 403-4) 'it was then that two virgins came to Brigit so that she might go with them to consecrate their place and house with them', *acht ro:gáid hó Día conid:nde-ro-lmed di lámaib Saul* (Ml. 55d4) 'but he prayed of God that he might protect him from the hands of Saul' and *as:ru-bart Día hi recht ón ara:sechitis* (unaugm.) *a thimnae arna:ructais* (augm.) *i ndoiri* (125c2) 'God said in the Law, namely, that they should follow his commandments lest they be carried into captivity'.

4.1. Since the resultative and potential meanings of the Old Irish augment seem to be strange bedfellows at first sight, a brief excursus into the system's likely antecedents may be helpful at this point.

Verbal actions are classified for **aspect** as **imperfective** if importance is attached to their repeated occurrence or to their duration over a certain period of time, however short, and as **perfective** if it is not. The action in English sentences like 'he kept arguing (all day)', 'he used to argue (regularly)' or 'he was arguing (at the time)' is imperfective because it is envisaged in fundamentally linear terms, whereas perfective 'he argued (against the motion)' merely records the happening punctually, so to speak, without developing its possible linear connotations. It is to be stressed that aspect refers to a basic dichotomy in the way a speaker or writer views a verbal action, and not necessarily to the objective nature of the action itself. This can be illustrated by comparing two statements such as 'King George I reigned for thirteen years' and 'King George I was reigning when the South Sea Bubble

burst'. The actual duration of the verbal action in the former was longer than in the latter, but the verb of the first sentence is perfective insofar as a past situation is simply recorded whereas the main verb of the second is imperfective because an element of duration is indispensable in relation to the subordinate action it encapsulates.

Aspect is most conveniently treated as a grammatical category, and as such is more consistently indicated at the formal level in some languages such as Russian and Modern Greek than in others including English and Old or Modern Irish, where distinction between, say, OIr. ipf. *no:bered*, whether iterative (habitual) 'used to carry' or durative (progressive) 'was carrying', and pret. *birt* 'carried' is above all one of imperfective versus perfective aspect.

However, a verb's basic lexical value can be classified according to its **mode** of action (German 'Aktionsart'), which is closely connected with the aspectual dichotomy and may have considerable implications for the grammatical system. Thus the modes commonly termed **iterative** and **durative** are used in the previous paragraph with reference to different subcategories of imperfective aspect. Whereas perfective versus imperfective is a binary grammatical opposition, there is no agreed limit on the number of modes of action to be employed according to circumstances and no restriction of them to the lexical sphere only.

A verb can be described as lexically **durative** if its action is susceptible to representation as a continuing process, as in 'he is drinking a cup of 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 perfectly 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 a cup of coffee (when I came in)', and is of necessity not yet completed. Even when perfectivized 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 focused. Thus, whereas 'drink' and 'retreat' are essentially durative, 'drink up' and 'leave' or 'depart' are telic by

virtue of an inherent goal for the finish or start of the action. Such actions can never be represented as going on at the same time as another action or the moment of utterance, as instances like 'he is drinking up his coffee', 'he was drinking up his coffee (when I came in)' or 'the army is leaving' demonstrate. These and others like them are statements to the effect that the all important goal of action may reasonably be expected to be realized in the near future. Whereas in the durative category 'he is drinking a cup of coffee' and 'he is about to drink a cup of coffee' are semantically distinct, telic 'he is drinking his coffee up' is a mere paraphrase of 'he is about to drink his 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 up his coffee' or 'the army left/departed'. Telic action cannot be expanded from point to continuous line, so to speak, and represented duratively, but it is compatible with the discontinuous series of points, so to speak, that 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)'. The crucial point is that, because the implementation or otherwise of its defining goal marks it as either already or not yet completed, telic action can never be truly contemporary with the moment of speaking or some other point of reference. Iterativity evades the issue, but a normal telic action can only be viewed prospectively as about to take place or retrospectively as already completed and never contemporaneously as actually happening at the moment. The close correlation between this state of affairs and the basic semantics of the Old Irish augment as defined in 3.1 above is at once apparent.

The promising semantics are compounded by formal considerations, since the grammaticalized process of Old Irish augmentation retains many 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 (see 1.1-2.2 above) that are not uncommonly linked with shifts from an atelic to the telic mode. One may illustrate this by means of English pairs such as atelic 'wound' versus telic 'slay' (change of root) or atelic 'drink', 'sit', 'move' versus telic 'drink up', 'sit down', 'remove' respectively (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 *trinken* vs. *aus-trinken*) shows telic use of the preverb *e(x)* cognate with Old Irish *ess* 'out of' used to augment *ibid* 'drinks' (see X.1), while Latin *com* and *ad* cognate with the OIr. preverbs/augments *cum* and *ad* (see XI.2.2-3) often have telic force, e.g. *edere* 'eat' vs. *com-edere* 'eat up' and *venire* 'come' vs. *con-venire* 'come together, meet', *ad-venire* 'arrive' or *urere* 'burn' vs. *com-burere* 'burn up', *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 above all 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 a change of 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', *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 *cum*, the most widely used augments, in lexicalized telic function.

A further indication of the telic origins of the augment lies in the fact that virtually all the verbs that do not formally differentiate between unaugmented and augmented forms in Old Irish (see XI.3.1-2) are inherently telic. Examples include the numerous compounds of *-ic(c)* and *-gni(n)*, *ad:co-ta/-é-ta* 'gets', *(ro)-finnathar* 'finds out', *(ro)-laimethar* 'dares' and *(ro)-cluineathar* 'hears'. The last four examples seem to have a telic marker in the independent form, *cum* for the compound *ad:co-ta* (*in-ta-*, see I.2.9e on *ad* for pretonic *in*, preserved in prot. *-é-ta*) and *ro* for the otherwise simple trio *-finnathar*, *-laimethar* and *-cluineathar*, but not in the dependent one. The most obvious explanation would appear to be that an accessory telic marker was at some stage applied to positive forms but not to negative ones, which were atelic in the sense that ultimate attainment of the goal was not envisaged, and that the negatives set the pattern for other dependent forms

(see XI.3.1.).

The shift from telic lexical item to resultative/potential counterpart of an atelic verb is most apparent in the case of *berid* 'bears', its compound *do:beir* 'bestows, brings = bears towards' and their respective suppletive augmented forms *r(o):uccai* 'can bear etc.', *do:uccai*, *(-)tuccai* 'can bring etc.' The former would constitute an exception to the rule exempting pretonic *ro* as augment from the common elision of its lexical preverb counterpart before a vowel (I.1.4), whence indep. *ric* 'reaches' more often than *ro:ic* but invariable augm. *ro:ic* 'has healed' etc. However, this problem is only apparent, since W2b *ro:uccai*, *(-)ruccai* etc. is obviously an old causative (II.2.2c and III.2) to telic S1a *ro:ic*, *(-)ric* 'reaches' and must once have meant something like 'bears to = makes to reach'. The relationship between *do:beir* and *do:uccai*, *(-)tuccai* is doubly peculiar in that it is the sole instance where the resultative/potential forms are differentiated from the base forms by a suppletive root only without concomitant extra preverb(s) and *do:beir* is unique in having a second set of augm. forms in *do:rati*, *-tar^tti* 'can give, has given' etc. (containing *ro* historically — cf. GOI 469). Conventional wisdom (e.g. GOI 469) is that the two basic meanings 'brings' and 'gives' covered by *do:beir* are distinguished in resultative/potential usage by *do:uccai* and *do:rati* respectively. However, whereas the behaviour of augm. *to-ro-at-* in relation to unaugm. *to-ber-* 'bestow, impose' conforms to the normal syntactic paradigm, that of *to-uc-* 'bring, take' only does so partially, the most notable anomaly being its formation of an imperative *(-)tuic* 'bring!, take!' etc. (e.g. Wb. 10a30) found with no other augmented stem and opposed to unaugmented *(-)tabair* 'bestow!, impose!' etc. (e.g. Wb. 13d15). The incorporation of W2a *do:uccai*, which is obviously an old causative to telic *do:ic* 'comes, arrives' (cf. *ro:uccai*, *ro:ic* above) and basically meant 'brings = makes to arrive', into the resultative/potential system was still incomplete in Old Irish, and there are vestiges of a wider usage even outside the imperative. Thus in the following passage with narrative unaugmented preterites throughout we find a clear non-resultative opposition between *du:bert* 'imposed' and *tuc* 'brought': *Laa n-and du:bert Dubthach ingari muc furri-si. Gatsait latraind dá thorc díib. Luid Dubthach ina charput de Muig Liphí co:comarnic-side friu , a(i)th:géoin a dá thorc leu. Ar:gaib-side na latrandu , nenaisc dag-éraic a muc foraib. Tuc leis a dá thorc ad domum suam , as:bert fri Brigti...* (BBrig. 58-62) 'One day Dubthach imposed the tending of pigs upon her. Robbers stole two boars of them. Dubthach

went in his chariot from Mag Lifi and encountered them and recognized his two boars with them. He seizes the robbers and bound a good mulct for his pigs on them. He brought his two boars home with him and said to Brigit...'. The most likely explanation of this somewhat puzzling state of affairs would seem to be that *to-ber-* 'bear towards, offer' (atelic) acquired and was influenced by an augmented counterpart *to-ro-at-* 'give, impose, bestow' (telic) which came to stand in a direct resultative/potential relationship of the normal kind with it. Telic *to-uc-* 'bring' retained a separate identity much longer and even developed a subsidiary specialized meaning 'take in, understand', before it too was attracted over much of its basic 'bring (take)' range into the sphere of *to-ber-* 'bear towards' as a corresponding resultative/potential 'has brought, can bring' that in turn exercised some telicizing influence on *to-ber-* 'bring etc.'. The roles of *to-rat-* and its new competitor *to-uc-* in the resultative/potential sphere had apparently been clearly demarcated before the Old Irish period. The marked concomitant tendency of *to-ber-* to oust *to-uc-* from the rest of its range outside the resultative/potential to normalize the situation as far as possible was by contrast far from complete, particularly in the imperative, and left *do:uccai* '(takes in =) understands' as a verb in its own right rather as *ro:saig* 'attains' survived the hiving off of *ro:saig* 'has sought, can seek' as augmented counterpart of *saigid* 'seeks'. Significantly, neither *do:uccai* 'understands' nor *ro:saig* 'attains' can themselves be augmented.

The foregoing has presented various reasons for believing that the Old Irish system of resultative/potential augmentation has its origins in the telic effects of certain preverbs upon a wide range of mostly atelic roots. Although the precise details of this development are not recoverable, the broad outlines can be more or less plausibly traced with the help of a number of clues encountered above.

At some stage in the prehistory of Old Irish there seems to have been a tendency to pair atelic verbs with a telic formation of similar meaning *mutatis mutandis*. Occasionally two different roots were so paired suppletively (*ber-* vs. *ro-uc-*, *(to-)téig-* vs. *(to-)de-cum-fed-* etc.), the telic counterpart being invariably compounded. However, by far the commoner method was to add a preverb (rarely more than one) to an atelic verb in order to generate a telic twin. Various preverbs were so used sporadically, but only three were at all common: *ad* occurred in specific circumstances, *cum* less predictably and *ro* by far and away the most generally. Telic verbs were, as indicated above, fundamentally perfective

aspectually, and most atelic verbs basically imperfective. Accordingly this development has much in common with the tendency in various Slavic languages to evolve a pervasive dichotomy between imperfective and perfective verbs, 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, a crucial difference was that in Slavic the derivational process was not only more morphologically diverse but also a two-way affair, imperfectives being derived from perfectives as well as *vice versa* to create the pairs in question. In the prehistory of Old Irish by contrast the perfective telic verbs did not generate atelic counterparts and remained outside the pairing system to yield the group of Old Irish verbs resistant to augmentation (XI.3.1-2).

The prevalence of *ro* seems to have been due to an especially broad telic applicability rooted in a rough meaning '(through) to the end', which would give rise to pairs like *de-gni-* 'do' vs. *de-ro-gni-* 'do to the end, accomplish', *sag-* 'strive for/seek' vs. *ro-sag-* 'strive for/seek to the end, attain/ reach'. Telic actions situated prior to the moment of utterance or some other point in time are automatically completed from that standpoint, as we have seen, whereas atelic actions are not necessarily so. Thus of the two sentences 'when he does something good, he feels happy' and 'when he accomplishes something good, he feels happy' the latter is a virtual paraphrase of 'when he has done something good, he feels happy' but the former is not, since happiness may then arise during as well as after the action. A similar relationship holds for 'when he strove for victory, he felt elated' and 'when he attained victory, he felt elated' in comparison with 'when he had striven for victory, he felt elated' except that 'had striven for', unlike 'attained', does not necessarily imply that the completed action was successful. In this way a prior telic action inevitably entails the anterior completion so basic to resultative use of the augment in Old Irish in sequences like *in tan do:ngní...*, *bid...* 'when he does..., he is wont to be...' vs. *in tan do:rónai...*, *bid...* 'when he has done..., he is wont to be ...' or *in tan siacht...*, *ba...* 'when he strove for..., he was...' vs. *in tan ro:siacht...*, *ba...* 'when he (had) attained/ had striven for..., he was...'. This scheme can be applied to any of the tenses or moods capable of resultative augmentation in Old Irish, and the fact that 'attained' and 'had attained', unlike 'strove for' and 'had striven for', in the final example both entail completion shows how easily a telic verb like *ro:saig* 'attains' in Old Irish could dispense with a formally distinct

augmented form. The formal split between *ro:saig* 'attains' and *ro:saig* the augmented form of *saigid* 'strives for' apparently arose because the telic form had already slightly modified the sense in which it completed the atelic verb's action. Semantic accommodations and splits of this type were presumably quite common as straight anterior completion came to the fore in the system, but usually only the grammaticalized augment survived them. A possible instance of the reverse pattern is, however, provided by telic and unaugmentable *do:roi-m^tnethar* 'forgets' (*de-ro-men-*), if this arose as a twin meaning 'neglect completely' to a putative *de-men-* 'neglect'.

This posited shift of emphasis from telicity or perfectivity to the anterior completion inherent in prior actions of this kind presumably represents an increasing dominance of tense over aspect in the system's prehistoric development. Viewed from the standpoint of the main clause action, subordinate verbs augmented to denote anterior completion were essentially resultative, and the resultative augmented preterite or 'perfect' geared to the moment of speaking in main clauses (e.g. *ro-m:bíth* 'I have been struck') seems to have been extrapolated from this situation.

Potential usage of the augment can be readily derived from the prospective nature of non-iterative telic presents referred to earlier, whence pairs such as atelic actual present 'he is doing his job', 'he is striving for victory' versus telic prospective present 'he is accomplishing (= about to accomplish) his task', 'he is attaining (= about to attain) victory'. The difference of nuance between a present expectation of this type and a less definite present potential is slight enough in the affirmative and virtually non-existent in the negative, e.g. 'he is not accomplishing (= cannot accomplish) his task' or he 'is not attaining (= cannot attain) victory'. Moreover, the presents of certain telic verbs are synonymous with a potential even in the affirmative, e.g. 'I see/hear it' = 'I can see/hear it', and the intensification of latent potentiality in the telic verb *ad:co-ta/-é-ta* 'gets, obtains' can actually be traced between Old and Middle Irish. The trigger was provided by Old Irish negative expressions such as *ní:hétas guth asa china* (LU 7256) 'a voice was not got (= could not be got) out of his head', *ógfritecht for rátha mani:éta nech a frepaid ó fiur chinad* (Crith G. 59-60) 'full guarantee from sureties if someone should not (= cannot) get his medical attention from the guilty party'. Particular significance attaches to the likes of *forcraid chethrae... nad:éta [a?] reicc ar thír*

(*Crith G.* 250-1) 'a surplus of livestock ... the sale of which for land he may not (be able to) get' (i.e. 'which he cannot sell for land'), and *ní:étaim dano techt sech nechtar in dá roth* (*Táin* 791-2) 'I am not getting a going/passage (= 'I cannot go' and mere variant of augm. pres. (pot.) *ní:dichthim* 'I cannot go' in following clause) over either of the two wheels'. As a result of further developments from such a nucleus the Middle Irish outcome of this verb (*f)ét-* (cf. XII.4.1 and 4.2b) simply means 'can, is able' like its Modern Irish continuation *féadann*.

Since they deny attainment of the in-built goal, the negatives of all tenses and moods of telic verbs can be paraphrased as negated potentials, e.g. 'he did not accomplish his task' = 'he was not able to accomplish his task', 'he will/ would not accomplish it' = 'he will/would not be able to accomplish it', whereas 'he will not do it' etc. (atelic) is no mere paraphrase of 'he will not be able to do it' etc. Thus potential use could arise throughout the system with great ease wherever telic augmented forms were negated, and was but a nuance away from development in non-general (-iterative) presents of telic verbs even in the affirmative. Once an augmented present potential had come into being in both negative and positive present contexts, a trigger had been created for a spread from negative to positive environments in the rest of the system too. Telic verbs, of course, scarcely needed separate potential forms, since such a nuance was latent in them in most prospective usages. As in the case of the resultative augment above, the shift from a pairing dominated by atelic vs. telic mode to one where non-potential vs. potential was paramount must often have involved some semantic accommodation on one or both sides to give pairs like *do:g ní* 'does', *do:rónai* 'can do' or *saigid* 'seeks', *ro:saig* 'can seek' (augm.), 'attains' (sep. verb). By the time such a stage has been reached, particularly in general presents where there is no appreciable difference between (iterative) atelic and telic verbs, one can no longer ascribe much synchronic importance to the atelic/telic dichotomy as such, and non-potential versus potential has achieved independent status.

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 documented in 3.1-3 above (see *VKG* II, 275-82, *LP* 255-8), including survivals of general present resultative use in Middle Welsh. This evidence shows that the predominance of *ro* (the only surviving British augment) and a fully developed resultative/potential system of augmentation go back at least as far as the common

ancestor of Irish and British, i.e. to Insular Celtic or even Common Celtic (depending on one's views of the basic relationship involved). Either way, the developments just documented with reference to Old Irish had already taken place a considerable way back in the language's prehistory, and may be briefly summarized as follows.

There was an early (Insular?) Celtic tendency to pair atelic verbs with a telic counterpart, usually a derivative by composition with *ro* or some other less frequently used alternative preverb. Telic verbs by contrast did not develop atelic partners and generally stayed outside this twinning system, except for a few that gravitated suppletively to atelic verbs. (e.g. *ro-uc-* to *ber-*) Because of its in-built goal a telic action could never be strictly contemporary with another action or moment, and so was either retrospective or prospective when viewed from such a standpoint. The retrospective type implied anterior completion of an action as a result over sufficient of its range for these resultative connotations to become dominant and generalized, while the link between prospective and potential action similarly generated a general potential significance. This generalization of resultative/potential meaning transcended the original environments where such connotations could reasonably be regarded as a mere function of the telic mode. By the time this stage had been reached prior to the split between Irish and British Celtic, it became possible to apply resultative/potential augmentation even to basically telic verbs. This process may have begun before the split, but sufficient groundwork had been laid for it to have taken place independently in the two branches.

At any rate, in Old Irish only a core of the commoner old telic roots in composition, usually throughout but at least in the independent forms, plus a handful of telic lexical *ro*-compounds resisted this drive towards a separate augmented resultative/potential form (XI.3), which is found with such manifestly telic verbs as *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^t-bala*), *do:fich* 'avenges' (e.g. augm. pret. *do:ru-ich*, *-de-r-aig*), *ar:foim* 'accepts' (e.g. augm. pret. *ar:róet*), *do:lugi* 'forgives' (e.g. augm. subj. *d-a:ro-l^tgea*) and so on.

There can thus be no question of attempting a synchronic definition of the augment's uses in Old Irish in terms of a dichotomy between telic and atelic mode or perfective and imperfective aspect, although there are plentiful traces of an

erstwhile connection still to be found there. Insofar as resultative and potential bring out the contemporary import of a past and future action respectively, they function synchronically as modifiers of the tense system rather than as concomitants of mode or aspect.

4.2. The terminology appropriate to what I have termed formally augmented and functionally resultative/potential formations in Old Irish has been bedevilled by inconsistencies and infelicities, particularly where English has been the language of discussion. Accordingly it seems desirable to sketch the main terminological developments and difficulties below.

Ebel's second edition (1871) of Zeuss's *Grammatica Celtica* described *ro* accurately enough on p. 411 as a 'mark of completed action' (*nota actionis perfectae*), and noted that it could be used in this way with subjunctives as well as the preterite. Potential use was not identified except for allusions to the frequency of *ro* plus subjunctive in final clauses and a quasi-imperative use of *ro* plus main-clause subjunctive.

The notion of perfective *ro* in the aspectual sense had been first mooted by Ebel in 1859 (*KZ* 2, 190ff.), was taken up with some qualification by Zimmer in 1884 (*Keltische Studien* II, 120ff.), and then received its most explicit formulation, definitive for a decade or more, in a review of Zimmer's work by Thurneysen in 1885 (*Rev. Celt.* 6, 322-3). According to this statement the basic function of *ro*, when not a mere lexical element in certain compounds, was to 'make any verb whatever perfective, to use an expression from Slavic grammar'. Hence its distribution in the Glosses: virtually absent from the pres. ind. (imperfective), virtually compulsory in the pret. (perfective) and optional in the fut. and subj. (perfective or imperfective). From the 8th century on, however, this aspectual distinction began to disappear with the result that *ro* was sometimes used in the pres. ind., while pret. forms without *ro*, which were already sporadically present in *ML.*, came into increasing use alongside the older forms with perfective *ro*. In the 1896 *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1-116) Strachan broadly accepted this view of things but, while prepared to maintain the perfective/imperfective opposition between subjunctives with and without *ro*, suggested that the use of *ro* with the pret. ind. had become 'merely symbolical' (p.69) in the Glosses rather like the compulsory augment with past tenses in Classical Greek. Like the Greek augment, *ro* tended to disappear later. By the following year (*Tr. Phil. Soc.* 1897,

1-137) his agnosticism regarding the actual meaning of *ro* in Old Irish had advanced a stage further with the claim that *ro*-subjunctives were not perfective as such but merely stereotyped from an earlier perfective usage.

The impasse was resolved in typically trenchant style by Zimmer in 1889 (*KZ* 36, 463-556) in an article that combined a fierce polemic against Thurneysen with a masterly demonstration that preterites without *ro* were the oldest in narrative, their infrequency in the Glosses being due solely to the shortage of narrative there, and that *ro* in Old Irish basically turned a preterite into a perfect or pluperfect tense but began to encroach upon the narrative preterite without *ro* in Middle Irish. Zimmer further pointed out that *ro* could give present and imperfect subjunctives a similar perfect meaning as well as combining with present subjunctives to indicate a command or wish, and after examining the British evidence went so far as to deny that aspectual perfectivity as such had ever played a part in *ro*'s development.

Zimmer's attack upon Thurneysen for holding views that he had himself helped to propagate and once subscribed to at least in part stung the latter into a definitive treatment of the question in *KZ* 37 (1900), 52-92 that broke a good deal of new morphological and syntactic ground and clearly anticipated many of the views expressed in 4.1 above. Accepting Zimmer's new interpretation of *ro* with the preterite, Thurneysen for the first time drew attention to less frequent functional equivalents involving suppletive roots and other preverbs, especially *ad* and *cum*, and also established use of *ro* with the present indicative to denote anterior subordinate action in timeless general statements as well as potential action in main clauses. A rare future potential with *ro* was also identified along with a perfect/potential dichotomy in pres. and past subj. similar to that in the pres. ind. with *ro* or an equivalent. Thurneysen derived the *ro*-subj. of wish from hortative plus potential and argued that this underlay the usage in final clauses, an insight followed in 4.1. Throughout he insisted that these diverse features could be explained historically only on the assumption of an earlier system of perfectivizing *ro* etc. for which the punctual nature of verbs such as *-ic* and *-gnin* compounds that resisted such modification provided significant evidence. At the same time the synchronic relevance of perfectivity was denied except in a rather unconvincing final section alleging its survival in *ro*-subjunctives geared to future time. The influence of this thinking upon 4.1 above should be obvious.

Once the main outlines of Old Irish usage had been firmly established,

attention could focus upon an appropriate terminology. With the appearance of volume II of Pedersen's *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen* in 1913 came the first really satisfactory succinct account (pp. 261-89) of the form and function of *ro* and its equivalents based upon the recent insights of Zimmer and Thurneysen. The use of such elements with various moods and tenses to denote anterior completion of a verbal action was termed *perfektisch* '(pertaining to) perfect' and the elements themselves were referred to as *perfektische* preverbs constituting *perfektische* forms in composition. Such preverbs and forms were, rather illogically, still termed *perfektisch* in the two non-perfect functions recognized by Pedersen in conformity with earlier authorities, namely that of potentiality (*Möglichkeit*) and wish (*Wunsch*). Pedersen insisted that these 'perfect' elements were 'temporal preverbs' (*Tempuspräverbia*) geared to tense and not aspect, even to the extent of denying with Zimmer that perfectivity or the like had any role in their prehistoric development. 'The system of perfect (*perfektisch*) preverbs in Ir. and Brit. has absolutely nothing to do with the distinction found in certain IE languages (e.g. in Slavic) of a perfective (*perfektiv*) and an imperfective (*imperfektiv*) aspect. The perfective aspect denotes an action à terme fixe, the imperfective the opposite; but neither the one nor the other aspect has anything to do with designation of an attained state or of relative time (functions of the perfect)... According to Slavic terminology the Celtic perfect forms would need to be designated imperfective as often as perfective and the non-perfect forms perfective as often as imperfective' (p. 282). Although Pedersen here makes the classic mistake of assuming that the inapplicability of aspectual or related connotations to the Old Irish system itself automatically precludes the possibility that they had operated at an earlier stage, his strictures about the synchronic incongruence of perfect and perfective are eminently valid.

In Lewis and Pedersen's 1937 abridgement of the *VKG* in English, *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*, *perfektisch* was consistently translated 'perfect' in a concise restatement (pp. 251-9) of the 1913 doctrine that ascribed the meanings of 'perfect', 'possibility' and 'optative' to the so-called 'perfect verb forms' in Old Irish.

Sjoestedt-Jonval in effect revived the later nineteenth-century notion that perfectivity was still central to the Old Irish state of affairs in a sensitive treatment of the topic in 1938 (*EC* 3, 219-63) that was systematic both in presentation and

terminology and has exercised not inconsiderable influence on the above presentation despite her untenable basic premise. For Sjoestedt lexical distinctions between verbs with and without telic value (*valeur terminative*) were grammaticalized by means of *ro* etc. into a system whereby atelic verbs acquired a telic counterpart, whereas lexically telic verbs remained 'in principle' outside this pairing process. *Ro* and equivalents in this function were called 'telic preverbs' (*préverbes terminatifs*) and their input into the dominant tense system inevitably produced a dichotomy between prospective (*aspect prospectif*) and retrospective (*aspect rétrospectif*) realized broadly as potential and perfect. As an account of the probable basic historical developments this would be quite unobjectionable, but it cannot be defended as a synchronic statement about the actual workings of the Old Irish system for reasons already intimated in 4.1. In the first place, not all resultative and potential usages can be ascribed directly to telic value, and secondly Sjoestedt's qualification 'in principle' of the alleged failure of lexically telic verbs in Old Irish to adopt a further grammatical telic preverb betrays a crucial weakness of her description since, as pointed out in 4.1, quite a few verbs of this type do add *ro* or an equivalent for resultative or potential purposes.

As is clear from the translators' preface, the genesis of the thoroughly revised and expanded English version of Thurneysen's *Handbuch des Altirischen* of 1909 that appeared as the now standard *Grammar of Old Irish* in 1946 was a complicated one owing first to the outbreak of war in 1939 and then to Thurneysen's own death in 1940, and students of Old Irish owe an immeasurable debt to all concerned for their herculean labours amidst such difficulties. Unfortunately the treatment of 'the verbal particle *ro* and other similarly used prepositions' (339-48) perpetrated a mistranslation of what could only have been *perfektisch* '(pertaining to) perfect' (quite different from *perfektiv*) in the German as an utterly unsuitable 'perfective' in the following passage on 'meanings of the verbal particle *ro*': '1. It indicates that an act or state is perfect, completed. It gives perfective force to the preterite indicative and past subjunctive, both of which without it have the force of a simple past. The indicative is thereby enabled to distinguish a *perfect* (with *ro*) from a *narrative* tense.' (p. 341). The lamentable current tendency of scholars of Old Irish writing in English to treat 'perfective' as an adjective corresponding to perfect tense is apparently rooted in this single error. It has by now become more or less standard practice to oppose a 'perfect' with *ro* or an equivalent to a 'preterite' without it, but

otherwise to call *ro*- and related forms 'perfective present', 'perfective subjunctive' and so on regardless of whether the usage is actually perfect or potential.

It is high time that this ludicrous terminology were abandoned on the grounds that it involves a completely inadmissible use of the term 'perfective', fails to distinguish between perfect and potential usage, and obscures the derivational homogeneity of the system by making a gratuitous differentiation in nomenclature between the preterite and the other tenses or moods in conjunction with *ro* etc. Lewis and Pedersen's 'perfect' throughout is a good deal better, but is still open to the second objection concerning perfect and potential and might, if prefixed to designations of tense and mood, give rise to misleading (in view of the identically named but rather different Latin category) 'perfect subjunctive' or monstrous 'perfect imperfect' and so forth. One might attempt to capture the neat German distinction between *perfektisch* and *perfektiv* by coining an English 'perfectic' or the like to set against 'perfective', but that is aesthetically unappealing and still unsuitable as an overall designation because of its strict inapplicability to potential function. Sjoestedt's bold attempt to create a generic 'telic' or 'terminative' which could be applied to all relevant tenses or moods and then subdivided into 'retrospective' (perfect) and 'prospective' (potential) as required is vitiated by the applicability of 'telic' or 'terminative' to the action of certain verbs outside this system and above all by a synchronically invalid classification according to aspect or mode of action. Once that prop is removed, the terms 'prospective, end 'retrospective' continue to describe the functions concerned but become too vague to define them.

In response to the apparent hopelessness of the quest for a functionally oriented term capable of covering all major grammatical uses of *ro* and equivalents, it has been decided in the present work to opt for 'augment' as a purely formal designation of the elements in question and to prefix 'augmented' to any tense or mood combined with them, thus emphasizing the homogeneous derivational system involved and avoiding the various terminological problems just mentioned. Strictly speaking, 'augment' need entail no more than a grammatically conditioned preverbal addition to the verbal complex, but the term is certainly not intended to imply 'merely symbolical' value as envisaged by Strachan. On the other hand, it has the advantage of being quite compatible with the general loss of meaning that was beginning to affect the augment in the Old Irish period (penult. para. of 3.2.1, and

3.3.2) and became endemic in Middle Irish (XII.4.1). For example, to describe a form like *as:ru-ba(i)rt* in a later text as 'perfect' or the like implies a meaning approximating to 'he has/had said' rather than narrative 'he said' and so seems inappropriate where 'he said' is the actual meaning. It then becomes necessary to add some qualification about a 'Middle Irish *ro*-preterite' or the like, but this rather clumsy procedure can be obviated by terming such a form 'augmented preterite', which begs no questions as to whether the augment has a determinable meaning or not in the form at issue.

When it is desirable or necessary to indicate which of the two basic functions is applicable in a given case, this can be tacked on to the formal designation easily enough in the manner recommended in 3.1. The above discussion has given reasons for regarding 'resultative' as a less confusing and cumbersome term than 'perfect', the only viable alternative, and the claims of 'potential' as a tag for the other function seem hard to resist.

CHAPTER IX

The Augment and Simple Verbs

1. Only two or three simple verbs (plus *-cuirethar*, on which see XI.1) undergo a change of root along with augmentation, the case for taking W1 *to-ell-* as suppletive augmented counterpart to W1 *gataid* 'takes away' being strong but not proven. Acceptance entails recognition of pairs like 1sg. subj. *-gat* vs. augm. subj. *-tall*, 3sg. pret. *gatais* vs. augm. pret. *du:ell*.

Of the two certain examples of suppletive augmentation, that of *ber-* 'carry' to *ro-uc-* involves the commonest preverb *ro* (but see IX.4.1 on the anomalous possibility of eliding pretonic *ro* to give *ruc-* here by I.1.4, to which *ro* as augment is otherwise exempt). Whereas *ber-* is a strong verb with S1a pres., *t*-pret. and so on, *r(o)-uc-* is weak with W2b pres., *s*-pret. etc., whence oppositions such as 3pl. pres. *-berat* vs. augm. *-rucat*, 3sg. subj. *-bera* vs. augm. *-rucca*, 3sg. and 3pl. pret. *birt*, *-bert(at)ar* vs. augm. *ro:uic*, *-ruc[†]sat*.

The other verb involved, *tég-* 'go' (irreg. 3sg. *téit*, *-té(i)t*), has a suppletive fut. (*rig-* or *reg-*), pret. act. (*lod-*) and pret. pass. (*eth(-)*) in its unaugmented forms. Its suppletive augmented counterpart *de-cum-fed-*, however, conforms to a normal inflectional type: S1b pres., *s*-subj. and fut., suffixless pret. act., *-s(s-)* pret. pass.

UNAUGMENTED		AUGMENTED	
Pres. 3sg. <i>téit</i> ,	<i>-té(i)t</i>	<i>do:co-at</i> ,	<i>-dichet</i>
lpf. 3sg.	<i>-téiged</i>		<i>-dich[†]theth</i>
Subj. 3sg. <i>téis</i> ,	<i>-té</i>	<i>do:coí</i> ,	<i>-decha</i> (<i>-dech/-dig</i> : IV.2.2)
3pl. <i>tíasait</i> ,	<i>-tíasat</i>	<i>do:cósat</i> ,	<i>-dech[†]sat</i> (<i>-dich[†]set</i>)
Past subj. 3sg.	<i>-téised</i>	<i>do:coised</i> ,	<i>-dech[†]sad</i> (<i>-dich[†]sed</i>)
Pret. act. 3sg.	(-) <i>luid</i>	<i>do:co-id</i> ,	<i>-dechuid</i>
3pl.	(-) <i>lotar</i>	<i>do:cótar</i>	<i>-dechutar</i>
pass. 3sg. <i>ethae</i> ,	<i>-eth</i>	<i>do:cós</i>	<i>-dechus</i>

2. Six or seven strong verbs (see *Ériu* 7, 146, §3 for 3sg. pres. rel. *lú(i)s* 'who drinks' (H3), the old verbal noun of which was *loimm* 'draft') use a preverb or preverbs other than *ro* as augment:

UNAUGMENTED	AUGMENTED
<i>ib-</i> 'drink'	<i>ess-ib-</i> , e.g. 1pl. augm. pret. <i>as:ib^tsem</i> .
<i>lu-</i> 'drink'	<i>ess-lu-</i> , e.g. 3sg. augm. subj. <i>as:lú</i> (<i>Ériu</i> 7, 146, §4, and cf. IV.2.1).
<i>ith-/ed-</i> 'eat'	<i>de-uss(?)ith/ed-</i> , e.g. augm. subj. 3sg. <i>du-d:n-óestar</i> (<i>Ériu</i> 7, 146, §4), 1sg. <i>-dáesur</i> (see GOI 471; <i>óe</i> from <i>-uss-ess-</i> by V.6b?), 3sg. augm. pret. <i>(-)duaid</i> .
<i>sed-</i> 'sit'	<i>de-in-sed-</i> , e.g. 3pl. augm. subj. <i>-des^t(s)et</i> (CIH 524.12), 3sg. augm. pret. <i>desid</i> , <i>do:esid</i> .
<i>leg-</i> 'lie'	<i>de-in-leg-</i> , e.g. 3pl. augm. subj. <i>-deil^tset</i> , 3sg. augm. pret. <i>(-)dellig</i> .
<i>mlig-</i> 'milk'	<i>to-uss-mlig-</i> , e.g. 1sg. augm. pret. <i>do:ommalg</i> .
<i>to(n)g-</i> 'swear'	<i>to-cum-to(n)g-</i> , e.g. 3sg. augm. past subj. <i>-toch^t-taised</i> , 3sg. augm. pret. <i>do:cui-t^t(t)ig</i> .

3.1. Otherwise the augment of simple verbs is *ro*, which is, of course, pretonic (cf. I.1.3) when attached to an otherwise unaccompanied simple verb and brings about the expected shift from absolute to conjunct inflection (I.1.3), e.g. 3sg. pret. *an(a)is* 'remained', *léic^ts-i* 'let him', *uirt* 'slew', *memaid* 'broke' vs. corresponding augm. *ro:an*, *r-a:léic*, *ro:ort*, *ro:mmemaid*, 3sg. pres. *maidid* 'breaks' vs. augm. pres. *ro:maid*, 3sg. subj. *cretid* 'believe' vs. augm. subj. *ro:cretea*. Where proclitic *no* would otherwise be prefixed to the simple verb (I.3.4 & 6, VIII.7.1), it is simply replaced by *ro* in contexts calling for augmentation, e.g. 3pl. pret. *no-s:n-altatar* 'they reared her' vs. augm. *ro-s:n-altatar*, 3pl past subj. *no:gab^tt(a)is* 'they might get' vs. augm. *ro:gab^tt(a)is*.

Proclitic *ro* in such cases could be taken as the pretonic preverb of what would then be, in effect, a deuterotonic compound (I.1.3) or as a conjunct particle (I.1.2) prefixed to a simple verb. A decision between these possible interpretations, both of them equally viable *a priori*, can only be reached on the basis of cases where an

undoubted conjunct particle (C) precedes *ro* and the otherwise simple verb. If *ro* functions as a preverb, the expected pattern is prototonic C(A):*ro*-V with stressed *ro*, whereas *ro* as a conjunct particle should remain pretonic and be attached to the other conjunct particle (cf. neg. *ní* 'not', *ma-ni* 'if not') to yield a pattern C-*ro*(A):V. In fact, both patterns are attested in Old Irish.

Elision of *ro* before a vowel in 1sg. augm. subj. *co:rr-an* 'that I may remain' or 1pl. augm. pret. *ní:rr-an^tsam* 'we have not remained' indicates the prototonic type with preverb, whereas non-elision of the same in 3pl. augm. subj. *co-rru:anat* 'that they may remain' or 3sg. augm. pret. *ní-ro:an* 'he has not remained' conforms to the behaviour of a conjunct particle. Where the verb begins with a consonant, presence or absence of syncope (I.2.5) can be a key diagnostic, as in prototonic 3sg. augm. pret. pass. *nach:rei-l^tced* '(because) it had not been allowed' (independent *ro:lécid* with proclitic *ro*) or *fu-a:ro-g^tbad* 'under which it had been uttered' with preverbal *ro* versus 1pl. augm. pret. *ní-ro:gab^tsam* 'we have not taken' with *ro* as conjunct particle. Changes in vowel length or quality dependent upon presence or absence of stress (I.2.4) may be similarly instructive, e.g. preverbal 3sg. augm. pret. *ní:re-lic* (indep. *ro:léc*, cf. I.2.9a on *re-* for *ro-*) 'has not let' or 3sg. augm. subj. *co:rro-chraitea* 'that it may believe' versus conjunct particle *arna-ro:chretea* 'that he may not believe'. In the event of an opposition like 3sg. augm. pret. *ní-m:rogab* versus *ní-ro-m:gab* 'has not seized me' the position of the infixed pronoun (A) would be a secure diagnostic, but I happen to have come across no definite instances of the latter type involving a lexically simple verb (see XI.4.3 for examples with compounds). Needless to say, it is not always possible to deduce from writing which stress pattern was applicable, e.g. scribal *nirogab* could represent *ní:rogab* or *níro:gab* equally well.

However, there can be no question that the augment *ro* hovered between the status of preverb and conjunct particle in Old Irish as far as its behaviour with simple verbs was concerned. In independent augmented forms there was no formal distinction, since *ro* would be pretonic in both cases, but in the corresponding dependent forms there was appreciable fluctuation between stressed (= preverb) and proclitic (= conjunct particle) *ro*.

3.2. Historically it is quite clear that the inherited behavioural pattern was (a) below with a deuterotonic/prototonic alternation due to *ro*'s preverbal status, and that pattern (b) with invariably pretonic *ro* as a conjunct particle was an innovation

that had begun to gain ground by the early Old Irish period. Some evidence is provided by the contrast between pretonic non-leniting *ro* (in main clauses, cf. I.2.2c and I.3.6) in *ro:cretea* and leniting *ro* in *ní-ro:chretea* and so on, which suggests that the latter is based upon the type *ní:ro-chraitea* by a shift of the stress boundary and modification of concomitant features of vocalism on the model of the former. However, a look at the pressures underlying the system provides the most cogent argument for this view of things, which has in any case been implicit in the overall treatment of the augment in the previous chapter.

The basic points can be conveniently illustrated by means of a diagram. The alteration in the overall stress pattern in (a) below can cause the corresponding independent and dependent augmented forms (deuterotonic and prototonic respectively) to diverge appreciably, whereas in (b) there is no such discrepancy. Consequently it would be perverse in the extreme to introduce type (a) if (b) were the inherited pattern. However, the reverse process of shifting from an inherited (a) to type (b) would be easy to motivate as a means of simplifying the relationship between independent and dependent forms as well as that between augmented and unaugmented (e.g. *C:cretea*, *C:gab^tsat*) dependent forms.

(DEUTEROTONIC)	<i>ro(-A):V</i>	(CONJUNCT PARTICLE)
3sg. augm. subj.	<i>ro:cretea</i>	'may believe'
3pl. augm. pret.	<i>ro:gab^tsat</i>	'have seized'
	← →	
(PROTOTONIC)		(CONJUNCT PARTICLE)
(a) <i>C(-A):ro-V</i>		(b) <i>C-ro(-A):V</i>
<i>C:ro-chraitea</i>		<i>C-ro:chretea</i>
<i>C:ra-g^tbaiset</i>		<i>C-ro:gab^tsat</i>

There can thus be little doubt that *ro* as an augment of lexically simple verbs was beginning to shift during the Old Irish period from inherited behaviour as a preverb to an innovatory status as a conjunct particle, thus minimizing its formal repercussions in dependent position by keeping it proclitic throughout.

3.3. Augmented reduplicated preterites (VI.2.2) of simple verbs such as 3sg. *ro:mmemaid*, 3pl. *ro:mem^tdatar* (*maidid* 'breaks'), *ro:leblangatar* (*lingid* 'leaps')

replace reduplication with diphthongized *roí-* (*róe-* etc.) by V.6b on becoming dependent and prototonic, whence *-róemaid*, *-roím^tatar*, *-ráebalang(a)tar* respectively. A rare parallel instance with reduplicated future stem is 3sg. augm. cond. *-ribuilsed* (LU 5215), if this reflects remodelling of **-roíbuilsed* 'should have leapt' from **-roíbl^tsed* (*ro-libles-*, pres. *lingid*) by I.2.5c under the influence of unaugm. **-libilsed*. However, *-rib(u)ilsed* may simply be due to Middle Irish dissimilation of **-lib(u)ilsed* without *ro*.

CHAPTER XI

The Augment and Compound Verbs

1. Suppletive augmentation similar to that documented in X.1 for two or three simple verbs also exists on a very limited scale for compounds. However, by no means all compounds of the two main roots, *ber-* and *tég-*, involved in X.1 likewise change their root along with acquisition of an augment.

The only compound of *ber-* to do so is *do:beir* 'imposes, gives; brings, takes', which is unique in having two augmented forms corresponding to the first ('imposes, gives') and second ('brings, takes') of its basic meanings, namely *to-r(o)-at* and *to-uc-* respectively (see IX.4.1 on unusual features of *to-uc-* especially). Whereas *do:beir* is an S1a pres. with *t-*pret. and so on, these two augmented equivalents are W2a and b pres. respectively with concomitant *s-*pret. and so on (cf. *ber-* and *ro-uc-* in X.1). Thus in the sense 'impose, give' we find 3sg. augm. pres. *-ta-r^tti*, augm. subj. 3sg. *do:rata*, *-tar^tta*, 3pl. *do:ratat*, *-tar^ttat*, augm. pret. 3sg. *do:rat*, *-tarat*, 3pl. *do:rat^tsat*, *-tar^ttisset*, but in the sense 'bring, take' 3sg. augm. subj. *-tuca*, augm. past subj. *-tucad*, augm. pret. 3sg. *du:u(i)c*, *(-)tu(i)c*, 3pl. *du:uc^tsat*, *tuc^tsat*. Other compounds of *ber-* simply add the augment (usually *ro*) to the lexical frame of preverb(s) and verb in the manner to be described later without further change (cf. IX.2.2 for *as:beir*).

A number of compounds of *tég-*, notably *do:tét* 'comes', *fris:táet* 'opposes', *for:tét* 'helps' and *remi:tét* 'precedes', augment suppletively in the same way as the simplex by substituting *de-cum-fed-* for *tég-* itself throughout. This can best be illustrated by comparing augmented forms of the common *do:tét* (unaugm. *to-tég-* vs. augm. *to-de-cum-fed-*) in the table below with those of *téit* in X.1.

		UNAUGMENTED		AUGMENTED	
Pres.	3sg.	<i>do:tét</i> ,	<i>-táet</i>	<i>do:dichet</i> ,	<i>-tui-d^tchet</i>
Subj.	3sg.	<i>do:té</i> ,	<i>-táe</i>	<i>do:decha/:dich</i>	<i>-tui-dig</i>
	3pl.	<i>do:tíasat</i> ,	<i>-táesat</i>	<i>do:dech^tsat</i>	<i>-tui-d^tchiset</i>

Pret.	3sg.	<i>do:luid</i>	<i>-tu-laid</i>	<i>do:dechuid</i>	<i>-tui-d^hchid</i>
	3pl.	<i>do:lotar</i>	<i>-tu-l^htatar</i>	<i>do:dechutar</i>	<i>-tui-d^hchetar</i>
pass.	3sg.	<i>do:eth</i>		<i>do:dechas</i>	<i>-tui-d^hches</i>

An example of a compound that augments without attendant suppletion beyond that occurring in the unaugmented forms of *tég-* anyway is *im:tét* 'goes around' with pret. 3sg. *im:luid*, 3pl. *im:lotar* vs. augm. pret. 3sg. *im:ru-laid*, 3pl. *im:ru-l^hdatar*.

Fo:ceird, *-cuirethar* (see I.2.9c) 'puts' combines *ro* as augment with a change of root to *la-*, and this *ro-la-* is also substituted for *cu(i)r-* in the augmented forms of all *-cuirethar* compounds. Whereas non-deponent *fo:ceird* has an S1a pres., *s*-subj., suffixless pret. etc. and deponent *-cuirethar* displays W2b pres., *a*-subj., *s*-pret. etc., non-deponent *-la* basically follows an H1 pattern except that its *s*-pret. is not reduplicated. The following table should give some idea of the forms.

UNAUGMENTED				AUGMENTED	
Pres.	3sg.	<i>fris:cuirethar</i>		3pl.	<i>-(f)rith-ro-lat</i>
Subj.	3sg.	<i>fo:cerr,</i>	<i>-corathar</i>	<i>ro:lá(a)</i>	<i>-ra-la</i>
	3pl.		<i>-coratar</i>		<i>-ra-lat</i>
Pret.	3sg.	<i>fo:cairt,</i>		<i>ro:lá(a)</i>	
			<i>(do:)-corastar</i>		<i>(do:)-ra-l(a)e</i>
	3pl.	<i>fo:cartatar</i>		<i>ro:lá(i)set</i>	<i>-ro-l^hsat</i>
pass.	3sg.	<i>fo:cress</i>	<i>-corad</i>	<i>ro:laad</i>	
			<i>-to-ch^hrad</i>	<i>do:ra-lad</i>	<i>-ta-r^h-lad</i>

In its basic meaning 'puts' *do:cuirethar* conforms to the above suppletive pattern of augmentation, but its secondary offshoot (W2a for differentiation) in the sense 'invites' does not, as in 3sg. augm. pret. *do-ro:chu(i)restar* 'has invited'.

2.1. All the other compound verbs liable to augmentation remain unaltered except for the addition of one of the preverbs *ad*, *cum* or *ro*. Behaviour as preverbal augments is invariable in the case of *ad* and *cum*, and quite common in the case of *ro*. The basic criterion is conformity to the positional hierarchy sketched in IX.1.1 for the three as lexical preverbs. However, the preverbal augment is subject to one notable constraint that does not apply to its lexical preverb

counterpart: it can never take precedence over the first lexical preverb of a compound. If the normal positional rules in IX.1.1 would imply such a position, they are circumvented. Thus the normal position for *ad* in relation to *cum* where both are lexical preverbs is seen in *ad:co-snai* 'strives for' and *ad:cum-aing* 'happens' but in the compounds to be considered in 2.2 below augment *ad* must follow *cum* as initial lexical preverb, e.g. pret. 3sg. *con:tuil*, 3pl. *-co-t^flaiset* 'slept' and augm. pret. 3sg. *con:a-tail*, 3pl. *-com-t^f-tal^fsat* '(has/have) slept'. Similarly the inversion apparent in comparing 3sg. augm. pret. *as:ro-chum-lae* 'has decamped' (*ess-ro-cum-lu-*) with *con:rotaig* 'has built' (*cum-ro-uss-di(n)g-*) can best be explained by the need to keep the augment from initial position in the chain of preverbs in the second example.

It is worth emphasizing that this positional constraint upon preverbal augments in conjunction with lexical compound verbs means that such augments can never stand in the pretonic position reserved for initial preverbs in the absence of a conjunct particle. This exclusion from proclisis means that an augment of this type shows no behavioural overlap with an invariably proclitic conjunct particle when attached to compound verbs, whereas it has been seen that there was such an overlap in the case of simple verbs and that this had significant repercussions (X.3.1-2).

2.2. *Ad* as augment is confined to lexical compounds with *cum* as their first preverb and a second element, a further lexical preverb or the verbal root itself as the case may be, that begins with a consonant other than *f*. Indeed, *ad* has a virtual monopoly in the augmentation of verbs meeting these requirements, which can usually be determined from the deuterotonic form. Thus *ad* is the augment of verbs like *con:boing*, *con:certa*, *con:di-eig*, *con:gní* and *con:sáidi*, but *ro* (see 2.4 and 3.1) performs this function for *con:air-leici*, *con:erbai*, *con:foírea*, *con:oírg*, *con:o-scaigi*, *con:os-t^fna*, *con:u-taing* and so on. Only a couple of weak verbs with *cum* followed by a consonant other than *f* seem to contravene the rule requiring augment *ad*, namely *con:delga* and *con:nessa* with augm. pret. 3sg. *con:ro-delg* '(had) compared' and *co-ru:nes* '(had) trampled upon'. Another apparent exception, *con:túairc*, is discussed in 2.3 below.

In the relevant augmented compounds *ad* follows *cum* directly as second preverb, and consequently always stands in the tonic portion, where it is realized as *a* through regular assimilation to the following consonant (cf. I.2.2b). This system

can be illustrated by *con:boing* 'smashes', *con:certa* 'corrects', *con:di-eig* 'seeks', *con:gní* 'helps', *con:meil* 'grinds', *con:midethar* 'controls', *con:rig* 'binds together', *con:scara* 'destroys' and *con:tuili* 'sleeps'.

	UNAUGMENTED	AUGMENTED
<i>cum-ad-bo(n)g-</i> :	3sg. pres. <i>con:boing</i>	<i>con:a-bbaing</i>
<i>cum-ad-cert-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:cert</i>	<i>con:ai-cert</i>
<i>cum-ad-de-sag-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:di-acht</i>	<i>con:ai-techt</i>
<i>cum-ad-gni-</i> :	3pl. subj. <i>con:gnet</i>	<i>con:a-cnat</i>
<i>cum-ad-mel-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:melt</i>	<i>con:a-malt</i>
<i>cum-ad-mid-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:míd(a)ir</i>	<i>con:a-mad(a)ir</i>
<i>cum-ad-rig-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:reraig</i>	<i>con:á-r[†]raig</i>
<i>cum-ad-scar-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:scar</i>	<i>con:a-scar</i>
<i>cum-ad-tul-</i> :	3sg. pret. <i>con:tuil</i>	<i>con:a-ttail</i>

When such augmented forms become dependent and prototonic, the *a* is invariably syncopated by virtue of standing in a second non-final syllable (see I.2.5). However, realization of underlying *-cum-* in that case as *-com-* indicates a lost back vowel and contrasts with the preconsonantal treatment of the lexical preverb in the corresponding unaugmented form. Variant syncope patterns are also telling in this respect, typical enough pairs being 3sg. pret. *-cuin-decht* vs. augm. pret. *-com-[†]tacht* (*con:di-eig*), 3sg. past subj. *-co-sc[†]rad* vs. augm. past subj. *-com-[†]scarad* (*con:scara*), 3pl. pret. *-co-t[†]laiset* vs. augm. pret. *-com-[†]tal[†]sat* (*con:tuili*). At all events, reduction of the augment's presence to various indirect reflexes did not prevent these and other dependent forms augmented by *ad* from remaining distinct from their unaugmented counterparts.

2.3. Despite the fact that only a score or so of compound verbs are involved, the occurrence of *cum* as an augment resists the neat formulation possible in the case of *ad* above. It seems to be restricted to certain S1 and S3 verbs, known attestations coming from a dozen different roots (S1 *aneg-*, *bo(n)g-*, *fed-*, *féd-*, *lo(n)g-*, *nig-*, *org-*, *rig-*, *to(n)g-*, S3 *be(n)-*, *fe(n)-*, *re(n)-*) in combination with quite a wide range of preverbs. However, the only root here whose compounds can be said to display an almost general affinity for augmentation by *cum* is *org-*, although one or two of the other roots (e.g. *fe(n)-*) above might prove to have a similar

affinity in their compounds if more evidence came to light. The only root above to use *cum* (preceded by *to*, apparently to keep it non-initial) as augment when simple is *to(n)g-* (X.2). Those of the rest so attested use *ro*, e.g. augm. pret. 3sg. *ro:ort* 'has slain'.

Apart from those already containing *cum* as a lexical preverb, i.e. *cum-org-* and *cum-ar(e)-org-* apparently with no augment (later *ro* by XII.4.2c) and *ro* respectively (see 4.2), those *org-* compounds with definite attestations regularly augment by means of *cum*, typical examples being 3sg. augm. pret. *as:com-art* 'has smitten' (*ess-org-*), *du:es-c^tm-art* 'has smitten' (*de-ess-org-*), *do:im-chom-artt* 'has constrained' (*to-imb(e)-org-*), *do:es-(c^t)m-art* 'has delivered' (*to-ess-org-*), *fris:com-art*, *-frith-chom-art* 'has offended', 3sg. augm. subj. *fris:chom-arr* 'who may be able to oppose' (all *fris-org-*), 3sg. augm. pret. *do:com-art* 'has crushed', 3sg. augm. subj. *du:com-arr* '(when) he have crushed' (both *do:fúairc*), and finally 2sg. augm. pret. *con:to-ch^tm-airt* 'thou hast pounded' (*con:túairc*). The last form looks like an exception to two rules, the first requiring *ad* as augment in *cum* + consonant compounds (2.2) and the second prohibiting augment *cum* from compounds already containing it as a lexical preverb (see above). This, however, can be explained by its status as a late derivative of *do:fúairc*, *-túairc* by secondary composition (see IX.1.2, and note 2sg. ipv. *comtúairc* vs. the treatment seen in old *cum* compounds like *con:tuili*, *-co-t^tlai* 'sleeps', cf. GOI 502-3). *Con:túairc* simply adopted the augment pattern of its primary compound base.

