

Fifty years on: absolute/conjunct, the 2pl.
copula, verbal accent and a pointless particle



Kim McCone

Celtica 37 (2025), 64–137

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-vz96z-ut5cx

DIAS

Institiúid Ard-Léinn | Dublin Institute for
Bhaile Átha Cliath | Advanced Studies



© School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

This work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. To view a copy of this
license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

FIFTY YEARS ON: ABSOLUTE/CONJUNCT, THE 2PL. COPULA, VERBAL ACCENT AND A POINTLESS PARTICLE

ABSTRACT

The focus below is upon attempts made in the last fifty years or so to account for the absolute and conjunct verbal inflections peculiar to the Insular Celtic branch of the large Indo-European language family. A critical survey of various proposals regarding the endings themselves and associated irregularities in compound verbs is accompanied by some new considerations, notably a hitherto overlooked 2pl. abs. form of the copula in the Würzburg Glosses and the negative passive preterite's potential as a means of generating enclitic pronouns with geminated initial consonant. These lead to a somewhat modified version of the author's previously published views on the topic.

1. PIE PRIMARY AND IC ABSOLUTE ENDINGS: AN ELUSIVE ENCLITIC PLUS 'PARTICLE PACKAGE', THE 'ACTUAL ENCLITIC' ALTERNATIVE, AND ACCENTUAL APPROACHES

THERE HAS BEEN over a century of argument about the origins of the contrast in a number of Old Irish (OIr.) tense/mood categories between an 'absolute' inflection typifying initial simple verbs and a 'conjunct' inflection generally used otherwise (GOI 350), and it is now fifty years since the great American Indo-Europeanist Warren Cowgill's (1975) conclusive demonstration that both sets continue Proto-Indo-European (PIE) primary endings, thanks in part to an early Insular Celtic (IC) apocope of 3rd-person $^{*}(n)ti > ^{*}(n)t$. Since almost general subsequent acceptance of this insight has not put an end to controversy¹ but has shifted its focus to specific formal issues such as the IC apocope's range and the factor(s) responsible for differentiating abs. from conj. endings, the half-century of Cowgill's decisive intervention seems a good time to take stock of later contributions and venture some further suggestions. There is a reason for the prominence of the infrequent OIr. active 2nd-person

¹Critical accounts of previous contributions to this debate are not lacking: e.g. Cowgill (1975: 40–8); McCone (1979: 1–5); Sims-Williams (1984: 139–46); ODVC 69–89; Budassi and Roma (2018, 293–301), who surprisingly assert that 'the bedrock of McCone's theory is C. Watkins' (1963) and Meid's (1963) simultaneous argument that, at an early stage, Proto-Indo-European had not yet developed the primary vs secondary opposition' (2018: 297). In fact, the bedrock of McCone's theory is neither Watkins's nor Meid's account but Cowgill's (1975) equation of IC conjunct with PIE primary endings (with $^{*}-i$ except in 1/2pl. and them. 1sg.) and rejection of PIE secondary endings (always without $^{*}-i$) as a factor in IC verbal inflection. I am grateful to an anonymous reader for a prompt report making inclusion of this long article in the current issue of *Celtica* possible and for a number of helpful suggestions on further reading and other matters.

plural absolute *-the*: despite playing a key role in particle-based derivations of IC abs. from PIE prim. endings, it was almost certainly not the original ending and this calls into question a particle's relevance to the basic active abs. inflections at the heart of its *raison d'être*.

'The presence, in every verb, of a particle **ed*, unless it is replaced by some other particle, such as **yo*, **k^{we}*, or **de*' was posited by Boling (1972: 85) in the first full application of an enclitic (E) of the shape **eC* (> 'C after V')² to the absolute endings of initial simple verbs (GOI 350) and otherwise irregular features linked with the proclitic first preverb of initial 'deuterotonic' forms of compound verbs (GOI 351): e.g., deut. *as:beir* 'says' < **eχs-ed=beret* (not **a:beir* < **eχs=beret*) vs 'prototonic' *ní:e-pir* < **nīs=eχs-beret*; *fo:ceird* 'puts' *fo-t:cheird* 'puts you (sg.)' < **wo-'d kerdet* and **wo-'d-tu kerdet* respectively (not **fo:cheird* < **wo kerdet* or **fo-d:cheird* < **wo-tu kerdet*). OIr. active pres. ind. abs. sg. 1 *biru*, 2 *biri*, 3 *be(i)rid*, pl. 1 *berm(a)i*, 3 *ber(a)it* were derived from **berū+d*, **berī+d*, **bereti+d*, **berosmesi+d*, **beronti+d* and in the 2pl., 'the most doubtful of all the absolute forms, the form **beretes+ed* would give the attested *beirthe* ... Such an explanation seems preferable to the suggestion that the relative forms of the first and second persons singular, **berū+yo* and **berī+yo* (→ *biru*, *biri*), have shifted to non-relative function' (Boling 1972: 94).

This amounts to a 'particle package' of three points out of six in the most basic OIr. paradigm where a clear edge is claimed for a particle over a plain primary ending with (except for thematic 1sg. **-ū* < **-ō*) final **-i*: PIE 1sg. athematic **-mi*, 2sg. **-si*, 3sg./pl. **-ti/*-nti*, and arguably Proto-Celtic (PC) 1pl. **-me/osi* (PIE **-me/os*), 2pl. **-tesi* (PIE **-te*). Boling posited OIr. abs. 1/2sg. *bir-u/-i* < **ber-ūd/-īd* (not **biur/*bir* like conj. *-biur*, *-bir* < **ber-ū/-ī*), and 2pl. *beirthe* < **bere-tēd* < **-te(h)ed* < **-tes-ed* (not **be(i)rid* like conj. *-be(i)rid* < **bere-tes*). The particle was, however, superfluous in abs. 3sg. *be(i)rid* < **bere-ti±d* (conj. *-beir* < **bere-t*), 3pl. *ber(a)it* < **bero-nti±d* (conj. *-berat* < **bero-nt*) or 1pl. *berm(a)i* < **bero-smesi±d* (conj. *-beram* < **bero-mo*; cf. Boling 1972: 83 and 97). Since Boling was concerned with the effect of an **ed* 'closely paralleled by the Vedic usage of the neuter pronominal form *id*' (1972: 80, followed by examples of Vedic Sanskrit *íd*) on the OIr. verbal system as a whole, he was mostly content to add **(e)d* to Watkins's reconstructions of personal inflections³ without further comment. These, however, were based upon two questionable assumptions:⁴ (i) that Celtic did not inherit regular

²C and V are italicised as abbreviations for consonant and vowel in order to distinguish these from other uses, notably C = conjunct particle and V = verb.

³Watkins (1963) was acknowledged by Boling (1972: 73), who then tacitly adopted his proposals: 'in the third person ... the absolute reflects the Indo-European primary endings and the conjunct reflects the Indo-European secondary endings. Abs. 3 sg. *berid*, 3 pl. *berait* < **bhereti*, **bheronti*, cjt. 3 sg. *-beir*, 3 pl. *-berat* = **bheret*, **bheront*... The other persons of the paradigm of the conjunct likewise clearly all go back to archaic secondary forms: 1 sg. **bherō*, 2 sg. **bheri* (**bherei*), 1 pl. **bheromo*, 2 pl. **bherete*... The forms of the other persons of the absolute are not entirely clear, though 1 pl. *-mi* strongly recalls Ved. *-masi* < **-mesi*' (Watkins 1963: 42).

⁴Cogent objections have been raised (e.g. Cowgill 1975: 42–8, and 1985; ODVC 97–9 and 102–4) against claims (i) that Celtic somehow rejigged (e.g. Kurylowicz 1964: 133–4) or did not inherit (Meid 1963: 99–107; Watkins 1963: 41–9) the tense- or mood-based primary/secondary

attachment of primary **-i* to the 2sg./3sg./3pl. and athem. 1sg. endings in certain tenses/moods, although this must have been a PIE feature because it is found not only in Indo-Iranian, Greek, Italic etc. but also in Anatolian, ‘generally regarded as the first branch to have separated from the other Indo-European languages’ (Watkins 2004: 551); (ii) that a formal difference reconstructed in the 1sg. (them. **-ō* vs athem. **-mi*) also characterised other persons such as the 2sg. with alleged them. **-ī*/**-ei* rather than **-e-si* aligned with athem. **-si*.

While recognising a particle’s relevance to problems affecting compound verbs, Cowgill focussed upon absolute/conjunct in some detail. Having exposed shortcomings of the then usual connection of OIr. conjunct endings with secondary inflections, he made an incontrovertible case (ODVG 78) for their derivation from the corresponding PIE/PC primary endings: e.g. 1sg. pres. conj. *-biur* ‘I bear’ < **bir-ū* < **ber-ū* < prim. **b^her-ō* rather than **-ber* < **beran* < sec. **b^her-o-m* (Cowgill 1975: 48–9). Cowgill (1975: 50–1) rejected unstressed *es* > *is* (GOI 49) as the cause of raising in 2sg. *-bir* or an *s*-stem dat. sg. like *nim* ‘heaven’ (< **ber-is*, **nem-is* < sec. **b^her-e-s*, endingless locative **nem-es*), positing (1975: 57) **2sg. conj. *-bir*** (as opposed to **-beir* < **ber-es*) < **bir-ī* < **ber-ei* < **ber-e(h)i* < **prim. **b^her-e-si***; dat. sg. *nim* (as opposed to **neim* < **nem-es*) < **niμ-ī* < **nem-ei* < **nem-e(h)i* < *i*-loc. **nem-es-i*. **Conj. 2pl. *-be(i)rid*** < **PC **ber-e-tes*** (with arguably Italo-Celtic prim. **-tes*; cf. Lat. *fer-tis* ‘you (pl.) bear’) and **1pl. *-beram*** < **b^her-o-mos* with prim. **-mos* (cf. Lat. 1pl. *feri-mus* ‘we bear’ etc.) were proposed (Cowgill 1975: 59–60; vs PIE 1pl. sec. **-me(m)* according to n. 16). A key innovation (Cowgill 1975: 56–7) was P(roto)-I(C) apocope of **-ti* > **-t* (cf. Lat. pres. 3sg. *fer-t* ‘bears’, 3pl. *feru-nt* ‘bear’) deriving **conj. 3sg. *-beir***, **3pl. *-berat*** < **beret*, **beront* < **prim. **b^her-e-ti*** and **b^her-o-nti* and ruling them out as direct precursors of abs. 3sg. *be(i)rid*, 3pl. *ber(a)it*. Crucially, when the *s*-preterite (e.g. conj. 1sg. *-carus* < **karass-ū*) ‘was partially thematicized, ... the only thematic endings the language had were the primary ones: the old imperfect had no doubt disappeared long before and thematic aorists like **lude* “went” < **ludh-e-t* had already been remodelled as perfects, on the basis of the coincidence ... of their third singulars in **-e*’ (Cowgill 1975: 63).

Once PIE prim. were made the source of PIC conj. endings, their abs. counterparts needed explaining. Boling’s **ed* was discounted (Cowgill 1975: 55–6) for the good reason that the identical 3sg. nom.-acc. neuter pronoun **ed*, far from blocking lenition, actually caused it owing to early loss of *-d*: e.g. OIr. *d-a:chlaid* ‘digs it up’ < **t(o)-e=χlaδeh* < **to-e(d)=kladet(i)* vs *do:claid* ‘digs up’ < hypothetical **to-(e)d=kladet(i)*. Etymological viability and two likely examples of verb + **id* in Gaulish (*buetid*, probably *bueti+id*; ODVC 173) could not withstand insuperable formal objections to **ed*. It is methodologically unacceptable, not to say absurd, to seek an explanation for phonological

opposition ineluctably reconstructed for PIE, or (ii) that PIE had peculiar thematic primary endings such as 3sg. **-e(i)* outside the 1sg. (e.g. Watkins 1969: 59–68). Even if (ii) is accepted, there are compelling grounds for positing primary them. sg. 2 **-e-si* and 3 **-e-ti* aligned with athem. **-si* and **-ti* in Celtic as in neighbouring Italic and Germanic (ODVC 104–6).

irregularities (notably, non-lenition after vowel-final proclitic preverbs) in an irregularly behaving (by not leniting) putative particle.

Cowgill (1975: 55–6) posited **es* of unclear origins as the only phonetic shape capable of both blocking lenition and generating abs. endings: e.g. pres. ind. sg. 1 *biru* < **birū-h* < **berū-(e)s*, 2 *biri* < **birī-h* < **beresi-(e)s*, 3 *be(i)rid* < **bereθi-h* < **bereti-(e)s*, pl. 1 *berm(a)i* < **beromos-es*, 2 *beirthe* < **bereθē-h* < **bereθe(h)-eh* < **beretes-es*, 3 *ber(a)it* < **berodi-h* < **beronti-(e)s* (1975: 58–61). 3sg./pl. **bereti-s*/**beronti-s* were preferred to apocopated **beret-es*/**beront-es*, because *beirthe* with 3sg. m./n. suffixed pronoun ‘points to **bereti-s-e(n)*; **beret-es-e(n)* should have given *šbeirthe* [cf. 2pl. *beirthe*]. If so, the loss of *-i* ... must be a development of Insular Celtic itself’ (Cowgill 1975: 59).

The ‘particle package’ now became (Cowgill 1975: 51) abs. 2pl. **beretes-es* (instead of **beretes-ed*), 1sg. **berū-(e)s*, 2sg. **beresi-(e)s*. Although ‘more difficult’ because **beromos-es* > OIr. **berm(a)e* should follow from ‘passive preterit, *brethae* < **britos-es*’, the 1pl. abs. was added on the dubious grounds that ‘*berm(a)i* cannot be from **beromo-s*, whereas it can be from **beromos-es*’ (Cowgill 1975: 60). Boling’s **(e)d* was superfluous to ‘the deictic particle **i*’ (1972: 95 and 98; cf. Watkins 1963: 47–9) in abs. 3sg./pl. but Cowgill’s **(e)s* differentiated 3sg./pl. abs. *be(i)rid*, *ber(a)it* < **bereti-(e)s*, **beronti-(e)s* from conj. *-beir*, *-berat* < **beret(i)*, **beront(i)* by blocking apocope, upping the ‘particle package’ from 50% to 100%. Schrijver essentially adopts Cowgill’s 3sg./pl. reconstructions (1994: 159) but tentatively envisages the prim. 1pl. **-mosi* liable to apocope (1994: 164) supported by McCone (1982: 27) and Sims-Williams (1984: 150). Also endorsing abs. 2pl. *beirthe* < **beretes-es* and 1sg. *biru* < **berū-s*, Schrijver (1994: 180) enthuses that ‘the capacity of the “particle theory” to explain the formal differences between the absolute and conjunct endings of Old Irish is stunning’.

Cowgill’s OIr. conj. 3sg. *-beir* and 3pl. *-berat* < **bereti* and **beronti* via PIC apocope of **(n)ti* was a gamechanger because, in the absence of some other means of preventing their loss of **-i*, it made derivation of abs. *be(i)rid* and *ber(a)it* < **bereti* and **beronti* seem impossible without adding a particle. The impeding of **(n)ti* > **(n)t* by an attached enclitic rendering its **-i* non-final was an eminently reasonable assumption, but it cannot be limited to a particle **ed* or **es* and must include other enclitics such as relative **yo*, connective **k^we* ‘and’ and object pronouns like 1sg. **me*/**mu*,⁵ 3sg. m./n. **en*/**e(d)* or 3pl. **sūs*: cf. the treatment of verb + enclitic as a single phonological unit in the later Prim(itive)Ir(ish) apocope exemplified by OIr. 3pl. abs. *ber(a)it* ‘they bear’ < **berod*’ < **berodi(h)* < **beronti-(s)* but rel. *bert(a)e* ‘who bear’ < **berod’e* < **berodeya* < **beronti-yo* or 3sg. abs. *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ < **ber’eθ*’ < **bereθi(h)* < **bereti-(s)* but (+ n. pron.) *beirthe* ‘bears it’ < **ber’eθ’i* < **bereθi(y)-e* < **bereti-(s)-e(d)*.

⁵Owing to depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics (*RelChron*, 135), non-palatal infixed *-m-* could be from **-me*, but not suffixed *-m* in *tāth-um* ‘(there is to me), I have’. It appears, then, that the immediate preform of OIr. 1sg. *-m(-)* was **-mu* through remodelling of inherited **me* (e.g. Gk. *me*) under the influence of 2sg. **tu*.

The non-controversial PIE syntactic rule known as Wackernagel's Law automatically placed a sentence E(nclitic) directly after an accented initial V(erb), P(reverb), N(egative) or X (= noun, non-enclitic pronoun, adverb, conjunction etc.). As a result, *-i was shielded from apocope by E only in clause-initial PIC verb forms like *bereti-yo/-k^we or *bereti(y)-e(d), as also assumed for *bereti-(e)s etc. Since that is exactly where OIr. simple verbs with absolute endings are found, it was proposed (McCone 1979: 29–31) that new initial forms with *-i but no enclitic were extrapolated after PIC *-i > -∅ from initial forms with enclitic(s) (# = clause/sentence boundary, . or ... = one or more unspecified constituents other than V): e.g. #*bereti-k^we(...)# 'and bears', #*bereti(y)-e(d)(...)# 'bears it' and then also #*bereti(...)# 'bears' (> OIr. abs. *beirid*) in clause-initial position but otherwise #.(E)(...)*beret# 'bears' (> OIr. conj. *-beir*).

This brief sketch will suffice, pending a closer look (§§7–8 below) at compound as well as simple verbs. The proposed solution starts from Cowgill's demonstration that PIE/PC primary endings underlie IC conj. and abs. inflections alike, but does not restrict apocope to 3rd-person *(n)ti or differentiate abs. from conj. by adding hypothetical *es to unapocopated primary endings. It obviates a particle by extracting the *-i of almost all PC prim. and PIC abs. active inflections (§§2–3 below) from a nucleus of initial forms in which it was shielded from loss by any 'actual' (in effect, securely reconstructed) PIC enclitic.

Cowgill (1975: 56) posited an effectively *ad hoc* PIC apocope of -i through reluctance 'to require of Celtic a rigidity in its sound laws which we do not require of its Italic sister languages. It is quite generally accepted that by 500 BC Latin *iouesat* and *mitat* had lost final *-i ... We are quite used to accepting an early apocope of *-i in finite verb forms in Italic, even though we know that in many other forms it remained, giving Latin *-e, e.g. in neuter *i*-stems like *mare*, *rēte*, locatives like *pede*, *rēge*, infinitives like *amāre*, *esse*. It is legitimate therefore to posit for Celtic also an early loss of *-i in third person verb forms'. Latin 2sg. forms such as pres. ind. *es* 'you are' < *esi or *regis* 'you direct/rule' < *reg-e-si display apocope of *-si like that of *-ti in 3sg. *est* 'is' < *es-ti or *regit* 'directs, rules' < *reg-e-ti etc. However, Cowgill did not admit a PIC parallel, preferring a decisive role for the particle in differentiating 2sg. abs. *biri* < *birī-h (*-h < *-(e)s) from conj. *-bir* < *birī and deriving -ī(-) more or less *ad hoc* from unapocopated *-e-si(-). Without further explanation, Schrijver (1994: 164) deemed apocope of *-si > *-s probable in 1pl. conj. *-mos < *-mosi, but merely possible elsewhere. While basically adhering to Schrijver's version of the particle (§4 below), Schumacher (KPV 141, 146–8) implicitly accepted regular *-si > *-s and derived pres. 1pl. abs. *berm(a)i* 'we bear' < *ber-o-mosi-(e)s but pret. pass. 3sg. abs. *breth(a)e* 'was borne' < *bri-tos-es.

A neophyte article (McCone 1978) proposed extending Cowgill's early loss of -i to account for the prevalence of 'shorter' over 'longer' (GOI 200) dat. sg. forms of consonant stems in the Würzburg Glosses before a dramatic shift towards the latter in Milan. A regular general PIC sound change could then replace a sporadic one after 3sg./pl. -t- alone: e.g. dat. sg. *n*-stem (GOI 209–14;

nom. *toimtiu* ‘opinion’) *toimte* < **tojedeyan* < **tomen-tiyon* < loc. *-ti(y)oni*; dat. sg. *t-stem* (GOI 205–7; nom. *ointu* ‘unity’) *ointu* < **oino-θūh* < **-tūt* < loc. **-tūti* like 3sg. conj. *-beir* ‘bears’ < **-ber-eh* < **-et* < **-eti*. The dat. sg. of OIr. *s-stems* (GOI 215–16) like *nem* ‘heaven’ is no problem (pace McCone 1978: 30–1) if PIC apocope of *-i* was preceded by unstressed *es* > *is* before a vowel (GOI 49; *RelChron.* 99–100): e.g. dat. sg. *nim* < **nīuih* < **nem-is* < **-is-i* < loc. **-es-i*. Starting from a normal PIE locative in **-i* (cf. Lat. *gener-e*) nullifies Cowgill’s (1975: 50–1) justified objection to an at best residual endless locative as the source and makes apocope of PIC 2sg. **-si* quite straightforward: e.g. 2sg. conj. *-bir* ‘you bear’ < **biri*h < **ber-is* < **-isi* < **-esi*.

Unlike Cowgill, Meiser (1998: 73–4) posited regular Proto-Italic loss of unaccented *-i* in categories where this was invariable (e.g. primary verbal endings, or Lat. *et* ‘and’ vs Gk. *éti*, OInd. *āti* < **h₁éti*) but its survival in those also containing accented *-i*: e.g. ‘in the abl. (< loc.) sg. of the *s-stems* (*gener-e* < **gēnes-i* cf. Gk. γένει) and the active infinitive ending based on it (*regere* < **reḡes-i* ...), cf. the likes of *ped-i*’ (> Lat. abl. *ped-e* ‘with the foot’). Alternatively, *-i* may only have been lost after *-s-* and *-t-* in Italic and then restored in categories where it had often been retained: e.g. Lat. nom./abl. (< loc.) sg. *vir-tūs/-tūte* ‘virtue’ (< **-tūt-i* for **-tūt* < **-tūt-i*) etc. like *pēs/ped-e* ‘foot’ (< **ped-i*) etc. or *pec-us/-ore* ‘livestock’ (< **-os-i* for **-os* < **-os-i*) etc. like *fulg-ur/-ure* ‘lightning’ (< **-ur-i*) etc.⁶

PIC apocope of *-i* was limited to position after a voiceless stop (*-t-*, *-k^(w)-*) and ‘perhaps’ *-s-* with the implausible help of endless locatives etc. by Schrijver (1994: 159–65; critique in *RelChron.* 100–2). Regular general PIC **-i* > *-ø* remains preferable, but its occurrence after *-s-* as well as *-t-* is all that really matters here. It has just been seen that PIC **-si* > **-s* combines with unstressed *es* > *is* before a vowel to account impeccably for dat. sg. forms like *nim* and 2sg. conj. forms like *-bir*. Where *-i* was shielded from loss by a hypothetical or actual enclitic, this combination also covers 2sg. OIr. abs. *biri* < **biri*⁷ < **biri*yī < **beri(h)i(-h)* < **berisi(-s)* < **beresi(±e)s* and Brit. **-ið* < **-iði* < **-iyi* < **-i(h)i(-h)* < **-isi(-s)* < **-esi(±e)s* satisfactorily, whereas with **-ī(-h)* < **-ei(-h)* < **-ehi(-h)* < **-esi(-s)* ‘some British endings remain obscure, e.g. 2sg. pres. ind. MW *-y(d)*, MCo. *-yth*, MBr. *-ez*’ (Cowgill 1975: 66). Allowing **-si* > **-s* also enables **esti* > **essi* by PIC postvocalic *st* > *ss* and then apocope to **ess*, whereas restriction of PIC apocope to **-ti* necessitates **esti* > **est* > **ess*. OIr.

⁶The Latin infinitive seen in *es-se* ‘to be’, *rege-re* ‘to rule’ is a petrified *s-stem* loc. **-(e)s-i* but does not go back to Proto-Italic (Meiser 1998: 325) and so was likely created after analogical restoration of **-i* in the *s-stem* paradigm.

⁷With *-ī* retained in OIr. as *-i* like nom./acc. pl. *cnám(a)i* ‘bones’ (GOI 190) < **knāu-ī* < **-ih* vs gen. sg. *fir* ‘man’s’ < **wir-i* < **-ī* (cf. *RelChron.* 120–1). For OIr. *biri* < **biri* < **biri*yī cf. McManus (1991: 115): ‘The *yo-stem* gen. sg. ending differed from that of the *o-stems* only in the presence of *y*, viz. *-yī* which became *iyī* in Primitive Irish ... That the distinction between the two was always maintained is clear from the fact that they have different reflexes in Old Irish, where the *yo-stem* ending appears as *-(a)i* as compared with the complete loss of original *-ī*. In Ogam, however, where both are written *-I*, this distinction is never brought out ..., and Kim McCone has suggested to me that the explanation may be that *-ī* had first become *-i* ... and then *-iyī* [> *-iyi*] > *-ī*, which survived in the same way as an original long vowel followed by /h/’ (cf. *RelChron.* 113).

2sg. abs. *-i* < **-isi* < **-esi*(-E) obviously entails 2pl. abs. **-thi* instead of *-the*, but that will turn out to be an advantage.

Koch (1987) posits PC retention of a PIE distinction, directly inferred only (and questionably according to Klein 1992: 96) from Vedic, between unaccented non-initial and accented initial verbs in main clauses as opposed to their invariable accentuation in a subordinate clause. However, the crux (1987: 161) of his ‘prosodic’ approach to abs./conj. inflection and (§8 below) non-lenition by vowel-final pretonic preverbs is an automatic (assignment or) shift of accent to the syllable preceding an enclitic⁸ in Celtic, resulting in (**béreti-me* or **bereti-me* ‘bears me’ etc. from which were then extrapolated initial (**béreti* or) **bereti* etc. with no enclitic and an **-í* immune to apocope in unstressed non-initial verbs (Koch 1987: 162–3). Hence **bereti*(E)...# vs #.(E)...**bereti*(i)# etc. by a two-stage process identical, to all intents and purposes, with that of the ‘actual enclitic’ hypothesis above. However, there is no evidence for enclitic P(I)C non-initial main-clause verbs (Watkins 1963: 39) or for automatic accentuation of a pre-enclitic syllable, and alleged main-clause verbal enclisis seems to be irrelevant or, in the case of deut. PV from original prot. PV (§8 below), unhelpful to Koch’s derivations.

Isaac (2007) envisages the survival of unstressed non-initial verbs ‘deep into the period of the Celtic languages’ (2007: 58) and limits apocope of **-i* to unstressed verbs (51–2), whence non-initial **bereti* > **beret* vs initial **béreti*(-E). Koch (2022: 43) silently shifts position by replacing the ‘actual enclitic’ mechanism with **bereti* > **beret* vs initial **béreti*, while retaining (**béreti*-E or) *bereti*-E with a pre-enclitic accent still needed to trigger gemination (§8 below). If

⁸The Ancient Greek and Latin parallels alleged by Koch (1987: 149–51) are conditioned quite differently from what he posits for Celtic. The basic Greek rule is that enclitics do not affect a directly preceding word’s accentuation (e.g. *phílos (tis)* ‘(some) friend’) unless their addition pushes that accent further back in the resultant unit than normal Greek constraints allow, in which case their host receives an extra acute on its final syllable: e.g. *ánthrōpos* ‘man’ or *sōson* ‘save!’ with maximally regressive antepenult acute and penult circumflex respectively and so *ánthrōpós tis* ‘some man’ or *sósón me* ‘save me!’ (e.g. Smyth 1920: 42–3). There are clear indications (vowel weakening and syncope) that Latin had regular initial stress until about the 4th. century BC, but in the classical language ‘the (main) accent lies on the last syllable but one, if this is long (by nature or position, i.e. ends on a long vowel or is closed), [and] otherwise the last but two (antepenult) is stressed’ (Meiser 1998: 53). So, the point that ‘in Latin a following enclitic moves the stress, as in *uirum-que* [wi.rũj.kʷe], *hominēs-que*, etc.’ (Koch 1987: 149) simply boils down to making the group as a whole conform to this rule, whence *virum* but *vi.rum-que*, *hominēs* but *homi.nēs-que*. Greek and Latin usage, then, depends on those languages’ specific restrictions upon the accent’s placement and would only be relevant to PC or PIC if it had had a similar constraint for which the attested Insular Celtic languages provide no evidence. Koch, however, makes a quite different claim (1987: 161–2) of automatic attraction of the P(I)C stress to the final syllable of a word directly followed by an enclitic. It is worth noting that addition of enclitics does not affect the position of the stress in Spanish (on the penult of words ending in vowel, *-n* or *-s* and otherwise on the final syllable as a rule, deviations being marked in writing by an acute; Kattán-Ibarra and Pountain 1997: 8–9): e.g. *sentémonos* ‘let’s sit (*sentemos*) ourselves (*nos*) down’ or *dámelo* ‘give me (*me*) it (*lo*)’. In Italian, where the stress is normally no further back than the antepenult, ‘clitic pronouns ... following the verb are irrelevant to stress placement. In (theoretically possible) forms such as *fabbricamicene* “make me some of them there” [V+mi-ce-ne], or *apiccaticelo* “stick it to yourself there” [V+ti-ce-lo], the stress may appear to be six syllables from the end, but it is only three syllables from the end of the “host” words (*fabbrica* and *apiccica*) to which the clitics are attached’ (Maiden and Robustelli 2013: 15).

absolute and conjunct inflections had arisen from originally accented and unaccented forms respectively, the former should, in the light of the aforementioned Vedic and arguable PIE distribution, also have occurred non-initially (including in compounds) in subordinate clauses. They do not.⁹

Restriction of **-i* > *-ø* to unstressed words runs counter to derivation of the ‘shorter’ dat. sg. of *t*-stem nouns (an undeniably accented category) found with over 80% of OIr. *-tu* abstracts in Wb. (McCone 1978: 26–7) from a normal PIE locative in *-i* (cf. Gk. dat. sg. *pod-í* ‘foot’ etc.): e.g. Wb. *oíntu* < **oino-ūh* < **-tūt* < loc. **-tūti*. This excludes ‘longer’ *oíntaid* < **oino-θūθi* < unapocopated **-tūti* much as Cowgill’s *-beir* < **beret* < **bereti* rules out *berid* < **bereti*. Isaac (2007: 52–4) opts to derive OIr. ‘shorter’ datives like *oíntu* from old endingless locatives like **oinotūt*, but it is impossible to see how or why a formation already greatly eroded by a more distinctive **-i* variant in PIE became so productive in Celtic (unlike other IE sub-families), especially when loc. sg. *-i* is clearly attested in the Gaulish consonant-stem names *Atemaguti* (a *t*-stem), *Magurīgi* and *Edađatextorigi* (*RelChron.* 101). Koch (2022: 47) evades the issue, merely claiming that ‘**móri* “sea, lake” did not undergo the Insular Celtic early apocope of **-i* that affected unaccented verbs, as shown by Old Irish *muir*; see also dative singular **déit* “tooth” < Proto-Celtic **dant-i* < **Hd̥nt-*, *inn-uraid* “last year” < Proto-Indo-European **péruti*’. The first two can easily be due to analogy (McCone 1978: 33 and 36) and the form of the article (OIr. *inn* not *ind*) shows that *inn-uraid* is not an old unapocopated *i*-locative but an accusative < **e/arut-en* (McCone 1992: 36, n. 101; *RelChron.* 101; ODVC 111; Schrijver 1994: 162). Anyway, since it would entail not endingless **pérut* (> Skt. *parut*) but **péruti* (> Gk. *πέρυσι*) with **-i*, a locative origin of petrified *inn-uraid* would be a further obstacle to deriving an OIr. dat. sg. like *oíntu* from endingless as opposed to apocopated (< **oino-tūti*) **oino-tūt*. Further evidence that *±stress* was irrelevant to PIC apocope of **-i* is furnished by OIr. neut. proclitic *na* ‘any’ < **neh* < PIC **nek^(w)* < **ne-k^wi* < **ne-k^wid*, and stressed *ní* ‘anything, something’ for **nē* (under the influence of *an-í*; GOI 311) < **neh* < PIC **nek^(w)* < **ne-k^wi* < **ne-k^wid* (McCone 2003). Apocope of **-i* cannot be credibly restricted to unstressed words.