The following are the principal attestations of *cum* as augment with lexical compounds of other roots. 3sg. augm. pret. *du:é-com-^tnacht* 'has bestowed' (*do:ind-^tnaig*, *to-in(de)-cum-aneg-*), *do:cum-(b^t)baig* 'has exacted', 3sg. pass. augm. subj. *-to-ch^tm-(b)astar* '(provided) it have been exacted' (*do:boing*, *to-cum-bo(n)g-*), augm. pret. 3sg. *do:cóem(n^t)nag^ttar* 'have washed' (*do:nig*, *de-cum-nig-*; see 2.6 on *-ro-/-roí-* and *-com-/-coím-*), 3sg. *do:com-arraig* 'has stripped' (*do:rig*, *de-cum-rig-*; from *-com-r^traig* by I.2.5c), 3sg. pass. *ad:cui-techt* 'has been denied' (*as:toing*, *ess-cum-to(n)g-*; see I.2.9e on pretonic *ad* for *as*), 3sg. pass. augm. past subj. *fo:com-bethe*, *-fo-ch^tm-(b)aide* 'might have been impaired' (*fo:ben*, *fo-cum-be(n)-*), augm. pret. 3sg. *do:com-bai* 'has cut off' (*do:ben*, *de-cum-be(n)-*), 3sg. pass. *do:com-rad* 'has been paid' (*do:ren*, *de-cum-re(n)-*), 3sg. augm. pres. *as:com-ren* 'can pay' (*as:ren*, *ess-cum-re(n)-*), 1pl. augm. subj. *-fo-chom-olsam* 'may be able to endure', 1sg. augm. pret. *fo:cóem-allag* 'I have

endured' (*fo:loing*, *fo-cum-lo(n)g-*; from **-com-l^tsam* and **-com-l^tlag* respectively by I.2.5c). When *cum* comes into contact with *f*, the resultant *-mf-* disappears entirely (cf. the *tég-* forms in X.1 and XI.1), whence 3sg. augm. pret. *ad:cu-aid*, *in:cu-aid* 'has related', 3sg. pass. augm. pres. *nicon:é-c^t-adar* 'cannot be related' (*in:fét*, *in(de)-cum-féd-*, see I.2.9e on pretonic *ad* for *in*), 3sg. augm. subj. *-im-c(h)u-a* '(until) he have fenced' (*imm:fén*, *imb(e)-cum-fe(n)-*), 3sg. pass. augm. subj. *do:air-^t-c-es^ttar* 'may be brought down' (*do:airnet* 'brings down, lowers', cf. *Thes.* II, 253.5 *t-a:n-aurnat* 'bows himself' listed in *DIL* under historically different but semantically similar *do:airindi* 'lowers, descends', with which it may have been confused at an early date. Apparently, therefore, *to-ar(e)-in(de)-cum-fed-*, and unnecessary to emend with *GOI* 345 and *Ériu* 17, 70, §11 to *do:air-chestar* as if from otherwise unattested **do:airet*, *to-ar(e)-cum-fed-*, inferred from *tairiden* 'watercourse').

These examples suffice to show that the positional behaviour of *cum* is essentially the same, whether it is used as an augment or a lexical preverb (see IX.1.1): it stands well down in the chain of preverbs, usually directly in front of the verbal root itself.

2.4. *Ro* likewise comes towards the rear of the preverb chain when functioning as a preverbal augment. It regularly follows all preverbs except *uss*, *ne* and *cum*, which it precedes as long as it is not thereby brought in front of the first lexical preverb (see 2.1 above). In other words *ro* the preverbal augment behaves very much like *ro* the lexical preverb (see IX.1.1), as the various examples to be adduced below should demonstrate.

Augm. pret. 3sg. *as:ru-bart*, *-é-r^t-bart* 'has said' (*as:beir*, *ess-ro-ber-*) *do:ri-g^tni*, *-dei-r^t-géni* 'has done' (*do:gní*, *de-ro-gni-*), *fo:rro-ch^tsul*, *-fo-r^t-chosul* 'has removed' (*fo:cois^tlea*, *fo-ro-cum-uss-ell-*, if *m* lost between two *us* as before *w*, later *f*, in 2.3. If not, *fo-ro-cum-sel-*), pass. 3sg. *con:r-o-scaiged*, *-cum-ar-scaiged* 'has been changed' (*con:oscaigi*, *cum-ro-uss-scuch-*, prot. form from *-cum-r^t-scaig-* by I.2.5c), *do:á-r^t-bas*, *(-)t-á-r^t-bas* 'has been shown' (*do:adbat*, *to-ad-ro-féd-*), 2pl. *do(-b):fo-r^t-bad*, 3pl. *-to-r^t-batha* 'you/they have been cut off' (*do:fuiben*, *to-fo-ro-be(n)-*), augm. pret. 1sg. *do:ro-mult*, *-to-r^t-mult* 'I have consumed' (*do:meil*, *to-ro-mel-*), 3sg. *a-t:ru-balt*, augm. subj. 1pl. *-é-r^t-balam* 'has died' and 'we may die' respectively (*a-t:baill*, *ess-ro-bel-*), augm. pret. 3sg. pass. *do:ro-g^tbad*, augm. subj. 3sg. *-de-r^t-gaba* 'has been diminished'

and 'may diminish' (*do:gaib, de-ro-ga(i)b-*), augm. pret. 3sg. *do:int-arr-ai*, augm. past subj. 3sg. *(-)t-int-arr-ad* 'has returned' and 'might return' (*do:int-ai, to-in(de)-ro-so-*, from *t(o)-ind-r[†]-ho-* by I.2.5c and 8), and augm. pret. 3sg. *du:rúa-rid, -de-r-úa-rid* 'has remained over' (*do:(f)úarat, de-ro-uss-reth-*).

All of the verbs in the above list apart from *con:oscaigi* are strong or hiatus, but there is no shortage of examples of the preverbal augment *ro* with compounds of weak verbs, notwithstanding the extraordinary claim of GOI 340 that this type of *ro* 'is found especially, though not exclusively, with compounds of strong verbs'. The following examples, like those in the previous paragraph, are from Wb. where possible but sometimes from Ml. and elsewhere. Augm. pret. 3sg. pass. *-de-r[†]-badad* 'has been drowned' (*do:bádi, de-ro-bád-*), 3pl. act. *tu:e-r[†]-c(h)om-[†]lassat*, augm. subj. 3sg. *-t-e-r[†]-chom-[†]la* 'have collected' and 'may collect' (*do:e-c[†]m-alla, to-in-ro-cum-ell-*), augm. pret. 3pl. *du:ai-r[†]-ilb[†]set*, augm. subj. 2sg. *-t-a-r[†]-ilbae* 'they have assigned' and 'thou mayest assign' (*do:aisilbi, to-ad-ro-seilb-*), *-t-ái-r[†]le* 'thou mayest visit' (*do:aid[†]lea, to-ad-ro-ell-*), augm. pret. 3pl. pass. *do:ro-l[†]getha, -de-r[†] [†]laich t([†])ea* 'have been forgiven' (*do:lugi, de-ro-lug-*), 3sg. pass. *du:roi-l[†]ged*, augm. subj. 2sg. *-de-r[†]-legae* 'has been destroyed' and 'thou mayest destroy' (*do:lega, de-ro-leg-*), augm. pret. 1sg. *do:ai-r[†]-fénus* 'I have pointed out' (*do:aisféna, to-ad-ro-sén-*), 3pl. *do:rí-l[†]tiset*, augm. subj. 1sg. *-de-r[†]-lind* 'have denied' and 'I may deny' (*do:sluindi, di-ro-sluind-*), augm. pret. 3sg. *fo:ro-dil*, 3pl. pass. *-fo-r[†]-dail[†]tea* 'has distributed' and 'have been distributed' (*fo:dáli, fo-ro-dál-*), and finally augm. subj. 3sg. *do:fo-r[†]s-laice(a)*, augm. pret. 3sg. *t-a-r[†]s-laic* 'may release' and 'has released' (*do:fúas-(a)ilci* from *-l[†]ci* by I.2.5c, *to-fo-ro-uss-léic-*).

Syncopé of *ro* in contact with another *r* can cause its complete disappearance if the corresponding unaugmented stem contains unlenited *r*, e.g. 3sg. pres. *do:etar-rat* 'comprehends', augm. pret. *do:etar-rid* 'has comprehended', where preceding *do:á-r[†]-buid* 'has shown' in the same gloss (Wb. 19c11) indicates analysis as *do:etar-(r[†])-rid* (*to-eter-ro-reth-*). Unaugmented lenited *r* should contrast with augmented unlenited *rr* in most such cases, e.g. 3sg. pass. augm. pret. *do:ar-r[†]-chet, t-a(i)r-r[†]-chet* 'has been prophesied' (*do:airchain, to-ar(e)-ro-can-*, apparently with presyncope loss of a vowel between two *r*'s, cf. end of VIII.6.4), 3sg. augm. past subj. *-ar-r[†]gabab* 'might seize' (*ar:gaib, ar(e)-ro-gab-*). However, this distinction may not be represented orthographically (see appendix), e.g. *amal*

do:n-airchet hi fáithib et ro:fiugrad i rrec(h)t (Wb. 13a36) 'as it has been prophesied in the prophets and has been figured in the law' or 3sg. pass. augm. subj. *ar:roi-l'gither* vs. *-ar-(r[†]?) -leg[†]thar* 'have been/ may be read out' (both Wb. 27d13) and 3sg. augm. pret. *-ar-(r[†]-)leg* 'read aloud' (Ml. 43b14, see IX.3.2.1 on marked prevalence of the augment with the pret. in expository glosses). This situation is most likely to arise where a preverbal augment *ro* directly follows stressed *for*, *eter* or *ar(e)*, but can also occur where it stands directly in front of a root beginning with *r*, as in 3sg. augm. pret. *ad:rui-rim*, *-á-r[†]-raim* 'has reckoned' (*ad:rími*, *-ái-r[†]mi*; *ad-ro-rím-*). A peculiar disjunctive augmentation often found in *for* compounds (see GOI 341) seems to be rooted in this phenomenon insofar as a sequence *-forr-* might stand for *-forr[†]-* or *-for[†]r-*. Consequently 3sg. augm. pret. prototonic *-forr-bris* 'has crushed' could be taken to imply deuterotonic *fo:ro-r-bris* (Ml. 67b24) rather than inherited *for:ro-bris*, and the former pattern with disjunct *fo:ro-r* tended to be preferred over a *for:ro-* indistinguishable from *fo:(r)ro-*, whence a doublet such as augm. pret. inherited 3pl. *for:ru-bartatar* 'have increased' (Ml. 101a10) versus innovatory 3sg. *fo:ro-r-bart* 'has grown' (*Fél. Prol.* 173, both *for-ro-ber-* but *for:ru-bartatar* theoretically compatible with *fo-ro-ber-*).

2.5. It has already been noted (I.2.9b) that various complexities of the largely redundant morphological opposition between independent deuterotonic and dependent prototonic forms of compound verbs sometimes opened the way for formal interaction between the two, a good example being the encroachment of deut. *con:oscaigi* 'moves' triggered by prot. *-cum-[†]scaigi* upon older *con:o-sc([†]c)ai* (cf. *do:róscai*, *-der[†]scaigi* 'surpasses'). Since *ro* as a preverbal augment was involved in similarly complicated alternations between deuterotonic and prototonic patterns, it is hardly surprising to find cases of comparable interaction between independent and dependent augmented formations. For instance, 3sg. augm. *t*-pret. prototonic *-to-r[†]-sat* 'has begotten' generated innovatory deut. *do:forsat* (Ml. 17b2) alongside inherited *do:rósat* (Sg. 31b2 = PCr. 15a2; *do:fuissim*, *to-ro-uss-sem-*). Influence in the reverse direction can be seen in the suppletive *to-rat-* augmented counterparts to *do:beir* 'gives', e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. prot. inherited *-tar[†]tisset* (Wb. 1b17) alongside innovatory *-tartsat* (24b20) modelled on deut. *do:rat[†]sat* or augm. subj. 1sg. *do:rat*, *-tart* (Wb. 14d17, expected *-tarat* apparently not attested) on the model of other persons such as 3sg. *do:rata*, *-tar[†]ta*, whereas 3sg. augm. pret. *do:rat*, *-tarat* apparently first gives way to *-tart*, *-tard* (see appendix) just after the

OIr. period (e.g. *SR* 2811). The tendency was to produce a consistent *do:rat*(^t-), *-tart*(^t-) throughout and to eradicate deviant patterns inherited in some prototonic forms.

The frequently convoluted nature of the deuterotonic and prototonic opposition in unaugmented compound verbs has been illustrated in I.2.1-9, and the foregoing sections of the present chapter provide ample exemplification of equal or even greater complexity in the case of augmented forms. Given that such variation between independent and dependent forms was basically accessory to absence or presence of a conjunct particle (I.1.2-3) and had no intrinsic grammatical function as such, it is rather surprising that Old Irish tolerated this elaborate and often synchronically unpredictable system of alternations so well on the whole and that the type of interaction or levelling between the two sets just discussed was not still more widespread than seems to have been the case. Nevertheless, certain tendencies in this direction do point to a system that had become seriously overloaded with non-functional formal complications. Moreover, the extent of this intricacy is even more striking when deuterotonic and prototonic variants of both unaugmented and preverbally augmented compounds are placed side by side, as in the three rather extreme but by no means untypical instances below.

	DEUTEROTONIC	PROTOTONIC
3sg. pret. pass.	<i>con:scarad</i>	<i>-cosc^trad (cum-ad-scar-)</i>
3sg. augm. pret. pass.	<i>con:asc^trad</i>	<i>-com^tscarad</i>
3sg. pret.	<i>do:géni</i>	<i>-dig^tni (de-ro-gni-)</i>
3sg. augm. pret.	<i>do:rig^tni</i>	<i>-deir^tgéni</i>
3pl. pret.	<i>do:sluind^tset</i>	<i>-díl^ttiset (dí-ro-sluind-)</i>
3pl. augm. pret.	<i>do:ríl^ttiset</i>	<i>-der^tlind^tset</i>

In fourfold systems of this type the opposition between unaugmented and augmented variants, unlike that between deuterotonic and prototonic, was functionally significant (IX.2.1-3.3). Nevertheless, its formal repercussions put a considerable extra strain on an already overburdened complex and thus increased

the pressures towards levelling. For instance, analogical augm. pret. deuterotonic *do:rigéni* alongside inherited *do:rig^tni* 'has done' could be due to the influence of corresponding augm. pret. prototonic *-deir^tgéni*, unaugm. pret. deuterotonic *do:géni* or, most likely, both. Conversely, joint pressure from *-dig^tni* and *do:rig^tni* presumably triggered the analogical augm. prot. *-deirgni* (Ml. 124b3). It is to be noted that formal affinities in the squares on the above list operate diagonally above all. The tonic portion of the verb in corresponding unaugm. prot. (+ first lexical preverb) and augm. deut. (+ preverbal augment) tends to have the same underlying syllable count and concomitant syncope pattern (e.g. *-di-g^tni*, *do:ri-g^tni*), while the presence of two extra syllables (+ first preverb, + augment) in the augm. prot. tends to effect some formal correlation with the unaugm. deut. (e.g. *-dei-r^t-géni*, *do:géni*). Indeed, augm. deut. *do:riltiset* obviously owes its *ri-* rather than expected *ro-* to the influence of unaugm. prot. *-diltiset* in the table.

At all events, formal interactions are by no means confined to the horizontal deuterotonic/prototonic axis in the above table, but operate on the vertical unaugmented/augmented axis too, as the following selection of examples demonstrates. 3sg. pres. *do:fúasilci* 'releases' (Ml. 127a17, **-fúasl^tci* by vowel support, *to-fo-ro-uss-léic-*), pret. *do-n:fúaslaic* 'released us' (SR 7519), augm. subj. *do-n:for^tslaice* 'may release us' (*Thes.* II, 301.7), pret. *(-)-tar^tslaic* '(who) has released' (304.1) show complex historically regular variation, but early analogical simplification is seen in augm. pret. 3sg. *du-n:for^tsailc* 'had released us' (Ml. 125a9), pass. *do:for^tsailced* 'had been released' (118d20). Augm. pret. 3sg. *do:ár^t-baid* 'has shown' etc. cannot possibly be the regular reflex of *to-ad-ro-féd-*, since lenition after the vowel of *ro* would have eliminated *f* to give unattested **do:áraid*, and obviously owes its *b* to corresponding unaugmented forms like pres. 3sg. *do:ad-bat* where *-féd-* was preceded by non-leniting *ad*. In the case of *do:aisféna* 'shows', which can hardly be other than *to-ad-sén-* in origin, augm. pret. 1sg. *do:airfénus* shows the expected lenition of *s* to *f* after *ro* in this root (cf. *sén* 'favourable sign, luck' vs. *ain-fén* 'ill luck') and thus reflects *to-ad-ro-sén-*. Its *-f-* seems then to have been added to an unattested erstwhile **to:aissén-*, the regular outcome of *to-ad-sén-*, as part of a levelling process in line with historically regular elimination of *s* by lenition after *ro*, thus making the relationship between unaugm. *to-aisfén-* and augm. *to-áirfén-* conform to the normal type seen, for example, in unaugm. *to-aissilb-*, augm. *to-áirilb-* 'assign'. By a further accommodation between

the two sets the *-á(i)r-* expected to result from *-ad-r-* (cf. 1.2.2b) might be shortened to bring it into line with *-a(i)s(s)-* from *-ad-s-*, whence doublets such as augm. pret. 3sg. *-táir^tilb* (Ml. 36c36) vs. 3pl. *du:air^tilb^tset* (46d10) from *do:aissilbi* 'assigns'. Given a tendency not to indicate the mark of length regularly in writing, some cases of *-a(i)r-* may be purely orthographical, but it is probably significant that the *a* of augm. pret. 1sg. *do:air^tfénus* 'I have shown' etc. is apparently never specifically represented as long. The sequence *fo-ad-gab* should yield *fo:acaib*, *(-)facaib* 'leaves' with short *a* (cf. *du:a-cair* 'pleads' reflecting *to-ad-gar-*), but the long *á* found in Modern Irish *fágann* 'leaves' is already clearly attested in the Glosses, e.g. 3pl. pres. *fu:ác^tbat* 'they leave' (Ml. 80a10), and can only have arisen by analogy from an augmented *f(o)-á-r^t-gab-* (no longer indubitably attested, see 4.2 below) with the regular reflex of *f(o)-ad-ro-gab-*. *Ro-u* should merge to give *ró-*, which was tending to become *rúa-* in Old Irish (GOI 39-40), and so *-uss-* compounds might be expected to oppose unaugm. *u-* or *o-* (by lowering, GOI 46) to augm. *ró-* or *rúa-*. In practice, two-way confusions seem to have arisen not infrequently. Thus the historically regular alternances seen in unaugm. 3sg. pres. deut. *fo:n-o-cuir* 'whom he denounces' (CIH 29.10, *fo-uss-gar-*), pret. *fo:s:ocart* 'denounced them' (Thes. II, 240.18) vs. 2sg. ipv. (prot.) *fúacair* (*fo-u-* to *fó-*, *fúa-* also) and augm. 3sg. pret. pass. deut. *fo:ró-c^trad* 'has been announced' (Wb. 19b6) or *fo:rrúa-c^trad* are subject to various analogical dislocations, as in 3sg. pres. deut. *fo-d:úacair* 'who proclaims it' (Wb. 11b24) and 1sg. augm. pret. deut. *fo:s:r-o-curt* 'I have denounced them' (Wb. 24a26). The last form might stand for *fo:s:ró-curt* but could equally well have adopted the vocalism of unaugmented *fo:s:o-cart*, and it is likewise doubtful whether the short *o* of 3sg. augm. pret. *con:rotaig* 'has built' is merely orthographical and to be read as *con:ró-taig* (cf. 3pl. *con:ró-t^tgatar*, Sg. 32b6) or is to be taken at face value as due to the influence of unaugmented forms such as 3sg. pres. *con:u-taing* 'builds, with short vowel.

2.6. The rule whereby *ro* plus reduplicator gives *roí* as a surrogate of reduplication in the stressed portion of the verb (see X.3.3 and V.6b) applies where appropriate to compound as well as simple verbs, e.g. augm. pret. 1sg. *for:roíchan* 'I have instructed' (*for:cain*, underlying **for:ro-che-chan*), 3sg. *in:roígrainn* 'has persecuted' (*in:greinn*, underlying **in:ro-gegrainn*), 1sg. *ar-ob:roínasc* 'I have betrothed you' (*ar:naisc*, underlying **ar:ro-ne-nasc*), *fo:roíblang* 'I have anticipated' (*fo:ling*, underlying **fo:ro-le-blaing*). Since most preterite actives and

all preterite passives, including those corresponding to reduplicated preterite actives, were unreduplicated and so retained *ro* without modification to *roí* in the first instance, the impression could easily arise that *ro* and *roí* were mere free variants. In fact, such confusion began early (see *GOI* 425) to produce forms like augm. pret. 3sg. *fo:rro-chain* 'has instructed, (Ml. 68b8), *in:ro-grainn* 'had persecuted' (26b24), or (with *roí* for *ro*) 1sg. *ad:róethach* 'I have besought' (*Thes* II, 353.5). There was also a tendency to blur the surrogate status of *roí* by analogically restoring the reduplicator from corresponding unaugmented forms, e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. *for-tan:roí-chechnatar* 'have taught us' (63b1), *ad:roí-gegrannatar* 'have persecuted' (25b11). Such *ro/roí* doublets further triggered alternations between *com* and *coím* (*cóem*), both as augment and lexical preverb, e.g. augm. pret. 3sg. *do:com-arraig* (Ml. 48d15) or *du:choím-arraig* (14b1) '(who) has laid waste' (*de-cum-rig-*, for **de:com-r^traig* by vowel support) and 3sg. pret. *for:com-^tnacuir* '(has) happened' (*for:cum-aing*) versus *con:ánacuir*, *-coím-^tnacuir* 'was/has been able' (*con:ic, -cum-aing*).

3.1. As intimated earlier (IX.2.2 and 4.1), some Old Irish verbs fail either completely or, less usually, partially to take an augment, and instead use a single set of forms, regardless of whether the syntax would otherwise call for an augment or not.

The first group consists of a handful of mostly rather common roots resistant to such differentiation. Two of these, *-ic* and *-gni(n)* (with the possible archaic exception of *ní:géoin* 'does not know'), occur only in compounds, of which *-ic* in particular forms a large number. These include *ar:ic* 'finds', *con:ic* 'is able', *do:ic* 'arrives', *ro:ic* 'attains', *con:r-ic* 'meets', *do:e-c^tm-aing* 'happens', *for:cum-aing* 'comes about' and *ad:gnin* 'recognises', *as:gnin* 'understands', *etar:gnin* 'distinguishes'. The fact that these are regularly unaugmented in the Glosses and other early sources in contexts that would normally call for an augment leaves no doubt about their incompatibility with this morphological process, the unaugmented preterite forms of these verbs in the Glosses (where augmented preterites are otherwise very prevalent; see IX.3.2.1) being particularly probative in this respect. The apparent exceptions 3pl. past subj. *remi:ergnaitis* glossing *praenoscerent* (Ml. 19b8) and 3sg. pret. *nad:ergéoin* 'does not know' in the Laws presumably belong to a rare *ar:gnin* with a well attested verbal noun *ergnae* 'understanding' rather than

reflecting *ess-ro-gni(n)-*, which would be an anomalous augmented form of *as:gnin*, verbal noun *ecnae*. The unaugmentable preterito-present deponent (*s*-subj. forms also attested) *do:futhracair*, (*do*)-*dúthracair* 'wishes' (see I.2.9d, *di-fo-trac*?) probably belongs to this category.

Three fundamentally simple verbs are invariably unaugmented in dependent position but augmented by *ro* when independent, namely (*ro*)-*finnathar* 'finds out' (pret.-pres. (*ro*)-*fitir* 'knows'), (*ro*)-*cluínethar* 'hears' and (*ro*)-*laimethar* 'dares' (see I.2.9d, IX.4.1 and *GOI* 351), e.g. pret. 3sg. *ro:fitir*, *ní:fitir* etc., *ro:lámair*, *ní:lámair* etc. These verbs, therefore, do not distinguish semantically between unaugmented and augmented forms, but instead have the two sets in complementary distribution according to purely formal criteria. The rule seems to be that independent telic simple verbs were not tolerated and had to be compounded with *ro*. It seems clear that a similar opposition between *ro:cúalae*, *ní:cúalae* etc. once existed in the preterite of (*ro*)-*cluínethar*, but in narrative contexts the hitherto independent forms of this pret. came to be regularly preceded by prosecutive *co* 'so that, and' (see *GOI* 347) with the result that pret. *co:cúalae* 'heard' became formally distinct from augm. pret. *ro:cúalae* '(has/had) heard' whereas independent *ní:cúalae* etc. made no such distinction between narrative and non-narrative preterites. The basic incompatibility of these roots with a normal augment is indicated by the fact that their few compounds cannot be augmented, notably *fo:lamathar* 'attempts', *ar:fo-l'mathar* 'ventures'.

The root *ta-* seen in *a:tá* 'is' (*ad-ta-*), *do:es-ta* 'is lacking' (*to-es-ta-*) also resists augmentation, but in the two compounds just mentioned this is evaded by suppletive use of *bi-*, which can be augmented by *ro*, outside the (non-habitual) present, e.g. 3sg. augm. subj. and (cons.) pres. in *cía ru:bé cen ní diib ní:ru-bai cenaib huli* (Ml. 20d4) 'though it be able to be without one of them, it cannot be without them all' or 3sg. augm. pret. *tesarb(ae)* 'had been absent' (Wb. 17d2, Ml. 34c16, for **t'-es-r'-boi* by vowel support). However, the compound *in-ta-* 'get' keeps the same root throughout, and never augments in the dependent forms *ní:é-ta* 'does not get' etc. Like *ro:fitir* etc. above, however, it equally regularly takes an augment, *cum* rather than *ro*, in independent *ad:co-ta* 'gets' etc. (see IX.4.1 and I.2.9e). The conditioning of the two sets is likewise purely formal and devoid of semantic connotations, so that one can hardly speak of conventional augmentation.

3.2. In other cases without a normal augmented/unaugmented opposition the

conditioning factor is particular compounds or types of compound rather than the root itself. The most important group here consists of verbs that already contain *ro* as a lexical preverb in the slot that might otherwise be occupied by *ro* as a preverbal augment, thus precluding a formal realization of augmentation in this way (but see 4.2 and 3 on some later tendencies to introduce distinct augmented forms here). Lexical compounds like *do:ro-choíni/-de-r[†]choíni* ‘despairs’, *do:rogaib/-tor[†]gaib* ‘transgresses’, *ad:roi-lli/-ái-ri-lli* ‘earns’, *do:roi-m[†]nethar/-de-r[†]-mainethar* ‘forgets’ cannot, therefore, add a further *ro* as preverbal augment and do not resort to other devices such as *cum* or suppletion in order to make up the deficiency (see GOI 346).

The telic compound *fo:gaib* ‘finds’ and its suppletive pret. act. *(fo)-fúair*, pass. *(fo)-fríth* (I.2.9d, VI.2.7 and VII.6) are, unlike other *gab-* compounds not already containing *ro*, immune to augmentation and display a single set of forms in all contexts. Similarly, although compounds of *ci-* ‘behold’ otherwise seem to take *ro* as augment in the normal way, telic *ad:cí, -a-cci* ‘sees’ appears to be fundamentally resistant to such augmentation, as the following example of *co* plus (where available) augmented subjunctives from *Bethu Brigitte* 434-5 indicates. ‘*Raga*’ *ar Brigit*, ‘*conid:n-acar (ad-ci-) , conid:n-arladar (ad-ro-glád-) , co: tarda (to-r[†]-at-, suppletive to to-ber-) bennacht form*’: “‘I shall go’ said Brigit, “that I may see him and that I may talk to him and that he may bestow a blessing upon me””. In the preterite, however, it seems originally to have followed the scheme seen in *(ro)-cluínethar, ad:co-ta* etc. in 3.1 above by regularly using the augment *cum* in independent position and dispensing with it when dependent without regard for semantic factors. In addition to this, the quasi-augmented independent preterite forms entailed suppletive exchange of *ci-* for *derc-*, whence indep. suffixless pret. *ad:con-dairc (ad-cum-derc-)* versus dependent *-a-ccae* ‘saw’ (*ad-ci-*). Like the closely connected *(ro)-cluínethar* ‘hears’, however, *ad:cí* developed a tendency to prefix *co* to its preterite in narrative contexts where there was no other conjunct particle (see 3.1), thus producing an opposition between narrative *co:n-accae* ‘saw’ and non-narrative *ad:con-dairc* ‘has seen etc.’ that corresponded broadly to the unaugmented/augmented dichotomy in most other verbs. On the other hand, undifferentiated *ní:accae* ‘did not see, has not seen’ etc. remained the rule after semantically significant conjunct particles. The virtual existence of a formal and semantic opposition in the basically independent preterite between unaugmented

co:n-accae and augmented *ad:con-dairc* seems to have led to sporadic introduction of separate augmented forms elsewhere on the evidence of 3sg. pass. augm. pres. *ad:ro-darcar* 'can be seen' (Sg. 172a2), the late and secondary nature of which is indicated by use of productive *ro* rather than *cum* as augment to the suppletive *derc-*. However, it seems most unlikely that *ní:airciu* 'I cannot see' (LU 6213, cf. 6098) and the like in later manuscripts represent *ad-ro-ci-* (GOI 346), since there is no lenition after *air-* and no suppletion of *derc-* for *ci-*. Moreover, a separate dependent augmented form would be quite unparalleled in this verb. Rather these forms belong to *ar:aicci* 'observes' or *for:cí* 'beholds', verbal noun *foircsiu*, with 'Middle Irish' substitution of *ar* for *for*, and so are not augmented.

The foregoing should have demonstrated that most Old Irish verbs are consistently augmented where the sense demands, but that some are never augmented or have a 'meaningless' augment in otherwise independent forms only. *(Ro)-cluine-thar*, *ad:cí* and a couple of *ro* compounds (see 4.2 below) are remarkable for a manifestly late and defective tendency towards semantically significant augmentation.

4.1. The standard grammars are agreed that the actually attested usage of *ro* in Old Irish, particularly the Glosses, only partially conforms to the type of positional rules set out in 2.4 above. Thus 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. GOI 339-41 essentially restates this doctrine. The older type is designated 'fixed *ro*' because it 'has an invariable position, normally after the other prepositions and immediately before the verbal stem', e.g. *do:ru-ménar* 'I have thought', *as:ru-bart* 'has said' vs. *nicon:to-r^t-ménar*, *ní:é-r^t-bart*. The 'more frequent' 'movable *ro*' by contrast 'always comes after the last pretonic preverb, whether this be a preposition or a conjunct particle'. It thus 'always stands in the second place' and 'usually remains unstressed after a conjunct particle... rarely after a preposition', e.g. *im:rui-d^tbed* 'has been circumcised' vs. *ní-ro:im^tdibed*, *as:r-in-gab^tsa^t* 'they have exceeded' vs. *nad:r-es-^tngab^tsa^t*. Not surprisingly, both types may be found on occasion with one and the same verb, e.g. technically 'fixed' or 'movable' independent

do:ro-gáeth 'has deceived' vs. dependent 'fixed' *ní-m:tho-r[†]-gáeth* 'has not deceived me' or 'movable' *ní-ru:tho-gaít[†] sam* 'we have not deceived'.

There is no shortage of evidence for a positional dichotomy along these lines, but closer inspection does indicate some more or less serious inadequacies. To begin with, the position of 'fixed' or, as I prefer to term it, 'preverbal' *ro* was not regularly at the end of the preverb chain as *VKG* claims, and *GOI*'s alteration of this to 'normally' merely substitutes vagueness for inaccuracy. The evidence adduced in IX.1.1 and XI.2.1 and 4 suggests that this position may be accurately defined as further down in the chain than all preverbs save *cum*, *uss* and *ne*, which come after *ro* as long as this is compatible with the basic rule that a preverbal augment may never precede the first lexical preverb of a compound. The present section, therefore, need be concerned only with the not infrequent cases where the position of *ro* as augment deviates from these 'preverbal' parameters.

The *VKG* doctrine of a tendency to avoid truncation of *ro* does not apply to the common innovatory type with elided *ro* seen in *as:r'-in-gab[†]sat*, *-r'-es-[†]n-gab[†]sat* etc., and it is not obvious that *im:rui-d[†]bed* would be significantly more predictable in relation to *im:dí-bed* than a putative **im:de-r[†]-bad*. *GOI* does not even attempt to motivate the rise of 'movable' *ro*, and there is no clarification either there or in *VKG* of the reasons why this type of *ro* is sometimes attached to a proclitic but otherwise begins the stressed portion of the verbal complex. Finally, 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*. *VKG* ascribes this type to a tendency to insert *ro* between the first lexical preverb and remaining lexical elements that had come to be felt as indivisible, but this account must be dismissed as *ad hoc* because no attempt is made to explain why it applies to a few verbs with a couple of lexical preverbs but not to the vast majority. This explanation only has any attractions in manifest cases of secondary composition (see IX.1.2), but even here the norm seems to be to follow the pattern of augmentation already existing in the base compound. Thus the calques *con:toi* 'converts' = Lat. *con-vertit* (base *do:soí*, *-toi* equated with Lat. *vertit* 'turns') and *con:foírea* 'provides' = Lat. *comparat* (base *fo:fera*, *-foírea* equated with Lat. *parat* 'prepares') show a preverbal augment predictable from their bases, e.g. augm. pret. 3sg. *con:toroe* 'converted' (cf. *do:roi* '(has) turned'), 3pl. *con:foroirisset* '(have) procured' (cf. 3sg. *fo:ruar* '(has)

prepared').

The peculiar augmentation of the calque *im:dí-ben* 'circumcises' = Lat. *circum-cidit* (base *do:ben*, *-dí-ben* equated with Lat. *caedit* 'cuts') seen in *imme:rui-d^tbed* 'who had been circumcised' vs. *ní-ro:im^tdibed* 'had not been circumcised' (both Wb. 18d9) would, however, seem to be an exceptional instance of the process posited by VKG. In this particular case the base *do:ben*, *-díben* used the non-productive *cum* as augment (see 2.3 above), and it is no surprise that the new verb should prefer productive *ro*. Since, however, the base provided no pattern for its insertion, it would seem natural enough to place *ro* between the first lexical preverb *imm* and a base *-díben* felt as equivalent to the Latin simplex *caedit*.

In view of the various problems just enunciated, it seems desirable to re-examine the positional behaviour of *ro* as augment in the Glosses in the hope of discovering a classification of divergences from preverbal behaviour as defined earlier that will prove better motivated and more comprehensive than the notion of 'movable *ro*' formulated implicitly in VKG and explicitly in GOI. In what follows just such a well motivated and comprehensive account of deviations will be proposed in terms of a trend towards simplification of the system by introducing prevocalic and proclitic *ro*. Since only *imme:rui-dbed* in the Glosses seems to be unamenable to an explanation along such lines, the special factors identified in the preceding paragraph concerning this verb are of some importance in excluding it from the need for further consideration.

4.2. 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'. This example neatly illustrates prevocalic *ro*'s main range: it is usually prefixed in the expected elided form to the tonic portion of a verbal complex that would begin with a vowel if unaugmented. Examples from Wb. include deuterotonic *do:r'-air-^tn-gert* 'has promised' (*to:r'-ar(e)-in-gar-*) as opposed to the preverbal type in *do:ar-r^t-chet* 'has been prophesied' etc. (*to-ar(e)-ro-can-*), *do:r'-a-cart^tmar* 'we have argued' (*to:r'-ad-gar-*, 3sg. pres. *do:a-cair*), *as:r'-é-racht* 'has risen again' (*ess:r'-ess-reg-*, *as:éi-rig*), *do:r'-es-set* 'has poured' (*to:r'-ess-sem-*, *do:es-sim*), *do:r-im-^tthi-rid* 'has served' (*to:r'-imb(e)-ath(e)-reth-*, *do:im-^tthi-ret*), prototonic *-r'-íar-facht* 'has asked' (*:r'-íarm-fo-sag-*, *íarmi:fo-ig*), *-r'-imm^t-fo-l^tngar* 'I may cause' (*:r'-imb(e)-fo-loing-*, *im:fo-l^tngi*).

The innovatory nature of this pattern emerges most clearly from the not uncommon cases where it is in competition with augmented forms conforming to the apparently older strata documented in 2.1-3.2. To begin with, prevocalic *ro* sometimes seems to have failed to make inroads upon preverbal *ro* even where conditions were conducive to its development, as in the augmented forms of *do:ad-bat* 'shows' and *do:air-chain* 'prophesies' seen in 3sg. augm. pret. pass. *do:á-r^t-bas* 'has been shown', *do:ar-r^t-chet* 'has been prophesied' 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^t-fo-r^t-lainge* 'thou mayest cause' (*-imb(e)-fo-ro-loing-*) etc. vs. isolated 1sg. *-r-im^t-fo-l^tngar* 'I may cause' (see previous para.), augm. pret. 3sg. *do:a-r^t-chiúir* vs. *do:r'-ad^t-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 *cum*, as in augm. pret. pass. 3sg. *do:rr'-ind-^tnacht* (Wb. 20d15) vs. normal *do:é-com-^tnacht* 'has been bestowed' (*do:ind-^tnaig*) 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 *cum* as first lexical preverb followed by a consonant (see 2.2): where a vowel followed, it had already given way to prevocalic *ro*, whence *con:r'-air-leic* 'has allowed, (*con:air^t-leici*), *con-id:r'eirb* '(when) he had entrusted himself' (*con:erbai*) etc.

Because prevocalic *ro*, unlike the corresponding preverbal augment, did not occupy the same position in the chain as the lexical preverb *ro*, it became possible to use it in order to give *ro*-compounds with an appropriate vowel-initial tonic portion distinctive augmented forms that they had previously lacked (see 3.2). Thus 3sg. (formally unaugmented) pret. deut. *as:ro-choíli* 'has determined' (Wb. 10b20, referring to *indicavit*) unsuitable for prevocalic *ro* vs. augm. pret. prot. *dia-nd:r'-e-r^t-choíl* 'to whom he has decreed it' (Ml. 46c7, *ess-ro-coíl-*; see VI.4.2 on *-i* vs. zero) compatible with such augmentation. In the case of *ind:á-r^tban* 'banishes' (*in(de)-ad-ro-uss-be(n)-*) both deut. and prot. forms could acquire prevocalic *ro* as augment, whence 3sg. augm. pret. *a-ta:r'-á-r^t-bi* 'has banished them' and similar forms in Ml. as well as *na-chim:r'-ind-a-r^t-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-^tlliset*, *-á-r^t-il^tset* 'have earned' etc. (*ad-ro-sli-*) in the Glosses despite the 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 at least as amenable to explanation in terms of prevocalic usage. Cases where only one of these preverbs was vowel-initial were more frequent, and then either the deuterotonic or the prototonic form, but not both, might begin the stressed portion of the complex with augment *r'*-, as in regular *im:fo-r^t-ling* etc. vs. *-r'-im^t-fo-l^tngar* (alongside normal *-im^t-fo-r^t-lainge* etc.), *do:r'-etar-racht* 'has been included' (alongside normal *do:etar(-r^t)-rid* 'has included' etc.) vs. *-t'-etar(-r^t)-raid* 'has included', *do:r'-int-ai* 'has turned' (alongside *do:int-arr-ai*) vs. *-t'int-arrad* 'might turn', augm. pret. 1pl. *do:r'-a-cart^tmar* vs. 3sg. *-t'-a-r^t-gart* (*to-ad-gar-*, *do:a-ccair* 'pleads'). 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 holds for cases like augm. (preverbal) 3sg. subj. *eter:ro-sc^tra* 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*. The chief 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.

Moreover, the motive for the rise of prevocalic *ro* under suitable conditions at the expense of preverbal augments is not hard to find. The serious formal repercussions of preverbal augmentation upon compound verbs have been amply illustrated in 2.1-4, and various piecemeal tendencies towards simplification of this overloaded system in the interests of greater synchronic predictability have already been documented in 2.5. The advantage of prevocalic over preverbal *ro* was precisely the synchronic simplicity and relatively wide application of the rule for derivation of such augmented forms from their unaugmented counterparts: elided *r'*- was simply prefixed to an initial stressed vowel and had no further formal effect,

principally because loss of its vowel left the syllable count unaltered and thus forestalled any impact upon syncope patterns. Thus 3sg. pret. unaugm. *do:int-ai* > augm. *do:r'-int-ai* (encroaching upon *do:int-arr-ai*), unaugm. *do:ind-^tnacht* > augm. *do:r'-ind-^tnacht* (encroaching upon *do:é-com-^tnacht*), unaugm. *do:a-cart* > augm. *do:r'-a-cart* (ousting *do:á-r^t-gart*), unaugm. *as:in-gab*, *-es-^tngab* > augm. *as:r'-in-gab*, *-r'-es-^tn-gab* (replacing putative **as:é-r^t-gab*, **-es-^t-ra-gab*) and so on. The thrust towards synchronic simplification of the system is obvious, even though it is partially obscured by the transitional nature of the change in our sources.

It seems clear on grounds of statistical frequency and motivation that the initial impulse to place *ro* before preverbs beginning with a vowel, regardless of the position it might otherwise be expected to occupy in the chain, came from the above environment where a vowel introduced the unaugmented tonic portion. Despite its positional deviance within the preverb chain, prevocalic *ro* remains within the broadest parameters of preverbal augmentation of compound verbs by invariably staying in the tonic portion of the verbal complex. That said, its placement before the first lexical preverb in relevant prototonic forms like *-r'-etar-scar* breaches a major positional constraint upon strictly preverbal augments (see 2.1).

Since *f-* was lenited to zero, vowel-initial forms in a leniting context (e.g. 3sg. past subj. rel. *fu:erad* 'that he had provided' at Wb. 33b13, base form *fo:fera*) might *a priori* correspond to unlenited forms with either initial vowel or *f-*. This ambiguity has again and again in the history of Irish proved capable of generating *f-* in unlenited forms that previously lacked it (e.g. OIr. *ní:ása*, *ásaid* 'does not grow, grows' but Mod. Ir. *ní fhásann*, *fásann* on the model of *ní fhágann*, *fágann* 'does not leave, leaves' etc.), and examples occur as far back as Old Irish. Where a pretonic preverb with final vowel was followed by stressed *uss*, the latter was particularly prone to prefix *f-* in this way as a hiatus filler, as in *do:fúa-rat* 'remains over' (*de-uss-reth-*) or *do:fuis-sim* 'begets' (*to-uss-sem-*) with corresponding non-hiatus forms with preverbal augments like *do:rúa-rid* 'has remained over' (*de-ro-uss-reth-*) and *do:ró-sat* 'has begotten' (*to-ro-uss-sem-*) unaffected by this trend. Such doublets gave the impression of augmentation by simply substituting *r-* for *f-* and thus enabled the pattern to spread to *ar:foim* 'receives' (*ar(e)-fo-em-*) at least on the evidence of Wb. forms like augm. pret. 3sg. *ar:roít* 'has received' rather than expected but unattested **ar:fo-roít* etc.

A few verbs with deuterotonic forms conducive to the standard prevocalic *ro*

seem to retain this contrary to the normal trend as a non-initial element in prototonic forms that do not usually begin with a vowel. *Ar:roít*, *-arroít* looks like a possible example at first sight, since both deut. and prot. forms could reflect a sequence *ar(e)-r'-(f)o-em-*, but the prot. form could just as well be from *-ar-^t-roít* (*ar'-(f)o-ro-em-*) with preverbal *ro*. Another possible example, augm. pret. pass. 3sg. *con:roscaiged*, *-cumarscaiged* (from **-cum-r^t-scaig-* by vowel support, *cum-ro-uss-scuch-*) 'has been changed' is perfectly consonant in both forms with preverbal *ro*. Although it was claimed above that the distribution of *ad* (before consonants) and *ro* (before vowels) as augments in verbs containing *cum* as first lexical preverb was basically due to the spread of prevocalic *ro*, it is possible that there was an old nucleus where *uss* as lexical preverb conditioned preverbal *ro* as augment.

However, there is a residue of undoubted cases centring upon *do:é-ci* 'looks at', *fo:á-caib* 'leaves', *do:é-rig* 'foresakes' and *do:e-c^tm-alla* 'collects'. The deuterotonic forms are eminently suited to and duly show prevocalic *ro* as a rule, e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. *do:r'-é-catar* (*-c-* for *-c(h)^tch-* by syncope and delenition) or *do:r'-é-cach^ttar* (reduplication restored on analogy of prot. forms below), 1sg. *fo:r'-á-c^tbus*, 2pl. *do:r'-é-rachtid*, 3pl. *do:r'-e-c^tm-all^tsat*. The anomaly is that these prevocalic sequences normally seem to underlie the corresponding prototonic forms too despite the shift of *r'* to unstressed position, a state of affairs apparently at odds with the central hypothesis of this section. Thus we find augm. pret. 3sg. *-de-r^t-cachae*, subj. 2sg. (dep.) *-de-r^t-caither* with *-derc-* implying *-de-r'-in-ci-* rather than the **-der^tch-* expected from *-d'-in-ro-ci-* with preverbal augment. Similarly augm. past subj. 3pl. *-fa-r^t-cab^ttis* implying *-fo-r'-ad-ga(i)b-* rather than *-f'-ad-ro-gab-* expected to yield **-f-á-r^t-ga(i)b-*, augm. pret. 3pl. *-de-r'-e-rachtatar* rather than putative **-d'-é-r^t-racht-* compatible with *-d'-ess-ro-reg-*, and augm. pret. 1sg. *-ta-r-com-^tlus* implying *-to-r'-ess-cum-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 (cf. 2.5), and there is no difficulty in positing a similar relationship between *do:r-é-racht(-)* and *-de-r-e-racht(-)*, particularly since putative preverbally augmented **do:é-r^t-racht(-)*, **-d-é-r^t-racht(-)* etc. would have been indistinguishable from the corresponding unaugmented forms. The prototonic forms of the other three verbs in the previous paragraph can likewise be explained as due 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 in the interests of greater synchronic similarity. This explanation is, in fact, strongly supported by various vestiges of preverbal augmentation in these verbs. Thus early augm. pret. 3pl. deut. *tu:e-r[†]-c(h)om-[†]lasat* (Wb. 7a7, *prima manus*) and later attested 3sg. pass prot. *t-a-r[†]-chom-[†]lad* (LU 9772) etc. show reflexes of preverbal augmentation (except for the secondary accommodation of **(-)tarch-* to 'prevocalic' *(-)tarc-*, itself modelled on patterns like *do:rei-lic*, *-ta-r[†]-laic* 'has cast' (*to-ro-léic-*), in place of original **(-)t'erch-*). Augm. pret. 3sg. *fo:r-a-gab* (Ml. 30a9), 3pl. *fo:r-a-gab[†]sat* (95a 12) 'has/have left' contain a lenited *g* and, in the second example, a syncope pattern difficult to square with old prevocalic *fo-r'-ad-gab-* (expected 3pl. **fo:r-a-c[†]baiset*). The most likely explanation is that they are due to confusion of an old preverbally augmented **fo:á-r[†]gab(-)*, which happens not to be directly attested but must be posited in any case to account for unaugmented *fu:á-c[†]bat* etc. (see 2.5), with the subsequently predominant prevocalic type *fo:r'-a-cab(-)* or *fo:r'-á-cab(-)*.

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 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.

4.2. Although effective as a means of rationalising the morphology of augmentation where the tonic portion of a compound verb began with a vowel, prevocalic *ro* had little or no simplificatory potential beyond this somewhat limited environment. A more generally applicable strategy was needed, and for this the shift already documented for simple verbs (X.3.1-2) from inherited preverbal *ní:rr-an[†]sam* 'we have not remained', *co:ra-g[†]baiset* 'until they had taken' etc. to new and less involved proclitic types like *co-rru:anat* 'that they may remain' or *ní-ro:gab[†]sam* 'we have not taken' provided an obvious model. This proclitic *ro* attached to conjunct particles shared with the prevocalic type described in 4.2 the advantage of minimizing the formal consequences of augmentation but surpassed

it by being equally effective with consonant-initial tonic portions and those beginning with a vowel.

Proclitic augmentation of dependent compound verbs frequently alternates 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:lui*) vs. (proclitic) *ní-ro:hé-la* 'may he not escape' (Wb. 30a10), augm. (prevb.) pret. 3sg. *ní-m:tho-r[†]-gaíth* 'has not deceived me' (Ml. 38a13, *to-ro-gaíth-*, *do:gáetha*) vs. (procl.) 1pl. *ní-ro:tho-gaí[†]sam* 'we have not deceived' (16a22), augm. (prevb.) past subj. 1sg. *co:to-roi-llinn* 'that I might earn' (*Mon. Tall.* 136.27, *to-ro-sli-*, *do:slí*) vs. (procl.) pret. 1pl. *ní-ro:thui-[†]llisem* 'we have not earned' (Wb. 24d6). Addition of independent forms to the picture yields a third variant, augm. (prevb.) subj. 3sg. *eter:ro-sc[†]ra* 'he should separate', in the first set above as well as further alternations such as augm. pret. 3pl. (prevoc.) *fri-t:r-a-catar* 'had hoped for it' vs. (procl.) *ní-ru:fres-[†]cach[†]tar* 'have not expected' (Ml. 131c10 & 26b25, *fris:a-cci*) and 2sg. (prevoc.) *con-id:r-air-leicis* '(than) thou hast permitted it' vs. (procl. 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 & 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 of augment made it possible to dispense completely with the complexities of preverbal augmentation where only the deuterotonic unaugmented set began with a vowel (contrast *as:r-ingabsat*, *-r-es-n-gabsat* in 4.2 with vowel-initial deut. as well as prot. forms and prevoc. *ro* augmenting both).

Straightforward synchronic derivation of augmented from corresponding unaugmented forms had 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 basically vowel-initial stressed portion. However, where the tonic portion of such deuterotonic forms began with a consonant, there was still no viable alternative to the morphophonemic intricacies of the preverbal augment. The 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 with a conjunct particle.

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 appended to 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'tset* (90b17) 'they had denied'. The formal advantages of the proclitic augment, particularly in syncopated forms like the 3pl., are obvious in relation to unaugm. pret. 3sg. *do:sluind*, 3pl. *do:sluind'tset*. 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 (see X.3.2). Because proclisis in this particular environment does not usually affect *ro*'s overall position, it is not always easy or even possible to differentiate proclitic from preverbal *ro* here owing to Old Irish orthographic conventions, but the diagnostics given in X.3.1 for augmented simple verbs should work for most augmented deuterotonic compounds too. Even on a conservative estimate, proclitic *ro* seems to be used with compounds liable to a preverbal augment second in the chain a good deal more frequently than GOI 339 implies, the following being typical enough examples. Augm. pret. 3sg. *ad-ro:neestar* (Wb. 4c25, *in(de)-ro-ne-sed-*, pres. *ind:ne-at*; cf. IX.1.1 and I.2.9e) '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-cum-sni-*, *ad:co-snai*, cf. IX.1.1) 'had striven'. A quite exceptional instance of the shift from preverbal to proclitic *ro* in a deuterotonic compound actually involving a change of position in the preverb chain is augm. pret. 3sg. (procl.) *co-ru:thoí* (Ml. 55c22, *con:toi*) 'has converted' contrasting with more normal (prevb.) *con:to-roe* (123b7, *cum-to-ro-so-*, cf. IX.1.2).

Alternations such as augm. pret. 3pl. deut. (prevoc.) *fri-t:r'-acatar* vs. prot. (procl.) *ní-ru:frescachtar* have been noted earlier in this section, and the converse may also occur where appropriate, as in augm. pret. 3sg. pass. deut. (procl.)

as-ro:llennad (Ml. 124d17) 'has been polluted' vs. 1pl. prot. (prevoc.) *nad:r'-éi-l't disem* (63d15, *as:lenna*) '(when) we have not polluted'. Proclitic *ro* may be attested with both sets, e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. *in-ru:sam^tlasatar* (Sg. 112b4) 'they have imitated' and 1sg. *as-ru:lúus* (Wb. 17d16) 'I have escaped' vs. augm. past subj. 2pl. *con-ro:int^t-sam^tlithe* (Wb. 17a13, *in:sam^tlathar*) 'that you might imitate' and *ní-ro:hé-la* (Wb. 30a10, *as:luf*) 'may he not escape' respectively. Since proclitic *ro* inevitably occupies second place in the frame of the verbal complex and the same position is likewise central to prevocalic *ro* (see 4.2), 'movable' *ro* (see 4.1) 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, as in the above examples. However, prevocalic and proclitic *ro* explain the situation more adequately, since a reason can then be given for fluctuations between proclisis of *ro* and its placement in the tonic portion. This is also true of alternations such as (prevb., second in chain) *do:rí-l'tisset* vs. (procl.) *do-ru:sluind^tset*, the apparent conformity of which to Thurneysen's definition of 'movable *ro*' is belied by prototonic augm. subj. 1sg. (prevb.) *-de-r^t-lind* (Wb. 10c14) 'I may deny'.

Like prevocalic *ro* (see 4.2), proclitic *ro* showed some tendency to encroach upon rarer preverbal augments like *cum* as well as upon *ro*, and also had some potential to supply compounds containing *ro* as a lexical preverb with distinct augmented forms that they had originally lacked (3.2). Thus augm. pret. 3sg. *for-t:[c]hu-i* (Ml. 33a18) 'has completed it' shows the original *cum*-augmentation of *for:fén* (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^tchoín* (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.

4.4. The elaborate details of the presentation in this and the previous chapter may now be pared down to a broad outline of the key features and developments of the augment system in the Old Irish period.

Due allowance being made for changes of root in a handful of cases (X.1, XI.1) and for lack of augmentation in some others (3.1-2), augmentation typically consisted in adding a preverb or (very rarely, see IX.2) preverbs to the verb in question. Apart from a few isolated alternatives, *cum*, *ad* and (by far the commonest

and most widespread) *ro* were the main augments. The basic pattern of behaviour for such augments was to occupy the same position in the chain as the corresponding lexical preverbs, as long as this did not result in placement before the first lexical preverb (see 2.1). This definition suffices fully for *cum* and *ad*, partially for *ro*, and generally implies a fixed position within or after the chain of lexical preverbs (see IX.1 and XI.2.2-4 for details). As far as lexical compound verbs were concerned, these rules inevitably added these preverbal augments to the stressed part of the verbal complex, upon which they inflicted varying degrees and various types of formal disruption (see especially 2.5 above). The upshot was an extremely cumbersome and synchronically unpredictable system ripe for streamlining in two main directions.

The first was a tendency to spread *ro* both as a replacement of other augments and as a means of augmenting hitherto defective verbs. Considerable progress in this direction had probably already been made before our earliest documentation, and limited further developments in the Old Irish period mostly concerned the innovatory types of *ro* (4.2-3), leaving the process of homogenization far from complete.

The second trend was towards minimizing and regularizing the formal impact of *ro*-augmentation. Preverbal *ro* as augment converted lexically simple verbs into deuterotonic *ro*:V and prototonic C:*ro*V quasi-compounds in independent and dependent position respectively, and was inserted into lexical compounds (P = any preverb except non-initial *cum*, *uss* or *ne*, which are represented by P*) to give independent P:(P₂..) *ro*(P*)V and dependent C:P(P₂..) *ro*(P*)V. Although it remained stationary in relation to the verb and any lexical preverbs present, this type of *ro* was responsible for myriad individual divergences between augmented and corresponding unaugmented forms, e.g. augm. pret. (simple) 3pl. *ro:gab^tsat* vs. unaugm. *gab^tsait*, *ní:ra-g^tbais^tet* vs. *ní:gab^tsat*, (compound) 3sg. *do:á-r^t-chiúir* (confusion of *-aith^t-ro-* with *-ad-ro-*) vs. *do:aith^t-chiúir*, *(-)'t'-á-r^t-chiúir* vs. *(-)'t'-aith^t-chiúir*, 3sg. pass. *im:fo-r^t-linged* vs. *im:fo-l^tnged*, *ní:im^t-(f)o-r^tlinged* vs. *ní:im^t-(f)o-l^tnged*, 3pl. *do:rí-l^ttisset* vs. *do:sluind^tset*, *ní:de-r^t-lind^tset* vs. *ní:dí-l^ttisset*.

Ro in *ro:gab^tsat* etc. was quite susceptible to analysis as a conjunct particle rather than a preverb, and this would imply dependent C-*ro*:V. In this way far more convenient oppositions such as *ní-ro:gab^tsat* vs. *ní:gab^tsat* arose to challenge

inherited *ní:ra-g^tbaiset* vs. *ní:gab^tsat* and so on. Lexical compounds, however, never placed preverbal *ro* in front of the first lexical preverb, and so had no inherited base capable of triggering analysis of the augment as a conjunct particle. Simplification here had to proceed by a more circuitous route.

Where the stressed preverb of a deuterotonic or prototonic compound began with a vowel (P^V), an elided form of *ro* placed before this would have no further effect and would thus constitute a single and homogeneous differentiating factor between augmented and corresponding unaugmented forms, e.g. *ní:r'-im^t-fo-l^tnged* in competition with *ní:im^tfo-r^t-linged* and formally closer to *ní:im^t-fo-l^tnged* or *do:r,-aith^tchiúir* vying with *do:á-r^tchiúir* as a more predictable counterpart to *do:aith^t-chiúir*. Thus the standard type of preverbal augment was tending to give way to a deviant type, best termed prevocalic, under these conditions. The shift can be formulated as preverbal $P:P^V_2(P_3)ro(P^*)V$ or $C:P^V(P_2..)ro(P^*)V$ to prevocalic $P:r'P^V_2(P_3..)V$ or $C:r'P^V(P_2..)V$. This was only applicable to both deuterotonic and prototonic forms of a given verb on the rather rare occasions when its first and second lexical preverbs began with vowels as in the case of *as:r'-in-gab*, *ní:r'-es^tngab* vs. unaugm. *as:in-gab*, *ní:es^tngab*.

The new pattern *C-ro:V* with simple verbs triggered the development of proclitic *ro* after conjunct particles among compound verbs too, whence a partial shift from preverbal $C:P(P_2..)ro(P^*)V$ to proclitic *C-ro:P(P_2..)V* that had the advantage of leaving the tonic portion virtually unchanged (apart from lenition after *C-ro:*) in the augmented and corresponding unaugmented forms, e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. (prevb.) *ní:to-r^t-oil^tset* to a more manageable (procl.) *ní-ro:thui^tlliset* in relation to unaugm. *ní:tui^tlliset*. Such proclitic augmentation was most necessary as a strategy of simplification where the tonic portion began with a consonant, but the model of (prevb.) *ní:rr'-an* or (conj. part.) *ní-ro:an* 'has not remained' etc. with vowel-initial simple verbs triggered proclitic *C-ro:P^V(P_2..)V* even alongside the perfectly straightforward prevocalic $C:r'P^V(P_2..)V$, e.g. *in-ru:etar-scar* beside *in:r'-etar-scar*. Proclitic *ro* equalled prevocalic *ro* in morphological simplicity but surpassed it in potential range. The last exclusive preserve of preverbal *ro*, deuterotonic compounds with consonant-initial unaugmented tonic portion (P^c or V^c), now became vulnerable to shifts from stressed to proclitic *ro* according to the formula $P:roV^c$ or $P:ro-cum/ne-V$ to $P-ro:V^c$ or $P-ro:cum/ne-V$, e.g. augm. pret. 3pl. (prevb.) *do:rí-l^ttisset* to (procl.) *do-ru:sluind^tset* vs. unaugm. *do:sluind^tset*.

Augm. pret. 3sg. (procl.) *co-ru:thoí* alongside (prevb.) *con:to-roí*, unaugm. *con:toi* is a quite isolated instance of $P-ro:P^C_2(P_3..)V$ vying with normal $P:P^C_2(P_3..)ro(P^*)V$

Since the innovatory prevocalic and proclitic patterns for *ro* regularly entailed second position in the verbal complex's basic frame and since even preverbal *ro* came second in the deuterotonic forms of the numerous compounds with only one lexical preverb, there is no difficulty in seeing why apparent instances of 'movable' *ro* (see 4.1) should be so numerous. However, all of these can be accounted for more rationally and efficiently in terms of the categories used here, the one apparent exception, *imme:rui-d^tbed* etc., being due to special factors already discussed (4.1). A further exception would be augm. 3sg. subj. *do:ro-d^tba* (*Thes.* II, 325.19) 'may destroy', pret. pass. *do:ro-d^tbad* (*Fél.* Prol. 96) 'has been destroyed', were these augmented forms of a *to-de-be(n)-* (so *VKG* II, 462). However, this verb is a ghost and these forms, all of them occurring in later manuscripts, are due simply to 'Middle Irish' metathesis of *do:ro-b^tda*, *do:rob^tdad* etc. from *do:bádi* 'destroys' with perfectly normal preverbal *ro* (cf. *bidba* for earlier *bibdu* 'criminal' for a parallel metathesis). As should have become clear at various points in the preceding sections (4.2-3), the main trouble with the doctrine of 'movable' *ro* is that it offers no real explanation of the development and distribution of the different attested patterns of *ro*-augmentation.

Not only the development but also the synchronic distribution of these may be formulated a good deal more precisely in terms of preverbal, prevocalic and proclitic usage as defined above. As a residual type still far from defunct, preverbal *ro* is found with verbal complexes of virtually any shape, probably being most resilient with commoner verbs. Prevocalic *ro* competed with it in one specific environment, namely where the tonic portion of the verb began with a vowel (II and V below). After a conjunct particle (IV and V), both preverbal and prevocalic *ro* were under threat from the latest arrival, proclitic *ro*, which was also beginning to rival preverbal *ro* in deuterotonic compounds with a consonant-initial tonic portion (III below).

Preverbal *ro* deviates but little from the positional behaviour of the corresponding lexical preverb, whereas prevocalic *ro* deviates a great deal more but still functions broadly like a preverb. When attached to a conjunct particle, proclitic *ro* itself functions in essence as a conjunct particle, but proclitic *ro* attached to a pretonic preverb is quite anomalous and behaves like neither a preverb ($P:roV$ etc.)

nor a conjunct particle (*ro*:PV etc.). The lateness of this pattern is clear from its preservation of features of juncture rather than contact (cf. I.2.2b), e.g. procl. *as-ru:lúus* like prevb. deut. *as:ru-lai* with 'juncture' *-s:r-* as opposed to prot. *-é-r[†]-los* with 'contact' treatment of the group or *ad-ro:neestar* like 'juncture' *ad:roi-lli* as opposed to 'contact' *-ái-ri-lli* 'earns' (cf. further IX.3.2). This ambiguous status and particularly late development presumably account for the failure of proclitic *ro* to compete with prevocalic *ro* over the latter's range after pretonic preverbs, although it did so with some success after conjunct particles.

Nevertheless, the overall trend was evidently towards proclisis of *ro* as a generally applicable means of ironing out the morphophonemic complications of augmentation, and compound verbs were at last beginning to catch simple verbs up by acquiring a nucleus of usages where *ro* behaved as a conjunct particle rather than a preverb. Because of their comparatively slow start, however, the compound verbs were not to make further significant progress in this direction until after the Old Irish period (see XII.4.2a). In the meantime the transitional and incomplete nature of the simplification of augment morphology in Old Irish had brought about a temporary state of confusion more serious in some respects than what had preceded it.

In conclusion, the basic position implied for Old Irish by the Glosses above all may be tabulated formulaically as follows.

UNAUG- MENTED	PREVERBAL	AUGMENTED PREVOCALIC	PROCLITIC
(I) P:P ^C ₂ (P _{3..})V	P:P ^C ₂ (P _{3..}) <i>ro</i> (P*)V	-	(v. rare)
(II) P:P ^V ₂ (P _{3..})V	P:P ^V ₂ (P _{3..}) <i>ro</i> (P*)V	P: <i>r'</i> P ^V ₂ (P _{3..})V	
(III) P:V ^C	P: <i>ro</i> V ^C	-	P- <i>ro</i> :V ^C
or P:P* ^C V	P: <i>ro</i> P* ^C V	-	P- <i>ro</i> :P* ^C V
(IV) C:P ^C (P _{2..})V	C:P ^C (P _{2..}) <i>ro</i> (P*)V	-	C- <i>ro</i> :P ^C (P _{2..})V
(V) C:P ^V (P _{2..})V	C:P ^V (P _{2..}) <i>ro</i> (P*)V	C: <i>r'</i> P ^V (P _{2..})V	C- <i>ro</i> :P ^V (P _{2..})V

CHAPTER XII

Key 'Middle Irish' Developments

1. In describing the evolution of Irish as revealed in the more or less continuous literary record from at least the seventh century A.D. onwards some scholars have been wont to recognize four main phases, namely *Archaic Irish* (before c. 700 A.D.), *Old Irish* (from roughly the beginning of the 8th to the middle of the 10th century A.D.), *Middle Irish* (c. mid-10th. to late 12th. century A.D.) and *Modern Irish* (late 12th. century onwards). Significant further subdivisions in the modern period spanning nearly eight centuries need not concern us here, since the present focus is upon the major changes leading from the rather inefficient complexities of Old Irish verbal morphology to the considerably streamlined and rationalized system of so-called 'Classical' Modern Irish, the clear textual emergence of which can be placed around the end of the 12th. century.

The principal diagnostics used to differentiate Archaic from Old Irish belong to the spheres of phonology and syntax, especially word order, rather than morphology, and it has recently been shown that the relevant syntactic features in particular by no means necessarily point to a pre-eighth-century date. Even the phonological features need to be treated with considerable caution, since highly literate scribes were quite capable of producing archaizing spellings throughout the so-called Old and Middle Irish periods. It follows that only their cumulative and consistently accurate presence in a text can provide reasonably convincing grounds for assuming a seventh-century original. Whatever about the questionable general validity of Archaic Irish as a basically chronological stage in the language's development, its virtual irrelevance to morphology, verbal or otherwise, is not in dispute, and there is no point in trying to distinguish it from Old Irish in a morphological treatise.

In accordance with their wish 'to facilitate the study of the interesting and difficult language commonly called Old-Irish, and for this purpose to put scholars in possession of trustworthy materials' the compilers of the indispensable

two-volume *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus* set out their terms of reference as follows in their preface. 'By Old-Irish we understand the Celtic language spoken and written in Ireland in the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries... If we include compositions such as the Martyrology of Oengus, parts of the Annals, parts of the so-called Brehon Laws, some pieces in the Book of the Dun, the Book of Leinster, the Bodleian MSS. Rawl. B. 502 and Rawl. B. 512, and other codices, which were undoubtedly produced in the Old-Irish period, the bulk and variety of Old-Irish literature still in existence is considerable. But unfortunately the Middle-Irish transcribers have often modernised or corrupted these ancient documents. Therefore, in forming a collection of texts on which scholars may rely with confidence the only safe rule is to exclude all matter not found in MSS anterior to the eleventh century'. This is indeed the practice followed in *Thes.* I and II, 1-297, which provides a comprehensive collection of such material, the bulk of which comes from manuscripts plausibly dated to the 8th. and 9th. centuries. Old Irish glosses on Latin texts are markedly preponderant, the three largest individual collections by far being from Würzburg (Wb., on a text of the Pauline epistles), Milan (Ml., on a Latin commentary on the Psalms) and St. Gall (Sg., on Priscian's Grammar of Latin). This material from manuscripts roughly contemporary with the Old Irish period is inevitably the corpus from which the norms of Old Irish grammar have been established in the first instance by modern scholarship, since it alone can be safely assumed to be free of the possible distortions of significantly later recopying.

Substantial though these Old Irish records are, they do leave some gaps in attestation, and these must be filled in as far as possible by quarrying the arguably early material surviving only in later manuscripts for forms compatible with or predictable from Old Irish usage as established from the earlier record. Recognition of such forms as Old Irish inevitably encompasses various degrees of probability ranging from the virtually certain to the frankly speculative, but reasonable confidence is usually attainable.

This process of using mostly eighth- or ninth-century documents as a bedrock but supplementing these where necessary or desirable from apparent survivals in later manuscripts was adopted to good effect by Thurneysen in his standard *Grammar of Old Irish* and has been followed in the present work too. For all its morphological complexity and inconvenience, the Old Irish so deduced appears to

have had a rather firmly regulated grammar conducive to its retention as a relatively stable medium of written vernacular discourse for some two or three centuries. Relative stability does not, of course, preclude steady systematic change or sporadic deviations from the standard. Examples of such developments in sources emanating from the Old Irish period proper have been given in the preceding chapters, and still more will be found below. Nevertheless, the vast majority of usages found in sources plausibly datable to the ninth century or earlier conform to a consistent, if cumbersome, grammatical system of the kind described by *OIPG*, *GOI* or, as far as the verb is concerned, the foregoing chapters.

Attempts at a more or less clear chronological definition of Old, Middle and Modern Irish along the lines indicated at the beginning of this chapter are at best crude, particularly as regards the arbitrary transitional dates, and at worst misguided, insofar as linguistic register rather than date may be the crucial factor in at least some cases. At all events, it seems best to keep a strictly linguistic inquiry unencumbered by gratuitous and often unanswerable questions of absolute date. Old Irish can be defined linguistically in terms of a wide range of specific grammatical traits that together constitute a distinctive system. Essential conformity to the appropriate criteria, which have been set out in the previous eleven chapters as far as the verb is concerned, then constitute grounds for describing an individual form or a whole text as Old Irish, regardless of the date of the manuscript in which it is preserved.

All varieties of Modern Irish are clearly differentiated from Old Irish by a far-reaching overhaul of the verbal system and various other developments of lesser concern for present purposes. A greatly simplified verbal morphology was achieved by a number of major developments. To begin with, there was wholesale creation of new simple verbs from old prototonic compound bases (see 5.1-2 below), thus marginalizing reflexes of the old deuterotonic/prototonic opposition to a handful of irregular verbs. A further factor was the virtual elimination of oppositions between unaugmented and augmented forms within a given tense or mood along with the introduction of almost invariable proclisis of the augment, where it did occur, to minimize its formal repercussions (see 4.1-2). The 'weak' pattern of immutable root shape throughout the various inflectional stems (II.2.2-3) was strongly preferred, and the multiplicity of stems used to express a given category (III-VII) drastically pruned (see 6 below). Not only were the diverse personal endings of present and

preterite largely homogenized (6.1 and 9) but the affixed pronouns (I.3.3-5) were mostly phased out in favour of new independent object pronouns (2.3 below). These and other modifications of a more restricted nature will be referred to at various points below, but the foregoing sketch should suffice as a bare indication of the major changes involved.

The upshot was a coherent system that was to prove remarkably durable both as a rigidly codified literary standard in force for several centuries and as a less standardised spoken language that has preserved many of its fundamental features in varying proportions right down to the present-day Gaelic dialects of Ireland and Scotland. As far as literary usage is concerned, Old and Classical Modern Irish both represent comparatively stable and normative phases in the language's evolution, while being readily distinguishable from each other with reference to a whole range of intervening transformations that affected the verbal system particularly strongly. However, problems of definition become a good deal more acute when the intermediate phase conventionally termed Middle Irish is brought into the picture. In textual terms Middle Irish may be rather vaguely and negatively defined in the first instance as having considerable, if variable, grammatical affinities with both Old and Classical Modern Irish while conforming to the overall norms of neither.

As a rule, Middle Irish texts can be analysed in terms of three linguistic strata, intermingled in varying proportions. The first of these comprises forms compatible with standard Old Irish usage, the second forms that anticipate Classical Modern Irish norms, and the third forms consonant with neither. Although this last category presumably includes natural developments that failed to gain acceptance into the Classical Modern standard because they had either already been superseded or were deemed unsuitable for other reasons, a good number of such phenomena may well be due to literary hypercorrections resulting from tension between the conservative first and innovatory second stratum. It must, of course, be realized that certain features of the system underwent no significant alteration between Old and Classical Modern Irish, and so are indeterminate as to stratum. These general points will suffice for the present, leaving the relevant details to the discussion below.

A text in which the first stratum is overwhelmingly preponderant, while the second or third are scarcely represented or even entirely absent, may safely be described as Old Irish, and a text lacking significant representation of strata one and three can be designated Modern Irish with equal confidence. The term Middle Irish

can accordingly be reserved for texts combining at least two of the diagnostic strata in question - even if the first or second should be quite dominant, there should be an appreciable admixture of one or both of the remaining strata. These criteria are for present purposes intended to be applied strictly descriptively to texts as transmitted, regardless of chronological considerations or the editorially crucial question as to whether the 'Middle Irish' appearance of a given text is due simply to the phase of initial composition or to an overlay of scribal modernizations during the copying, recopying or adaptation of an Old Irish original (Middle Irish originals would, of course, also be liable to subsequent scribal modernization).

Verbal forms peculiar to or compatible with the first stratum as described in the preceeding eleven chapters will be termed Old Irish regardless of the date of the manuscript in which they are attested. Third stratum forms are Middle Irish by definition, and this label will also be applied below to second stratum forms attested in Old or Middle Irish texts as defined in the previous paragraph. Second stratum phenomena will, as a rule, be ascribed to Middle as well as Modern Irish only if they are attested in one or more of the three earliest manuscripts containing plenty of Middle Irish material, namely *LU*, *LL* and *Rawl. B.502*, or in some still earlier source.

In what follows, then, 'Middle Irish' will basically apply to forms that deviate from the Old Irish standard and occur in texts which do not conform to the essential Modern Irish norm. In this sense, as will be seen in the rest of this chapter, a wide range of 'Middle Irish' developments are attested, either once only or sporadically, even in such definitively Old Irish sources as the Würzburg and Milan Glosses.

Seriously overcomplicated though it was in certain respects, the Old Irish verbal system was simplicity itself compared overall with its Middle Irish counterpart, which was still capable of generating an almost complete range of 'correct' Old Irish formations in addition to a sometimes bewildering array of innovatory usages. The relative stability, homogeneity and durability of written Old Irish in the face of internal pressures towards structural streamlining and simplification create the suspicion that even by the time of *Wb.* and *Ml.* it may have been an artificially fostered learned and literary standard in competition with more mundane registers of speech which were rather more evolved in the direction of an early Modern Irish grammatical type. If so, stray 'Middle Irishisms' can be put down to occasional breaches of the literary standard's defences by the odd lapse

into colloquial or hypercorrect usage. Although the comparative evidence would indicate that Old Irish does indeed reflect a stage in the everyday language's evolution, it appears unlikely that this stage was strictly contemporary with the written record, which bears abundant signs of an unnatural conservatism. The chance that the monstrously overblown system found in certain Middle Irish texts bore any close resemblance to normal speech, contemporary or otherwise, seems quite remote. It might be more reasonable to view it instead as essentially a written hybrid between the time-honoured but increasingly outmoded Old Irish literary standard (first stratum) and contemporary upper-register speech with a grammar ever closer to that of early Modern Irish (second stratum and part of third). Such tensions would be almost bound to generate hypercorrect and otherwise bogus forms in profusion (part of third stratum) until coherence was finally restored by the emergence of the Classical Modern literary standard.

Although valuable catalogues of the verbal systems of individual Middle Irish texts have been produced, a satisfactory synchronic grammar of Middle Irish in English has yet to be written. Liam Breatnach's major contribution on 'An Mheán-Ghaeilge' on pages 221-333 of *Stair na Gaeilge* (Maynooth, 1994) has, of course, gone a long way towards remedying this defect through the medium of Modern Irish. As indicated above, from a strictly synchronic point of view Middle Irish had a grammar that was at best quite permissively regulated and at worst might be considered the partly hybrid product of an unstable and inconsistent textual amalgam between a moribund Old Irish standard and a nascent early Modern Irish vernacular standing in an essentially diachronic relationship to each other.

A general description of Middle Irish usage is nonetheless desirable in order to facilitate the handling of the material involved, which is far more extensive in scope and interesting in subject matter than the strictly Old Irish corpus as identified by the compilers of *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*. As usual, it is the verbal system that presents most problems. The 'Old Irish' first stratum of that system has already been treated (see I-XI) in a manner intended to emphasise dynamic pressures within a fairly stable but far from immutable whole. The present chapter will, therefore, focus upon a wide range of innovatory verbal usages that deviate from Old Irish norms and are characteristic of so-called 'Middle Irish' texts above all despite isolated or sporadic occurrences of some of them in Old Irish sources. Rather than seeking to give a long synchronic catalogue of these, the present chapter aspires to

a dynamic diachronic approach geared to locating and explaining as many of the phenomena in question as possible within the broader context of the shift from an Old to a Modern Irish verbal system. In accordance with this aim examples of any given feature below will be kept to the rough minimum judged necessary to indicate basic trends and tensions rather than seeking to be in any way exhaustive. However, in what follows the examples from the first edition will on occasion be supplemented by some further instances culled from Breatnach's collection.

2.1. A considerable number of changes in the pronominal and relative systems as described in I.3.1-7 characterize Middle Irish and will be dealt with first, beginning with the clitic infixed and suffixed pronouns.

(a) The merger of previously distinct proclitic vowels as 'murmured' mid-central schwa (ə in phonetic transcription) eradicated standard Old Irish differentiation between, say, augm. pret. 3sg. *ro:gab* 'has seized', *ro:ngab* 'whom he has seized', *ro-m:gab* 'has seized me', *ro-s:(n)gab* 'has seized her/them' and *r-a:ngab* 'has seized him' or *r-a:gab* 'has seized it', which had all come to be pronounced /rə/. Consequently spelling confusions between now identically pronounced *o* and *a* affected pretonic preverbs or particles like *do*, *fo*, *ro* and *no*. Sometimes *a* was written for historic *o*, e.g. *da:lluid* 'came' (LL 31337), *ra:ráid* '(that) he said' (30875, 30889—but see 2.2 also on *ra-*, *da-* etc.), *co-ra-s:innarbsat* 'so that they expelled them' (31253). However, the main trend was towards replacement of *a* in forms with the 3sg. m. or n. infixed pronoun by the *o* spelling preponderant elsewhere, including usage with all other persons of the infixed pronouns, e.g. *no:mbertaigedar* 'vaunts himself' (LL 13077), *fo:n-ópair* 'attacks him' (LU 5004), *no:slaiss* 'thou shouldst strike him, (6070). In view of such *a/o* alternations in the basic pronouns and of the fact that *(n)d/ta-* and *(n)d/to-* variants of the composite pronouns (1.3.5) outside the third person were already common in Old Irish, it is hardly surprising that *o* occasionally replaces *a* in the historic *(n)d/ta* 3sg. f. or pl. of the latter in Middle Irish, e.g. *no-do:ansed* 'who would protect them' (LU 7776), *ar-do:petet* 'they entertain them' (8181).

(b) In the first and second persons of the basic infixed pronouns the identity of sequences of preverb plus 1 or 2sg. pronoun like *do-m:*, *fo-t:* with those of preposition plus possessive such as *do-m* 'to my', *fo-t* 'under thy' apparently gave rise to a tendency to use the 1 and 2pl. possessives *ar* 'our', *for*, *f/bar* 'your' (both

nasalizing) of Old Irish in place of the original infixed pronouns 1pl. *n(n)*, 2pl. *b*. Typical examples are *na-ch-ar:lén* 'do not wound us' (SR 1726), *na-ch-ar:ndílsi* 'he may not hand us over' (1551), *do-'r:rala(i)d* 'we have been put' (1754), *do-for:ficba* 'will come to you' (LU 1213), *ar-na-ch-bar:(n-)accaister* 'so that you be not seen' (6889). The 2pl. *bar* etc. is a good deal commoner than 1pl. *(a)r* and, presumably under the influence of the syntagm possessive *f/ba/or* plus noun, is occasionally prefixed to a simple verb without the help of *no* or the like: e.g., *for:bía* '(there shall be to you,) you shall have' (SR 1448), *messe for:sáera* '(it is) me that frees you' (SR 4831) and *is é far:saig* 'it is he who seeks you' (LL 7815).

(c) The rule governing the distribution of basic ('class A') and lenited composite ('class C') infixed pronouns in Old Irish (I.3.6) had largely broken down in Middle Irish, with the result that the former tended to be used even in the third person in relative clauses and the latter were occasionally found in main clauses, e.g. *is Ádom no-s:ordaiged* 'it is Adam who used to rule them' (SR 1112) but *ar-dot:chuibdig* 'adapt thyself!' (LU 3506), *no-d:slaid* 'strikes him' (3288), *do-dos:rósat* 'he (has) created them' (SR 1110). The most probable explanation would seem to be that the basic forms had mostly ousted the composite ones from relative clauses, and that sporadic use of such composite forms in main clauses was due to hypercorrection. This flux is conducive to sporadic confusions between other pronoun classes, e.g. *nach-dot:ro-marbus* '(that) I did not kill thee' (SR 1908, for *na-chat*), *ra-ta:fetamar* 'we know him' (LL 11865, 11877 etc., unmutated 'class B' composite for OIr. basic 'class A').

(d) As pointed out in I.3.5, first and second person forms of composite infixed pronouns simply prefix *(n)d/t* (*ch* after neg. *na(d)*) plus vowel to the corresponding basic forms, whereas the third person forms were not so directly related at first. However, there was a tendency to spread this simple relationship to the third person forms too. Thus 3sg. m. basic *a* (+NAS.) could trigger composite *(n)d/ta* or *cha* (+NAS.) in place of older *(n)d/t* or *ch* (+NAS.). There is a striking sporadic attestation as early as Wb. *ru-da:n-ordan* 'which has dignified him' (33c5), but the phenomenon becomes commoner in Middle Irish sources, e.g. *ra-ta:fetamar* in (c) above, *ro-da:car* 'loved him' (SR 3173), *co-nda:tarat* 'and gave him' (LU 1683), *co-no:rucur-sa* 'that I may take him' (LU 4408, see (a) on *a/o* and I.3.5 on *nd* to *n(n)*), *na-cha:n-innill* 'do not yoke it (m.)' (LU 6382), *na-chi:nghúasid* 'do not disturb him' (LU 3291, trivial orthographic variant of what was doubtless

pronounced /χə/).

Similar interaction between 3sg. f. or 3pl. basic *s* (+ NAS.) and composite *(n)d/ta* or *cha(-)* generated the normal Middle Irish composite *(n)d/tas*, *chas* etc. (with considerable trivial fluctuation in vocalism, and often *n(n)* for *nd*) for these persons, e.g. *atas:cím* 'I see them' (LL 38625), *atos:condaire* 'saw it (f.)' (242), *co-ndas:rara* 'until one put them' (32154), *co-nos:tuc* 'that I may bring her' (SR 1665), *ro-das:car* 'who loved them' (2991), *do-dos:rósat* in (c) above, *na-chas:cretid* 'do not believe it!' (SR 4700), *na-chas:bérad* 'that he would not take her' (LL 31148).

The basic point is that Old Irish 3sg. m./n. *(n)d/t*, 3sg. f./3pl. *(n)d/ta* (and also *ch*, *cha*) were giving way to Middle Irish 3sg. m./n. *(n)d/ta*, 3sg. f./3pl. *(n)d/tas* (likewise *cha*, *chas*) more predictable from basic *a*, *s* respectively (see 2.2 below on the virtual absence of 3sg. n. *(n)d/ta* in practice). This development is particularly marked in the 3sg. f./3pl., where *(n)d/tas* etc. is overwhelmingly preponderant in Middle Irish texts.

(e) In the 3sg. there was a tendency to confuse masculine and feminine forms (see 2.2 below for the neuters), principally because the originally fem. (and 3pl.) *s*-forms began to be used as masc too. This may have been triggered in part by the lack of a gender distinction in the 3pl., which used *s*-forms throughout. It is also probably a reflection of the decline of infixed pronouns, which had themselves already largely ousted the suffixed variety (I.3.3-4, a process accelerated in Middle Irish), in the contemporary spoken language (see 2.3 below). Typical examples are *ra-s:uc* 'took him' (LL 31233), *co-nas:tuc* 'until he brought him' (31242), *ar-na-chas:torsed* 'so that it should not reach him' (31427), *no-s:geib* 'seizes him' (31561). This pressure on the old 3sg. m. infix occasionally led to hypercorrect literary usages as a fem. or pl., e.g. *co-ro:n-innarba..... íat* 'until it expelled them' (LU 205).

2.2. One of the most significant changes in the nominal system between Old and Modern Irish was the reduction of the former's three genders by loss of the neuter to produce the latter's binary grammatical contrast between masculine and feminine only (cf. the progress from Latin to Romance, e.g. French). Middle Irish texts display their customary fluidity in relation to these two stages, retaining old neuters in many instances while frequently employing innovatory masculine or feminine features in others. Old neuter and new masculine may occur virtually side

by side in a text, neuter and masculine features on occasion even being intermingled in a single form, and neuter characteristics such as nasalization associated with the nom. sg. may be used hypercorrectly with words that never had been neuter. This confused state of affairs most probably reflects serious tension between literary norms retentive of old neuters and current speech in which the neuter had either disappeared or was at least quite moribund as a formal grammatical category. As one might expect, the latter stratum seems increasingly to have gained the upper hand over the former in the texts.

This crucial systematic change was bound to diminish the meaningful use of neuter pronouns, whether suffixed, infixes or other, and this would explain, say, the non-occurrence of innovatory 3sg. n. (*n*)*d/ta* in comparison with the corresponding masc. (2.1d). Far more important, however, was a tendency towards **petrification** of neuter singular infixes and suffixed pronouns, whereby they continued to be used despite loss of meaning with the result that verb plus neuter affix became synonymous with and eventually displaced corresponding forms without such an affix.

(a) Typical examples are *a-t:beir* 'says it' or *a-t:chl* 'sees it' contrasting with *as:beir* 'says' and *ad:cí* 'sees' respectively in Old Irish, but more often than not coming to mean simply 'says' and 'sees' in Middle Irish at the expense of *as:beir*, *ad:cí* without petrified old 3sg. n. pronoun. The linguistic reality of this phenomenon is confirmed by spoken Modern Irish (*a-*)*deir* 'says' from *a-t:beir* and (Ulster) '*tchl* 'sees' from *a-t:chl*.

This petrified *t* (+LEN.) is naturally confined as a rule to verbs with a first preverb compatible with main-clause composite ('class B') infixes in Old Irish and occurs far more freely where preverb plus infix combined to produce *a-t:* than elsewhere (see I.3.5). In *a-t:baill* 'dies' Old Irish already had one verb with a regular and presumably etymological (cf. Eng. 'snuffs it') petrified infix of this kind, and this may have provided the model for sporadic instances of petrified *a-t:*'s spread in the Old Irish Glosses, notably *a-t:ruirmed* 'has been reckoned' (Wb. 2c6, *ad:rími*), *a-t:roillisset* 'that they had deserved' (4c15) and *a-t:roilli* 'deserves' (Ml. 51d12, both *ad:roilli*) with lack of meaning guaranteed by passive, relative and prolepsis to a fem. noun respectively. These presumably hail from a spoken register in which the neuter gender was already under some threat, and over-reaction to such pressure would explain hypercorrect *ad:reig* 'rises' (Wb. 13a12) rather than

normally reflexive *a-t:raig* 'il s'élève' etc. Old Irish confusion between pretonic *as*, *in* and *ad* documented in I.2.9e might likewise have been triggered by a lower register *a-t* with petrification that tended to neutralize such 'learned' distinctions.

In Middle Irish texts *at* becomes quite endemic in certain such compounds in both main and relative clauses, e.g. *res at:chí* 'a vision that he sees' (LU 3292; OIr. *ad:c(h)í*), *at:chota* 'gets' (e.g. LU 1026; *ad:cota*), *at:bert* (augm.) *at:rubairt* 'said' (e.g. LL 37674, 37663; *as:bert*, *as:rubart*), *amal at:chondairc* 'as she saw' (3767; *ad:condairc*), *at:aig* 'thrusts' (33072; *ad:aig*), *at:luí* 'absconds' (33074; *as:luí*). Similar petrification sometimes occurs after *con*, e.g. *co-t:éraig* 'sets out' (33075, *con:érig*), *co-t:regat* 'they meet' (LU 6863, *con:ric*) or compromise *con-d:recat* (5885), *con-t:ric* (1527) with *n* of the preverb restored.

(b) It has already been seen that in the Middle Irish system lenition was the only distinction between, say, main clause *fo:ceird* 'puts' and *fo:cheird* 'puts (it)', both usually written *fo* (see 2.1a). Petrification of the 3sg. n. basic ('class A') pronoun in such cases would simply lead to the introduction of main-clause lenition after a pretonic preverb where there had been none, e.g. *fo:cheird* ousting *fo:ceird* in the sense 'puts'. In the case of preverbs construed with basic infixed pronouns in main clauses (I.3.3), this development is clearly parallel to the petrification of *t* (+LEN.) in (a) above with preverbs taking composite pronouns.

Like petrified *t* (2.2a), this main-clause lenition is very occasionally attested as early as the Old Irish Glosses, where it is presumably due to stray inroads from a lower register of speech in which pretonic vowels had already become /ə/. Notable examples are *ro:chrochsát* 'they have crucified' (Wb. 5c11), *du:thluchedar* 'he asks' (Ml. 38d1), *du:thluchim-se* 'I ask' (71c20), *fu:chéillfea* 'will take care of' (90c15) and *ad:chess* 'was seen' (96d1), which seems to reflect tension between learned *ad:cess* and more colloquial *at:chess* (cf. *at:ruirmed* and *ad:reig* in 2.2a).

This phenomenon is common in Middle Irish texts, where forms like *ra:chotail* 'slept' (LL 10239) and *ra:frecair* 'answered' (10245) may contain an orthographic reflex of the petrified pronoun but are more probably due to a general *o/a* fluctuation in which the *o*-forms predominated (see 2.1a), e.g. *fo:chairt* 'he cast' (LU 3281; OIr. *fo:cairt*), *do:tháet* 'he comes' (3284; *do:tét*), *ro:chan* 'he sang' (3591, 3665; (ro:)cechain), *do:choid* 'he went' (4024; *do:coid* or *luid*), *ro:chreit* 'he believed' (4089; *ro:creit(i)* or *creitis*), *ro:tharngir* 'prophesied' (4090, *do:(r')airngert*).

The standard Old Irish distinction between, say, *ní:ceil* 'does not conceal' and

ní:cheil 'does not conceal it' (I.3.3) was likewise tending to disappear through spread of *ní:cheil* with petrified pronoun in the sense 'does not conceal', a process possibly assisted by the lenition normal after the longer negative *nicon* in Old Irish, e.g. *nicon:chechrat* 'they will not love' (Wb. 30c4). Examples of this Middle Irish spread of main-clause lenition after *ní* include *ní:chélat* 'they will not conceal' (LU 8953; OIr. *ní:célat*), *ní:chéltar* 'it will not be concealed' (LL 33345, *ní:céltar*), *ní:tharmescad* 'it would not disturb' (LU 8566), *ní:chóemstais* 'they could not' (SR 932), *ní:chuingem* 'we do not seek' (1219).

Lenition after surviving pretonic preverbs, the negative and the past tense marker *do* (for *ro* or *no*, see 4.3 and end of 5.3 below) has become regular in Modern Irish main clauses as a result, e.g. classical *do-bheir* 'brings', *do-ní* 'does', *ní mhol(ann)* 'does not praise', *do mhol(astar)* 'praised', *do mholadh* 'used to praise', modern spoken *bheir*, *ní* (Ulster and Scots Gaelic), *ní mholann*, *(do) mhol*, *(do) mholadh* (all Irish dialects).

(c) Corresponding petrification of neuter suffixed pronouns with independent simple verbs (I.3.3) is also attested on occasion, as in 3sg. *gaibthi* 'he utters' (Sg. 26b7), *maiti* 'it breaks' (LU 4925) or 3pl. *bértait* 'they will carry off' (LL 13085), *céstait* 'they suffer' (SR 953). GOI 271 teaches that the special 3sg. m. or n. suffixed pronoun *-it* used with 3pl. verbs could also be meaningfully attached to 1pl. *-m(a)i* to give *-m(a)it* and to 1sg. fut. *-a* to give *-(a)it* in the first instance (see 6.6 on subsequent depalatalization of 1sg. fut. *-t*). Petrification of such a pronoun is then held responsible for the normal Middle Irish 1pl. abs. *-m(a)it*, attested as early as Wb. *guidmit* 'we pray' (15d18), and 1sg. abs. fut. *-(a)it* or *-et/-at* that yielded the Modern Irish 1pl. *-m(a)id* and 1sg. fut. *-(e)ad*. Examples include 1pl. *herálmít* 'we implore' (SR 2175), *guidmit* (3597), 1sg. *regait-se* 'I shall go' (LL 37151), *gébat-sa*, *gébait-sa* 'I will get' (LL 36634 and 36635 respectively), *failsigfit-sea* 'I shall reveal' (LU 173).

Since, however, there seem to be no unambiguous instances of *-it* as a meaningful suffix with a first person ending and any such usage would contravene the otherwise well established restriction of suffixed pronouns to third person absolute endings, it is both unnecessary and undesirable to explain 1sg. fut. or 1pl. *-(i)t* as a suffixed pronoun in origin. If 3pl. *ber(a)it* 'they carry' could change a putative *ber*t(a)i* to *ber*t(a)it* 'they carry it' and so on, there is no reason why 3pl. abs. *-(a)it* could not have similarly influenced 1pl. abs. *-m(a)i* to produce a more

highly characterized *-m(a)it* clearly distinguishable from rel. *-m(a)e*. Indeed, since Old Irish sources offer sporadic, and Middle Irish sources countless, spelling confusions demonstrating that once discrete unstressed final vowels were falling or had fallen together as /ə/ (cf. the unstressed proclitic vowels in 2.1a), such differentiation will have been particularly desirable. Once 1pl. abs. *-m(a)it* had come into competition with older *-m(a)i* (pronounced /-mə/), 1sg. fut. *-a* (pronounced /-ə/ and no longer distinct from identically pronounced 2sg. *-ae*) would obviously be ripe for remodelling to *-(a)it*.

(d) As one might expect, loss of pronominal sense through petrification reduced the lenited composite ('class C', I.3.5 and 6) infixed pronoun 3sg. n. *(i)d* (+LEN) to a mere relative marker. Even as early as the Glosses this incipient status was liable to be exploited as a hiatus-filler (cf. *GOI* 268), e.g. *do-d:esta* 'which is lacking' (Wb. 1a9, 23d17, 26d8 alongside rarer *desta*, presumably for *do:esta*, or *testa* identical with the non-rel. forms; cf. I.2.2 and 3.6), *fo-d:era* 'which causes' (Wb. 3c33, alongside less common type *fu:erad* 'which he should have produced' at Wb. 33b13; non-rel. *fo:fera*) but augm. pret. *fo:ru-ar* 'which he has prepared' (8b5, or *fo:ru-ar* 'which has caused' at 14c43 vs. *fo-d:era* 'which causes' at 14c42), *du-d:uccai* (Ml. 27d23) or *du-d:uic* (67a3) 'which he has brought/cited' (but standard *tu(i)c*, *do:u(i)c* identical with non-rel. far commoner). In Middle Irish texts merely relative *d* is quite well attested, and not only to avoid hiatus, e.g. *no-d:faídmis* 'whom we would send' (*LU* 597), *no-d:ragam* 'that we shall go' (*LL* 1614), *do-d:rónsat* 'that they had made' (*LU* 8002). Middle Irish use of *nach* in place of *na(d)* on occasion presumably originated in a similar petrification (cf. end of I.3.6), e.g. *nach:cúalammar*, *nach:fetammar* 'which we have not heard and do not know' (*LL* 7557).

(e) Occasionally non-neuter third persons may be used without real meaning, perhaps by hypercorrect response to the demise of infixed pronouns in contemporary speech (3.3), e.g. *do-s:fuit* 'she falls' (*SR* 1719), *do-s:luí* 'escaped' (*LU* 7979), *ní-s:ra-g^tbad* 'she was not taken' (*LU* 1229-30, by hypercorrect extension from usage of non-third person infixed pronouns with passives in Old Irish by VIII.6.2).

2.3. The foregoing sections bear abundant testimony to the steadily accelerating demise of the elaborate Old Irish system of affixed clitic object pronouns. In the later stages of this process all manner of textual confusions were

liable to occur as pronominal infixation itself gave way to the independent object pronouns normal in Modern Irish. Although an attempt has been made to highlight the major developments, the above treatment cannot claim to be exhaustive. Nevertheless, attention will now be shifted to the rising system of independent object and, on a far more limited scale, subject pronouns that constitute one of the most important features differentiating Modern from Old Irish. Such pronouns are far from common in twelfth century manuscripts, but this seems more likely to be due to the conservatism of literary usage than to a similar rarity in more normal contemporary speech.

In Old Irish the stressed independent personal pronouns (*GOI* 253-5) were for the most part confined to predicative use with the copula, although forms of *ol* 'says, said' in the Glosses contain peculiar inflectional increments that have some affinity with the 3sg. m. (*h*)*é*, f. *sí*, 3pl. (*h*)*é* independent forms but mark pronominal subjects in *olse* 'he said', *olsi* 'she said', *olseat* 'they said' (influenced by the 3pl. ending *-at*). Otherwise the pronominal subject of a verb was expressed solely by the appropriate personal inflection and a pronominal object by the appropriate clitic form.

It has already been seen that the 3sg. m. basic infixed pronoun had come to be recognisable only by associated nasalization (2.1a), and it may well be that the need for formal reinforcement by an independent pronoun, usually placed at the end of the clause as a kind of afterthought, was first felt where there was no difference between a nasalized and a non-mutated initial, as in *ro:sáraig. . hé* (*LU* 9976) 'destroyed him' and *ra:marb. . hé* (*LL* 31229) 'killed him'. If so, the usage soon became established where there was no such ambiguity, the 3sg. f. in such cases being (*h*)*í* under the influence of the m. and the 3pl., which was itself remodelled to *eat*, *iat* (cf. *olseat* above). Examples include *bennachais... hé* (*LU* 9765-6) 'blessed him', *ní:chosna... hé* (8974) 'does not dispute it', *ro:charsat... hé* (10159) 'had loved him', *con:mél... hé* (6711-2) 'I shall destroy him', *ro:baist... hí* (3130-1) 'baptized her', *ní-r:léic... hí* (3185) 'did not let her', *no:fégad eat... , no:taidled eat* (1004) 'he used to observe them... and visit them', *do:rat... iat* (8550) 'he gave them', *fo:géba messi* (10454) 'she will find me', *lenad... sind* (1294) 'let follow us', *at:choncammar-ni... thú* (2331), *at:chonnarcmar... tú* (2332) 'we saw thee'.

Sometimes the innovatory independent object pronoun is combined with an infixed or suffixed counterpart, e.g. *con-da:ralsat é* (*LL* 22396) 'so that they put

him' and *do-s:ratais... íat* (35207) 'you have put them'. This might represent a transition between two stages of development, although in some cases at least the amalgam appears to be an artificial textual one resulting from partial modification of the orally obsolete infixing construction during later recopying. Thus *BDD* 144 has *aincith-i fer dib hé* 'a man of them protects him' but absence of *hé* in three other manuscripts shows that the archetype had only a suffixed pronoun here. Similarly the *LU* text of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* has *conna-ch:ráncatar hé* (4878) but the other two manuscripts show only the infix. One may further note *no-s:beir... íat* (*LL* 2549) 'she bears them' or *ro-s:gab.. íad* (*BDD* 204, *íad* in two mss. but not the third) 'seized them'.

Independent subject pronouns seem to have become established first with the copula, where the boundary between subject and predicate was not always clear, and with the passive-impersonal, which used infixed pronouns as subject outside the third person in Old Irish (VIII.6.2). Thus *robo lesmac di é* (*LU* 319) 'he was a stepson to her', *is crot cen chéis íat-side* (613) 'they are a harp without lute' (cf. 1.2.5 on progress to a copula uninflected for person and number), *fritháilte misi* (3101) 'let me be looked after', *ní:érfaider... sibsi* (1570-1) 'you will not be refused', *tucad... hí* (3108) 'she was brought', *ro:adnacht... hé* (7978) 'he has been buried', *no:adnaictis... íat* (4084) 'they used to be buried'.

It was but a small step from passive to quasi-passive intransitive types like *da:fuit leis-sium hé* (*LL* 31217) 'he falls at his hand' and then to an intransitive active construction such as *arnach:tlissad friss hé* (30875) 'that he should not come against him'. The final stage was a more general independent subject pronoun, which usually followed the verb directly and then began with *s-* in the 3sg. m. and 3pl. (presumably on the model of 3sg. f. *sí* vs. ...*(h)í* but *ol-se/-sé*, *ol-seat* was probably a factor too).

Examples are still sparse in Middle Irish texts, e.g. *ragaid missi* (*LL* 38874) 'I shall go', *co-ro:choíne mé* (*EIL* 27, v.7) 'may I lament', *baí sinne* (*LL* 460) 'we were', *ra:chuibrig sé Hercoil* (31232) 'he bound Hercules', *ní:biat síat* (34108) 'they will not be'.

As the independent subject pronouns' apparent origins with the copula and passive might lead one to expect, the concord rules at this stage were 3sg. verb with all such pronouns except the third plural, which required a 3pl. verb. Although never popular in the literary standard, so-called 'analytic' forms with third person verb

plus such pronouns have steadily expanded their range at the expense of 'synthetic' forms with personal inflection only in Modern Irish, this tendency becoming more marked in a northwards direction until the analytic type acquires a virtual monopoly in modern Scots Gaelic. Apart from survivals of the older system in Munster, the 3sg. verb came to prevail even with a third plural subject pronoun.

2.4. A notable feature of Middle Irish was a tendency to lengthen the vowel of (mostly non-passive) personal endings displaying the basic shape cons. + vow. (\pm final cons.). For instance, although there are plenty of cases where length is not indicated, this phenomenon occurs in various *LU* texts such as *Siaburcharpat Con Culainn* with considerable frequency. Examples from that text (hand *M* unless *H* specified) include pret. 3pl. *co:n-accatár* 'they saw' (*LU* 9285; OIr. *co:n-accatar*), *batár* 'they were' (9323; cop. *batar*), *ro:mmebdatár* 'they broke/were defeated' (9347; -*memdatar*), *do:rochratár* 'they fell' (9369; *do:rochratar*), *batár* 'they/which were' (9248&9, cf. 9285; subst. *batár*), 1pl. *co:n-accamár* 'we saw' (9244; *co:n-accamar*), *do:bertamár* (9422; *do:bertamar*), rel. *a mbámmár* 'while we were' (9251; subst. *bám(m)ar*), ipf. 3pl. *imma:n-aigtís* 'whom they used to drive round/pursue' (9311; -*aigtis*), *no:bítís* 'who used to be' (9322; subst. -*bítis*), past subj. 3pl. *connaptís* 'so that they would not be' (9519 *H*; cop. -*ptis*) and arguably 3pl. augm. pass. *cía (a)d:cutís* 'though they might be able to be recounted(?)' (9405; *ad:fét?*).

Uncommon outside *LU* (but note *SR* 4461 *at:rachtár* 'they arose' vs. *at:rachtatar* at 5881 etc.), substitution of *á* for *a* in the 1 and 3 pl. suff. and *t*-pret. is not found in any variety of Modern Irish and can hardly be divorced from further instances of *á* for unstressed *a* in *LU* especially, including the following from *Siaburcharpat*: 3sg. pret. pass. *inn-ut:tarfás* 'was there shown to thee?', *do-m:arfás* 'there was shown to me' (both 9234), *tarfás* 'which was shown' (9237), cop. pret. 3sg. *bá* (9312, 9325, 9332, 9337) beside *ba* (9310-1 etc.), 1sg. *bása* (9327, six exx. 9332-6) beside *basa* (9326, 9334 etc.), 3pl. *batár* (9246) beside *batar* (9249) and even *batár* (9330) beside *batár* above, 1sg. ipf. *immá:redind-sea* 'I used to drive round', pret. *immá:rubart-sa* 'I plied' (9341 and 9447; *imma:*), *mád:tulad* 'well have I come' (9467; *mad:*). It is difficult to know what to make of this tendency to write a length mark over *a* (sometimes even when stressed, e.g. *it:rácht* 'arose' *LL* 9723) but clearly it was not confined to the pret. 1 and 3pl.

Although they are paradoxically less common in *LU* than -*már* and -*tár*, the

linguistic reality of most other lengthened variants is put beyond doubt by Modern Irish survivals, the chief instances being 'basic' 1pl. *-m(a)ít* for *-m(a)it* (2.2c; also 3pl. *-t(a)ít* for *-t(a)it*), 'imperfect' 2sg. *-t(h)(e)á* or *-t(h)é* for *-t(h)(e)a*, 3sg. pass. *-t(h)(e)á* or *-t(h)é* for *-t(h)(a)e*, 1pl. *-m(a)ís* for *-m(a)is*, 2pl. *-t(h)(a)í* for *-t(h)(a)e*, 3pl. act./pass. *-t(a)ís* for *-t(a)is*. Examples include pres. 1pl. *anmaít-ni* 'we remain' (LL 11598), fut. 1pl. *faicfimmít* 'we will leave' (10993), 3pl. *betít* 'they will be' (9871-2, cop.; *betit* 9868-9), past subj. 2sg. *no:chingthé* 'thou shouldst step' (8723), *má thíastá* 'if thou shouldst go' (LU 4764), ipf. 1pl. *im:reidmís* 'we used to ride around' (LL 10444), *im:théigmís* 'we used to go around' (10445), 3pl. *na:laimtís* 'that they did not dare' (8472), past subj. 3pl. *go:tócbaitís* 'that they might raise' (10064-5), augm. *arco:nderntaís* 'that they might make' (10063-4), 3sg. pass. *ar-na:laimthé* 'that would not be dared' (LU 4955), *cond:ristá* 'there might be an encounter' (5082), augm. *cen co:tucthá* 'though it might not have been given' (LL 7669), augm. pret. pass. 3pl. *ro:rímthé* 'have been counted' (9764; OIr. *ro:rímthea*). It would seem that final /-ə/ was lengthened to *-á* after a non-palatal and to *-é* after a palatal consonant in the first instance, *-(e)á* then tending to predominate as in 3sg. augm. past subj. *ce ro:craiteá* '(although) had been shaken' (LL 9724). Forms such as 'imperfect' passive *-t(h)(a)í* distinguished from 2sg. *-t(h)(e)á* in Modern Irish presumably arose by analogy with 1pl. *-m(a)ís*, 3pl. *-t(a)ís*.

This lengthening has been plausibly ascribed to the influence of analytic forms with verb plus personal subject (*mé, tú, sé, sí, siat*). Not surprisingly fluctuation between unlengthened and lengthened variants in the categories just discussed occasionally generated forms with lengthened vowel elsewhere, e.g. 3pl. pres. *ascnaít* 'they make for' (LL 31065; normal *-(a)it*), 3sg. pret. *ra:imrastár* 'he rowed' (LL 31609; see 6.4.2a), *tafnís* 'chased' (LL 33828; normal *-(a)is*).

3.1. Various factors referred to at certain points in 2 above conspired to obfuscate standard Old Irish formal distinctions between independent compound verbs in main and relative clauses, although the practical effects of these developments were considerably mitigated by the steady replacement of compound by simple verbs to be documented later (5.1). Similar confusions were prone to arise, with somewhat more serious consequences, after proclitic *ro, no* or *do* (4.2-3).

Loss of all clear functional distinction between the moribund lenited composite ('class C') and the basic ('class A') or base composite ('class B') infixed pronouns (cf. 2.1c) was one aspect, but petrification of 3sg. neuter infixed pronouns had more fundamental effects still. Thus once distinctively relative forms like *fo:cheird* or *ro:chrochsát* (I.3.6) had become increasingly common in main clauses too as a result of 2.2b, while the *a-t:chí* type brought about by 2.2a was used more or less indifferently in relative as well as main clauses. Such convergence could generate further confusions like rel. *im:ráidi* (SR 1209) 'that thou considerest' (cf. I.3.6).

The relative infix *d* developed by 2.2d failed to become sufficiently common to offer more than partial resolution of such ambiguities.

3.2. Standard Old Irish restricted the general relative to use after a subject or object antecedent, allowing for the optional replacement of lenition by nasalization where appropriate in the latter environment (I.3.6-7). After all other antecedents non-relative forms could be used, either in competition with a nasalizing relative in the case of certain adverbials or compulsorily in the case of some others, particularly clefted prepositional phrases (see I.3.7).

Middle Irish usage is marked by the expansion of the relative construction in and to all of these environments as well as by its increasingly regular association with lenition, which was basically confined to the binary complex in Old Irish (I.3.6).

(a) Nasalizing relatives are largely replaced by the leniting variety, sporadic instances of this being found as early as *ML. risíu ad:cheth* (38c9) 'before he should see', *amal imme:chomairsed nech* (63c9) 'as if some one had asked', *cíd dían, cían no:théisinn* (41d9) 'though it were fast and far I should go'. However, the type of nasalizing relative clause without antecedent that served as complement to verbs of saying etc. (*GOI* 318, type (g)), tended to give way to a *co* 'that' clause, e.g. *as n-é tairrchet a patriarchis combad adramail in macc, con:robad écosc a cheneóil foir* (Wb. 6d6, old nas. rel. followed by two *co* types) 'that it is he who was prophesied by the patriarchs (= of whom it was prophesied..) that the son would be fatherlike, that the mark of his race would be on him', *at:bert.. co:ndingned* (LU 9022) 'he said that he would do'.

(b) The replacement of non-relative by relative constructions after clefted prepositional phrases occurs sporadically in *ML.*, e.g. *ní fris ru:chét* (64a13) 'it is not regarding it that it was sung' vs. normal non-rel. *is airi ní:táet* (Sg. 159a3) 'it

is for this there does not come', and becomes preponderant in Middle Irish, e.g. *is orot rirfes* (SR 1073) 'it is for thee that he shall abandon', *conid de ro-d:lil Goll de* (LU 3177-8) 'so that it is from this that (the name) Goll has stuck to him' (see 2.2d), in anticipation of the Modern Irish norm.

(c) Independent simple verbs with relative endings could not be lenited in Old Irish as a rule, but eventually began to be reinforced by initial lenition modelled on the infixed variety inherited after proclitics. The Glosses offer occasional instances with an object antecedent, e.g. *aní chanas* (Ml. 24d14) 'what it sings', *intí charas nech* (30c3) 'he whom anyone loves', *cid folad sluindes* (Sg. 25b17) 'what substance it signifies', *cisi aimser derb thechtas* (26a6) 'what certain time it has', *sens aidbligthe thechtas* (221b3) 'the sense of enhancement that it has', or even a subject antecedent with pronominal *-í*, e.g. *intí théite* (Sg. 114b2) 'the one that goes', *innahí thechtaite* (179b2) 'those that have'. Since these represent early textual manifestations of a rising pattern of lenition that was to become regular in Modern Irish, it is no surprise to find the phenomenon quite well represented in Middle Irish sources, e.g. *is mé chométas Pardos* (SR 1193) 'it is me who looks after Paradise', *is é charas Conaire sech cách* (LU 7336) 'he it is whom Conaire loves above all', *is é Crimthand chinnes ar cách* (LL 6468) 'it is Crimthann who surpasses everyone', *mad hi céin chingges* (SR 6125) 'if it be far that he go(es)' (cf. b).

3.3. The basic Old Irish rule for concord between relative verb and a subject antecedent was singular with singular, plural with plural, the verb being third person even with a first or second person pronoun as antecedent. Concord between copula and clefted antecedent followed similar rules, e.g. *ní tú no-d:n-ail acht is hé no-t:ail* (Wb. 5b28) 'it is not thou that nourishes it (m.) but it is it (m.) that nourishes thee', *it sib ata chomarpi Abracham* (19c20) 'it is (lit. 'are') you that are heirs of Abraham', *air it hé-sidi ata eclais* (Ml. 65d19) 'for it is ('are') these that are the Church'. However, 1 and 2pl. pronouns could take a 3sg. copula or relative even in the Glosses. Thus *is snisni ata bobes* (Wb. 10d7) 'it is we that are cattle' has 3sg. cop. and 3pl. rel., but 3sg. concord in both is commoner in such cases, e.g. *ní sní cet-id:deirgni, ní sní du-d:rigni nammá* (Ml. 124b3) 'it is not we who have ('has') done it first and it is not we who have ('has') done it only', *combad sissi do:berad teist dim-sa* (Wb. 18a3) 'that it might be you who would bear witness of me'. This new rule of 3sg. verbal concord with all but a 3pl. clefted independent pronoun

bears an obvious relationship to the rule of 3sg. verb with all but a 3pl. independent subject pronoun in later Middle Irish (see 2.3).

In Middle Irish sources this system of 3sg. concord is sometimes spread to a 3pl. clefted pronoun or even to a plural noun antecedent, e.g. *is íat do-d:róni in smúitchéo* (LU 6749) 'it is they who made the cloud of smoke' (see 2.2d), *nach siat na meic Nectain sin maides* (LL 8610) 'are ('is') not those the sons of Nechtan who boast ('boasts')?' This, of course, accords with the Modern Irish concord rules in such cases, and there are occasional anticipations in a Middle Irish source of the Modern Irish tendency, carried through in all present-day dialects apart from vestiges of the old system in Munster, to use a 3sg. verb with a 3pl. subject pronoun or a plural noun subject. Thus *do:berar... íat* (Bk of Ballymote 453b12) 'they are brought', *ro:báided ann... cóic cét rí* (SR 4013-5) 'five hundred kings were drowned there', *at:raacht in Galéoin , in Munnig* (LL 11319, 11758-9), 'the Leinstermen and the Munstermen arose'.

The Old Irish restriction of relatives with subject antecedent to the third person meant that first and second person relatives could only be used when the antecedent was object. The Middle Irish tendency, doubtless still more advanced in actual speech than in the written record, to generalize third singular concord with any subject antecedent triggered commensurate progress towards generalization of the 3sg. and elimination of the 3pl. forms as subject relatives.

3.4. Loss of a distinct 3pl. relative over part of its previous range seems to have put pressure on the 1 and 3pl. relative endings elsewhere, and there is no survival into Modern Irish of any specifically relative inflection but the 3sg. *-(e)as* type used as a general subject and an analytic object relative in the modern spoken dialects outside Munster, where there is no special ending and initial lenition (3.2c) suffices as a relative marker. As far as synthetic forms are concerned, Modern Irish does not differentiate between independent relative and non-relative inflection outside the 3sg. except insofar as initial lenition may affect the former.