Koch and Isaac are both sceptical of a PIC node, and Koch’s preference for Gallo-British (1987: 49, n. 113) would perforce shift alleged non-initial enclitic V-**i* > V back to PC or at least a Gallo-Insular phase. There is some evidence for *-t* instead of **-ti* (de Hoz 1997) at later stages of Celtiberian and Gaulish, when Latin influence could have been a factor. Nevertheless, it is clear from examples like *Atemaguti* above, non-initial *uedííumi* ‘I pray’ (§2 below) and *i(m)mi* ‘I am’ (2×, both disobligingly non-initial; Lambert 1994: 89 and 124; §5 below) that there was no general or enclitic loss of PC **-i* in Gaulish. There is also at least 80% probability that Celtiberian attestations of *-(n)ti* represented /*(n)ti*/, either actually or at least when the Iberian alphabet was adopted (*RelChron.* 10, 12–15). Final *-d* was retained undoubtedly in Celtiberian (as [ð] or [z] written

⁹Isaac (2007) ignores this problem but Koch (2022: 35) tackles it with a change of opinion: ‘it is unlikely that Celtic continued a subordinate clause structure like that seen in Vedic’, thereby significantly weakening the case for a direct accentual comparison.

z) and almost certainly in Gaulish (*buetid* above), and OIr. *na/ní* above proves PIC loss of *-i* after loss of *-d*. It follows that the apocope of *-i* now generally agreed to have been responsible, one way or another, for the idiosyncratic Insular Celtic absolute/conjunct opposition was a specifically PIC development (ODVC 172–5).

As seen above, proposed solutions to the problem have tended to correlate inflections peculiar to initial simple verbs with aberrant deuterotonic stress-patterns and (in main clauses) non-leniting pretonic preverbs of initial compound verbs, for the good reason that these features coincide with post-initial ‘Wackernagel position’. The obvious inference was that enclitics played a role. All versions of the particle hypothesis devise and prime enclitics to generate absolute endings, block lenition and then disappear, but the alternative (McCone 1979 etc.) uses directly attested enclitics as an indirect trigger of the features in question. Koch’s (1987) version of this ascribes absolute inflection of initial verbs and gemination of post-initial enclitics to the accent on an initial constituent’s final syllable assumed to result from a following enclitic: e.g. initial simple **béreti-me* > **beretí-me* > **beretí-mme* > OIr. *beirthium(m)* ‘bears me’ and compound **tó-bereti* > prot. **tó-bberet* > deut. **to:bbéret* (with flipped accent; §8 below) > OIr. *do:beir* ‘brings’.

Isaac does not give enclitics a central role and so there is a disconnect, duly criticised by Koch (2022: 44), between his accentually based account of the abs./conj. opposition (Isaac 2007) and a proposal (Isaac 1993: 19–28) that lenition of suffixed/infixed pronouns or deut. compounds’ stressed/tonic portion (e.g. the *:beir* of *do:beir*) was blocked by ‘an inherited, non-intraphrasal juncture, across which neither earlier sandhi nor later mutations operated’ (1993: 27; §8 below). The earlier account, which ‘is not necessarily incompatible with the origin of absolute and conjunct given by McCone (1979: 28–31)’ (Isaac 1993: 26), is not discussed in the later one (Isaac 2007), which is incompatible with it. Koch’s recent (2002) move from an ‘actual enclitic’ trigger to basically the same explanation of abs./conj. as Isaac (2007) uncouples abs./conj. from gemination as the outcomes of two different ‘prosodic’ factors: a lack of stress rendering non-initial finite verbs liable to **-i* > *-∅* and hence conjunct, and an enclitic-induced syllable-final stress causing sentence-initial preverbs or verbs to geminate enclitics.

There is a disconcertingly arbitrary contrast between light/weak and heavy/strong: for Isaac (2007: 22) ‘the constituents which come first in the phrase are the lightest in phonological terms’ but for Koch (2022: 29) ‘phonologically stronger forms of verbs and preverbs occur in sentence-initial position’. Isaac (1993) sees attested $\acute{P}\acute{V}$ where Koch posits counter-intuitive $\acute{P}\acute{V}$, but Isaac’s $\acute{V}\acute{E}$ seems bizarre unlike Koch’s $\acute{V}\acute{E}$. Isaac keeps his ‘juncture’ (#) in place by excluding the proclitic preverb of a lexical compound like deut. *do:beir* from the verbal phrase (Isaac (1993, 24–5) and by making clitic pronouns heavy ($\acute{V}^{\#}E$, $P^{\#}E\acute{V}$) as surrogates of the noun(-phrase) in $\acute{V}\acute{N}^{obj}$, although it is not that such ‘objects are always really “heavier” than verbs’ but ‘simply that the formal category NP potentially allows greater complexity’ (Isaac 1993: 23). Non-phonological criteria like these belie Isaac’s classification of constituents

as light or heavy ‘in phonological terms’ and, anyway, his later postulate of unstressed non-initial V (Isaac 2007) would presumably change his $\acute{P}\acute{V}$ to PV (or $\acute{P}\acute{V}$ à la Koch?).

2. 2PL. ABSOLUTE AND/OR RELATIVE FORMS OF THE COPULA,
AND 2PL. ABS. -*THE* IN OLD IRISH

The PIE active 2pl. was most likely prim./sec. $*-te$,¹⁰ as in ancient Greek (e.g. Rix 1976: 240). Hittite sec. 2pl. *-ten* must have acquired *-n* from the 1pl. as a prerequisite for 2pl. *-teni/-ten* as well as 1pl. *-ueni/-uen* with an analogical ‘mainstream’ prim./sec. *-i/-ø* pattern. Similar influence, this time from 1pl. $*-me/os$, would have produced (prim./sec.) $*-tes$ underlying Lat. *-tis* (Meiser 1998: 216) and OIr. 2pl. forms, but this could easily have become 2pl. sec./prim. $*-tes/-tesi$ (cf. 1pl. prim./sec. $*-mosi/-mos$; §3 below) on the model of 2sg. sec./prim. $*-s/*-si$. Latin *-tis* could continue $*-tesi$ as well as $*-tes$, and 2pl. prim. *-tesi* and sec. *-tes* may well be attested in Gaulish. Lines 1–2 of the Chamalières inscription (text Lambert 1994: 151) contain 1sg. *uediūmī* ‘I pray (to), beseech’ (OIr. *-guidiu* ‘I pray (to), beseech’ < $*g^w ed-yū$), a cross between them. $*-ū$ and athem. $*-mi$ (like, but independent of, OInd. them. $-āmi = *-ā$ [< $*-ō$] + $*-mi$), plus at least four accusative forms likely enough to include the names of more than one deity. Line 3’s *lop/tites snī eddīc sos* preceds the names of six males in the acc. sg. (ll. 4–7), to whom *sos* presumably refers as an acc. pl. (/so:s/ < $*sons$)¹¹ of the Celtic *so-* demonstrative (PIE $*so-/*to-$; Schrijver 1997: 9–16). This is coordinated with 1pl *snī* corresponding to PIC $*snī$ (> OIr. *snī*, MW *ni* ‘us’) by *etic* ‘and’ (cf. l. 7 *addēdilli etic secoui* ‘of A. and S.’ and Lambert 1994: 98–102 and 161). Whatever it means, *lop/tites* looks like a 2pl. verb and an optative ($-ī-$ < PIE $*-ih_1-$) with expected secondary ending $*-tes$ would suit a wish ‘may you ... us and them’ directed at the gods invoked. However obscure overall, the Châteaubateau tile (text Lambert 2000: 71) contains more 1sg. verb forms in $-(i)umi$ (l. 1 *nemnaliūmī* [+ neg. *ne?*], 4 and 7 *iegumī*, 6 *upīūmmī*), including *mīiīiegumī* (l. 4) plausibly segmented as *mī iegūmī* ‘I say (?)’ with 1sg. subj. pronoun + 1sg. verb. It is hardly a coincidence that one of the two forms ending in *-tesi*, namely *íexsetesi/sue* and *suirexetesi*¹² (ll. 2/3 and 5), is directly followed and the other directly preceded by an element with *su-* like

¹⁰OInd. prim. *-tha* vs sec. *-ta* arguably points to PIE prim. $*-th_1e$ (e.g. Beekes 1995: 232), but this would anyway have fallen together with sec. $*-te$ in Italic and Celtic.

¹¹See *RelChron.* 61–2 on late (after $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$ and, in final syllables only, $\bar{o} > \bar{u}$) PC simplification of $-ns > -s$ with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. The analogies proposed there to account for the different reflexes of $-ons$ seen in OIr. acc. pl. *fir-u* < $*-ūs$ and Gaul. *sos/sōs/* < $*sons$ could be avoided by positing $-ns > -s$ in the separate prehistories of Celtiberian, Gaulish and Insular Celtic, the result after $-o-$ being lower $-ōs$ in Gaulish but higher $-ōs > -ūs$ in PIC. This would be no more problematical in Celtic than in Ancient Greek, where different reflexes prove that compensated simplification of $-ns$ was not a Proto-Greek phenomenon but occurred separately in a number of dialects and not at all in a couple: e.g. PGk. acc. pl. $*tons$ (< PIE $*to-ns$; PC $*so-ns$) > Cretan/Argive *tóns*, Arcadian *tós*, Lesbian *toís*, Heracleian *tōs*, Attic-Ionic *tous* (Rix 1976: 67) denoting /tōs/ with a higher $\bar{o}$ later raised further to $\bar{u}$ (Lejeune 1987: 230) to give *tous* /tūs/.

¹²There seems to be no doubt about *su...tesi*, despite Lambert’s hesitation about the intervening letters (2000: 71).

the PIC 2pl. pronoun **swī* underlying OIr. *sí* and MW *chwi*. The parallel with *mī iegūmi* ‘I say (?)’ on the previous line points strongly to contrasting *mī/suī* and analysis of the second example as *suī...etesi* ‘you ...’ with 2pl. *-e-tesi*. PC prim. 2pl. **-tesi* > OIr. abs. *-the* contradicts Cowgill’s **-esi-(e)s* > **-ehi-h* > **-eih* > **-ih* > OIr. 2sg. abs. *-i* (§1 above) but, even without **-esV-* > **-isV-*, the latter would be quite compatible with **-thi* < **-θih* < **-θeih* < **-θehi-h* < **-tesi-(e)s*.¹³

The only OIr. 2pl. abs. forms of the copula recognised by GOI (484 and 488) are pres. ind. *adib* (19 exx. plus 1 of *idib* in Wb., *LexWb.* 583; none in Ml.) and subj. *bede* (Wb. 13^a10). There are four examples of *adi* in the Würzburg Glosses, three of which may be due to assimilation of *-b* to a following labial in speech, i.e. to *b-* probably or to *m-* possibly: *adi boill* (Wb. 22^b10; *adib baill* 22^b1), *adi mmaic* (9^a13; *adib mairb* 3^b6, *adib mogae* 3^b15, *idib maithi* 16^b9), and *ada baill* (3^b7) reflecting assimilation of quality to non-palatal *b-*. That leaves *hóre adi ellachti* ‘since you are united’ (21^c17; cf. *adib ellachti* 19^c18 and 22^a14), dismissed as ‘probably a mere scribal error’ by GOI 484 (and similarly *Thes.* i, 635, n. e, and *LexWb.* 583).

The *-b* is an example of 1/2sg./pl. abs. pres. ind. forms of the OIr. copula (paradigms GOI 484–92) with personal affixes like those seen in prepositional *fri(u)-m(m)/-t(t)/n(n)*, *fri-b* ‘against me/thee/us/you’, *indiu-m(m)/-t/-n(n)*, *indi-b* ‘in(to) me/thee/us/you’ etc. (GOI 272–6). This feature is regular in monosyllabic 1sg. *a-m* ‘I am’ and 2sg. *a-t* or *i-t*, the norm in disyllabic 2pl. *adi(-b)* but still very rare in 1pl. *ammi(-n)* (in Wb. just *ammin éulig* 14^d28 vs 12 exx. of *ammi*; *LexWb.* 583). It is confined to the pres. ind. as the only tense/mood with inherited 1sg. *-m*, namely *am* ‘I am’ < **em’* < PIC/PC **e-mmi-* (*RelChron.* 45–6; < **es-mi* < PIE **h₁és-mi*), the trigger for conversion of 2sg. **i* < **i-h’* < IC **isi-* < PC **e-si* (*RelChron.* 99–100) or **a* < **e-h’* < PC/PIC **esi-* (< PIE **h₁é(s)-si*)¹⁴ into *at* or *it* on the model of *frim*, *frit* etc. If already proclitic, **esi-* would have become **isi-* by PIC **es* > **is* but, if not, would have remained unchanged. Whether preceded by *a-* or *i-*, the form’s *-t* had led to *-b* prevailing in the 2pl. by the time of Wb. The innovatory nature of the affix outside the 1sg. is obvious from its bare beginnings in the 1pl. and evidently palatal *-b* (as in stressed *frib*, *indib* etc.) pointing to the creation of 2pl. *adib* after EOIr. depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics (*RelChron.* 135). GOI etc. give no reason for arbitrarily emending Wb. 21^c17 *adi ellachti* to *adib ellachti* but apparently acted on a presumption of original 2pl. *-the* (as in 2pl. pres. subj. cop. *bede*, subst. vb. *be(i)the* etc.) implying that *adib* /aðəβ’/ was created by adding palatal *-b* to **ada* (< **e-θ’e*).

It was later argued (McCone 1995: 124–6) that *adi* was the inherited form < **e-θ’i* < **e-θī* < **e-θi yi* < **e-θi hi* < PIC **e-tisi* < PC **e-tesi* (or, with a formally pointless particle, < **e-tis-es*/**e-tisi-s* < **e-tes-es*/**e-tesi-(e)s*) and the copula had retained once general 2pl. abs. **-thi*. There will have been ambiguity between,

¹³Alternatively **-tesi-(e)s* or **-tes-es* > **-tisi-s* or **-tis-es* (both > OIr. **-thi*) if the particle had been added to main-clause verbs before **-esV-* > **-isV-* and **-i* > *-ø*. If not, unaffected (in the absence of a following vowel) **-tes* and then **-tes* + **es* > **-te(h)-eh* > **-tēh* > OIr. **-the*.

¹⁴Underlying root **h₁es* + 2sg. *-si* realised as **h₁esi* (e.g. OIrd. *ási*, Gk. *eī* < **e(h)i* < **esi*) because PIE did not tolerate geminate consonants.

say, 2pl. abs. **beirthi* ‘you bear’ and more frequent *beirthi* ‘(s)he bears him/it’¹⁵ (3sg. abs. + 3sg. m./n. suffix). An obvious response would be to free 2pl. rel. *-the* < **-θ’eya* < **-θiya* < **-θīya* (cf. OIr. *muilenn* ‘mill’ < **mul’ena(h)* < **molina* < **molīnah*, Lat. *molīna*) < **-tisi-yo* < **-tesi-yo* for use as a distinctive 2pl. abs., whence *beirthe* ‘you bear’ etc., by introducing a relative construction with *no* into the 2pl.: e.g. *no:(m)beirid* in place of **beirthi* ‘whom/which you bear’. The proclitic copula, however, used infixes not suffixed pronouns (e.g. *iss-id n-aithrech* ‘(it is a regret to him,) he repents’; *GOI* 269), and ‘class C’ *-id* here (cf. OIr. rel. *imm-id*, preverb *imm* + ‘class C’ 3sg. m./n.) was doubtless a late prehistoric replacement of **-i* (*pace* Schrijver 1997: 64 and 145). It differentiated 2pl. abs. forms like fut. **beθ’i* from 3sg. + m./n. pronoun **beθ’ið*, a solution unavailable to stressed verbs with their single set of suffixed pronouns, and also spread to pres. ind. 3sg. + m./n. pron. **is’i*, although it was already distinct from 2pl. abs. **eθ’i*.

After a discussion (*KPV* 90–114) of abs./conj. that opts for Schrijver’s particle **eti* > **(e)t* (§4 below), Schumacher rejects unstressed *-es-* > *-is-* before a vowel (*KPV* 138–53) but accepts **-si* > **-s* (see §1 and §3). 2pl. abs. *-the* < **-tes-et* is insisted upon (*KPV* 143), but the divorce of *-si* > *-s* from *es* > *is* complicates the derivation of an *s*-stem dat. sg. like *nim* with analogical replacement of **neueh* (> OIr. **neim*) < **nem-es* < **nem-es-i* by **neuih* under the influence of a gen. sg. **neui-ah* (> **niui-ah* > **niue-ah* > OIr. *nime*) etc. with *-i* < *-e-* in hiatus before a back vowel after loss of *-h-* (*KPV* 144–5). This is at best weakly motivated, at worst impossible. Schrijver (1995: 387) gives just four examples of this alleged raising. Two of these (*s*-stems and **so-de-sos* > **suð’iah* > OIr. *suide* ‘the aforementioned’) could just as easily be due to *-es-* > *-is-* and the other two involve PrimIr. raising of stressed *e* > *i*,¹⁶ which hardly supports raising of unstressed *e* in view of the restriction of normal PrimIr. raising of *e* > *i* to a stressed syllable (*GOI* 47–8; *RelChron.* 110).

The fact that Wb. only has *a-* in the 2sg. abs. (3 exx.; *LexWb.* 579) and Ml. has *at* (36^a32, 126^c9) or *it* (55^d11, 108^d2) persuades Schumacher that *a-t* was the older form with **a* < **e* < **ē* < **ēh* < **e(h)iθ* < **esi-t* (*KPV* 139–40). The awkward consequence of this is 2sg. pres. ind. abs./conj. **beire/*-beir* (< **berēh/-eh* < **ber-e(h)i-θ/-eh* < **esi-t/s*) and an elaborate set of implausible analogies and/or preforms leading to actually attested OIr. *biri/-bir* ‘you bear’ (*KPV* 145–52; criticised by *ODVC* 111–15). One way of avoiding troublesome 2sg. **-esi(s)* > **-ē(h)* would be PC 2pl. **-te* directly inherited from PIE (e.g. McCone 1982: 27–8; now scarcely tenable in view of Gaulish *-tes* and *-tesi* above) and OIr. abs.

¹⁵Relative endings and those containing a suffixed pronoun occurred in the same basic independent ‘slot’ as absolute endings and so were subject to similar pressure towards distinction of their forms from other (abs./rel.) independent inflections. In practice, only the commonest (half the total of the table in Breatnach 1977: 86) and least clearly characterised 3sg. m./n. suffixed forms were likely to be troubled by ambiguity.

¹⁶See *RelChron.* 109 on Ogam NIOTTA. Schrijver’s two OIr. exx., acc. sg. *sieir* ‘sister’ < **sweor-* and gen. sg. *niad* ‘of a sister’s son’ are due to a significantly later post-syncope (and hence post-apocope) raising in hiatus (*RelChron.* 130): e.g. OIr. *niad* < *nioth* < (by raising in hiatus) **neoθa(h)* < (by lowering) **nioθa(h)* (= Ogam NIOTTA) < (by early raising of stressed *e* in hiatus) **neoθah* < **ne(p)ot-os*.

-*the* < **-θēh* < **-tēs* < **te-es* (cf. -*the* < **-te-e(d)* posited by Sims-Williams 1984: 178–9). This, however, would necessitate more ‘whack-a-mole’ analogy, this time because of resultant OIr. suffixless pret. 3sg. abs. **gegn(a)e* < **g^weg^won-ēs/t* < **g^weg^wone-es/t* vs conj. -*geguin* < **g^weg^wone* etc. instead of actually attested abs./conj. (-)*geguin* ‘killed’ etc. (§9 below).

While the obvious inference from the few attestations in Wb. and Ml. is that *a-t* was older than *i-t*, earlier forms unattested in Wb. are sometimes found in Ml. (e.g. original 3pl. *t*-pret. -*at* vs -*atar* from suffixless pret.; KPV 63), and 2pl. *idib* (Wb. 16^b9) for normal *adib* implies the existence of 2sg. **i* and/or *it* at the time. Anyway, priority for 2sg. *at* does not have to incur 2sg. **beire*/**-beir*, since IC unstressed prevocalic *es* > *is* would not have applied to initial 2sg. cop. **esi(-)* if it was still stressed at the time. Alternatively, if it was already proclitic and became IC **isi(-)*, it could have got its -*t* by the proportion 1sg. *fri(u)-m* : 2sg. *fri(u)-t* = 1sg. *a-m* : 2sg. *x* (*x* = *a-t*). Coexistence with well-characterised 2sg. *a-t* would then have led to acquisition of -*t* by increasingly sidelined **i* (cf. rare *adi* beside *adi-b*) with the result that 2sg. *it* aligned with 3sg. *is* competed more or less equally in Ml. with 2sg. *at* aligned with 1sg. *am*.

An origin of OIr. -*the* as a 2pl. relative ending would obviously rule out the derivation < **-θēh* < **-θe(h)eh* < **-tes-es/t* prized by aficionados of a particle. Schumacher rather desperately takes *ada* (once, before *baill!*) as the oldest 2pl. cop. form (allegedly < **e-θe* < **e-tes-et*) and *adi* /aði/ as an unmotivated back-formation from *adib* /aðəβ/ owing its /-i/ to the influence of 1pl. *ammi* (KPV 306–8; criticised by ODVC 120–2).

This would be disproved by just one example of OIr. -*di* outside the copula’s pres. ind., its only tense/mood with added personal affixes. An indubitable case seems to have escaped detection hitherto, namely *badi fíriáin-si*, *hóre adib ellacht* in Christo, *amal as firían-som* ‘you will be righteous, because you are united in Christ, as he is righteous’ (Wb. 22^a24). This oversight was presumably due to 2pl. subjunctive *be-de* and the reading *badí* in *Thes.* through misinterpretation of the long straight line plus two dots well above the gloss (facsimile ed. Stern 1910) as a mark of length and not as a construe mark probably relating to the previous line of main Latin text. Two gratuitous emendations (*Thes.* i, 637, note f.) of *badi* were *bad fíriáinsi* ‘be ye righteous’ with a 2pl. ipv. or *adib fíriáinsi* ‘ye are righteous’ but, if not trifled with, it gives perfect sense as *badi fíriáin-si* ‘you shall be righteous’ with a fut. 2pl. abs. of the copula having exactly the same vocalism as 1pl. abs. *bami* ‘we shall be’ (Wb. 4^a17) and deriving regularly < **be-θ’i* < **be(y)a-θī* < **bi(y)-ā(h)e-θi(h)i* < **bi(b)w-āse-tisi* (McCone 1991: 124) < **-tesi-*. Wb. *badi*, then, conclusively confirms preservation of 2pl. abs. -*di* < **-thi* with the copula as the only verb where it was not formally ambiguous.

2pl. subj. *bede* (as opposed to **bada* with *a* < *e* in proclisis; *RelChron.* 115) differs only in voicing of /θ/ between unstressed vowels (*RelChron.* 133) from the substantive verb’s *beithe* (e.g. Wb. 6^b4, 24^b13; cf. 1pl. *bemmi* 31^c11) and

seems to owe its *e* and probably palatal *-d-* to the latter's influence.¹⁷ It could be an instance of 2pl. abs. *-de/-the* penetrating the copula's paradigm, but the context makes for a better explanation: *con:icfid-si bede preceptoru uili* (Wb. 13^a10) 'you will all be able to be teachers' (lit. 'you will be able that you all be teachers'). Thurneysen (*GOI* 318) notes frequent use of nasalising relative clauses 'as the complement of verbs ... of saying and thinking, and also of possibility' and *DIL* (C-446, 3) gives this gloss and three others from *ML* and *Sg.* as examples of this with *con-icc* 'can, is able': e.g. (3sg. rel. cop. twice), *etir in dobrethir s6n con:ic bes ndobr(iathar) 7 bes rems(uidigud)* (*Sg.* 27^a18) 'that is between the adverb which can be an adverb and a preposition' (lit. 'is able that it be an adverb and that it be a preposition'). Since 'a nasalising relative clause can be replaced by a formally independent (i.e. principal) clause in almost every instance' (*GOI* 319) and the *OIr.* 2pl. did not have a rel. ending as a rule, *bede* was taken by *GOI* (488) as a 2pl. abs. However, the copula's retention of 2pl. abs. *-di* makes 2pl. rel. *-de* < **-the* there, as in 1pl. abs. *-(m)mi* vs rel. *-(m)me*), eminently plausible.

Supporters of a particle have vaunted *OIr.* 2pl. abs. *-the* as the one ending upon which its vowel had a tangible effect instead of having to be zapped by aphaeresis so as not to mess things up. However, the *OIr.* copula's uncontradicted evidence leaves little doubt that it is not an old main-clause form at all but a recently shifted relative containing **-yo* not **-es*. Ambiguous inherited 2pl. abs. **-thi* may have been replaced by *-the* elsewhere, but the original system is still attested in the *OIr.* copula as 2pl. abs. *-di* vs rel. *-de* with regular voicing between unstressed vowels. That being so, unstressed *-es-V(-)* > *-is-V(-)* can be accepted without (further) detriment to the case for a particle by positing *-di* < **-thi* < **-tis-es* < **-tes-es* or, alternatively, < **-tesi(-e)s* as a (formally, at least) equally viable preform for **-thi*, whether via **-tisi(-e)s* or Cowgill's more questionable **-te(h)i-h* > **-tī-h*. Similarly, 2sg. *-i* can be < **-e-si(-e)s* via either **-isi(-e)s* or Cowgill's **-e(h)i-h* > **-ī-h*.

How does the 'particle package' now fare in comparison with 2sg. **-si*, 3sg. **-ti*, 2pl. **-tesi* and 3pl. **-nti* extrapolated from environments shielding **-i* from PIC apocope by any 'actual enclitic'? Clearly, forms like *OIr.* abs. 3sg. *be(i)rid* and 3pl. **ber(a)it* can be derived just as easily < **bereti* and **beronti* in the latter way as < **bereti(-e)s* and **beronti(-e)s*. Cowgill's derivation of *OIr.* abs. 2sg. *biri* can be extended to 2pl. **beirthi* and requires a particle **(e)s* for preservation of the *-i*. Since, however, *biri* and **beirthi* are now straightforward < **berisi* and **beretisi* < **beresi* and **beretesi*, with or without **(e)s*, they too are ineligible for inclusion in a 'particle package' calling for an indubitable formal advantage.

1sg. abs. *biru* can, of course, be < **berū(-e)s* but not < **berū*. However, if 2pl. abs. *beirthe* must be a shifted relative, with or without a main-clause particle, there is no reason why *biru* could not similarly be < rel. **berū-yo* displaced by *no:(m)biur* 'which/whom I bear'. While not ambiguous, **biur* would have been quite anomalous as a monosyllabic abs. form identical with

¹⁷See *GOI* 488 and 490 for cop. pres. subj. 2pl. conj. *-baid* with pal. final (like corresponding subst. vb. *-beith*) beside regular *-bad*, or cop. 1pl. abs. fut. *bemmi* (like subst. vb. *be(i)mmi*) beside regular *bami*.

its conj. counterpart (-*biur*). Substituting *biru* (< **berū-yo*) for abs. **biur*, would produce a 1sg. abs. with at least two syllables in conformity with an otherwise general rule (including the likes of OIr. 1sg. abs. *ben(a)im* 'I strike' < **bina-mi*; §3 below) outside the 3sg., where a limited number of exceptions were at least distinct from the corresponding conjunct forms (e.g. abs. pres. ind. *tét* 'goes' vs conj. -*tét*, s-subj. *geis* 'may pray' vs conj. -*gé*).

Sims-Williams (1984: 153) suggested that 'the reason why REL 1sg. †*biru* and 2pl. †*beirthe* were not used was surely their identity with the ABS forms'. It now appears that the latter actually were the old relative forms. Indeed, as Ruairí Ó hUiginn points out to me, rel. 2pl. is attested in *saigthe* 'which you seek' (*Fél. Prol.* 161; ed. Stokes 1905) and may well survive in OIr. combinations of simple *tá(-)* with nasalising *ol* in the sense 'than (is/are)' (*GOI* 477–8). Since the well-attested 3sg. *od-daas* and 3pl. *ol-dáthe* are patently relative, OIr. 1sg. *ol-dau/-dó* and later attested 2pl. *ol-dáthe* (*GOI* 278) should also be analysed as containing an original rel. 1sg. -*u* and 2pl. -*the* while 2sg. *ol-daí* could be the direct outcome of rel. **tai-(y)a* < **taī-ya* < **ta-yiyi-ya* < **yihī-ya* < **yisī-yo* < **-ye-si-* + **-yo* (see *LexWb.* 726 for exx. of 1/2sg. and 3sg./pl. in *Wb.*). Since petrification of these forms of the substantive verb with *ol* seems unlikely to have been much earlier than the OIr. period, a full personal set of relative endings apparently survived (in the pres. ind. of the substantive verb, at least)¹⁸ well into or even beyond the 6th cent. AD before being replaced in the 2sg. and displaced in the 2pl. and 1sg. by the *no* construction.

3. 1PL. ABSOLUTE AND CONJUNCT IN THE COPULA AND OTHER VERBS

There can be no reasonable doubt about 1pl. conj. pres. ind. -*beram* 'we bear' < **beromah* < **ber-o-mos* etc. or PIE primary *-*mos* (§1 above). The question is whether PIC conj. *-*mos* is its direct outcome or arose from *-*mosi*. 'The primary/secondary hypothesis explains *berm(a)i* by reference to Vedic -*masi*, Avestan -*mahi*. But no other Indo-European language points to a first plural ending *-*mVsi* ..., so that -*masi*, -*mahi* must be ... made by adding the primary marker -*i* of the singular and third plural to the inherited primary ending -*mas* from -*mos*; to explain Irish -*m(a)i* in similar fashion we have to suppose that the same innovation occurred independently at opposite ends of the Indo-European territory' (Cowgill 1975: 53). What Indo-Iranian -*masi/-mas* and Hitt. prim. -*ueni/sec.* -*uen* do show is that descendants of PIE 1pl. *-*me/os* (e.g. WGk. -*mes*; Lat. -*mus* < *-*mos*) or *-*mem* (EGk. -*men*, Hitt. sec. -*uen*) could

¹⁸MidIr. 1pl. *oldammit* (*GOI* 478) with innovatory abs. ending (*EIV* 174–5) is quite compatible with OIr. rel. **oldāme*, given a MidIr. tendency to use abs. instead of rel. endings outside the 3sg. (*EIV* 182–3). Pret. 3pl. *ol-mbatar* (Ml. 123*8) could be rel., abs. or conj., while 3sg. *ol-mboí* (*Wb.* 9^c10) looks abs./conj. but could be an old rel. if OIr. *boí* (cf. *a mbaí* 'when was' at ll. 15 and 498 of the OIr. Life of Brigit, ed. Ó hAodha 1978) was the regular outcome of **boe* < rel. **bo(w)e-ya* and *boí-e* (*GOI* 483) analogical to the likes of 3sg. abs. *luid* 'went' vs rel. *luid-e* 'who went'. Alternatively, occasional conj. forms like 2pl. fut. *ola-mbieid-si* (*Wb.* 26^d26 *ol* + *a* 'that (which)'; *GOI* 278) may have been triggered by the formal identity of 1sg. -*dáu/-dó* and 2sg. -*daí* to conj. *a:táu/a:tó* 'I am', *a:taí* 'you (sg.) are'. The only reasonable starting point is a consistently relative construction with *ol* + substantive verb at the time when the forms became stereotyped.

acquire new ‘regular’ primary endings post-PIE through addition of **-i*. Pace Cowgill, straightforward 1sg. **-m* : **-mi* = 1pl. **-me/os* : *x* (*x* = **-me/osi*) makes such regularisation easy to envisage in Indo-Iranian and Celtic independently – or even in Italo-Celtic, assuming Lat. 1pl. *-mus* < **-mosi* and/or **-mos* (cf. Lat. 2sg. *-is* < **-esi* and 2pl. *-tis* < **-tesi* and/or **-tes* in §1 and §2 above).