In Old Irish such object relatives were regularly distinguished from the corresponding non-relatives either by a special ending like 3pl. rel. *-(a)ite*, usually realized as *-^tt(a)e* by syncope, vs. abs. *-(a)it* or by prefixed *no* (+LEN/NAS) with concomitant conjunct ending as in 1sg. rel. *no:biur* vs. abs. *biru, berim* (see I.3.6), but Middle Irish shows a strong trend towards use of absolute endings with independent simple verbs in both relative and non-relative contexts outside the third

singular. Thus rel. 1sg. *iarraim-se* (LL 9183) 'that I seek', 2sg. *iarraí* (9182) 'that thou seekest', *fégai-siu* (9149) and *fégai-siu* (9151) 'that thou art looking at', *gaba-su* (9076) 'that thou wouldst accept', 3pl. *curit* (LL 11698) 'which they throw off', *aní rádit* (7677) 'what they say', *segtait* (SR 459, by 2.2c above) 'which they seek out', *derbait* (SR 1101) 'whom they assert', *carait* (7945) 'who love', *canait* (7946) 'which they sing'.

This type of convergence seems to have triggered fluctuations between rel. and abs. forms in the passive, resulting in virtual free variation between forms with palatal *-r* (originally abs.) and those with non-palatal *-r* (originally rel., see VIII.6.1). Thus abs. for rel. pass. 3sg. *ármthir* (LL 8295) 'that is reckoned', 3pl. *fír gontair*, *mná berdair*, *bae aegdair* (11447 etc.) '(it is) men (that) are killed, women (that) are abducted, cows (that) are driven', and conversely rel. for abs. 3sg. pass. *cladar* (LU 5704) 'is dug', *gutter* (5985) 'is besought'. Such fluctuation in the 3sg. persisted into Classical Modern Irish, but the present-day dialects of Ireland and Scotland have generalized the non-palatal variants.

The largely obsolete Old Irish 3pl. rel. *-t(a)e* (now pronounced /-də/) seems on occasion to have been replaced textually by the phonetically close and presumably rather less arcane 3sg. *-th(a)i* (now pronounced /-θə/), which was originally 3sg. plus 3sg. n. or m. suffixed pronoun but had been subject to the effects of petrification (2.2c). This scribal replacement of a more by a less obscure form may have been assisted by the beginnings of a shift from 3pl. to 3sg. concord (3.3), but at any rate the upshot was a rather scarce and no doubt purely literary 3pl. rel. variously written *-th(a)e*, *-tha*, *-thi* etc., e.g. *trí laích ata dech gaibthe gaisced* (LU 7149, 7710) 'the three best warriors who take up arms', *toi(n)gthe Ulaíd* (5195 = *Táin* 808, where note Eg. 1782 variant *tongte*) 'what the Ulstermen swear', *dechmada derbtha bí* (SR 4861) 'tithes which the living assert'.

4.1. In Old Irish any tense or mood apart from the imperative could be augmented to give it resultative or potential force, due allowance being made for the possible incompatibility of the preterite with potential and the probable immunity of the future stem to resultative augmentation (IX.3.1-3) as well as for the total or partial resistance of certain verbs to augmentation as a whole (XI.3.1-2). It was only in the preterite and subjunctive, however, that the (resultative and mostly potential respectively) augmented forms outstripped or seriously rivalled the corresponding

unaugmented forms in frequency and showed any tendency to encroach upon them semantically (IX.3.2.1 and 3.3.2).

The semantic differences between augmented and unaugmented forms disappeared between Old and Modern Irish along with the formal opposition. Resultativity had ceased to be marked as such, just as standard modern spoken French uses, say, *il a parlé* for 'he spoke' as well as 'he has spoken' indifferently. Potentiality was expressed by a new syntagm of *fét-* 'is able', present-day *féadann*, plus verbal noun, this 'Middle Irish' outcome of *ad:cota*, *-éta* 'gets' (see towards end of IX.4.1 as well as 5.2 and 5.5 below) being seen in competition with an augmented potential as early as *Táin Bó Cúailnge*: *ní:étaim dano techt sech nechtar in dá roth ((f)ét- plus vb. noun of téit)... , ní:dicht(h)im dano sech in dam* (augm. pres. (pot.) of *téit*)... (*LU* 5180-1) 'I cannot go over either of the two wheels... and I cannot, moreover, go over the stag...'. Once it had become semantically irrelevant, the pervasive opposition between augmented and unaugmented forms was hardly likely to be maintained for long, and Modern Irish generally retains only one set in any given tense or mood. Virtually all Modern Irish or Scots Gaelic preterites are based upon earlier augmented preterites, e.g. (*do*) *chuaidh*, *-deachaidh* 'went, has gone' from OIr. augm. *do:coid*, *-dechaid* 'has gone, went' and not unaugm. *(-)luid* 'went', and it has been seen in IX.3.2.1 that even in Old Irish the augmented forms were already markedly preponderant here except in formal narrative. In the other tenses only the statistically overwhelming unaugmented forms of Old Irish survived into Modern Irish, but in the subjunctive mood, where unaugmented forms were not so strongly prevalent over augmented counterparts, Modern Irish does preserve vestiges of augmented forms in some particularly common 'irregular' verbs against an overall preference for the unaugmented type. The only such survival in the modern spoken language is the subjunctive of the substantive verb seen in *go raibh* 'may be' (OIr. *-roi-b*, cf. IV.3), but the classical standard retains a handful of others like indep. *do-né* (OIr. unaugm. *do:gné*) vs. dep. *-dearna* (OIr. augm. *-der^tna*) 'may do', *ruga* (OIr. augm. *(-)ruca*) alongside *beara* (OIr. *-bera*) or *beire* 'may bear'. Such instances merely involve the sporadic retention of a few common old augmented subjunctives against the general trend because they were thoroughly distinct from the corresponding presents. This is particularly obvious in the verb 'to do', which uses unaugm. subj. *do-né* in independent position, where its vocalism would always be distinct from pres. *do-ní* 'does', but prefers augm. subj. *-dearna*

in dependent position, where an unaugm. subj. stem *-déan-* would be the same as the pres. At all events, surviving augmented forms in Modern Irish, whether of the normal preterite or vestigial subjunctive type, are entirely devoid of such semantic value as attached to them in the Old Irish system. In Modern Irish, augmented and unaugmented forms are in complementary distribution according to the basic scheme augm. pret. vs. unaugm. remainder, except for the odd insignificant augm. subj. survival (also tending towards complementary distribution, as in class. *do-né*, *-dearna* or current *go raibh*), and there is no meaningful dichotomy within a given tense or mood as in Old Irish.

Middle Irish texts might reasonably be expected to present some sort of transition between these two systems, and do indeed yield plenty of augmented forms that comply broadly with Old Irish usage alongside many others that seem to reflect or anticipate Modern Irish developments. As usual, the main problem is to identify the linguistic reality underlying this confusing textual evidence.

The status of augmented forms outside the preterite and subjunctive in Middle Irish texts is hard to establish because such forms were at best fairly uncommon in the pres. ind. and at worst very rare in the ipf. ind., fut. and cond. even in strictly Old Irish sources. Attestations in later manuscripts can usually be put down to an Old Irish original, and it seems probable that all augmentation outside the preterite and certain subjunctive categories to be discussed below was at least moribund in the innovatory stratum (see 1 above) of Middle Irish.

In Middle Irish narrative augmented and unaugmented preterite forms, which are still quite clearly distinguished in Old Irish narrative (IX.3.2.1), seem to be used more or less indiscriminately. The following passage will serve as a brief and typical enough illustration, containing as it does unaugmentable (*fúair*, *-fétais*), unaugmented (*-báatar*, *hit:racht = a-t:racht*) and augmented (the rest) preterites with no appreciable semantic differentiation. *Fúair-seom bás iar sin ⁊ ro:ferad comarli oca áes gráda ⁊ is ed ro:chinset a adnacol isin Bruig áit i mbáatar rí Temra romi-seom. Ro:tócbad iarom corp in rí fo thrí dia breith issin Bruig ⁊ hit:racht Boand fo thrí in arda conná:fétais a techt* (LU 4062-5) 'He died then and counsel was taken by his retainers and what they decided was to bury him in the Bruig, the place where the kings of Tara were before him. The body of the king was raised thrice to be carried into the Bruig, and the Boyne rose up thrice so that she could not be crossed'. It would seem that the augmented preterite had ousted the unaugmented

preterite, allowing for a few unaugmentable verbs (see 4.2 below), in the actual contemporary usage taken to underly the innovatory stratum of Middle Irish and that the not infrequent unaugmented survivals were deliberately but not altogether successfully (see further 6.9) maintained in writing as literary archaisms where they did not emanate from an Old Irish original. The occurrence of unaugm. *luid* 'went' etc. alongside augm. *do:c(h)uaid* 'went, has gone' etc. in Middle Irish texts is no more significant than the purely literary survival of *il parla* 'he spoke' etc. in Modern French.

Although there is no reason to suppose that strictly resultative (e.g. IX.3.2.4-5) or potential (IX.3.3.1) augmentation of subjunctives was well maintained in the innovatory stratum of Middle Irish (for instance, it became optional after *resíu* 'before' or *acht co* 'provided that' replacing *acht* plus augm. subj.), the particular outgrowth of the potentially augmented subjunctive used to express wish in main clauses and purpose in subordinate *co* or *ara* clauses in Old Irish (IX.3.3.2) seems to have fared remarkably well in Middle Irish. As pointed out in IX.3.3.2, both augmented and unaugmented subjunctives appear to be well represented as more or less free variants in Old Irish final clauses, but even in the probably ninth-century *Bethu Brigte* or tenth-century *Saltair na Rann* the augmented subjunctive is markedly preponderant in such clauses and this dominance increases still further in *LU* and the *LL-Táin*. The line between unaugmented jussive and augmented hortatory subjunctives in Old Irish was not always clearly drawn (see IX.3.3.2), and in the later language the augmented hortatory type tended to prevail along with the spread of *co* from the closely related final-clause usage, e.g. *mástat carait conná'mus:n-ágat, mastat námait co'mmos:ralat* (*LU* 9090-1) 'if they are friends, let them not fear each other; if they are enemies, let them cast at each other' showing *co* plus unaugm. and *co* plus augm. subj. respectively with no appreciable difference of meaning, *co-ro:choíne mé* (*EIL* 27, v.6) 'may I lament', *go nderna* (*EIL* 44, v.18) 'mayest thou perform'. These, of course, are precursors of the Modern Irish *go* plus subj. to express a wish, as in *go raibh maith agat* 'thank you' (lit. 'may there be good with you'), *go maire tú* 'may you live' and so on. The basic innovation of Middle Irish seems to have been an increasing tendency towards complementary distribution of augmented and unaugmented subjunctives according to the type of clause involved, the augmented type being associated with wish, purpose and, above all, the particle *co* often accompanying such constructions,

whereas the unaugmented type was preferred elsewhere. Being merely accessory to certain syntactic features, this dichotomy was purely formal and correspondingly devoid of semantic significance. Its erosion in Modern Irish to a general unaugmented subjunctive plus augmented vestiges in a few irregular verbs is no surprise.

In conclusion, it would appear that meaningful contrasts between augmented and unaugmented forms were a thing of the past in Middle Irish, apparent survivals being due to scribal conservatism in recopying older manuscripts or conscious literary archaizing. The underlying trend was towards semantically vacuous complementary distribution giving the augmented forms a virtual monopoly in the preterite and in subjunctives of wish or purpose, where augmentation had been commonest in Old Irish, but generalizing the unaugmented forms in other subjunctive contexts and the non-preterite tenses.

4.2. As far as morphology of the augment is concerned, the extended treatment in chapters X and XI has identified two major but far from complete simplificatory trends in Old Irish. Firstly, there was a marked tendency towards proclisis of *ro* and towards a shift of status, considerably further advanced with simple than with compound verbs, from preverb to conjunct particle. Secondly, the range of *ro* as augment was gradually expanded. The logical outcome of these developments would be a morphologically straightforward system of augmentation by a regularly proclitic conjunct particle *ro* throughout, and there is plenty of evidence to suggest that Middle Irish was well on the way to this state of affairs, due allowance being made for the literary survival of quite a few older types and for the effective restriction of the augment in living contemporary usage to the preterite and certain subjunctive syntagms.

(a) Behaviour of *ro* as a conjunct particle was already well established with simple verbs in Old Irish, the basic pattern being seen in *ro:gab^tsat*, *ní-ro:gab^tsat* 'they have (not) taken' etc. (see X.3.1-2) Once the practice of attaching *ro* proclitically to another conjunct particle had been established with compound verbs too in Old Irish (see XI.4.3), the stage was set for the prefixing of unsupported *ro* as a conjunct particle to compound verbs on the analogy of the rising pattern with simple verbs. Thus an Old Irish opposition *as-ru:lennad* (Ml. 124d 17, see XI.4.3), *ní-ro:éil^tned* 'has (not) been polluted' could be transformed into *ro:héilled* (Ml. 127a13, showing *ln* to *ll*), *ní-ro:(h)éilled* with *ro* conforming fully to conjunct

particle patterns in compound as well as simple verbs. *Ro:héilled* at Ml. 127a13 and another form of the same verb, *a rru:n-éillestar* 'when he polluted' at Ml. 63a14 (see 6.4.2a on *-estar*, and note *as-ru:len^tsat* 'have polluted' still at Ml. 74a3), seem to be the only attestations of the final stage of this progress to conjunct particle status in the Old Irish Glosses. In Middle Irish the pattern *ro:(P₁₄)V*, *C-ro:(P₁₄)V* becomes dominant with old compound as well as old simple verbs. Typical instances are *dia-ro:diúlt* (SR 7747) 'when he denied' and *ro:diúltsat* (2685) 'they denied' (OIr. *-der^tlind*, *do:rí-l^ttiset* or *do-ro:sluind^tset*, see XI.2.5 and 4.3), *ro:thepi* (29) 'who has fashioned' (*do:ei-pen* 'cuts, fashions'; Sg. 60b18; *do:é-r^tbai* 'has cut off', *Bk. of Lecan* 338b29 *do:r'-ei-bi* with preverbal and prevocalic augment respectively), *ro:déccai* (1069) 'beheld' (*do:é-ccai*, see latter part of XI.4.2 on OIr. augm. here), *ra:thuissim* (LL 30902; OIr. *do:fuis-sim*, augm. pret. *do:rósat*) 'begat', *ra:(f)recair* (LL 10179, 10245; OIr. *fris:gair*, augm. pret. *fris:ro-gart*) 'replied'. Further examples of *ro* prefixed to old compound verbs in Middle Irish will be given below, and it must be emphasized that this phenomenon is intimately bound up with the well known Middle Irish tendency to replace compound verbs with new simple verbs extrapolated from prototonic forms (see 5.1-2 below). Sometimes *ro* as conjunct particle may have helped to trigger such creations, but *ro* was probably more often than not prefixed in this manner precisely because the verbs in question had already been re-analysed as simple rather than compound. If so, a form like *ro:diúltsat* should be ascribed to a new simple *diúltaid*, *-diúltai(nn)* rather than to the old compound *do:sluindi*, *-díltai*.

It remains to note that sequences of *C-ro:* frequently appear as *C-r'*: in Middle Irish texts in anticipation of Modern Irish *níor* (OIr. *ní-ro*), *gur* (OIr. *co-ro*) etc. Resegmentation of prevocalic types like *co:rr'-an* 'that I may remain' or *ní:rr'an^tsam* 'we have not remained' (X.3.1 and XI.4.2) as *co-r:*, *ní-r:* would be a conceivable factor, but a more general Middle Irish apocope in proclitics (e.g. 3sg. cop. OIr. *nírbo* 'was not', later *nír(b)*, prepositional rel. OIr. *forsa* (+NAS.) 'on which', Mid. Ir. usually *fors* ' (+NAS.)) was almost certainly the basic cause. A typical enough example is *nír':léicsetar* (SR 6421) 'they did not let'.

(b) Only the commonest verbs, notably those able to preserve significant inflectional irregularities into Classical Modern Irish and often beyond, seem to have been really resilient in the face of conjunct particle *ro*'s inexorable expansion in Middle Irish. Outside this privileged category other types of augmentation were

prone to be replaced, e.g. *ro:bligt(h?)ea* ‘were milked’ (*Thes.* II, 334.44; *bligid* = OIr. *mligid*, 3sg. augm. pret. pass. *do:o-mlacht*, cf. X.2 and note intermediate *ro:thomlacht* at *Bk. of Ballymote* 397a17), *ní-ro:chotail* ‘did not sleep’ (*Táin* 2908), *ra:chotail* ‘slept’ (LL 10239; OIr. *ní:com^ttail*, *con:a-ttail*, XI.2.2), *ro:chompir* ‘which she begat’ (LU 4252) or *ro:coimpred* ‘was born’ (4264, OIr. *con:a-p^trad*; *cum-ad-ber-*, cf. XI.2.2), *ro:thobgiset* ‘they exacted’ (LL 38720; OIr. *to-cum-bo(n)g-*, see XI.2.3), *ro:tidnaic* (LL 38643) or *ro:t(h)idnacht* ‘(who) has bestowed’ (SR 1977, 2633 vs. *do:ri(n)dnacht* 1469, 2020 and once in Wb., see XI.4.2, but OIr. normally *do:é-com-nacht* see XI.2.3). As can be seen from such examples, augmentation of certain compound verbs by *ad* or *cum* rather than *ro* was moribund in Middle and did not survive into Modern Irish. Indeed, even the non-functional quasi-augment *cum* of *ad:co-ta*, *ní:é-ta* ‘gets, does not get’ (end of XI.3.1) is replaced by *ro* in the Middle Irish outcome *ro:(f)éta*, *ní:(f)éta* ‘can(not)’, e.g. *ro:fétat* ‘that they can’ (LU 2379) vs. *mani:fétur-sa* ‘if I be not able’ (8088-9).

(c) Very few verbs resistant to meaningful augmentation in Old Irish (XI.3.1-2) survive into Modern Irish without acquiring a descendant of the augment in their preterites, the most obvious cases being dep. *-faca* ‘saw’, *fuair* with dep. *-bhfuair* ‘got’, and partial resistance in *go gcuala*, *go dtáinig*, *go dtug* ‘that he heard, came, gave’ alongside *gur chuala*, *gur tháinig*, *gur thug* or *níor chuala*, *níor tháinig*, *níor thug*.

Even in some such cases Middle Irish texts present very sporadic instances of a *ro*-augmentation that does not seem to have established itself, e.g. exceptional *do:r-áinic*, *ru:tháinic* ‘(who) came’ (SR 5339, 7609), *fo:r’úair* ‘got’ (LL 23698). Although *ro:saig* and *do:roig* seem to have held aloof, the Middle Irish descendants of various other once unaugmentable verbs do seem often to have acquired an augment, e.g. *ar-na-r’:lám* ‘since he did not dare’ (LL 34699-700), *na-ra:chumaing* ‘(so) that he was not able’ (34700), *ní-ro:fét* ‘could not, (LU 3293), *ro:dermatad* ‘was forgotten, (LL 14167-8, Mid. Ir. *dermataid* based on *dermat*, vn. of OIr. *do:rui-m^tnethar*, see 5.2b), *co-ro:áiriller* ‘that I may merit’ (*Leabhar Breac* 191b13). The expanding use of *ro* in the preterite at least is obvious in this as in the previous section. The overall trend was to make this type of augmentation as synchronically predictable as possible with a minimum of formal variation, syntactic freedom and lexically conditioned deviation.

4.3. Although *ro* survived in its apocopated form *-r* (4.2a) after another

conjunct particle in the Modern Irish preterite, e.g. *níor bhuail* 'did not hit', *gur bhuail* 'that (he) hit', it was replaced by *do* (see 5.3 below) on its own, e.g. Class. *do bhuail(easdar)* 'hit', *do shaor(astar)* 'freed'. Apart from vestiges in Munster, all modern spoken Gaelic dialects have lost this *do* before a consonant, leaving only lenition as in *chuir* 'put', but it remains before a vowel, e.g. *d'ith* 'ate', *d'fhág* 'left'. In modern Scots Gaelic speech (and in Manx), *do* has replaced *-r* even after conjunct particles, e.g. *cha do chuir* 'did not put', *cha do dh'fhág* 'did not leave' vs. Irish *níor chuir*, *níor fhág* etc.

Instances of *do* for *ro* do occur in Middle Irish sources, albeit not unduly frequently, e.g. *do:dílsig* 'who has made over' (SR 1225), *do:gait* 'took away' (5556), *do-das:sáer* '(who) had delivered them' (4818), *do:chachain* 'sang' (LU 10016), *do:ráda* 'which she spoke' (LL 12301), *da:maid* 'it broke = defeat came' (12309), *da:baí* 'there was' (9942). That *do* was a good deal commoner than this in contemporary speech is indicated by certain instances in LL especially of hypercorrect *ro* for *do*, e.g. *ro:chuaid* (LL 38644, 38473), *ra:chuaid* (31001, 38411 etc.) 'went' (3sg. for *do:c(h)uaid*, X.1, and see 2.1a above on *ro/ra*, *do/da* etc.), *ra:chuatar* (31120) 'went' (3pl. for *do:c(h)uatar*), *ra:dechaid* (9892) 'came' (3sg. for *do:dechaid*, XI.1), *ra-s:fárraid* (9883) 'came upon them' (OIr. *do-s:(n-)arraid*, pres. *do:air-ret*), *ra-s:etarrad* (11646) 'I have accomplished it (f.)' (OIr. *do-s:(n-)etarrad*, last para. of XI.2.4; pres. *do:etar-rat*), *ro-ta:fárfaid* (11710-1) 'which appeared to him' (OIr. *d-a:n-árbaid*, pres. *do:adbat*; see 2.1c-d and 5.5). This hypercorrection is particularly common in the augm. pret. of *téit* 'goes', and the phenomenon presumably arose because literary *ro* so often corresponded to spoken *do* in normal augm. preterites, thus causing some doubt as to how *do:chuaid* 'went' etc. should be written. Whereas *do* for *ro* undoubtedly represents a real development, *ro* for *do* was almost as certainly the artificial creation of erudite insecurity.

There are two notable survivals of non-suppletive forms with a stressed augment in the Modern Irish preterite, namely modern spoken (*do*) *rinne*, *-dearna* 'did' (OIr. *do:ri-g^hni*, *-dei-r^h-géni*) and *dúirt* 'said, (OIr. *as:ru-bart*). The former underwent comparatively little change from Old through Middle into Modern Irish with its forms derived directly from Mid. Ir. *do:ringne*, *-derna* continuing *do:rigni* by assimilation of nasality and a *-dergni* modelled on the deuterotonic pattern and simplified as early as Ml. 1sg. *ní:dernus* (39a11) 'I did not'. OIr. *as:ru-bart*,

however, mostly appears in Middle Irish as *a-t:ru-bairt* by 2.2a and 6.9.2b, but sometimes undergoes a simplification parallel to pres. *a:teir* from *a-t:beir* etc. (see 6.1.2 and 6.6.3), e.g. *a:tubairt* (LL 31136, 31295), whence Class. Mod. Ir. *a-dubhairt* etc. and ultimately *dúirt*.

5.1. The extraordinary and largely redundant complexity of compound verb morphology in Old Irish, particularly when augmentation is taken into account, has been amply illustrated in the previous chapters, especially I.2.1-9 and XI.2.1-6. Simplification of augment morphology (XI.4.14) culminating in fairly general proclisis (4.2 above) could not resolve the overall problems of a deuterotonic/prototonic opposition that comprised a multitude of diverse and often unpredictable alternations geared to individual verbs and not governed by any synchronically obvious general principles of derivation. In morphological terms this system was, in effect, a collection of irregularities that was correspondingly difficult to preserve on the scale obtaining in Old Irish. Although no less redundant, the absolute/conjunct opposition of simple verbs was based on inflections used with a more or less wide range of lexical items and so was a great deal less problematical. There are very few genuine survivals of old compound verbs in any variety of Modern Irish, where a small class of so-called 'irregular' verbs partly continues a handful of the commoner old compounds and stands in varying degrees outside a 'regular' system based on the conjugation patterns of old simple verbs but incorporating a good many old compound verbs no longer recognisable as such. Thus irregular *ad:chí* or *do:chí*, dep. *-faic(eann)* 'sees', (OIr. cpd. *ad:cí*, *-aicci*) vs. regular *saoraidh*, dep. *-saor(ann)* 'frees' (OIr. simple *sáeraid*, *-sáera*) and *teilgidh*, *-teil(eann)* 'casts' (OIr. cpd. *do:léici*, *-teil^fci*) in the classical language. This marginalization of the Old Irish compound verb inflection and corresponding expansion of conjugational types proper to simple verbs is one of the major characteristics of Modern Irish, and it remains to consider various developments along these lines in Old and, above all, Middle Irish material.

5.2. The most important Middle Irish strategy for eradicating the complexities of the deuterotonic/prototonic alternation in compound verbs was the creation of new simple verbs from suitable parts of the old compound paradigm. This is the process that did so much to change the face of the language between Old and Modern Irish, and two main subtypes can be identified.

(a) A new simple verb was extrapolated from the prototonic stem of an old compound. The crucial factor here was that, whereas the (absolute and conjunct respectively, I.1.3) inflections of independent simple and compound verbs usually diverged, dependent simple and compound forms were both characterized by conjunct inflection. This significant point of agreement could trigger further accommodation of compound inflection to its more straightforward simple counterpart according to the following formula, here illustrated by the simple/compound pairs *sluindid* 'declares' / *do:sluindi*, *-díltai* 'denies' and *léicid* 'leaves' / *do:léici*, *-teilci* 'throws' in the 3sg. dep.: indep. Thus *-sluindi: sluindid* = *-díltai: x* (*x* = *díltaid* in place of *do:sluindi*) *-léici: léicid* = *-teilci: x* (*x* = *teilcid* in place of *do:léici*). In this way new simple verbs *díltaid*, *-díltai* (later *diúltaid* by a shift of syllable centre, and later still *diúltaigid* underlying Mod. Ir. *diúltaíonn* 'denies' by a spread of the *-aig-* suffix briefly discussed in (c) below) and *teilcid*, *-teilci* (Mod. Ir. *teilgeann*) came into being and the awkward alternation of stem in the old compounds was obviated.

Numerous examples of this well motivated development are to be found in Middle Irish, but the selection of 3sg. presents below will suffice for illustration: *tócbaid* (OIr. *do:fócaib*, 3pl. *-tóc^tbat*), *-tócaib* 'lifts' (Mod. Ir. *tógann*); *imrid* (OIr. *imm:beir*, 3pl. *-im(b)ret*), *-im(b)ir* 'plays' (Mod. Ir. *imríonn*); *impaid* (OIr. *imm:soí*), *-impai* 'turns' (Mod. Ir. *iompaíonn*); *élaid* (OIr. *as:luí*), *-élai* 'escapes' (Mod. Ir. *éalaíonn*); *tuismid* (OIr. *do:fuissim*, 3pl. *-tuis^tmet*), *-tuissim* 'begets' (Mod. Ir. *tuismíonn*); *cotlaid* (OIr. *con:tuili*, 3pl. *-cot^tlat*), *-cotlai* 'sleeps' (Mod. Ir. *codlaíonn*); *éitsid* metathesized to *éistid* (OIr. *in:túaisi*), *-éitsi* to *-éisti* 'listens' (Mod. Ir. *éisteann*); *tuillid* (OIr. *do:slí*), *-tuilli* 'earns' (Mod. Ir. *tuilleann*); *foirbrid*, *forbraid* (OIr. *for:beir*, 3pl. *-foirp^tret*), *-forbair* 'grows' (Mod. Ir. *forbraíonn*); *coimlid*, *comlaid* (OIr. *con:meil*, 3pl. *-coim^tlet*), *-com(m)ail* 'grinds, rubs' (Mod. Ir. *cuimlíonn*); *oslaicid* (OIr. *as:oilci*), *-oslaici* 'opens' (Mod. Ir. *osclaíonn* by metathesis of *l* and *c* plus new syncope pattern vis à vis *ipv. oscail* etc.); *derscaigid* (OIr. *do:róscai*), *-derscaigi* 'excels' (Mod. Ir. *dearscaíonn*); *imthigid* (OIr. *imm:tét*, 3pl. *imm:tíagat*, III.4.1a(ii)), *-imthig* (OIr. *-imthet*, 3pl. *-imthiget*) 'travels, sets out' (Mod. Ir. *imíonn*). References to support this schematic presentation will be found under the entries for the appropriate old compound and/or new simple verbs in *DIL*. The rise of the 3sg. pres. conj. *-enn/-ann* ending (see 6.1. below) seems to have made it possible to extrapolate simple *in(d)arbaid* (OIr. *be(n)-* cpd. *in(d):árban*)

from 3sg. dep. *-in(d)arban(n)* 'expels' (Mod. Ir. *ionnarb-*), if *indarbaid* is not rather formed from verbal noun *indarbae* by (b) below. Examples like *imrid*, *-imir* 'plays' above, in which the addition of *-id* is made to the stem found in pl. and other forms with a similar extra syllable (e.g. 3pl. *-im(b)[†]ret*), show how vibrant syncope still was in synchronic patterning.

As one might expect, Middle Irish sources usually preserve plenty of deuterotonic forms alongside this innovatory type. However, they often display an uncertainty in handling them (5.4-5) below) that points to largely literary retention of a category obsolescent or even obsolete in contemporary speech. This was thus probably a good deal more evolved here as elsewhere in the direction of early Modern Irish norms than a literal evaluation of the written record would suggest. Indeed, there are very occasional examples of new simple for old compound verbs even in the Old Irish Glosses, e.g. 1sg. abs. *imfolnguba* 'I shall cause' (Ml. 142b3, expected *im:folngub* with 1sg. conj.), prot. 3sg. rel. *roichther* 'that it was extended' (Ml. 138a2, from *ro:saig*, *-roig* and apparently subjunctive, see 6.2) and *thórnther* 'that is denoted' (Sg. 59b18, expected *do:foirndither*, cf. 3.2c).

Compounds with *to*, *fo* or *ro* followed by a vowel can be either prototonic or deuterotonic in independent position in Old Irish (I.1.4), but in that case telltale abs. or rel. endings may indicate re-analysis as simple verbs in Middle Irish, e.g. *fácbait* 'they leave' (SR 7655, OIr. *fácbat* or *fo:ácbat*), *tecait* 'they come' (3488, OIr. *tecat* or *do:ecat*), *taidbrit* '(which) they display' (7731, OIr. *taidbret* still at SR 749 or *do:aidbret*, cf. 3.4), augm. subj. *t(h)ucas* 'who could bring' (335, 2384, OIr. *tuc(c)a* or *do:uc(c)a*, cf. 3.2c).

(b) An alternative model for the creation of new simple verbs in place of earlier compounds was provided by a few Old Irish pairs of (verbal) noun plus derived verb (cf. II.2.2b) such as *ás* 'growth, growing' and *ás-aid* 'grows' (W1), *cennach* 'purchase, buying' and *cennaig-id* 'buys' (W2a). Thus OIr. *con:óí*, *-cumai* 'protects, keeps', vn. *coimét* generating the replacement *coimétaid* (Mod. Ir. *coimeádann*), and similarly OIr. *do:ruimnethar*, *-dermainethar* 'forgets', vn. *dermat*, Mid. Ir. *dermataid* (Mod. Ir. *derm(h)adann*); OIr. *con:utaing*, *-cumtaing* 'builds', vn. *cumtach*, Mid. Ir. *cumtaigid* (Mod. Ir. *cumhdaíonn*); OIr. *in:fét* or *ad:fét* (I.2.9e), *-indet* 'relates', vn. *in(d)isiu*, Mid. Ir. *in(d)isid* (Mod. Ir. *insíonn* with a new syncope pattern vis à vis ipv. *innis* etc.); OIr. *do:fich*, *-dích* 'requisites', vn. *dígal*, Mid. Ir. *díg[†]laid* (Mod. Ir. *díolann*); *toim[†]sid* 'measures' (OIr.

do:midethar), vn. *tomus*. This method of eradicating the deuterotonic/prototonic opposition by new formations based on verbal nouns was evidently as effective as (a) and likewise produced initially stressed simple verbs. Even where the base verb was already simple, a significantly different suppletive verbal noun could generate a new simple verb standing in a regular relationship to it: e.g., OIr. *nascaid* 'binds', vn. *naidm* 'binding', Mid. Ir. *naidmid* alongside *nascid*; OIr. *tongaid* 'swears', vn. *luige* 'oath, swearing', Mid. Ir. *luigid* 'swears' alongside *tongaid* (cf. late Mod. Ir. replacement of *ib(h)id(h)* 'drinks', vn. *ól* 'drinking', by a new *ólann* 'drinks').

(c) Often it cannot be determined whether a new Middle and Modern Irish simple verb is based upon the prototonic stem or the verbal noun of an earlier compound, e.g. *frecraid* (OIr. *fris:gair*), *-frecair* 'replies', vn. *frecrae* (Mod. Ir. *freagraíonn*); *togaid* (OIr. *do:goa*), *-toga* 'chooses', vn. *togu* (Mod. Ir. *toghann*); *aithnid* or *aichnid* (simplification of *aithgn-*, OIr. *ad:gnin*), *-aith(g)nen(n)* 'recognizes' (cf. *in(d)arbaid* in (a) above), vn. *aith(g)ne* (Mod. Ir. *aithníonn*).

The productive *-(a)ig-* denominative (VIII.5.1) could also be used to turn a verbal noun into a new verb, an unusually early instance being standard OIr. *for:tét* 'helps' (later *fortaigid*, Mod. Ir. *fortaíonn*; cf. *imm:tét* to *imthigid* in (a) above), vn. *fortacht*, and sporadic denominative *fortachtaigid(ir)* (Ml. 25c5, 88b16, and further Mid. Ir. attestations, Mod. Ir. *fortachtaíonn*). A formation of this type could produce, say, *aithnigid* 'recognizes' from *aith(g)ne* alongside *aithnid*, and give rise to more widespread fluctuation between *-(a)id* and *-(a)igid*, the descendant of which seems often to have prevailed in present-day Irish (e.g. *aithníonn* 'recognizes').

5.3. A handful of verbs in Old Irish avoided, or appeared to avoid, an awkward deuterotonic/prototonic alternance by means of a 'dummy' preverb used only with the independent forms (I.2.9d and XI.3.1-2), e.g. *do:tuit*, *-tuit* 'falls', and an isolated extension of this pattern is seen in 3sg. subj. pass. *-cotar* (Ml. 118d10) for standard *-étar* vs. indep. *ad:cotar*. In Middle Irish this device was quite often exploited by pretonic reiteration of what was taken to be the first preverb, e.g. *as:oslaic* 'opened' (SR 4801; OIr. *as:oilc*, *-oslaic*). In practice *do* and *cum* were the usual candidates precisely because they were particularly common as first preverbs owing to positional hierarchy and secondary composition (IX.1.1-2): e.g., *con:coméirget* 'they arise' (LL 12136 and 7; OIr. *con:éirget*, *-coiméirget*), *con:congbathar* 'be held' (12244; *con:gaib*, *-congaib*), *con:compred* 'that was begotten, (37266; *con:breth*, *-coimpred*), *con:comairnectar* 'they met' (11613; *con:ráncatar*,

-comairnectar), *con:coicertar* 'are pronounced' (*Ériu* 16, 83.63; *con:cert(a)tar*, -*coicert(a)tar*) involving *cum*. Examples of this type involving forms with imperfect endings, preterites or relative constructions (note 3.2b) seem to have led to somewhat more general use of *con* in place of *no*, *ro* or the like, particularly in *LL*, e.g. *con:cured-som* 'he used to throw' (*LL* 4989, for *no:cured*, OIr. *fo:cerded*), *con:gab* 'who has taken' (*LL* 8636, for *ro:gab*), *daig con:mebdatar* 'because they have broken' (8807-8, for *ro:memdatar*). These phenomena involving *con* seem more likely to reflect increasingly inept literary attempts to maintain moribund proclitics in the face of rapid progress towards new simple verbs (5.2 above) than to correspond to any wider linguistic reality, and belong in a broader context of literary confusions between obsolescent Old Irish categories such as *ro*, *no* and various pretonic preverbs (see 4.3 and 5.4-5).

Repetition of the first preverb may, however, have had more foundation outside the literary medium in the case of those verbs, mostly compounds with initial *to* followed by a vowel, which were often prototonic in independent as well as dependent position in Old Irish (I.1.4), e.g. *fo:ácaib* or *fácaib*, -*fácaib* 'leaves', *do:ic* or *tic*, -*tic* 'comes'. Here Middle Irish was quite prone to replace the anomalous independent non-imperative prototonic forms by prefixing a repeated first preverb, e.g. *fo:fácaib* 'leaves', (*LU* 5406, *SR* 1201, but cf. 5.5.1), *do:tic* 'comes' (*Fél.* May 25, a possible OIr. example), *do:ticed* 'used to come' (*SR* 1116), *do:t(h)árfas* 'was shown' (1941, 3316; *do:árfas*, (-)*tárfas* augm. pret. of *do:adbat*), *do:tháirced* 'used to provide' (4521; *do:áirced*, (-)*táirced*), *do:thuc* 'brought' (2235; *do:u(i)c*, (-)*tu(i)c*), *do:ss:timchellae* 'goes around them' (180, but note extraordinary *im:thimchellat* 'which encircle' at 346; *do:imchella*, (-)*timchella*), *do:thaitni* 'shines' (183; *do:aitni*, (-)*taitni*), *a ndo:thidnacht* 'what he has given' (*Ériu* 1,46.9, cf. 4.2b; OIr. pres. *do:indnaig*, (-)*tindnaig*), *do-m:tháraill* 'has come to me' (*Rawl.* B.502 151b16 on p. 226 of *Corp. Gen.*; *do:áraill*, (-)*táraill*, augm. pret. of *do:aidlea*), *do:toirc(h)echnatar* 'had prophesied' (*CIH* 528.19; *do:airchain*, (-)*tairchain*). This deletable pretonic *do* had the advantage of keeping the main body of the verb dependent and hence unaltered throughout, and shows some tendency to spread beyond this range, e.g. frequent *do:t(h)áet* 'comes' etc. (e.g. *SR* 5963, *LU* 4782, 5719 etc.; *do:tét*, -*táet*) or unusual and presumably hypercorrect *do-m:thabair* 'which brings me' (*SR* 3301; *do:beir*, -*tabair*, and still *do-bheir*, -*tabhair* in Class. Mod. Ir.), *do:thung* 'I swear' (*LL* 7697; *tongu*, -*tung*, old simple

verb; cf. *con:cométad* at LL 8456 with new simple verb by 5.2b). However, this response to the problems of deuterotonic/prototonic alternations was soon superseded by the more radical and generally applicable approach of creating new simple verbs (5.2a-c), and did not survive as such into Modern Irish. Indeed, once *fo:fácaib*, *do:thaitni* etc. were yielding to simple abs. *fácbaid*, *taitnid* as independent counterparts of *-fácaib*, *-taitni* and so forth, *do:tuit*, *-tuit* tended to become simple *tuitid*, *-tuit* (Mod. Ir. *t(u)iteann*), *fo:fúair* 'got' gave way to *fúair* (LU 4062, LL 38656), *ro:fetar* to *fetar* 'I know' (LL 12576), *fo:fúasna* to *fúasnaid* 'stirs', and so on (cf. I.2.9d).

However, repetition of *do* may have left a major, if indirect, mark on Modern Irish in the form of the *do* prefixed proclitically to otherwise independent preterite and imperfect, past subjunctive or conditional forms in the classical language (except before a vowel, only the lenition usually remains in current speech) in place of older *ro* (4.3) and *no* (5.3) respectively. Thus Mod. Ir. *do mhol*, later *mhol* 'praised', *níor mhol* 'did not praise' (OIr. augm. pret. *ro:molastar*, *ní-ro:mol astar*) or *d'im(th)igh* 'departed' (OIr. *imm:ru-laid*, later Mid. Ir. *ro:imthigh* by 5.2a), *do mholadh*, later *mholadh* 'used to praise', *ní mholadh* 'used not to praise', (OIr. ipf. *no:molad*, *ní:molad*), *d'im(th)igheadh* (modern spelling *d'imíodh*) 'used to depart' (OIr. *imm:téged*, later Mid. Ir. *no:imthiged*).

The rise of new simple verbs in competition with the independent type with *do* replication was bound to produce doublets such as *ro:tháraill* (ZCP 6, 49) and *do:tháraill* (above), *ro:thidnacht* (4.2b) and *do:thidnacht* (above), *ro:thaircha(i)n* (LL 38082) and *do:thair-(che)chain* (cf. *do:toirchechnatar* above). Such pairs were presumably liable to give the impression that *ro* and *do* were free variants in proclisis before preterites unaccompanied by a further conjunct particle, to which *ro* might be attached as in *ní-r(o)* etc. but which caused the deletion of replicated *do*. Since the class of verbs (old compounds with *to* followed by a vowel) liable to generate such alternations was large and had some common members, this seems to be an adequate trigger for the further spread of *do* as a variant and ultimately replacement of unaccompanied proclitic *ro*, the type *ní-r(o)* etc. surviving precisely because repeated *do* could not be used in such an environment. Owing to the demise of all but a handful of compound verbs as a distinct grammatical category and to the fact that these survivors generally avoided proclitic *ro* in the preterite (e.g. *do:chuaid*, *at:(r)ubairt*, *tánaic* or *do:ánaic*, *do:ri(n)gni*, *tuc* or *du:uc* and *do:rat*,

at:chonnai(r)c), there was no longer any need to maintain formal distinctions between a semantically empty preterite marker *ro* (4.1) and preverbs such as *do* in proclisis.

Where replicated *do* was followed by an infixed pronoun and/or an imperfect, past subjunctive or conditional it came into competition with *no* prefixed to new simple verbs (I.3.4 and VIII.7). Thus a form like *do-ss:timchella(e)* above would presumably be in free variation with simple *no-s:timchella*, while a very nice instance from the imperfect is provided by *Three Hom.* 58 with *da:thimthired* 'which she used to serve' and *no:thimt(h)ired* 'she used to serve' (*do:imthiret*, *-timthiret*, new simple *timthir(th)id*) virtually juxtaposed. In such cases *do* could be perceived as a free variant of *no* and spread at its expense, *da:benad* 'would strike' (LL 11087; *no:benad*), particularly since *no* could only be used with otherwise unaccompanied simple verbs and like replicated *do* was incompatible with a further conjunct particle.

Once a triple equation *ro* = *do* = *no* had been established it should be no surprise to find *ro* replacing *no* on occasion in Middle Irish, e.g. ipf. *is tussu... ra:armad mo slega*, *ra:déirged mo lepaid* 'it is thou that used to equip my spears and make my bed' (LL 10379-80) or the sequence of futures with infixed pronoun *ra-t:meliub... ra-t:nigiub... ra-t:nasciub... ra-s:lécub...* 'I shall grind thee ... I shall scour thee ... I shall bind thee ... I shall let them (?) go ...' (LL 12297-9). As in the preterite, *do* prevailed over *ro* and *no* with the imperfect etc. in Modern Irish. However, *ro* (or rather *ra*) replaced *no* and resisted *do* as the particle used to attach artificially preserved (2.3) infixes in the classical standard as in the above LL passage, presumably because this usage was already well established with the extremely common *b*-forms of the substantive verb as early as Old Irish (end of I.3.4). A striking instance with a preterite normally resistant to *ro* (but cf. 4.2b-c) is *cid ro-t:tuc-su* 'what has brought thee?' (LL 10377-8).

5.4. The only pretonic preverbs to survive vestigially into Modern Irish were *do* (OIr. *do*) and *ad* (OIr. *at*, 2.2a): class. *do-ní*, Ulst. and Sco.G. *ní* (cf. 4.3) 'does' (OIr. *do:gní*); class. *do-bheir*, Ulst. and Sco.G. *bheir* 'gives' (OIr. *do:beir*); class. *do-gheibh*, Ulst. and Sco.G. *gheibh* 'gets' (OIr. *fo:gaib*); class. *a-deir*, current Ir. (*a-*)*deir*, Sco.G. *their* 'says' (Mid. Ir. *at:beir*, OIr. *as:beir*); class. *ad:chí* (Ulst. *'tchí*) or *do:chí* (Munst. *c(h)íonn*, Sco.G. *chí*) 'sees' (Mid. Ir. *at:chí*, OIr. *ad:cí*); class. *do:chluin* or *ad:chluin*, *-cluín* 'hears' (regular simple verb in current speech;

Old Irish *ro:cluine*thar, -*cluine*thar, I.2.9d). From this it appears that the tendency to spread proclitic *do* was not confined to the range of the verbal particles *ro* and *no* (4.3 and 5.3) but that *do* also tended to replace pretonic preverbs of similar shape such as *ro* or *fo*. Even in Old Irish there was a tendency for *ad:cí* 'sees' and *ro:cluine*thar 'hears' to interact grammatically: the anomalous and innovatory deponent *e*-subjunctive (IV.3) of *ad:cí* was presumably developed under the influence of the subjunctive of deponent *ro:cluine*thar, while both verbs share a peculiar use of *co* with their narrative preterites in the absence of a further conjunct particle (XI.31-2) and pret. pass. (*ro*)-*clos* is obviously modelled on *ad:cess* (VII.4). Examples of *do* for *ro* and especially of *at* transferred from *at:chí* occur with forms of old *ro:cluine*thar in Middle Irish, e.g. *do:chlunim* (LL 10324), *at:chlunim* (10301), *at:chluiniu* (38409) 'I hear', *at:chúala* 'heard' (SR 1717). Conversely, *ro* and *do* may replace *at* in *at:chí*, e.g. *ra:connaic* (LL 31408-9), *da:chonnaic* (9912) 'saw'. One may further note *at:rochair* 'fell' (37959; Old Irish *do:rocha(i)r*). Given the Modern Irish survivals, confusion of *at* and *do* here cannot have been confined to literary usage, although it is impossible to be sure about *ro* in this respect. Owing to the rise of new simple verbs (5.2) the Old Irish inventory of pretonic preverbs (cf. IX.1.1) had been massively depleted by classical Modern Irish, only *do* and *ad* maintaining a tenuous and partially interchangeable existence. If Middle Irish is indeed by and large a literary hybrid between earlier more or less Old Irish written norms and a current vernacular evolving rapidly into early Modern Irish (see 1), we can envisage a spoken background in which all but the commonest compound verbs had developed simple verb patterns, only the pretonic preverbs *ro*, *do*, *at* remained as such, and even these were interchangeable in at least two important survivors. A writer attempting to reproduce broadly Old Irish usage in such circumstances might be expected to perpetrate all manner of literary confusions between pretonic preverbs, and a flux of solecisms and hypercorrections, more egregious in some cases than in others, does indeed characterize efforts to retain deuterotonic forms of old compound verbs against the rising tide of new simple verbs (5.2) in various Middle Irish texts, especially some of those in LL.

Before giving examples, a couple of preliminary remarks are in order. Voicing of the initial consonant of certain proclitics between Old and Modern Irish, e.g. Old Irish *co*, *cach* vs. later *go*, *gach* but stressed *cách* unchanged, seems to account for replacement of Old Irish *fo* and *for* by *bo/ba*, *bar* etc. in some LL texts particularly,

retained *f* being presumably due to orthographic conservatism and/or the common phenomenon of back-formation from the stressed 'conjugated' prepositions like *fáe* or *fó* 'under him', *fair* 'on him'. The prepositions *for* and *ar* along with their 'conjugated' forms had coalesced by Modern Irish into a single set without initial *f*, and confusion between them, most often *ar* in place of *for* but sometimes the (hypercorrect?) reverse, is common enough in Middle Irish.

It is no surprise to find cases of similar confusion between the corresponding preverbs, e.g. *ar:did^fsiter* 'will be crushed' (*Táin* 3534, OIr. pres. *for:díng*), *dia:forgéni* 'when he had prepared' (*LU* 4975; OIr. pres. *ar:fogni*). *Ar* can also replace *ad*, e.g. *ar:cotaim* 'I possess' (*LU* 10258; OIr. *ad:cota*), *ar-dot:chiat* 'who see you' (*LU* 10028: *ad:cí*). Indeed, the possibilities of preverb interchange are legion and even encompass the preterite marker *ro/do*, as the following selection should demonstrate. For instance, OIr. *íarmi:foacht* 'asked' can appear variously as *at:fócht* (*LL* 11060), *im:facht* (9082), *con:fóchta* (7880), while its simple development *ro:íarfacht* (38496) or *ro:íarfaig* (38129) may be realized as *bar:íarfacht* (38496). *Ra:bert* means 'said' (*at:* or *as:bert*) at 10803, 10816, 10826 etc. but 'gave, plied' (*do:bert*) at 11112, and likewise *ra:chúaid* means 'related' (*at:chuid*, OIr. *ad:cuid*) at 10225 but 'went' (*do:c(h)uaid*) at 10240 etc. Further examples include *ro:tháet* 'who comes' (10166; *do:t(h)áet*, *do:tét*), *fo:fuctha* 'they were brought' (*SR* 3263; *do:(f)uctha*, cf. 5.5.1), *fo:cengat* 'they advance' (*LL* 37716; *do:cengat*), *fo:gniat* '(that) they do' (7883; *do:gniat*), *bo:gníset* 'they did' (10604; *do:génsat*), *ba:cheird* 'puts' (10704; *fo:c(h)eird*), *bo:gebed* 'used to get' (38687; *fo:gaibed*), *do:gébaind* 'I would get' (11140; *fo:gébainn*), *ba:érig* 'arose' (38935; *ro:érig*; OIr. *at:raracht*), *ba:recart* 'replied' (34899; *ro:(f)recart*, OIr. *fris:rogart*), *for:ecmaing*, *bar:écmaing* 'comes to be, happens' (9318, 34837; *do:ecmaing*), *bar:róega* 'who has chosen' (10578; *do:róegu*), *bar:asfénad* 'would show' (11085; *do:aisfénad*), *bar:asfén* 'showed' (11102; *do:aisfén*), *con:áirgeba* 'will cause' (11079; *do:áircibea*), *con:arraid* 'came upon' (7661; *do:arraid*), *con:cechlabat* 'they will hear' (8465; *ro:cechlatar*).

5.5.1. Limited Old Irish tendencies to spread prosthetic *f* before stressed vowels in appropriate deuterotonic compounds have already been mentioned (see 1.2.9d and XI.4.2). The basic point is that, since vowel-initial forms in leniting contexts could correspond to unlenited forms with initial vowel or *f*- (e.g. rel. *fo:era*, cf. Wb. 33b13, vs. non-rel. *fo:fera*, but both rel. and non-rel. *f(o):ácaib*), *f* could be

spread as a hiatus-filler to vowel-initial unlenited forms: e.g., *do:fuissim*, *-tuissim* (*to-uss-sem-*), which then provided a model for *do:fuit* partially replacing anomalous *do:tuit* as an alternant with prot. *-tuit*.

In Middle Irish sources this phenomenon becomes quite common, e.g. *do:farraid* 'arrived' (SR 5715, *do:arraid*), *do:fuc* 'took' (SR 1285 etc., *do:uc*), *fo:fácaib* 'left' (SR 1201, but cf. 5.3). Since pretonic preverbs had come to lenite in Middle Irish main clauses (2.2b), the *f* in such cases was presumably purely graphic and not pronounced as such, e.g. *do:fuc* 'brought' (SR 4068), *do-t:fuc* 'has brought thee' (1714, *do-t:uc*), *ro:fuc* '(who) bore' (7164, *ro:uc*), *fo:úair* '(that) he got' and *fo:fuarus* '(that) I got' (LL 38647, 27335, arguably Mid. Ir. relatives, but anyway OIr. *fo:fúair*, *fo:fúar*), and even *con:facca* 'saw' (SR 1067, 1304 etc.; *co:n-accae*). Even in such cases the writing of *f* is indicative of the way such forms tended to be perceived, and there are further instances of non-leniting infixes followed by an *f* that was presumably pronounced as such, e.g. *ra-ta:fárfaid* 'which appeared to him' (LL 11710-1; OIr. *do-d:n-árbaid*, cf. 2.1c-d, 4.3), *ra-s:farraid* 'came upon them' (9883; *do-s:(n-)arraid*, cf. 4.3, 5.3), *ro-s:fuc* 'took it (f.)' (37823, *ro-s:(n-)uc*), *do-s:fuc* 'brought them' (SR 3529; *do-s:(n-)uc*), *do-s:fánaic* 'came to her' (SR 1687; *do-s:(n-)ánaic*).

A development of considerable significance in Modern Irish (e.g. *fásaidh*, *ní fhás(ann)* replacing earlier *ásaid*, *ní:ása* 'grows, does not grow') was the tendency to prefix *f* to an initial vowel of prototonic forms, including independent simple verbs old and new. This doubtless owed much to the rise of main-clause lenition after conjunct particles such as *ro* or *ní* in Middle Irish (2.2b), which duly presents us with some early instances of this phenomenon, e.g. *do:farnaic* 'came' (LL 12817, pres. *do:air-ic*) and *co:farnaic* 'until he came upon' (SR 3736), *co-nda:fairnechtar* (LL 35989, both *ar:ic*, *ní:(f)air-ic*) or *fostaic* 'stops' (LL 12823), *ro:fastai* 'stopped' (SR 3777; new simple verb based on OIr. *ad:suidi*, *ní:as^tai* re-analysed *-fastai*; Mod. Ir. *fostaíonn*).

5.5.2. Occasionally literary over-reaction to the erosion of compound by new simple verbs produced a presumably bogus compound by hypercorrection, e.g. *do:thung* 'I swear' (LL 7697, old simple *tongid*, *-toing*), *con:cométad* 'used to protect' (8456, new simple *cométaid* from verbal noun *comét* of *con:oí*, *-cumai*), *co-ta:coimsed* 'who would be able for him' (SR 5387, new simple *coim^tsid* from verbal noun *commus* of *con:midethar*) modelled on the Middle Irish type with

replicated preverb (see 5.3). A striking example apparently reflecting artificial creation of compound *do:foing* (properly *tongid*), *-toing* on the model of types like *do:fuism*, (giving way to simple *tuisim*) *-tuisim* 'begets' occurs as early as Ml. *do-d:fongad* 'who used to swear it' (36a21), which in addition to being an instance of bogus composition is also remarkable for exemplifying an innovatory prosthetic *f* by 5.5.1 in comparison with standard OIr. *no:thongad* 'which he used to swear' in the immediately preceding gloss. Such hypercorrections point to an incipient confusion between simple and compound verbs.

5.5.3. As has been seen in chapters I-XI, Old Irish verbs were liable to numerous modifications of basic shape owing to a multitude of inflectional factors. These ranged from stem formation (e.g. *s*-subj., perf. and fut. reduplication), particularly in the case of strong types, the syncope accompanying endings that involve an extra syllable (e.g. 3sg. prot. *-epir* 'says' but 3pl. *-ep^tret*) and the deuterotonic/prototonic opposition (e.g. *as:berat*, *-ep^tret*) to the effects of preverbal augmentation (e.g. *as:bert* vs. *as:ru-bart* 'said', prot. *-epert* vs. *-é-r^t-bart*). A subsequent shift from strong to weak inflectional patterns involving minimal alteration of the basic root shape (see I.2.2-3 and 6.2 below), from compound to simple patterns of inflection (5.2a-c) and from preverbal to proclitic augmentation of preterites and subjunctives especially (4.1-3) meant that in Modern Irish the vast majority of verbs kept their basic root shape intact and more or less unchanged throughout their various inflections, significant traces of major alterations typical of Old Irish surviving only in a fairly small number of common 'irregular' verbs. It has already emerged that progress in this direction was well under way in Middle Irish.

Such trends towards rationalization were bound to put pressure on the handful of verbal paradigms characterized by suppletion. For instance, OIr. *fo:ceird*, *-cuirethar* 'puts' (I.2.9c), augm. pret. *ro:lá(a)*, *-ralae* (XI.1) could be replaced by forms of an entirely regular *cuirid*, *-cuir* (Mod. Ir. *cuireann*, *chuir* etc.) based on the unaugm. dependent stem (see 6.4 on loss of deponent inflection), e.g. *curit* 'which they throw' (LL 11698), *ro:chuir* 'put, sent' (39059) or *ra:chuir* (9329). The suppletive preterite *do:cer*, augm. *do:ro-chair* (VI.2.7) of *tuitid* (*do:tuit* or *do:fuit*), *-tuit* 'falls' could likewise be regularized, e.g. *tuttis* (LL 38710) or *ro:thuit* (LU 1350) 'fell' (Mod. Ir. *t(u)iteann*, *th(u)it* etc.), while *imthigid* (OIr. *imm:tét*, 5.2a) develops pret. *imthigis*, *ro:imthig* (LL 38537, 38389) in place of *im:luid*, *im:ru-laid*. Sometimes experiments along these lines failed to establish themselves,

e.g. 3pl. pret. *fo:gaibset* 'they found' rather than suppl. *(fo)-fúaratar* (Mod. Ir. still *fuaradar*) to pres. *fo:gaib* 'finds' (VI.2.7), and a few common verbs like *téit* 'goes' retained suppletive forms right down to present-day spoken Irish.