Examples of OIr. 1pl. abs. *-mi* with unsynocopated preceding vowel like *pridchimmi-ni* ‘we preach’ (Wb. 15^b18) < **preð’iχam’i* (cf. rel. *pridchimme(-ni)* in 14^d39 and six more exx.; *LexWb.* 741) reveal its basically palatal unlenited /*m’*/ vs the non-palatal lenited /*μ*/. of 1pl. conj. *-beram* etc. with invariable OIr. *-m*. The different outcomes of *-os-es* in Cowgill’s 1pl. abs. *-mi* < **-mos-es* and pret. pass. 3sg. abs. *brethae* < **britos-es* seem to have inclined Schrijver (§1 above) towards 1pl. **-mosi*. Schumacher (KPV 140–2) was less hesitant: ‘The absolute form is OIr. /-m’i/, the relative form /-m’e/. The nasal is palatalised in both cases ... Following McCone (1996 [=RelChron.]: 131f.) and Schrijver (1997: 55), I consider it probable that the underlying form here is to be reconstructed as **-mosi*. Unlike McCone, I assume with Schrijver that the absolute forms arose through the attachment of a particle **(e)t* < **eti* ...: **-mohit* > **-mo.iθ* > **-mohi* > **-m’ih* > *-mi* /-m’i/ ... The development of the relative form, by contrast, is as follows: **-mohijo* > **-mo.i.a* > **-moja* → *-me* /-m’e/ ... The arrow between **-moja* and *-me* simply signifies that the palatalisation of the /*m’*/ is not regular ... The absolute form of the 3sg. of the passive preterite developed somewhat differently: **-tohet* > **-θo.eθ* > **-θēh* > **-θ’ēh* → *-thae* /-θe/ ... The palatalisation was obviously cancelled later on the analogy of the conjunct form (*-breth* < **-briθah*).’ Furthermore, ‘in the original Insular Celtic form the reflex of a geminate *-mm-* is ... due to the copula’s analogical influence ... whether the Insular Celtic form was already influenced by the copula [as implied by Boling’s *berm(a)i* < **bero-smesi±d* in §1 above] or this analogy first occurred later ... [I]t could be that final Proto-Celtic **-t#* became **-h* via **-s* (cf. Schrijver 1994)’ (KPV 141, n. 155).

A particle plays a significant, if problematical, role in generating a 1pl. abs. like *berm(a)i* from **beromos-es*, but **beromosi(-e)s* has no formal edge over **bero-mosi* and so reduces to zero a ‘particle package’ that once claimed up to four items out of seven.

The trouble with OIr. 1pl. abs. *-mi* < **-mosi(±e)s* and rel. *-me* < **-mosi-yo* is that both are essentially *ad hoc*, insofar as the intervening steps are devised to lead, with the help of some special pleading, from a desired preform to the required outcome. It is not clear that *-oy(-)* < *-o(h)i-* < *-osi(-)* would have yielded palatalising *-ī(-)* > OIr. *-i* rather than non-palatalising *-ē(-)* > OIr. *-e* as in pret. pass. 3sg. rel. *brethae* ‘who/which was borne’ < **breθoy* < **briθo(h)ya* < **britos-yo* or OIr. stressed (ro:)boi /boi/ ‘was’ < **boy* (RelChron. 131) < **bow’* < **bow-e* versus unstressed *-ra-bae* /ra-βe/ < **bē* < **boy* etc. Thurneysen saw a possible way out: ‘The 1pl. [abs.] may go back to *-mesi*, thus corresponding to Skt. *-masi* (the by-form of *-mah*). The doubling of *m* is probably due to the influence of the copula, where 1sg. **es-mi*, pl. **es-mesi* (?) gave **emmi*, **emmesi*’ (GOI 361–2). ODVC (100) suggest that ‘OIr. 1pl. *bermai* can be plausibly derived from a Proto-Celtic primary ending **-mosi* (> **-mohi* > **-moī* > **-moi* > **-mī* >

OIr. *-mi*; ... **-mesi* > OIr. *-mi* would be even easier formally in line with **-tesi* > OIr. *thi* ... but hard to square with the undoubted **ber-o-mos* underlying 1pl. conj. *-beram* etc.). Cowgill's **-mos-es* could be salvaged by a development (like *brethae* < **britos-es*) to OIr. 1pl. abs. **-me* identical with rel. *-me* (< **-mē* < **-moy* < **-mo(h)ya* < **-mos-yo*) and then creation of a distinctive abs. from the corresponding EOIr. 2pl. forms: 2pl. rel. **-the* : abs. **-thi* = 1pl. rel. *-me* : abs. *x* (*x* = *-mi*). Nevertheless, if sec./prim. 2pl. **-tes* had been reshaped in Italo- or Proto-Celtic to **-tes/*-tesi* on the model of 2sg. sec./prim **-s/*-si*, sec./prim. 1pl. **-mos* would most likely have followed suit, becoming **-mos/*-mosi*.

The two attested ablaut variants (e.g. EGk. *-mes* but Lat. *-mus*) seem likely (Rix 1976: 240; cf. *ODVC* 100) to have originated as accented **-més* in amphikinetic athematic paradigms (e.g. Ved. *ás-mi* 'I am', *s-más* 'we are' < PIE **h₁és-mi*, **h₁s-més*) and unaccented **-mos* elsewhere, notably in thematic paradigms. Generalisation of the latter in the OIr. 1pl. conj. (e.g. *-beram* 'we bear' < **-beroqah* < **ber-o-mos(i)*) is no surprise in view of the prevalence of thematic formations in Insular Celtic (McCone 1986: 227–9 and 243–54). Unlike the corresponding British form (e.g. MW *-af* < **-a-μi* < **-a-mi*), originally athematic OIr. 1sg. abs./conj. *-(a)im(m)* (e.g. *ben(a)im(m)* 'I strike'; PIC **bi-na-mi*) has an unlenited /m'/, which must also have come from the copula (1sg. *a-m* < **e-m'* < **e-mmi* < **es-mi*). GOI's 1pl. abs. *-(m)mi* /-m'i/ from cop. 1pl. abs. *a-mmi* < **e-m'i* would make morphological as well as phonological sense in the likely event that the verb 'to be' preserved 1pl. athem. prim. **-mes(i)*.

It would imply 1pl. conj. *-beram* < **-beroqah* < **ber-o-mos* < **-mosi* and PC 1pl. primary/secondary **-mosi/*-mos* for the most part but **-mesi/*-mes* in still athematic **e(s)-* with pres. ind. **e-mmese/*e-mmes* < **es-mesi/*es-mes*. If this contrast survived into Primitive Irish, the result would have been 1pl. abs./rel. **bero-μe* (< **-mosi(-yo)*) and 2pl. abs. **bere-θ'i* (< **-tesi*), rel. *bere-θ'e* (< **-tesi-yo*; §2 above) in most verbs but fully symmetrical 1pl. abs. **e-m'i*, rel. **e-m'e* and 2pl. abs. **e-θ'i*, rel. **e-θ'e* in the common copula. There would then be natural pressure towards homogeneous symmetry by replacing (non-pal.) abs./rel. **-μe* with the copula's (pal.) abs./rel. **-m'i/*-m'e* (rel. < **-mesi-yo* just like **-θ'e* < **-tesi-yo* in §2) as 1pl. counterparts of (pal.) 2pl. abs./rel. **-θ'i/*-θ'e*. Unlenited 1pl. **bena-m'i* (> OIr. *benm(a)i* 'we strike') etc. then exposed 1sg. **bena-μ'* (< **bina-μi*) to the copula's influence: abs. 1pl. **e-m'i* : **bina-m'i* = 1sg. **e-m'* : *x* (*x* = **bena-m'* > OIr. *ben(a)im(m)*). This account provides a hitherto lacking reason for cop. **-mmes(i)* vs **-mos(i)* elsewhere and a motive for the copula's undeniable analogical influence upon other verbs in the 1st person.

4. MORE PROBLEMS WITH PARTICLES

PrimIr. loss of only the last syllable of OIr. proclitic neg. rel. *nad* < **ne-de*, *nach* < **ne-k^w(e)-en* and *nacham* < **ne-k^we-mu* etc. shows that enclitics and their host formed a single phonological unit. As Boling (1972: 75) puts it, 'the pretonic portion functions as a word and not as a collection of separate words: i.e., there are no occurrences of word boundaries of any sort between the various formatives of the pretonic complex'. Although far from ubiquitous in main

clauses, Indic *id* and probable Gaulish *id* (§1 above) make Boling's **ed* the most functionally viable particle proposed so far. It also calls for no word boundaries within the proclitic chain as a rule. However, 'to explain why *fa:ceird* "puts him" is not *§fod:ceird*, as would be expected if the pretonic portion is from **wo-d-en*, and why *beirthi* "carries him" is not *§beirthid*, as would be expected from **bereti-d-en*, Boling says "that we have to do with an early reduction rule" (86) which deletes **(e)d* before a third singular masculine or neuter object pronoun. But surely an explanation is greatly to be preferred which does not have to posit such an unmotivated sporadic deletion' (Cowgill 1975: 55). Worse still, Boling's basic *fo:ceird* 'puts' < **wo-(e)d:kerdet* was falsified by identical leniting neut. sg. **ed* as in OIr. *f-a:cheird* 'puts it' < **w(o)-e(d):kerdet* (§1), and OIr. *na* 'any' < **neh* < PIC **nek^(w)* < **ne-k^wi* < **ne-k^wid* (§1) makes **(e)d* incapable of shielding **-i* from loss: e.g. 3sg. **bereti-d* > **bereti* > **beret* > **bereh* > OIr. **beir* (not *be(i)rid*) or 1sg. **berū-d* > **berū* > **biru* > **biur* (not *biru*). In short, Boling's **ed* is utterly untenable formally.

A consonant lost intervocalically was needed, and that boiled down to a single *s* making *f-a:ceird* and *beirth-i* 'quite regular from **wo-s-en kerdet* and **beretisen*' (Cowgill 1975: 55). The originally 3sg. nom. m. enclitic subject pronoun **is* (or **es* in view of PIC **ed* or **en* for **id* and **im*; Schrijver 1997: 51–63) advocated by Dillon (1943) was to be rejected, despite phonological advantages over other candidates, because of two serious functional drawbacks: (a) there is no need or evidence for such a form in PIE or its non-Anatolian descendants, including Celtic, where personal verbal inflections were the grammatical indicators of a pronominal subject;¹⁹ (b) its supposed spread from 3sg. m. **beret(i)-is* to other persons to give 3pl. **beront(i)-is*, 1sg. **berū(i)s* etc. is hard to justify.

Pedersen (VKG ii, 340–4) presented a mishmash of abs./conj. from athem./them. prim. endings (§1, esp. n. 3) with some analogy in the 1/2sg. but otherwise sec. endings (> conj.) plus matching enclitic subject pronouns (> abs.) in combinations of varying antiquity: abs. 3sg. **beret is*, 3pl. **beront ei* (< nom. pl. m. **joi*; VKG i, 170), 1pl. (after PrimIr. apocope) **berom ni*, 2pl. (old) **berete wes*. The idea of varying subj. pronouns has been taken up and developed (but with **is* in 3pl. as well as 3sg.) into a less arbitrary scheme of suffixation to (except for them. 1sg. **-ū*) **-i-* and lenition-blocking infixation by Budassi and Roma (2018). Their key proposal, namely assimilation of 'old subject clitic' pronouns in Wackernagel position to main-clause verbs to contrast them as declarative with relative forms marked by **-yo* (Budassi/Roma 2018: 301), is vitiated by the *notae augentes* (GOI 252) of Old Irish and the functionally as well as formally

¹⁹Dillon later (1947: 21–4) compared his Celtic **is* with Hittite subject enclitic *-aš*, but it has since been shown that the latter (e.g. OHitt. *aki-aš* or *n-aš aki* 'he dies') was an Anatolian innovation: 'Hittite and other Anatolian languages show a *split-ergative* system ... an important common innovation of the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European family. It is closely connected with another important morpho-syntactic innovation of Common Anatolian, the development of enclitic subject pronouns with "unaccusative" intransitive verbs' (Watkins 2004: 560). This refers to a classification of intransitive verbs as "unaccusative" [e.g. 'die', 'hide'] if the subject is "notionally equivalent to the object" and "unergative" [e.g. 'look', 'speak'] if it is 'notionally identical to the subject of their corresponding transitive counterparts' (Watkins 2004: 564).

similar affixed pronouns of British (GMW 57–8 on Middle Welsh): these are almost certainly derived from secondarily cliticised PIC subject pronouns (cf. Griffith 2011: 184) and the OIr. *notae* do not behave as Wackernagel enclitics but are regularly attached to the end of the verbal complex (ODVC 214–24; Greene 1973: 122–30), probably to mark a pronominal topic in the first instance (Griffith 2011: 184). Their form, placement and function thus differ markedly from those of the subject pronouns envisaged by Budassi and Roma, and it is not clear how both developments could have taken place or, indeed, why main-clause marking was needed when **-yo* already marked relative clauses. Analysis of Gaulish *-u-mi* as 1sg. *-ū* plus cliticised 1sg. subject pron. *-mi* < *mī* (Budassi/Roma 2018: 304–6; cf. Sims-Williams 1984: 151) seems less likely than 1sg. them. *-ū* + athem. *-mi* (cf. Gaulish *mī iegūmi* with overt 1sg. subj. pron. *mī*; §2 above). The reconstructions of the supposed affixes as 1sg. **-m(V)*, 2sg. **-t(V)*, 1pl. **-n(V)*, 2pl. **-w(V)* (rather than expected but intractable **-sw(V)*) is unacceptably imprecise, especially since their unspecified vowels are arbitrarily included or excluded as needed (e.g. Budassi/Roma 2018: 315–27). Incompatibility between abs. 2sg. **berisi-t* (not **berisi-tu*) > **birīθ* > *biri* (316) and 2pl. **beretesi* + **w(V)* > **beretesiV* > **beretehiV* > **bereθei* > *berthe* could be resolved by positing original OIr. 2pl. **-thi* < **bereθih* < **beretesiV* (cf. §2 above), but fusional pronominal approaches still raise far more questions than they answer.

Cowgill (1975: 66) noted that ‘*es*, ‘*s* is exactly what should develop in Primitive Irish and Early British from an apocopated enclitic Celtic **est* < PIE **esti* ‘is’ and would be ‘quite at home’ in 3sg. pass. pret. **britos es(t)* > OIr. *brethae* (abs.) ‘was carried’ or **nī’s(t) britos* > OIr. *ní:breth* ‘was not carried’, but was mystified by its spread thence ‘to all other indicative and subjunctive non-relative verb forms’. Another problem got short shrift: ‘That **bereti-s(t)* must have been formed before *-i* had been lost in ordinary presents is not a decisive argument against this etymology, since enclitic **esti* can well have been apocopated in advance of other verbs’ (Cowgill 1975: 67). Lack of a viable alternative trumped concerns about ‘etymology and rationale’ and Cowgill (1975: 67) invoked Sherlock Holmes’s adage in chapter 1 of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s novel *The Sign of Four*: ‘eliminate all other factors, and the one which remains must be the truth’. An asseverative function in declarative main clauses was then suggested for **es* < **esti* ‘it is (so)’ (Cowgill 1975b: 30–2; Kortlandt 1979: 51–2;²⁰ Kim 2002: 151).

Schrijver (1994: 180–6 and 1997: 131–80) sought to improve the semantics by deriving **es* < **et* < **eti* ‘and’ (183). Since his and Schumacher’s (KPV 96–114) claims are criticised elsewhere (ODVC 225–46 and 112–15), a couple of points will suffice. The semantics are fairly straightforward and there are obvious cognates (Gk. *éti* ‘still’, Lat. *et* ‘and’, Goth. *ip* ‘but’), including Gaulish

²⁰ Although he later expressed doubts: ‘We may have to return Pedersen’s view and derive the particle from the Italo-Celtic subject pronoun **es* (PIE **e*), Latin *is*, Old Irish *é*’ (Kortlandt 1984: 182, n. 3). Since Lat. *is* and OIr. *é* were not enclitic and a pronominal subject was indicated by a verb’s personal endings, not an enclitic pronoun, from PIE to OIr., this effective reprise of Dillon’s **is* (rather than Pedersen’s model) has little to recommend it.

eti-c (§2 above), but none of these is enclitic and leniting initial O/MW *yt/d* (GMW 171–2) would be a regular reflex of non-enclitic PIC **eti* (ODVC 231–2). Allegedly parallel narrative *nu* in SOV late Hittite (Risch *apud* Cowgill 1975: 68) and *wa* ‘and’ in VSO Biblical Hebrew (KPV 102) are both sentence-initial like O/MW *yt/d* and Hitt. *nu*’s OIr. cognate *nu/no*. This and occupation of the PIC ‘Wackernagel’ connective slot by **k^we* ‘and’ and **de* ‘and, but’ (ODVC 227) make conversion of initial **eti* into a still unparalleled general enclitic marker of main clauses (cf. Koch 2022: 59) most implausible. Once cliticised onto the verbal complex, already apocopated **et* < **eti* underwent loss of its initial vowel after any other vowel (like Dillon’s **(i/e)s*, Boling’s **(e)d* and Cowgill’s **(e)sti*) and otherwise unnecessary *-t* > *-s* (Schrijver 1994: 165–77; criticised by ODVC 225–6). Schumacher (§3 above) ignored *-t* > *-s* (§3 above) by proceeding straight from **(e)t* > **(e)θ* > **(e)h* in KPV, but counter-intuitive auslaut *-θ/s* to *-h* was still necessary directly before an enclitic pronoun (cf. Cowgill 1985: 117) in breach of Boling’s principle above. There was a blatant mismatch between this supposed boundary (#) and the lack of one with a directly preceding verb or preverb that was indispensable for blocking PIC auslaut loss of *-i* in, say, **bereti-(e)t*, **bereti-t^h-e(n)* > OIr. *beirid*, *beirithi* ‘bears (him)’.

Generalisation of already apocopated **es*, whether < enclitic **esti* or **eti*, in main clauses before apocope of *-ti* or **-si* elsewhere is hard to swallow. The phonetic convenience of Dillon’s **is* explains Cowgill’s and Schrijver’s deployment of implausible *ad hoc* auslaut developments within the enclitic chain to reduce their own particles to **es*. A form like **beret-es-e(n)* etc. combining an apocopated particle and verb would be preferable to **bereti-s-e(n)* as a source of OIr. *beirithi*, but would have to become **beret-is-e(n)* via *es* > *is*. This is ruled out because apocope of **esti* (or **essi*) or **eti* > **est* (or **ess*) or **et* must have preceded its attachment to apocopated **beret* < **bereti* etc., by which time necessarily pre-apocope *esV* > *isV* would have ceased to operate. As Schrijver (1997: 150) admits, ‘the assumed phonological development of the particle is tricky’.

The very idea of enclitic **esti* founders on the OIr. copula’s frequently initial position. Its proclisis to a stressed predicate (e.g. Wb. 1^a2 *is día-som*, 8^d26 *ammi mogae* etc.) is parallel to the likes of proclitic preposition + stressed noun (ODVC 65) and can involve attachment to a ‘conjunct particle’ (GOI 28), as in neg. *ní fír* ‘it isn’t true’ < **nīs ‘wīron* (‘ = stress on the following syllable) with *ī* demonstrating **ne* + *esti* > **nēsti* (in PIE according to Cowgill 1975: 66) before PC *ē* > *ī*. Fused NV^{cop} underwent a normal PIC shift to initial position before proclisis to its predicate in **nīs ‘wīron*. In 3sg. augm. pret. *nírbo* < **nī-ro-βowe*, the copula was originally no more enclitic than the preverb/augment *ro* (EIV 92–3 and 127–60), both being part of a complex NroV^{cop} made proclitic to a stressed substantival predicate. Otherwise proclisis of a negative to a finite verb plus preverb(s) was the norm, whence a formal split between copula (e.g. OIr. *nírbo*) and substantive verb (e.g. OIr. *ní:ra-bae* ‘has not been’ < **nī ‘ro-βowe*). A preform **esti-st* (or **essi-s(s)*) combining unapocopated 3sg. pres. cop. **esti* (or **essi*) with already apocopated enclitic 3sg. cop. **(e)st* (or **(e)ss*) is frankly preposterous.

Since they too are tainted by phonological irregularity (precocious apocope of *-i* and quasi-auslaut *-ss* or *-t* > *-s* > *-h* within an enclitic chain), **s(s)* < **(e)st* < **esti* or **s* < **(e)t* < **eti* are no real improvement on Boling's **(e)d*. Since 3sg. abs. *marbais* 'killed' (< **marwass-ess/-et* < **marwast*) necessitates placing the particle's addition to the verbal complex before *-ss* > *-s* (otherwise OIr. **marb(a)e* < **marwaheh* < **marwas-es*), one would expect not OIr. *beirthi* 'bears him', *f-a:ceird* 'puts him' but **beirthis*, **fo-s:ceird* < **bereti-(e)ss-en*, **wo-(e)ss-en:kerdet*. Such outcomes are evaded by positing *ad hoc* and, in view of OIr. *is* < **issi* < **esti*, highly questionable simplification of the particle to **es*. This burdens an element whose sole *raison d'être* is to account for apparent irregularities in the verbal complex with yet another irregularity of its own. Kim (2002) tries to do without precocious apocope of **essi* by invoking arbitrary early elisions (cf. Schrijver's *cot*: < **kon-t-e(n)* < **kon-et-en*; §5 below) as well as pretonic **(e)ssi* > **(e)si* affecting the particle but not the copula (ODVC 82–3 and 231). This is no better than the supposed immunity of Boling's **ed* to the loss of *-d* that affected the identical pronoun.

After completing its lenition-blocking mission, the particle is required to disappear without further trace – often under what can only be described as suspicious circumstances: a final *-i* must always be apocopated, an initial vowel regularly removed by aphaeresis, and the consonantal residue converted to a single *s* destined for loss (via lenition-blocking *h*) intervocally or in postvocalic auslaut. Invariable aphaeresis is essential because the tangible results of elisions etc. elsewhere are conspicuous by their absence: e.g. *fo:ceird* 'puts' but *fa:cheird* 'puts it' < **w(o)-e χerde* < (+ particle) **wo-h-e kerdeh* < **wo-(e)s(s)-e(d) kerdet*.

As a result of 'fiendishly complicated'²¹ (Griffith 2020: 239) engineering by its adherents, in Irish (and, most likely, British too; §5 below) 'the particle **eti* is itself totally lost. The only clue to its original existence is the presence of additional morphological material on the verb in the absolute endings [but see §§2–3 above] ... and the lack of otherwise expected lenition ... Given this lack of direct evidence, any additional evidence for the presence of the Cowgill particle would be quite welcome' (Griffith 2020: 240). This is sought in uncommon pretonic *ceta/cita* 'first' (Wb. *cetu* once; see 242 for 13 exx. in glosses with refs.). Although 'the standard assumption underlying the particle theory is that the **e* was elided after any vowel', Griffith (2020: 246) posits 'no elision of the **e* of **eti* after **u*' and so: **kentu-eti* > **kentuēti* > **kēdoūeh* > **kēdoū* > **kēdoi* > **kēde* > *ceta*. Pretonic *ocu* in 'fairly rare' *ocu:ben* (2020: 246 for 6 exx. in ML., including prot. *-ocman-*) is derived similarly to *ce/ita*, despite puzzlement (247) about their *-u* and *-a*. This will only work before PIC aphaeresis of **eti* (or rather **et*; n. 21 above), since the form added would otherwise have been **-t* or still later **-h* incapable of preserving the final vowel of **onku't*, **ogu'h* or **kentu't*,

²¹For example, Griffith's (2020: 240) *do'cing* < **to-(e)ti-kingeti* with an as yet unapocopated particle in the verbal complex would necessitate a good deal of 'whack-a-mole' elsewhere (cf. the above remarks on Kim's proposal). If, say, quasi-auslaut **(e)ti-tu-* > **-t-tu-* > OIr. *-t* 'you (sg.)' had coincided with actual auslaut **-i* > *-ø*, the result would have presumably been **-kingeti-(e)ti* > **-kinget-t* > OIr. **cingit*. So that must be ruled out.

**kedu'h* (*RelChron.* 107 on non-lengthening of unstressed *e/ɪ* before lost *n*). However, their use as preverbs looks like an Irish innovation, given *ce/ita*'s invariable proclisis (e.g. *fris-cita:comrici* 'whom you first encounter'; *Thes.* ii, 23.38) and consequent lack of prototonic **cét-*. Mole-whacking would also be needed, since Griffith's proposal entails main-clause **nuwet(i)* > **now'* > **noy* > **na* instead of OIr. *nu/no* and presumably also 1sg. **berūwet(i)* > **berūweh* > **beruwe* > **beruy* > **birui* > OIr. **bir(a)i* (cf. OIr. *as:luí, -élai* 'absconds') or > **beruy* > **beroi* (cf. Griffith 2020: 246, n. 13) > OIr. **ber(a)e* rather than *biru*.²² Obviously, *ce/ita* 'first' is too problematical to provide badly needed support for a particle.

The very probable PrimIr. origin of uncommon *ceta/cita* 'first' and *ocu* makes PIC **et(i)* very improbable as the reason for their final vowels. The similar looking preverb *ce/ita* found solely in composition with the substantive verb as *ce/ita:bí* 'perceives' etc. and attested under the stress as expected *cét-* (in its verbal noun *ceítbuid* 'perception' Wb 24^b4) is also uncommon (Wb. 1×, Ml. 7×, Sg. 1×, all but three in rel. clauses; Griffith 2020: 247). However, the compound must go back to PIC **kanta-bi-* on account of MW *canfod* 'perceive' (Griffith 2020: 241). In this case, a contrast between main-clause **cet:* < **keda* < **kanta* and rel. *ceta:* < **keda-ya* < **kanta-yo* (< *-yo) could well have been levelled in the latter's favour (García-Castillero 2014: 87–9). If the motive was the avoidance of /db/ with juxtaposed voiced stops, the same explanation would apply to **cet:* 'first' < **ke/ɪdu* vs rel. **ceto* < **ke/ɪdu-ya*, followed by **ceto* > *ceta*.²³ There is no need for a particle.

5. THE PRESENT INDICATIVE PARADIGM OF THE COPULA, ESPECIALLY WITH NEGATIVE *NE

Schrijver puts neg. 3sg. pres. ind. MW *nyt*, OIr. *ní* '(it) is not') centre-stage (1994: 186) in claiming direct reflexes of his particle as -*t-* [d] in British: 'The British forms most likely reflect **ne-eti esti* > **nīti essi* > **nīt ess* (early *i*-apocope) > **nīdess* (fusion) > *nyd* (post-apocope). Here, the MW -*t* reflects the connector **eti* and the copula ... The syntagm is comparable with OIr. *nad* 'who is not' < **ne-de esti* ... It follows that OIr. *ní* "is not" reflects a similar syntagm, **ne-eti esti*, which became **nīt ess* > (early *i*-apocope) > pr.Ir. **nīs es* > **nīh eh* > **nīheh* (fusion) > **ní h-*'. This does not follow. Like OIr. *ní* 'is not' < **nīh* < **nīst(i)* (by

²²Since the only plausible mechanism for preserving *e* from contraction with preceding *ū* would be insertion of a glide *w*, Koch's (2022: 60–1) proposed derivation of OIr. 1sg. *biru* < **berū-e* (by contraction, > **berū* > **biur*) is hardly viable as it would entail **berūwe* liable to the same development as **berūwe(h)* with a reflex of **et(i)*.

²³Since pretonic *ro*, *to/do* and *fo* (with original *o* clear from prototonic forms) regularly appear (under the influence of *nu?*) as *ru*, *tu/du* and *fu* in early OIr., it seems quite likely that usual *ro*, *do*, *fo* and *no* in Wb. onwards are due to *u* > *o* in proclitics (cf. *RelChron.* 135) and that proclitic *o* had become *a* prior to this, as in nom./acc. neut. article 'the' or antecedent 'that (which)' *a* < **on* < **som*. It is also possible that merger of -*o* with -*a* in non-initial syllables (*RelChron.* 139) occurred particularly early in proclitics or even that *ce/ito* 'first' was confused with *ce/ita* in *ce/ita:bí*. Non-rel. **oc* < **ogu* < **onku* and rel. **oco* < **ogo-ya* < **onku-yo* could have undergone the same type of levelling as *ceta*, in which case the -*u* of *ocu* may be due to a rounding environment for an unstressed vowel between a guttural and a labial (cf. McCone 2015: 127–8).

PC $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$; *RelChron.* 59) < **nēsti*, **ne eti* > **nīti* presupposes **nēti* and PC $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$. If so, enclitic **eti* should have been a feature of PC main clauses, despite a complete lack of Celtiberian and (*pace* Schrijver 1997: 177–9) Gaulish evidence.

The negative pres. ind. of the OIr. copula contains a straightforward correspondence to *nyt* in MW 1/2/3 sg. *nyt wyf/wyt/yw*, pl. *nyt ym/ywch/ynt*, namely *níd-/nīd-/nīd̄/* < **nīθ-V* < **nīt-V*:- 1sg. 1 *nida* (Wb. 18^c1; *nita* 20^c25), 1pl. *nidan* (14^c41, 14^d37; *nitan* 18^b9, *nitam* 15^b21 ‘prima manus’), 2sg. *cenita* (Ml. 84^c3; cf. *a nu-nda* 38^c27), 2pl. *nidad* (Wb. 8^c7, *nidad* 14^a8, 21^b14; *nitad* 9^d11); 3pl. *nitat* (4^a8, + 16 more exx., *nítat* 9^b17 and 12^b18; *LexWb* 587). The origin of 1/2sg. *-a* is obscure but their *-d/t-* is undoubted. The 3pl. is *nitat* (rarely *nítat*) in Wb. but *nit* in a couple of slightly later OIr. exx.²⁴ Either *nit* was doubled to *nit-at* pre-Wb. after 2pl. *níd-ad* or inherited *nitat* was sometimes truncated to *nit* matching 3pl. *it* ‘are’. Regular Wb. *nitat* shows that sporadic *nítat* (e.g. Ml. 115^b1) is analogical to 1/2pl. *níd-* and not < **nīθ-id* < **nīt-int*. 1/2sg./pl. *nit*-beside *níd-* is clearly from the 3pl. and may have triggered shortening of *níd-* to *nīd-*, at least sometimes, sporadic 3pl. *nítat* showing the reverse.

The following PC paradigm of the pres. ind. of the verb ‘to be’ (cf. McCone 1995: 123) may be reconstructed (> denoting direct and → at least partially analogical outcomes): sg. 1 **es-mi* > **e-mmi* (OIr. *am*, Gaul. *i(m)mi*; Lambert 1994: 62), 2 **e-si* (OIr. *a/i-t*), 3 **es-ti* → **is-ti* (OIr. *is*, MW *ys*), pl. 1 **s-mesi* → **es-mesi* > **e-mmesi* (OIr. *ammi*; conj. EOIr. *-am*, OIr. *-an*, MW *ym*), 2 **stesi* → **e-tesi* (OIr. *adi(b)*, conj. *-ad*), 3 **s-enti* → **e-nti* > **inti* (*RelChron.* 55–6; OIr. *it*, MW *ynt*). The sg. full- vs pl. zero-grade root seen in Vedic (sg. 1 *ás-mi*, 2 *ási*, 3 *ás-ti*, pl. 1 *s-más*, 2 *s-thá*, 3 *s-ánti*) tends to be levelled elsewhere: e.g. Attic (unless noted otherwise) Greek sg. 1 *εἰμί* < **es-mi*, 2 *εἶ* < **esi*, 3 *ἐστί* < **es-ti*, pl. 1 *εἰμέν* (Ionic; Attic *ἐσμέν* analogical to the 2pl.) < **es-men*, 2 *ἐστέ* < **es-te*, 3 *εἰσι* (Doric *ἐντι*), Myc. *eesi* /*eensi*/ < **es-enti* (Chantraine 1961: 205). Celtic was similar, but 2sg. **e-si* generated 2pl. **e-tesi*, PC *-sm-* > *-mm-* (*RelChron.* 45–6) produced 1sg./pl. **e-mmi*/**e-mmesi*, and 1/2pl. **e-mmesi*/**e-tesi* may well have triggered 3pl. **s-enti* → **e-nti*,²⁵ leaving **es-* only in the commonest and so most resilient form, where 3sg. **i/issi* (> OIr. *is*, O/MW *is/ys*) could be due to PC **nīnti* : **inti* = **nīsti* : x (x = **isti*). The PC 2sg. may then have been remodelled through **nīsti* : **isti*²⁶ = **nīsi* : x (x = **isi*), *i-* later spreading in Gaulish to yield 1sg. *i-mmi* (2×) at least.

The PIC neg. forms were thus sg. 1 **nīt-emm(i)*, 2 **nīt-is(i)*, 3 **nīs(s)* (< **nīst(i)*), pl. 1 **nīt-emmis(i)*, 2 **nīt-etis(i)*, 3 **nint(i)* (< **nīnti*; *RelChron.* 55 and 63) and/or **nint-int*. The relationship between PIC 2pl. **etisi(-)* and **nītetis* (> OIr. *adi(b)* and *nidad*) could have generated from 3pl. neg. **nint* a PIC neg.

²⁴Ml. 128^d1, *Thes.* ii 292.18 (a poem in the Ml. codex), and perhaps *Félire Óengusso* (ed. Stokes 1905, and dated to c. 800 AD but extant only in much later mss.; *GOI* 7) Mar. 1 and Sept. 8. The last two are metrically guaranteed as monosyllables in the original composition and could alternatively be 2sg., in which case they seem to have been modelled on affirmative 2sg. *it* (§2 above; cf. *GOI* 485).

²⁵3pl. cop. OIr. *it*, MW *ynt* would then not have arisen by PIC loss of *s-* in proclitics as claimed in *RelChron.* 98.

²⁶Which probably replaced **isti* sooner or later, as *i* was otherwise only found before a nasal (*RelChron.* 55–6). If not, 2sg. **isi* would presumably have developed in the same way as **isi*.

**nint-int* matching **inti* (> OIr. *it*, MW *ynt* ‘(they) are’). That it did is indicated by neg. *nyns* (< **nint*) used before vowel-initial forms of the verbs ‘to be’ and, by extension, ‘to go’ in Middle Cornish (Lewis 1946: 49): e.g. *nynsoff* ‘am not’, *nynsyw* ‘is not’, and *nynsyns* ‘are not’ < **nint-int*. 3pl. **nint-* seems to have triggered **nīt-* to **nit-* (> MW *nyd*, MBret. *ned*) in British or even PIC. In the latter case, OIr. *níd-* beside *nid-* would be due to 3sg. *ní* < **nīh* < **nīst(i)*. Reflexes of **nīt-* and **nint-* survived in OIr. (and MBret. *ned* and *nend*; Hemon 1975: 281), but **nit-* prevailed in Welsh and **nint-* in Cornish.

OIr. *níd-ad* etc. may hide a regular reflex of *(*e*)*t(i)* in plain sight but Schrijver (1997: 132–4) looks away to *cot-*, positing 3sg. m./n. infix (class B) < **kod-e(n)* < **kon-t-e(n)* < **kon-et-en* through ‘*ad hoc* ... early syncope’ (135) in proclitics only before ‘auslaut’ *-*et-* > *-*es-* essential to his derivation of other OIr. forms. Since the vowel of other persons remains unexplained, the **de* ‘and, but’ just replaced by **et(i)* ‘and’ is now added to it, optionally in 3sg. m./n. **kon-(e)t(-de)-e(n)* but regularly in 3sg. f./3pl. **kon-(e)t-de-sin/-sus* > **kodē(-h)in/(-h)uh* > *co-ta*. 1sg./pl. *cotom/n* are due to an anaptyxis of **kodm/n* at odds with OIr. *maidm* ‘breaking’ etc., and 2sg./pl. to influence from class C: e.g. 2sg. *co-tot* for **co-t* (< **kod-tu* < **kon-(e)t-tu*) on the analogy of *condot* < **kon-de-tu*. A single substitution of analogical *cot(-)* for **cond(-)* < **kon-de(-)* is surely preferable to this jumble (ODVC 229–31).

Schrijver (cf. KPV 96) discounts MW *nyt* = OIr. *níd-/nid-* by established sound laws in favour of MW *nyt* = OIr. *ní* by an essentially *ad hoc* PrimIr. -*t(-)* > -*s(-)* needed to make **et(i)* work in Irish. An OIr. trace of -*t* is then conjured from *cot(-)* by *ad hoc* pre-apocope proclitic syncope, addition of **de* ‘and’ to *(*e*)*t(i)* ‘and’, anaptyxis and analogy. There is a reason for this: if MW *nyt/d* /*níd/* and OIr. *níd-/nid-* /*nīð/* contain reflexes of **eti*, its *-*t-* underwent normal intervocalic development in Irish, thereby disproving a quasi-auslaut change -*t-* > -*s-* necessary for **et(i)* to work there. That said, MW *nyt* etc. probably never contained **eti* anyway.

After (a) unstressed **es* > **is*, (b) *st* > *ss*, (c) general loss of -*i* and (d) -*ss* > -*s* (in that order, but b/c or c/b), the PIC forms would be (+/- neg.) sg. 1 **nīm/*emmi(-)*, 2 **nīs/*isi(-)*, 3 **nīs/*issi(-)*, pl. 1 **nīmmis/*emmisi(-)*, 2 **nītis/*etisi(-)*, 3 **nint/*inti(-)* (*RelChron.* 55–6). If not already created by analogy, 2sg. **isi(-)* would have resulted from **esi(-)* by (a), as long as the copula was already proclitic. Identity of 2sg. and 3sg. **nīs* could have been resolved by shifting 2pl. **nītis* to the 2sg. as neg. *nīt + is* matching indep. 2sg. **isi* and creating a new 2pl. neg. **nīt-etis* corresponding to indep. **etisi*. It would be natural for this transparent alternation and convenient hiatus-filling neg. **nīt* to spread to the 1st person: 2sg. **isi* : **nīt-is* = **emmi* : x (x = **nīt-em(m)*), 2pl. **etisi* : **nīt-etis* = **emmisi* : x (x = **nīt-emmis*). Addition of 3pl. **int* to **nint* rather than **nīt* resulted in **nint-int*, regularly shortened to **nint-int* (*RelChron.* 63) and then responsible for **nīt* → *nit* in British or perhaps PIC. This process was withstood only by PIC 3sg. **nīs* > OIr. *ní* ‘is not’, but completed in British by **nit-is* (> MW *nyt* ‘is not’).

This scenario undermines the case for British /-*d(-)*/ < alleged enclitic

*-et(i)²⁷ by denying it any role in the creation of MW *nyt(-)*, the convenient hiatus-filling -t of which spread from the copula to other verbs as a prevocalic alternant of neg. *ny* and also generated -t in some other environments (ODVC 232–45, incl. criticism of KPV 96–114). Allowing for the obscurity of 1/2sg. -a and the late addition of pronominal affixes -t, -b and -n, the PIC forms posited above yield most of the OIr. pres. ind. paradigm of the copula quite regularly: sg. 1 *am* (< **emmi*), 2sg. *i-t* < **isi* (or perhaps *a-t* by analogy or < **esi*;²⁸ §2 above), 3 *is* (< **issi*), pl. 1 *ammi(-n)* (< **emmisi*), 2 *adi(-b)* (< **etisi*), 3 *it* (< **int*); neg. sg. 1 *nída*, 2 *ní-da*, 3 *ní* (< **nīs*), pl. 1 *nídam/n* (< **nītemmis*), 2 **nídad* (< **nītetis*), 3 *nitat* (< **nint-int*).

6. INDEPENDENT PROTOTONIC FORMS OF THE *TADBAT* TYPE

Normal PIC > OIr. phonological rules can at least be applied to **esti*, **eti* etc. in real proclitic/pretonic auslaut before a consonant-initial tonic portion, as in deut. *fo:ceird* ‘puts’ < **wo-h* ‘kerdeh’ < **wo-(e)st(i)* ‘kerdet(i), but the same cannot be said of a vowel-initial counterpart.

Although ±h/- is not reliably indicated by use or non-use of *h-* in OIr. orthography (GOI 19–20), there is good evidence for retention of -h < *-s(s) etc. between a proclitic and a following stressed vowel right down to Modern Irish: e.g. OIr. *ní hed* ‘it isn’t’ (cop. *nī h-V* < **nīs* < **nīss* < **nīst(i)*), *a ainm* ‘her/his name’ (*a h-V/a V* < **esy-ās/o*), *cu/co (h-V)* ‘until’ (< **k^wus(s)* < **k^wut-s*; McCone 1993) = ModIr. *ní hea(dh)*, *a hainm* ‘her name’/ *a ainm* ‘his name’, *go (hoíche)* ‘until (night)’. OIr. cpd. verbs with lexical *to*, *ro* or *fo* followed by a stressed vowel should regularly have had independent deuterotonic forms in main clauses, if they had contained a particle: e.g. *fo:ácab*²⁹ /fo ‘hāgəβ/ ‘left’ < **wo-(e)s* ‘ad-gabas; *do:adbat* /do ‘haðβəd/ ‘shows’ < **to-(e)s* ‘ad-wēd-et;³⁰ *ro:ic* ‘comes’ /ro ‘hig’ / (< **ro-(e)s* ‘ink-et). However, these expectations are belied by a collection (McCone 1979: 4–6) of the relevant independent forms in the Würzburg and Milan Glosses (c. middle and end of the 8th cent. AD respectively): in main clauses, where *(e)s would be predicted, prototonic forms account for c. 63% of actives³¹ (e.g. prot. *tadbat-som* ‘shows’ 26^c1 etc.) but only c. 20% of passives (e.g. deut. *do:adbadar* ‘is shown’ 7^a13) in Wb., and there is a steep decline to about 10% of each in Ml.; in leniting relative clauses, where lack of *(e)s is non-controversial, prototonic forms constitute act./pass. Wb. 87.5%/80% and Ml. 54%/28.5%. More numerous deut. forms in the 3sg./pl. passive may well be due to pressure from always deut. independent 1st/2nd-person forms with subject infix (McCone 1979: 8): e.g. *do:ucad* ‘has been brought’ like *do-m/-b:ucad* ‘I/you (pl.) have been brought’, but non-use of such infixes in len. rel. clauses left 80% prot. forms in Wb.

²⁷See chapter 5 ‘*eti and pseudo-eti’ of ODVC (225–45) for a fuller treatment and further details.

²⁸In which case *i-t* and *i-dib* would presumably owe their vocalism to 3sg./pl. *is/it*.

²⁹See EIV 154 on its analogical *á* from augmented **-ā-ro-* < **-að-ro-*.

³⁰See McCone (1981: 35–41) on **-t’t* < **-d/tet* in this and similar cases.

³¹Combining the totals for *to* (21 prot. vs 15 deut.) and lexical (as opposed to augment) *ro* (8 vs 2). Full references are given in the article cited.

The only relevant forms in the tiny 7th-cent. corpus (*GOI* 6–7) are all deut. actives (McCone 1979: 5): *tú:ercómlásat* ‘they have put together/collected’, *tu:aisilbiu* ‘I set forth’, rel. *tu:esmot* ‘who shed’ (blood).³² The obvious inference was that prot. *tesmet* etc. simply resulted from elision of a rounded back vowel (*u/o*) in hiatus contact with a stressed vowel (i.e. *tu/ru/fu*’V_ > *t’/r’/f’*V_) by the beginning of the 8th century (McCone 1979: 5 and 7–8). ‘Wb. would thus seem to be not far removed from a stage when only prototonic forms were found’ (*ODVC* 89). Language that ‘seems on the whole to represent the Irish of the early eighth century’ (*Thes.* ii, xv) makes the *Additamenta* closer still, and their 100% score of (all main-clause) prototonic forms³³ confirms c. 700 AD as the elision’s date: act. *fác(c)ab* (*Thes.* ii, 238.15, 241.17, 242.19) or *facab* (240.14) ‘(he) left’, *facib* ‘leaves’ (240.15) and *tucad* (242.15) ‘it has been brought’. Since *tu:erchomlasat* etc. do not yet show *tu* > *du* and elision of, say, *du:adbat* ‘shows’ would have yielded **dadbat* not *tadbat*, it must have predated *tu* > *du* (McCone 1981: 41–4). This is upheld by invariable *du* for *tu* in 15 attestations such as *du:lluid* ‘came’ (5×) and *du:bbert* ‘conferred, gave’ (3×)³⁴ in the *Additamenta*. Wb. has pretonic *du/do* as well as prot. *tadbat* etc. but already displays a shift from independent prot. to normal deut. forms like *do:adbat* (see below).

Independent *tadbat* etc. cannot have contained a regular reflex /h/ of *(e)s after pretonic *tu*, *ru* or *fu*, since this would have impeded their elision or contraction, and it behoves adherents of a particle to find a credible way round this otherwise fatal obstacle.

Kortlandt’s (1982) phonological approach was predicated on denial that ‘lenited *s* first became the aspirate *h*, which has been preserved down to the present day at the beginning of fully stressed syllables’ (*GOI* 84), as in *ní hea(dh)*, *a hainm*, *go hoíche* above. Having placed loss of intervocalic *h* second in a sequence of fifteen sound-changes up to and including PrimIr. loss of final syllables (1979: 39–47), Kortlandt linked the claim ‘that [post-apocope] intervocalic **h* is always due to restoration’ (1982: 7) with a footnote that ‘this is why the reasoning of McCone (1979: 5–10 [on *tadbat* etc.]) is mistaken’. At Kortlandt’s stage 2, then, *-h* (< *-s*) was lost everywhere between vowels, including across word boundaries: e.g. (**to*-(e)s are-beret(i) >) **tu h*-are-βereh > **tu* ‘are-βereh with no **-h* < *(e)s to impede elision to OIr. *tairbir*. So far so good, but numerous reflexes of post-apocope intervocalic *h* then burden analogy with an awful lot of restoration work.

³²Wb. 7^a7 *prima manus* (apparently with an idiosyncratic use of ‘ to mark unstressed vowels), Pal. 68 2^a (*Thes.* i, 3; ‘the Irish may be at least as old as that of the chief glossator in Wb., possibly older’, *Thes.* i, xiv) and Cambrai Homily (*Thes.* ii 247, l. 19) respectively.

³³*Thes.* ii 239.3 *du:écastar* ‘it will be seen/considered’ is not an exception as the first preverb is here is *di/de* (OIr. *do:éci*, prot. *-déci* with *d*, not *t*- as in *do:meil*, *-tomil* ‘eats, consumes’ etc. with *to*), and so not liable to elision in proclisis. Pretonic *tu* > *du* was an obvious prerequisite for replacement of pretonic *di/de* by *du/do* (*GOI* 505), as here in hiatus before a vowel but not yet before a consonant, to judge from *di:rrógel* ‘acquired’ and *di:géni* ‘made’ (239.15 and 20). However, Wb. 3^a7 *ho desid* ‘when it had (settled,) been established’ is independent prototonic, perhaps under the influence of *to*-compounds after replacement of proclitic *di* by *do*.

³⁴*Thes.* II *du:bber* (239.4), *du:tét* (240.13), *du:lluid* (240.14 and 16, 241.5, 242.3 and 7), *du:llotar* (240.17 and 24), *du:chooid* (241.11, rel.), *du:bbert* (241.15&16, 242.18), *du:foid* (242.12), *du-t:fidedar* (242.13, rel.).

After loss of final syllables, the article's *-d* was devoiced to *-t* before a noun beginning with lenited *s-* (GOI 294): e.g. nom. sg. f. *int serc* (Wb. 22^b11) 'the love' /int 'erc/ < **ind herk* < **sindā serkā*; gen. sg. m. *int srotho* (ML 93^b11) 'of the stream' /int 'roθo/ < **ind hroθō* < **sindī srutōs*; dat. sg. (m.) *dint sruth* (ML 2^b2) 'from the stream' /dint 'ruth/ < **dī(hi)nd hruθ* < **dī sindū srutū*. Thurneysen contrasted post-syncope devoicing by *h* 'at the beginning of the second element of a compound' (e.g. *fochith/fochaid* [*fo* + *saigid* 'seeking'] 'tribulation' < **wo-h(a)yiθ*; *fothae* 'basis' [*fo* + *suide* 'seat'] < **wo-h(u)ð'e*) with 'no such effect on non-compound words; thus the dat. pl. of **teg**, **tech** 'house' is **tigib** < **tegesobis*, never **tichib*' (GOI 84). Thus *-h-* was lost within a lexical word plus inflections (hence *tigib* etc.) or a proclitic chain (*dind* etc.) but retained between a proclitic and a stressed word (*int serc* etc.) or on word boundaries within lexical compounds, whether nouns (*fochaid* etc.) or verbs: e.g. *do:intai* or *tintai* 'returns, translates' < **tu-ind(e)-hoy*, deut. *im:soi* 'turns' but prot. *-impai* < **imb(i)-hoy* (RelChron. 119, 128, 130). A parallel is seen in some northern varieties of Italian, where *s* is voiced intervocalically to [z] in cases like *casa* [kaza] 'house' but not over boundaries like those in *buonasera* 'good afternoon', *la sera* 'the evening' (proclitic article + noun), *lo so* 'I know (it)' or a verbal compound such as *risegnare* (*ri* 're-' + *segnare* 'mark'), all with *s* = [s] (Budassi and Roma 2018: 330).

Kortlandt (1982: 77) regards only the likes of *tigib* as regular and numerous exceptions as due 'to the gradual substitution of **h* for zero as the alternant of initial **s-* after words which ended in a vowel. The chief model for this ... was the alternation of unlenited **s-* with lenited **h-* in words which originally began in **sl-*, **sr-*, **sn-*, **sm-*, **sw-*, **sp-*'. The last three should be excluded,³⁵ but the basic idea is that, say, **ind erk* 'the love' (< **indā (h)erkā*) and **e erk* 'his love' (< **ehya (h)erkā* < **esyo serkā*) became **ind herk* and **e herk* (> OIr. *int serc*, *a s/serc* = ModIr. *a shearc*) on the model of the type **ind hliý'e* and **e hliý'e* 'the/his way' (< **sindā/esyo sligyā*; OIr. *int/a s/slige* = ModIr. *an tslí/a shlí*). Remodellings like **fo-ayīθ* (of **sayīθ*) to **fo-hayīθ* are analogical to post-syncope devoicing in, say, **dī-hl(on)dīh* < **dī-slondīt(i)* (Kortlandt 1982: 77 and 79) underlying OIr. prot. *-dīlt(a)i* (ModIr. *diúlt-*, OIr. deut. *do:sluindi* 'denies'; cf. GOI 84 and RelChron. 130).

It is not clear why *s-/h-* before *r*, *l* or *n* should have displaced *s-/ø-* before a vowel but not a consonant like *m*: e.g. *faoi cheann* but *faoi smacht*. Kortlandt (1982: 76) maintains that *-h* < *-s* < *-ss* (< *-st*, *-ts*, *-χs* etc.) was retained before vowels and 'strengthened the morphophonemic relationship between unlenited **s* and lenited **h*'. If so, the likes of (**eχs* > **ess* > **es* >) **e huχt* 'out of a/(the) bosom' (OIr. *a (h)ucht*) vs **e kaθer* 'out of a fortress/city' (< **eh k-*; OIr. *a cath(a)ir*) generated **e han'm* 'her name' instead of **e an'm* (**e* < **esyās*; henceforth vs **e an'm* 'his name' with **e* < **esyo*) matching **e kaθer* 'her

³⁵Lenition did not affect *sm-*: e.g. ModIr. *faoi smacht* 'under control' and the contrast between *in smachta* 'of the rule' and *int srotho* above. Both **sp-* and **sw-* boil down to the latter (Kortlandt 1982: 74; RelChron. 44–5), and **sw-/hw-* is only relevant if **hw-* had not already been simplified to *f-*.

fortress/city (< **e h k-*; OIr. *a cathair* vs *a chathair* ‘his fortress/city’ < **e χ-* < **e k-*).

This account is patently uneconomical, calling for (1) *-Vs V-/-V sV- > (2) -Vh V-/-V hV- > (3) -V V-*, and then for (4) post-apocope *-h V-* or *hV-* through wholesale analogical restoration of *h* and not as direct outcomes of (2). That alone calls (3) into question, but the *coup de grace* comes from the form of the article before the nom. sg. of vowel-initial masc. nouns: e.g. *int athir* ‘the father’ (Wb. 4^b13 etc., *LexWb* 542–3; ModIr. *an t-athair*) < **int (h)aθ’ir* < **ind haθ’ir* < **inda haθir* < **indah aθir* < *(s)*indos atir*, whereas Kortlandt requires **indah aθir* > **inda aθir* > *ind aθir*, at which point ‘the antevocalic *h* of *int* “the” < **ind-h* ... was taken from the position before a consonant’ (1982: 77).

The trouble is that there is no trace of *int* < **ind-h* before any m. nom. sg. noun beginning with a consonant, including *f* (< *w*), *r*, *l*, and *n* (*LexWb* 542): e.g. *in bethu* (Wb. 31^a9), *in gním* (12^a6), *in coimdiu* (8^a6, + 7 more exx.), *in macc* (6^d6, + 3 more), *in sonirt* (10^c3), *in fer* (9d18, + 5 more), *in rect* (1^d4 + 13^d27), *in rinnd* (13^d25), *in linn* (4^d7, + 2 more), *in lie* (4^d16), *in nóibad* (25^b2). Since the likes of *int srotho*, *dont sruth* above show that the resonants *r*, *l* or *n* were quite compatible with *int*, regular OIr. *in* (never *int*) before them in Wb. is conclusive. Kortlandt (1982: 79) admits ‘that word-final **h* seems to have caused ordinary gemination of an initial resonant and to have been lost before the apocope’ but not that this disproves his claim that prevocalic *int* < **ind-h* was analogical to preconsonantal **ind-h*. The fact is that there is no evidence whatever for post-apocope survival of *-h* except before vowels. There is, moreover, post-syncope devoicing of preposition bases with final *-CV* historically (e.g. *im* < **imbi* < **ambi*) by acc. 3sg. f. **-he* (< **-siyan*; McCone 1993: 172–3) and 3pl. **-hu* (< **-sūs*): e.g. *imp-e/-u* ‘around her/them’ < **imb(i)-h’é/-hu*, *cucc-e/-u* ‘towards her/them’ (ModIr. *chui*, *chucu*) < **kug(u)-h’é/-hu* (McCone 1993: 173–5), *int-e/-iu* ‘into her/them’ < **ind’(e)-h’é/-hu* vs *imm-* (< *imb-*), *cucc-* (ModIr. *chu(i)g-*) and *ind-* in the rest of the paradigms (*GOI* 272–6), where the personal affixes did not begin with *s*. The devoiced variants demonstrate survival of intervocalic *h* on word boundaries at least until syncope, but there was no relevant *h* + *C* form as a source for the analogical **imb-h-*, **kug-h-*, **ind-h-* needed by Kortlandt. His universal intervocalic *s* > *h* > *ø* is quite untenable as a means of deleting *-h* (< *(*e*)*s*) to expose a form like **to(-h)=are-βereh* (< **bereθ* < **beret(i)*) to the elision (or contraction) responsible for OIr. *tairbir* and so on.

The treatment of PrimIr. final syllables implies the following sequence (McCone 1982: 24–5): (i)(a) *VsV > VhV*, and (b) *-Vχ/θ/s* (inc. *-s* < *-ss* < *-χs/-st/-ts* etc.) > *-Vh*; (ii) *-V̄ > -V̇* (but *-V̄C*, inc. *-V̄h*, unchanged); (iii) *-Vh V- > -VhV-* (but *-Vh C-* unchanged); (iv) *-h > -ø*; (v) *-V̇ > -ø* (but retention of *-V̄* < *-V̄h* by (iv)); (vi) *-V̄ > -V̇* (since (v) had removed a phonemic contrast *-V̄/-V̇*). Hence, where *h* < *s* was word-initial, (i)(a) **indā hliyeā* > (ii) **inda hliye(y)a* > (v) **ind hliye* > **int hliye* > **int liye* (= OIr. f. *int slige* ‘the way’). Where, however, *-h* < *s* (inc. *-s* < *-ss* etc.) was word-final, (i)(b) **indah eθnah* > (iii) **inda heθnah* > (iv) **inda heθna* > (v) **ind heθn* > **int heθn* > **int ēn* (= OIr. *int én* ‘the bird’) but (i) **indah reχtuh/karēh* (< **karēs* < **karan(t)s*) > (iv) **inda reχtu/karē* >

(v) **ind Rext/karē* > (vi) *in Rext/kare* (= OIr. *in rec(h)t/car(a)e* ‘the law/friend’). Unlike Kortlandt’s, this scheme generates regular Wb. *int* before a vowel or lenited *s*- versus invariable *in* before unlenited consonants.

Cowgill (1985: 111 and 118) briefly floated (a) spread of the prot. *tadbat*-type from relative to main clauses or (b) absence of a main-clause particle from certain verbs for as yet unspecified reasons. Since there was no /h/ < *(e)s to block elision in relative clauses (e.g. rel. *tesmet* ‘who pour out’ < 7th-cent. *tu:esmot* < **to-yo* ‘*ex(s)-semont(i)*’), the result should have been consistent OIr. oppositions of the type *tadbat* ‘who shows’ vs *do:adbat* ‘shows’ /*do* ‘*haðβæd*/ correlating neatly with *fo:cheird* ‘who puts’ (< **wo-yo* ‘*kerdet(i)*’) vs *fo:ceird* ‘puts’ (< **wo-s* ‘*kerd-et(i)*’), a useful distinction most unlikely to have been deliberately blurred. So (a) is unworkable and (b) an ‘unmotivated sporadic deletion’ of the type rightly castigated by Cowgill above (§4).

Schrijver (1997: 91–9) invokes disparate syntactic/semantic factors at a perforce early stage when *(e)t(i) had a definable function and so rel. *-yo was still a syllable impeding elision/contraction of a preverb’s vowel. That necessitates an extra relative marker able to produce at least some prototonic forms. The choice is acc. sg. n. *(e)(d) ‘it’, which is then eliminated completely by loss of -d like PIC *e(d) ‘it’ and aphaeresis like Boling’s *(e)d to yield required **to-e* V > **to* V > **t* V. Rel. *-yo was supposedly used with a subject but n. *(e)(d) and m./f. *(e)n³⁶ with an object antecedent (cf. Sims-Williams 1984: 159–60): e.g. *fo:cheird* ‘who puts’ < **wo-yo=kerdet*, *fo:cheird* ‘which (n.) (s)he puts’ < **wo-(e)=kerdet* ‘and *do:mbeir* ‘whom/which (m.) (s)he brings’ < **to-(e)n=beret*. However, its main-clause anaphoric origin (‘the story, I hear it’ > ‘the story which I hear’) make obj. *e(n) a dubious reason for missing *(e)s in rel. *fo:cheird* < **wo-(e) kerdet* ‘puts (it)’ vs *fa:cheird* ‘puts it’ < **w(o)-e=kerdet* < **wo(-h)-e=kerdet* < **wo-(e)s-e(d)=kerdet(i)* (Schrijver 1997: 110–11).

Schrijver’s hypothesis is contradicted by statistics (McCone 1980: 15–16) showing that lenition was commoner than nasalisation with an m./f. sg. obj. antecedent in Wb., a situation more or less reversed in Ml. So these need adjusting (Schrijver 1997: 92–9) by excluding clefts as ambiguous, if analysed as copula (sometimes omitted) + predicate + relative clause with covert antecedent: e.g. *hóre is mórad daggnímo do:gní* (Wb. 6^a8) ‘because what he does is magnification of a good deed’ rather than ‘because it is magnification of a good deed that he does’. To this is added a subtle and untestable semantic difference between a nas. and a len. rel. in such cases. The relationship of a rel. clause with a clefted constituent may not be the same as with a non-clefted antecedent (e.g. *cech irnigde do:ngneid i tuil dée* (Wb. 5^c20) ‘every prayer that you may make in God’s will’), but they may well have obeyed the same basic rules of relative concord in Old Irish, as they do in Modern English, French or Irish. *Pace* Schrijver (1997: 108), this is indicated by their joint participation in the increase in rel. nasalisation between Wb. and Ml. Even with rejigged data,

³⁶One might have expected separate sg. f. and pl. forms like **sin* and (m. pl.) **sūs*, but these are ignored, presumably because the likes of rel. **to-sin* would be hard to reduce to the required **to*^{NAS} in view of OIr. *d-a:mbeir* allegedly < **to-s-en* with a particle.

the nas./len. ratio with m./f. sg. antecedent in Wb. rises from 9/11 to 6/2 but not to 8/0.³⁷

Subj. rel. *-yo vs obj. rel. n. *-(e) (m./f. *-(e)n) should have yielded a consistent OIr. distinction between deut. *do:adbat* with a subj. and prot. *tadbat* with an obj. antecedent (if n.; *do:n-adbat*, if m./f.). However, Wb. shows no significant difference between active forms with subject (1 deut., 3 prot.) and object (4 prot., all n. sg.) antecedent.³⁸ Since Wb. inconveniently has mostly prot. forms with subj. antecedent, Schrijver (1997: 116) turns to the more (but still only c. 80%) favourable statistics in Ml., ‘where there is more material than in Wb.’ The passive is harder still, because its invariably subj. antecedent should have conditioned rel. *-yo and deut. forms throughout but the prot./deut. ratio is 3/1 in Wb. and 2/3 in Ml. Prot. forms with neut. (Wb. 3×, Ml. 2×) and deut. with mostly masc. (Wb. 1×, Ml. 2×; prot. Ml. 1×) antecedent prompt the extraordinary proposal (Schrijver 1997: 118–21) that, in the passive, a masc. subj. antecedent correlated with *-yo and a neut. one with *-(e)d in an otherwise unknown role as subj. not obj. These manoeuvres are unnecessary if rel. *tadbat* etc. are simply due to elision and deut. *do:adbat* etc. to a later normalising tendency (see below).

The direct challenge of *tadbat* etc. in OIr. main clauses calls for three unconnected *ad hoc* explanations (Schrijver 1997: 122–9) boiling down to ‘unmotivated sporadic deletion’. ‘One might argue’ that invariably prot. forms of *do:ic* and *do:uc-* in Wb. retained, ‘presumably as a fossil’ (Schrijver 1997: 125), a reflex of omission of **es* < **et(i)* (‘after that’ >) ‘and’ because it was redundant after a completed action. This would not cover a telic after a non-telic verb (e.g. *he ran and (then) arrived on time*), the redundancy would apply to any following verb (e.g. *he arrived and (after that) laughed*), and anyway would hardly cause a connective’s omission: cf. an English sequence of three telic verbs such as *he fell down and (after that) got up and (after that) finished the race*. This proposal accounts for only 10 of the Wb. total of 26 considered (or 18 out of 36 by including 8 prot. and 2 deut. non-rel. active forms of *ro:ic* in Wb.; McCone 1979: 7). The 90% main-clause prot. score of *t-áinic* ‘came’ etc. (5×), *t-uic* ‘(has) brought’ etc. (5×) and *r-ic* ‘reaches’ etc. can just be due to a well-known tendency of common verbs to preserve anomalous forms (cf. García-Castillero below).

Since they (like *ric*) show both deut. and prot. forms, the other verbs concerned are not amenable to the lexical criterion applied to *tuc* etc. and ‘a different approach is called for’ (Schrijver 1997: 125). For the next group

³⁷There is little to be said for Schrijver’s (1997: 98–9) attempts to explain the two ‘exceptions’ away: Wb. 12^a7 as a cleft (and so excluded according to his lights) despite the obvious correspondence between *for imbed inna precepte as:bir-siu* and Lat. *super tuam benedictionem*, and 22^c2 with an overt m. sg. pronominal antecedent *intí* strangely taken as quasi-covert.

³⁸Subj. 3^b8, 12^c31, 27^d23 (prot.), 31^b21 (deut.); obj. (all prot.) 4^b4, 13^c26, 24^b25, 26^d23. Schrijver makes 27^d23 *tairthet cach fer imm alaile* obj. not subj., presumably on the basis of a note ‘perhaps = *to-air-thet* “that which every man pursues”’ (*Thes.* ii, 679 a) with an otherwise unattested verb. Surely, however, it is the 3pl. of a well-attested compound of *reth-id* ‘runs’, namely *do:air-ret* ‘comes upon, assails’. That entails sg. *cach fer* as obj., Lat. *quaestiones* ‘questions’ as subj. antecedent and ‘which assail every man concerning another’ as a translation.

(10 prot., 15 deut.), ‘one might ... tentatively propose’ (Schrijver 1997: 127) a key role for preceding *.i.* ‘i.e.’ (Lat. *id est*) with alleged Irish equivalents *nochis/sechis* and *edón* conditioning prot. (no /-h/ < *es) and deut. (/ -h/ < *es) respectively, since the first two included a copula already containing the particle (*is* supposedly < *essi-s) but *edón* did not. ‘Sometimes, notably in Ml., it [*.i.*] is followed by a complete sentence prefaced by **sech is** or **noch is**, the Irish equivalent of *id est* ...; in such cases *.i.* is nothing more than a graphic symbol’ (GOI 25). Attestations of *sechis* ‘that is’ in Wb. (10^b12, 12^a8, 14^b9, 20^d8, 25^c7) are directly preceded by *.i.*, while the copula after *noch* ‘yet, but’ is inflected for tense/mood and person in Wb. and introduces a predicate, whether cleft (2^b6 *is*, 9^c33 *is*, 10^b9 *ba*, 19^c6 *is*) or not (5^a18 *ém am*, 15^b2 *is*, 18^c10 *ba*, 19^c4 *ba*). An *.i.* directly precedes *noch is/ba* at the beginning of a gloss (9^c33, 19^c4 and 6), and (*h*)*edón* seems to occur in Wb. only as a clefted pronoun with the copula: e.g. *is hedón bias and* ‘it’s that that will be there’ (23^b38; cf. 9^c15, 10^b9, 23^c2, 30^d5). That said, *idón* is found twice in the *Additamenta* (*Thes.* ii, 241.8 and 16) with a basic meaning ‘namely, i.e.’, when Patrick asks Dubthach ‘for the makings of a bishop’ from his disciples, *idón fer socheniúil cen on cen ainim* ‘namely a man of good family without defect, without blemish’ and gives a container/shrine (*cumtach*) to Fiacc, *idon clocc 7 menstir 7 bachall 7 poolire* ‘namely a bell and a reliquary and a crozier and a writing tablet’.