Where old augmented preterites, whether suppletive or containing an obsolescent preverbal augment or both, were displaced by regularization of this kind, complete new paradigms very occasionally arose by a process known as **skewing**. For example, once the product of a fully regular *tuit-* paradigm *ro:thuit* had entered into serious competition with inherited *do:rochair*, *-torchair* in the preterite the impression of free variants thus given could trigger a spread of *-torchr-* alongside *tuit-* elsewhere, e.g. 1sg. subj. *co:torchrór-sa* 'that I fall' (SR 1533) and Class. Mod. Ir. pres. *ní thorchrann* (pret. *torchair*) alongside *tuitidh* etc. Similarly *teilcid* (OIr. *do:léci*, *-teil^tci*) 'throws' developed a regular pret. *ro:theilc* that tended to oust *tarlaic* (OIr. *do:re-lic*), *-tar^tlaic*. Doublets here and in the subj. (unaugm. *teilcid*, augm. *tarlaicid*) triggered two verbs with full paradigms, *teilcid* and *tarlaicid* 'throws', by skewing.

5.5.4. Formal divergences, particularly those due to different syncope patterns, between deuterotonic and prototonic, unaugmented and augmented variants gave rise to some confusion and analogical levelling even in Old Irish (see I.2.9b and especially XI.2.5), e.g. *do:ro-ch^tratar*, *-to-r^tchar^ttar* (*Thes.* II, 242.1) alongside innovatory *-torchratar* (Ml. 48c28) 'they fell' influenced by the deuterotonic form. Such levelling was continued in Middle Irish, e.g. subj. *-torchrór* 'I fall' above (5.5.3) or augm. subj. 3pl. *-é-r^t-brat* (LL 13244) 'they may say' in place of earlier *-é-r^t-barat* (e.g. Wb. 27c8) by imitation of deut. *as:ro-b^trat* and/or unaugm. *-ep^tret*. Preference for syncopated over unsyncopated variants of certain endings and suffixes (notably those of the *f*-fut. and *s*-pret.) were strengthened, as in *ní:chóemstais* (SR 932) modelled on deut. *con:ís^ttais* etc. alongside older prot. *ní:chóem^tsaitis* (SR 519) 'would not be able'. Likewise *no-m:diúlt^tfa* (SR 7723) 'thou shalt deny me' or *ro:diúlt^tsatar* (SR 5268) 'they denied' with patterns strictly irregular in a new simple verb based on an already syncopated prototonic stem *-dí-l^tt-* (deut. *do:sluindi* 'denies', OIr. 3pl. augm. pret. *do:rí-l^ttiset* at Wb. 5c11). A similar phenomenon is seen in 3pl. *ní-r:tuill^tset* (BNnE 267.9) 'they have not deserved', in comparison with OIr. *ní-ro:thui^tllisem* (Wb. 24d6) 'we have not earned' (cf. *ad:roi^tlliset* in VI.4.3), while *do-s:n-uilliub* 'I shall earn it (f.)' (LL 36762) reflects a *do:uill-* created from *tuill-*, the prototonic stem of *do:slí*. Augm.

pret. 3sg. *do:ri-g^tni* 'has done, did' is replaced in the OIr. Glosses by a pl. stem analogical to prot. *-der^tgén^tsat*, unaugm. deut. *do:gén^tsat* 'they have done, did' etc., namely 1pl. *do:rigénsam*, 2pl. *do:ri-génsid*, 3pl. *do:rigénsat* (Wb. 14b26, 20d3, 7d10 etc.), but in Middle Irish the tendency is to spread both the *do:ri(n)gn-* stem and syncope before preterite *s*, e.g. 2pl. *do:rinnsid* (SR 3616), 3pl. *do:rigset* (SR 3533 etc.). Needless to say, the above is just a random selection of more or less typical processes of this kind to be encountered in Old and especially Middle Irish sources.

6.1.1. Inflection of the present indicative active displayed considerable variation in Old Irish because of a number of factors. Firstly, there was the lexically conditioned dichotomy between deponent (VIII.5.2) and basic active (VIII.2.1-5) endings. Secondly, although the deponent endings and those of the basic active plural (VIII.2.2) were homogeneous, the basic active singular was prone to desinential variations according to the class of verb involved (VIII.2.3-5).

The fundamental trend in Middle Irish material is towards the eradication of most of these variants in favour of a single set of endings used with virtually all verbs in the present indicative active. One facet of this was the general demise of the basic active/deponent opposition to be discussed in 6.4 below. In the present indicative this development simply amounted to the replacement of deponent by the corresponding basic active forms. The inventory of basic active plural endings in Old Irish was reduced through loss of the distinct 1 and 3pl. relative endings (see 3.3-4), while the 1pl. abs. *-m(a)i* of Old Irish generally gave way to innovatory *-m(a)it* (2.2c) or occasionally *-m(a)ít* (2.4). Otherwise there seem to have been no significant changes in this part of the system.

6.1.2. The 1sg. ending *-im(m)* inherited in W1 and S3 presents had already expanded to other present stems within Old Irish itself because of its distinctive shape, indifference as to absolute and conjunct, and especially its restriction to the present indicative unlike the various *u*-endings ranged against it (see VIII.2.4). Its spread had been most successfully resisted in the conjunct of S1a verbs and of H1/2 verbs with stressed root, e.g. *as:biur*, *-epur* 'I say', *do:gníu* 'I do' etc. quite regularly in the Glosses. In Middle Irish this trend towards generalization of *-im(m)* as 1sg. abs. and conj. of the present indicative continued and led to major encroachment even in those areas most resilient in Old Irish, e.g. *at:berim* (SR

1873), *at:derim* (LL 11199 with simplification of *tb* to *t* as in Mod. Ir. *(a-)deirim*) 'I say', *do:gním* 'I do' (SR 1196), *a-tas:cím* (LL 38626) 'I see them'. This, of course, is yet another instance of the innovatory component of Middle (and Old) Irish prefiguring modern usage: in the classical standard *-im* is ubiquitous in the present apart from *ad/do-chiú* (alongside *-chím*) 'I see' and *a-tú* 'I am' and in present-day speech *c(h)ím* and *táim* are the rule even here, wherever the synthetic 1sg. prevails over the analytic form with 3sg. verb and pronoun *mé*.

6.1.3. In the Old Irish 2sg. pres. the productive pattern of *-(a)i* in both abs. and conj. was resisted only by the endingless conjuncts of H2 (abs. *cii*, conj. *-cí* 'thou weepst') and S1a (abs. *biri*, conj. *-bir* 'thou bearest'), where it was already coming under pressure because it was not consistently differentiated from the 3sg. conj. (see VIII.2.5). Middle Irish tends quite strongly towards generalization of *-(a)i* in these remaining pockets, e.g. *at:beire* 'thou sayest' (SR 1268), *na:tabrai* '(since) thou cost not grant' (848), *at:beri* '(whom) thou mentionest' (LL 8957, cf. 9195), *do:beri* '(which) thou bestowest' (11199), *-tégi* 'thou goest' (9113). This development made it possible to replace synchronically anomalous *i*-vocalism by more predictable *e* in S1a verbs with short *e* in the root, e.g. *-beri* for *-bir* (distinct from 3sg. *-beir*) above.

The collapse of final unstressed vowels still distinct in standard Old Irish into a single obscure 'schwa' or /ə/ with palatal and non-palatal allophones in Middle Irish (cf. 2.2c) resulted in spelling confusions between *-i*, *-e*, *-ea*, *-iu* after a palatal and *-a*, *-(a)e*, *-(a)i*, *-u* after a non-palatal consonant. Consequently 2sg. *-(a)i*, having become /ə/ phonetically, is liable to appear in Middle Irish sources as *-i* or *-e* etc. after palatal and *-a*, *-ae* or *-ai* etc. after non-palatal consonants, whence *at:beire* or *at:beri* above, *con:daige* 'thou seekest' (e.g. SR 3095) or *con:daigi* (e.g. LU 5669), *no-t:medra* (LL 7939) = *no-t:medrai* (LU 4715) 'thou perturbest thyself'. Needless to say, this phonetic convergence and concomitant spelling confusions apply to any unstressed final vowels in Middle Irish and had formal repercussions well beyond the 2sg. pres.

In H2 verbs alternations such as *cii*, *-cí* were eradicated by a general Middle Irish tendency to merge hiatus vowels as a single long vowel, thus producing abs. *cí* as well as conj. *-cí* etc. Further examples of this significant Middle Irish contraction, which is sometimes attested in Old Irish, are pres 3pl. *-tat* (MI. 42b10), *a:tát* (LL 38623-4) 'are', 3sg. *bíth* (*Thes.* II, 293.15) or *bíd* (SR 4588 vs. *biid* at

4537) 'is wont to be' (cf. III.3).

Except where a specific form from a manuscript is being cited, the Modern Irish practice of writing non-palatal schwa as *-a* and its palatal counterpart as *-e* will be followed below, while bearing in mind that a number of spelling variants are actually attested in Middle Irish (see above) and very occasionally even in Old Irish sources.

6 1.4. In standard Old Irish, W1 verbs opposed 2 and 3sg. conj. pres. *-marbai*, *-marba* to subj. *-marbae*, *-marba* and W2a contrasted pres. *-léici*, *-léici* with subj. *-léice*, *-léicea* respectively. In both cases there was a threefold distinction but ambiguity at one point, the 3sg. pres. and subj. in W1 and the 2 and 3sg. pres. in W2a. As a result, however, of the Middle Irish homogenization of unstressed final vowels as schwa all four personal inflections collapsed together as variously spelled *-marba*, *-léice* (see 6.1.3) and so on, a degree of ambiguity too extensive to tolerate. The upshot was considerable pressure towards remodelling of the 3sg. pres. conj., the only form for which alternatives were readily available elsewhere.

The first of these was provided by S1 and 2 verbs with an endingless pres. 3sg. conj. clearly distinguished from the 2sg. conj. and the subj. 3sg. conj., e.g. pres. 2sg. *-beire*, 3sg. *-beir*, subj. 2 and 3sg. *-bera* allowing for the emergence of *-ə/*. Imitation of this state of affairs generated some instances of endingless 3sg. conj. in originally weak verbs in Middle Irish, e.g. *-tib* 'smiles' (LL 10501, cf. *-tibi* at LU 2977), *ní-m:léic* 'does not let me' (SR 4795). The presumably hypercorrect converse of using a weak 3sg. conj. pres. with an originally strong verb is seen in *im:riada* '(who) rides round' (LL 8964). The fact that 3sg. conj. pres. *-léic*, *-marb* etc. would be formally identical with *s*-pret. *-léic*, *-marb* was no major impediment to development of the endingless presents, since the augment had been generalized in the Middle Irish preterite (see 4.1). Thus *ní:léic* 'does not let', say, would normally be opposed to *ní-r(o):léic* 'did/has not let' and so on. Since, however, unaugmented preterites continued to be used fairly extensively in the literary medium, there seems to have been an understandable reluctance to write forms like pres. *ní:léic* in order to avoid confusion with surviving unaugmented preterites like *ní:léic* in written narrative.

The second model was provided by certain 3sg. conj. pres. and subj. forms in the S3 class, which was characterized by a final *n* in the present stem only (III.4.3). The commonest and most extensively compounded root in this group, *be(n)-*,

influenced the presents of a couple of other roots with initial *b*. Thus even in Old Irish *do:es-ta*, *(-)t-es-ta* 'is lacking' sometimes undergoes replacement of pres. *-ta(-)* by *-ban(-)* because non-present forms based upon *bi-* (I.2.9c) suggested a compound of *be(n)-* and a means of eradicating synchronically anomalous suppletion (pres. *(-)testa* but habit. pres. *-tesbi*, subj. *-tesaib*, augm. pret. *tesarb(ae)* etc.), e.g. 3sg. *(-)tesban* 'is lacking' (*CrithG.* 169), 3pl. *(-)tesbanat* 'are lacking' (*Wb.* 11d11, *PCr.* 65a2). Likewise a form like *(s-)* subj. 3sg. conj. *tadbae* could be interpreted as a *be(n)-* compound (*a-*) subj. (cf. IV.4.3, e.g. 3sg. subj. *-ind-ar-be* to pres. *-ind-ar-ban* 'expels') and lead to present forms like 3sg. pass. *do:n-adbantar* '(that) it is shown' (*Acr.* 10a2) or act. *tadban* (*SR* 8225) 'shows' in place of *do:adbadar*, *tadbat* respectively. This restricted phenomenon does not, however, appear to be directly related to the development of a specifically 3sg. conj. pres. *-enn/-ann* that will now be considered.

The starting point here was provided by the 3sg. pres. of the compounds of vowel-final S3 roots such as *as:ren* 'pays', *fo:tlen* 'removes'. Because of its origins in an Indo-European prototype confined to roots containing a sonant, the S3 nasal present class of Old Irish is dominated by roots containing *r*, *l* or *n* such as the two examples just given. Since Mac Néill's law conditions the regular conversion of final *-n* to *-nn* (often written *n* or *nd*) after sequences of *r*, *l* or *n* plus unstressed vowel, deuterotonic forms such as *as:ren*, *fo:tlen* will have alternated in Old Irish with prototonic *-éi-renn*, *-fo-thlann* etc. The only two compound-forming S3 roots of this shape without a nasal or liquid conducive to the development of 3sg. conj. pres. *-nn* by Mac Néill's law, where the root itself was unstressed, were *be(n)-* and *fe(n)-*, but it seems that these developed *-nn* quite early after an unstressed vowel in the 3sg. on the model of the majority of relevant S3 roots in which it had arisen by regular phonetic developments, e.g. *do:esbann* (*CIH* 488.2-3), *-tesband* (*LL* 15641) 'is lacking', *ní:thadbann* 'does not show' (*SR* 303), *ní:fuband* 'does not attack' (*LU* 3647, *fo:ben*), *ní:s:dérband* 'does not prevent them' (*LU* 7546, *do:rorban*). Alternations in this class between, say, 3sg. subj. *-fothla* (*OIr.* *-fothlae*) or *-éire* and 3sg. pres. *-fothlann* or *-éirenn* were readily applicable to old weak verbs as a means of resolving ambiguities, the basic proportion being:

subj. *-fothla*: pres. *-fothlann* = subj. *-marba*: pres. x (x = *-marbann*)

subj. *-éire*: pres. *-éirenn* = subj. *-léice*: pres. x (x = *-léicenn*)

In this way ambiguous inherited 3sg. conj. pres. *-marba* (W1), *-léice* (W2a) etc. tended to be replaced by an analogical *-marbann*, *-léicenn* etc. distinct not only from the corresponding 3sg. subj. but also from the 2sg. pres. *-marba*, *-léice* etc. The motive for this development is thus obvious, and only S3 forms with unstressed subj. *-e/-a* provided a suitable model for weak verbs in which subj. *-e/-a* was invariably unstressed. That, of course, restricted the choice to S3 types with unstressed root and 3sg. conj. pres. *-nn* as a result.

As this explanation would predict, weak verbs preponderate markedly in the earliest attestations of 3sg. conj. pres. *-enn/-ann*. The two probable instances in *SR*, *-adrann* 'worships' (3308) and *-innisenn* 'relates' (4607, cf. 5.2b), are of this type, and in those parts of *LU* written in the earlier *M* hand weak verbs outnumber other types by about two to one: *-lesaigend* 'remedies' (587), *-étsend* 'listens' (707), *-erchótigend* 'damages' (1988, *-(a)ig-* denominative from *erchót*, vn. of OIr. *ar:co-at*, cf. 5.2c), *-fastand* 'detains' (2114, cf. end of 5.5.1), *-curend* 'casts, puts' (2137 and 6543), *-foichlend* 'beware of' (2225), *-funend* 'sets' (3691), *-carand* 'loves' (3964). Erstwhile deponent formations are well represented on this list (see 6.4), and the preference of these innovatory types for *-enn/-ann* over the old non-deponent weak *-e/-a* as a replacement of originally deponent *-ethar/-athar* (VIII.5.2) seems particularly significant. Since H1 and H2 verbs with unstressed roots would be liable to the same formal convergences as W1 and W2a respectively, *-a(i)cend* 'sees' (*LU* 3988 and 3992) comes as no surprise, even though this particular H2 verb had a distinctive deponent subjunctive (IV.3) that was tending to give way to a normal active type in Middle Irish.

That leaves only three old strong verbs with *-enn/-ann* in the older *M* sections of *LU*, namely *-aithrethend* 'runs back' (603, *sic leg.*), *-tócband* 'raises' (2118), *-lenand* 'follows' (3990). Since a major tendency in Middle Irish was for originally strong verbs to adopt weak inflectional characteristics such as the *s*-preterite and *f*-future with the result that the Old Irish dichotomy was tending to disappear (see 6.2 below), increasing use of the *-enn/-ann* 3sg. conj. pres. without regard to weak or strong origins was more or less inevitable and came full circle when an old S3 verb like *-len* 'follows' could develop a conj. 3sg. *-lenann* alongside 2sg. *-lena* and 1sg. *-lenaim* on the model of patterns like 1sg. *-marbaim*, 2sg. *-marba*, 3sg. *-marbann*. Like 1sg. *-(a)im* (6.1.2), 3sg. conj. *-enn/-ann* had the attraction of being a distinctively present ending, and further examples of its spread include originally

strong *-ithend* 'eats' (LU 1895, later *H* hand), *-imrend* 'plies' (LL 8668) and *-gonand* 'smites' (LL 11065).

In Classical Modern Irish a 3sg. abs. *-(a)idh* was opposed to conj. $-\emptyset$ or *-(e)ann* in largely free variation in the present, e.g. *beiridh*, *-beir* or *-beireann* 'carries' (OIr. S1a) and *saoraidh*, *-saor* or *-saorann* 'frees' (OIr. W1), but in current spoken Irish *-(e)ann* has spread throughout the 3sg. pres., e.g. *saorann*, *ní shaorann* or *beireann*, *ní bheireann*, apart from limited survivals of old *-(a)idh* and $-\emptyset$ that become somewhat more frequent the further north one goes. In Scots Gaelic, however, the variant conj. *-(e)ann* failed to establish itself firmly, although its erstwhile existence is testified to by the stereotype *nach maireann* 'who does not live = the late', and abs. *-(a)idh* vs. conj. $-\emptyset$ is general, e.g. *beiridh*, *-beir* 'will carry' (old pres. as fut. in Scots Gaelic).

6.1.5. As far as present inflection is concerned, the foregoing indicates that the innovatory stratum in Middle Irish sources was tending towards the following more or less homogeneous system of endings regardless of verbal class or an obsolescent basic active/deponent dichotomy.

	CONJ.	ABS.
1 sg.		<i>-(a)im</i>
2sg.		<i>-e/-a</i>
3sg.	$-\emptyset$ or <i>-enn/-ann</i>	<i>-(a)id</i> , REL. <i>-es/-as</i>
1pl.	<i>-em/-am</i>	<i>-m(a)it</i>
2pl.	<i>-(a)id</i>	<i>-the/-tha</i>
3pl.	<i>-et/-at</i>	<i>-(a)it</i>

The rel. ending *-es/-as* was used with any subject antecedent (3.3), although the 3pl. *-(a)it* could still function optionally as relative to a plural antecedent. With non-subject antecedents the abs. form of the requisite person was used as relative (3.4) except in the 3sg., where *-es/-as* retained this function. Syncope of a predesinential vowel in forms such as the 1 and 2pl. abs. is even more dominant in Middle than in Old Irish (cf. 5.5.4), whence the omission of such vowels in the above table compared with that in VIII.2.2. The above system is very close in essentials to that of Classical Modern Irish and is considerably simplified in relation to the Old Irish inventory of present endings (VIII.2.2-5 and 5.2) still in competition

with it in varying degrees in Middle Irish texts. It will, of course, be borne in mind that final *-e* or *-a* in the table could be spelled in various ways (6.1.3), that *-the/-tha* was liable to delenition where appropriate (cf. I.3.3c), that *-m(a)it* had a bye-form *-m(a)ít* (2.4) and that 3sg. and pl. abs. forms with a petrified neuter suffixed pronoun (2.2c and 3.4) were also available in Middle Irish.

6.2. In Old Irish there was a typical 'weak' paradigm involving a present with unvarying quality of the stem-final consonant, an *a*-subjunctive, an *f*-future, an *s*-preterite active and *-th(-)* preterite passive, to which were opposed various 'hiatus' and 'strong' paradigms that deviated from this pattern in varying degrees (very slightly in H3, more noticeably in H1 and 2, very considerably in most strong verbs: details in chapters III-VII). The great formal advantage of the weak type was that the root generally remained readily recognisable throughout, whereas in a typical strong paradigm it was liable to more or less extreme modifications even before the dislocating effects of lexical composition, augmentation etc. came into play. The contrast between characteristic weak and strong paradigms in II.2.2 and 3 will give some idea of the greater simplicity of the former, which almost inevitably put pressure upon synchronically less predictable strong formations. The result overall was a tendency to spread the *a*-subjunctive at the expense of rivals, notably the *s*-subj., to generalize the weak (unreduplicated) *s*-preterite and *f*-future at the expense of less straightforwardly derived reduplicated and other strong formations, and to eradicate anomalous discrepancies between preterite active and preterite passive stems (cf. VII.1). The homogenization of present inflection already discussed in 6.1 is thus part of a wider simplificatory process that favoured weak inflectional patterns for the most part and tended to use the present stem as the base for such innovations, a process particularly apparent in S3 verbs with a stem-final *n* hitherto confined to the present (cf. III.4.3 and IV.4.1-3) but now liable to spread to subjunctive, future and preterite stems.

Two typical enough examples of the formal rationalization to which these developments were geared in anticipation of Modern Irish norms for all but a few common irregular verbs are *benaid* 'strikes' and *aingid* 'protects' (a tendency to replace lenited *g* or *ch* by unlenited *c* /*g*/ in some forms below is presumably due to influence from the verbal noun *anacul*). In OIr. we find 3sg. conj. S3 pres. *-ben*, *a*-subj. *-bia*, *i*-fut. *-bí*, suffixless pret. act. *-bí*, pret. pass. *-bíth* but Middle Irish offers innovatory forms such as 3sg. conj. pres. *-ben(ann)*, *a*-subj. *-bena*, *f*-fut.

-benfa, *s*-pret. (*ro*)-*ben*, pret. pass. (*ro*)-*benad*. Similarly OIr. S1(a) 3sg. conj. *-anaig*, *s*-subj. and fut. *-ain*, *t*-pret. and pret. pass. *-anacht* come under pressure from more manageable pres. *-ainic/-aincenn*, *a*-subj. *-aing*, *f*-fut. *-aincfe*, *s*-pret. (*ro*)-*ainic*, pret. pass. *-ainced*. In both cases intricate variations of stem all too typical of Old Irish strong verbs were giving way to a vastly simplified weak pattern prevalent in Modern Irish whereby the stem of the present remained clearly identifiable throughout. This is the inflectional counterpart of the trends towards eradication of compound verbs with their complex deuterotonic/prototonic alternations (5.1-2) and towards elimination or regular proclisis of the augment (4.1-3). Each of these developments greatly reduced Old Irish variations in the form of a verb's lexical core (root plus any lexical preverbs) on the way towards a greatly streamlined system in which that core usually remained quite stable amidst minimally disruptive and maximally predictable suffixation and (basically proclitic) prefixation for inflectional purposes. Nevertheless, alternations between syncopated (e.g. pres. 3sg. abs. *im^trid*, conj. *-im^trenn* 'plays') and unsyncopated (e.g. conj. *-immir*, fut. 3sg. *iméraid*, *-iméra* 'will play', cf. 6.6.3) variants of the core's final syllable continued to be tolerated and were even liable to be spread by analogy (e.g. *innisid*, current *in^tsíonn* 'relates' in 5.2b, *oslaicid*, current *osc^tlaionn* in 5.2a, or the spread of the *é*-fut. in 6.6.3).

Even in the Old Irish Glosses there are a number of sporadic prefigurations of these trends. Thus 3sg. pass. rel. *roichther* '(when) it is extended' (Ml. 138a2) rather than standard *ro:sásar* (*ro:saig*) probably entails the dual innovation of new simple for old compound verb (see 5.2a) and *a*- for *s*-subjunctive, while examples of the spread of the *f*-future are given in V.2.2. Examples of the *s*-preterite replacing older standard formations (cf. Vl.4.1) include 3pl. *-arroímsat* '(who) have accepted' (Wb. 26a23, standard 3pl. augm. *t*-pret. *-arroítatar*; pres. *ar:foím*, *-eroím*), *-frescisset* 'expected' (Ml. 72c13, standard redup. pret. 3pl. *-fres^tcach^ttar*; *fris:a-ccai*, *-fres^t-cai*).

Such phenomena are, of course, a good deal commoner in Middle Irish sources, as the following small selection of actual examples indicates (note that old compound verbs have often given way to new simple ones). Subj. 1sg. *-benur* 'I may strike' (LU 5855, OIr. *-bíu*; pres. *-ben*, see 6.4.2b and 6.5 on *-ur*), 3sg. rel. *benas* 'who should strike' (LL 11352, OIr. *bias*; *-ben*), 3sg. *-maidi* 'should break' (YBL-Táin 3577, OIr. *s*-subj. *-má*; *-maid*), *-aing* 'should protect' (LU 3352, OIr.

s-subj. *-ain*; *-anaig*), 3pl. *-guidet* 'may beseech' (SR 1615, OIr. s-subj. *-gessat*; *-guid*), 3sg. past *ra:thuitted* 'might have fallen' (LL 11663, OIr. augm. s-subj. *do:ro-t^tsad*; (*do*)-*tuit*). Fut. 3sg. abs. *tuitfid* 'will fall' (LL 38590, OIr. s-fut. *do:tóeth* etc.; (*do*)-*tuit*), *oirgfid* 'will slay' (LU 4588, OIr. s-fut. *íuraid*; *-oirg*), conj. *ro-t:aincfe* 'will protect thee' (LL 6625, OIr. s-fut. *no-t:ain*, cf. end of 5.3; *-anaig*), pass. abs. or rel. *benfaider* 'will be struck' (LL 38490, OIr. *bíthir*, see 3.4 and 6.7a on *-thir/-ther*; *-ben*), 3pl. *con:benfat* 'will cut off' (SR 8070, OIr. *-biat*; *con:ben*), cond. 1sg. *-aisnéidfind* 'I would recount' (SR 827, 956, OIr. s-cond. *-ais^tndisinn*; *as:indet*, prot. stem *-ais^tnded-*), 3sg. *no:maidfed* 'would break' (SR 5036, OIr. second. *no:mem^tsad*; *-maid*). Pret. 1sg. *ro:thacrus* 'I debated' (SR 1865, OIr. augm. *t*-pret. *do:r-acurt*; *do:accair*), 3sg. abs. *tuittis*, conj. (augm.) *ro:thuit* 'fell' (LL 38710, LU 1350, OIr. *do:cer*, augm. *do:ro-chair*, VI.2.7; (*do*)-*tuit*), *ro:guid* 'besought' (LL 39035, OIr. (-)*gáid*, VI.2.4; *-guid*), *ro:theich* 'fled' (SR 6912, OIr. (-)*táich*; *-teich*), *ro:maid* 'broke' (LU 5251, OIr. (-)*memaid*, VI.2.2; *-maid*), *ní-ro:chan* 'did not sing', *ro:chan* 'sang' (SR 4804, LU 6588, OIr. (-)*cechain*; *-cain*), *ro:ben* etc. (SR 5871, LU 5252, LL 38694, OIr. (-)*bí*, VI.2.3; *-ben*), *ro:chosain* 'strove' (LU 2955, OIr. augm. redup. *s*-pret. *con:ai-ssenai*, VI.4.3 and XI.2.2; *con:sní*), *ra:érig* 'arose' (LL 39035, OIr. augm. *t*-pret. *a-t:ra-racht*; *a-t:reig*, *-érig*), *ro:chompír* 'begat' (LU 4252, OIr. *con:ai-pert*; *con:beir*, *-compír*), *ro:tidnaic* 'bestowed' (LL 38715; OIr. *do:é-com-nacht* or *do:rr-indnacht*; *do:indnaig*, (-)*tindnaig*), *ra:thuissim* 'begat' (LL 30902, OIr. *do:rósat*; *do:fuissim*, *-tuissim*), *ro:sern* 'arrayed' (SR 2987, OIr. (-)*sert*; *-sern*), 3pl. (unaugm., see 6.9.1a on conj. for abs. ending) *sernsat* (LL 8003, OIr. *sertatar*), *ro:lensat* 'followed' (LL 38715, OIr. (-)*le^tdar*, VIII.4; *-len*), *ro-s:gonsat* 'slew them' (LL 8003, OIr. *-geg^tnatar*; *-goin*), *ro:gnísset*, *gnísit* 'did' (SR 5175, 4077; OIr. *-génsat*, VI.4.3; *-gní*), *bo:gníiset* 'made' (LL 10604; OIr. *do:génsat*, cf. 5.4; *do:gní*), *fa:cheirdset* 'cast' (LL 10601, OIr. *fo:cartatar*, VI.2.5; *fo:ceird*, *-cuiirethar*, 1.2.9c). Pret. pass. 3sg. *ro:canad* 'was sung' (LU 398; OIr. *-cét*; *-cain*), *ro:guded* 'was besought' (LU 6688, OIr. *-ges*, cf. abs. *gessa* at LU 6686; *-guid*), *ra:nascéd* 'was bound' (LL 11406, OIr. *-nas*; *-naisc*), *ro:hainced* 'was protected' (LL 11258, OIr. *-anacht*; *aingid*, *-anaig*), *ro:sernad* 'was arrayed' (SR 1385, OIr. *-sreth*; *-sern*), 3pl. *ro:bligt(h)ea* 'were milked' (Thes.-II, 334.44, OIr. *do:omlachta*, X.2; *-mlig* later *-blig*). The 3pl. augm. pret. *co-ra-s:innarbsat* 'so that they expelled them' (LL 31253, OIr. *-r'indarbatar*; *ind:árban*), although not at first sight based upon a

present stem, is probably formed from a new simple pres. *innarbaid*, *-innarbann* (5.2a).

Such developments foreshadowed the Modern Irish elimination of the strong vs. weak inflectional dichotomy in favour of a single regular type subdivided into two basic conjugational patterns. In comparison with the earlier language Modern Irish has severely restricted inflectional variations in consonant quality, tending to retain broad or slender consonance throughout except in certain types of future (6.6.3-4) by steady expansion of patterns prevalent in OIr. W1 and W2a. This trend too is sometimes prefigured in Old and Middle Irish, especially in W2b and S2 *gab*-plus compounds with a central opposition between present stem with palatal final and *a*-subjunctive or (outside the 3sg. conj.) *s*-preterite with non-palatal final consonant. The basic divide between palatal pres. *gaib*- and non-palatal *gab*-elsewhere (even 3sg. conj. *s*-pret. *-gab*) was beginning to be eroded in Old Irish, e.g. 3sg. augm. pret. *du:rurgaib* 'arose' (Ml. 63a15, gl. *emersit*), and two-way confusion sets in in Middle Irish, e.g. 3sg. pres. abs. *gabaid* 'takes' (SR 4789, 5869) alongside older *gaibid* (e.g. SR 5874), pret. conj. 3sg. *-gaib* (e.g. SR 2016) alongside *-gab* (e.g. 1299) or even 3pl. *fo:gaibset* 'found' (LU 1792, cf. 5.5.3) vs. normal *-gabsat* (e.g. LL 38959). Probable examples of spread of palatal consonance from S2 pres. to *a*-subj. on the model of W2a are 3sg. rel. (*riasiú*) *gaires* '(before) he call' (SR 7724) and 3pl. *co-r:guidet* 'that they may beseech' (SR 1615, old *s*-subj., see previous para.). The usual pattern in W2b was alternation of pres. and *f*-fut. *CuC'*- with *CoC*(-) elsewhere (apart from 3sg. conj. non-deponent *s*-pret.), but even in Old Irish there are instances of non-palatal consonance in the former environment, e.g. 3sg. pres. *du:lugai* 'who forgives' (Ml. 51a15) and fut. *du:lugfa* 'will forgive' (58c18, cf. III.2 and V.2.1), and more frequent cases of palatal quality in the latter, e.g. 3sg. augm. *a*-subj. *d-a:ro-l^tgea* 'may he forgive it, (Wb. 31a2), pret. pass. *du:ro-l^tged* 'has been forgiven' (Wb. 3b12, Ml. 124a3, cf. IV.4.1 and VII.2). It is, of course, no surprise that the small W2b group, which alone among the large class of weak verbs displayed fluctuations in quality unrelated to syncope, should have come under such pressure particularly early, and in Middle Irish confusions between *u* and *o* vocalism become endemic too, e.g. past subj. 1sg. *con:tulind* 'I would sleep' (LL 12620), pret. 1sg. *con:tuius* 'I slept, (ZCP 7, 307.3), 3pl. *d[o]:coirsetar* 'put', *sloicsitt* 'swallowed' (both cited GOI 419), pres. 3pl. *scorit* 'unyoke' (LU 9038), 1pl. ipv. *scoirem* 'let us unyoke' (LL 10600).

Indeed, owing to a dearth of reliable early attestations it is uncertain whether the original vocalism of the pret. 3sg. conj. with its palatal final consonant (cf. VI.4.2) is best preserved in *d-a:loig* 'forgave him' (*Trip.* 2340), *-sloic* 'swallowed' (*LU* 10652) or *con:tuil* 'slept' (*LU* 9982, *Thes.* II, 327.14, *LL* 15916), but *ad-ro:soid* 'held back' (*MI.* 97dl6, cf. 39a16) tips the balance of probability in favour of the former. The new simple verb *cuirid*, *-cuir(enn)* 'puts' (cf. 6.1.4 and 6.4.1) replacing *fo:ceird*, *-cuirethar* (subj. *-corathar*, pret. act. *-corastar*, pass. *-corad*, augm. pret. *ro:lá(a)*) keeps *u* and palatal *r* throughout, e.g. 3sg. augm. pret. *ro:chuir* 'put, waged' (*LU* 4393, *LL* 39059), 3pl. augm. pret. pass. *ro:curthea* 'were cast' (*LL* 888). See III.4.1b on tendencies to homogenize the quality of S1c presents from the 3sg. conj. with palatal final, whence for instance 3sg. pres. rel. *oirges* 'who slays' (*CIH* 341.14) and new weak formations outside the pres. such as fut. 3sg. abs. *oirgfid* 'shall slay' (*LU* 4588), augm. *s*-pret. 3sg. *ra:airg* 'ravaged' (*LL* 9330), 1pl. *ra-tas:airgsemar* 'we have ravaged them' (*LL* 12068), 3pl. *ra:airgset* 'they ravaged' (*LL* 39344), pret. pass. 3sg. *ra:airged* 'was ravaged' (*LL* 3932-3).

6.3. In Middle Irish texts a compromise between an old strong stem and the emergent weak types generally geared to the present stem in 6.2 above occurs quite frequently. This typically involves attaching a weak suffix such as future *-f-* or preterite active *-s-* to an inherited strong stem or a later modification thereof different from the present and thus falls short of the thorough rationalization described in the previous section. Even the Old Irish Glosses present a couple of innovatory *s*-preterites of this type in *ro:lin* 'has clung' (*MI.* 54d7, S3 *-len*), a halfway house between standard reduplicated *ro:lil* (VI.2.2) and a new *s*-pret. *ro:len* (cf. 3pl. *ro:lensat* in 6.2) fully adapted to the present stem, and 3pl. *du:forsaisset* 'created' (*MI.* 110a8, 3sg. pres. *do:fuissim*, *-tuissim*, augm. *t*-pret. *do:rósat* or *do:forsat*, *-tor^tsat*; XI.2.5), where inherited augm. *t*-pret. 3pl. *du:for^tsat^ttar* seems to have been reanalysed as suffixless *du:fors-atar* to provide a base for the new *s*-pret. Typical later examples include fut. 1sg. *-ririub* (*LU* 10778), 3sg. rel. *rirfes* (*SR* 1073), cond. *-rirfed* (*LL* 31130, OIr. 3sg. pres. *-ren*, fut. *-riri*, V.4, '(will) sell/abandon'), *no-m:bífad* 'who should smite me' (*SR* 5812, *-ben*, *-bí*, V.4), *resfed* 'would run' (*LL* 329a21 = *Corp. Gen.* p. 404; *-reith*, *-ré*, V.3.1), 3sg. rel. *linfes* 'who shall cling' (*LL* 19089, *-len*, *-lili*, V.4 and cf. pret. *ro:lin* above), 3pl. *con:cechlabat* 'shall hear' (*LL* 8464, OIr. S3 depon. pres. 3pl. *(ro)-chluinetar*, fut. *(ro)-cechlatar*; V.5.1, cf. 5.3 above and 6.4 below on *con* for *ro*

and loss of deponent inflection respectively), pret. 3sg. abs. *lilis* 'clung' (LL 8907, 11244, see above), 3pl. *as:bertsat* 'said' (LU 1718, 9023), *at:bathsat* 'died' (LU 3568), *ro:n-ortsat* '(who) slew him' (LL 2972), *(co-)ro:scáigset(ar)* 'were exhausted' (LL 11356-8), *do:bertsat* 'gave' (LU 6365), pret. pass. 3sg. *ra:bertad* 'has been played' (LL 11239).

Preterite forms such as these are generated by taking old 3sg. conj. suffixless (e.g. redup. *-lil*, defective *at:bath* in VI.2.7, *-scáich* or *-scáig* in VI.2.4) and *t*-preterites (e.g. *as:bert*, *ro:ort*, *do:bert*) as endingless *s*-preterites, and a weak pret. pass. like *-bertad* (OIr. *-breth*) can be extrapolated from act. 3sg./pl. *-bert(sat)* on the model of inherited weak patterns such as *-marbad* 'was killed' vs. *-marb(sat)* '(they) killed' (VII.2). More specifically, interchangeable plural inflections in Middle Irish preterites probably resulted from the development of a homogeneous singular inflection for suffixless, *s*- and *t*-preterites to be discussed in 6.9, while the tendency to homogenize preterite active and passive stems has been illustrated in 6.2 and will be treated further in 6.7.

It is difficult to assess how far cases such as those above reflect a genuine transition between obsolescent strong forms differing significantly from the present stem and innovatory weak types based directly upon it or may rather be due merely to erudite confusion between archaic literary norms and those of current speech. In the former case gradual regularization such as 3sg. conj. fut. *-rire* > *-rirfe* > *-renfa* 'will sell' (pres. *-ren*) would be implied, but in the latter regularization to a normal weak *-renfa* type would have ensued directly and *-rirfe* would be a purely literary confusion between this and obsolete *-rire*. The tendency in some Modern Irish dialects to reinforce a handful of retained stressed *é*-futures with the otherwise normal *f*-suffix (phonetically /h/ as a rule), e.g. *béar(f)aidh* 'will bear' and *déar(f)aidh* 'will say' without further accommodation to the present *beir*-, *(a-)deir*-, would provide a parallel (but hardly a guarantee) for *-rirfe* and the like as genuine linguistic developments rather than bogus literary creations. In any given instance it is virtually impossible to decide between these alternatives, but overall it seems quite likely that both processes underlie textual phenomena of this type.

However, there are certain types of confusion or contamination of stems in Middle Irish that are almost certainly purely literary products which could only have arisen when the range and function of certain formations already obsolete in the current vernacular were liable to be misunderstood. For instance, a 3sg. abs. *s*-fut.

such as *memais* or (by dissimilatory denasalization) *mebais*, once ousted by *f*-fut. *maidfid* in ordinary usage, could easily be mistaken for a 3sg. abs. *s*-pret. as at *LU* 3791 or *LL* 1855, 38740. This analysis in turn could generate bogus corresponding stems such as 3sg. subj. *-meba* 'should break' (*Ériu* 5, 336.80). 3pl. *bibsat* 'smote, (*LU* 6194; pres. S1d *-boing*, OIr. pret. *(-)bobaig*) is a further instance of an old reduplicated *s*-future functioning as a preterite. The suppletive suffixless preterite *(-)luid* 'went' (pres. *téit*) developed Middle Irish *s*-preterite forms such as abs. 3sg. *luidis*, 3pl. *luidset* (*LL* 38494), 2pl. *lodsaid* (*LU* 5300, 5347) alongside the original formations in the manner described in the preceding paragraphs. Since such preterites had become obsolete by virtue of being supplanted by the augmented forms (in this case *do:coid* etc.) in normal speech (4.1 above and 6.9.1a below), they could acquire corresponding non-preterite forms through reanalysis of *luid-llod-* as a separate verb in its own right, e.g. pres. 1pl. abs. *lodma* 'we go' (*LL* 9109), 1sg. ipf. *ra:luidin-se* 'I used to go' (*LL* 29423, see end of 5.3), 1pl. fut. *lud^ffamar* 'we shall go' (*LL* 12762, hypercorrect deponent inflection suggested by old 1pl. suffixless pret. *(-)lod^fmar*, cf. 6.4 and 6.9.2a below plus VIII.4). Hypercorrect *t*-prets. such as 3pl. *bentatar* 'they struck' (*LU* 5282, 5296; OIr. suffixless *(-)béotar*) were occasionally extrapolated from innovatory *s*-pret. *(-)bensat* etc. on the model of new 3sg. *s*-pret. *-compir* vs. old *t*-pret. *-compert* and so on. Further, the coexistence in Middle Irish texts of an old literary *(ro)-ráith* alongside innovatory current *(ro)-reith* 'ran' (6.2) proved capable of generating a hypercorrect present stem *ráith-* in writing beside normal inherited *reith-* (Mod. Ir. *ritheann* 'runs'), whence 1pl. abs. *ráithmit* 'we run' (*LL* 29156). A final example of such formal and functional confusion is 3sg. past subj. *no:maidsed* 'would have broken' (*LL* 8269, 8277), where the *s*-subjunctive suffix is added to the present stem like the still vigorous *s*-preterite and *f*-future markers and does not absorb the root-final consonant as in *no:maissed* (*LL* 8262, cf. IV.2.1). In Middle Irish, conditional forms sometimes encroached upon those of the past subjunctive (e.g. *LU* 5125, cf. X.3.3), but *no:mai(d)sed* in the three examples just given reflects a hypercorrect reaction to this, namely a past subjunctive doing duty for a conditional.

The possibilities for the creation of intermediate or hybrid forms of the kind illustrated in this section are enormous, and there is no point in seeking to give an exhaustive inventory. Consequently the emphasis has been put on a small selection of examples that lend themselves to the elucidation of certain key processes, the

effects of which should then be recognisable when applied to forms not dealt with specifically above.

6.4.1. As has already been pointed out (VIII.5.1, especially end), the formal differentiation of separate deponent (VIII.5.1-4) and non-deponent (VIII.2-4) inflections in the active, being conditioned by purely lexical factors, lacked a real semantic or grammatical function and was beginning to be eroded even in the Old Irish Glosses, where deponent desinences are sometimes replaced by corresponding non-deponent endings in all but the particularly common and hence resilient 3sg. conj. outside the *f*-fut. (e.g. non-depon. *ní:deintamlafa* 'he will not dissimilate' at Ml. 69d8, *connacha:dánaigfea* 'so that he will not bestow it (f.)' at Ml. 96a7). Such erosion is rather more frequent in Ml. than in Wb.

In Middle Irish texts this process continues apace and is extended to the hitherto immune non-future 3sg. conj., e.g. *-cuir* 'puts' (LU 8845), *-lesaigend*, *-erchótigend*, *-curend*, *-foichlend* (see 6.1.4), pret. *ro:dechraig* '(who) distinguished' (SR 2773), *ro:chruthaig* '(who) created' (33), *ro:ainmnig* 'he named' (2651), *ro:foilsig* '(who) revealed' (713), *ra:chuir* 'gave' (LL 9329), *ro:attlaig* 'thanked' (SR 2593, OIr. pres. *a(d):tluchedar*, *-atlaigethar*). Overall one may speak of a gradual merger of the non-deponent and deponent active endings that generally favoured the former because of their statistical preponderance from Old Irish on.

6.4.2. However, historically deponent inflections managed to survive the strong trend towards generalization of non-deponent forms at two points in the system engendered by this convergence, namely the 3sg. conj. *s*-pret. and 1sg. subj.

(a) Once hitherto deponent verbs had acquired 3sg. conj. *s*-pret. forms such as *ro:chruthaig* (e.g. SR 33) alongside inherited *ro:cruthaigestar* (e.g. LU 9510) 'created', *-estar/-astar* (end of VIII.5.2) acquired the status of a mere variant of the originally non-deponent endingless form in a number of verbs. Under normal circumstances the more restricted variant of deponent origins might have been expected to be ousted by the more widespread variant that still monopolized historically non-deponent verbs, as usually happened elsewhere during the merger of the two inflections. However, *-estar/-astar* had a crucial formal advantage over \emptyset , in that it contained the *s*-marker ubiquitous in the paradigm outside the 3sg. conj. (VI.4.2). For this reason *-estar/-astar* actually spread as a variant 3sg. conj. ending to other parts of the system where it had not been inherited in this function.

Indeed, as a result of the spread of *s*-preterite inflections documented in 6.2 and 3, *-estar/-astar* in effect became a variant of the endingless 3sg. conj. throughout the preterite active system in Middle Irish, as the following small selection of examples (including a couple of isolated early instances from the Glosses) indicates: *ro:dligestar* 'who was entitled' (Ml. 36a29, pres. *-dlig*, original augm. *t*-pret. *ro:dlecht* at *Thes.* II, 347.34), *ru:n-éillestar* '(when) he had polluted' (Ml. 63a14, *as:lenu*, standard augm. *s*-pret. *as:ru-len*), *ro:charastar* 'who loved' (*LU* 3257-9, *-cara*, cf. inherited augm. *s*-pret. *ro-t:char* 'has loved thee' at *LU* 3614), *ro-s:biathastar* 'he fed them' (*SR* 3413, vs. inherited *ro-s:biath* at 3409), *ro:mairnestar* 'betrayed' (*LU* 1033, OIr. pres. *-mairn*, *t*-pret. *-mert*), *ra-t:melestar* 'has ground thee' (*LL* 10746-7, OIr. *-meil*, *-melt*), *ní-ra:gonastar* 'did not kill him' (12327-8, OIr. pres. *gonaid*, *-goin*, redup. pret. *(-)geguin*), *ro:theichestar* 'fled' (*Trip.* 499-500, pres. *-teich*, augm. *á*-pret. *ro:tháich* at *Trip.* 2032, cf. *SR* 7903, later *s*-pret. *ro:theich* at *SR* 6912), *ro:gabastar* 'took' (*LL* 9644, 9647, 9649-50, 9655-6 etc., vs. inherited augm. *s*-pret. *ro:gab* at 9643, 9655 etc.), *tucastar* 'gave' (*LL* 9196-8, vs. older augm. *s*-pret. *tuc* at 9189).

Although *-(e)astar* and a palatalized bye-form *-(e)astair*, e.g. *ní-ra:labrastair* 'has not spoken' (*Ériu* 2, 114, §42), apparently triggered by palatal/non-palatal fluctuations in the final *-r* of passive-impersonals (3.4 above), are quite common alongside the zero 3sg. ending in Classical Modern Irish literature, only the latter type survives in the current Gaelic speech of Ireland and Scotland.

(b) In the *a*-subj. the most weakly characterized form in the whole non-deponent active paradigm was the endingless 1sg. conj., which was thus in a similar position to the endingless 3sg. *s*-pret. just discussed and like it was opposed to a deponent ending with the typical tense/mood marker, in this case *-ar* (see VIII.2.4c(i) and 5.2). An apparently quite isolated instance of the spread of this ending to a non-deponent verb in the Old Irish Glosses is seen in augm. 1sg. subj. *arna:r-imfolngar* 'lest I cause' (Wb. 10c14, pres. *im:folngi*). The various 1sg. deponent endings of Old Irish, notably *-(i)ur*, *-or* and *-er/-ar* (VIII.5.2), fell together as */-ər/* with consequent spelling confusion in Middle Irish, where *-(i)ur* or *-or* are thus quite commonly written rather than *-er* or *-ar* in the *a*-subj.

In Middle Irish texts this is the commonest 1sg. subj. act. ending. It tended to spread to the abs. too in place of an *-a* = */-ə/* no longer distinct from 2sg. *-a(e)* = */-ə/* (cf. 6.1.3) and sometimes from the productive *a*- to the moribund *s*-subjunctive

(see 6.2): e.g., *a*-subj. 1sg. conj. augm. *-érbalur* 'I may die' (SR 1260, *at:bail*), *-torchror* 'I should fall' (1533, *do:tuit*, cf. end of 5.5.3), *-rucur* 'I may bear' (1666, *beirid*), unaugm. *-toimliur* 'I should eat' (Trip. 2349, *do:meil*), *-apror* 'I may speak' (LU 6661, *as:beir*), *do:néor* 'I should do' (10122), augm. *-dernar* 'I may perform' (5775, *do:gní*), unaugm. *-benur* 'I should strike' (LL 12265, *benaid*; cf. 6.2), abs. *beor-sa* '(that) I may be' (12697), *s*-subj. abs. *tíasur* '(that) I should go to' (LU 7882), conj. *-tíasur* 'I should go' (LL 12227, both *tég*-).

The regular outcome *-(e)ar* of this ending has a total monopoly of the 1sg. subj. in Classical Modern Irish, but does not survive in the present-day dialects.

6.4.3. Despite the overall decline of once deponent forms outside the two categories just mentioned in Middle Irish, a couple of new but specifically deponent endings did gain some currency there.

(a) The first of these was formed from the still vigorous 1sg. subj. *-ar* (6.4.2b) on the model of the historically non-deponent 1 and 2sg. *a*-subj., e.g. augm. *-ér^tbar* 'I may say' vs. *-ér^tbara(e)* 'thou mayest say' with inherited 1sg. *-Ø*, and 2sg. */-ə/* < OIr. *-ae* (VIII.2.4-5) respectively. This relationship could easily trigger a 2sg. *-ara(e)* from 1sg. *-ar*, e.g. *a*-subj. *-ágara* 'shouldst fear' (LU 3891; standard 1, 2, 3sg. (*ad*)-*ágar*, *-áigther*, *-ágathar*), *s*-subj. *-essara* 'shouldst eat' (LL 13039; *-essur*, *-esser*, *-estar*, cf. IV.3), *-fessara* 'thou mayest find out' (LL 3362; *-fessur*, *-fesser*, *-festar*). More rarely 3sg. *-ara* or 3pl. *-(a)rat* were developed in the same way, e.g. *-fessara* '(he) should find out' (LL 36905), *-clórat* '(they) should hear' (LL 11603; 1sg. (*ro*)-*cloor*, later *-clór* by contraction of hiatus in 6.1.3, 3pl. (*ro*)-*cloatar*). Sporadic formations of this type can hardly be other than purely literary attempts to hang on to distinctive deponent forms in the subjunctive when they were already obsolete in speech outside the 1sg.

(b) In the Old Irish suffixless preterite, deponent and non-deponent endings were formally distinguished in the singular but not the plural, which had 1pl. *-(am)mar* and 3pl. *-(a)tar* for both types as a rule (VIII.5.4). However, there were sporadic tendencies, one even attested in the Würzburg Glosses, towards development of a distinct deponent plural, although these were obviously overtaken quite rapidly by the general demise of the basic active/deponent distinction. In essence, a non-deponent suffixless preterite pattern such as 3sg. (augm) *do:rochair*, 3pl. *do:roch^tratar* 'fell, has/have fallen' could make deponent 3sg. forms like *ro:lám-air* '(has) dared', *ro:míd-air* '(has) judged' the springboard for innovatory

deponent 3pl. *ro:lám-ratar*, *ro:míd-ratar* (see GOI 429) alongside the old undifferentiated *ro:lámatar*, *ro:mídatar* '(have) dared/ judged'. By the same token the alternative pattern of 3sg. (augm.) *-tor^tchair*, 3pl. *-tor^tchar^ttar* 'fell, has /have fallen' could trigger from 3sg. dep. *ro:gén-air* 'was/has been born' a distinct 3pl. *ro:gén-artar* 'were/have been born' (Wb. 4c12) alongside standard *ro:génatar*, and similarly one finds 3pl. *ro:fetartar* '(they) know' (LU 7334) beside normal *ro:fetatar*.

6.5. The productive subjunctive inflection of Middle Irish rested upon the Old Irish *a*-subjunctive and was typically formed from the same stem as the present (6.2). In the 2sg., the 3sg. abs. and rel. as well as throughout the pl. the inflections were basically identical with those given for the pres. ind. in 6.1.5, but addition of the augment often served to differentiate subjunctive from corresponding pres. indicative forms (4.1). The distinctive inflections were 1sg. abs./conj. subj. *-(i)ur* etc. (6.4.2b) vs. pres. *-(a)im*, 3sg. conj. subj. *-e/-a* vs. pres. \emptyset or *-enn/-ann*. Needless to say, such forms coexist in varying proportions in the texts with older stem formations and inflections, as is usually the case in Middle Irish.

A further inflectional development in the subjunctive is occasionally represented in Middle Irish and transitional early Modern Irish texts and, although it did not gain acceptance in the Classical Modern Irish literary standard, must have expanded steadily in ordinary speech to emerge as the sole synthetic 2sg. *-(a)ir* in present and future as well in those current dialects of Munster above all that have resisted the trend towards analytic *tú* forms most strongly (cf. end of 2.3). In the Old and Middle Irish *s*-subjunctive a conj. 1sg. with broad *-s* was opposed to a 2sg. with slender *-s*, e.g. *-tías* 'I may go' vs. *-téis* 'thou mayest go'. Moreover, the concomitant Old Irish *u*-infection responsible for 1sg. *-us* in unstressed syllables (VIII.2.4) disappeared in Middle Irish (cf. 6.4.2b), the upshot being a phonetic opposition between 1sg. */-əs/* and 2sg. */-əs'/* in such cases, e.g. augm. *s*-subj. *-dechus* 'I may go' vs. *-dechais* 'thou mayest go' (X.1). Once 1sg. */-ər/*, usually written *-ur*, had been established as a variant of \emptyset , in the *s*-subj. (6.4.2b), whence *-tíasur* (LU 7882) alongside commoner old *-tías* or *-tísor* 'I should come' (LU 5415) alongside *-tís* (pres. *do:ic*, *(-)tic*), the relation between 1sg. \emptyset and 2sg. \emptyset' in the inherited forms could easily generate 2sg. */-ə r'/* corresponding to the new 1sg., as in *-tíasair* 'thou mayest go' (LL 8570) and *tísir* 'thou shouldst come' (34676).

In the α -subj. 1sg. /-əɾ/ was becoming the ever commoner counterpart (6.4.2b) of a 2sg. /-ə/ identical with both the 3sg. conj. /-ə/ and pres. ind. 2sg. /-ə/. Accordingly spread of new 2sg. /-əɾ/ from the s - to the α -subj. would greatly ease this nexus of ambiguity, and one duly finds stray later 2sg. forms like *do:finnair* 'until thou shouldst find out' (*Acallam* 107.5), *-dechair* 'shouldst go' (*TTebe* 3985, cf. 1sg. *-dechar* for *-dechus* at *Táin* 4041) in new α -subjunctives and *-ding(b)ir* 'thou shouldst take away' (*PH* 7541) in an old one. This 2sg. subj. variant /-əɾ/ of better established /-ə/ could be profitably spread to the f - or α -futs., where inherited 2sg. /-ə/ was likewise undifferentiated from the 3sg. conj. (see 6.6.5), whence the odd form like *do:génair* 'thou shalt do' (*Acallam* 225.7). Once a more highly characterized 2sg. /-əɾ/ had come into existence alongside /-ə/ in both subjunctive and future, its eventual spread to the present indicative by modern times need cause no surprise. We may assume that subj. or fut. 2sg. *-(a)ir* was still too rare or colloquial to compete with inherited *-e/-a* when the Classical Modern Irish literary standard was established.

6.6.1. Of the multiplicity of Old Irish future formations described in chapter V only two have survived into Modern Irish, namely descendants of the f - and \acute{e} -futures (V.2.1-2 and 5.2 respectively). Although Mod. Ir. *íosaidh* 'will eat' goes back to an old s -fut. stem, this had already adopted α -fut. inflection in Old Irish (end of V.3.3) and constitutes an irregular stem along with suppletive *raghaidh*, *rachaidh* 'will go' (V.5.3). Apart from u -infection of the 1sg. conj. of the f -fut. (VIII.2.4), e.g. *-léiciub* 'I shall leave' vs. \acute{e} -fut. *-bér* 'I shall bear' etc., all of the futures just mentioned were inflected alike for person and number (VIII.2.2-5). Despite some changes of ending to be discussed in 4 below (cf. 2.2c above), this inflectional homogeneity was maintained in Middle and Modern Irish, even being extended to the 1sg. conj. when *-(i)ub* became /-əv/ (cf. *-(i)ur* to /-əɾ/ in 6.4.2b).