Even if *idón*’s *i* here ‘is a Latinism’ (GOI 26), it hardly follows that *.i.* stood for OIr. *edón* and even *sechis* or *nochis* as well as Lat. *id est* in the 8th century. Not only is *nochis* not found as ‘that is’ in Wb. but regular prefixing of *.i.* to *sechis* indicates that either the two were not seen as equivalents or *.i.* was a mere graphic symbol and, as such, prefixed to almost all glosses in Wb as an element extraneous to the text itself. Either way, it is irrelevant to forms like *tadbat* ‘shows’. In the case of five examples (4 prot., 1 deut.) followed by *tra* ‘then, so, indeed’, it seems ‘at least conceivable that *tra* and *es were in complementary distribution’ (Schrijver 1997: 127).

Having tentatively given three quite different reasons covering all but one of 26 main-clause independent prototonic forms in Wb., Schrijver (1997: 128) ends on a defiant note: ‘Irrespective of whether one does or does not accept the explanations suggested, the link between contraction and telic verbs and the mere fact that the contracted forms occur in so few syntactic contexts surely indicates that contraction was originally governed by strict syntactic rules rather than by a merely phonetic tendency. This conclusion offers clear support to the particle hypothesis.’ Since *tu-/ru-fu-V* verbs are by definition compounds and these are frequently telic (EIV 112–16), the relative prominence of *ro:ic* ‘reaches’, *do:ic* and *do:ucci* in the sample need be due to no more than their status as particularly common verbs of the relevant shape. A preceding *.i.*, far from being a ‘strict syntactic rule’, is of no significance whatever for the simple reason that opening *.i.* is the overwhelming norm in Wb. glosses of any shape or form: for instance, Wb. 4^d8 *.i. tairchechuin* ‘he prophesied’ (deut. *do:air-chain* ‘prophesies’) opens with *.i.* but so do all but one of the other 32 OIr. glosses in 4^d. As for *tra*, it is common enough for its occurrence with a few independent prototonic forms to be unremarkable.

Schrijver's scattergun semantic/syntactic approach to *tadbat* etc. seems wide of the mark, and García-Castillero (2015: 93–4) accepts 'in contrast to Cowgill and Schrijver's proposals' that 'hiatus in the [main-clause] declarative and leniting relative clause forms of CV·VC(-) lexical compounds was inherited in OIr. from previous linguistic stages' (2015: 96), despite a rather odd caveat.³⁹ García-Castillero (2015: 76) adds chronologically composite Sg.⁴⁰ to Wb. and Mb. (statistics for which essentially agree with McCone 1979: 4–6), makes light (2015: 90) of a chronological dimension to striking statistical differences noted above between Wb. and Ml., and much (2015: 90) of non-elision after proclitic *no* and augment *ro* in len. rel. clauses. His tables (2015: 92–4) have the merit of indicating the statistical frequency of individual lexical compounds, showing more prot. forms with commoner and more deut. ones with less common verbs. Since the former were synchronically anomalous and anomalies tend to be more resistant to normalisation in commonly used forms, this is hardly surprising (cf. *t-áinic*, *t-uic* and *r-ic* above) and quite compatible with a general recent elision.

While conceding a role to elision (e.g. 2015: 100), García-Castillero places greater emphasis on morphological factors, arguing (2015: 99–100) that 'for OIr. CV·VC(-) lexical compounds, which were structurally unable to express lenition, the use of prototony as a marker of relative clauses may be a good way to distinguish that clause type from the declarative form'. Two central processes envisaged are the creation of 'semi-simplex' *r-icc*, *t-icc* under the influence of *téit* 'goes' (2015: 100) and the extrapolation of active *tadbat* 'which shows' from *hi:tadbat* 'in which (he) shows' etc. on the model of passive *pridchider* 'which is preached' vs *i:pridchider* 'in which is preached' (2015: 98–9). The 'semi-simplex' idea is quite a stretch, as is the correlation of act. *hi:tadbat* and pass. *i:pridchider* as quasi-relatives: prepositional relative (*h*)*i* is a conjunct particle (GOI 28) and, notwithstanding homonymy with pass. rel. *pridchider*, *-pridchider* is synchronically conj. like act. *hi:pridcha* 'in which he preaches' vs formally distinct rel. *pridchas* 'who/which he preaches'.

The lack of distinction between, say, len. rel. and main-clause EOIr. /tu 'aðβet/ was doubtless ripe for remedy, but by straightforward introduc-

³⁹To say that OIr. lexical compounds such as *ro·icc* or *do·icc* had no intervocalic /h/ in their declarative form does not necessarily contradict the idea of a declarative clause marker such as *-h- in prehistoric times ... a particle which explains the lack of lenition in the declarative clause forms of CV(C)·CV(-) verbs ... I suggest that the *-h- was eliminated from the CV·VC(-) lexical compounds according to those CV(C)·CV(-) verbs in which the diachronically regular phonological opposition lenis vs fortis had been grammaticalised as the marker of the opposition relative vs declarative clause respectively' (García-Castillero 2015: 91, n. 12). This opaque suggestion can hardly be addressed without further specifics, but it is very hard to see how the grammaticalisation of relative lenis vs main-clause fortis in 'CV- could lead to the eradication of a corresponding distinction between main-clause 'hV- and rel. 'V-.

⁴⁰Some glosses are shared with other Priscian mss. (*Thes.* ii, xvii) and evidently come from an older common source. According to *Thes.* ii, xxiii, 'the codex was probably written about the middle of the ninth century. The date of the Irish glosses has been much disputed; sometimes they have been considered earlier, sometimes later than Ml. ... The explanation of the fluctuation of opinion is that the collection of glosses is not homogeneous, but comes from various sources and is of a varying antiquity'.

tion of main-clause *hV*- rather than García-Castillero's fanciful alternatives, and the hiatus was also ripe for resolution. As it happens, the latter came first through a general elision responsible for the /t'adβet/ underlying OIr. main-clause and len. rel. *tadbat* /tadβəd/ (*RelChron.* 132–3, 135–6). Only then did unambiguous main-clause *h*- start to spread into lexical compounds of the *tadbat*-type. García-Castillero complicates matters unnecessarily by putting the cart before the horse but his argument is explicitly (2015: 89, n. 9) divorced from the case for or against 'Cowgill's (1975) Wackernagel particle **es* > **(e)h*' and implicitly undermines **es* by accepting inherited hiatus in OIr. main as well as relative clauses.

Thurneysen's evolving views on non-lenition and /h-/ after the likes of OIr. *no*, *ro* and pretonic preverbs have been referenced and lucidly expounded by Sims-Williams (1984: 141–2). The crux is his 'hypothesis that the **-s* seen in the reconstructed negative particle **nīs* spread by analogy not only to other particles ending in vowels, such as the "perfective" (etc.) **(p)ro* and untranslatable **nu*, but also the preverbs of compound verbs like the **to* of *dobbeir*' (Sims-Williams 1984: 141). Sims-Williams then (1984: 143) took account of *tadbat*-type elision, concluding (144) that 'in environments in which the negative particle took the form **nīs* rather than **ne*, other syntactically comparable elements (*not* preverbs) with vocalic auslaut adopted **-s* by analogy. This has the advantage of explaining the /h/ after *ro* and *no* ... and so providing an obvious starting point for any analogical spread of /h/ to position after preverbs like *ro*, *do* and *fo* ... In general, the fact that *ro* functioned both as a particle and as a preverb will have played an important part'.

Initial main-clause *no* (GOI 348) and *ro* followed directly by a vowel-initial tonic portion were far from common in Old Irish: *no* without an attached infix was confined to the imperfect, conditional and past subjunctive (GOI 348), and proclitic augment *ro* was only possible with an otherwise independent simple verb (EIV 128–30) as it could 'never take precedence over the first lexical preverb of a compound' (EIV 135): e.g. *no:ainfeda* 'you (sg.) would have remained', *ro:ort* 'slew' (Ml. 48^c8). The proposed analogy would be easier to motivate after PrimIr. reductions of final syllables sketched above had phonemicised initial mutations and correlated initial len. C- and V- with unlen. C- and *hV*-:⁴¹ e.g. **nī 'g^wey^won'* : **nī 'hort* = **ro 'g^wey^won'* : x (x = **ro* 'hort in place of **ro* 'ort) > OIr. *nī:geguin*, *nī:(h)ort* 'did not slay', *ro:geguin*, *ro:(h)ort* 'has slain'.

Despite the paucity of early examples, 'it is surely significant that forms like *ro-ucc* "has brought" [Wb. 2×: 9^b6 *ro:uiccius* and 27^a7 *ro:uic*; none of *r'u(i)c(-)*] are hardly ever elided to ***r'ucc*, whereas the preverb *ro* in *ro-icc* 'reaches' is often elided, giving *r'icc* (McCone 1979: 7 [6 prot., 2 deut.,]; but note *ructha* Ml. 102^d7, *rucad* Sg. 174^a1, which are perhaps influenced by *t'uctha*, *t'ucad* ...) (Sims-Williams 1984: 143–4). Since *r(o)-uc(-)* '(makes to reach,) bears (to)' is an old causative of *r(o)-ic(-)* 'reaches' (McCone 1999: 355–60) that had gravitated

⁴¹See §8 below on the PIC gemination of consonants after initial **nī(s)*, **nu*, **ro*, **to*, **ambi* etc. that led directly to OIr. main-clause non-lenition after their OIr. outcomes *nī*, *no*, *ro*, *do*, *im(m)*: etc.

to *beirid* as its suppletive augmented form (EIV 115–16), the resistance of its *ro*: to elision is indeed noteworthy and the likes of prot. *ructha* may be survivals of *ro*'s erstwhile lexical status. Non-elision of *no* and *ro* before a stressed vowel is, of course, also a feature of leniting relative clauses, which certainly lacked /h-/: e.g. *no:adamrugur* 'which I admire' (Wb. 16^c3), *ru:horth* 'which slew' (ML 63^b12). Pace García-Castillero above, this can easily be due to pressure from unelided *no* and augment *ro* in main clauses (owing to a following /h-/) and in the nas. rel. type in *tain ro:n-anis-siu* 'when you have remained' (Wb. 29^d9).

Sims-Williams rightly notes the OIr. augment *ro*'s potential to influence pretonic lexical preverbs (including *ro*). Being basically a grammaticalised preverb (EIV 134–44) beginning to move in the direction of a conjunct particle (EIV 149–61 and 187–9), it displayed normal deut./prot. alternations as the augment of simple verbs: e.g. *ro:uic* vs *ní:r-u(i)c* or *ro:an* vs *ní:r-an*. In the likely event that as a proclitic it already prefixed /h-/ to a vowel in main clauses and so differentiated deut. main-clause /ro 'hug^(c)/ formally from len. rel. /ro 'ug^(c)/ and prot. /-rug^(c)/, it provided an obvious pattern to 'disambiguate' the elided type with prot. (-)*tadbat*, (-)*ric(c)* etc. in all three contexts. A proportion prot. /-rug^(c)/ : deut. /ro 'hug^(c)/ = prot. /-rig'/ deut. x (x = /ro 'hig'/) will have generated new main-clause deut. forms like *ro:ic(c)* /ro 'hig'/ 'reaches' and *do:adbat* 'shows' /do 'haðβəd/, thereby introducing a useful distinction between these and corresponding len. rel. *ricc*, *tadbat* etc. A further proportion would have introduced a normal contrast between deut. forms in both (e.g. OIr. *fo:ceird* 'puts' vs *fo:cheird* 'who puts'): main /ro 'hug^(c)/ : len. rel. /ro 'ug^(c)/ = main /ro 'hig'/ : len. rel. x (x = /ro 'ig'/), whence deut. relatives like OIr. *ro:ic(c)* /ro 'ig'/ 'who reaches', *do:adbat* 'who shows' /do 'aðβəd/. This two-stage process is reflected in statistics above showing that deut. forms were a substantial minority in main but rather uncommon in len. rel. clauses in Wb.

The main point for present purposes is that Kortlandt and Schrijver both fail in their attempts (one (morpho)phonological, the other semantic/syntactic, and both extremely uneconomical) to remove an elision-blocking *(e)s or its later reflex *h from the preforms of OIr. main-clause independent prototonic verbs like *r-ic*, *t-ic*, *f-ácaib*, *t-adbat*. That leaves only one solution still standing: this polyproblematical particle never existed in the first place.

7. ENCLITIC PRONOUNS AND INITIAL VERBS IN GREEK AND INSULAR CELTIC

According to Vendryes (1911–12) as summarised by Dillon (1943: 252), 'most Irish verbs are compounds, and a pronominal object is infixed as enclitic after the first preverb. Since by Wackernagel's Law enclitics tend towards the second position, and since in Irish these enclitic pronouns were attached to the preverbs, the compound verbs came regularly to stand at the head of the sentence, and this position then became regular for simple verbs as well' (cf. Sims-Williams 1984: 167–8). Borgstrøm emphasised, albeit as part of an untenable hypothesis (§1, n. 4 above), that 'the system of suffixed and infixed pronouns is the special condition by which the Indo-European system of thematic and athematic terminations was transformed into the Old Irish

system of absolute and conjunct terminations' (1933: 61–2) at a stage 'before the final separation of the Gaelic and Britannic languages' (1933: 64). Dillon (1943: 254) invoked an untenable 3sg. m. subject pronoun **is* generalised in main clauses (§4 above): 'if most of the primary [= absolute] endings originally contained enclitic pronouns, they would tend, by Wackernagel's Law, to force the simple verb to the head of its clause, and we need not assume with Vendryes that initial position began with compound verbs containing infixed pronouns.'

Whatever drawbacks their various overall theories have, all three identify enclitic pronouns governed by Wackernagel's Law as the main triggers of a regular clause-initial verbal complex and/or an absolute conjugation peculiar to initial simple verbs. The present hypothesis similarly sees the apocope-blocking effect of enclitics in 'Wackernagel' position as the key factor, and it is now time to consider the mechanics of the development of a PIC initial verbal complex with peculiarities affecting compound as well as simple verbs (§1 above).

Sims-Williams (1984: 184) posits not only the rise of 'VSO under the influence of constructions in which object pronouns and certain particles attached to the verb tended to tie it to initial position in the sentence' but also 'the proliferation of proleptic object pronouns attached to the verb', although the latter are quite rare in Old Irish (Lucht 1996) or British (*GMW* 56–7). Extensive prolepsis (Sims-Williams 1984: 175–6) would have made initial 'unemphatic' abs./deut. forms supporting enclitic object pronouns etc. particularly frequent and initial 'emphatic' conj./prot. forms (now only possible in the absence of enclitics) marginal and defective. Nevertheless, far from disappearing as might be expected (see below), the latter 'lasted down to the eve of the historical period of Irish' (1984: 170). Instead of a typical role reinforcing a noun object's definiteness (1984: 176; cf. *ODVC* 125), prolepsis came primarily 'to differentiate unemphatic from emphatic verbs in initial position' along with 'a tendency to generalize the n. Pronoun **e*' (1984: 177 and 178). Since deut./abs. + **e* were doubly characterised vis à vis 'emphatic' prot./conj. lacking **e*, **e*/+len. was deleted (leaving *ø*/-len.) as a redundant feature from compound verbs and 3sg./pl. simple verbs, but not from 1sg **biru-e* or 2pl. abs. **berete-e* (on account of a supposedly 'important distinction' between them and conj. **biru* and **berete*) and, 'in solidarity', probably not from 2sg. or 1pl. either (1984: 178–9). Generalising 3sg. proleptic **e(d)* (in effect, a phonetically regular version of Boling's **ed*; §1 above) in spite of and then deleting it because of substantial redundancy only adds dubious derivations of the 1sg. and 2pl. abs.⁴² to the results of the basic 'actual enclitic' hypothesis.

Gravitation of clitic possessives to their head noun (e.g. OIr. *do chenél* 'your people', Turkish *baba-m* 'my father', Akkadian *bēl-ni/-šunu* 'our/your lord') is matched by widespread cliticisation of object pronouns on the finite verb governing them: e.g. Akkadian *ana mārī-ka TADDIŠ-šū-ma itti-ka IMHURŪ-šu* 'YOU GAVE **it** (m.) to your sons and THEY ACCEPTED **it** from you' (Huehnergard

⁴²Contracted **ber-ū* and **bere-tē* (< **-ū-e* and **-te-e*) > **-biur*, **-beirid*, and uncontracted 1sg. **beruw-e* > **-berae* or the like (§4 above). 2pl. **-te-e* is incompatible with OIr. cop. *-di* < **-thi* and **-tes(i)-e* adds nothing to **-tesi* (§2 above).

2011: 170) or Basque *gaur IKUSI na-u* '(s)he (-ø) has SEEN me today', *gaur EMAN di-zki-o* '(s)he (-ø) has (di-) GIVEN them to him/her today'. In Basque, as in many other non-IE languages (see Eska 2010: 39–43 for examples), pronominal elements of this type are retained as a feature of verbal concord correlating with overt objects: e.g. *Jonek medikuari EMAN di-zki-o liburuak* 'John has GIVEN the books to the doctor'. Dixon (1994: 95) notes that such 'cross-referencing systems are thus basically pronominal (with the affixes having developed from free-form pronouns, in some earlier stage of the language)'. Evidently, cliticisation of pronominal objects on a finite verb or verbal complex, with or without evolution into regular concord markers, is a cross-linguistic commonplace.

The tendency of IE languages, particularly earlier attested ones, to buck this trend can be explained by a probable PIE combination of basic verb-final SOV word-order with automatic 'Wackernagel' attachment of enclitics to a clause's accented initial constituent. While enclitic sentence connectives like PIE **-k^we* may naturally gravitate to their clause's opening, that is hardly true of enclitic direct and indirect object pronouns separated, often quite widely, from their governing verb by mechanical post-initial placement.

One possible remedy, apparently applied in Germanic and Italic,⁴³ was to abandon enclitic forms in favour of independent counterparts behaving more like direct and indirect noun objects. Directly observed developments in Greek are more relevant to IC, given that 'structural facts indicate that the basic word order in Standard Modern Greek is VSO' (Skopeteas 2016: 687). In colloquial Greek from early Christian Egypt, 'clitic pronouns normally appear immediately after the verbs that govern them, except where there is an initial scope-bearing element (e.g. mood-marking conjunctions, interrogatives, negatives, foci) ... This pattern of word order and clitic distribution continues into (vernacular) Medieval Greek and survives in certain modern dialects, though standard Modern Greek has generalised the preverbal clitic position' (Horrocks 2014: 173): e.g. *αἴγραψά σοι* (*égrapsá sy*) 'I wrote to **you**' (Horrocks 2014: 178; 2nd cent. AD; vs standard modern *su égrapsa*) or *ὅπου ἠπάντηκά σου ... καὶ εἶρηκά σου* (*ópu ipántiká su ... ke íriká su*) 'when I met **you** and said **to you**' (Horrocks 2014: 183; late 4th cent. AD).

Both the basic verb-final SOV word-order posited for PIE by Delbrück, chiefly but not exclusively on the strength of Old Indic prose, and Wackernagel's Law received dramatic confirmation from a later addition to the IE language family: Hittite, its earliest attested member, with almost invariably sentence-/clause-final finite verbs and a chain of enclitic sentence connectives, pronouns and other particles conforming strictly to Wackernagel's Law (e.g. Rieken 2005: 118–19). Delbrück (1900: 74) deduced from the contrast between initial verbs in Old Irish and non-initial verbs in the exiguous Gaulish material available at the time that the latter had also predominated in Proto-Celtic and 'the constant initial placement of the verb developed first in Insular Celtic'. Further support for his view on this and basically verb-final PIE came several

⁴³See Meiser (1998: 156–61) on the main Latin forms and Ringe (2006: 288–91) on those reconstructed for Proto-Germanic.

decades later from eleven lines of continuous text on the 'first' Botorrita bronze (e.g. Jordán Cólera 2004: 327–45): 'Whatever about the precise interpretation ... there is general agreement about its firmly SOV character and marked preference for clause-final verbs ... In short, this piece of Celtiberian prose conforms quite faithfully to and thus corroborates Delbrück's Proto-Indo-European model ... [I]t follows that the intervening Proto-Celtic too was fundamentally SOV and verb-final and that the verb-initial patterns normal in Old Irish do indeed represent a major shift within Celtic itself' (McCone 1997: 380).

However, 'beside this [unmarked verb-final SOV] traditional word order there is an occasional [marked] one: the more important a word seems to the speaker, the more decisively it gravitates to the beginning of the sentence ... It seems indubitable to me that this basic occasional rule was also present in the parent language' and 'the subject can change its position through the preposing of other sentence constituents calling for strong emphasis' (Delbrück 1888: 16): e.g. XSOV, OS(X)V or VSO(X) with marked X, O or V respectively. Wackernagel's Law and a fronting rule for some sort of emphasis, most likely to mark a topic, were accepted even by proponents of largely free PIE word-order such as Meillet (1937: 365–7): 'No word had a definite and constant place in the Indo-European phrase. Most of the Indo-European languages have tended more or less to fix the order of words and Sanskrit prose, for example, offers almost a fixed order. But this order varies from one language to another ... The verb normally occurs at the end of the phrase in early Sanskrit prose and normally at the beginning in Old Irish; but it can occupy any position in Greek ... It is Greek that best preserves the Indo-European usage of putting the most important word first ... Immediately after the first word of the phrase appear firstly the accented or unaccented particles and indefinites, then the enclitic personal pronouns.'

Meid (1997: 398) recognised three main word-order patterns in Celtic, namely 'SOV Celtiberian', 'SVO Gaulish' and 'VSO Insular Celtic', and claimed (1997: 405) 'that Gaulish word-order is flexible ... As far as the verb is concerned, final, medial and initial position are attested. Final position is the relic of the older rule, medial position seems to have become the normal position ...; initial position ... is the expression of a particular emphasis'. Similarly (McCone 1997: 385), 'Proto-Celtic would seem to have inherited patterns with an SOV core ascribed by Delbrück to Proto-Indo-European without significant change. This system was apparently preserved more or less intact in Celtiberian but may eventually have given way in Gaulish to a dominant SVO order subject to interference from a fronting rule for topic inherited via Proto-Celtic from Proto-Indo-European. In Insular Celtic, by contrast, topicalisation of constituents by shifting them to initial position within the clause had to be abandoned as hitherto marked VSO patterns became normal. Thereafter a system of copular clefting arose and optional postverbal amplifications of SOV patterns [McCone 1997: 369–70] gave way to likewise optional pendens constructions preposed to VSO patterns.'

The role played by enclitic object pronouns (E^o; E^c = enclitic connective) in the aforementioned Greek shift towards VSO has been recognised by Horrocks

(2014: 108–9):

‘Originally these typically collocated with sentence connectives in second position in a sentence (cf. Wackernagel (1892) ...):

(18) ἐν^[1] δέ^[Ec] οἱ^[Eo] ἐλάσσονι χρόνῳ^[2] ... ἡ γυνή^[S] αὕτη τίκει^[V]
... (Herodotus 6.63.2) ... “and^[Ec] in^[1] less time^[2] this woman^[S]
bears^[V] for him^[Eo] ...”

The frequently wide separation of such pronouns from their natural governors led, however, to a tendency for them to appear instead immediately after their relevant head in a syntactic phrase:

(19) πυρετοὶ^[S] δέ^[Ec] παρηκολούθουν^[PV] μοι^[Eo] συνεχεῖς^[adj]
(Demosthenes 54.11) ... “and^[Ec] continued^[adj] fevers^[S] hounded^[PV]
me^[Eo]”

But as we move into the Hellenistic period, the tension between these two options began to be resolved by placing the verb initially before clitic pronouns in second position, thus combining the traditional distribution of the latter, as in (18), with the semantically transparent head-complement order seen in (19). The result was increasingly standard V(erb)-clitic-S(ubject)-O(bject) order, with VSO then becoming routine even in the absence of a motivating clitic ...

This distribution was typically disrupted only under certain circumstances, i.e. when some clausal element, including a subject, was preposed as an emphatic/contrastive focus, or when some sentential “operator” (e.g. expressing negation, interrogation, or modality over the clause as a whole) occupied the initial slot. In these cases, we find instead the order F(ocus)/Op(erator)-clitic-V, i.e. with V as near to initial position as possible, but still adjacent to its dependent pronoun; all other constituents follow.

Verb-final thus ceased to be a “natural” order in popular Greek ... Furthermore, the dual distribution of clitics (i.e. V-cl in most cases, cl-V in the presence of initial F/Op) continued into Medieval Greek, and even into some modern dialects (e.g. Cypriot). In standard Modern Greek, however, the order clitic-verb has now been generalized except in the case of imperatives and gerunds.

As an example of both types together, consider the following sentence from an early Ptolemaic will (P. Elph. 2. ii. 10–11, 284 BC):

(20) ἐὰν^[Op/C] δέ^[Ec] τι^[Eo] ἐξαπορώνται^[PV] ... Διονύσιος^[S] ἢ
Καλλίστα^[S] ζῶντες^[pp] τρεφέτωσαν^[V] αὐτοὺς^[Eo] οἱ υἱεῖς^[S]
πάντες^[adj] ... “[and^[Ec]] if^[Op/C] Dionysios^[S] or Kallista^[S] should
be in need^[PV] [of anything^[Eo]] during their lifetimes^[pp], their
sons^[S] collectively^[adj] shall support^[V] them^[Eo].”

The two basic ways of juxtaposing a clitic pronoun and the non-initial verb governing it were attaching the pronoun to the verb as in Horrocks's example 19 (cf. Akkadian and Basque above) or placing the verb in initial or near-initial position contiguous with the pronoun as in his example 20. As his 19 shows, in an IE context the former solution entailed disruption of the clause's enclitic chain by leaving a connective such as Gk. *de* 'and' in its natural post-initial position. That ultimately favoured the second approach in Greek, leaving the chain intact as in 20, and the same may reasonably be assumed for Insular Celtic, given the reflexes of P/N **-de-/k^we-* *me* in cases like OIr. *do-dom:áinic* and *na-cham:tháinic* '(and it >) which has (not) befallen me' (*Echtrae Chonnlaí* §6, ed. McCone 2000: 121).

Basically verb-final SOV word-order with optional location of grammatically dispensable 'amplifications' after the verb (Gonda 1959) seems to have been inherited from PIE into PC. A tendency towards medial verbs and SVO was probably innovatory in Gaulish, but it is immaterial for present purposes whether Celtiberian-style SOV (with some post-verbal 'amplification'; McCone 1997: 379) or something like Greek-style flexibility prevailed in early PIC. In the absence of serious evidence for VSO as the basic PIE or PC word-order pattern, any constituent (such as V) liable to 'occasional' fronting to initial position as topic must have had a contrasting 'traditional' position as non-topic further back in the clause or sentence. Both types are covered by the formula #.(E)(...)V(...)# with an initial slot reserved for sentence connectives like **nu* or **eti*, a S(ubject) or some other topic. For a finite verb, this setup entailed 'traditional' #.(E)(...)**bereti*(...)# vs 'occasional' #**bereti*(E).(...)# with V as topic.

Enclitic object pronouns (E^o) could only be attached simultaneously to a finite verb and an enclitic sentence connective [E^c] like **k^we* or **de* by shifting V to initial position. The result would be PIC #.(...)**bereti*(...)# versus #**bereti*(-de)-*me*.(...)#. The latter pattern's mechanically conditioned (+E^o) clause-initial verb was bound seriously to impair the scope and viability of fronting for topic, leading to loss of anyway infrequent 'occasional' #V(...)# or #**bereti*(...)#. Apocope of *-i after this stage would have resulted in #.(...)**beret*(...)# versus #**bereti*(-de)-*me*.(...)#. Generalisation of an initial verb, as in later Greek, will then have led to loss of #.(...)**beret*(...)# and regular PIC #**bereti*(-de)(-me).(...)#, if the unnecessary complication of a switch from #**bereti*-E.(...) to #**beret*(...)# was avoided by preferring already initial **bereti* over non-initial **beret*. This motivated mechanism, rather imprecisely dubbed 'enclitic deletion' or the like⁴⁴ for short, straightforwardly generates PIC

⁴⁴The inaugural version (McCone 1979) referred to 'infix deletion' (16) and 'deletion of the suffixed -E' (30) with reference to initial compound and simple verbs respectively. Sims-Williams (1984: 146) opined that 'McCone's basic idea of infix- and suffix-deletion is both brilliant and plausible', but 'deletion' can be misunderstood if taken too literally. Koch (2022: 33), for instance (cf. Budassi and Roma 2018: 327), claims that 'enclitic-deletion explanations ... can be counted a subtype of particle explanations ..., in which the rule is formulated that the obligatory enclitic is phonologically nil'. Paradoxically, Koch's own 'vacant Wackernagel's position' (1987: 162; cf. ODVC 70) is just another name for the 'enclitic deletion' rejected by him (1987: 175–6). Whatever it is called, the mechanism envisaged by McCone (1979: 16 and 30; ODVC 70), Sims-Williams (1984: 146) and Koch (1987: 162), namely creating initial forms without enclitic from already

initial absolute endings from the initial or non-initial PC primary endings reconstructed above (§§1–3).

In Isaac's (2007: 50) opinion (basically of *ODVC* 106–10), a solution along these lines is 'elegant and simple. But there is a problem ... There is nothing in the theory to explain why ... **bereti*-E should have been taken as a model for initial verbal forms without an enclitic ... Why was there any *need* to get the same shape (**bereti*) when there was *no* enclitic? It is perfectly usual for languages to operate with special forms for special purposes (marked forms) and in **bereti*-E we have a special form for a special purpose: adding an enclitic. Why should this special form be taken into positions where no special form was required (the regular use of the verb at the start of the sentence), thereby giving rise to the whole complicated system of absolute and conjunct flexion?'. Formal complications resulting from later PrimIr. sound changes are neither here nor there, and little more was involved at the stage in question than initial and pre-enclitic **-i* vs non-initial *-ø*. Given that the present hypothesis makes the only initial type at the time **bereti*-E vs apocopated **beret* in any other position, the verbal inflection of type **bereti*-E could just as easily be considered specifically initial as pre-enclitic. An *a priori* fifty-fifty toss-up for a general initial form between the only two alternatives, **bereti* and **beret*, was actually biased towards the former because it already occurred in initial position and had a final vowel to keep consonants apart, as in **bereti-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes*. All that was needed was conversion of **bereti* etc. from the initial form supporting enclitics to the initial form capable of supporting enclitics. It is not a question of necessity but of probability and convenience, and there is no problem.

The negatives, interrogatives and various conjunctions placed before the verb in Old Irish as 'conjunct particles' (*GOI* 28) have much in common with what Horrocks above terms 'an initial scope-bearing element (e.g. mood-marking conjunctions, interrogatives, negatives ...)' or 'some sentential "operator" (e.g. expressing negation, interrogation, or modality over the clause as a whole) occup[ying] the initial slot' in Greek. In both Old Irish and Greek, the basically clause-initial elements in question (C) are the default supporters of enclitics, whence #V(E)(...)# but #C(E)V(...)#. They may well have contributed to the shift to VSO order in both by, in effect, serving as a magnet for the finite verb: cf. Vedic *na^N vā^{Ec} u^{Ec} yoṣad^V Rudrā^{abl} asuryā^S* 'let not divine dominion depart from Rudra' (*RV*2, 33, 9), Ancient Greek οὐ^N γάρ^{Ec} πώ^E σφιν^{Eo} ἀκούετο^V λαός^S ἄτρη^{Ogen} 'for (his) host had not yet heard their (lit. 'them') cry' (*Iliad* 4, 331) or Basque *liburua^O Joni^{dat} eman^V diot^{aux}* 'I have^{aux} (it = ø, to him = o)

existing initial forms regularly followed by enclitic(s), was not deletion of enclitic(s) as such but simply using the same inflectional form of the verb itself in initial position, whether accompanied by one or more Wackernagel enclitics or not. This, surely, is quite different from positing the permanent fusion of an enclitic element such as a particle or pronoun(s) with verbal endings. 'Enclitic deletion', 'null enclitic' or even 'vacant Wackernagel's position' may be usefully applied as synchronic or even convenient labels to verbal forms without as opposed to corresponding ones with attached enclitic(s), but it must be borne in mind that such tags do not accurately reflect the diachronic process involved.

given^V the book to John' but *ez^N diot^{aux} liburua^O Joni^{dat} eman^V* 'I have not given the book to John'.

An important further factor was that in PIE, as in Vedic or Homeric Greek poetry and early Old Indic prose, 'the preposition [preverb] usually stands immediately before the verb, but one or more words often come between them ... In these cases the preposition [preverb] occupies the position that the verb itself would occupy if it were simple. Hence the usage *jīvati sá* [VS] is paralleled by the usage *prá sá mīyate* [PSV] TS 2, 2, 2, [and] beside the usages like *páraivá bhavati* [PeváV] cited above there is *bhávaty evá* [Vevá]' (Delbrück 1888: 45). In other words, a preverb in so-called 'tmesis' did duty for a topicalised verbal expression as a whole in 'occasional' sentence-initial position, and the verb itself (± 2nd preverb) stayed put (Delbrück 1888: 46–7): e.g. Old Indic 'traditional' *yūyaṃ^S hi^E devīr^{voc} ṛtayúgbhir áśvaiḥ^{inst} pari^P pra^P yāthá^V* 'you, then, o goddesses, come on forwards with properly yoked horses' (RV 4, 51, 5) but 'occasional' *abhi^P savyéna^{inst} prá^P mṛśá^V* 'get stuck in with the left [hand]' (RV 8, 81, 6). Apart from stray survivals of minimal PEV, initial preverbs had become fused with the rest of the verb in Ancient Greek prose and most attested IE languages with the result that compound verbs were treated like simple verbs (e.g. P(P)VE just like VE).

By contrast, in Old Irish prose as well as poetry the normal pattern was #PE(P)V(...)# (e.g. *do-s:(m)beir* or *do-s:(n-)air-bir* 'brings/inclines them') alongside #CEP(P)V(...)# (e.g. *ní-s:tab(a)ir* or *ní-s:t-air-bir* 'does not bring/incline them') or #VE(...)# (e.g. *beirthiu-s* bears them'). This implies PIC #(E)(...)P(P)V(...)# and, with V as topic, #(E)(...)(P)V(...)# as compound counterparts of #(E)(...)V(...)# and 'occasional' #V(E)(...)# respectively: e.g. #(E)(...)*to-(are)-bereti(...)# and #*(E)(...)(are)-bereti(...)# tending increasingly to become contiguous #*(to(E)=(are)-bereti(...)# as also sometimes in Vedic and Homer.⁴⁵ In this case, regular attachment of E^o to the verb governing it while maintaining its link with naturally post-initial E^c would have resulted in compound #*(to(-de)-me)=(are)-bereti(...)# and #(...)*to-(are)-bereti(...)# corresponding to simple #*(bereti(-de)-me(...)) and #(...)*bereti(...)# above. Moreover, like #*(bereti(...)# as topic in the face of automatic #VE(...)#, topicalised #*(to-(are)-bereti(...)# could hardly have survived the undermining of a pragmatic role for initial verbs by automatic #PE(P)V(...)#.

In Old Irish, a word's stress regularly fell on its first syllable, excluding a pretonic preverb plus enclitics in the case of independent deuterotonic forms of compound verbs such as *do(-s):beir* or *do(-s):air-bir* above. This stress-pattern seems likely to have been inherited more or less directly from PIC.⁴⁶ As far as the verb(al complex) was concerned, 'the Insular Celtic rule

⁴⁵E.g. *ā^P vivāseyaṃ^V Rudrāśya sumnām^O* 'I would wish to win Rudra's favour' (RV 2, 33 6) and *ἐκ^P δ^E ἄγαγε^V κλισίης Βρισηίδα^O καλλιπάρηον* 'and he led fair-cheeked Briseis out from the hut' (Il. 1, 346).

⁴⁶As noted in §1 above, Cowgill regarded apocope of -i (and hence the abs./conj. opposition for which it was a prerequisite) as a PIC innovation, a position explicitly followed by McCone 1979: 28–30. Various arguments for PIC (which, of course, excludes a Gallo-Brittonic node) have since been advanced by McCone (1992, esp. 34–9; *RelChron.* 67–104; *ODVC* 277–85), Schrijver

of demarcative initial stress' applied 'to the semantic core of the verb (V plus any P) except where an enclitic intervened' (ODVC 281), in which case the parts before and after it received demarcative stress: e.g. bi-tonic initial (always +E) $\#^{*}to(-de)-me=(are-)beret(i)(...)\#$ vs uni-tonic non-initial (always -E) $\#(...)^{*}to-(are-)beret(i)(...)\#$. A Romance parallel is seen (ODVC 210) in the single stress from an early stage on periphrastic futures like *cantar(e-h)ábeo* 'I (have to/) shall sing' (Fr. *je chanterai*, Sp. *cantaré*) but retention of two stresses on either side of a clitic pronoun in Old Spanish, Old Provençal and Portuguese (Lausberg 1972: 230–231): e.g. Port. *comprará* '(s)he will buy' but *comprá-lo-á* '(s)he will buy it'). A similar situation may well underlie a couple of archaic Latin liturgical survivals of minimal PEV tmesis recorded by Festus (206L, 17), notably *ob vos sacro* and *sub vos placo* for classical *vos obsecro* or *obsecro vos* 'I beseech you (pl.)' and *vos supplico* or *supplico vos* 'I supplicate you (pl.)'. The weakening of *a > e/i* (Meiser 1998: 66–71) seen in *obsecro* and *supplico* is absent from the forms with an insert. This suggests that, when the reduction of internal unstressed vowels occurred (before a new system replaced regular initial stress in the 4th cent. BC; §1, n. 8 above), a single initial stress characterised $\#^{*}obsacro/\#^{*}supplaco$ and their internal vowels were duly weakened, whereas weakening did not affect $\#^{(*)}ob-vos-'sacro$ or $\#^{(*)}sub-vos-'placo$ because at the time their post-clitic syllable was stressed (cf. OIr. deut. *fo-b:ceird* 'puts you (pl.) etc.) and quite possibly their pre-clitic syllable too (cf. the bi-tonic > deuterotonic PIC pattern posited above).

Two further factors support this scenario: the likely double-stressed origins of other OIr. sequences of proclitic + stressed constituent (e.g. prep./possessive + noun, cop. + pred.), and a PIE rule requiring an element beginning a sentence/clause to be accented (cf. initial *ná, prá, pára, bhávati, abhí* in the Vedic examples above). The result combined with apocope of $\#-i$ would be $\#^{*}to(-de)-me=(are-)beret(...)\#$ with minimal PE(P)V tmesis and two stressed (') syllables versus contiguous non-initial $\#(...)^{*}to-(are-)beret(...)\#$ with a normal single initial stress. As in the case of simple verbs above, the initial form with enclitic was made the base for new initial forms without enclitic. It was argued above that gratuitous formal alternations such as $\#^{*}beret(...)\#$ versus $\#^{*}bereti-E(...)\#$ were avoided by generalising simple $\#^{*}bereti(-E)(...)\#$ in absolute initial position. Shifting uni-tonic $\#(...)^{*}to-(are-)beret(...)\#$ etc. to initial position would have opposed uni-tonic $\#^{*}to-(are-)beret(...)\#$ to bi-tonic $\#^{*}to-E=(are-)beret(...)\#$, an unnecessary complication avoided by general-

(1995: 463–5) and Schumacher (KPV 84–8). Schrijver (1995: 17–19) has argued for PIC word-initial stress: 'It is generally acknowledged that at some stage in PBr. a strong stress accent fell on the penultimate syllable, which as a result of PBr. apocope became the final syllable ... At a subsequent date the stress shifted to the penultimate syllable (if there was one) ... This is essentially the position we meet in MW, MCo. and MB [17] ... It may be concluded that there is sufficient evidence for Thurneysen's idea that prior to the period of LPBr. penultimate accentuation there was a time when the predecessor of British had initial stress. This strongly suggests that the system of initial stress that we find in Irish goes back at least to PInsCl. times [19–20]'. PIC unstressed prevocalic PC *es >* is also implies initial stress at that stage and, after all, 'the change in British to an accental pattern defined in relation to the end of the word would be no more surprising than a similar shift away from earlier word-initial stress in Latin (Palmer, 1954, 211–3)' (ODVC 100).

ising the already existing initial pattern as $\#^*to(-E)='(are-)beret.(...)\#$ etc. Deuterotonic $\#^*to(-E)='(are-)beret.(...)\#$ etc. arose from this by proclisis, probably also in PIC (cf. Schrijver 1995: 17–18). If a ‘conjunct particle’ was present, $\#^*n\bar{i}(s)(-E)='to(-are)-beret.(...)\#$ etc. became $\#^*n\bar{i}(s)(\pm E)='to(-are)-beret.(...)\#$ etc. by proclisis with a pattern like $\#^*to(-E)='(are-)beret.(...)\#$, although the stress on its (first) preverb made the compound verb itself ‘prototonic’ ($\#^*to(-are)-beret > OIr.$ prot. $-ta(ir)bir$).

Whatever about the Ancient Egyptian analogues claimed by Isaac (2001: 156–168) and questioned in *ODVC* (126–9), there is something to be said for his idea of $-i$ and deuterotony as accessory morphological markers of emphatic simple and compound verbs in initial position (*ODVC* 129–131). If $\#^*-i$ had been lost at a PIC stage when initial demarcative stress had been introduced but sentence-initial position was still available to mark the topic, a simple verb would have opposed $\#^*beret... \#$ or $\#^*'bereti-E... \#$ to unmarked $\#.(E)(..)^*beret(...)\#$ and a compound $\#^*to-beret... \#$ or $\#^*to-E='beret... \#$ to $\#.(E)(..)'to-beret(...)\#$. Since the initial forms with attached enclitic were formally distinct, their differentiating feature ($\#^*-i$ or, if compound, bi-tonic stress) could have been spread to initial forms without $-E$, whence $\#bereti... \#$ and $\#^*to-E='beret... \#$ with morphological reinforcement of their positional marking as topic. Although statistically infrequent, $\#bereti(-E)... \#$ and $\#^*to(-E)='beret... \#$ will have been the only initial forms at this stage and hence likely to be generalised when initial position became the norm for the verbal complex. This scenario is a possible alternative to the more likely one above supported by Greek parallels.

The foregoing provides a framework for tackling peculiarities (§1 above) connected with the first preverb of initial (bi-tonic $>$) deuterotonic compound verbs. A bundle of circumstantial agreements between Old Irish and, however vestigially on occasion, Old and/or Middle Welsh (*ODVC* 12–16) were hardly due to coincidental parallel developments in the separate prehistories of Irish and British. It follows that *abs./conj.* inflections and the relevant features of compound verbs arose at an ancestral stage shared by both Irish and British, i.e. PIC at latest.

This litmus test of credibility presents no particular obstacle to any version of the particle hypothesis except Kortlandt’s (1979) idiosyncratic blend of $\#es$ with alleged major differences (§1, nn. 3–4 above) between them. and *athem.* primary endings. Even if it were not beset by many other problems (*ODVC* 84–5 and 132–5), his thesis is quite untenable for the simple reason that the complex set of developments mostly ascribed by his relative chronology to a prehistoric Irish stage could not possibly have occurred similarly but separately in prehistoric Irish and British (*ODVC* 135–6). Otherwise, the PIC prerequisite has proved more challenging for proposals making no use of a particle. McCone (1979) envisaged a two-stage process triggered in PIC by the presence of one or more enclitics and then extended to patterns without an enclitic in the separate prehistories of Irish and British, but this was later modified to an entirely PIC process (*ODVC* 166–70). Sims-Williams (1984: 147) firmly excluded a PIC dimension, contending that ‘the Brythonic and Irish systems may be independent results of various shared structural features ...

and various shared syntactical tendencies which are far from peculiarly Insular Celtic – tendencies, for instance, towards the univerbation of compound verbs and towards VSO word-order'. However, the processes envisaged (and sketched above) seem far too circumstantial for parallel coincidence(s) to be plausible (ODVC 123–5), even in the case of VSO order: since this is a good deal less common cross-linguistically than the main alternatives (SVO, SOV) at c. 10% of the total (Carnie and Guilfoyle 2000: 3), the odds of regular VSO arising independently in Irish and British are about 100–1 against.

8. THE PRETERITE PASSIVE AND IRREGULARITIES ASSOCIATED WITH PRETONIC PREVERBS

Since a particle **es* has no significant impact on OIr. active absolute inflections (§§2–3 above) and is formally incompatible with all OIr. deponent and related passive absolute endings (§9 below), the case for it boils down to originally vowel-final pretonic preverbs' non-lenition of a following tonic portion or enclitic pronoun (§1 above): e.g. *fo(-s):cren* 'purchases (them)' < **wo(-sūs)=k^wrinat(i)*; *ar(us):coat* 'injures (them)' < **are(-sūs)=kom-wēdet(i)* (§6, n. 30 above). This contrasts with lenition by a vowel-final enclitic pronoun or relative marker, the same preverb when non-pretonic, or a corresponding preposition: e.g. *fo:chren* 'who purchases' < **wo-yo=k^wrinat(i)*, *aru:t:choat* 'hinders you (sg.)' < **are-tu=kom-wēdet(i)*; (neg. +) prot. *ní:fo-chrann*, *ní:air-chót* 'does not purchase/hinder' < **wo-k^wrinat(i)*, **are-kom-wēdet(i)*; *fo chloich* 'under a stone' < **wo klokī*, *ar chiunn* 'ahead (of)' < **are k^wennū*. A PIC origin follows from non-lenition of pronominal object affixes (GMW 55–6) as well as vestiges of an abs./conj. opposition (GMW 118–19) and non-lenition of the rest of the verb by an initial verb-final preverb (GMW 61–2) in Old and Middle Welsh.

Supporters of a particle claim that its 'Wackernagel' position in PIC main clauses, notably #C(**es*)(E):(P)(P)V(...) and #P^{*}*es*(E):(P)V(...)#, accounts for such discrepancies: e.g. *fo(-s):cren* and *ar(us):coat* regularly < **wo(-e)s(-sūs)=k^wrinat(i)* and **are(-e)s(-sūs)=kom-wēdet(i)*. Even unapocopated PIC **esti* or (± *-t* > *-s*) **eti* would do the job in auslaut before an initial stressed syllable beginning with a consonant: e.g. (**wo(-e)ti* > **wo-t* >) **wo-θ=k^wrinaθ* > **wo-h=k^wrinah* > **wo=k^wrena* > OIr. *fo:cren*; (**are(-e)sti* > **are-ssi* or **are-st* >) **are-ss=kom-wēdet* > **are-s=ko(m)-wēdet* > **are-h=kowēt't* > **ar(e)=ko(w)et* > OIr. *ar:coat*. Here, then, a hypothetical particle outperforms an 'actual enclitic'. However, the reverse applies when the directly following stressed syllable begins with a vowel: initial *tu:ac-cair* (**to+ad+gar-*) to OIr. *taccair* 'pleads' etc. in main as in leniting relative clauses is simply due to hiatus-cancelling elision in the absence of a particle, but a particle should have produced /to 'hagar'/ etc. with elision-blocking *-h* < **(e)s/θ* (< **est(i)/*et(i)*) and then regular OIr. *do:accair* /do 'hagər'/ etc. in main clauses. So there is a fifty-fifty standoff. If it is to work with a following enclitic pronoun, **esti* or **eti* must be counter-intuitively supposed (§4 above) to form a phonological unit with a preceding verb/preverb but a word-boundary (#) with a following enclitic causing 'auslaut' *-ss/-t-* > *-s-* > *-h-*: e.g. *f-a:chren* 'purchases it (n.)' < **w(o)-e=χ^wren(a)*

< *wo-h[#]-e=χ^wrinah < *wo-s[#]-e=k^wrinat < *wo-(e)ss/t(i)[#]-e=k^wrinat(i), not *fo-s/-d:chren < *wo-s/θ-e=χ^wrinaθ < *wo-(e)ss/t(i)e(d)=k^wrinat(i) with normal inlaut developments (cf. §5 above). Given this and its helplessness before a following vowel (§6 above), a particle only seems admissible as a lenition-blocker if there is absolutely no viable alternative.

A single set of PIE mediopassive endings made any distinction between passive and middle function syntactic not morphological: passive and deponent inflection are, for instance, formally identical throughout in Latin. Although secondarily differentiated passive and middle/deponent forms are found elsewhere in the odd tense (e.g. the Ancient Greek future and aorist or the Vedic pres. ind. and 3sg. aorist), Insular Celtic uniquely introduced a pervasive contrast in the 1/2sg./pl. between separate verbal endings in the deponent and 3sg. verb plus relevant enclitic pronoun in the passive: e.g. OIr. dep. *midur* 'I judge' or *ní:midemmar* 'we do not judge' but pass. *no-m:mitter* 'I am judged', *ní-n:mitter* 'we are not judged', MW (virtually no remaining deponent) *y-m:gatter* 'I am left', *hand-yth-uagwyd* 'you have been reared' (GMW 56). The obvious starting point was the preterite passive (Cowgill 1983: 104–6), an erstwhile verbal adjective (cf. Celtib. *ne litom* below) originally inflected for number, case and gender but not person. The shift to a finite verb entailed pruning to just two forms with -s, namely m. sg. and f. pl., and using 1st/2nd-person affixes: e.g. (*ag-* 'drive'), nom. m./f./n. sg. *aχ-tos/-tā/-ton, pl. *aχ-toi/-tās/-tā 'driven' and so on reduced to PIC 3sg./pl. *ro aχ-tos/-tās and 1/2sg./pl. *ro-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes=aχ-tos > OIr. *ro:acht(a)* 'has/(have) been driven' and *ro-m/-t/-n/-b:acht* 'I/you (sg.)/we/you (pl.) have been driven'.

Cowgill's suggestion of 3sg. pass. pret. *britos es(t) > OIr. *brethae* (abs.) 'was borne' vs *nī's(t) *britos* > OIr. *ní:breth* 'was not borne' was independent of his slightly later idea of *est(i) 'so it is' as an asseverative particle (§4 above). The copula was not a 'Wackernagel' enclitic in PIC (§4 above) and its normal proclisis to a stressed predicate implies *esti *britos* rather than *britos *est*. However, *nīs(t) *britos* would follow from early fusion of *ne-est (§4) and the normal position of the negative and other 'conjunct particles' (EIV 1).

Nevertheless, initial *britos *est* etc. could have resulted, if a periphrasis similar to Lat. *fact-us/-a/-um est* 'was made' had been effectively 'unverbated' before PIC generalisation of VSO order (V = verbal complex) and so was shifted as a unit. Inflection of the passive participle for number and gender and of the copula for number and person would then be expected, as in Lat. *fact-us/-a sum/es* 'I/you was/were made', *fact-i/-ae sumus/estis* 'we/you were made', *fact-i/-ae/-a sunt* 'they were made'. A 3rd-person pres. ind. cop. could easily be omitted, as in Celtiberian ...*ne litom*, *nekue...litom* '(is) not allowed' (Bot. I, ll. 1–2, Jordán Cólera 2004: 327), giving a choice between, say, PIC neg. m. sg. *ne or *nīs *britos*, f. pl. *ne or *nint *britās* (cf. GOI 153). However, 'to mark person and number with 1st and 2nd person patients we might have expected reflexes of the copula, as in Latin *amātus sum*, *amātī sumus*, Polish *był-em*, *byli-śmy*, or Persian *kærd-æm*, *kærd-im*. This suggests an antecedent state where person and number were expressed by nominative pronouns, on the model of Russian *ja byl*, *my byli* ... and the copula, if present at all, played

a quite subordinate role ... If so, Old Irish shows two innovations in the 1st and 2nd person preterite passive: the pronouns have acquired enclitic oblique shapes, and the verb has ceased to mark plural number. Instead of *šrosni-messa* from Insular Celtic **ro-s snīs messās* we have *ron-mess* as if from **ro-s nos messon* (Cowgill 1983: 105; -s < particle **es* < **esti*). Cowgill (1983: 105–6) suggests that the use of enclitics may have been enabled by a lack of formal distinction between nom. and acc. forms of pronouns. This may well have been true of P(I)C independent 1sg. **mī*, 2sg. **tū*, 1pl. **snī*, 2pl. **swī* (§2 above on Gaulish subj. *mī*, *suī* and obj. *snī*), but the enclitic forms were invariably objects until the rise of this PIC passive construction. So OIr. *ro-n:mess* ‘we have been judged’ < **ro-nnos messos* and not **ro:mess-(s)ni* < **ro messos snī*⁴⁷ (without a particle) is still puzzling.

If a copula was regularly used in the PIC pret. pass. 1/2sg./pl., there would have been no role for pronouns, whether independent or clitic, as markers of person and number. Even so, enclitic pronouns could have been introduced by a PIC process not unlike the generation of OIr. pres. ind. cop. forms like 2sg. *a/i-t* from 1sg. *a-m* (§2 above). If 1sg. **nīmm aχtos* (< **nīmm(i)* < **nīsmi*) was understood as elided **nī-mm(e)* similar to, say, **ro-m(e) aχt* ‘has driven me’ (cf. prevocalic elision of Gk. *me* ‘me’ to *m*), then **nī-mme* could have replaced **nīmm* before a consonant by a proportion (neg. 3sg. pret. act. + 1sg. pron.) **ne-m aχt* : **ne-me birt* = **nī-mm aχtos* : x (x = **nī-mme britos*) (neg. 1sg. pret. pass). Such a development before PIC creation of 1/2sg. **nīt-emm/-is* etc. (§5 above) would have facilitated substitution of unambiguous 2sg. **nī-ttu* for **nīs* (< **nīs(i)*; 3sg. **nīs* < **nīss(i)*) and then 1pl. **nī-nnos* for **nīmmis*, 2pl. **nī-swes*⁴⁸ for **nītis* (§5 above) by a proportion (neg. pret. act. 3sg. + pron.) **ne-me birt* : **ne-tu/-nnos/-swes birt* = **nī-mme britos* : 2sg./1pl./2pl. x (x = **nī-ttu/-nnos/-swes britos*) (pret. pass. 1sg.).

If the 3sg. alone had resisted cop. + pred. order, the result will have been 1/2sg. **emmi/*isi britos*, 3pl. **inti britās* etc. but 3sg. **britos is(s)* (§5 above on PC **isti* for **esti*). Once established with the negative, the convenient affixing pattern outside the 3rd person could spread to non-neg. sentence-initial connectives or conjunctions. It seems that one of these, **nu*, was sufficiently neutral semantically to become the means of attaching the forms used with **nī(s)* if there was no other prefix: e.g. 1/2sg./pl. **nu-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes britos*⁴⁹ > OIr. *no-m/-t/-n/-b:breth* ‘I was/you were borne’ versus 3sg. **britos-is* > **britoh-ih* > **breθo(h)ih* > **breθē(h)* > OIr. *breth(a)e* ‘was borne’. Crucially, **is* here is not a particle but a normal copula form on its way to becoming

⁴⁷The pronoun’s position here is based on the virtual certainty that at least some earlier independent subject/object pronouns are continued by OIr. pronominal adjuncts or *notae augentes* (GOI 252–3; ODVC 214–24).

⁴⁸With non-gemination of *s*- because of the following *w*. Most likely, this was because, whereas the 1sg./2sg./1pl. syllable boundary was **nī-m.me/-t.tu/-n.nos*, 2pl. **nī-ss.wes* would have had a tautosyllabic geminate. Even if such a form was created, it would have been liable to syllable-final simplification (as assumed by Boling 1972: 87 and Kortlandt 1979: 36 in relation to **-s-swes* containing a particle) matching postvocalic word-final *-ss* > *-s*.

⁴⁹With the same **britos* in 1/2pl. as with the trigger **nī-mme*, not least because 3pl. **nint britās* will have had a specifically 3pl. ending *-nt* unlike impersonal **nī-* (3sg. **nī-ss*).

an 'absolute' inflectional element like **-i*. The origin of **britos* etc. as a verbal adjective implies compound **to-brit-os/-ā/-on* etc. (with normal substantival initial stress) and 1sg. **emmi/*nīmm tobritos* etc. but 3sg. **tobritos-is/*nīs tobritos*. Loss of inflection for gender and case by **(to)britos* (3pl. **(to)britās*) etc. presumably paved the way for verb-like behaviour through creation of a bi-tonic initial form to support enclitics: **ne-me 'to-birt : *to-me 'birt* = pass. **nī-mme 'to-britos : x* (*x = 'to-mme 'britos*) corresponding to OIr. act. *nī-m:thabart* '(s)he did not bring me', *do-m:bert* '(s)he brought me' and pass. *nī-m:thabrad* 'I was not brought', *do-m:breth* 'I was brought'.

In the absence of OIr. examples (GOI 440), all that can safely be said about the 3pl. abs. is that it had a final vowel like conj. *-bretha* < **britās* (e.g. ML 58^d6 *ar fo:roiblachta* 'for they have been anticipated' gl. *quia ... sunt praeventi*). If they were identical,⁵⁰ the abs. may have become **britās > *breθāh > OIr. bretha* (?) through disuse of a probably optional preposed (3pl.) copula now confined to this one point in the paradigm.

The scenario just outlined accounts for non-inflection of the verb itself for number in the 1/2pl., for the total lack of OIr. 1sg. abs. **brethum* etc. with suffixation and, above all, for the otherwise problematical PIC pressing of enclitic object pronouns into service as passive subject markers. Its potential to differentiate 1/2sg./pl. passive from corresponding active forms of deponent verbs (§9 below) was a powerful motive for spreading this system from its preterite base to all other tenses and moods of the passive. Once established at the expense of inherited **ne*⁵¹ in main clauses throughout the passive (except its imperative), more highly characterised **nīs(E)* was set to displace **ne(E)* with non-imperative active (incl. deponent) verbs in main clauses (cf. Latin *nōn* for *ne* except for the stray compounded survivals *ne-queo* 'I cannot' and *nolo* 'I do not wish' < **ne-velō*). One consequence of such a development would be new combinations of **nīs* with a 3rd-person pronoun such as 3pl. **sūs*, which (shortened in proclisis to **suh*) underlies OIr. *nī-s:beir* 'does not bear them' etc. < **nīssus=beret*. Derivation of the likes of OIr. *nī:cheil* 'does not conceal it (n.)' or *nī:mbeir* 'does not bear him/it(m.)' from PIC **nīs-e/-en* (> **nī(h)-e/(n)*) with the same outcome as old *-s* requires an anyway probable PIC postvocalic *-ss > -s* in auslaut before a similar simplification of *-ss-* in intervocalic inlaut (e.g. OIr. *is*, MW *ys* 'is' < **isi* < IC **issi-*). PC **nīd/m* < **nēd/m* < **ne+ed/m* is ruled out by the enclitic pronouns' forms **id* and **im* at that stage (cf. Schrijver 1997: 51–63; §1 above on OInd. *id*, Gaul. *buēt(i)+id*; Ernout 1953: 83 on OLat. *im/em*). These seem more likely to have combined with **ne* as PC **neid/m* > **nēd/m* > PIC n. **nē*, m. **nēn*, but could easily have been remodelled to **nī* and **nīn*, once neg. **nīs*, **nī-mme* and so on had been established. Whether originally based upon **nī-* (**nī-ssūs* like **nī-mme/-ttu/-nnos*) or **nīs* (**nīs-sūs* like arguable 3sg. m./n. **nīs-e(n)*), neg. + 3pl. pron. was almost bound to be analysed as **nī-ssūs*

⁵⁰3pl. abs. *-(a)i* tentatively suggested by GOI 440 is quite uncertain, being based on a couple of examples from texts written or copied after the late OIr./early MidIr. merger of final short vowels as schwa (*RelChron.* 142–3).

⁵¹Inherited from PIE (e.g. OInd. *na* < **ne*) via PC (e.g. Celtib. *ne litom*) and still underlying OIr. rel. neg. *nad*: < **ne-de*, *nacha*: < **ne-k^we-huh* < **ne-k^we-sūs*.

beginning with two consonants like all of the other consonant-initial forms (e.g. 1pl. *-nnos*, 2pl. **-swes*). Whether $< *sin$ or $*-s(iy)an$ ⁵² $< PC *sīm$ or $*siyām$, the f. sg. seen in OIr. *ní-s:(m)beir* ‘bears her/it (f.)’ will have acquired PIC **ss-* like 3pl. **-ssūs*.

The PIC forms in column I below yield OIr. *ní-m/-t:chleth* ‘I was/you (sg.) were not concealed’, *ní:cleth* ‘was not concealed’, *ní-n/-b:cleth* ‘we/you (pl.) were not concealed’, *ní:cletha* ‘were not concealed’. Those in II are direct precursors of OIr. *ní-m/-t:chelar* ‘I am/you (sg.) are not concealed/praised’, *ní:celar* ‘is not concealed’, *ní-n/-b:celar* ‘we/you (pl.) are not concealed’, *ní:mol(a)tar* ‘are not praised’ etc. Likewise the actives (and deponents) in III: e.g. *ní-m/-t:cheil* ‘does not conceal me’, *ní:ceil* ‘does not conceal’, *ní:cheil* ‘does not conceal it (n.)’, *ní-n/-b:molathar* ‘does not praise us/you (pl.)’, *ní-s:ceil* ‘does not conceal them’.

I	II	III
preterite passive	other passive	active/deponent (3sg. + obj. pron.)
1sg. <i>*nī-mme=klitos</i>	<i>*nī-mme=kelor/=molātor</i>	<i>*nī-mme=kelet/=molātor</i>
2sg. <i>*nī-ttu=klitos</i>	<i>*nī-ttu=kelor/=molātor</i>	<i>*nī-ttu=kelet/=molātor</i>
3sg. <i>*nīs=klitos</i>	<i>*nīs=kelor/=molātor</i>	<i>*nīs=kelet/=molātor</i>
	(+n.(m.) pron.)	<i>*nī(n)/=kelet/=molātor</i>
1pl. <i>*nī-nnos=klitos</i>	<i>*nī-nnos=kelor/=molātor</i>	<i>*nī-nnos=kelet/=molātor</i>
2pl. <i>*nī-swes=klitos</i>	<i>*nī-swes=kelor/=molātor</i>	<i>*nī-swes=kelet/=molātor</i>
3pl. <i>*nīs=klitās</i> ⁵³	<i>*nīs=kelontor/=molantor</i>	<i>*nī-ssūs=kelet/=molātor</i>

It has been argued above that 1/2sg./pl. infixed pronouns with a geminated (**mme* etc.) or at least double (**swes*) initial consonant had spread as subjects throughout the preterite passive system from their point of origin with negative **nīs*: e.g. not only PIC **nī-mme/-nnos=molātos* ($>$ OIr. *ní-m/-n:molad* ‘I was/we were not praised’) but also **nu-mme/-nnos=britos* ($>$ OIr. *no-m/-n:breth* ‘I was/we were borne’), augm. **ro-mme/-nnos=molātos* ($>$ OIr. *ro-m/-n:molad* ‘I/we have been praised’) and cpd. **to-mme/-nnos=britos* ($>$ OIr. *do-m/-n:breth* ‘I was/we were brought’). Their further spread to the other tenses and moods of the passive was likewise not confined the neg. type in column II: e.g. not

⁵²General previous agreement that **-siyan* (or less obvious **-seyan*) is the only morphologically plausible preform capable of yielding 3g. f. $-e < *he < *se$ with prepositions (McCone 1993: 172–3) has been helpfully documented and discussed by a dissenting Schrijver (1997: 36–8), but his alternative **-so-san* is unconvincing. An older **-sin < *-sim* could have remained in use as the enclitic form with verbs. This accounts for non-pal. infixed *-s* thanks to EOIr. depalatalisation of consonants in proclitics, but the invariably non-pal. *-s* of the plentifully attested (Breatnach 1977: 82–3) 3sg. f. suffixed pronoun would then have to be due to analogy. However, both would result regularly $< *san < *-s(y)an < *-siyan$ by a Primlr. reduction of unlenited **-siya > *-sya > *-sa > -s* after an unstressed syllable posited (McCone 1995: 130–2) to account for OIr. 3sg. rel. forms such as cop. pres. as ‘who/which is’ $< *esa < *is(y)a < *issi-ya < *issi-yo$ ($>$ MW *yssyd*) $< *esti-yo$ or s-pret. *marbas* ‘who/which killed, whom/which (s)he/it killed’ $< *marwas(y)a < *marwass(y)o$ ($\leftarrow *marwast + *-yo$).

⁵³In place of original *nint*, once this had been left unsupported by affirmative **britās* for **inti britās*.

only neg. **nī-mme/-nnos*=*molātor*/=*toberor* but also **nu-mme/-nnos*:*molātor* (> OIr. *no-m/-n*:*moltar* ‘I am/we are praised’), **to-mme/-nnos*=*beror* (> OIr. *do-m/-n*:*ber(a)r* ‘I am/we are brought’) and so on.