The Modern Irish outcome of the f - and \acute{e} -futures involves some notoriously tricky phonetic problems and considerable redistribution of the two types' range, but the overall simplificatory trend between Old and Modern Irish is tolerably clear. As usual, Middle Irish texts present us with evidence for a transitional stage of progress between these points, and there can be no doubt of the rise of the f - and \acute{e} -futures in various guises at the expense of other moribund formations in the relevant material (cf. 6.2-3 on the expanding f -fut.). However, it must be admitted that the relevant sources show considerable confusion or overlap between the

various types, and that it is often next to impossible to determine the extent to which this is due to genuine transitional fluctuations, literary hypercorrections triggered by interaction between old written and new spoken norms or to both factors in varying proportions.

6.6.2. In the relevant, i.e. mostly weak, inflectional groups the typical shape of the Old Irish *f*-fut. when added to a stressed monosyllabic base was $-^t fV(-)$ apart from the 1sg. conj. (cf. 6.6.1 and V.2.1), e.g. *léic-fid* 'will let' (W2a), *do:luich-fea* 'will forgive, (W2b), *sóer-faid* 'will free' (W1). Even in Old Irish this morphologically straightforward formation spread somewhat beyond its original range (V.2.2), and in Middle Irish this process accelerated rapidly as part of the drift from old strong to new weak inflectional patterns (6.2), e.g. 3pl. *teich-fit* 'shall flee' (LL 9941, OIr. *s*-fut. *tessit*). Moreover, this formation was not infrequently spread to historically syncopated (cf. 5.5.4) stems after which the *-Vb-* bye-form of the suffix might have been expected, presumably through re-analysis of old prototonic stems like *diúlt-*, *teilc-* as basic monosyllables rather than underlying disyllables (OIr. *do:sluindi*, $-díl^t tai$ and *do:léici*, $-teil^t ci$), e.g. *no-m:diúlt-fa* 'thou shalt deny me, (SR 7723) and *teilg-fe* 'thou shalt cast' (LU 6694). Similar treatment of historically disyllabic stems that did not have an *f*-fut. in Old Irish is also attested, e.g. *chung-fea* 'that thou shalt ask for' (LL 10117, cf. 3.2c and 3.4; OIr. *con:di-eig*, $-cuin(d)^t g-$, with an *s*-fut.).

The primary locus of the *é*-future in Old Irish was roots with a final liquid or nasal, and it too showed some early tendencies to spread beyond its original range even at the expense of the highly productive *f*-future on occasion (see V.5.2). In Middle Irish this formation only occasionally ousts an apparently inherited *f*-future in association with stressed monosyllabic bases, e.g. 1sg. $-scér$ (LL 8539) vs. $-scairiub$ (Ml. 43a23) 'I shall part'. However, on the evidence of compound forms such as *con:scéra* 'he will destroy' (Wb. 26a8), *eter:scértar* 'they will be separated' (Wb. 8b3) the *f*-fut. of Ml. might be the innovatory form in this old primary verb (cf. V.5.1 for a couple of weak verbs with 'strong' futs. in Old Irish). Spread of the stressed *é*-future is best attested in the residual OIr. strong verbs with root-final liquid or nasal and a fully reduplicated future (see V.5.1), notably *gén-* for *gig^tn-* 'will be born' (*gainithir*), 'will slay' (*gonaid*), *lém-* for *lil^tm-* 'will dare' and *dém-* for *did^tm-* 'will suffer', e.g. *géntair* 'they shall be born' (LL 18609), *ní-t:gén-sa* 'I shall not kill thee' (LU 5659), *noco:lémaitheir* 'he will not dare' (LU

5185), *ní:déma* 'he will not endure' (LU 6188).

After a stressed monosyllabic base, however, spread of the *f*- at the expense of or in competition with the *é*-future is somewhat better attested in Middle Irish, beginning even in Old Irish (V.2.2), e.g. *-meliub* 'I shall crush' (LL 12297, OIr. *-mél*), *-genfed* 'would be born' (LU 4261), *-gonfaitis* 'they would have killed' (LL 8154), *-lin(d)fadar* 'will dare' (LL 12278, 12301, probably *lil^tm*- with dissimilation of second *l* to *n* and adaptation of *m* to the *f*-fut. marker), *-mairnfed* 'would not deceive, (LL 8488, gl. *-mérad*). In Modern Irish, of course, the descendant of the *f*-fut. has generally triumphed in this environment, confining descendants of the *é*-fut. to the residual handful *béaraidh* 'will carry', *a-déara* 'will say', *do-bhéara* 'will bring', *do-ghéana* 'will do', and *do-ghéabha* 'will get' along with *géabhaidh* 'will take', *léamhaidh* 'will dare', *déamhaidh* 'will suffer' and *géadaidh* 'will steal' in the classical standard.

This final group also has bye-forms *do-gheabha*, *geabhaidh*, *leamhaidh*, *deamhaidh*, *geadaidh* suggestive of a sporadic tendency to dispense with vowel length as a future marker, presumably because *e*-vocalism and final broad consonant would suffice to distinguish many such forms from corresponding subjunctives that were increasingly adopting the same stem as the present indicative. Absence of a length mark is quite common in Middle (and Old) Irish futures of this type, but is almost certainly due mostly to orthographical inconsistency rather than the significant presence of short-vowel bye-forms. However, *ní:chel* 'I shall not conceal (it)', (*Celtica* 13, 11.189, cf. ed. note on p.23) provides us with at least one Middle Irish example with a short vowel guaranteed by rhyme.

6.6.3. In Old Irish compound verbs such as *imm:beir*, fut. *imm:béra* or *do:ceil*, fut. *do:céla* the fut. *é*-marker stood in an unstressed syllable in the prototonic forms, *-im(b)éra* 'will plie', *-díchéla* 'will conceal'. It was resistant to expected syncope (V.5.2) except in the case of the fut. of *do:gní* 'does', e.g. 3sg. *do:géna* 'will do' (Wb. 26a20) vs. 3pl. *-dig^tnet* (Ml. 56b15), 1pl. *-dig^tnem* (Wb. 17b9) beside *-digénam* (Ml. 30c9). The new Middle Irish simple verbs based on the prototonic stem (5.2b) consequently opposed pres. *imrid*, *díchlid* (pret. *-immir*, *-díchl*) to fut. *íméraid*, *díchélaid* and so on. This pattern then began to spread to old and new simple verbs of similar shape that had not inherited an *é*-fut., e.g. *lomraid* 'strips' (pret. *-lommair* by vowel support), *díglaid* 'avenges' (5.2b, pret. *-dígaíl*) developed to *lómraid*, *dígláid*. This type, which had become highly productive at the

expense of the *f*-future by Modern Irish under appropriate conditions (see 4 below), is not unduly common in the earlier Middle Irish manuscripts, but actual examples include *mannérat* ‘I shall destroy’ (SR 1877, *mandraid*), *dígélaid* ‘he shall avenge’ (SR 6267, LL 38585), *lomméras* ‘who shall strip’ (LL 37140), *saltéras* ‘who shall trample, (37141, *saltraid*). Conversely the optional syncope hitherto confined to *-dig(é)n-* ‘will do’ is sometimes spread in Middle Irish to other common verbs (cf. V.5.2), e.g. *-tibred* ‘would give’ (LL 9934, Class. Mod. Ir. *-tíbhre* or depalatalized *-tiobhra* still surviving in Connemara ‘will give’), *-faigbed* ‘would find’ (LL 11213, Class. Mod. Ir. *-foighbhe* ‘will find’ alongside *-fuighéabha* reflecting older *-fuigéba*).

The rise of the unstressed *é*-fut. type *dígélaid* etc. not surprisingly created pressure towards replacement of short unstressed vowels before a liquid, nasal or *b* by long *é* in other types of future, e.g. *ébéltair* ‘will be reared’ (LU 5026, *alid*, cf. end of V.5.1), *-didém* ‘I shall yield, (LU 5232, *daimid*, cf. V.5.1), *-anéb* ‘I shall remain’ (LU 6375, *anaid*, standard 1sg. conj. *f*-fut. *-aniub*). The *-éb(-)* future was particularly prone to replace the *f*-future’s *-Vb(-)* variety with unsyncopated suffix (V.2.1) in Middle Irish, e.g. *-aicéba* ‘will see’ (LU 309, cf. *-aicfea* at 2030; OIr. *-aicigi*, V.4), *do:fucébad* ‘would understand’ (386, OIr. *do:uc[†]fad*), *taitnébtaít* ‘they will shine’ (2635, *H*; 2.4 on *-t(a)ít*), *-tatnéba* ‘will shine’ (2681, OIr. W2a pres. *do:ait[†]ni*), *-taid[†]lébat* ‘they shall visit’ (4463, OIr. 3sg. *do:aid[†]libea*; *do:aid[†]lea*), *-aid[†]léba* ‘will visit’ (7719, *ad:ella*), *-aisnébat* ‘they will not relate’ (7118, OIr. *s*-fut. *-ais[†]ndiset*; *as:indet*, later *ais[†]néidid*, cf. fully normalized *f*-fut. *-aisnéidfe* ‘thou shalt relate’ at Ériu 6, 121, §1), *-air[†]mébaind* ‘I would reckon’ (10270-1, *ad:rími*). Forms with *-eb-* rather than *-ib-* in Middle Irish material are more likely to reflect *-éb-* with common omission of the length mark in writing than survival of original non-palatal *-b-* between vowels (cf. V.2.1), so that *-éb-* should probably be understood in cases like *claid[†]bebtair* ‘they will be put to the sword’ (LU 1419 and 1425), *gairmebtair* ‘they shall be summoned’ (2460; *gairmid* to vn. *gairm* of *gairid* by 5.2b), *ailebthair* ‘shall be reared’ (LL 8460), *con:airgeba* ‘will cause’ and *taircebat* ‘they will cause’ (LL 11079, 13850; OIr. 3sg. cond. *do:áir[†]cibed*, cf. end of 5.4 for *con*).

This type may have originated in a general spread of *é* to *f*-futures with unsyncopated suffix as suggested above, but the examples show that the *-éb-* had spread somewhat beyond this range even in *LU*. An alternative explanation has been

to seek a precise trigger in the relationship between present and *é*-future stems in some *ga(i)b*- compounds in Middle Irish owing to a tendency, only sporadic in writing but doubtless far commoner in contemporary speech, to drop *b* after certain consonants (e.g. *a:teri* 'thou sayest' at LL 34878 rather than standard *at:beri*; Mod. Ir. (*a*-)*deir* 'says' etc. regularly), e.g. 1sg. *-fagaim* 'I get' (LL 23015, standard *-fag^tbaim*; *fo:gaib*), *for:facsam* 'that we have left' (SR 1485), *-fárgsat* 'they left' (6459), *ra:fác* '(that) he left' (LL 31600, 31955), *facthair* 'is left, (38740; *fo:ácaib*, later *fác^tbaid* but based on reduced *fác*- rather than standard *fác^tb*-). Once a fut. like *-fuicéba* 'will leave' was opposed to pres. *-fác(ann)* 'leaves' instead of *-fác^tbann/-fácaib* and so on, *-éb*- could be re-analysed as a future suffix in its own right and spread accordingly.

Certain H3 verbs with a radical *o* (III.3) not liable to syncope tended to merge this with a following retained vowel to give *á* in unstressed position, e.g. pres. 1pl. *do:intám* 'we translate', subj. 3sg. *tintá* 'that should translate', 2pl. *-tintáith* 'you should translate' (Sg. 26b4, Ml. 37a10, Wb. 12d 2, *do:intai*; *to-inde-so*-), past subj. 3sg. *-impád* 'he might turn' (Ml. 122a14, *imm:soí*; *imbe-so*-), pres. 1sg. *con:(co)imchláim* 'I change' (Sg. 186a1, *con:im^tchlai*, *-caim^tchlai* by V.6b, later simple *c(l)áemchláid* etc.). The *f*-fut. and *s*-pret. of such verbs presumably originally contained a stressed diphthong *-oí*, unstressed short *-ai*-, e.g. *im:soífitis* 'they would be turned' (*Ériu* 2, 142, §157, regular outcome of underlying *sow^tf*-), but it seems that *á* tended to be generalized in unstressed position to give forms like 3pl. pret. *tintáiset* 'they returned' (LL 32101) and an *-áb*- future. However, presumed alternations such as 3pl. pres. or subj. stressed *imm:soat* or *do:soat* (both so spelled at SR 1013, but one monosyllabic *-sót* metrically), unstressed *-impát* seem to have generated unstressed *ó* variants in these verbs. e.g. pret. 3sg. *impáis* (LL 7731) alongside 3pl. (augm.) *ro:impóset* (PH 3770) 'turned', 3pl. pres. *claemchlóit*, subj. *-cóemchlót* 'they change' (LU 5899, 1734), and *IGT Verbs* §64 attests to *ó/á* variants throughout verbs of this type in Classical Modern Irish, including an *-áb*(-) or *-ób*(-) fut. alongside *-aoif*-. The following is a selection of certain or probable examples of the *-áb*(-) or *-ób*(-) future in basically Middle Irish sources, even though the mark of length is by no means regularly written (cf. the remarks on *-eb*- above and the probable significance of broad rather than slender *-b/f*- after a vowel): *nocon:érnába* 'shall not escape' (LU 6972; H2 *as:roi-nni*, *-é-r^tnai*), *ro-b:díd^tnoba*, 'who shall console you' (1213, W1 *do:dona*, *-dí-d^tna*, cf. end of 5.3 on *ro* here),

con:clóechlabam ‘we shall change’ (LU 1735, ms. *-babam* with *b* for orthographically very similar *l*, cf. 5.3 on *con:*), *noco:chloemchlob* ‘I shall not turn’ (LL 36395, corrupted to orthographically similar *-od* in Ms.), *impabas* ‘who shall turn’ (Eél. 76.10 comm.), *terbabaid* ‘will sever’ (PH 3633, back-formation from augm. pret. *-ter^tbai* of *do:eipen* by skewing, see end of 5.5.3), *saebobthar* ‘will be perverted’ (PH 6555, W1 *sáebaid*), *ro:dérbobmais* ‘we would prove it’ (PH 2744, W1 *derbaid*). It would seem that the *á/ó* alternation and concomitant future was prone to spread to some old hiatus and weak verbs bearing formal affinities to the originally H3 *-impa(i)* etc. type, e.g. 3sg. pret. *-érna* or *-érno* ‘escaped’, (LU 7956, 6529), pret. pass. *-terbad* or *-terbod* ‘was severed’ (Ériu 2, 108.12, PH 5317).

6.6.4. In Classical Modern Irish the *é*-fut. regularly remains as *-é(a)-* under the stress (last para. of 6.6.1), but may be realized as *-é(a)-* or *-eó-* in unstressed syllables, e.g. *minéaghaidh/minéachaidh* or *mineóghaidh/mineóchaidh* alongside older *f*-fut. *minighfidh* ‘will explain’ (pres. *minighidh*), *coidéalaidh* or *coideólaidh* ‘will sleep’ (pres. *codlaidh*), *foghluméabhaidh* or *foghlumeóbhaidh* ‘will learn’ (pres. *foghlamaidh*). In current Irish speech the remnant of stressed examples retain *-éa-*, e.g. *béar(f)aidh* ‘will carry’, apart from a late tendency to round to *-eó-* before a labial, e.g. *gheobhaidh* ‘will get’ vs. Class. *do-ghéabha* (6.6.1), but reflexes of *-eó-* have become the norm in unstressed position. Middle Irish trends towards the *é*-future in disyllabic bases even at the expense of the *f*-future accelerate considerably during the passage into Modern Irish, and even hitherto immune W2a *-(a)ig-* denominatives eventually begin to shift from the inherited *-f-* to an *-ég-* or *-éch-* fut. in PH, which also has examples of the *-eó-* variants, e.g. *deléchaid* ‘will separate’ (780), *-deleochar* ‘will be separated’ (7775, both *deiligid(ir)*), *cuindegat* ‘I shall seek’, (2188-9, *con:dieig*, later *cuin(d)chid* or *cuin(d)gid*), *-ereochad* ‘should rise’ (2367, *at:reig*, later *éirgid*), *-scuaibeobthar* ‘will be swept’ (7525). However, neither of these phenomena becomes at all common until Modern Irish proper, e.g. *méteobhaidh*, *méteochaidh* ‘will increase’, *laibeorus* ‘who shall speak’, *sailteoraid* ‘shall trample’, *-cuiteocha(idh)* ‘will repay’ (Ériu 5, 126-41, §§ 18, 34, 51, 90, 107). LL occasionally writes *ía* for *é* in these futures, e.g. *ní:dergían* ‘will not be able to do’ (9878), and so *ní:sáriagum* ‘we shall not outrage’ (LL 8074 twice, *sáraigid(ir)*; Stowe *ní saireocham*) must be a very early attestation of the *-ég-* fut.

It has been suggested that the *eó-* arose in the 1sg. conj. of the *é*-fut. through

analogical introduction of the *u*-infection in the 1sg. of the *f*-fut. *-léiciub* 'I shall leave' etc., an early and isolated instance being *-digéon* 'I shall do' (LU 6134). The existence of *-é/-eó-* variants in the 1sg. conj. is then supposed to have generated *-eó-* beside *-é-* throughout the rest of the paradigm. This explanation comes up against three insuperable difficulties. Firstly, *-iub* had almost certainly become */-əv/* (see 6.6.1) without phonemic rounding before any such *-eó-* forms could be created from it. Secondly, the initial base of the *-é/-eó-* variation in the 1sg. conj. is too slight and peripheral for its fundamentally unmotivated spread to be credible. Thirdly, there is no good reason why *-eó-* should not have spread equally in stressed and unstressed position rather than being confined to the latter. It seems preferable to assume that the *-áb/-ób-* alternance documented at the end of 6.6.3 could have triggered a likewise unstressed *-éb/-eób-* alternance throughout the *-éb-* fut. in the first instance and that *-eó-* then became an increasingly preponderant variant of unstressed *-é-* in other futures of this type. LU *-digéon* could then be taken as a particularly early literary reflex of this process that just happens to be 1sg. or as a purely literary imitation of the rounding still often present orthographically in the 1sg. of the *f*-fut.

The *-ég/-eóg-* and *-éch/-eóch-* variants of the new fut. of various *-(a)ig-* verbs, particularly denominatives, were geographically conditioned in the first instance, to judge from the monopoly of reflexes of the former in Munster and Connacht and of the latter in Ulster (and, probably, indirectly in Scots Gaelic) in the present-day dialects. The *-ég-* type was clearly extrapolated from present *-(a)ig(-)* in the normal way, but the *-éch-* variant has seemed more problematical. However, although the *-g-* of *-(a)ig-* denominatives etc. is most often so written before fut. *-^tf-* in the Old Irish Glosses in the interests of orthographic homogeneity, there are a number of examples of a *-ch-* that can only be an attempt to render the actual devoiced pronunciation normal in this environment (cf. orthographic *-bf-* vs. phonetic *-f-* in V.2.1), notably *-daing^tnich^tfe* 'thou shalt fortify' (Ml. 78c6, *daing^tnigidir*), *du:luich^tfea* 'he shall forgive' (128c6, *do:lugi*), *ad:áich^tfer* 'I shall fear' (68c17), *ad:áich^tfedar* '(who) shall fear' (46c20), *ní:áichfetar* 'they shall not fear' (80b13, all *ad:ágathar*). Bearing in mind the marked Modern Irish tendency for devoicing to supplant *-f-* as the basic marker of the *f*-future (cf. OIr. pres. *a(d):treba*, fut. *a(d):trefea* etc. in V.2.1 and Mid. Ir. *fagb-* > *fag-* etc. in 6.6.3), we can envisage transformation of unstressed fut. *-ich(f)-* into *-éch-* through

replacement or reinforcement of one marker by another rather than equally viable extrapolation of *-ég-* from present *-(a)ig-*.

This devoicing of *g* to *ch* in the productive *f*-future may well explain a sporadic Middle Irish tendency to replace *g* by *ch* in the isolated suppletive fut. *regaid* (V.5.3) of *téit*, e.g. *rachat*, *rach* 'I shall go' (LL 8571, 9998, 18805), *rech^tmi* 'we shall go' (LU 3423), which are apparently early instances of a dialect feature (present-day Connacht, Ulster and Scots Gaelic *rach-* vs. Munster *ragh-*), but *ch/g* alternations elsewhere in this verb's system, e.g. 3sg. augm. subj. *-dech* or *-dig* etc. (X.1), were probably at least a contributing factor.

6.6.5. The inflection of the Middle Irish *é*-fut. is identical to that of the subjunctive (6.5 taken in conjunction with 6.1.5) except for the 1sg. with abs./conj. pres. *-(a)im*, subj. *-ur* but fut. abs. *-at* vs. conj. *-Ø*: e.g., *bérat* '(that) I shall bear' (SR 3321, LL 8458), *regat* 'I shall go' (SR 5825, 5860), *do:bér* 'that I shall give' (1173), *ní:thibér* 'I shall not give' (842). A similar contrast is found in the *f*-fut. except that *u* is still usually written in the 1sg. conj. (cf. subj. *-ur* in 6.5), e.g. *rann^tfat* 'I shall divide' (SR 1264), *foídfet* 'I shall send' (3835), *clóenfet* 'that I shall incline' (LU 5183), *teilcfet* 'I shall cast' (LL 9450), *techfet* 'I shall flee' (LL 9940), *do:lécub* 'I shall let loose' (SR 2428), *nád:aniub* 'that I shall not stay' (LU 6378), *nachas:linub* 'I shall not follow him' (LL 9947), *ní:thechiub* 'I shall not flee' (LL 9162). It has been pointed out earlier (2.2c) that the new 1pl. abs. *-m(a)it* triggered reshaping in the fut. of the old 1sg. abs. *-e/-a* now indistinguishable from 2sg. *-e/-a* (OIr. 1sg. *-(e)a*, 2sg. *-(a)e* mostly) to *-(a)it*, of which there are a few examples. However, this solution was unsatisfactory because of a more distant ambiguity with 3pl. abs. *-(a)it* so that the 1sg. abs. fut. was swiftly depalatalized to the unambiguous *-et/-at* (Mod. Ir. *-(e)ad*) overwhelmingly preponderant in Middle Irish (3pl. conj. *-et/-at* being confined to dependent, 1sg. abs. *-et/-at* to independent position).

Although the inflection of *é*- and *f*-futures was fundamentally the same in both Old and Middle Irish, endings with two underlying syllables like the 1pl. abs. (VIII.2.2) or the 3sg. or pl. pass. (VIII.6.1) tended to be syncopated in the former but not in the *-^tf-* form of the latter with its already syncopated suffix (cf. VIII.6.5). This discrepancy in syncope patterns tends to be retained and even strengthened in Middle Irish futures, e.g. 1pl. abs. *an^tfamit* 'we shall wait' (SR 1425), *faic^tfimmít* 'we shall leave' (LL 10993, *f*-fut. for *-éb-* as based on *fác-* not *fác^tb-*, see 6.6.3) but

géb^tmait 'we shall take' (LL 12229), pass. 3sg. *tróeth^tfaidir* 'will be subdued' (SR 8317), *fill^tfidir* 'shall be bent' (8141), *no-t:sóer^tfaider* 'thou shalt be freed' (3804), *no-t:mair^tfider* 'thou shalt be killed' (6496) but *cobér^tthair* 'will be helped, (1949, *cob^traid(ir)*), *ailéb^tthair* 'will be reared' (LL 8460, *alid*), *con:scér^tthar* 'shall be destroyed' (SR 2529, *con:scara*), 3pl. *clo^tfitir* 'shall be overthrown' (8215) but *con:gér^tda(i)r* 'shall be summoned' (453, 8367).

Now that Middle Irish modifications of the present, subjunctive and future stems with their basic personal inflections have been considered, it may be noted that the imperfect endings (VIII.7) added to such stems in order to yield imperfect indicative, past subjunctive and conditional respectively underwent no significant changes in Middle Irish apart from the optional lengthening of the vowel seen in 2sg. *-thé/á*, 1pl. *-m(a)ls* and 3pl. *-t(a)ls* (2.4).

6.7. Although the passive-impersonal has been restricted to third-person inflections throughout the recorded history of Irish (cf. VIII.6.1-2), some formal modifications of these did take place in Middle Irish.

(a) Previous distinctions between non-palatal *-r* in conj. or rel. and palatal *-r* in abs. (VIII.6.1) were eroded in Middle Irish, probably for the reason suggested in 3.4 above. This produced a situation still obtaining in Classical Modern Irish whereby broad and slender *-r* were in more or less free variation. To the examples given in 3.4 may be added 3sg. abs. *clóentar* 'deceit is practised' (LL 9491) and 3pl. conj. *con:gérdair* 'shall be summoned' (SR 453).

(b) Occasionally the *-a(i)r* and *-(a)ithir/er* 3sg. passives (VIII.6.4) were confused, e.g. *imchomarcthír* 'is enquired' (LL 31325, probably new simple verb; OIr. *im:comarcar*), *co:tístar* 'until there should come' (SR 2055, *do:ic*, *(-)tic*).

(c) Literary attempts to reproduce obsolete deponent forms sometimes resulted in forms identical with rather than merely similar to passives that were still in current use, e.g. *noco:lémaither* 'will not dare' (LU 5185, OIr. *-lil^tmathar*), *míannaighther* 'craves' (LL 12126).

(d) In the passive preterite the 3sg. abs. and 3pl. abs. and conj. all apparently had distinctive final vowels in OIr. (VIII.6.6) but reduction of these to schwa in Middle Irish (e.g. 6.1.3) merged all three as variously spelled */-ə/* in opposition to 3sg. conj. *-Ø*. Generalization of the augmented preterite in Middle Irish (4.1) meant that all such forms came to be regularly preceded by a particle or preverb and that the abs. endings were consequently moribund except as an exercise in literary

conservatism. Moreover, the nascent use, probably more advanced in speech than in writing, of a 3sg. verb with a 3pl. pronoun or a pl. noun as subject (3.3) created an area of overlap between 3sg. and 3pl. forms. Taking the productive weak pret. pass. lenited dental suffix (VII.2, and 6.2 in present chapter) as a base, one may set up the following square of hitherto phonetically and grammatically distinct forms now totally confused phonetically or partially interchangeable syntactically (< >) as a result of the developments just outlined (brackets indicate obsolete or obsolescent forms):

	3sg.		3pl.
abs.	(-the/-tha)	<>	(-the/-tha)
conj.	-ed/-ad	<>	-the/-tha

Total phonetic confusion of 3sg. and 3pl. forms in the moribund abs. allied with some syntactic erosion of the difference overall was likely to trigger a similar identity in the conj. The vertical axis provided commensurate pressure with a total convergence of 3pl. abs. and conj. liable to lead to a probably hypercorrect tendency to substitute moribund abs. (see 6.9.1 below) for living conj. 3sg. forms in writing at least. Consequently it comes as no great surprise to find a number of instances of variously spelled *-the/-tha* as a 3sg. conj. instead of the still overwhelmingly preponderant *-ed/-ad* (Mod. Ir. *-(e)adh*), e.g. *ro:anmnigthe* 'was named' (SR 3052), *ro-dos:suidighi* 'was established' (5158, infix referring to fem. subj. of passive, cf. *ní-s:ragbad* in 2.2e), *ra:(h)idnaicthea* 'was bestowed' (LL 10610, 10613; OIr. *do:indnaig*), *do:bretha* 'was brought' (LL 8215), *ra:berthea* 'that was brought' (10612, note accommodation to pres. stem and *ro* for *do* by 4.3), *ra:naidmthea* 'was bound' (9982, OIr. pres. *nascid*, pret. pass. *-nass*, verbal noun *naidm* as base for new simple verb by 5.2b).

(e) The foregoing would indicate that the 3pl. conj. pret. pass. in *-the/-tha* was coming under considerable formal pressure in writing at least, and that a more clearly characterized ending might be welcome. Further trends towards ambiguity must also have been developing in more mundane discourse because of the gradual merger of *ro* and *no* as *do* (end of 5.31), reduction of unstressed final vowels (d above) and the increasing preference for 'weak' patterns with virtually unvarying stem throughout the different tenses and moods (6.2). As a result 3sg. imperfect

passives (VIII.7) could converge with originally quite distinct 3pl. augm. pret. passives: e.g., OIr. ipf. *no:ainmnig^tthe* 'used to be named', pret. *ro:ainmnig^tthea* both becoming *do:ainmnig^the*, OIr. ipf. *no:ben^ttae* 'used to be struck', pret. *ro:bítha* 'were struck' both tending towards *do:ben^tta*, OIr. ipf. *no:oig^tthe* 'used to be slain', pret. *ro:orta* 'were slain' converging as *do:oig^tthe* and so on. The need for a distinctive new 3pl. conj. ending for the ever expanding 'weak' preterite passive was presumably becoming urgent.

The most obvious choice among existing 3pl. endings was basic *-a(i)t*, which alone lacked an *-r* not favoured in the pret. pass. and had prospects of being added direct like 3sg. *-ed/-ad* to a stem appearing also in pres., subj. and pret. act. (6.9.2 below) without giving rise to serious ambiguity with other passives or preterites. However, the conj. 3pl. *-et/-at* most natural with regularly augmented forms would have resulted in confusion with the 3pl. act. of the still quite common augm. subj.: e.g., *co-r(o):chuiret* 'so that they might put' would be formally indistinguishable from a putative 'so that they were put'. However, use of the hitherto abs. palatalized *-(a)it* in this conjunct position (cf. the identically motivated but inverted preference of *-et/-at* over *-(a)it* in the 1sg. abs. fut., 6.6.5) would avoid such problems and was duly adopted. This 'weak' augm. pret. pass. 3pl. *-(a)it* is very well attested in texts such as the *LL* versions of *Togail Troí* and the *Bórama*, where it has largely ousted *-the/-tha*, e.g. *ro:fodlait* 'were divided' (*LU* 25,94), *co-ro:gabait* 'until were seized' (4028), *ro:marbait* '(who) were killed' (7039, 10702), *do:rónait* 'were made' (7691), *ro:hordaigit* 'were appointed' (4217), *tucait* 'were brought' (*LL* 7610 etc.), *ra:hármit* 'were counted' (7611 etc.), *(ní-)ra:canait* 'were (not) sung' (8252, 9012), *ra:tinóilit* 'were gathered' (38661), *ra:iarfaigit* 'were asked' (38474), *ra:togait* 'were selected' (30942), *ra:scoiltit* 'were split', *ra:scáilit* 'were divided' (both 30944), *ra:cuirit* 'were put' (30946), *ra:tócbait* 'were raised' (30959), *ra:nertait* 'were strengthened', *ra:gressit* 'were incited' (both 30971).

A precise model for the replacement of 3pl. pret. pass. *-the/-tha* has recently been sought in the rare literary equivalence of *-the/-tha* to normal *-(a)it* as a 3pl. rel. present active (see 3.4). This would imply that the 3pl. pret. pass. *-(a)it* was a largely or exclusively erudite creation at a time when the spoken language was moving inexorably towards the Modern Irish system of a single originally 3sg. passive throughout plus appropriate independent pronoun, whence, say, *tucait* above corresponding to a *tucad (...)* (*íat*) '(they) were brought' (Mod. Ir. *tugadh (...)*)

(*iad*)) in actual speech. Against this by no means impossible assumption it must, however, be urged that the *-(a)it* pret. pass. is remarkably common in the texts for a form with such extremely recondite origins, that concord of 3pl. verb with 3pl. pronoun or pl. noun subject seems to have been quite resilient (cf. 3.3), and that as a common innovatory form this *-(a)it* seems likely to have had its roots in more or less contemporary speech. As such it could easily have been created during a transitional stage where 3pl. concord, although beginning to come under threat, was still the norm, and then abandoned in speech as the new concord system triumphed in copula and passive especially.

If the general pressures and possibilities for the emergence of pret. pass. *-(a)it* outlined above are not regarded as sufficient and a precise model is to be sought, the best place to look is the copula, which was becoming increasingly depersonalized (cf. I.5) in tandem with the passive. This is particularly apparent in a Middle Irish tendency to adopt the passive system of indicating a first or second person subject by attaching an appropriate infixed pronoun to the base 3sg. form (VIII.6.2 and 6.6). Hence frequent replacement of OIr. inflections such as indep. pres. *am* 'am', *at* 'art' *is* 'is', *ammi(n)*, *adi(b)*, *it* 'we/you/they are' by *is-am*, *is-at*, *is* and (usually with 3pl. *it/at* as a base) 1pl. *at-in*, *at-ar*, *is-ar*, 2pl. *it-ib*, *at(a)-bar* (see 2.1b on 1pl. *-ar*, 2pl. *-bar*), 3pl. *it/at* (but sometimes *isat*, probably through confusion of old 2sg. *at* with 3pl. *it/at*). The inherited 3pl. pret of the copula, *batar/-b^ttar* (cf. VIII.4), acquired a Mid. Ir. bye-form *-p^tsat* as a result of developments in preterite inflection to be discussed in 6.9.2a as well as the fairly common *(-)bat* perhaps extrapolated from 3sg. *ba*, *-b(o)* on the model of 3pl. pres. *is-at* etc. and made viable by progress towards a basic pres./past formal opposition in the copula (I.5, see the *DIL* entry *is* for examples of these various forms). In essence the copula was increasingly becoming a depersonalized predicator restricted to a basic sg./pl. inflectional dichotomy in Middle Irish that could only heighten its affinities with the passive-impersonal. Accordingly it seems reasonable enough to suppose that the ending of 3pl. pret. cop. *(-)bat* 'were' was transferred to the corresponding 3pl. pret. pass. of stressed verbs. As a proclitic liable to depalatalization (cf. I.2.3b), the copula sometimes opposed endings with non-palatal final consonant to corresponding endings in stressed verbs with a palatal final, e.g. 1sg. pres. cop. *(-)am* vs. general *-(a)im*, and this will have made a response to the systemic pressure noted earlier towards palatalized *-(a)it* in the 3pl. pret. pass. of normal

verbs particularly easy.

It is worth noting in conclusion that forms such as *ra:togait* 'were selected' above testify to the general resistance of the pret. pass. (which could not, of course, normally be construed with a third person pronoun) to the rise of Middle and Modern Irish main-clause lenition documented earlier (2.2b).

(f) The *-s* variant of the pret. pass. suffix had already begun to spread from *ad:cí* to *(ro)-cluine-thar* in Old Irish, whence *ro:clós* 'has been/was heard' ousting *-cloth* on the model of *ad:cess*, *-aices* 'was seen' (see VII.4). On a very limited scale this continued into Middle and Modern Irish, e.g. *ra:condcas* 'was seen' (LL 9819, OIr. pass. corresponding to *ad:condai(r)c* unattested but hardly in *-s* originally), *ro:bás*, *-rabus* 'one was' (LU 301, 2794 and *Trip.* 54, older form doubtless *ro:both*, *-rabad*), *nocon:fúaross* 'has not been found' (LL 10642, OIr. *-fríth*, VII.6), *táncas* 'there was a coming' (LL 7573 and 7575, OIr. pret. pass. of *(-)tic* doubtless *-tícht*), *-hétas* 'was got' (LU 7256, OIr. *-étad*). Apart, however, from this limited use mostly to reduce anomalies between the pret. act. and pass. of a few irregular verbs, the *-s* variant inevitably came under pressure from the 'weak' type *-ed/-ad* etc. (see 6.2).

6.8. Only in the preterite was a change of stem as well as endings involved in the shift from active to passive, the upshot being that in strong verbs particularly the formal divergence between a pret. act. and a pret. pass. could be quite marked, e.g. *(-)cechain* 'sang', *-cét* 'was sung', *(-)gáid* 'besought', *-gess* 'was besought', *fo:caird* 'put', *fo:cress* 'was put', *do:rigni* 'has done, did', *do:rónad* 'has been/was done' and so on (compare VI and VII for many further examples). In the case of the weak pattern, however, the root itself was identical in both forms, and only the suffix (act. *-Vs-*, pass. *-Vth-* with vowel often syncopated, cf. VI.4.2 and VII.2) plus endings served to differentiate them. The Middle Irish spread of weak at the expense of strong inflectional patterns greatly favoured simplification of the relationship between the two stems, the upshot being a tendency to replace *(-)gáid*, *-gess* by *ro:guid* 'besought', *ro:guided* 'was besought', *(-)cechain*, *-cét* by *ro:chan* 'sang', *ro:canad* 'was sung' and so on. In view of the argument below (6.9.2a) that the pret. act. in Middle Irish was developing a single inflectional type based on some endings with *s* and some without, this rising pattern was presumably re-analysed in terms of an unchanged stem (*guid-*, *can-*, *marb-*, *léic-* etc.) upon which a shift of endings only operated to transform active into passive and vice

versa in the preterite as elsewhere in the system: e.g., 3sg. act. *ro:guid(-estar)*, *ro:marb(-astar)* > pass. *ro:guid-ed*, *ro:marb-ad*, 3pl. act. *ro:can-sat(ar)* (or *-atar*), *ro:léc(-set(ar))* (or *-etar*) > pass. *ro:can-ait* (or *-ta*), *ro:léc-it* (or *-the*).

Even in Old Irish fully homogenized pret. act. and pass. stems had been inherited in a handful of strong verbs with a *t*-pret. act. and an unchanged root shape in the pass. pret. to which underlying *-t(-)* was likewise suffixed (compare VI.3.1 with VII.3), e.g. 3sg. (3pl.) act. *-acht(atar)* ‘drove’, *-ort(atar)* ‘slew’, *-alt(atar)* ‘reared’, *do:rósat(†tar)* ‘begat’ vs. pass. *-acht(a)* ‘was (were) driven’, *-ort(a)* ‘was (were) slain’, *-alt(a)* ‘was (were) reared’, *do:rósat(a)* ‘was (were) begotten’. This formal identity in the 3sg. allied with the later overall trend towards homogenization along ‘weak’ lines discussed in the previous paragraph sometimes led to interchange between pret. pass. and act. stems in Middle Irish sources, especially where one of these either was or resembled a *t*-pret., e.g. 3sg. *ro:dét* ‘granted’ (SR 6873; OIr. pret. act. *(-)dámair*, pass. *-dét*), *dia-rro:chét* ‘to whom sang’ (SR 7533), *do:breth* (LL 8125, 9226 etc.) or *do:bretha* (LL 7641, 7931 etc., see 6.7d and 6.9.1c), 3pl. *do:brethsat* (LL 8696, 12971) ‘brought, gave’ and conversely *ra:bertad* ‘was practised’ (LL 11239; OIr. pret. act. *do:bert*, pass. *do:breth*). The extraordinary 3sg. pret. pass. *ra:léicsed* ‘there was a releasing’ (LL 38000; OIr. pret. act. *léicis*, *-léic*, pass. *-léiced*) is like *ra:bertad* apart from being quite exceptionally based upon an *s*- and not a *t*-pret. act.

Most if not all of the forms in the preceding paragraph are suspect of being purely literary products of uncertainty about obsolescent or extinct strong preterite actives and passives, the result being hypercorrect interchange between them on the basis of a small old core of *t*-preterites identical with corresponding passives in the literary standard. However, some accommodations of this type outside the increasingly regular ‘weak’ pattern of the first paragraph were firmly anchored in real speech on the evidence of Modern Irish. For instance, the replacement of OIr. pret. pass. 3sg. *-tícht*, *-fríth* by *táncas*, *-fúaross* respectively in 6.7f was doubtless largely motivated as a formal rapprochement with the corresponding pret. act. *(-)tánaic* (pl. *(-)tán†catar*), *(-)fúair* (pl. *(-)fúaratar*). *Do:gní* ‘does’ was one of the few verbs to preserve an appreciable measure of irregularity into Modern Irish, including a quasi-reduplicated *s*-pret. act. (VI.4.3) and a non-proclitic augment *ro* (end of 4.3 in present chap.). Consequently it opposed 3sg. augm. pret. act. *do:ri(n)gne*, *-derna* to pass. *do:rónad*, *-dernad* in the first instance in Middle Irish.

Coincidence of the two prototonic stems and the overall trend towards homogenization led to a skew in the independent (deuterotonic) forms with *do:ri(n)gn-* being used in passive as well as active and *do:rón-* in active as well as passive: e.g., in *SR* 3sg. act. mostly *do:rigne* 'made' (13, 17 etc.) but sometimes *do:róni* (1530), *do:róne* (656), *do-s:róna* (295) 'made (them)', pass. *do:rónad* 'was made' (82, 782) or *do:rigned* 'was made' (3727, 4111, 6985). Further examples of the skewed forms include act. 3sg. *do-d:róni* 'who made' (*LU* 6749), 3pl. *do-d:rónsat* 'which they had made' (8002, cf. 2.2d), *do:rónsat* 'they made' (*LL* 39179), pass. 3sg. *do:rigned* (*LU* 7770), *do:ringned* (*LL* 37715, 37833, 38326) 'was made'. These *do:ri(n)gn-* and *do:rón-* variants in both active and passive survive into Classical Modern Irish, but in the present-day dialects the former have prevailed.

6.9.1. (a) The Middle Irish generalization of augmented preterites that always contained at least one preverb (cf. IX.2.2) and so were incompatible with absolute endings (I.1.3) inevitably made it increasingly difficult to preserve these desinences in the artificially maintained literary unaugmented *s*-preterites of independent simple verbs. The possibilities for confusion were compounded by the fact that the endings of the other two main types of preterite were either totally or partially undifferentiated for abs. and conj. (VIII.4). The result was that, allowing for considerable resilience on the part of the comparatively frequent (in writing at least) 3sg. abs. *-(a)is* (see 2 below), the unaugm. *s*-pret. of independent simple verbs increasingly appears with conj. rather than the proper abs. inflections in Middle Irish sources: e.g., 1sg. *gabús* 'I took' (*LU* 3281, 6088; OIr. *gab^tsu*, *-gabús*); 2sg. *dális* 'thou didst pour out' (*LL* 19336; OIr. *dál^tsi*, *-dális*); 3sg. *gab* 'took' (*SR* 3383, OIr. *gabais*, *-gab*), *suidig* 'placed' (*SR* 6661); 1pl. *lodsam* 'we went' (*LL* 29138); 3pl. *gabsat* '(they) took' (*LU* 1348, 6954, *LL* 207, 222 etc.; OIr. *gab^tsait*, *-gab^tsat*), *oirgset* '(they) ravaged' (*LU* 1623), *gonsat* 'who slew' (*LL* 936), *marbsat* 'they slew' (950, *SR* 6958; OIr. *marbsait*, *-marbsat*), *léicset* '(they) let' (*LL* 8929; OIr. *léicsit*, *-léicset*), *scarsat* 'they parted' (*SR* 3953; OIr. *scarsait*, *-scarsat*). In essence a literary 1sg. *gabús*, 3pl. *gabsat* and so on were extrapolated from the current augm. *ro:gabús*, *ro:gabsat* on the model of literary (old suffixless) pret. 1sg. *memad*, 3pl. *mem^tdatar* identical with augm. *ro:memad*, *ro:mem^tdatar* 'I/they broke'. The conflation of suffixless and *s*-preterite inflection to be discussed in 2 below obviously helped in this respect.

The late and only partial Old Irish tendency to create new abs. 1pl. *-(a)im(m)ir*, 3pl. *-(a)itir* to complement inherited abs./conj. *-em(m)ar/-am(m)ar*, *-etar/-atar* in the suffixless and *t*-pret. (end of VIII.4) failed to establish itself and was doomed by the generalization of augmented forms, an isolated example being *lotair* ‘they went’ (SR 3457) vs. usual *lotar* (1417 etc.). The OIr. abs. forms of the sg. *t*-pret were particularly liable to replacement by conj. even in the 3sg. owing to the formation’s moribund status (2b below) and its virtual lack of an inherited abs./conj. distinction in the pl. as well as to the rise of augmented forms. Moreover, developments to be described in 2b below meant that the old broad 3sg. conj. of *as:ru-bart* ‘(has) said’ etc. was usually palatalized to give *at:(r)ubairt* ‘said’ and so on in Middle Irish, so that old abs. forms like *uirt/oirt* ‘slew’, *birt* ‘bore’ (VIII.2.3a) could easily be hypercorrected to *ort* (SR 6203, 6227) and *bert* (LU 3160) respectively.

(b) The OIr. 2pl. *-(a)id* (conj. only in the *s*-pret., probably abs. too in the suffixless and *t*-pret. but no certain exx., cf. VIII.2.2 and 4) tends to be replaced by innovatory *-(a)bair* in Middle Irish. Thus in SR old suffixless preterites regularly have this ending, e.g. *in:cúalabar-si* ‘have you heard?’ (1393), *do:chúabair* ‘you have gone’ (1443), *táncabair* ‘you have come’ (3472), *do:rochrobair* ‘you have fallen’ (3608), and it even spreads to the old *s*-pret., e.g. *ro:recsabair* ‘you have sold’ (3636) alongside *do:rinnsid* ‘you have done’ (3616). Further examples include *ní:fúarabair* ‘you have not found’ (LL 38623) and *ro:bábair* ‘you have been’ (37110). This ending could even spread to the moribund deponent *s*-subj., presumably triggered by a conj. 1pl. *-am(m)ar*, 3pl. *-atar* reminiscent of the suffixless pret., e.g. *dia-nd:essabair* ‘if you eat it’ (SR 1232), *co:fessabair* ‘that you may know’ (1089, 2022).

That the at first sight bizarre pret. 2pl. *-abair* was no mere learned invention is proved by its vigorous survival in present-day Munster Irish, and its origin can hardly be sought anywhere but in the copula’s 2pl. *-bar* formed by attaching an infixed pronoun (see end of 6.7e). Although broad final consonance was the rule in the proclitic copula (2.7e), sometimes palatalization was introduced on the analogy of corresponding endings of stressed verbs, e.g. subj. 2pl. *-bad* (Wb. 5d38 etc.) or *-baid* (Ml. 115b10) ‘you may be’ vs. substantive verb with invariably palatal-final 2pl. conj. subj. *-beith*, *-beid* etc. (GOI 481). Consequently it is no surprise to find palatalized *-bair* alongside basic *-bar* in the new 2pl. of the copula, e.g. *níbar* ‘you

are not' (*SR* 3641), *atbar* 'you are' (*LU* 6870, Ms. *abtar*) or *atabair* (8097). As it happens, the 2pl. pret. of the copula is not attested, but we can be reasonably confident that its basic form would have been **-bad* with a rarer bye-form **-baid* as in the subj. and that spread of *-bar* to it would have yielded a similar alternation between **-babar* and **-babair*. The attraction of *-ba(i)r* as a 2pl. suffixless pret. ending was that it ended in *-r* like the 1 and 3pl., whence its tendency to encroach on *-a(i)d*. Its first conquest outside the copular system would most likely be the neighbouring substantive verb with an inherited 2pl. that must regularly have been **-báid* with palatal final (*GOI* 483). The obvious proportion would be:

2pl. cop. *-ba(i)d*: subst. vb. *-báid* = cop. *-baba(i)r*: subst. vb. *x* (*x* = *-bábair*). Thus mediated, the spread of 2pl. *-(a)bair* to the suffixless preterites of other stressed verbs could proceed.

(c) In VI.4.2 it was pointed out that W2a weak verbs had a 3sg. conj. *s*-pret. in *-i* that was already giving way in OIr. to \emptyset on the model of other weak *s*-pret. formations in order to minimize ambiguity with pres. *-i* in W2. The generalization of a mechanical opposition between augm. pret. and unaugm. pres. in Middle Irish (4.1) meant that both pres. and pret. could end in *-i* without ambiguity, e.g. *ní-ro:rádi* 'did not say' vs. *ní:rádi* 'does not say', and some survivals of the old W2a *-i* ending alongside \emptyset do occur in Middle Irish sources, e.g. *ra:rádi* (*LL* 7675) or *ra:ráid* (7729) 'said'. Such survivals along with (reduplicated) *s*-pret. hiatus verb types like *do:ri(n)gne* 'did', *-beba(e)* 'died' (VI.4.3) seem to have served as a core from which a 3sg. *-e/-a* could spread somewhat without ambiguity in Middle Irish. *SR* is particularly rich in examples, e.g. *ro-d:asta* 'who has established it' (7527; OIr. W2b *ad:suidi*), *ro:delba* 'who fashioned' (331; OIr. W1), *ro:gaba* 'encountered' (6383; S2), *ro-das:biathai* 'he fed them, (4636; W1), *co-ro:legai* 'so that there perished' (5063; W1), *ro:scrútai* 'considered' (3189, 3193; W1), *ro-s:léice* 'released them' (7870; W2a), *ro:rá(i)di* or *ro:rá(i)de* 'said' (numerous exx., e.g. 834; W2a) and the extraordinary *sernai* 'arrayed' (5965; cf. 6.2 and *suidig* in (a) above). Since there is no trace of this ending in Modern Irish regular verbs, innovations in its use are quite likely to have been restricted to the literary medium in Middle Irish and may well be due to hypercorrection as the weak *-a* and *-i/-e* 3sg. pres. conj. came under pressure from endingless forms (see 6.1.4).

6.9.2. It has already been pointed out (VIII.1) that the absence of independent subject pronouns in Old Irish meant that the various inflectional forms of the verb

were the sole indicators of person and number there and that care was normally taken to ensure that 1, 2 and 3sg. and pl. were formally distinct within the mutually exclusive abs. and conj. sets in order to avoid intolerable ambiguities. Although the use of independent subject pronouns was beginning in Middle Irish (end of 2.3), this development was still peripheral and is far from complete even in the present-day dialects, especially those of Munster. As a result the maintenance of distinct personal inflections remained paramount, and it has been argued at various points above (e.g. 6.1.4, 6.4.2b, 6.5, 6.6.5, 6.7e) that certain new endings arose or were modified in Middle Irish precisely in order to resolve ambiguities that had been brought about by phonetic developments such as the weakening of final unstressed vowels to schwa. Similar moves in the pret. act. had far-reaching effects that will now be examined.

(a) One notable exception to the rule of distinct personal inflections occurred in the suffixless preterite, where 1 and 2sg. were identical (VIII.4), e.g. 1sg. *(fo)-fúar* 'I found', 2sg. *(fo)-fúar* 'thou foundest', 3sg. *(fo)-fúair* 'he found'. The 3sg. of the suffixless preterite was, of course, very similar to the normal 3sg. conj. of the *s*-pret., e.g. *ro:ga(i)b* 'seized'. This point of congruence served as a conduit, so to speak, for transfer of the distinctive *s*-pret. 1 and 2sg. endings *-us* and *-ais* respectively, e.g. *ro:gab-us* 'I seized', *ro:gab-ais* 'thou seizedst', to the suffixless preterite in Middle Irish in order to resolve the ambiguity, whence forms like *-fúarus* 'I got' (SR 1758 etc.), 2sg. *fo:fúarais* 'thou didst get' (1751) in place of the old identical inflections alongside 3sg. *fo:fúair* 'found' (3091 etc.). Further examples include 1sg. *do:chúadus* 'I went' (LU 3716, LL 13132; OIr. *do:cúad*), *at:c(h)onnarcus* 'I saw' (LU 7559, *at:c(h)ondarc* at 7539, 7553), *do:chúadais* 'thou wentest' (LL 13125, 13170; OIr. *do:cúad*), *at:chonnarcas* 'thou sawest' (LU 7218; *at:c(h)onnarc* 7219 etc.), *thánacais* 'thou camest' (13169; OIr. *tánac*). Clearly such forms betoken progress towards a homogeneous singular paradigm 1sg. *-(i)us*, 2sg. *-(a)is*, 3sg. *-Ø* for all preterites regardless of their origins (see (b) below for the *t*-pret.).

Because of 3pl. *do:c(h)úatar*, *-dechatar* 'went' (syncopated and delenited *do:chúad[†]tar*, *-dech[†]ad[†]tar*), 3sg. *do:c(h)úaid*, *-dechaid* could be reanalysed as stem *do:c(h)ú(a)-*, *-dech-* (cf. 2pl. *do:chúabair* in 6.9.1b) plus ending *-(a)id*, which then seems to have been liable to spread to other vowel-final irregular preterites, e.g. *-faccaig* 'saw', *at:chúalaig* '(whom) he had heard' (LL 31838, 31839, spelling

confusion between lenited *d* and *g* due to their eventual merger in speech as *g(h)*; OIr. *-accaae*, *ro:cúalae*). Segmentation of the 2sg. as *do:chúa-dais* could likewise produce *-cúaladais* 'thou heardest' (LL 37878, 37882, 37884).

In all varieties of Modern Irish the only synthetic 2sg. pret. form is *-(a)is* or *-adhais*. The latter has been generalized in present-day Munster Irish as *-(a)ís*, whereas a handful of originally suffixless preterites retain the old endingless 1sg. with broad final consonant where applicable either as the sole inflection or as a variant of the otherwise general *-(adh)as* from OIr. *-us*. Thus Classical Modern Irish has 1sg. *do-bhá*, *-rabha* 'I was', *ad/do-chonna(r)c*, *-faca* (*-fac(adh)as* dismissed as substandard but doubtless in existence in speech) 'I saw', *(-)t(h)ánag* 'I came', *ad/do-chuala* or *-chualadhas* 'I heard', *do:chuadh*, *-deachadh* or *do:chuadhas*, *-deachadhas* 'I went'. In the present-day dialects *-as* (where, notably in Munster and in Connemara responsives, it has not been replaced by the analytic type with *mé*) has generally prevailed except for residual *ch^tnoc*, *-faca* 'I saw', *chuala* 'I heard', *thána(g)* 'I came' but *bhíos*, *-rabhas* 'I was', *chuas*, *-deaghas* 'I went' in Munster.

This situation suggests that resolution of the formal identity of 1 and 2sg. in the old suffixless preterite began by adding *-(a)is* to the latter to produce a paradigm 1sg. *-C* (or *-V*), 2sg. *-(C)-ais*, 3sg. *-C'* (or *-V*) identical with that of the old *s*-pret. except in the 1sg., which soon began to suffix *-us* to make the identity complete, a tendency partially resisted only by a handful of irregular preterites.

To all intents and purposes, then, a uniform singular paradigm 1sg. *-(i)us*, 2sg. *-(a)is*, 3sg. *-Ø* had been established throughout the preterite system (see (b) on the *t*-pret.). However, two types of plural existed alongside this according as a verb had originally had an *s*- (1pl. *-sem/-sam*, 2pl. *-s(a)id*, 3pl. *-sat*) or a *t*- (see (b) below) or suffixless (1pl. *-am(m)ar*, 2pl. *-abair*, 3pl. *-atar*) preterite. Given the convergence in the singular, it was almost inevitable that the two plural sets should become interchangeable, i.e. that old suffixless preterites should acquire *-sem/-sam*, *-s(a)id* *-set/-sat* and old *s*-preterites *-em(m)ar/-am(m)ar*, *-ebair/-abair*, *-etar/-atar* alongside their original endings. It is furthermore easy enough to imagine that these free variants would interact to produce a hybrid set *-sem(m)ar/-sam(m)ar*, *-sebair/-sabair*, *-setar/-satar*, which could be used with virtually any preterite (asigmatic variants of *-sem/-sam*, *-s(a)id*, *-set/-sat* were, of course, ruled out because they would have been insufficiently distinctive as preterites). These are most unlikely to

be old deponent forms of the *s*-pret. (cf. 6.4.1-2) as has sometimes been suggested. The fact is that the survival and spread of such inflections over the corresponding basic actives (6.4.2a-b) would be otherwise unparalleled (6.4.1) in the absence of powerful formal advantages and hence only sustainable if there were no reasonable alternative. The upshot was a single inflectional type in the innovatory stratum of Middle Irish for all preterites apart from the few verbs to retain an endingless 1sg., but considerable free variation between endings in the plural.

Sg.		Pl(I)	(II)	(III)
1.	-(i)us	-sem/-sam	-semar/-samar	-emar/-amar
2.	-(a)is	-s(a)id	-sebair/-sabair	-ebair/-abair
3.	-Ø	-set/-sat	-setar/-satar	-etar/-atar

This is basically the system obtaining in Classical Modern Irish apart from the demise of 2pl. *-s(a)id*, but in the present-day dialects still retentive of synthetic pret. inflections the plural forms have been pruned to set III only.