Adoption of neg. **nīs* (±geminated pronouns) in III differed from I and II insofar as active (incl. deponent) verbs already used ungeminated (except **-nnos* < **-snos*) enclitic pronouns as objects: e.g. neg. **nī-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes/-ssūs*=*beret* (> OIr. *nī-m/-t/-n/-b/-s*:*beir* ‘does not bear me/you/us/you/them’) but **to-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes/-sūs*=*beret* (OIr. *do-m/-t/-n/-b/-s*:*beir* ‘brings me etc.’) and **bereti-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes/-sūs* (OIr. *beirthiu-m* ‘bears me etc.’).

Gemination is central to Koch’s ‘prosodic’ explanation (§1 above), which posits doubling of the initial consonant of enclitics (including supposedly atonic non-initial main-clause verbs) by a preceding short stressed final vowel. Alleged accentuation of a pre-enclitic syllable (§1 above) extends this effect to all postvocalic enclitics (Koch 1987: 149–52; 2022: 44–7): e.g. **ambí-s.sūs-beret(i)* > OIr. *imm-us:beir* ‘plays them’, **beretí-s.sūs* > OIr. *beirthiu-s* ‘carries them’, **arí-k.kanet(i)* > OIr. *ar:cain* ‘recites’.⁵⁴ Gemination is due to a tendency of languages with a stress accent to avoid this on short final vowels by either de-stressing them⁵⁵ or making their short/light syllable long/heavy in one of two ways: by lengthening either its vowel (as in the likes of OIr. *sé* ‘six’ < **s(w)e* < **sweh* < **swes(s)* < **sweχs* > MW *chwech*; GOI 32) or, less frequently, the following consonant. In Tuscan Italian, for instance, ‘the juncture of a short stressed vowel + consonant results in gemination: e.g., *caffè nero* [kaffé nné:ro], *resterà con me* [resterá kkom mé], *sto benino* [stó bbení:no], *carità divina* [karità ddiví:na]; see M. Chapallaz, *The Pronunciation of Italian* (London 1979) 133ff.’ (Koch 1987: 147).

An accentual approach would have some attraction, if the distribution of OIr. conj. (-*beir* etc.) or prot. (PV -*tab(a)ir* etc.) and abs. (*beirid*) or deut. (PV *do:beir* etc.) corresponded reasonably neatly to that of Vedic main-clause $\check{V}(\dots)$ or $\dots V$ (e.g. *yāti devāh* ‘the god goes’ RV 1, 35, 3 or *sá id devēsu gachati* ‘that goes to the gods’ 1, 1, 4), including $\check{P}(\dots)V$ (e.g. *Agnīh ... ā gamat* ‘let Agni come’ 1, 1, 5; *ā devō yāti* ‘the god comes’ 1, 35, 3), and subordinate-clause $(\dots)\check{V}(\dots)$ (*yá u tát cíketat* ‘who may understand this’ 1, 35, 6), including $P\check{V}$ or $\check{P}(\dots)\check{V}$ (e.g. *yáh párthivāni vimamé rájāṃsi* ‘who has measured out the terrestrial regions’ 1, 154, 1 or *ví yé bhrájante* ‘who shine forth’ RV 1, 85, 4). It doesn’t, and Koch (1987: 172) pleads the absurdity of expecting an IE language like OIr. with a fixed initial stress accent to preserve direct traces of the free tonal accent inferred for PIE. Quite so, but that makes Vedic accentuation irrelevant to OIr. and so ‘close’ vs (with P separable from V by E etc.) ‘loose’ compounding are substituted as a pretext for correlating OIr. P’V and ‘PV with Vedic/PIE $\check{P}V$ and $P\check{V}$ respectively: ‘OIr. [initial] **do-beir** ... and IE [main] *pró bhereti* are

⁵⁴The adaptation of Koch’s (1987: 162) preforms here to an IC look does not affect the basic point.

⁵⁵This would be tempting as an explanation of the PIC proclisis responsible for deuterotonic verb forms, conjunct particles, proclitic copula, prepositions, article, possessives (e.g. OIr. *a* ‘his’ < **ehya* < **esyo*), were it not for a shortage of the vowel-final monosyllables liable to be affected on an initial-stress model of PIC.

loosely compounded; [non-initial] **tabair** ... and [subordinate] *probhéreti* are closely compounded' (Koch 1987: 172). As the above examples show, a preverb is as readily separated from its verb in Vedic subordinate as in main clauses, the only difference being that it then bears an accent. It seems absurd to call subordinate *PV* here fully compounded in a way that *Ǿ(...)**V* was not and lump subordinate *Ǿ(...)**V* with the latter. The basic Vedic (and PIE?) rule was, surely, that *Ǿ* underwent proclisis in direct contact with *V*.

Even if this objection is ignored, Koch's contrived correlation would yield an OIr. opposition between deut. *do:beir* etc. in main and prot. *tabair* in subordinate clauses and so it must be assumed that eventually a questionable distinction between 'loosely and closely compounded versions of compound verbs ... could come to be used exactly like abs. and cjt. forms of simple verbs' (Koch 1987: 174). This scenario is scuppered by Koch's later restriction of apocope of **-i* to unstressed forms, which would yield (with simple and compound verbs alike) non-initial conj. inflection in main but invariable abs. inflection in subordinate clauses as well as initially. Consequently, now 'it is unlikely that Celtic continued a subordinate clause structure like that seen in Vedic' (Koch 2022: 35; cf. his n. 31). This seriously undermines the relevance of Vedic/PIE to OIr. accentuation, but Koch (2022: 54–6) posits a Pre- or Proto-Celtic phase with initially stressed **eḡs bereti* etc. (now a direct outcome of PIE main-clause *ǾV*) improbably converted to the deuterotonic pattern underlying OIr. *as:beir* 'says' etc. at a much later PrimIr. date on the model of patterns like prep. + noun **eḡs bardobis* (OIr. *a bardaib* 'out of bards') dubiously assumed to have had a proclitic from the Pre- or Proto-Celtic stage envisaged. Old verbal enclisis and/or early proclisis in such groups as preposition/possessive + noun are essential for Koch's gemination rule. This is arbitrarily restricted to following enclitics on account of its non-application to cases like *fo chenn* '(down to the head of,) towards, regarding' (not **fo cenn* < **'wo 'kk^wennom*, because a noun is stressed but a verb isn't), but early proclisis would do just as well: e.g. **wo 'k^wennom* > *fo chenn* vs **'wo 'kk^wrinat(i)* > *fo:cren* 'purchases'. Koch could dispense with either P(I)C enclisis of verbs or proclisis of prepositions etc. but not with both. However, he chooses to retain both verbal enclisis and precocious proclisis of prepositions etc., presumably as belt and braces.

Although Koch's two 'prosodic' solutions (1987 and 2022) rest upon improbabilities or worse, his idea of post-tonic gemination seems worth considering in combination with PIC word-initial stress patterns (n. 46 above and *RelChron.* 100).

The comparable Italian gemination is a widespread feature of speech and by no means confined to enclitics (cf. *caffè nero* [kaffè nné:ro] above), but it is only recognised by standard orthography in expressions written as a single word (Maiden and Robustelli 2013: 10–13): e.g. *vabbene* 'OK', *davvero* 'truly, indeed', or a small group of monosyllabic imperatives plus clitic pronouns such as *dillo* 'say (*di*) it (*lo*)', *fammelo* 'do (*fa*) it (*lo*) for me (*me*)',⁵⁶ *stammi*

⁵⁶In this case and *dillo*, the gemination could presumably be a reflex of the final consonants of Latin *dic* 'say!' and *fac* 'do!' but that would not apply to *sta* etc.

bene ‘stay (*sta*) well (for me, *mi*)’, *vattene* ‘go (*va*) ([reflexive] you, *te*) away (*ne*)’ (2013: 98), but otherwise *città persa* [tʃitˈta pˈpersa] ‘lost city’, *sarà bello* [saˈra bˈbello] ‘it will be nice’, *chi sei?* [ki sˈsei] ‘who are you?’, *va bene* [va bˈbene] ‘it’s going well’, *è vero* [ɛ vˈvero] ‘it’s true’ etc. (2013: 10–11).

Such doubling might be expected chiefly in languages with phonemic gemination, and geminate consonants are certainly common enough in Italian (*caffè*, *città*, *bello* above, *acqua* ‘water’, *hanno* ‘they have’, *tutti* ‘all’ etc.). They were also a feature of PIC (McCone 2015: 110–111) and their survival past that stage, at least intervocalically after a stressed vowel, is indicated by different Irish and British outcomes in cases like PIC **bigg-o/-ā* (> PrimIr. **beg-a/-ā* > OIr. *bec(c)* /beg/, ModIr. *beag* ‘small’, but > Brit. **bikk-o/-ā* > MW *bych-/bech-* ‘small’)⁵⁷ or **nidd-o-* (> PrimIr. **neda-* > OIr. *net* /ned/, ModIr. *nead* ‘nest’, but > Brit. **nitto-* > MW *nyth* ‘nest’). In a PIC system with word-initial stress and bi-tonic ‘CE’(P)(P)V or ‘PE’(P)V, an Italian-style rule would only have geminated consonants after stressed monosyllables with a short vowel such as **nu*, **ro*, **to*, or **wo*: e.g. **to-me/-tu/-sūs*=‘beret above > **to-mme/-ttu/-ssūs*=‘beret (> OIr. *do-m/-s:beir* ‘brings me/you (sg.)/them’) or act. augm. pret. **ro-me/-tu/-sūs*=‘gabas(s) > **ro-mme/-ttu/-ssūs*=‘gabas(s) > OIr. *ro-m/-t/-s:gab* ‘has seized me/you/them’) by regular sound change. Gemination does not apply in Italian ‘where a consonant is immediately followed by another consonant (e.g., *ho studiato* [ˈɔ stuˈdʲato] ‘I’ve studied’ ...)’ (Maiden and Robustelli 2013: 11), and its syllable-closing function (e.g. **wo.me*, **ro.tu*, **to.sūs* > **wom.me*, **rot.tu*, **tos.sūs*) was likewise otiose in PIC 2pl. **tos.wes*.

Gemination would not have applied after the unstressed short final vowel of a disyllabic PIC preverb like **ambi*:⁵⁸ e.g. unchanged **ambi-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes/-sūs*=‘*dī-wiket* (OIr. *imm:dích* ‘protects’). With or without an Italian-style sound change, the formal identity of 1pl. **-nnos* and 2pl. **-swes* throughout could have triggered complete homogenisation between the likes of **nī-mme/-ttu/-ssūs*, **wo-(m)me/-(t)tu/-(s)sūs* and **ambi-me/-tu/-sūs* easily enough. Their biconsonantal initials would have favoured **ambi-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes/-ssūs*=‘*dī-wiket* (> OIr. *immu-m/-t/-n/-b/-s:dích* ‘protects me/you/us/you/them’), regardless of whether a form like **wo-sūs*=‘*k^wrinat* became **wo-ssūs*=‘*k^wrinat* (> OIr. *fo-s:cren* ‘purchases them’) by regular sound change or analogical influence from a neg. form like **nī-ssūs*=‘*k^wrinat* (> OIr. *nī-s:cren* ‘does not buy them’). Once generalised after vowel-final preverbs, the geminated set would be likely to spread from the commoner infixed to the less common suffixed pronouns: e.g. **bereti-mme/-ttu/-ssūs* (> OIr. *beirthiu-m/-t/-s* ‘bears me’) for **bereti-me/-tu/-sūs*.

There is no alternation in Old Irish between lenited and unlenited forms of individual pronouns within the suffixed or a given infixed class: unlenited 1sg. *-m(m)*, 2sg. *-t*, 1pl. *-n(n)* and lenited 2pl. *-b* are ubiquitous; unlenited 3sg.

⁵⁷MW *bychan*, f. *bechan* with an *i/e* alternation only explicable if *-an* had been added to the form after ultimate *ā*-affection in British (McCone 2015: 111–12).

⁵⁸The final *-i* of a PIC preverb like **ambi* or initial connective like **eti* ‘and’ (§4 above) will have been shielded in initial position from apocope by a following enclitic and then generalised in initial position just like abs. 3sg. **-ti(-E)* etc.

f. and 3pl. -s typify the suffixed and Class A infixed pronouns, but lenited reflexes are regular after a vowel-final enclitic connective in the 3sg. f. and 3pl. (**huh* < **sūs*) of Class B (used with consonant-final preverbs) and relative Class C: e.g. OIr. *for-da:cain* ‘teaches them’ < **wor-de-(h)uh*=‘*kaneh*’; *do-da:berat*, *na-cha:taibret* ‘who (do not) bring them’ < **to-ðe-(h)uh*=‘*berod*, **ne-χ^we-(h)uh*=‘*to-βerod*. Likewise, invariable British forms correspond to OIr. Class A: MW 1sg. -*m* (< **mme*), 2sg. -*th* (< **ttu*), 1pl. -*n* (< **nnos*), 2pl. -*ch* (< **hweh* < **swes*), 3sg./pl. -*s* (< 3pl. *-*ssūs*) or -*e/-y* (3sg. m. *-*en*) (GMW 55–6). A similar pattern is seen with the consonant-initial clitic pronominal forms attached to OIr. prepositions: almost always unlenited 1sg. -*m(m)*, invariably unlenited 2sg. -*t* and 1pl. -*n(n)*, but lenited 2pl. -*b*, (acc.) 3sg. f. -*e* and 3pl. -*u*⁵⁹ (GOI 272–6).

Gemination after a stressed short final vowel is called into question as a regular P(I)C sound law by OIr. *do-da*: and *na-cha*: above. Unlenited *-*de-* in Class B after a consonant-final preverb⁶⁰ is regular, but Class C **do-ta:beir* < **to-dde-sūs*=‘*beret* and *na-c(c)a:tab(a)ir* < **ne-kk^we-sūs*=‘*to-beret* would be the expected outcomes of the gemination rule. OIr. *dom* ‘to me’ (some 60 exx. in Wb., none with -*mm*; *LexWb.* 318, cf. GOI 272–6) may well be, and its Classical ModIr. outcome *damh* certainly is (McManus 1994: 435–7), the sole exception to use of unlenited -*m* as the 1sg. prepositional affix. This -*m(m)* must be due to analogy in the case of leniting prepositions like OIr. *imm(-um(m))* ‘around (me)’ (< **imbi(-mu)*) > ClModIr. *um(-am)*). The /-μ/ of OIr. *dom* /doμ/ cannot be analogical and so must directly continue **do-mu* (the vowel of the pronoun is immaterial here) by normal lenition. However, OIr. **dom(m)* /‘dom(m)/ < **do-mmμ* < **do-mu* would have resulted from automatic gemination after a stressed short final vowel and a PIC sound law to that effect seems untenable in the light of this, *do-da* and *na-cha*. Nevertheless, the syllable-closing properties of gemination may have assisted its analogical spread to clitic pronouns after **to*, **ro*, **wo*, which then provided a platform for its extension to the likes of **ambi*, **are* with unstressed final vowels.

To recap, the IC 1/2sg./pl. passive system of 3sg. verb plus relevant infixed pronoun as subject evolved from taking clause-initial 1sg. neg. cop. **nīm* (< **nīsmi*) used with verbal adjectives like **axtos* ‘led’ or **britos* ‘borne’ as **nī-mm(e)* with a geminated 1sg. clitic pronoun. This triggered corresponding 2sg./1pl./2pl forms, firstly neg. **nī-ttu/-nnos/-swes*=(*to-*)*britos* and then affirmat-

⁵⁹OIr. *tairse*, *tairsiu* ‘over her/them’ (GOI 273) < **tares-siyan/-sūs* (OIr. *tar* ‘over’ < **tares*, OIInd. *tiraḥ* ‘across’; GOI 531: both < **tṛh₁es*) certainly preserves unlen. -*s*- historically but synchronic analysis as *tairs-e/-u* with the same exclusively 3rd-person element as 3sg. m./n. *tarais* (cf. *úad(-)* vs 1st/2nd-person *úa-*; GOI 274) seems more likely than anomalous *tair-se/-siu*. The -*s* of *tarais* itself must be analogical (to *fris*, *leis* according to GOI 351; otherwise OIr. **tar(a)e* < **tarēh* < **tare(h)-e(n)* < **tares-e(d)/-en*) and it may well be that earlier segmentation of 3sg. f. and 3pl. as **tares(s)-eya(n)/-ū(h)* triggered 3sg. m./n. **tares(s)-e(n)*. At any rate, *tairs-e/-iu* were doubtless taken to contain the same 3rd-person element as *tarais* (cf. *úad*, *úad-i*, *úad-ib* ‘from him/it, her them’ vs *úa-* elsewhere; GOI 274).

⁶⁰PIC consonant-final preverbs like **wor* or **eχs* are, of course, irrelevant here because clitic pronouns used with them, regardless of whether they were geminated or not (presumably the latter), would not have become lenited.

ive **nu-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes*='britos and **to-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes*='britos etc.. These distinctively passive forms were then understandably spread throughout the passive system: e.g. **nī*-, **nu*- or **to-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes=beror*. Originally copular neg. **nīs(s)* also spread to the active (incl. deponent) at the expense of less distinctive **ne* with the result that its pronominal forms could now be used as objects: e.g. **nī-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes=(to-)beret*. This shift called for the use of 3rd-person object forms with **nīs*, probably 3sg. n./m.) **nī(n)* for **nē(n)* (< PC **nēd(/m)* < **ne-id(/-im)*) and 3sg. f. **-ssi(ya)n*, 3pl. **-ssūs* with a prevocalic geminate like **-mme*, **-ttu* and **-nnos*: e.g. **nī-ssūs=(to-)beret*. Homogenisation of non-neg. clitic object **-me/-tu/-nnos/-swes/-sūs* etc. and the **-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes/-ssūs* used with **nīs* generalised the latter on account of already identical 1/2pl. forms with a biconsonantal initial in both: e.g. cpd. **to-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes/-ssūs=beret* (OIr. *no-* or *do-m/-t/-n/-b/-s:beir*), simple **bereti-mme/-ttu/-nnos/-swes/-ssūs* (OIr. *beirthiu-m/-s* etc). This sequence of motivated developments removes any need for a particle conceded even by advocates (§4 above) to be 'tricky' to 'fiendishly complicated' as a means of generating unlenited OIr. infixes and suffixed pronouns.

It is reasonable to assume that the PIC phase when a verb or preverb was placed at the head of its clause solely to support enclitic pronouns (§7 above) also saw the generalisation of postvocalic enclitic pronouns beginning with either: (a) a geminate stop (1sg. **-mme*, 2sg. **-ttu*, 1pl. **-nnos*); (b) double s (3sg. f. **-ssi(ya)n*, 3pl. **-ssūs*); (c) a consonant cluster (2pl. **-swes*); or (d) a vowel (3sg. n. **-e*, m. **-en*). From this would follow the patterns below for specifically initial (a)(i)–(d)(i) bi-tonic compound and (e)(i) absolute simple verbs.

+E	-E
(a)(i) # ^{*/} <i>to-mme</i> = <i>'beret</i> (...)# (also <i>*to-ttu/-nnos</i> =)	vs (ii) #.(...) ^{*/} <i>to-beret</i> (...)#
(b)(i) # ^{*/} <i>ambi-ssūs</i> = <i>'dī-wiket</i> (...)# (also <i>*ambi-ssi(ya)n</i> =)	vs (ii) #.(...) ^{*/} <i>ambi-dī-wiket</i> (...)#
(c)(i) # ^{*/} <i>ambi-swes</i> = <i>'dī-wiket</i> (...)#	vs (ii) #.(...) ^{*/} <i>ambi-dī-wiket</i> (...)#
(d)(i) # ^{*/} <i>to-en</i> = <i>beret</i> (...)# (also <i>*to-e</i> =)	vs (ii) #.(...) ^{*/} <i>to-beret</i> (...)#
(e)(i) # ^{*/} <i>bereti-mme/-ttu/-nnos-ssūs/-swes/-e(n)</i> (...)#	vs (ii) #.(...) ^{*/} <i>beret</i> (...)#

The above scheme will have been in operation when the shift to VSO order was completed by the PIC creation of new initial compound and simple verbs without an attached enclitic pronoun in place of non-initial (a)–(e)(ii), unless their uni-tonic verbal forms directly followed an initial negative or some other 'conjunct particle' capable of attaching enclitic pronouns: e.g. unaffected #^{*}*nīs*='nī-mme='(to-)beret(...)#. #, #^{*}*nīs*='nī-mm(e)='ambi-dī-wiket(...). Minimal formal fuss was achieved (§7 above) by having initial simple verbs use absolute inflections without as well as with an enclitic (e.g. (e) #^{*}*bereti(-mme/-ssūs/-swes/-e(n))*(...)#) and similarly employing initial bi-tonic compound verb forms, whether or not an enclitic was present. That raised the question of the form to be taken, in the absence of a previously always

intervening enclitic, by the anlaut of the second part of the new bi-tonic initial forms. The obvious solution was simply to adopt existing syllable-closing patterns used with enclitics, e.g.: (a) *#to='mmelet...#* (cf. **to-mme=*) > OIr. *do:(m)meil* ‘consumes’, *#*ambi=ttēgont...#* (cf. **ambi-ttu=*) > OIr. *imm:tiāgat* ‘(they) go around’, **are='nna(d)sket* (cf. **are-nnos=*) > OIr. *ar:naisc* ‘betrotths’, *#*to='bberet...#* > OIr. *do:(b)beir* ‘brings’, *#*ambi=ddī-wiket...#* > OIr. *im(m):dich* ‘protects’, **wo='kkerdet* > OIr. *fo:ceird* ‘puts’; (b) *#*ro=ssagit...#* (cf. **ro-ssūs=*) > OIr. *ro:saig* ‘reaches’, **ambi='ssowet...#* (cf. **ambi-ssūs=*) > OIr. *im(m):soi* ‘turns round’; (c) *#*to='swannet...#* (cf. **to-swes=*) but OIr. *do:seinn* ‘hunts’, *#*to:'skarāt...#* > OIr. *do:scara* ‘throws down’; (d) *#*to='in-kom-inket...#* (cf. **to-en=*) > OIr. *tecmaing* ‘happens’, *#*to='eχs-orget...#* > OIr. *tessuirc* ‘rescues’, *#*to='ad-wēd-et...#* > OIr. *tadbat* ‘shows’.

This mechanism yields the attested initial unlenited consonant and *h*-less vowel of the tonic portion of almost all OIr. deuterotonic main-clause compounds. It not only matches a hypothetical particle in efficiency as an explanation of the failure of pretonic preverbs to lenite a consonant but also has a decisive advantage over it in relation to the vowel-initial tonic portion responsible c. 700 AD for elision of the pretonic vowel of OIr. *tadbat* ‘shows’ etc. (§6 above): being modelled on (d) **to-e(n)=* (> **t'-e-* > OIr. **d-a-*), verbs of this type were not encumbered by elision-impeding /h/ < hypothetical **(e)s* after the first preverb.

The consonant clusters in (c) call for further comment. A case like *do:scara* presents no problem because *sc* was never lenited. The regular development of **sw-* in **to='swannet* would have been to **to='hwanneθ* with the same lenition as in rel. **to-yo='hwanneθ*, but **sw-* could easily have been restored on the model of, say, **ro='sayiθ* (< **ro='ssagit* in (b)) versus rel. **ro-yo='hayiθ* (< **ro-yo='sagit*). A similar explanation could be applied to the likes of *#*wo='χ^wrinaθ...#* < *#*wo='k^wrinat...#* and *#*wo='θlinaθ...#* < **wo='tlinat#*. However, it seems preferable to take cases like OIr. *fo:cren* ‘purchases’ or *fo:tlén* ‘removes’ as the direct outcomes of **wo='k^wrinaθ* and **wo='tlinaθ* < **wo='kk^wrinat* and **wo='ttlinat* owing to peculiarities in the syllabification of clusters consisting of stop plus liquid. The ‘muta cum liquida’ rule of Latin and ancient Greek prosody dictates that syllables preceding such clusters may be heavy/long or light/short owing to their boundary’s ambiguity between splitting (e.g. Gk. gen. sg. *pat.ros* ‘father’s’) or preceding the cluster (e.g. *pa.tros*). The latter syllabification is the reason why the usual immunity of the first consonant of a cluster to gemination in Italian noted above does not apply ‘if the second consonant is [r] or [l] ... (e.g., *è troppo* [ɛ t'ɾɒppo] “it’s too much”, *è fluido* [ɛ ffluɪdo] “it’s fluid”)’ (Maiden and Robustelli 2013: 11). That being so, cases where the hypothesis just proposed calls for analogy to account for the initial of an OIr. tonic portion are a vanishingly small number of the total.

Main-clause non-lenition of the stressed predicate after proclitic OIr. copula forms such as *is* ‘is’ and *it* ‘are’ < PC **isti*, **inti* < **esti*, **(s)enti* (§5 above) was given some prominence by Cowgill (1975: 51–2) in his case for a particle. A clitic pronoun is used with the copula in Old Irish, albeit infrequently (GOI 269; §2 above): e.g. *iss-um écen* ‘it is necessary for me’ (Wb. 10^d24).

Confinement of *is* etc. to copular function by the introduction of suppletive **(ad-)tā-* (< **(s)tā-* ‘stand’) as the pres. ind. substantive verb is not found in British (see *GMW* 144 on rare MW (y) *taw*) and must be an Irish innovation (cf. Sp. *está* ‘is’ < Lat. *stat* ‘stands’ as a replacement of *es* ‘is’ < Lat. *est* ‘is’ in various functions; Kattán-Ibarra and Pountain 1997: 114–18). The implication that the OIr. possessive construction *táth-ut/- (a)i/-us/-unn* (*GOI* 271) ‘you (sg.) have’ etc. (lit. ‘there is to you, him, her/them, us’) once used *is* is confirmed by occasional examples in early Welsh poetry: e.g. *yssym eur ac aryant* ‘I have gold and silver’ (*GMW* 142) corresponding formally to OIr. *iss-um* and functionally to OIr. *táth-um* ‘I have’. At the PIC stage in the table above, the copula will have opposed (e)(i) possessive *#*issi-mme/-ssūs/-swes/-e(n)P^{red}* (...)# to (ii) *#(..)P^{red*}iss* (...)#. Replacement of (ii) with initial **issi* plus gemination taken over from the existing pattern with enclitics will then have resulted in *#*issi mmatis/kkarēs* ...# etc. (> OIr. *is maith* ... ‘is good’, *is car(a)e* ... ‘is a friend’, ModIr. *is maith* ..., *is cara* ...). Non-lenition by the copula in main clauses is completely predictable on the present hypothesis.

A particle has now proved to be dispensable as a reason for non-lenition of consonants by a vowel-final preverb or copula and completely helpless in the face of the lack of /h/ before a tonic portion beginning with a vowel. That leaves the minor matter of irregular retention of their final consonants by a handful of OIr. pretonic preverbs, notably *ad*-, *as*- and *fris*-. With the exception of *ad* (presumably > OIr. **a* by early PIC loss of *-d* noted in §4 above, in which case *ad* could well have been restored from forms with an attached enclitic like **ad-e(n)/-yo*), this issue would hardly have arisen until *-s* < *-ss* < **-ts/-χs* had become *-h* (> *-ø* before a consonant; §6 above). Whereas *-ts(-)* > *-ss(-)* almost certainly occurred in PIC, different Irish (*-s(s)-*) and British reflexes (*-ch-*) seen in, say, OIr. *se(i)ssed*, MW *chwechet* ‘sixth’ < PC **sweχs-eto-s* prove that assimilation of *χs* > *ss* was a PrimIr. development. Nevertheless, the same principle of homogenisation with corresponding forms with attached enclitic would convert PrimIr. non-leniting **a*, **e(h)* and **wri(h)* into **að*, **es* and **wris* (> OIr. *ad*-, *as*-, *fris*-) in normal alignment with leniting rel. **aðe* (< **að-eya* < **að-iyō*), **es* and **wres* (< **es-(y)a* and **wris-(y)a*; similarly *mos* ‘soon’ < **mos-(y)a*; n. 52 above): cf. non-len. main-clause **wo*, **imb’* (< **imbi*) vs len. rel. **wo* (< **wo-ya*), **imb’e* (< **imbe-ya* < **ambi-yō*). There is no need for a particle here or, for that matter, anywhere else in the system.

A previous explanation (*ODVC* 212–14) of main-clause non-lenition after vowel-final preverbs depended upon already partially phonemicised PIC lenition of voiced (as opposed to voiceless) stops, nasals/liquids and *s* (*RelChron.* 81–98). Although this remains quite possible, it is hardly certain (particularly as regards phonemicisation) and not a prerequisite for the above proposal based on a shift from PIC geminate vs non-geminate to Irish/British unlenited⁶¹ vs lenited consonants: e.g. PIC **wo=’kkerdet* > OIr. *fo:ceird* /fo=’ker’d/

⁶¹So-called ‘spirant mutation’ (MW *ph-*, *th-*, *ch-* for *p-*, *t-*, *c-/k-*) in the case of British voiceless stops. Although the present hypothesis is compatible with the traditional derivation of these directly from geminates, this is best viewed as a ‘second’ British lenition (*RelChron.* 92–6) of still unlenited voiceless stops.

‘puts’ but PIC **wo-yo=kerdet* > OIr. *fo:cheird* /fo=χer’d/ ‘who/which (s)he puts’. It is immaterial here whether some types of lenition occurred in PIC, or even PC, or lenition was a more or less uniform process in the separate prehistories of Irish and British (to which lenition of voiceless stops clearly belongs on account of different reflexes in each branch; *RelChron.* 81–4).

9. ACTUAL VERSUS HYPOTHETICAL ENCLITICS, AND VERBAL INFLECTION

The focus above has been upon the OIr. pres. ind. active of the idiosyncratic but common athematic copula and the basic ‘strong’ thematic class, S1 (*EIV* 25; = BI/III in *GOI* 353–7), but forms in other moods, tenses or present classes have been discussed elsewhere (McCone 1982: 9–28; *ODVC* 116–20). When it comes to deponent and suffixless preterite inflections, a particle ceases to be a mere irrelevance (§§2–3 above) and becomes a real encumbrance. Moreover, one of the two ‘market leaders’ (cf. Griffith 2020: 239–40) is mysteriously missing from the imperative and the other just as inexplicably found with the present subjunctive.

Boling’s (1972: 94) observation that ‘if our theory is to have any value, it must include the deponent as well as the active paradigm’ obviously also applies to particles and theories other than his. Deponent or passive forms have hitherto been ignored by proponents of an accentual or ‘prosodic’ approach (§1 above) and it is difficult to see why existing specifically initial stressed 3sg. **molātor* expected beside specifically pre-enclitic **molāti*-E (cf. Isaac’s point cited in §7 above) and unstressed non-initial **molātor* on this theory should have been remodelled to **molātir* (see below).⁶² As for enclitic particles (or subject pronouns), the addition of an element shaped *-eC(i)* fails to yield a single attested abs. from the corresponding conj. deponent forms with *-r* (i.e., all but originally active 2pl. conj. *-id*, abs. *-the*; *ODVC* 138). Whatever their origin (*ODVC* 139–141), 1sg. abs./conj. *-ur*, 2sg. *-ther* (*GOI* 365–6 for full paradigms) with non-pal. /-r/ should have been conj. only and had abs. equivalents like **-uir*, **-thir* with pal. /-r’/ if *-eC(i)* had been attached. They don’t. A striking trait of the other persons is OIr. abs. /-C’ər’/ with two palatal and conj. /-Cər’/ with two non-palatal consonants: e.g. 3sg. *midithir* ‘judges’ (Ml. 30^c8), *-labrathar* ‘speaks’ (Wb. 7^d2); 3pl. *labritir* (13^a5), *-labratar* (12^d28) ‘(they) speak’; 1pl. *messimmir*, *-messammar* (both 9^c10) ‘we shall judge’. Conj. 3sg./pl. *-thar/-tar* are < PIE mediopassive primary **-tor/*-ntor* and 1pl. *-(m)mar* < innovatory (Italo-Celtic?) **-mor* also seen Lat. *-mur*.⁶³ OIr. **-e/a-th(a)ir/-t(a)ir/-m(a)ir* with perfectly viable abs. /-Cər’/ would have resulted < 3sg./pl./1pl. **-tor/-ntor/-mor + -eC(i)* (*ODVC* 141).

The preform needed to generate OIr. 3sg. abs. *-(a)ithir* is not *-V*-tor-es* but *-V*-tir* (*ODVC* 141–3). As Cowgill (1983: 96) puts it, ‘it looks more as if, somehow, the absolute 3rd-person deponent forms were made ... by adding

⁶²Insofar as Koch’s first (1987) proposal ascribed a major role to ‘actual’ enclitics (§1 above), it could handle deponent endings in a similar manner to the one employed by the present hypothesis, but that option is not available to his second (2022) version (§1 above).