Examples of 3pl. *-set/-sat* with verbs that had a suffixless preterite in Old Irish include *ro:lensat* 'followed', *ro-s:gonsat* 'slew them', *fa:cheirdset* 'cast' in 6.2, *luidset* 'went', *at:bathsat* 'died', *ro:scáigset* 'were exhausted' in 6.3 and so on, the old stem being sometimes preserved (6.3) but more often accommodated to that of the pres. in line with rising 'weak' patterns (6.2). As a result of this development, of course, the old *s*-pret. 3sg. abs. *-(a)is*, which was common enough despite being in all probability a purely literary survival (cf. 6.9.1a), could be used with verbs that had once had a suffixless preterite, e.g. *imthigis* 'went away' (LL 38377), *tuittis* 'fell' (6.2), *luidis* 'went' (6.3). Examples of 3pl. *-etar/-atar* added direct to the stem appearing in the pres. in place of an old *s*-pret. or an old suffixless pret. with a different stem formation include *ro:chenglatar* 'they bound' (LU 239; OIr. W1 with *s*-pret.), *ro:chésatar* '(what) they suffered' (LL 190; W1 *césaid*), *ra:thócbatar* 'raised' (38400; *ga(i)b-* compound with OIr. *s*-pret.), *ra:benatar* 'they struck' (23111; OIr. *-béotar*), *fo:cherdetar* 'they put' (10563; OIr. *fo:cartatar*), *ro:guidetar* 'they besought' (13338; OIr. *-gádatar*). Examples of the hybrid inflections include old *s*-pret. 1pl. *ro:cráidsemmar* 'we have persecuted' (SR 3622), 2pl. *ro:recsabair* 'you have sold' (3636), 3pl. *ro:scarsatar* 'have lapsed' (1725), *ro:ráidsetar* 'they said' (5497), *ní-r:léicsetar* 'they did not let' (6421), old

suffixless *ro:teichsetar* 'they fled' (LU 283; OIr. *-táchatar*), *fo:cherdsetar* 'they put' (LL 10543; see above), and *ro:scáigsetar* 'were exhausted' (11357-8; OIr. *-scáchatar*; see above) without accommodation to the pres. stem.

(b) Although the three sg. conj. endings of the OIr. *t*-pret. were quite distinct, e.g. 1sg. *as:ru-burt*, 2sg. *as:ru-bairt*, 3sg. *as:ru-bart* 'I have/thou hast/he has said', in unstressed position the 1 and 3sg. will have fallen together as /-ərt/ in Middle Irish (cf. 6.4.2b). The relationship between old suffixless pret. 1sg. *at:chonna(r)c* and 3sg. *at:chonnai(r)c* 'I/he saw' etc. with broad and slender final consonant respectively could be applied in order to resolve this ambiguity by palatalizing the 3sg. conj. of the *t*-pret., whence 1sg. *am:ru-bart* 'I practised' (SR 1869; *imm:beir*) vs. 3sg. *at:ru-bairt* 'she said' (1325; *as:beir*), *-érbairt* 'said' (1399 etc.), *-tormailt* 'ate' (7069); *do:meil*), *do:rósait* 'created' (291; *do:fuissim*) although the non-pal. 3sg. is still far commoner than the pal. in SR. This solution, of course, created a new problem of identical 2 and 3sg. The obvious way out of this was to introduce the 2sg. *-ais* now becoming general in old suffixless preterites, whence, for example, *do:rar(n)gertais* 'thou didst promise' (LU 5155; *do:airngir*). This in turn made it possible for the 1sg. to acquire *-us*, as in *-tormaltus* 'I had consumed' (LU 1347; *do:meil*). It thus appears that the *t*-pret. was tending towards the homogeneous sg. inflection described in (a) above, a process least advanced in the 1sg. as in the case of the suffixless pret. The basic innovatory pattern was thus 1sg. *-t(-us)*, 2sg. *-t-ais*, 3sg. *-t*, and it now became possible for *t*-prets. to acquire plurals I and II in addition to III, which they had inherited from Old Irish, e.g. 3pl. *as:bertsat* 'said', *ro:n-ortsat* '(who) slew him', *do:bertsat* 'gave' in 6.3, *ra:bertsatar* 'gave' (LL 11278).

However, the main development to affect the *t*-pret. between Old and Modern Irish was its demise in favour of the combined *s*-/suffixless inflection described in (a) and usually based upon the pres. stem, as a good number of examples of *s*- for *t*-pret. in 6.2 testify, e.g. *ra:thuissim* for *do:rósat* 'created', *ro:chompir* for *con:aiptert* 'begat', *ro:sern* for *ro:sert* 'arrayed'. The only *t*-pret. to survive into present-day Irish, *(a-)dúirt* 'said' from *(a-)deir* 'says', has the following paradigm in Munster: 1sg. *dúirt* (Class. *a-dubhart*), 2sg. *dúraís*, 3sg. *dúirt*, 1 pl. *dúramar*, 2pl. *dúrabhair*, 3pl. *dúradar*, from which it is evident that even here the *-t* only survived in final position and that the *s*-/suffixless formation supplanted it wherever an extra syllable was added. There are occasional examples of this phenomenon in Middle

Irish sources, e.g. 1pl. *remi- 't:rubarmar* 'whom we have aforementioned' (*SR* 7420), *at:rubratar* 'they said' (*LL* 30924).

7. It remains to stress that this chapter is most emphatically not intended as a grammar of the Middle Irish verb but only as a reasonably comprehensive review of the innovatory forms and processes liable to be found in Middle Irish texts but not at all or only on a barely nascent scale in strictly Old Irish sources. This emphasis is suggested on grounds of practicality, in that a concurrent treatment of old and new forms would be cumbersome, to say the least. It also serves to highlight developments leading on to Modern Irish, for the emergence of which Middle Irish material provides crucial and hitherto underexploited evidence. However, the result is inevitably a distortion as regards the gamut of linguistic forms one is likely to encounter in a given Middle Irish text, since a good many of these are liable to conform to the Old Irish norms described in chapters I-XI rather than to the innovations described in the present chapter. In a sense, chapters 1-XI of this book are a grammar of the Old Irish verb and these plus chapter XII constitute a grammar of its Middle Irish counterpart.

Appendix

Old Irish orthography and pronunciation

Old Irish spelling rules may seem surprising in some respects to anyone encountering them for the first time, and are sufficiently different from the peculiar orthographical conventions of Modern Irish that a reader familiar only with the latter may often fail to recognize Old Irish words still occurring with little or no major modification in the present-day language. Accordingly it seems desirable to expound the rules governing the written representation of sounds in Old Irish both in general terms and in relation to later Irish orthography prior to the sweeping post-war reform that is such a gratuitous impediment to the reading of earlier texts by the uninitiated, unless he or she has the good fortune to be literate in the more conservatively spelt present-day Gaelic of Scotland.

It seems best to begin with the representation of consonants at the beginning of a word, whether proclitic or initially stressed. In this respect deuterotonic compound verbs are binary (cf. 1.2.1 and 3.1), with both proclitic and tonic portion counting as words in their own right for orthographical purposes (e.g. *ad:gair* vs. prot. *-acair*, with word-initial and word-internal spelling of /g/ as *g* and *c* respectively).

The fundamental phonetic values of these initial consonants in Old Irish are quite straightforward and apparently correspond closely to those of the present day. However, Old Irish shares with Modern Irish a capacity for the grammatically conditioned mutation of initial consonants, e.g. *in carae*, 'the friend' (m., nom. sg.) but *in charat* 'of the friend' (m., gen. sg.) or *in chomairle* 'the counsel' (f., nom. sg.) with lenition, *dét* 'a tooth' but *a ndét* 'the tooth' (n., nom. sg.), *inna ndét* 'of the teeth' (gen. pl.) with nasalization. In Old Irish, lenition changed stops and /m/ into the corresponding fricatives, reduced /s/ to /h/, eliminated /f/ and probably somewhat relaxed the articulation of /N/, /L/ and /R/, whereas nasalization voiced voiceless stops and /f/, nasalized voiced stops and did not affect the rest. However, the orthographical representation of these changes to initial consonants was far from fully worked out in Old or Middle as opposed to later Modern Irish, and a number of ambiguities for which Latin spelling offered no obvious solution were tolerated in writing. The overall situation is set out in the table below, which groups the various symbols into threes (base, lenited and nasalized variants from left to right)

in each of the three main columns (Modern Irish spelling, Old Irish spelling and presumed Old Irish pronunciation from left to right).

Mod. Ir.			OIr.			OIr. pron.		
p-	ph-	bp-	p-	ph/f-	p-	/p/	/f/	/b/
t-	th-	dt-	t-	th-	t-	/t/	/θ/	/d/
c-	ch-	gc-	c-	ch-	c-	/k/	/x/	/g/
b-	bh-	mb-	b-	b-	mb-	/b/	/v/	/m/
d-	dh-	nd-	d-	d-	nd-	/d/	/ð/	/n/
g-	gh-	ng-	g-	g-	ng-	/g/	/ɣ/	/ŋ/
f-	fh-	bhf-	f-	f/f-	f-	/f/	/-/	/v/
s-	sh-	s-	s-	s/s-	s-	/s/	/h/	/s/
m	mh-	m-	m(m)-	m-	m(m)-	/m/	/ĩ/	/m/
n-	n-	n-	n(n)-	n-	n(n)-	/N/	/n/	/N/
l-	l-	l-	l(l)-	l-	l(l)-	/L/	/l/	/L/
r-	r-	r-	r(r)-	r-	r(r)-	/R/	/r/	/R/

Unlenited consonants could optionally be written double after a vowel and such spellings are sporadically attested after proclitics, particularly in the case of liquids and nasals, e.g. *du:bbert* 'imposed' (*Thes.* II, 241.15-16), *fu:rráith* 'took the place of' (ibid. 14) vs. more usual *do:bert*, *fo:ráith* and so on. However, the ambiguous single spelling was strongly preferred. Being confined to loanwords, *p-* was not obviously adaptable to native patterns and so was generally resistant to lenition in Old Irish (e.g. *fo peccad* 'under sin' at Wb.3c17). Otherwise actual lenition of voiceless stops was more or less regularly indicated orthographically by postposed *h* (e.g. *in phectho* 'of the sin' at Wb. 14d27, *a thech* 'his house', *in charat* 'the friend's' above) whereas nasalization was not (e.g. *a tech* /a dex/ = Mod. Ir. *a dteach* 'their house'). The converse applied to voiced stops, the nasalization of which was indicated in spelling (e.g., gen. pl. *inna mban*, Mod. Ir. *na mban* 'of the women') whereas lenition was not (e.g. nom. sg. f. *ind ben* /ind

ven/ = Mod. Ir. *an bhean* 'the woman'). For the most part, *f*- and *s*- were orthographically invariable regardless of lenition or nasalization (e.g. gen. pl. *inna fer* /iNa ver/ = Mod. Ir. *na bhfear* 'of the men'). However, disappearance of lenited *f*- was very occasionally indicated in Old Irish sources (e.g. *m'oísitiu* 'my confession' at Ml. 46bl2 but more usual *do foísitin* 'for confession' et Tur. 58a) even before the roughly ninth-century introduction of the so-called *punctum delens* as an optional means of indicating loss of *f* and near loss of *s* through lenition (e.g. *do súidib* 'to the aforementioned', *to: fóirndet* 'which they signify' at Sg. 72b5 vs. more usual *do:foirnde* 'which signifies' at 72a1). The symbols /θ/ and /ð/ represent the sounds occurring at the beginning of English 'thin' and 'them' respectively, but in the Modern Irish period *th* became /h/ and *dh* fell together with *gh* to produce the only two major divergences from the pronunciations given in the above table.

The spelling rules for non-initial consonants, whether medial or final, deviate quite sharply in some respects from those above and from Modern Irish practice, as can be seen from the table overleaf, but at least this part of the system is not bedevilled by the morphophonemic variable of mutation. The voiceless stops (I) and the fricatives (III, IV) are spelt just like their word-initial counterparts, as indeed are *s*, the liquids and nasals (V, VI). The crucial divergence from the values of the previous table relates to the Old Irish voiced stops (II), which present a number of ambiguities and pitfalls for the reader familiar only with Modern Irish orthography.

Representation of the internal voiceless fricatives (III) is quite unambiguous and corresponds well enough to Modern Irish spelling, while it is hardly necessary to add to earlier remarks about *s(s)*, *n(n)*, *l(l)* and *r(r)*. Just as initial *m* may represent the unlenited nasal stop /m/ or the lenited nasal fricative /̃v/ (e.g. *a mac* 'her/his son' corresponding to Mod. Ir. *a mac*, *a mhac* respectively) but unambiguously expressed the former if written double (e.g. *a mmac* 'her son' not 'his son'), so too with medial or final *m*, e.g. *lám* = Mod. Ir. *lámh* 'hand' but *lom* or *lomm* = Mod. Ir. *lom* 'bare', *domun* = Mod. Ir. *domhan* 'world' but *imáin* or *immáin* = Mod. Ir. *iomáin* 'driving, hurling'.

After a vowel non-initial *b*, *d* and *g* invariably represent fricatives, e.g. *lebor* = Mod. Ir. *leabhar* 'book', *bolud* = *boladh* 'smell', *leges* = *leigheas* 'healing'. In this position the corresponding voiced stops are represented by *p*, *t* and *c*, e.g. *popul* = *pobal* 'people', *saiget* = *saighead* 'arrow', *éicen* = *éigean* 'compulsion'. After a consonant, however, *b*, *d*, *g* may stand for stops or fricatives and the voiced stops

may be written *p, t, c* as well as *b, d, g*. As a result *b, d, g* are quite ambiguous in any given instance, although presence or absence of *p, t, c* variants may indicate which is involved overall: e.g., *ingen* = *inghean* (now *inlon*) 'daughter' or *ingen* = *ingin, ionga* 'nail', *arbar* = *arbhar* 'grain' but *indarbae* or *indarpae* = *ionnarbadh* 'expulsion'.

	Mod. Ir.	OIr.	OIr. pron.
I	-p(-)	-p(-)	/p/
	-t(-)	-t(-)	/t/
	-c(-)	-c(-)	/k/
II	-b(-)	-Vp(-), -Cp/b(-)	/b/
	-d(-)	-Vt(-), -Ct/d(-)	/d/
	-g(-)	-Vc(-), -Cc/g(-)	/g/
III	-f(-)	-ph/f(-)	/f/
	-th(-)	-th(-)	/θ/
	-ch(-)	-ch(-)	/x/
IV	-bh(-)	-b(-)	/v/
	-dh(-)	-d(-)	/ð/
	-gh(-)	-g(-)	/g/
V	-s(-)	-s(s)(-)	/s/
	-m(-)	-m(m)(-)	/m/
	-nn(-)	-n(n)(-)	/N/
	-ll(-)	-l(l)(-)	/L/
	-rr(-)	-r(r)(-)	/R/
VI	-mh(-)	-m(-)	/ṽ/
	-n(-)	-n(-)	/n/
	-l(-)	-l(-)	/l/
	-r(-)	-r(-)	/r/

The above table shows that *p, t, c* can represent voiced or voiceless stops after a vowel, but in practice the voiced stops are a good deal commoner than the voiceless in this environment: e.g., *lepaíd* = Mod. Ir. *leaba(idh)* 'bed', *tecosc* = *teagasc* 'instruction', *bec(c)* = *beag* 'small' but *mac(c)* = *mac* 'son', *boc(c)* = *bog* 'soft' or *boc* 'he-goat, buck', *cét* = *céad* 'hundred', *étach* = *éadach* 'clothing' but *eitech* = *eiteach* 'refusal', *e(i)t(t)e* = *eite* 'wing'. A similar ambiguity exists after consonants, where both voiced and voiceless values are common but the former may be revealed in this context by *b, d, g* variants: e.g., *comarb(b)ae* or *comarpae* = *comharba* 'heir', *ard(d)* or *art* = *ard* 'high' but *art* = *art* 'stone', *derg* or *derc* = *dearg* 'red' but *derc* = *dearc* 'eye(-socket)', *serg* or *serc* = *searg* 'wasting sickness' but *serc* = *searc* 'love', *delg* or *delc* = *dealg* 'thorn, pin' but *olc(c)* = *olc* 'bad'.

In stressed syllables Old Irish had a symmetrical system of five short (*a, e, i, o, u*) and five corresponding long (*á, é, í, ó, ú* but the mark of length is frequently omitted in manuscripts) vowel phonemes that have survived with little or no change into Modern Irish. In addition there were a number of diphthongs, of which *ía* and *úa* still occur virtually unchanged. However, the remainder have undergone certain modifications, the most important of which are given below: the bracketed developments are typical of Middle Irish but also occur, some more frequently than others, in Old Irish.

OIr.		Mod. Ir.
iu	(> i)	io
íu/éu/éo	(> iú/eú/eó)	eó
áu, óu	(> ó)	ó
aí/áe, oí/óe	(> aí/áe/oí/óe)	ao(i)

Typical examples of the diphthongs are OIr. *ciáll* = Mod. Ir. *ciáll* 'sense', OIr. *slúag* = *slua(gh)*, OIr. *úas cinnn* (> *os cinn*) = *os cionn* 'above (the head of)', OIr. *céol* (cat. sg. *ciúl*, gen sg. *céoil*, *ciuil*, var. *ceóil* etc.) = *ceól* 'music', OIr. *bóu*, *báu*, *bó* = *bó* 'of a cow, of cows' (gen. sg. or pl.), OIr. *taib*, *táeb*, *tóeb*, *toib* (nom. or gen. sg.) = *taobh* (nom. sg.), *taoibh* (gen. sg.) '(of a) side'.

Lenition did not affect, nasalization prefixed /n/ to, and some non-leniting

proclitics prefixed /h/ to an initial vowel, e.g. Mod. Ir. *a athair*, *a n-athair*, *a h-athair* 'his/their/her father'. In Old Irish orthography prefixed *n-* regularly represented nasalization but *h-* was an 'empty' letter as it had become in Vulgar Latin and the Romance Languages (cf. English 'honour' loaned from French). It was optionally prefixed to initial vowels, especially in short words (e.g. *ed* or *hed* 'it' = mod. *ea(dh)*), but had no consistent value. Thus Old Irish could write *a athair* or *hathair* indifferently to denote 'his' or 'her father' and made no attempt to use *h-* consistently to denote the prefixed /h/ mutation that it must have had, whereas *a nathair* would represent 'their father' quite unambiguously.

Like Modern Irish, Old Irish had a pervasive phonological opposition between broad or non-palatal and slender or palatal consonants in non-initial position (where it was at first merely allophonic), and tended to use various glide vowels to represent these crucial distinctions orthographically. The essential techniques were the same in both, but as usual Old Irish spelling differentiates the two sets less comprehensively and consistently than its present-day counterpart. In both Old and Modern Irish *a*, *u* or *o* before a broad consonant need no glide. This applies to *e* and *i* too in Old Irish, whereas present-day orthography prefers *ea* and *io* (often inverted to palatal glide plus /a/ or /o/ in pronunciation). Before a slender consonant a glide *i* is written after *a*, *e*, *o* or *u* regularly in Modern and less regularly (especially after *e* in open syllables) in Old Irish. After a broad consonant *e* and *i* often prefix an *a* glide, while after a slender consonant *a*, *o* and *u* tend to become *ea*, *eo* and *iu* respectively in Old Irish orthography. Most of these rules apply to long as well as short stressed vowels and to final unstressed vowels. The following are some typical enough examples to illustrate the basic workings of the system, which applies in essence to unstressed vowels too, once their lack of independent quality is taken into account (see I.2.4.a): *bec* 'small' (Mod. Ir. *beag*), dat. sg. *biuc*, *síl* '(of a) seed' (Mod. Ir. nom. *síol*, gen. *síl*), nom. *mac(c)*, gen. *maic(c)* '(of a) son' (Mod. Ir. *mac*, *mic*), *be(i)rid* 'bears' (Mod. Ir. *beireann*), *fer*, gen. *fir* '(of a) man' (Mod. Ir. *fear*, *fir*), *-lé(i)cea* 'leaves', *-tab(a)ir* 'gives' (Class. Mod. Ir. *-tabhair*), *ainf(e)a* 'I shall stay', *tol*, gen. *tuile* '(of) will' *gu(i)de* 'prayer' (Mod. Ir. *guidhe*, *guí*), *(-)marb(a)i* 'thou killest', *(-)marb(a)e* 'thou mayest kill'.

List of abbreviations.

As mentioned in the introduction, these mostly conform to those used by the Royal Irish Academy's *Dictionary of the Irish Language (DIL)*, which includes a list of abbreviations for ready reference. Accordingly the list below only refers to deviations from this practice, usually because the editions concerned appeared too late to be used by the compilers of the dictionary. Where notations at all or some points in the main text diverge from those of the dictionary for one reason or another, equivalents on the dictionary's list are given below.

- Acallam:* *Agallamh na Senórach, Silva Gadelica I* (ed. S. H. O'Grady, Dublin, 1892), 94-233.
- Ap. Chr* *Apgitir Chrábaid* (ed. V. Hull, *Celtica* 8, 1968, 44-89).
- BBrig.* *Bethu Brigitte* (ed. D. Ó hAodha, Dublin, 1978).
- BDD* = *BDD*² (Knott's edition of *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*).
- Carlsr. Aug.* = *Acr.*
- CIH:* *Corpus Iuris Hibernici* (ed. D. A. Binchy, Dublin, 1978).
- CMT:* *Cath Maige Tuired* (ed. E. A. Gray, *Irish Texts Society* LII, 1982).
- EIL:* *Early Irish Lyrics* (ed. G. Murphy, Oxford, 1956).
- Ét. Celt.* = *Études Celt(iques)*.
- GOI.:* *A Grammar of Old Irish* (R Thurneysen, Dublin, 1946).
- KZ:* *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* (*Kuhns Zeitschrift*).
- OIPG.* *Old-Irish Paradigms and Selections from the Old-Irish Glosses*, (J. Strachan and O. Bergin, 4th ed., Dublin, 1949).
- LL-Táin* = *Táin (Tain Bó Cúailnge from the Book of Leinster)*, ed. C. O'Rahilly, Dublin, 1970).
- Táin:* *Táin Bó Cúailnge, Recension I* (ed. C. O'Rahilly, Dublin, 1976).
- Trip.* = *Trip.*² (Mulchrone's *Bethu Phátraic*, Dublin, 1939).
- VKG:* *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen* (H. Pedersen, Gottingen, 1908-11).
- YBL-Táin* = *TBC*² (Strachan and O'Keefe's ed. from the Yellow Book of Lecan).

Index Verborum

This index has been generated by means of a computer programme with the result that (unaccompanied dependent) forms preceded by a hyphen are placed before those forms (independent or dependent plus conjunct particle or the like) which are not. A colon also ranks ahead of a letter, a procedure which has the advantage of grouping all deuterotonic compounds beginning with the same preverb together (e.g. *fo:* ahead of *for:* regardless of the next letter). An effort has been made to remove some inconsistencies and ambiguities manually but this has not always seemed feasible. Homonymous forms (e.g. pres. ind. and pres. subj. *canaid*) tend not to be differentiated in the index but are, of course, usually distinguished in the main body of the work. Spelling variations inevitably pose something of a problem (e.g. different positions for *do:beir* and *du:beir*) as do forms preceded by various conjunct particles or the like (e.g. different positions for *-tabair*, *tabair*, *ní:tabair*, *forsa:tabair* and so on). However, it is hoped that this will be minimized by the decision to group all forms belonging to a particular verb together, the independent pres. ind. 3sg. heading each such section and being followed by other citations on separate lines with an indent. It is assumed that a reader looking for a particular form will usually know or at least be able to hazard a reasonable guess as to what basic verb it belongs to. Once this has been established, some 'shopping around' in the relevant section may be necessary in order to run it and, where applicable, all of its variants to ground. Forms occurring exclusively or mostly before page 163 will be Old Irish as a rule, whereas those occurring solely or predominantly thereafter will more than likely prove to be Middle Irish. Since the index is long enough as it is, virtually no cross referencing has been attempted.

a:tá	8, 9, 11, 22, 25, 28, 67, 145	-bíu	68
-ba	72	-boí/-baí	53, 72
-bá	72	(in)-daí/-taí	69
-bábair	236	(ol)-dáu/-dó	68
-bae	72	-f(e)il	8
-baid	72	-rabad	232
-báid	236	-rabus	232
-bammar	72	-robat	35
-bámmar	72	-roib	35, 184
-bátar	72	-tat	204
-batar/-btar	72	a mbámmár	178
-bé	35	a:tá oc techt	101
-beith/-beid	235	a:taat	25, 28
-béo	68	a:tát	204
-bet	35	a:táu/-tó	68
-bí	35	arnda:beth	13
-biat	35	baí	99

baí sinne	177
bátar	73
bátár	178
bátir	73
beid	22
beit	35
beith	35
beor-sa	218
bethiumm/-ib	12
beu/beo	68
bíd	204
biid	22, 25, 29, 35, 204
biit	35
bíth	204
bíthir	80
biuu	68
biuu-sa oc irbáig	22
boí	11, 22, 72
boie	73
boithium	15
boithum/-i/us	11
cenin:fil	8
con:robad	180
da:baí	190
f(e)il	8
fil(e)	8
filus	8
for:bía	170
is oc precept soscéil attó	22
ní:biat síat	177
ní:rubai	108, 145
ním:bia	104
ním:thá	8
nís:fil	8
nís:rabae	100
no:biad	106
no:bíth	86
no:bítis	178
nob:tá	8
nom:thá	15
ro:bábair	235
ro:bás	232
ro:bátar	97
ro:boí	97
ro:both	232
ro:pia	12
rom:bia	12
ru:bé	108, 145

táthum	8
táthum/-ut/-ai/-us etc.	11
ad:ágathar	9
-ágar	218
-ágara	218
-ágathar	9, 218
(ad)-áigsetar	77
-áigther	75, 218
ad:áichfedar	226
ad:áichfer	226
connámus:n-ágat	186
ní:áichfetar	226
ad:aig	
at:aig	173
atan:ebla	48
at(t)ot:aig	13, 15
ad:anaig	
ad:anacht	96
ad:ranact	96
no:adnaictis . . . íat	177
ro:adnacht . . . hé	177
ad:cí	24, 25, 61, 74, 114, 146, 147, 172, 191, 198, 232
-accae	146, 238
-accam	9
-accastar	33, 82
-accatar	36
-accathar	74
-acci	24, 146
-accigi	46
-a(i)cend	207
-aiccess	61
-aicci	61, 191
-aiccichet	46
-aicébá	223
-aices	232
-aicfea	223
-aicigi	223
-cí	33, 56
-faccraig	237
ad:cess	61, 173, 198, 232
ad:ceter	36
ad:cether	74
ad:chess	173
ad:ciam	9
ad:ciat	36
ad:condairc	146, 147
ad:condai(r)c	232

- gnin 45, 46, 114, 122
- ad:gén 53
- ad:géuin 4, 5, 53
- adid:géuin 15
- aichnid 194
- aithnid 194
- aithnigid 194
- ní:géoin 144
- ad:greinn 29
- ad:guid
 - aicdiu 6
 - ad:guidiu 6
- ad:midethar
 - aimmded 77
 - na:aimmdetar 77
- ad:muinethar
 - ad:muintir 76
 - ad:munemmar 77
- ad:opair 89
 - ad:opart 96
 - ad:opartha 85
 - ad:rópart 96
 - ad:rópert 96
 - atam:roipred 85
- ad:reith
 - aithrethend 207
- ad:rimi 23, 223
 - árraim 140
 - airmébaind 223
 - ad:rímetar 84
 - ad:rímiter 83, 84
 - ad:rímter 84
 - ad:rímther 84
 - ad:ruirim 140
 - ármthir 183
 - at:ruirmed 172, 173
 - ra:hármit 230
- ad:roilli 4, 9, 28, 43, 58, 146, 161
 - áirilli 4, 9, 146, 161
 - áril(l)set 58, 151
 - ad:roilled 60
 - ad:roillet 28
 - ad:roilliu 68
 - ad:roilliset 58, 202
 - adid:roillifet 43
 - as:roillea 35
 - as:roillet 36
 - as:roilliset 151
- as:roilli 9, 36
- as:rollfe 43
- at:roilli 172
- at:roillisset 172
- coro:áiriller 189
- ad:suidi 6, 23, 27, 200
 - ast(a)i 6, 27
 - fastai 200
 - fastand 207
 - suidi 28
 - addom:suiter 80, 82
 - adro:soid 213
 - fostaíd 200
 - ní:astaidir 82
 - ní:astai 200
 - ro:fastai 200
 - rod:asta 236
- ad:teich
 - ad:róethach 144
- ad:tluchedar
 - atlaigethar 216
 - ro:attlaig 216
- ad:treba 226
 - a:trefea 42, 226
- adraid
 - adrann 207
- agid 33, 48
 - acht 55
 - acht(a) 233
 - acht(atar) 233
 - agat 30
 - aig 30, 55
 - agait 30
 - aigid 30
 - bae aegdair 183
 - eblas 48
- aidlignigidir
 - aidlignigitir 75
- aingid 10, 24, 29, 34, 43, 209, 211
 - ain 71, 210, 211
 - ainced 210
 - aincenn 210
 - aincfe 210
 - ainge 210
 - (ro)-ainic 210
 - anacht 55, 60, 210, 211
 - anaig 10, 24, 29, 34, 43, 55

aincithi... (hé)	177	nád:aniub	227
aingithi	10	ní:rran	159
ainsium	11	ní:rransam	129, 154, 188
an(a)is	11, 34	níro:an	129, 159
nís:n-ain	43	ro:an	128
nodo:ansed	169	ar:aicci	147
nom:ain	71	ní:airciu	147
not:ain	211	ar:áli	
ro:hainced	211	ara:rálad	104
rot:aincfe	211	herálmit	174
ainmnigid(ir)		ar:beir	
do:ainmnigthe	230	ara:roibrea	108
no:ainmnigthe	230	ar:berta	
ro:ainmnig	216	arro:bert	156
ro:ainmnigthea	230	ar:clich	
ro:anmnigthe	229	ar:clessid	35
airchóitigid(ir)		ar:coat	30
-erchótigend	207, 216	-airchós	60
airid		-erchótigend	207
-ebrat	47	ar:cuibdigedar	
alid		ardot:chuibdig	170
-ail	30, 37, 55	ar:díbdai	89
-ala	37	ar:folmathar	145
-alt	55, 60	ar:fócair	89
-alt(a)	233	ar:fogni	
-alt(atar)	233	dia:forgéni	199
-ebla	47	ar:foím	89, 120, 152, 210
ailebthair	223	-arroímsat	210
ailébthair	228	-arroít	153
ebaltair	47	-arroítatar	210
ébéltair	223	-eroím	210
is hé not:ail	181	ar:róet	120
ní tú nod:n-ail	181	ar:roít	152, 153
nod:n-ail	15	ara:foimi	70
nos:n-altatar	12, 128	eroím	71
ros:n-altatar	128	ar:gaib	
anaid	23	-arrgabad	139
-ana	37	ar:gair	
-anéb	223	ar:gair	66
-aniub	68, 223	ar:garad	59
ainf(e)a	42, 68, 248	ar:gérat	66
an	71	ar:rograd	60
an(a)is	128	ar:gnin	144
anfamit	227	nad:ergéoin	144
anmaít-ni	179	ar:ic	144
co:rran	188	co:farnaic	200
corru:anat	129, 154	conda:fairnechtar	200
na:anam	70	ar:lega	

-ar(r)leg	140	-epur	68, 203
-ar(r)legthar	140	-érbairt	240
ar:roilgither	140	-érbar	218
ar:léici		-érbara(e)	218
-airlicther	81	-érbarat	202
ara:léicther	81	-érbart	9, 93, 138, 201
ar:moinethar		-érbrat	202
ara:muinfetar	43	a:teir	191
ar:naisc		a:teri	224
ar:nenas	44	a:tubairt	191, 235
arob:roínasc	143	ad:rubartmar	9
ar:neat	43, 56	as:beired	21
ar:neut	30, 68	as:beirthe	21
arrot:neithius	156	as:ber(a)e	69
arru:neastar	79	as:ber(r)	82
arru:neithset	79	as:bera	21, 86
arut:neithius	11	as:béra	21
ar:neget	31, 89	as:berad	21, 86, 87, 102
ar:reith		as:bérad	21
ar:riuth	30, 68	as:beram	29, 65
ara:rethi	70	as:berar	21, 82
ar:sissedar	4	as:berat	201
-airissedar	4	as:bered	86, 87
-airsir	78	as:berid	66
-sissedar	74, 78	as:bert	92, 93, 98, 201, 214
ar:roísestar	79	as:bertar	81
ar:slig		as:berthae	21
ar:sil	45	as:bérthae	21
ar:tá		as:berthar	21
ara:robatis	106	as:bérthar	21
ar:troítha		as:bertsat	214, 240
ar:troídfe	42, 69	as:bir	69
ara:chrin	31	as:biur	68, 203
-aurchriat	38	as:mbeir	16
ara:chíurad	46	as:robrat	202
ara:chíuri	46	as:ruba(i)rt	126
ara:chrinat	31	as:rubairt	240
armaid		as:rubart	93, 98, 138, 147, 190, 201, 235, 240
ra:armad	197	as:rubartmar	9
as:beir	5, 14, 18, 21, 86, 133, 172, 218	as:ruburt	68, 240
-apror	218	asid:rubart	99
-eperr	82	asind:biur	16
-epert	92, 201	asndon:berat	16
-epertar	81	at:beir	13, 92, 172, 191
-epir	5, 69, 201	at:beire	204
-epred	87	at:beirmis	87
-eprem	29, 65	at:beri	204, 224
-epret	201, 202		

at:berim	203	ru:n-éillestar	217
at:bert	173	as:luí	5, 29, 38, 114
at:derim	204	-éla	38
at:robair	93, 108	-élafe	41
at:rubairt	173, 191, 196, 235, 240	-élai	5, 29, 192
at:rubratar	241	-élat	29
co:n-epert	99	-élub	41
frisa:n-érbrath	99	-érlos	161
ní:érbarid	110	as:loa	38
ní:érbart	147	as:luat	29
ra:bert	199	as:luiset	57
remit:rubarmar	241	as:rulai	161
as:comlai	89, 114	asru:lúus	157, 161
as:rochumlae	135	at:luí	173
as:congair		dos:luí	175
as:congarar	82	élaid	192
as:éirig		man[i]:érla	155
as:réracht	149	níro:héla	109, 155, 157
mani:esersitis	104	as:oilci	192
as:gnin	144, 145	-oslaic	194
as:indet	30, 89, 211, 223	-oslaici	6, 192
-aisnébat	223	as:oilc	194
-aisnéidfe	223	as:oslaic	194
-aisnéidfind	211	oslaicid	192, 210
-aisndiset	223	as:oirg	
-aisndisinn	211	-resarta	150
aisnéidid	223	as:comart	137
as:indiset	44	as:comarta	150
as:ingaib	89	as:ren	206
-esngab	152	-éire	206
-resngabsat	149, 155	-éirenn	206
-resngab	151	as:comren	137
-resngabsat	148	as:renai	69
as:ingab	152, 159	as:riri	46
as:ringab	151, 152, 159	as:ririú	46, 68
as:ringabsat	147-149, 155	as:rirther	81
nad:resngabsat	147	as:rochoíli	56, 89, 150
ní:esngab	159	-érchoil	57
ní:resngab	159	diand:rerchoíl	150
as:lana	217	as:roilli	see ad:roilli
a rru:n-éillestar	188	as:roinni	224
as:rulen	217	-érna	225
asru:lennad	157, 187	-érnai	224
asru:lensat	188	-érno	225
nad:réildisem	157	nocon:érnába	224
níro:(h)éilled	187	as:toing	
níro:éilned	187	ad:cuitecht	137
ro:héilled	187, 188	as(a):gnin	38

as(a):gnintar	82, 84	-bá	57
asa:gnioither	38	-baat	25, 29, 38
ásaid	152, 193, 200	-batis	38
ní:ása	152, 200	-beb(a)e	57, 236
at:baill	31, 37, 102, 120, 172, 218	bebaid	47
-érbala	120	bebais	57
-érbalam	138	bait(h)sid	
-érbalur	218	baitzisi	95
arnach:érbalam-ni	110	ro:baist... hí	176
at:ballat	31	beirid	11, 16, 18, 24, 29, 37, 63, 66, 115, 218
at:bél	104	-bartat	73
at:bela	31, 37, 102	-bartmar	73
at:bélat	48	-beir	24, 29, 37, 55, 67, 204, 205
at:rubalt	138	-beire	205
dia:n-érbalam	105	-bér	220
ní:epil	102	-bera	37, 127, 184, 205
at:bath	54, 61, 214	-béra	48, 67
at:batha	54	-berar	82
at:bathsat	214, 239	-berat	29, 37, 127
asind:bathatar	54	-beri	204
at:raig	43, 55, 91, 173	-bert	55, 66, 73
-éir	34	-bert(sat)	214
-é(i)rig	34, 91	-bertad	214
-ereochad	225	-bertar	73, 80
-érus	68	-bert(at)ar	127
-res	68	-bertatar	73
ad:reig	172, 173	-bir	69, 204
at:ré	34, 43, 71	-birt	73
at:recht	55	-biur	68
at:raacht in Galéoin	182	-biurt	73
at:rachtár	178	-breth	61, 214
at:rachtatar	178	(-)ruca	184
at:raracht	199	-rucat	127
ata:resat	43	-rucca	127
at:ressed	34	(-)ruccai	115
atam:res	68	-rucur	218
ba:érig	199	-rucus	97
éirgid	225	-rucsat	127
it:rácht	178	arna:ructais	111
ním:érus	68	be(i)r	71
ro:érig	199	be(i)rid	248
bádid		beirthe	63
ro:báided ann... cóic cét rí	182	beirthi	11
bágid	27	ber(a)id	37
-bágim	68	ber(a)ir	81
-bágu	28, 68	ber(a)it	29, 174
báigmi	27	béraid	66
baid	57		

berait	63
berar	81
béras	66
berat	70
bérat	227
beres	66
berid	37
berim	182
bert	235
bértait	174
bertair	80
bertar	73, 80
bertatar	74
bert(a)e	66, 65
berth(a)ir	81
bérthar	81
biri	69, 204
birt	66, 73, 92, 127, 235
biru	68, 182
brethae	60, 85
cono:rucursa	170
duna:rructhae	101
mberes	16
mná berdair	183
na:berat	70, 71
nách:beir	15
nachas:bérat	171
nachib:berar	80
ní:beir	63
ní:beirid	63
ní:berae-siu	110
ní:berat	71
nicon:ructais	108
no:biur	182
nodom:bera	15
nos:beir... íat	177
nos:berinn	86
not:beir	15
ro:fuc	200
ro:u(i)c	92, 127
ro:uc	200
r(o):uccai	115
ros:(n-)uc	200
ros:fuc	200
benaid	11, 24, 31, 66, 209, 218
-ba	72
-bai	72
-batar	72

-ben	24, 31, 67, 209-211, 213
(ro)-ben	210, 211
(ro)-benad	210
-ben(a)im	67
-ben(ann)	209
-bena	209
-benat	31
-benfa	209
(-)bensat	215
-benur	210, 218
(-)béotar	53, 72, 215, 239
(-)bí	53, 72, 209, 211, 213
-bia	38, 209
-biat	211
-bíth	60, 61, 209
-bíu	210
ben(a)im	31, 67
benai	69
benar	81
benas	210
benfaider	211
benir	101
bentai	11
bentatar	215
betir	38
bias	46, 210
bíthir	211
bíthus	46
biu	46
bíu	68
da:benad	197
do:benta	230
ní:rubai	107
no:benad	197
no:bentae	230
nom:bífad	213
ra:benatar	239
ro:bítha	230
rom:bíth	118
bendachaid	
bennachais... hé	176
ro:mbennachais	97
ru:bendach	97
béoigidir	17, 23, 75
berbaid	
ro:mberbais	94
berraid	
berrsi	95

bertaigidir	11
bertaigthi	12
bertaigthius	11, 12
na:mbertaigedar	12
no:mbertaigedar	169
nos:mbertaigedar	12
bíathaid	
rodas:bíathai	236
ros:bíath	217
ros:bíathastar	217
bongid	
-biba	45
(-)bobaig	215
-bocht	60
-boing	215
bibsat	215
bruthnaigithir	
bruthnaigim	75
cáechaid	
cáechsite	65
canaid	24, 30, 37, 47, 70
-cain	24, 30, 37, 211
-cana	24, 37
-canad	87
-canat	30, 37
(-)cechain	211, 232
-cechain	72
-cechan	68
-cechna	24
-cechnatar	72
-cét	24, 60, 61, 211, 232
-céta	60
ca(i)n	71
canait	30, 52, 183
canas	30
cechain	24
cechnatar	52
cechnaid	24
cechnae	69
cétae	24
chanas	181
diarro:chét	233
do:chachain	190
ní fris ru:chét	180
níro:chan	211
no:canad	87
no:canta[e]	103
ra:canait	230

ro:canait	233
ro:cansat(ar)	233
ro:canatar	233
ro:canad	211, 232
ro:chan	173, 211, 232
caraid	14, 46, 66, 75
-car(a)e	69
-car(a)i	69
-car(a)im	67
-cara	67, 217
-carand	207
-cechrat	47
car(a)e	69
car(a)id	70
car(a)im	67
carait	183
caras	14, 15
carmae	14
carthai	15
cartae	14
charas	181
na:car(a)id	70, 71
nicon:chechrat	174
no:chantais	86
no:char-	14
nod:cara	15
ro:charastar	217
ro:charsat... hé	176
roda:car	170
rodas:car	171
rot:char	217
ceilid	
-ceil	37, 55
-ceiltis	87
-cela	37
-célam	48
-celt	55
-cleth	60, 61
cél-	48
nad:ceil	16
nad:cheil	14
ní:ceil	14, 173
ní:cheil	174
ní:chel	222
ní:chélat	174
ní:chéltar	174
nuda:ceiltis	88
celebraid	

celebirsimme	78
cenglaid	
ro:chenglatar	239
cennaigid	193
césaid	
céstait	174
ro:chésatar	239
ciid	52
-cetis	39
-cí	56, 69, 204
-cia	39
-ciad	39
cí	204
cich	52
ciche	46
cichiu	46
cii	69, 204
cingid	52
-cíasat	44
-cichset	44
cechaing	52
céis	44
chingges	181
cíastae	35
cichis	44
no:chingthé	179
cinnid	
chinnes	181
claidid	
cladar	183
-class	60, 61
claidbid	
claidbebtair	223
clóenaid	
clóenfat	227
clóentar	228
cloid	
-cloí	57
-cloífether	42
cloífitir	228
nob:cloífether	80
cobraid(ir)	
cobérthair	228
coínid	
coro:choíne mé	177, 186
comalnaithir	41, 83
-comallad	87
-comallatar	75

-comalnabadar	41
(-)comaln(a)ither	83
-comalnastar	77
-comalnathar	74, 75, 83
-comalnisid	75
-comalnither	83
comallaibther	83
comallaid	75
comalnas	75
comalnit	75
na:chomalnid	12
nos:comalnamar	12
nos:comalnithe	77
con:airleici	135
-comairleic	57
con:airleicter	81
con:airleicther	81
con:rairleic	150
conid:rairleicis	155
indaron:comarlecis	155
con:beir	211
-coimpred	194
-compert	215
-compir	211, 215
con:aipert	211, 240
con:aprad	189
con:breth	194
con:compred	194
ro:chompir	189, 211, 240
ro:coimpred	189
con:ben	211
con:benfat	211
con:boing	52, 101, 135, 136
chon:abboing	102
chon:bósad	100
con:abbaing	136
con:bobaig	52
cota(b):bósad	87
nad:chombaig	52
con:certa	4, 135, 136
-coicerta	4
-coicert(a)tar	195
con:aicert	136
con:cert	136
con:cert(a)tar	195
con:coicertar	195
con:clich	
con:cichuil	45

con:delga	135
con:rodelg	135
con:dieig	5, 91, 135, 136, 221
-comtacht	136
-contagad	87
-cuindecht	136
-cuindig	5, 72
-cuinchetar	81
-cuintea	72
chungfea	221
con:aitech	136
con:daige	204
con:daigi	70, 204
con:degar	81
con:diacht	136
cuin(d)chid	225
cuin(d)gid	225
cuindegat	225
na:cuindig	71
ní:chuingem	174
con:éirig	91
-coiméirget	194
con:coméirget	194
con:éirget	194
cot:éraig	173
con:éitet	91
con:éit	34, 49
con:erbai	135
cot:nerba	13
conid:reirb	150
con:fodaim	90
con:foírea	90, 135, 148
con:foroirisset	148
con:gaib	
-congaib	194
-congbaitis	87
con:congbathar	194
con:gab	99
con:gaibetar	81, 84
con:gaibter	84
con:gair	
con:gérda(i)r	228
con:geil	
mani:conglá	102
con:gní	135, 136
con:acnat	136
con:gné	71
con:gnet	136

cungne	71
con:ic	29, 144
-coímnacuir	79, 144
-comarnic	7
-cum	34
-cumai	34
-cumaing	5
-cumcaibed	42
-cumgubat	42
con:anacuir	79
con:ánacuir	144
con:ecat	29
con:í	34
con:iis	34
con:ístais	202
con:ránic	7
con:ráncatar	7
cot:aneccar	79
cot:ánic	79
nara:chumaing	189
ní:chóemsaitis	202
ní:chóemstais	174, 202
con:imthet	34, 91
-coíimthet	49
con:imthe	34
con:imchlai	91, 224
-caíimchlai	224
-cóemchlót	224
c(l)áemchláid	224
claemchlóit	224
con:(co)imchláim	224
con:clóechlabam	225
noco:chloemchlob	225
con:meil	136, 192
-coimlet	192
-com(m)ail	192
coimlid	192
comlaid	192
con:amalt	136
con:mél... hé	176
con:melt	136
con:midethar	136, 200
coimsid	200
con:amad(a)ir	136
con:míd(a)ir	136
cota:coimsed	200
con:nessa	135
coru:nes	135

- con:ocaib
 con:ocabar 82
 cota:ucbat 13
 con:oi 24, 29, 74, 193, 200
 -comathar 74
 -cumai 24, 193, 200
 choméas 181
 co(i)métaid 193, 200
 con:cométad 196, 200
 con:oot 29
 con:ófathar 74
 con:oíther 74
 con:roíter 74
 con:oirg 135
 con:oscaigi 135, 139, 140
 -cumarscaiged 138
 -cumscaigi 140
 -cumarscaiged 153
 con:oscai 140
 con:roscaiged 138
 con:roscaiged 153
 condid:chumscaiged 13
 con:osna 6, 89, 135
 -cumsana 6
 -cumsanfa 42
 con:ric 91, 144
 -comairsem 34
 -comarnactar 54
 -comarnic 54
 -comraic 54
 con:comairnectar 194
 con:ránaic 54
 con:ráncatar 54, 194
 con:risam 34
 cond:recat 173
 cond:ristá 179
 cont:ric 173
 cot:regat 173
 ní:comraiced 107
 con:rig 29, 136
 con:árraig 136
 con:regat 29
 con:reraig 136
 con:rias 35
 con:rigi 70
 ra:chuibrig sé 177
 con:sáidi 135
 con:scara 136
 -comscarad 136, 141
 -coscrad 136, 141
 con:ascar 136
 con:ascrad 141
 con:scar 136
 con:scarad 141
 con:scéra 48, 221
 con:scérthar 228
 con:secha
 cotob:sechfider 83
 con:sní 57, 211
 -coisséna 48
 -coissenai 58
 -cosnai 57
 con:aissenai 211
 con:senai 58
 ní:chosna... hé 176
 ro:chosain 211
 con:tibi
 con:tifea 42
 con:toí 90, 148
 coru:thoí 156, 160
 con:toroe 148, 156
 con:toroí 160
 con:toí 160
 con:túaire 90, 135, 137
 comtúaire 137
 con:tochmairt 137
 con:tuili 136, 137, 192
 -comtalsat 92, 93, 135, 136
 -cotlai 137, 192
 -cotlaiset 92, 93, 135, 136
 -cotlat 37, 192
 con:atail 135
 con:at(t)ail 92, 136, 189
 con:tola 36
 con:tolat 37
 con:tolus 56
 con:tuil 92, 135, 136, 213
 con:tuilet 37
 con:tuilius 212
 con:tulind 212
 cotlaid 192
 ní:comtail 189
 níro:chotail 189
 ra:chotail 173, 189
 con:utaing 52, 89, 193
 -cumtaing 193

con:otacht	60	ro:chruthaig	216
con:otaig	52	ro:cruthaigestar	216
con:rotaig	135, 143	cúrsachaid	
con:rótgatar	143	ro:cúrsacha	106
cumtaigid	193	rond:cúrsagus	16
coscid		daimid	79
maniro:chosca	108	(-)dámair	233
cosmiligithir		-dámar	79
cosmiligmmar	76	-damdatar	79
crádid		-damnatar	79
ro:cráidsemmar	239	-dét	60, 233
creitid	23	-didam	47
-creit	57	-didem	47
-cre(i)tea	37, 130	-didém	223
-cre(i)ti	37, 56, 57	dámair	79
-rochraitea	130	damdatar	79
arnaro:chretea	129	ní:déma	222
chretsit	99	ro:dét	233
co:rochraitea	129	daingnigidir	226
creitfes	42	-daingnichfe	226
cretid	128	nundun:daingnichfe	105
nachas:cretid	171	dálid	
nadid:chreti	15	-dális	234
ní:rochraitea	130	dális	234
níro:chretea	130	dálsi	234
ro:chreit	173	damnaid	11
ro:cretea	107, 128, 130	damanti	11
ro:cretem	106	dánaigithir	
crenaid		connacha:dánaigfea	216
-cíuir	53	de:intamlathar	
-cíur	46	ní:deintamlafa	216
-cren	37	dechraigithir	
-crenat	37	dechrighmir	76
-cri(a)e	69	ro:dechraig	216
-cria	37, 38	dedaid	
-criat	37	ru:deda	102
cri(a)e	69	deiligid(ir)	
crieid	37	-deleochar	225
crochaid		deléchaid	225
ro:chrochsar	173, 180	delbaid	
crothid		ro:delba	236
ce ro:craiteá	179	denaid	52
cruthaigidir	23	did	52
-cruthaigsemmar	76	derbaid	225
cruthaigedar	74	derbait	183
cruthaigetar	81	derbtha bí	183
cruthaigter	80, 81	ro:dérbobmai	225
		dérgid	

- ra: déirged 197
 dílsid
 nachar: ndílsi 170
 dílsigidir
 do: dílsig 190
 dingid 31, 52
 -dedaig 52
 -dengat 31
 dedaig 31
 dirrudigidir
 -dirrudigeddar 81
 dligid
 -dlecht 55
 -dlegar 81
 -dlig 55, 217
 dlegair 81
 dlegtir 81
 dligim 68
 ro: dlecht 217
 ro: dligestar 217
 dlongid
 -dedlaig 52
 -dloing 52
 do: acair 4, 143, 211
 (-)tacair 4
 -targart 151
 do: acart 152
 do: árgart 152
 do: racart 152
 do: racartmar 149, 151
 do: racurt 211
 ro: thacrus 211
 taiccéra 48
 do: adbat 30, 69, 142
 (-)tárbas 138
 (-)tárfas 195
 da: n-árbaid 190
 do: adbadar 206
 do: adbit 30, 69
 do: árbaid 142
 do: árbas 138, 150
 do: árbuid 139
 do: árfas 195
 do: n-adbantar 206
 do: t(h)árfas 195
 dod: n-árbaid 200
 dom: arfás 178
 du: aidbsed 87
 du: n-aidbdtis 87
 innut: tarfás 178
 ní: thadbann 206
 rata: fárfaid 200
 rota: fárfaid 190
 tadbae 206
 tadban 206
 tadbat 206
 tarfás 178
 do: aidbir
 do: aidbret 193
 taidbret 193
 taidbrit 193
 do: aidlea 89, 195
 -taidlébat 223
 -táirle 139
 (-)táraill 195
 do: aidleba 42
 do: aidlibea 42, 223
 do: áraill 195
 do: tháraill 196
 doda: aidlea 15
 dom: tháraill 195
 ní: táirle 110
 no: taidled eat 176
 ro: tháraill 196
 do: airbir
 du: arbartha 60
 do: airchain 89, 195
 (-)taírchain 195
 do: airchet 60
 do: arrchet 139, 149, 150
 do: n-airchet 140
 do: thair(che)chain 196
 do: toirc(h)echnatat 195, 196
 du: airchechain 52
 ro: thaircha(i)n 196
 ta(i)rrchet 139
 do: áirci
 (-)táirced 195
 con: airgeba 223
 con: áirgeba 199
 do: áirced 195
 do: áircibea 199
 do: áircibed 42, 223
 do: tháirced 195
 taircebat 223
 táircebat 42

do:airic	200	(-)taithchiúir	158
(-)tarnactar	54	do:árchiúir	158
(-)tarn(a)ic	54	do:aithchiúir	158
do:arnactar	54, 72	do:radchiúir	150
do:arn(a)ic	54	do:aithbéogedar	
do:farnaic	200	dos:raithbéoigfed	109
tair	72	do:aithchuirethar	
tair(i)	72	do:n-aithfoícherr	105
tairic	72	do:aitni	195
tairced	72	(-)taitni	195, 196
do:airindi	138	-tatnéba	223
do:airissedar		do:thaitni	195, 196
-tairissedar	90	taitnébtaít	223
-tarrastar	78, 79	taitnid	196
tarrasair	78, 79	do:bádi	139
do:airmesca		-derbadad	139
arna:tarmasca	111	do:robda	160
ní:tharmescad	174	do:robdad	160
do:airmet	138	do:rodba	160
do:aircestar	138	do:rodbad	160
do:airngir	1-3, 89	do:beir	3, 5, 7, 8, 63, 69, 90, 92, 115, 133, 195
do:n-airgnir	16	-tab(a)ir	69
do:rairngerad	59	-tabarr	82
do:rairngred	59	-tab(a)ir	5, 248
do:rar(n)gertais	240	(-)tabair	115
do:rairngert	149	-tabair	7, 8, 90, 195
dos:airngir	3	-tabrad	60
ndu:rairngred	100	-tarat	133, 140
ro:tharngir	173	-tart	140
tairngir	3, 14	-tart/-tard	140
do:airret		-tartsat	140
con:arraid	199	-tarta	133, 140
do:arraid	199, 200	-tartat	133
do:farraid	200	-tarti	115, 133
dos:(n-)arraid	190, 200	-tartisset	133, 140
ras:farraid	190, 200	-tibérad	48
do:aisféna	142	-tibred	48, 223
bar:asfén	199	-tubart	5
bar:asfénad	199	-tuca	133
do:airfénus	139, 142, 143	-tucad	133
do:aisfén	199	(-)tu(i)c	69, 133, 195
do:aisfénad	199	(-)tuccai	115
do:aisilbi	143	asnacha:tucad	13
-táirilb	143	cen co:tucthá	179
-tarilbae	139	co:tarda	111, 146
du:airilbset	139, 143	conas:tuc	171
do:aithchren	89	conda:tarat	170
(-)tárchiúir	158		

conda:tardat	111	dud:uccai	57, 175
conos:tuc	171	dud:uic	175
combad sissi do:berad	181	fo:fuctha	199
do:beirid	63	fora:tarat	100
do:beir-som	17	na:tabrai	204
do:bér	68, 227	nanda:tibérad	16
do:ber(r)	82	nad:tardatis	103
do:béra	86	ní:thibér	227
do:bérad	87	ní:tibérais	104
do:beram	18	ra:bert	199
do:berar	82	ra:bertad	233
do:berar... íat	182	ra:berthea	229
do:beri	204	ra:bertsatar	240
do:bert	5, 92, 214, 233, 244	rot:tuc-su	197
do:bertamár	178	t(h)ucas	193
do:bertatar	97	tab(a)ir	3, 71
do:bertis	64	taibrid	71
do:bertsat	214, 240	thuctha	100
do:birt	69	tu(i)c	175
do:biurt	68	tuc	115, 196, 217
do:breth	60, 233	tuc(c)a	193
do:bretha	229, 233	tucad	95, 97
do:brethsat	233	tucad... hí	177
do:(f)uctha	199	tucad... (íat)	230
do:fuc	200	tucait	230
do:rat	92, 133, 140, 196	tucastar	217
do:rat... íat	176	tucsat	133
do:rata	133, 140	do:ben	90, 149
do:ratat	133	-díben	90, 149
do:rati	115	do:combai	137
do:ratsat	133, 140	do:bidci	
do:thuc	195	do:bidced	104
do:u(i)c	92, 175, 195	do:boing	8
do:uc	200	-tochm(b)astar	137
do:uc(c)a	193	-tobuing	8
do:uccai	115	do:cum(b)baig	137
dom:thabair	195	ro:thobgiset	189
dos:(n-)uc	200	do:ceil	222
dos:beir	3	-díchéla	222
dos:fuc	200	-díchil	222
dos:ratais... íat	177	díchélaid	222
dot:uc	200	díchlid	222
du:bbert	95, 244	do:céla	222
du:bert	96, 115	do:cing	
du:bir	69	do:cengat	199
du:u(i)c	133	do:cich	45
du:uc	196	fo:cengat	199
du:ucsat	133	do:claid	4, 7

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|
| -tochlaid | 4, 7 | do:recmallsat | 153 |
| da:chlaid | 12 | tarchomlad | 154 |
| dos:claid | 11 | tu:erc(h)omlasat | 154 |
| ní:thochlaid | 12 | tu:erc(h)omlassat | 139 |
| do:comlai | | do:eim | 48, 55 |
| do:comlaiset | 57 | airn[d]:deroímasom | 110 |
| do:cuirethar | 52, 134 | conid:nderoimed | 13, 111 |
| -tochar | 82 | do:éma | 48 |
| -tochrathar | 52 | do:emfea | 43 |
| -tochuirther | 82 | do:ét | 55, 61 |
| d[o]:coirsetar | 212 | don:eimni | 69 |
| do:corad | 85 | du:éma | 43 |
| do:corastar | 56, 85, 134 | em- | 54 |
| do:corathar | 36 | do:eipen | 225 |
| do:cuiur | 75 | -terbad | 225 |
| do:cuirther | 82 | -terbod | 225 |
| do:ral(a)e | 134 | -terbai | 225 |
| dor:rala(i)d | 170 | do:érbai | 188 |
| doro:chu(i)restar | 134 | do:reibi | 188 |
| to:rala | 109 | ro:theipi | 188 |
| do:diat | 30 | terbabaid | 225 |
| do:diut | 30 | do:érig | 153 |
| do:dona | 224 | -dereracht | 153 |
| -didna | 224 | -dererachtatar | 153 |
| doron:donad | 156 | do:réracht | 153 |
| rob:dídnoba | 224 | do:rérachtid | 153 |
| do:dúthraccair | 9, 78, 145 | do:essim | |
| -dúthraccair | 9, 145 | do:eset | 60 |
| do:fúthraccair | 9, 145 | do:resset | 149 |
| do:éci | 89, 114, 153 | do:essuirg | 89 |
| -déccu | 68 | do:es(c)mart | 137 |
| -décci | 71 | du:escmart | 137 |
| -dercachae | 153 | do:esta | 145, 206 |
| -dercaither | 153 | -tesaib | 206 |
| dé(i)cce | 71 | (-)tesban | 206 |
| do:écuchus | 46 | (-)tesbanat | 206 |
| do:écastar | 33 | -tesband | 206 |
| do:récachtar | 153 | -tesbi | 206 |
| do:récatar | 153 | (-)testa | 206 |
| du:écigi | 46 | desta | 175 |
| ro:déccai | 188 | do:esbann | 206 |
| do:ecmaing | 144 | dod:esta | 175 |
| bar:écmaing | 199 | tesarb(ae) | 145, 206 |
| for:ecmaing | 199 | testa | 175 |
| teccomnocuir | 79 | do:etarrat | 30, 89, 139 |
| do:ecmalla | 89, 153 | -tetar(r)raid | 151 |
| -tarcomlus | 153 | do:etar(r)rid | 139, 151 |
| -terchomla | 139 | do:etarrid | 139 |

do:retarracht	151	do:comart	137
dos:(n)etarrad	190	du:comarr	105, 137
ras:etarrad	190	du:fuarr	105
do:feid	54	do:fúas(a)ilci	142
do:fáid	54	(-):tarslaic	139, 142
do:fé	35	do:forsailced	142
do:feissed	35	do:forslaice(a)	139
do:fessind	43	don:forslaice	142
dud:fessed	87	don:fúaslaic	142
do:fich	5, 8, 53, 114, 120, 193	dun:forsailc	142
-deraig	120	du:föbi	46 do:fuiben89
-dich	5, 8, 53, 193	-torbatha	138
-digail	222	du:föbi	46
deich	71	do:fuibnim(m)	31, 67
dígélaid	222, 223	do(b):forbad	138
díglaid	193, 222	do:fuissim	48, 152, 192, 200, 201 211, 213
do:fius	44	-torsat	213
do:ruich	120	-tuis(s)im	192, 200, 201
du:fesatar	44	-tuismet	192
du:fi	44	do:forsat	140, 213
du:fiastar	44	do:fuissémthar	48
du:fichi	70	do:rósait	240
do:fonaig		do:rósat	140, 152, 188, 211 213, 240
do:fonus	49	do:rósat(a)	233
do:(f)ócaib	192	do:rósat(tar)	233
-tócaib	192	dodos:rósat	170, 171
-tócband	207	du:forsaisset	213
-tócbat	192	du:forsattar	213
go:tócbaitís	179	ra:thuissim	188, 211, 240
ra:thócbatar	239	sem-	54
ra:tócbait	230	tuismid	192, 201
tócbaid	192	do:furgaib	
do:foirndea		du:rurgaib	212
do:foirnde	245	do:fuschi	
do:foirndither	193	ním:dersaige	110
thórnter	193	nom:diusca[e]	110
to:foirndet	245	do:gáetha	
do:formaig	8, 55, 89	do:rogáeth	148
-tórmaig	8	mani:torgaíthat	108
do:forma	49	ním:thorgáeth	148
do:formacht	55	ním:thorgaíth	155
do:formastar	49	níro:thogaítsam	155
do:(f)úarat	30, 152	níru:thogaítsam	148
-derúarid	139, 153	do:gaib	
do:rúarid	152, 153	-dergaba	138
du:rúarid	139	do:rogbad	138
do:fúairc	90, 137	do:gair	1-3
-túairc	90, 137		

to:rogarthar	109
-togair	2
do:gní	5, 24, 25, 28, 53, 57, 119, 218, 222, 233
-deirgéni	138, 141, 142
-de(i)rgni	142, 190
-dén(a)e	69
-dén(a)i	5, 24, 28, 48, 53, 57, 71
-déna	35, 71
-dénat	28, 35
-dénatar	81, 84
-dénim	68
-déntar	81, 84
-dergénsat	203
-derna	184, 190, 233
-dernad	233
-dernar	218
-digni	142
-digénam	222
-digéon	226
-dignem	222
-dignet	222
-digni	57, 141, 142
arco:nderntaís	179
bo:gní(i)set	199, 211
co:ndingned	180
da:gné	71
da:gníusa	17
da:rigénte	109
déne	24, 71
do:gén(a)i	57
do:géna	48, 222
do:génair	220
do:géni	97, 141, 142
do:génsat	57, 203, 211
do:gné	35, 69, 184
do:gnet	35
do:gnethe	100
do:gnether	81
do:gniat	28, 66, 199
do:gním	204
do:gníther	81
do:gníu(-sa)	17, 68, 203
do:néor	218
do:ngní	117
do:rigéni	142
do:rigénsam	203
do:rigénsat	203

do:rigénsid	203
do:rigned	234
do:rigset	203
do:rigni	97, 101, 138, 190, 141, 142, 203, 232
do:ri(n)gne	190, 233, 234, 236
do:ri(n)gni	196
do:ringned	234
do:rinnsid	203, 235
do:rónad	101, 232-234
do:rón(a)i	117, 119, 234
do:rónait	230
do:róne	234
do:rónsat	234
do:rónta[e]	101
dod:róni	234
dod:rónsat	175, 234
dos:ngniith	70-72
dos:róna	234
du:gnéu/gnéo	68
du:rónad	109
duda:gnetis	104
fo:gniat	199
go:nderna	186
is íat dod:róni	182
ná:dermam	108
nach:derni	108
ndo:rigéni	98
ní sní cetid:deirgni	181
ní sní dud:rigni	181
ní:dergénat	109
ní:dergían	225
ní:dernus	190
do:goa	28, 33, 36, 46, 56, 67, 194
-toga	28, 194
bar:róega	199
do:gegat	47
do:gó	33
do:róegu	199
do:roíga	72
do:roigu	72, 94
do:roígatar	72
ra:togait	230, 232
togaid	194
do:ic	91, 114, 115, 144, 195, 219
-án(a)ic	72
-ánac	72
-áncamar	72

- áncatar 72
 -áncid 72
 -ic 114, 122
 (-)tán(a)ic 54, 233
 (-)táncatar 54, 233
 -tí 35
 (-)tic 219
 -tic 91, 195
 -ticed 87
 -tícht 232, 233
 -ticfea 43
 -ticfed 87
 -tis 219
 -tísat 35
 -tised 87
 -tisor 219
 arnach:tíssad friss hé 177
 co:tístar 228
 do:án(a)ic 54, 196
 do:áncatar 54
 do:ecat 193
 do:icfa 43
 do:ránic 189
 do:tic 195
 do:ticed 195
 dofor:ficba 170
 dos:(n-)ánaic 200
 dos:fánaic 200
 ru:thánic 189
 tánac 237
 tánaic 196
 táncabair 235
 táncas 232, 233
 tecaít 193
 tecat 193
 thánacais 237
 tic 195
 tísir 219
 do:imchella 89, 195
 (-)timchella 195
 doss:timchella(e) 195, 197
 im:thimchellat 195
 nos:timchella 197
 do:immoirg
 do:imchomartt 137
 dob:imchomart 15
 do:imthiret 89, 197
 -timthiret 197
 da:thimthired 197
 do:rimthirid 149
 no:thimt(h)ired 197
 timthir(th)id 197
 do:inmliɡ
 du:inmail 34
 do:indnaig 29, 89, 195, 211
 (-)tindnaig 195, 211
 do:écomnacht . 92, 137, 150, 152,
 189, 211
 do:indnacht 92, 152
 do:indnagar 81
 do:indnasatar 81, 84
 do:indnastar 81, 84
 do:ri(n)dnacht 152, 189
 do:rrindnacht 150, 211
 do:thidnacht 195, 196
 ra:(h)idnaicthea 229
 ro:t(h)idnacht 189
 ro:tidnaic 189, 211
 tindnagat 29
 tindnagtar 81
 do:ingaib 89
 -ding(b)ir 220
 do:inóla
 ra:tinóilit 230
 do:intai 152, 224, 230
 -tintáith 224
 (-)tintarrad 139, 151
 do:intá 38
 do:intae 38
 do:intai 57
 do:intám 224
 do:intarraí 139, 150-152
 do:rintai 150-152
 tintá 224
 tintáiset 224
 do:lega
 -derlegae 139
 du:roilged 139
 ní:derlegae 110
 do:léici 6, 8, 191, 192, 202, 221
 -tarlaic 154, 202
 -teilci 6, 8, 191, 192, 202, 221
 do:lécub 227
 do:lécicet 66
 do:reilic 154, 202

- ro:theilc 202
 tarlaicid 202
 teilcfet 227
 teilcid 192, 202
 teilgfe 221
 do:lin 31
 do:linat 31
 do:lugi 28, 37, 57, 120
 -derlaicht(h)ea 139
 -dílga 36
 -dílgai 36
 -fia 38
 da:loig 213
 da:rolgea 109, 120, 212
 da:rolgid 109
 dílgid 109
 do:loga 37, 42
 do:logae 36
 do:loig 56, 57
 do:lugfa 42
 do:luichfea 42, 221
 do:luigim 28
 do:rolgetha 139
 du:logae 69
 du:logaid 109
 du:lugai 212
 du:lugfa 212
 du:luichfea 226
 du:rolged 212
 do:meil 218
 -toimliur 218
 -tormailt 240
 -tormaltus 240
 -tormult 138
 do:romult 138
 ní:tormult 94
 do:midethar
 toimsid 193
 do:moinethar 38
 -ménair 78
 -ménar 78
 -ménatar 78
 -ménid 78
 -ménmar 78
 -muinethar 75
 do:menathar 38
 do:muiniur 76
 do:ruménar 147
 nicon:torménar 147
 do:nig
 do:cóem(n)nagtar 137
 do:ren
 do:comrad 137
 do:rig
 do:comarraig 137, 144
 do:résed 35
 dos:merged 108
 du:choimarraig 144
 do:rochoíni 89, 146
 -derchoíni 146
 do:rochoinset 157
 níru:derchoin 157
 do:rogaib 146
 -torgaib 146
 do:roig 114, 189
 arnachas:torsed 171
 do:roimnethar 118, 146
 -dermainethar 146, 193
 dermataid 189, 193
 do:roimnibetar 43
 do:ruimnethar 193
 nacham:dermainte 13
 ro:dermatad 189
 do:rorban
 nis:dérband 206
 do:róscai 6, 89, 140, 192
 -derscaigi 6, 140, 192
 -derscaigfet 6
 derscaigid 192
 do:rósc(c)aifet 6
 do:saig 114
 do:scara
 do:rascrad 107
 do:seinn 52
 -tafainn 52
 do:sefainn 53
 do:sefnatar 53
 do:sephainn 53
 do:sés 35
 tafnís 179
 to:sessa 60
 do:slí 28, 52, 192
 -slí 45
 -tuilli 52, 192
 -tuillet 39
 co:toroillinn 155

- do:sliat 28, 39
 dos:n-uillib 202
 ní:toroilset 159
 ní:tuilliset 159
 ní:tuillset 202
 níro:thuillisem 155, 202
 níro:thuilliset 159
 tuillid 192
 do:sluindi 7, 27, 188, 192, 202, 221
 -derlind 139, 157, 188
 -derlindset 141
 -díltai 7, 188, 192, 221
 -díltiset 141, 142
 -diúlta(nn) 188
 diaro:diúlt 188
 díltaid 192
 diúltaid 188, 192
 diúltaigid 192
 do:riltiset . 139, 141, 142, 156-159
 188, 202
 do:sluind 156
 do:sluindset . . 141, 156, 158, 159
 dod:rolluind 156
 doro:sluindset 188
 doru:sluindset 156, 157, 159
 duru:sluind 156
 ní:derlindset 158
 ní:díltisset 158
 nom:diúltfa 202, 221
 ro:diúltsat 188
 ro:diúltsatar 202
 do:soí 24, 90, 148
 -toí 24, 90, 148
 con:toroí 160
 do:roafath 109
 do:roí 148
 do:soat 224
 toí 24
 do:srenga 6
 -tairngea 6
 do:tét 103, 114, 133, 195
 -táe 133
 -táesat 133
 -táet 49, 133, 195
 -terga 49
 -tuidig 133
 -tuidches 134
 -tuidchet 133
 -tuidchetar 134
 -tuidchid 134
 -tuidchiset 133
 -tulaid 134
 -tultatar 72, 134
 co:tuidchet 102
 da:lluid 169
 do:decha/-dich 133
 do:dechaid 190
 do:dechas 134
 do:dechod 97
 do:dechsat 133
 do:dechuid 134
 do:dechutar 134
 do:eth 134
 do:lluid 100
 do:lod 72
 do:lotar 72, 134
 do:luid 72, 134
 do:rega/-riga 49
 do:t(h)áet 195, 199
 do:té 133
 do:tháet 173
 do:tiasat 133
 is airi ní:táet 180
 mád:tulad 178
 mani:tuidig 103
 ní:dichthim 119
 ní:táet 16
 ra:dechaid 190
 ro:tháet 199
 do:tluchethar
 du:thluchedar 173
 du:thluchim 173
 do:tuit 9, 54, 194, 196, 200, 201, 211,
 218
 -taíth 49
 -toíthus 49
 -torchair 54, 202, 219
 -torchartar 99, 202, 219
 -torchratar 202
 -torchror 202, 218
 -tuit 9, 194, 196, 200, 201
 at:rochair 198
 co:torchrorsa 202
 co(n):torchartar 95, 99
 da:fuit leissium hé 177
 do:cer 54, 201, 211

do: fáeth	105	itardam: dībitis	88
do: fuit	9, 200, 201	etar: gnin	144
do: rochair	54, 198, 201, 202	etir: génat	48
	211, 218	etar: scara	
do: rochratar	178, 202, 218	-retarscar	151, 152
do: rochrobair	235	eter: roscra	103, 151, 155
do: rotsad	211	eter: scértar	221
do: thuit	102	in: retarscar	100, 155, 159
do: tóeth	211	inru: etarscar	100, 155, 159
dos: fuit	175	narú: etarscara	110
fora: tuit	102	níru: etarscara	110
ra: thuitted	211	fégaid	
ro: thuit	201, 202, 211	fégai- siu	183
tuitfid	211	no: fégad eat	176
tuitid	196, 201	feidid	43
tuittis	201, 211, 239	fedir	81
do: uccai	115, 116	feidligidir	
do: fucébad	223	ro: feidligfitis	106
do: ucfad	223	feithid	
ní: tucus	100	no: fethedsom	22
dubaid		fergaigithir	
ro: dubtis	104	fergaigthe	75
éraid		fergaigthe- si	17
ní: érfaidir... sibsi	177	fichid	114
erbaid	27	fechtae	60
-eirpset	57	fich	53
-erbad	59	fillid	
-erbai	28	fillfidir	228
-erbtas	28	firiánaigidir	
eirbthi	27	firiánichthi	75
erpais	56	firiánigedar	75
indam: erbainn	13	fo: ácaib	153
nachib: erpid	13	-farcabtis	153
ro: erbad	98	fo: rácbus	153
ro: erthe	108	fo: ácaib	4, 89, 195, 199
ernaíd		-fác(ann)	224
-era	37	-fácaib	195, 196, 224
-ern	37, 54	-fácann	224
-rath	60	-fárgsat	224
ebarthi	47	-fuicéba	224
ebarthir	81	arna: farcabtis	148
ír	53	fa: n-ácaib	12
étaigithir		fácaib	4, 195, 199
-étaigther	76	fácbaíd	196, 224
etar: déccai	90	fácbaít	193
etar: díben	90	fácbaít	193
etir: díbet	38	facthair	224
etir: díbnitis	88	faicfimmít	179, 227

- fo:ácbat 193
fo:fácaib 195, 196, 200
fo:ragab 154
fo:ragabsat 154
fot:racbus 148
for:facsam 224
fu:ácbat 143, 154
ra:fác 224
- fo:ben
-fochm(b)aide 137
fo:combethe 137
ní:fuband 206
- fo:ceird 8, 14, 16, 29, 34, 54, 74, 134
. 173, 201, 211, 213
-corad 59, 87, 134, 213
-corastar 59, 134, 213
-corathar 134, 213
-cuir 201, 216
-cuir(enn) 213
-cuired 87
-cuiretar 81
-cuirethar 8, 59, 74, 127, 134,
. 201, 211, 213
-cuirter 81
-curend 207, 216
-foicher 49
-rala 134
-ralat 134
-ral(a)e 134, 201
-rolsat 134
-tarlád 134
-tochrad 134
ba:cheird 199
condas:rala 171
cor(o):chuiet 230
con:curedsom 195
conda:ralsat é 176
commos:ralat 186
cuirid 201, 213
curit 183, 201
do:ralad 134
fa:cheirdset 211, 239
fo:caird/t 54, 92, 134, 232
fo:cartatar 134, 211, 239
fo:ceirr 34
fo:cerdat 29
fo:cerded 195
fo:cerr 44, 66, 134
- fo:chairt 173
fo:cheird 14, 173, 180
fo:cherdetar 239
fo:cherdsetar 240
fo:cicher(r) 44, 49, 66
fo:cress 61, 134, 232
ní:rolad 97
no:cured 195
ra:chuir 201, 216
ra:cuirit 230
ro:chuir 201, 213
ro:curthea 213
ro:lá(a) 134, 201, 213
ro:lá(i)set 134
ro:laad 134
ro:lae 92
- fo:ciállathar
-foichlend 207, 216
fu:chéillfea 173
nacha:rochlat 108
- fo:coislea 89
-forchosul 138
fo:rrochsul 138
- fo:daim 31, 90, 114
-fodaim 90
-fodmat 31
fa:didmed 47
fo:daimet 31
fo:didmat 47
- fo:dáli 27
-dail 57
-dáli 57
-fodail 5
-fodl(a)i 46
-fodlat 46
-fordailtea 139
fo:dáil 5
fo:dáilter 27
fo:dálet 28
fo:rodil 139
ro:fodlait 230
- fo:fera 4, 90, 148, 199
-foírea 4, 90, 148
fo:era 199
fo:firfea 42
fo:ruar 148, 175
fod:era 175
fod:ruar 15

fu:erad	152, 175
fo:(f)ópair	
fa:n-ópair	22
fo:n-ópair	169
fo:(f)úacair	
fo:n-ocuir	143
fo:rócrad	143
fo:rrúacrad	143
fod:úacair	143
fos:ocart	143
fos:rocurt	143
fúacair	143
fo:fúasna	9, 196
-fúasna	9
fúasnaid	196
fo:gaib	54, 61, 146, 202
-fagaim	224
-fagbaim	224
-fagbaitis	87
-faigbed	223
-fogbat	6, 31, 37
(fo)-fríth	61, 146
-fríth	232, 233
(fo)-fúair	9, 61, 146, 237
(-)fúair	233
(fo)-fúar	237
(fo)-fúaratar	202
(-)fúaratar	233
-fúaross	233
-fúarus	237
-fuigéba	223
bo:gebed	199
do:gébaind	199
fo:fúair	54, 196, 200, 237
fo:fúar	200
fo:fúarais	237
fo:fúarus	200
fo:gabat	37
fo:gaibed	199
fo:gaibet	6, 31, 37
fo:gaibset	202, 212
fo:géba messi	176
fo:gébainn	199
fo:rúair	189
fo:úair	200
fúair	196
ní:fúarabair	235
nocon:fúaross	232

fo:geir	
gér-	48
fo:gleinn	
fo:gliunn	68
fo:lamathar	145
fo:ling	
fo:roiblang	143
fo:loing	5, 31, 114
-fäelais	69
-fochomolsam	137
-fóelsat	49
-fóelus	68
-ful	34
-fulaing	5
-fulsat	34
-lolaig	31
fo:lil	45
fo:lilais	69
fo:lilsat	44, 49
fo:lilus	68
fo:ló	35
fo:lós	34, 35
fo:lósat	34, 44
fu:lilsain	104
nad:fochomlaing	108
nád:fochomolsam	108
fo:reith	
fo:ráith	244
fo:ré	34
fu:rráith	95, 244
fum:ré	43
fo:rochluinethar	
-forchluinter	82
fo:rrumai	28
fo:saig	
fodan:segat	15
i(n)ndob:fochad	13
fo:tabair	90
fo:timmdiret	
fo:timmdiriut	30
fo:tlen	206
-fothla	206
-fothlae	206
-fothlann	206
fograigithir	
-fograigethar	83
fograigedar	74
ní:rograigther	83

- foid
 -(f)a 72
 -féotar 53, 72
 -fifea 42
 -fiu 53, 72
 -foi 56
 fibait 42
 foi 71
- foídid
 -foídi 56
 foides 66
 foidfet 227
 nod:faídmis 175
- foillsigithir
 failsigfit-sea 174
 ro:foilsig 216
- for:aithminedar 89
- for:beir 5, 102, 192
 -foirpret 192
 -forbair 5, 192
 fo:rorbart 140
 for:bera 102
 for:rubartatar 140
 forbraid 192
- for:brissi
 -forrbris 140
 fo:rorbris 140
 for:robris 140
- for:cain
 fo:rochain 144
 for:cechan 47
 for:cechna 47
 for:chanim 68
 for:chun 68
 for:roíchan 143
 forcanid 71
 fordon:cain 13
 fortan:roíchechnatar 144
- for:cenna 6, 23, 27
 -foircnea 6, 27
 -foircniter 83
 forrum:chennad 156
- for:cí 147
- for:comai 29
 for:como 68
 for:cumat 29
 fordom:chomaiter 80
 fort:chomi 13
- forta:comai 13
- for:congair 1, 2, 89
 -forngair 2
 fornda:congair 16
- for:cuirethar
 for:corad 59
 for:cumaing 144
 for:comnacuir 144
 for:cumai 89
- for:ding
 ar:didsiter 199
 for:dengar 81
 for:diassatar 35
- for:diúrat
 for:diuair 34
- for:fen
 forru:chui 157
 fort:[c]hui 157
- for:gella
 forro:gelsam 156
- for:tét 133, 194
 for:regae 49
 for:téig 30
 for:tiag 68
 fortachtaigid(ir) 194
 fortaigid 194
 fortachtaigid(ir) 194
- fris:acci 52, 210
 -frescachtar 210
 -frescai 210
 -frescisset 210
 níru:frescachtar 155
 níru:frescachtar 156
 fris:accachae 52
 fris:aicim 68
 frit:racatar 155
 frit:racatar 156
- fris:áilethar
 -frithalim 75
 fritháilter misi 177
- fris:cuirethar 134
 -(f)rithrolat 134
 frit:curethar 15
- fris:gair 194
 -frecair 194
 ba:recart 199
 frecraid 194
 fris:rogart 188, 199

ra:(f)recair	173, 188
ro:(f)recart	199
fris:indlea	89
fris:oírg	90
-frithchomart	137
fris:chomarr	137
fris:comart	137
fris:orcai	70
fris:orcar	81
fris:orr	34
fris:orrat	34
frissid:n-oírcis	15
fritam:oirci	70
fritamm:orcat	13
fris:tabair	90
fris:táet	133
fris:tairissedar	90
fris:tét	90
fuinid	
-funend	207
gaibid	24, 31, 37, 59, 66, 100, 212
-gab	56, 66, 92, 212, 234
-gaba	37
-gabad	59
-gabat	37
-gabsam	66
-gabsat	57, 130, 212, 234
-gabt(a)is	87
-gabus	68, 234
-gaib	24, 31, 37, 48, 67, 70, 212
-ga(i)bet	37
-gaibi	69, 70
-gaibter	81
(-)gaibther	83
-gaibther	82, 84
-gaibtis	87
-ragbaisét	130
-ragbaitis	104
-rogab	92
ara:rogba	102
arin:rogab	13
co:ragbaisét	154
coro:gabait	230
con:gab	195
fua:rogbad	129
fuand:rogab	13
gab	234
gab-	56

gaba-su	183
gab(a)id	37, 212
gab(a)is	11, 56, 59, 66, 92, 234
gabsait	158, 234
gabsat	234
gabsu	68, 234
gabsus	11
gabthae	59
gabus	234
gaib	71
gaibde	65
gaibed	70
gaibes	16, 18, 66
gaibid	70
gaibit	31
gaibthe	183
gaibthi	174
gaibthir	82, 83
géba(i)t-sa	174
gébaid	48
gébait	11
gébmait	228
gébtit	11
nad:rogaib	102
ní:gabsat	158, 159
ní:ragab	100
ní:ragbaisét	158, 159
ní:rogab	129
ním:rogab	129
níro:gab	129
níro:gabsam	129, 154
níro:gabsat	158, 187
nírom:gab	129
nís:ragbad	175, 229
no:gabt(a)is	128
no:gaibtis	104
nos:geib	171
ro:ga(i)b	237
ro:gab	92, 95, 195, 217
ro:gabais	237
ro:gaba	236
ro:gabastar	217
ro:gabsat	130, 158, 187, 234
ro:gabt(a)is	128
ro:gabtis	106
ro:gabus	234, 237
ros:gab.. (iad)	177
ro/a:(n)gab	169

- gainithir 75, 221
 -gainethar 38
 -gén(a)ir 78
 -génar 78
 -génatar 78
 -genathar 38
 -genfed 222
 génair 78
 géntair 221
 gignithir 47
 no:gigned 47
 ro:génair 219
 ro:génartar 219
 ro:génatar 219
 gairid 1-3, 24, 223
 -gair 2, 24, 37
 -gara 37
 gaires 212
 gairmebtair 223
 gairmid 223
 gataid 127
 -gat 127
 -gét 48
 -tall 127
 do:gait 190
 du:ell 127
 gatais 127
 geilid
 gél- 48
 glanaid 23
 glenaid 31
 -glen 31, 37
 -gléu 37, 68
 -glia 37
 giuil 53
 giulae 73
 giulait 46
 glete 38
 glúasid
 nachi:nglúasid 170
 gniid 25, 29, 57, 66
 -gé(i)nset 57
 -gén(a)i 57
 -génsat 211
 -gné 67
 -gní 45, 46, 57, 67, 211
 -gnith 60, 61
 gén- 48
 gén(a)is 57
 gnete 35
 gni(i)d 70
 gniit 29
 gnísit 211
 gníte 29, 35
 gníthi 29
 ro:gnísset 211
 gonaid 30, 52, 217
 -gáet 60
 -gegnatar 211
 (-)geguin 217
 -goin 30, 37, 211, 217
 -gona 37
 -gonand 208
 -gonfaitis 222
 fir gontair 183
 geguin 52
 gén- 48
 góetae 60
 goítae 60
 gonsat 234
 níra:gonastar 217
 nít:génsa 221
 not:gignether 47
 ros:gonsat 211, 239
 gressaid
 ra:gressit 230
 gúaigithir
 níru:guigter 108
 guidid 24, 31
 -gád 72
 -gádammar 72
 -gádatar 72, 239
 (-)gáid 211, 232
 -gáid 54, 72
 -gé 24, 33, 34
 -ges(s) 24, 61, 68, 211, 232
 -gessat 211
 -gig 24
 -gigius 68
 -guid 24, 31, 54, 211
 -guidem 66
 -guidet 31, 211
 -guidimm 68
 -guidiu 68
 cor:guidet 212
 gádatar 73

gáid	24	as:ibsem	128
geis	24, 33, 69	ebait	29
ges	44	ib-	56
gesme	65	ibis	56
gessa	211	no:ibed	103
gessae	24, 60	ícaid	
gessir	82	dinad:ricthe	101
giges	44, 66	ro:ic	115
gigeste	65	ro:n-icc	101
gigis	24	ru:ic-si	97
gigsea	68	ru:n-icca	105
guidimm	68	imm:aig	
guidiu	68	imma:n-aigtis	178
guidme	65	imm:beir	192, 222
guidmi	65	-im(b)éra	210, 222
guidmit	174	-im(b)ir	192, 193, 210, 222
gutter	183	-im(b)ret	192
guittius	12	-im(b)ret	193
gute	65	-imrend	208
nges	66	-imrenn	210
ngesar	82	am:rubart	240
nos:nguid	12	iméraid	210, 222
nos:nguid-som	17	imm:béra	222
not:guidiu	12	immá:rubartsa	178
ro:gigsed	105, 106	imrid	192, 193, 210, 222
ro:guded	211	ra:bertad	214
ro:guid	211, 232	imm:cloí	91
ro:guid(estar)	233	imm:comairc	
ro:guided	232, 233	amal imme:chomairsed	180
ro:guidetar	239	im:cáemros	49
íarmi:foig		im:comarcas	228
-ríarfacht	149	imchomarcthir	228
at:fócht	199	imm:comarcas	79
bar:íarfacht	199	imme:chomarcas	81
con:fóchta	199	imme:chomarcatar	81
íarmi:foacht	199	na:imchomarcad	70
im:facht	199	imm:díben	90, 149
ra:íarfaigit	230	-imdibed	60
ro:íarfacht	199	im:díbed	148
ro:íarfaig	199	im:ruidbed	147, 148
íarraid		imme:ruidbed	149, 160
iarrai	183	níro:imdibed	147
iarraim-se	183	imm:dích	
ibid		imma:ndích	12
-ib	29, 56	immus:(n-)dích	11
-íb	47	ní:n-imdích	12
-ibed	59	nís:(n-)imdích	11
-ibset	57	imm:fen	

- imc(h)ua 138
- imm:folngi 89, 217
- immolngaither 82
- imforlainge 150
- rim(m)folngar 51, 149-151
- arna:rimfolngar 217
- im:folngar 82
- im:folnged 158
- im:forling 94, 151
- im:forlinged 158
- im:folngub 193
- imfolnguba 193
- immid:folngi 15
- immum:forling 15
- ní:im(f)olnged 158
- ní:im(f)orlinged 158
- imm:fresnai 89
- imm:imgaib 9
- imgaib 9
- imm:lúadi 27
- im:lúadad 28
- imm:lúai(t)ter 27
- imm:rá 24, 29, 57
- imra 24
- imm:rerae 57
- ra:imrastár 179
- imm:rádi 27
- im:ráidi 180
- imm:rái(t)ter 27
- imm:réid
- im:reidmís 179
- im:ríada 205
- immá:redindsea 178
- imm:soi 7, 69, 192, 224
- impa(i) 225
- impád 224
- impai 7, 192
- impát 224
- im:soífitis 224
- im(m):soat 25, 66, 224
- imm:soither 81
- impabas 225
- impaid 192
- impáis 224
- ro:impóset 224
- imm:tabair 90
- imm:tét 14, 91, 134, 192, 201
- imthet 192
- imthig 192
- imthiget 192
- im:luid 134, 201
- im:lotar 134
- im(m):rulaid 134, 196, 201
- im:ruldatar 134
- im:théigmís 179
- imm:téged 196
- imm:tiagat 192
- imme:lotar 99
- imme:tét 16
- imme:thét 14
- imthigid 192, 194, 201
- imthigis 201, 239
- no:imthiged 196
- ro:imthig 196, 201
- imm:tic 91
- in:fét 5, 9, 193
- indet 5, 193
- innisenn 207
- ad:cuaid 98, 99, 138, 199
- ad:cutís 178
- ad:féit-som 30
- ad:fét 9, 30, 193
- ad:fiadar 81
- ad:fiadatar 81
- at:chuaid 199
- in:cuaid 138
- in:fid 53
- in(d)isid 193
- indiad 9
- innisid 210
- nicon:écadar 138
- ra:chúaid 199
- in:gleinn
- ecail 34
- in:gléis 35
- in:gnin
- connach:n-ingéuin 14
- in:greinn
- ingre 9, 34
- ad:greinn 9
- ad:roígegrannatar 144
- asid:grennat 9
- atam:grennat 13
- in:grennat 9, 29
- in:griastais 34
- in:rograinn 144

in:roígrainn	143
inda:greinnsiu	70
in:lá	
nacha:n-innill	170
in:neat	
adro:neestar	79, 156, 161
in:otat	
-rindúalad	151
in:olaid	151
in:otsam	49
in:rúalad	151
ní:inotsat	49
in:samlathar	7
-intamlae	75
-intamlathar	7
conro:intsamlithe	157
in:samailter	75
inru:samlasatar	157
intamaltae	77
intamlid	75
ní:intamlammar	80
nín:intamaltar	80
in:tét	91
-étet	91
in:túaisi	192
-éisti	192
-éitsi	192
-étsend	207
éistid	192
éitsid	192
ind:árban	89, 150, 211
-in(d)arban(n)	193, 212
-indarban	206
-indarbe	38, 206
-rindarpai	151
-rindarbatar	211
ata:rárbi	150
coras:innarbsat	169, 211
coro:n-innarba..... íat	171
ind:rárpai	151
inda:árben	71
in(d)arbaid	192, 194
indarbaid	193
innarbaid	212
nachim:rindarpai	150
is	18, 231
-b(o)	231
-ba(i)d	236

-baba(i)r	236
-bad	235
-baid	235
(-)bat	231
-psat	231
adi(b)	231
am	18, 231
ammi(n)	231
as	19
as né	180
at	231
atin/atar/ísar	231
ba	117, 178, 231
bá	178
basa	178
bása	178
batar	73, 178
batár	178
bátar	178
bátár	178
batar/-btar	231
batir	73
betit	179
betít	179
bid	117
combad	180
connaptís	178
is crot cen chéis íatside	177
is snisni ata	181
isam	231
isat	231
isum	18
isat	231
it	231
it hésidi ata	181
it sib ata	181
itib/at(a)ba(i)r	231, 236
it/at	231
ní	18
níbar	235
nír(b)	188
nírbo	188
robo lesmac di é	177
ropo	102
ithid	11
-dáesur	128
(-)duaid	128
-essara	218

- esser 218
- essur 218
- estar 35, 36, 45, 218
- ísa 45
- ithend 208
- diand:essabair 235
- dud:n-óestar 128
- itius 11
- no:ithed 87, 103
- no:ittis 87
- labraithir
 - labrathar 74
 - labraimme 75
 - labramar 75
 - labraither 76
 - labrar 76
 - níra:labrastair 217
- laigid 29, 43
 - (-)dellig 128
 - deilset 128
 - laig 29
 - legat 29
 - legait 29, 43
- lasaid
 - ro:las 100
- legaid
 - coro:legai 236
- léicid 23, 27, 28, 36, 192
 - léici 67
 - lé(i)cea 36, 205, 248
 - lé(i)cet 27, 36
 - lé(i)ci 27, 36, 192, 205
 - lécetar 81
 - léic 205, 233
 - léice 205-207
 - léiced 59, 87, 233
 - léicenn 206, 207
 - léiciub 220, 226
 - léicfea 67
 - léicfider 83
 - léicset 57, 234
 - léicther 83
 - léic 71
 - léicfid 221
 - léicid 27, 70, 71
 - léicis 56, 233
 - léicset 234
 - léicsi 95, 128
- léicsit 234
- léicfidir 83
- léicfimmi 42, 65
- léicthe 59, 71
- nach:reilced 129
- ní:léic 205
- ní:relic 129
- ním:léic 205
- nír:léic... hí 176
- nír:léicsetar 188, 239
- nír(o):léic 205
- no:léicthe 86
- ra:l(l)éic 95, 128
- ra:léicsed 233
- ras:lécub 197
- ro:léic 129
- ro:léicit/-the 233
- ro:léicset(ar)/-etar) 233
- ro:léiced 129
- ros:léice 236
- lenaid 52
 - (-)leldar 211
 - leldar 72
 - len 211, 213
 - lena 207
 - lenaim 207
 - lenand 207
 - lenann 207
 - lil 72, 214
 - lili 213
 - conid de rod:lil 181
 - lenad... sind 176
 - lil 52
 - lile 46, 69
 - liles 46, 66
 - lilit 46
 - lilis 214
 - linfes 213
 - nachas:linub 227
 - ro:len 213
 - ro:lensat 211, 213, 239
 - ro:lil 213
 - ro:lin 213
- lénaid
 - nachar:lén 170
- lesaigithir
 - lesaigend 207, 216
- liid

liim	68	ro:mmebdatár	178
línaid		ro:mmemaid	128, 130
ro:lína	109	ru:maith	102, 103
lingid	29, 52	ru:memaid	103
-lengat	31	maídid	
-ling	31	nach siat... maídes	182
-ráeblang(a)tar	131	malartaid	
-ribuilsed	131	ní:malartae-siu	110
leblaing	31, 52	mandraid	223
lengtae	29	mannérat	223
ro:leblangatar	130	marid	30
lomraid	222	-mair	30
-lommair	222	mairid	30
loméraid	222	marbaid	27, 36, 120
lomméras	223	-mairbfe	42
luid	33	-marb	56, 205
-lú	33	-marb(sat)	214
as:lú	128	-marba	27, 36, 205-207
lú(i)s	128	-marbad	59, 214
maidid	11, 128	-marbae	205
(-)memaid	211	(-)marb(a)e	248
-má	35, 44, 210	-marbai	205
-maid	51, 210, 211	(-)marb(a)i	248
-maidi	210	-marbaim	207
-meba	215	-marbann	206, 207
-mema	44, 45	-marbat	27, 63
-memaid	51, 72	-marbsat	57, 234
-memdatar	72	marbai	63
-róemaid	131	marbais	56
-roímdatar	131	marb(a)it	27
con:mebdatar	195	marbsait	234
da:maid	190	marbsat	234
maidfid	215	marbthae	59
máis	35, 44	marbthair	81
mait(t)i	11, 174	na:marbtar	81
mani:ro(i)ma	105	nachdot:romarbus	170
mebais	215	ní:marbai	63
memad	234	no:marbtha[e]	103
memaid	128	not:mairfider	228
memais	44, 215	ra:marb... hé	176
memdatar	234	ro:marb	120
ní:mema	105	ro:marb(astar)	233
no:maidsed	215	ro:marbad	233
no:maissed	215	ro:marbait	230
no:memsad	211	marnid	
ro:maid	128, 211	-mairn	37, 55, 217
ro:memad	234	-mairnfed	222
ro:memdatar	130, 195, 234	-marnat	31

- mera 37
- méra 48
- mérad 222
- mert 55, 217
- ro:mairnestar 217
- medraid
 - not:medra 204
 - not:medrai 204
- meilid
 - meil 37, 217
 - mél 222
 - mela 37
 - méla 48
 - meliub 222
 - melt 217
 - rat:melestar 217
 - rat:meliub 197
- míanaigid(ir)
 - míannaighther 228
- midithir 75, 82
 - mesar 82
 - mesor 44, 76
 - mess 60, 85
 - mestar 35
 - mídair 78
 - mídar 78
 - mídatar 78
 - midetar 81
 - mitter 76
 - mesair 82
 - messimmir 44
 - mestar 82
 - mesur 76
 - miastar 44
 - miast(a)ir 82
 - mídair 85
 - midid 77
 - miditir 81, 84
 - midur 76
 - nachib:mided 77
 - ro:mídair 218
 - ro:mídratar 219
 - ro:mídatar 219
- mligid 29, 34
 - blig 211
 - meltar 34, 35
 - mlig 211
 - bligid 189
- do:omlacht 189
- do:omlachta 211
- do:ommalg 128
- ro:bligt(h)ea 189, 211
- ro:thomlacht 189
- molaithir
 - moladar 74
 - molathar 84
 - molfaither 83
 - molfar 76
 - molfathar 83
 - molor 76
 - moltar 83, 84
 - ní:molad 196
 - níro:molastar 196
 - no:molad 196
 - nondob:molor 16
 - ro:(m)molastar 99, 196
- móraid
 - mórais 69
- nascid
 - ná 44
 - naisc 30, 51, 211
 - nas(s) 60, 211, 229
 - nena 44, 45
 - nenaisc 52
 - naidmid 194
 - ra:naidmthea 229
 - ra:nascad 211
 - rat:nasciub 197
- nertaid
 - nertfidir 81
 - ra:nertait 230
- nigid 29
 - nig 52
 - ninus 49
 - nenai 52
 - rat:nigiub 197
- noib(a)id
 - noibfea 42
- núallaighther
 - núallaigem 77
- óenaigidir
 - n-óenaigedar 75
 - óenichthi 75
- oirdnid
 - citaru:oirtnead 95
 - ruda:n-ordan 170

olse/-sé, olseat	177
ordaigidir	
nos:ordaiged	170
ro:hordaigit	230
orgid	24, 30, 34, 120
-oirg/c	24, 30, 55, 211
-orcat	30
-ort	55, 60, 61, 66
-ort(a)	233
-ort(atar)	233
do:oirgthe	230
iúraid	211
no:oircthe	86
no:oirgthe	230
oirges	213
oirgfid	211, 213
oirgid	30
oirgset	234
orgar	81
ort	235
ortae	60, 66
ra:airg	213
ra:airged	213
ra:airgset	213
ratas:airgsemar	213
ro:n-ortsat	214, 240
ro:ort	120, 128, 137, 214
ro:orta	230
uirt/oirt	66, 128, 235
pridchid	28
-pridach	68
mani:pridag	104
predchabthar	83
pridcha	68, 104
pridchabat	41
pridchaid	28
pridchas	28
pridches	28
pridchidir	83
pridchimme	65
pridchite	65
rádid	28, 36
-ráda	36
-rádat	28, 36, 46
-rád(a)i	36, 46, 56, 69
aní rádit	183
do:ráda	190
ní:rádi	236

níro:rádi	236
ra:rádi	236
ra:ráid	169, 236
rádas	28
ro:rá(i)di/e	236
ro:ráidsetar	239
raid	29
-ráthar	81
rannaid	
rannfat	227
réidid	
-réid	30
-rét	30
ríadait	30
reithid	23, 29, 43, 54
(ro)-ráith	215
-ré	213
-reith	29, 213
-rethat	30
ráith	54
ráithmit	215
ráthatar	73
resfed	213
reth(a)it	30
remi:ergnin	
remi:ergnaitis	144
remi:tét	133
renaid	
-ren	31, 52, 213
-renat	31
-renfa	214
-rethar	38
-ria	38
-riat	38
-rire	214
-riret	46
-rirfe	214
-rirfed	213
-riri	67, 213
-ririub	213
is orot rirfes	181
rir	52
rirfes	213
ríthae	60
ro:recsabair	235, 239
rigid	55
reraig	55
rimid	

ro:rimthé	179	-fetatar	78
ro:cluineathar	9, 31, 38, 46, 74, 75, 78, 114, 145-147, 198, 232	-fiastar	35, 77
(ro)-cechlatar	213	-finnatar	81
(ro)-cloathar	38	-finnathar	114
-cloatar	218	-fintar	82, 84
-cloor	218	(ro)-fitemmar	78
-clór	218	-fitetar	78
-clórat	218	(ro)-fitid	78
-clos	61	(ro)-fitir	78, 145
(ro)-clos	198	-fitis	78
-cloth	61, 232	co:fessabair	235
(ro)-cluinetar	213	do:finnair	220
-cluineathar	114	fetar	196
-cúaladais	238	finnamar	77
-cúalae	53, 74	fintae	77
at:chluiniu	198	nach:fetammar	175
at:chlunim	198	ní:fitir	145
at:chúala	198	rata:fetamar	170
at:chúalaig	237	ro:fessatar	44
cluinte	77	ro:fessur	44
co:cúalae	145	ro:fetar	196
co:cúalatar	100	ro:fetartar	219
con:cechlabat	199, 213	ro:fiastar	44, 82
do:chlunim	198	ro:finnatar	77, 84
in:cúalabarsi	235	ro:fitir	145
nachid:chúalatar	15	ro:ic	91, 115, 144
nach:cúalammar	175	(-)rí	35
ní:cúalae	145	-ric	91
ra:chúala	97	(-)ric	115
ro:cechladar	47	(-)rísat	35
ro:cechlatar	199	connach:ráncatar (hé)	177
ro:clos	232	ric	115
ro:cluinemmar	76	r(o):icub	43
ro:cúala	72	ro:icfea	43
ro:cúalae	72, 145, 238	ro:laimethar	9, 75, 114, 145
ro:cúal(a)id	72	-laimethar	114
ro:cúalammar	72	-lámair	78
ro:cúalatar	72	-lilmatar	47
ro:finnathar	9, 75, 78, 82, 114, 145	-lilmathar	228
-fessar	82	-lin(d)fadar	222
-fessara	218	arna:laimthé	179
-fes(s)atar	77	arnar:lám	189
-fes(s)er	76, 218	laimthe	77
-fessur	218	lém-	48
-festar	35, 77, 218	na:laimetar	77
-fetammar	78	na:laimtís	179
(ro)-fetar	78	noco:lémaither	221, 228
		ro:lámair	145, 218

ro:lámatar	219	-samlasatar	77
ro:lámratat	219	-samlathar	74, 84
ro:saig	7, 34, 55, 114, 116-118, 189, 193	condan:samailter	80
-roa	34	samaltae	77
-roacht	55	sáraigid(ir)	
-roachtatar	55	ní saireocham	225
-roichet	7	ní:sáriagum	225
-roig	7, 34, 193	ro:sáraig. hé	176
ra:saig	12	scallid	
ro:sá	34, 35	ra:scáilit	230
ro:sáis	34, 35	scaraid	23
ro:sásar	210	-scairiub	48, 221
ro:segat	7	-scarsat	234
ro:siacht	55	-scér	221
ron:saig	12	arna:rascra	111
roichther	193, 210	ní:scartha	86
roithid	23	ro:scarsatar	239
sádid		scarsait	234
-sádu	28	sceid	29, 67
sáebaid	225	-scé	29, 67
saebobthar	225	-sceet	29
saidid	23, 43, 79	sceirdid	54
-des(s)et	128	-scaird	54
-said	29	scoltaid	
-sess	61	ra:scoilit	230
desid	128	scribaid	
do:esid	128	rod:scribad	101
saides	29	scrútaid	
sedait	29, 43	no:scrútain	86, 100
seiss	43	ro:scrútai	236
síasair	79	ro:scrútais	109
síasatar	79	scúapid	
saigid	55, 114, 116, 119	-scuaibeobthar	225
-sá	44	scuchid	54
-sásad	87	-scáchatar	240
-sia	44, 45	-scáich	54, 214
far:saig	170	-scáig	214
ro:saig	116, 118, 119	ro:scáigset	239
ro:siacht	117	ro:scáigset(ar)	214
sáis	44	ro:scáigsetar	240
segar	81	scuirid	23
segtaid	183	scoirem	212
siacht	117	seichithir	74
saltraid	223	-sechestar	77
saltéras	223	ara:sechitis	111
samlaitheir	41	na:seichem	77
-samaltar	84	sernaid	
-samlafammar	41, 76	-sern	55, 211

-sernar	82	-soirf(e)a	23, 42
-sert	55	-soirfad	42
(-)sert	211	dodas:sáer	190
-sreth	60, 61, 211	for:sáera	170
ro:sern	211, 240	indam:soirfad	86
ro:sernad	104, 211	manin:sóeraeni	17
ro:sert	240	nob:soirfea	12
sernai	236	non:soir	12
sernsat	211	not:sóerfaider	228
sertatar	211	num:soirad	100
slaidid		rond:sóer	95
no:slaiss	169	sóerfaid	221
nod:slaid	170	sóerfudut	12
sligid		sóersai	69
-selgatar	52	soir	23
-selaig	52	soirais	23
-sil	66	soirf(a)id	23
-slecht	60, 61	soirthae	23
-slig	52	suidigithir	
silis	44, 66	-suidigestar	77
sléis	44	-suidigser	76
slucid		-suidigsiur	76
-sloic	213	rodos:suidigthi	229
sloicsitt	212	suidigethar	83
sluindid	192	suidigther	83
-sluindi	192	techtaid	
-sluindiu	68	-techta	67
run:sluinfemni	109	techtas	66
sluindes	181	techtid	66
snádid	11	thechtaite	181
snáidsiunn	11	techtas	181
sniid		teichid	43, 54
-sní	45, 46	-táchatar	240
soid	38	(-)táich	211
-soa	38	-teich	35, 211, 217
-soad	59	-tes	35
-soi	38, 67	ní:thechiub	227
-soife	42	ro:teichsetar	240
-soíthea	59	ro:tháich	217
ro:soad	97	ro:theich	211, 217
soais	56	ro:theichestar	217
soas	29	táchaitir	73
soífitir	42	táich	54, 73
soíraid	23, 191	techfet	227
-sáera	191	teichfit	221
-soir	23	tessit	221
-soira	23	téit	30, 33, 35, 43, 48, 54, 62, 66, 90,
-soirad	23		101, 103, 127, 133, 190, 202, 215, 227

-dech	227	do:coised	127
-dech/-dig	127	do:cós	127
-decha	127	do:cósat	127
-dechaid	184	do:cótar	127
-dechair	220	do:cúad	237
-dechais	219	du:chooid	94
-dechar	220	du:coístis	107
-dechatar	237	lod	73
-dechsad/-dichsed	127	lodma	215
-dechsat/-dichset	127	lodmar	73
-dechuid	127	lodsaid	215
-dechus	127, 219, 220	lodsam	234
-dechutar	127	lotair	235
-dichet	127	lotar	54, 73, 235
-dichtheth	127	ludfamar	215
-dig	227	luid	54, 73, 92, 186
-eth	62, 127	luide	73, 94
(-)lod	63	luidis	215, 239
-lodmar	72	luidset	215, 239
(-)lodmar	215	má thíastá	179
(-)lotar	127	ní:dicht(h)im	184
(-)luid	127, 184, 215	nod:ragam	175
-té	33, 34, 66, 127	ra:chuaid	190, 199
-té(i)t	30, 127	ra:chuatar	190
-téigi	204	ra:luidinse	215
-téig	69	rach	227
-téiged	127	rachat	227
-téis	69, 219	ragaid missi	177
-téised	127	rechmi	227
-tét	30, 66, 69, 90	regaid	49, 227
-tiag	68	regait-se	174
-tiagat	30, 33	regat	227
-tias	68, 219	rigas	49
-tiasair	219	ro:chuaid	190
-tiasat	33, 127	téigi	69
-tiasur	218, 219	téis	33, 66, 127
cid dían 7 cían no:théisinn	180	téisi	69
co:ndigsed	111	téte	66
do:choid	173	théite	181
do:chooid	95	tiag	70
do:chúadais	237, 238	tiagait	30, 33
do:chúabair	235, 237	tiagar	80
do:chúadus	237	tiagme	65
do:c(h)uaid	186, 190, 196, 199	tiagmi(-ni)	17, 65
do:c(h)úatar	190, 237	tiagu	68
do:coat	127	tiasait	33, 127
do:coí	103, 109, 127	tiasu	68
do:coid	92, 127, 184, 215	tiasur	218

tibid	
-tib	205
-tibi	205
tongaid	194, 200, 201
-tochtaised	128
-toing	200, 201
-tongat	31
-tung	195
do:cuit(t)ig	128
do:foing	201
do:thung	195, 200
dod:fongad	201
luigid	194
no:thongad	201
toi(n)gthe	183
tongte	183
tongu	195
tróethaid	
tróethfaidir	228

National University of Ireland, Maynooth
DEPARTMENT OF OLD IRISH PUBLICATIONS

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/krmccone>

e-mail: krmccone@compuserve.com

Prepaid orders (in Irish Pounds or a eurocheque/draft for the equivalent in a negotiable currency) for titles below should be made payable to the Department of Old Irish, Maynooth, and sent to Prof. Kim McCone, Dept. of Old Irish, NUI Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland. Postage is free except in the case of *Stair na Gaeilge* (add IR£5 for Ireland and UK, IR£10 for Europe and USA).

Non-prepaid orders from booksellers etc. should be sent to ÁIS, 31 Fenian Street, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Stair na Gaeilge in Ómós do Phádraig Ó Fiannachta, ed. Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó Háinle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach. Maigh Nuad, 1994 (reprinted 1996). xxiv + 905 pp. Price IR£28. ISBN 0 901519 90 1.

(A multi-authored volume in Irish tracing the history of Irish, Scots Gaelic and Manx from earliest times down to the present. Extensive bibliography, word and subject indices.)

Progress in Medieval Irish Studies, ed. Kim McCone and Katharine Simms. Maynooth, 1996. 275 pp. Price IR£18. ISBN 0 901519 35 9.

(A multi-authored volume covering topics such as language, literature, law, history, archaeology and Hiberno-Latin. Bibliography and author index)

Maynooth Studies in Celtic Linguistics (ISSN 1393-3393):

I *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change* by Kim McCone. Maynooth, 1996. 195pp. Price IR£18. ISBN 0 901519 40 5.

II *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles* by Peter Schrijver (forthcoming November, 1997). Price IR£18.

Maynooth Monographs, Series Minor (ISSN 1393-368X):

I *Viking Raids on Irish Church Settlements in the Ninth Century* by Colmán Etchingham. Maynooth, 1996. vi + 79pp. Price IR£10. ISBN 0 901519 94 4.

II *Ogam Stones and the Earliest Irish Christians* by Catherine Swift. Maynooth, 1997. vi + 150 pp. Price IR£15. ISBN 0 901519 98 7.

MAYNOOTH MONOGRAPHS

ISSN 0790-8806

A series in English devoted to early and medieval Irish language, literature and history published by An Sagart, Maynooth. Scripts or proposals for suitable topics should be sent to Prof. Kim McCone, Dept. of Old Irish, NUI Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland.

1. **The Early Irish Verb** by Kim McCone (1987). 297pp. hardback (out of print). ISBN 1 870684 00 1.
Revised 2nd ed. (1997). xviii + 291 pp. paperback, IR£12.
ISBN 1 870684 76 1.
2. **Sages, Saints and Storytellers. Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney**, ed. Donnchadh Ó Corráin, Liam Breatnach and Kim McCone (1989). 488 pp. hardback (out of print). ISBN 1 870684 07 9.
3. **Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature** by Kim McCone (1990). 286 pp. hardback (out of print) and paperback, IR£12.
ISBN 1 870684 10 9.
4. **A Guide to Ogam** by Damian McManus (1991). 211 pp. hardback (out of print) and paperback, IR£12. ISBN 1 870684 17 6.
5. **Patronage, Politics and Prose** by Caoimhín Breatnach (1996). 180 pp. hardback, IR£12. ISBN 1 870684 56 7.
6. **The Celebrated Antiquary** by Nollaig Ó Muraíle (1996). xxiv + 427 pp. hardback, IR£24. ISBN 1 870684 53 2.
7. **Church and Polity in Pre-Norman Ireland: The Case of Glendalough** by Ailbhe Mac Shamhráin (1996). xxv + 274 pp. hardback, IR£24.
ISBN 1 870684 68 0.

Orders from abroad or from Irish booksellers should be placed with
ÁIS, 31 Fenian Street, Dublin 2, Ireland.