⁶³*ODVC* 136–9, following Cowgill (1983: 75–6 and 81).

/r/ to the non-deponent absolute endings'. Although *-tir cannot be generated by a hypothetical particle,⁶⁴ it can be accounted for by means of an actual enclitic, since this actually triggered a switch from deponent to normal active inflection in Old Irish: e.g. *fírian-ichthi* 'justifies him' < *-hayi-θi(y)-en (Wb. 2^b28; *fíriánig-ithir* < *-hayi-θir), *foilsig-thi* 'manifests it' < *-θi(y)-e (12^a7; *foilsigithir* < *-θir), *oenichthi-som* 'he unites himself' (32^d8; *óenigithir*). Since restrictions on the use of suffixed pronouns in normal OIr. prose (basically a 3rd-person pronoun, especially m./n. sg., with a 3sg. verb) were clearly quite recent, an earlier stage may be inferred at which any person/number of the pronoun could be combined with at least most persons of the verb: e.g. (Bretnach 1977: 84, 76, 79), OIr. 3sg. + 3pl. *bertaig-thus* 'brandishes them' < *-θi-ssus (*bertaigithir*), 3sg. + 1sg. *slánuig-thium* 'may he save me' < *-θi-mmu (*slánaigithir*), 3pl. + 3sg. *mol-tait* '(they) praise him' (for earlier *-tai; GOI 271) < *-a-nti(y)-en (*mol-aitir*). The origins of OIr. 2sg. dep. -ther are quite uncertain (ODVC 140–1) but a particle is certainly no help.

The opposition between middle and active voice had a semantic function in PIE and many verbs used both, as still in Old Indic or Ancient Greek.⁶⁵ However, the deponent/active contrast deriving from it in Latin, Old Irish or Modern Greek was functionally redundant because a given verb had either deponent or active inflection and never both. If this was already the case in PIC, *sek^wetor-me 'follows me' (OIr. -sechethar, Lat. *sequitur* etc. < PIE *sek^w-e-tor) or *sek^wetor-rūs 'follows them' (cf. cf. OIr. *forru* 'on(to) them', *etarru* 'between them' < *wor-sūs, *entor-sūs – cf. Celtib. *entor-kue*, Bot. 4, l.1; Jordán Cólera 2004: 346) could have been replaced by 3sg. *sek^weti-mme/-ssūs without semantic repercussions. Attachment of enclitic pronouns to verb-final vowels only would have had certain formal advantages, such as restoration of regular *ssūs while avoiding phonotactically odd *-rs-. In the case of consonant-final preverbs, a similarly convenient glide took the form of the generalised connective *de 'and, but' underlying OIr. Class B infixed pronouns (ODVC 212–13): e.g. OIr. *for-da:naisc* 'binds them' < *wor-de-sūs=na(d)sket(i) replacing *wor-rūs=. Extrapolation of new initial verbal forms from those with an enclitic pronoun (e.g. -mme; PrimIr. -mmu) would have resulted in dep. #*sek^weti(-mme)...# versus #X(-(m)me)(...)*sek^wetor(...)#. Once 3sg./pl. *sek^w-e-ti/-o-nti had arisen without *-mme etc. in absolute initial position only, they simply acquired -r from the statistically preponderant *-(n)tor used elsewhere and became *sek^wetir and *sek^wontir leading directly to the endings of OIr. abs. 3sg. *sechithir* and 3pl. *sechithir*.⁶⁶

Application of the same process to 1sg. *-ū(-E) would have generated initial *-ūr > OIr. abs. -ur identical to conj. -ur (probably < *-ūr < PIE *-o-h₂-or; Cowgill

⁶⁴The best that the particle hypothesis (or, for that matter, Sims-Williams 1984: 182–3) can do with regard to OIr. dep. abs. -(a)it(h)ir/-(a)im(m)ir is highly improbable late analogy (Cowgill 1983: 95–6; criticised by ODVC 142).

⁶⁵E.g. Ved. act. *yáj-ati*, mid. *yáj-ate* 'offers, sacrifices' for another, oneself respectively; Gk. act. *amún-ei* 'wards off', mid. *amún-etai* 'wards off from/defends oneself'.

⁶⁶PIE *sek^w-e/o- is certain but the absence of S1 deponents (with 3sg. -or passive) points to a transfer to the S2 *-ye/o- class in PIC or PrimIr.

1983: 75–6). The origin of OIr. 2sg. dep. abs./conj. *-ther* is obscure⁶⁷ (ODVC 140–1), with or without a particle. A PIC dep. 1pl. opposition between **-mosi-E* and **-mor* elsewhere should have resulted in initial **-mosir* vs non-initial **-mor*. In the likely event that the former became **-μer* identical with rel. **-μer*, abs./rel. *-mir/-mer* could well have been introduced on the analogy of act. *-mi/-me* (§3 above). Unlenited *-m(m)-* then spread to the conj., which also had final *-Vr* (whereas act. 1pl. conj. *-μ* lacked the extra syllable of abs. *-m'i*): e.g. OIr. 1pl. abs. *messimmir*, conj. *-messammar* above, and rel. *a cosmiligmmmer* ‘when we compare’ (Sg. 211^a14).

It may seem odd that a new initial type **sek^weti* with the potential to trigger eradication of a redundant deponent inflection (EIV 74) was instead modified to **sek^wetir* as a halfway house between initial **sek^weti-E* and non-initial **sek^wetor*, but non-functional distinctions can be very resilient (cf. McCone 1982: 8). For instance, a redundant abs./conj. opposition remained intact in the EModIr. 3sg. despite some erosion elsewhere (McManus 1994: 396–7) and, although no longer a feature of ModIr., lives on in the present-day Scots Gaelic pattern *beiridh* ‘shall bear’ vs *cha bheir* ‘shall not bear’. Still more to the point, deponent verbs such as αἰσθάνομαι ‘I feel’ or φαίνομαι ‘I seem’ continuing the middle forms of Ancient Greek are ‘very numerous’ in Modern Greek (Holton et al. 2012: 140) after more than two and a half millennia. From this perspective, it seems less strange that *-r* should spread from significantly commoner non-initial forms (PIC sg. 1 **-ūr*, 3 **-tor*, pl. 1 **-mor*, 3 **-ntor* > OIr. conj. *-ur*, *-thar*, *-(m)mar*, *-tar*) to *r*-less initial counterparts, the result being sg. 1 **-ū-r*, 3 **-ti-r*, 1 **-mosi-r*, 3 *-nti-r* underlying OIr. abs. sg. 1 *-ur*, 3 *-thir*, pl. 1 *-(m)mir*, 3 *-tir*. Synchronically, initial **sek^wetir/*sek^weti-me* would merely amount to deletion of functionally dispensable *-C* before a clitic pronoun, as in Port. *comprar* ‘to buy’ but *comprá-la* ‘to buy it’ (f.) or Sp. *vamos* ‘let’s go’ but *vámonos* ‘let’s depart’ (*vamos* + reflexive clitic 1pl. *nos*).

OIr. 3sg./pl. abs. dep. and pass. tend to be identical if both have an unsynocopated penult: e.g. dep./pass. pres. 3sg. *comalnaithir* ‘fulfils, is fulfilled’, 3pl. *miditir* ‘judge, are judged’, fut. 3sg. *suidigfidir* ‘will (be) establish(ed)’ (pres. dep. *suidigithir* but pass. *suidigthir*), pass. *pridchidir* ‘is preached’ (non-dep. *pridchid*) etc. This is unsurprising, insofar as divergent late PrimIr. syncope patterns often seem to have been exploited to differentiate them (EIV 80–5). The unsynocopated dep. 3sg./pl. conj. always had non-pal. *-t(h)Vr* (e.g. *-sechethar*, *-suidigfedar*, *-midetar*), but post-syncope assimilation of quality could palatalise *-t(h)-* in the passive: e.g. abs. *gaibthir* < **-gaβ'iθ'ir* and conj. *(-)gaibther* ‘is seized’ < **-gaβ'iθor*) as a base for distinctive new passives like *(-)comaln(a)ither* ‘(which) is fulfilled’ (dep. *(-)comalnathar* ‘(who/which (s)he) fulfils’) that could then spread to non-dep. verbs: e.g. *(-)pridchider* ‘(which) is preached’ (*prichchid* ‘preaches’). The lateness of such developments points to identity of 3rd-person dep. and pass. forms in PIC except for the pret. (§8 above) and 3sg. them. passive **-o-r* (EIV 81–2; e.g. OIr. 3sg. pres. ind. sg. *-berar* ‘is borne’, *s*-subj. *-messar*

⁶⁷If 2sg. **-si* extrapolated from initial **-si-E* was harmonised by endowment with *-t-* as well as *-r*, resultant **-tir* (> **-θir*) identical with the abs. 3sg. would have been liable to be replaced by the conj. form underlying OIr. *-ther*.

'may be judged' vs *-mestar* 'may judge'. A passive formally identical with a corresponding deponent would have shared the latter's development of an abs./conj. opposition, PIC initial dep. **molāti-r* 'praises' (> OIr. *molaithir*) becoming dep./pass. (OIr. *moltair* 'is praised' < **molāθir*) like non-initial dep./pass. **molātor* 'praises, is praised' (> OIr. dep. *-molathar*, pass. *-moltar*).

Distinctive passives such as OIr. 3sg. conj. pres, (-)berar and pret. *-breth* apparently inherited from PIC **beror* and **britos* do have abs. counterparts that can be derived directly by means of a particle: e.g. *berair* 'is borne' < **beror-es*, *brethae* 'was borne' < **britos-es*. The latter has already been dealt with (§8), and analogical **beror'* as the abs. counterpart of rel./conj. **beror* could have arisen from abs. *-r'* vs conj./rel. *-r* in most of the passive system at any stage between loss of final syllables c. 500 AD and the late 7th century.

The OIr. imperative lacks an abs./conj. opposition, using a single set of act., dep. and pass. endings as well as invariably prototonic compound forms⁶⁸ if there was no infixed pronoun requiring a deuterotonic one (*GOI* 372–5). Cowgill (1975: 68, n. 22) makes the valid point that, if the particle had been a sentence connective, 'its absence ... from commands would remain puzzling, since collocations of the type "go there and do it" ought to have been just as frequent as "he went there and (he) did it", and if the "and" of the latter could become an automatic component of every narrative clause, one would think that the "and" of the former could become equally automatic in commands'. Since a generalised connective like **et(i)* should occur with any tense or mood, its absence from the imperative is a serious problem.

Conversely, non-use of asseverative **est(i)* 'it is (so)' in (imperative) commands as opposed to (indicative) statements seems quite natural but its supporters are faced with the major and as yet unfronted difficulty (*ODVC* 79–80) of the abs./conj. opposition in all stems of the intrinsically non-factual OIr. present subjunctive (*GOI* 380–95). The semantic problem can be sidestepped by positing an unmotivated major expansion of the abs./conj. opposition's range (from pres./fut./pret. ind. to pres. subj.), but that would explode claims (e.g. Kortlandt 1979: 35; Cowgill 1985: 110–11, cited by *ODVC* 85–6) that **est(i)* eliminates the need to posit significant analogical spread of a redundant inflectional distinction. As Cowgill (1975: 44) puts it, 'it is possible, a priori, that once the absolute/conjunct contrast had come to pervade the whole system of the Irish verb, it could spread to one or two forms which lacked it; but the spread to an entire tense or voice, or creation of new forms just to get a distinction of absolute and conjunct are not credible'.

The often reduplicated OIr. suffixless preterite clearly derives from a PIE perfect typified by reduplication and peculiar personal endings (*GOI* 424–37) outside the prim./sec. system: PIE 1sg. **-h₂a* and 3sg. **-e* are directly continued in OIr. 1/3sg. *-gegon/(-)geguin* 'killed' < PC **g^weg^won-a/-e* etc. Endings were added directly to the stem in PIE, but in Celtic (as in classical Greek) irregularities through contact between a root-final consonant and an ending's initial

⁶⁸ Analogical to the single set of conjunct-looking endings and motivated by the desirability of formally distinguishing a 2sg. ipv. identical with, say, deut. 3sg. **tu=mel'* (> OIr. *do:meil* 'consumes') from the latter as prot. **tope^l* (> OIr. *tom(a)il* 'eat!') according to McCone (1979: 22).

consonant were avoided by spreading *-a-* as a liaison vowel from 1sg. to 2sg. (**-a-s* for **-ta* < PIE **-th₂ a*), 1pl. (**-a-mor* for PIE **-me/o*) and 2pl. (**-a-tes*⁶⁹ for **-te(s)*, PIE **-e*). IC 3sg. **lud-e* (< PC sec. **lud-e-d* = **-e-t* with [-d] for /-t/ as in Italic; ODVC 102) underlying OIr. *luid* ‘went’ probably paved the way for adoption of suffixless pret. inflection (OIr. 1/2sg. (-)*lod* < **lud-a/-as*, 1pl. (-)*lodmar* < **ludamor*) by this thematised root aorist (McCone 1986: 231). In the 3pl. a compromise seems to have added the inherited *r*-ending (probably *-ar* < PIE **-r*; Rix 1976: 256) to original and more typical 3pl. sec. **-o-nt* to give **lud-ontar* (> OIr. *lotar*, perhaps via **-ontor* modelled on the pass./dep. 3pl. conj.), which then spread from this common verb and became the general suffixless pret. ending (e.g. (-)*gegnatar* ‘(they) killed’ < **g^weg^won-onta/or*).

Since a main-clause particle could hardly have endowed the *s-* and *t-* but not the suffixless preterite with an abs./conj. opposition, its proponents are forced into two assumptions: (a) it was present but left no trace in singular forms such as abs./conj. 1/2sg. (-)*lod*, 3sg. (-)*luid* ‘went’) and (b) abs. plural forms with palatal *-r* (allegedly < **-r-es*; e.g. 3pl. *báir* ‘were’) predate those with non-palatal *-r*: e.g. abs./rel. *báitar* and conj. *-báitar* ‘were’ (GOI 433).

As usual, aphaeresis is resorted to in the vowel-final 1 and 3sg.: e.g. abs. **luda-(e)s* and **lude-(e)s* with the same outcomes as conj. **-luda* and **-lude*, namely (-)*lod* ‘I went’ and (-)*luid* ‘(s)he went’. Since 2sg. abs. **lud-as-es* would have yielded a disyllabic form, most likely **lod(a)e*⁷⁰, different from conj. *-lod* < **lud-as*, Boling (1972: 95–6) and Cowgill (1975: 64) posit 2sg. abs./conj. *lod/-lod* on the analogy of 1sg. *lod/-lod*. The complementary distribution of abs. and conj. made their formal identity in a given person unproblematical, but distinctive 1/2/3sg./pl. forms within each set were functionally important. That makes deliberate eradication of a distinction between 1sg. *lod* and 2sg. **lod(a)e* far less likely than introduction of **-lodae* into the conj. paradigm to distinguish 2g. from 1sg. *-lod*: cf. OIr. 2sg. abs./conj. (-)*reithi* ‘you run’ or (-)*benai* ‘you strike’ because 2sg. conj. **-reith* (< **reih* **-retis(i)* without raising, unlike 2sg. *bir* < **birih* < **beris(i)*; GOI 47) and **-ben* (< **benah* < **binas(i)*) were identical with 3sg. *-reith* ‘runs’ (< **-retet(i)*) and *-ben* ‘strikes’ (< **binat(i)*); similarly, 1sg. abs./conj. (-)*benaim* ‘I strike’ < abs. **binami* displacing conj. **-ben*⁷¹ < **-binam(i)*).

Subsequently, Cowgill (1985: 116) noted the lack of an obvious basis for replacing 2sg. **-ta* with **-as* in Celtic, unlike Greek, and wondered if it had somehow been remodelled to **-a* (1983: 80, n. 6) to give 2sg. abs. *lod* < **loda-(e)s* as in the 1sg. Regularisation of anomalous 2sg. forms of roots with a final dental could have resulted in **-a* (McCone 1986: 238 and ODVC 148–9): e.g.

⁶⁹Possibly **-(a)te* but secondary **-(a)tes* seems more likely, once the perfect had become a mere type of preterite as in Italic (cf. Lat. 2pl. *cecinitis* ‘you (have) sung’ etc. with **-tes*). See Rix (1976: 207, 222, 255–7) on Greek and McCone (1986: 233–8 and ODVC 148–55) for a more thorough discussion of the somewhat intricate path from PIE via PC and PIC to OIr.

⁷⁰Or **lod(a)e* if monophthogisation of untressed *-ae* > **-ē* preceded lowering, in which case **lod(a)e* would still be likely by analogy with **-lod* elsewhere.

⁷¹Assuming that PC fronting of *-am* > *-æm* > *-en* (RelChron. 79) did not apply after PIC *-i* > *∅*. If it did, presumably resultant 1sg. conj. **-bin* < **-binen* with anomalous pal. /-n’/ and *-i-* could hardly be remodelled to ambiguous **-ben* and so abs. *benaim* became conj. too.

2sg. **g^wātsa* (< **g^wād-ta*) → **g^wād-a* as in 3sg. **g^wād-e* etc. (> OIr. (-)gáid ‘besought’). Ambiguous 1/2sg. *-a would hardly have replaced distinctive **g^weg^won-a/-ta* ‘I/you killed’ etc. but there would have been pressure from differentiated 1/2sg. *-a/-as towards 1/2sg. **g^weg^won-a/-as* etc. (> OIr. 1/2sg. (-)gegon; cf. 1/2sg. (-)gád). Once 2pl. **g^wād-e* or **g^wātses*, **g^weg^won-e/-tes* etc. had been remodelled (perhaps with **lud-a-tes* for **lud-e-tes* as the trigger) to **g^wād-a-tes* and **g^weg^won-a-tes*, an alternation between 2pl. *-tes and 2sg. *-s elsewhere in the system could easily have generated 2sg. *-a-s corresponding to 2pl. *-a-tes (perhaps as early as PC and/or with the help of 2sg. **lud-a-s* for **lud-e-s*).

Cowgill (1975: 44, n. 2) thought it ‘a priori possible’ that the 3pl. pattern abs./conj. (-)lotar was old and abs./conj. lotir/-lotar analogical to deponent pres. 3pl. abs./conj. -itir/-etar. However, he then (Cowgill 1975: 64–5) opted for suffixless pret. 1/3pl. abs. -mir/-tir as ‘probably the older, from *-mor-es, *-addar-es (or the like)’ with a particle and -mar/-tar as ‘analogic to the lack of separate absolute forms in the singular; cf. Boling 1972: 95–96’ (also Schrijver 1997: 151–2). Thurneysen (GOI 435), by contrast, viewed original 1/3 pl. abs./conj. -mar/-tar as ‘probable’ and suggested more credibly that ‘the resemblance of the plural endings to those of the deponent flexion, which in the absolute distinguishes relative -mar, -tar from non-relative -mir, -tir, led to the occasional use of -mir, -tir in non-relative forms.’

Since abs. and rel. inflection was only compatible with an OIr. unaugmented preterite (effectively a narrative tense; EIV 93–8) and early manuscript sources (mostly glosses; GOI 4–9) contain precious little narrative, relevant OIr. suffixless pret. forms are rare. Nevertheless, the chronological priority of 3pl. abs. -tar emerges from some reliably OIr. narrative texts surviving in later manuscripts (ODVC 155–63): (i) 3pl. abs. lotar ‘they went’ was incontrovertibly the archetype’s form in the early-8th-cent. (McCone 2000: 43–4) *Immram Brain* §62 (ODVC 158); (ii) cop. batir ‘they were’ (Wb. 5^c14) is the only 3pl. abs. in the roughly mid-8th-cent. Würzburg Glosses (GOI 4), but its palatal -r’ must be analogical (cf. §2, n. 16) because of regular EOIr. proclitic depalatalisation (*RelChron.* 135 and ODVC 156–7); (iii) in the 9th-cent. OIr. Life of Brigit (Ó hAodha 1978) there are four orthographically unambiguous exx. of the 3pl. abs., namely disyllabic lotir (l. 87), cop. batir (l. 316), subst. vb. bátir (l. 376; ms. batir) and trisyllabic gádatar⁷² (l. 208; ms. gatatar) (ODVC 161); (iv) the earliest attestation of the trisyllabic palatal 3pl. abs. ending -(a)itir is táchaitir ‘they fled’ in the Tripartite Life of Patrick (Mulchrone 1939: l. 765) compiled 895–901 AD (GOI 8), but this ending must be analogical to deponent 3pl. abs. -(a)itir vs rel./conj. -atar above and cannot be the direct outcome of *-onta/or-es (> OIr. *-at(a)ir) with a particle.

These and other relevant forms indicate (ODVC 161–2): (i) originally undifferentiated abs./rel./conj. -(a)tar; (ii) optional (ML 90^d17 batir vs 31^a3 and 23^c16 batar) introduction of a formal abs./rel. distinction into the common copula’s

⁷²With retained vowel (unlike (-)lotar < *loðodor) under the influence of the reduplicated type (-)gegnatar < *(-)g^wey^wonodor.

disyllabic 3pl. by the mid-8th. cent.; (iii) creation of optional 3pl. abs. *-t(a)ir* distinct from rel. *-tar* in the common stressed disyllables *bát(a)ir* '(they) were' and *lot(a)ir* '(they) went' (vs rel. *bátar* 'who were', *lotar* 'who went') in the 9th cent., probably (as with the copula) on the model of the *s*-pret. 3sg. pal. vs non-pal. pattern abs. *gab-ais* 'took' vs rel. *gab-as* 'who took'; (iv) analogical introduction of a deponent-style opposition between 3pl. abs. *-(a)itir* and rel. *-atar* into trisyllabic suffixless pret. forms by the end of the 9th century, e.g. distinctively abs. *memdaitir* '(they) broke' vs abs./rel./conj. *(-)memdatar*. The suffixless preterite, then, almost certainly did not inherit an abs./conj. opposition, the obvious reason being absence of a particle.

Since PIE/PC primary endings are now generally recognised as the source of both, the range of IC conj. and abs. forms is crucial. PIE prim. endings characterised not only the pres. ind. but also a typically reduplicated *-se/o-* desiderative found in Indo-Iranian and, as a future, Old Irish (McCone 1986: 248–59; 1991: 137–82). The preserve of PIE sec. endings always lacking **-i* was the aorist and imperfect ind. as well as the optative mood. The PIE subjunctive was formed by adding *-e/o-* to a pres. or aor. stem, 'hyperthematic' **-ē/ō-* resulting from *-e+e/o+o-* if the base was also thematic. Even if it used both prim. and sec. endings as in Indo-Iranian (Rix 1976: 259), the former probably prevailed in PC on the very limited evidence of Gaulish and Celtiberian (McCone 1991: 119–20, and ODVC 109; KPV 751–6). The optative did not survive and an *s*-aor. subj. in **(a-)se/o-* was generalised in PIC (McCone 1986: 243–5; 1991: 59–64, 94, 110–11), with *-χ/t/s-se/o-* responsible for the *s*-subj. and **-H-se/o- > *-a-se/o- > *-a(h)e/o-* for the OIr. *-ā-* and Brit. *-h-* subjunctives (McCone 1986: 243–8; 1991: 55–113). PIC loss of *-d* (before *-i > -ø*;) would have favoured **-s-e-ti* etc. with prim. endings over weakly characterised 3sg. **-s-e* even if **-s-e-d* with a sec. ending had survived. Indeed, primary subj. endings may have been the norm in PIE as in Ancient Greek (nb. Homeric pres. subj. 3sg. *-ē-si*⁷³ = OInd. *-ā-ti* < PIE **-ē-ti*; Rix 1976: 260).

The PIE *s*-aorist indicative clearly took secondary endings and its 3sg. **-s-t* regularly underwent either *-V-s-t > -V-ss* or *-χ/r/l-s-t > -χ/r/l-t* in PIC: e.g. PIE **h₂anh₁-s-t*, **b^hēr-s-t* (OInd. *aniṣ-*, *bhārṣ-*) > PC **ana-s-t*, **bīr-s-t* > PIC **ana-ss*, **bir-t* > OIr. *-an* 'remained', *-bert* 'bore'. Taken as stem plus zero ending, 3sg. forms like **ana-ss-ø*, **bir-t-ø* became a platform for thematising the rest of the paradigm (Watkins 1962: 170–8) at a stage when there were no longer any thematic formations with secondary endings (e.g. suffixless pret. *(-)luid* 'went' < **lude* < them. root aor. **lud-e-d* by early PIC loss of *-d*). In consequence, this process was bound to introduce primary endings before PIC apocope of *-i* (Cowgill in §1 above) or an abs./conj. opposition after it (ODVC 107–8): e.g. (*s/-t*-pret. prim. them. 1sg.), MW *kereis* 'I loved' < **karass-ī* < **-ū*; OIr. *-carus* 'I loved' < **kar-ass-ū*, *-biurt* 'I bore' < **bir-t-ū*. The resultant PIC **(s)s-* formations had identical inflections (e.g. 1/2sg. *-(s)s-ū/-is(i)*, 3pl. **(s)s-ont(i)*) apart from normal thematic 3sg. subj. *-(s)s-et(i)* vs 3sg. pret. *-ss(-i)* with zero

⁷³Written *-ησι* like standard 3sg. *-η*. Forms with secondary endings in Arcado-Cypriot and Indo-Iranian (Rix 1976: 261) could well be due to influence from the optative.

ending and abs. *-i* from the rest of the paradigm. Since the *s*-subj. only and the *s*-pret. never characterised strong verbs with a final (*s*- or) dental/guttural stop, full homogenisation of their complementarily distributed paradigms in the separate prehistories of Irish and British is hardly surprising. In Irish, the *s*-subj. adopted a zero 3sg. from the *s*-pret. typical of productive weak verbs: e.g. OIr. subj. abs./conj. *téis/-té* ‘may go’ < **tēssi*/**-tēh* (< **-tēs(s)*) < **tēχ-si*/**-tēχ-s(i)* ← PIC **tēχ-s-eti*, **tēχ-s-et* on the model of, say, pret. *anais*, *-an* ‘remained’ < **anassi*, **-anah* (< **-anas(s)*) < PIC **ana-ss-i*, **-ana-ss(-)*. In British, by contrast, the pret. (*t*- as well as *s*-) adopted the normal them. 3sg. from the subj.: e.g. MW 3sg. pret. *keress-yt*, **caras* (cf. *cafas* ‘got’ etc.) ‘loved’ < **karass-iti*, **karass-it* (for **-e-ti*, **-e-t*); 3sg. subj. *gwnech* ‘may do’ for **gwrech* < **wreχ-s-it* (for **-et*) vs pret. *gwneithyt*, *gwnaeth* (influenced by *aeth* ‘went?’) ‘did’ for **gwreiθ(-it)* < **wreχt-it(i)* (for **-et(i)* and PIC **wrex(-s)-t(i)*; cf. McCone 1986: 243–4). MW 3sg. *-as* < abs. **-a-ss-i* entails unlikely late borrowing (with analogical *i*-affection!) of *-yt* /*-id*/ from the pres. If MW *-(s)s-yt* continues abs. **-a-ss-iti* (for **-e-ti*), MW *-as* can hardly be other than old conj. **-a-ss-it* (for **-et*). The (short) *-i* needed before *-t(i)* for internal *i*-affection in abs. *keress-yt* ‘loved’, *kewssit* ‘got’ etc. but no final *i*-affection in *cafas* etc. can easily be an analogical replacement of the *-e-* of 3sg. **-e-t(i)* under pressure from 1sg. **-ī* (< PIC **-ū*), 2sg. **-ið*⁷⁴ < **-iyi* < **-ih(i)* < IC **-i-si(-)* (§2 above) < **-e-si*.

To sum up, PC primary endings characterised by *-i* in all but the thematic 1sg. **-ū* were inherited in the PIC pres. ind., pres. (originally *s*-aorist) subj. and desid./fut. active. This *-i* was lost by PIC apocope unless shielded by an enclitic object pronoun bound by Wackernagel’s Law to a clause-initial constituent: e.g. prim. 3sg. *bere-ti* ‘bears’ > *bere-t* but clause-initial **bereti-e* ‘bears it (n.)’ and then, by extension, initial abs. **bereti(±e)* vs non-initial conj. **beret*. Use of clause-initial **molāti-e* ‘praises it (n.)’ etc. but otherwise **molātor* ‘praises’ etc. provided PIC deponents with a nucleus of forms with **-ti-E*, from which clause-initial abs. **molāti-r* could develop as a bridge between initial **molāti-e* and non-initial **molātor*. This also entailed a new initial counterpart **marwātir* (> OIr. abs. *marbthair* ‘is killed’) etc. of formally identical passives like **marwātor* (> OIr. conj. *-marbthar* ‘is killed’). After early PIC loss of inherited secondary endings, all thematic formations had primary endings, making them or (at a later stage) their abs./conj. outcome an automatic part of the thematisation involved in the PIC creation of *s*- and *t*-preterites.

Abs./conj. inflection thus characterised the act./dep./pass. of the OIr. pres. ind, fut. ind. and pres. subj., the act./dep. *s*- and *t*-pret.,⁷⁵ and the pret. pass. Its attested range and forms can be generated by the ‘actual enclitic’ hypothesis without difficulties such as the unmotivated analogical spread⁷⁶ of functionally redundant distinctions between complementarily distributed abs. and conj.

⁷⁴MW *kereist* is clearly innovatory, presumably formed by adding *-t* to 1sg. *kereis*.

⁷⁵Allowing for the *t*-preterite’s obviously rather late adoption of 1/3pl. *-am(m)ar/-atar* from the suffixless preterite (GOI 423–4).

⁷⁶2pl. abs. *beirthe* avoided ambiguity with 3sg. *beirthe* + 3sg. m./n. suffix, 3sg. pass. *ber(a)ir* was created in opposition to rel. *berar* (not conj. *-berar*), and the **-i* attached to clause-initial 3sg. *s*-/*t*-pret **anass*/**birt* had an obvious purpose in separating consonants: e.g. **marwassūs* → *marwassī-ssūs* ‘killed them’, **birt-me/-tu/-swes* → **birti-mmu/-ttu/-swes*. Each of these and the

forms. Crucially, this explanation accounts straightforwardly for a single set of personal inflections inherited in other categories, notably the imperative and the suffixless preterite with reflexes of PIE *ipv.* and perfect endings lacking the primary **-i* needed to trigger an *abs./conj.* dichotomy in PIC.

A particle fares appreciably worse than this in relation to the verbal inflections that have figured so prominently in arguments for it, since there is no good reason for **es* or the like in the *s-* and *t-* but not the suffixless preterite or for the failure of a single OIr. *abs.* deponent ending to ensue from its addition to the corresponding *conj.* form. Connective **et(i)*'s absence from the imperative defies convincing explanation, and invoking an asseverative function to justify **est(i)*'s absence from the imperative without questioning its compatibility with the equally non-factual subjunctive is a classic case of wanting to have one's cake and eat it.

10. CONCLUSIONS

Since Cowgill's 1975 gamechanger, there has been near-general agreement (with the exception of Kortlandt 1979) that at least some Insular Celtic *conj.* endings directly continue PIE primary endings via early apocope of *-i*. Apart from a couple of accentually oriented hypotheses, there has also been consensus that *abs.* counterparts resulted from protection of the same primary endings from apocope by a following enclitic. The main dispute has been about whether this function was performed by a hypothetical near-invisible particle (or subject pronoun(s)) or by tangible enclitic connectives and object pronouns. Both approaches posit *pres. ind. 3sg. conj. -beir* 'bears' < **-bereti* versus *abs. be(i)rid* 'bears' </← **bereti*-E and so can be covered by notations pared down to that core: e.g. OIr. *pres. ind. act. 3sg./pl. abs. be(i)rid/ber(a)it* < **bereti-/beronti-*, *conj. -beir/-berat* < **-beret(i)/*-beront(i)*, *1sg. abs. biru* < **berū-*, *conj. -biur* < **-bir(u)* < **-berū*. Brackets signify an element lost in PIC (**-i*) or later (e.g. **-u* < **-ū*) unless shielded by an attached enclitic, while the mutually exclusive factors of preceding constituents and following enclitics are denoted by an initial and a final hyphen respectively, as in *conj. -beir* < **-beret(i)* versus *abs. be(i)rid* < **bereti-*. Notations like **-beret(i)/*-beront(i)* are quite compatible with an accentual approach, and their initial alternates (with a final hyphen indicating optional enclitic attachment) merely require accentuation according to preference (e.g. **béreti-/béronti-* or **beretí-/berontí-*).

OIr. active *abs.* and *conj.* endings derive as follows from PIE/PC primary endings (§§1–3), / separating distinct *athem./them.* forms and [] enclosing a usual thematic vowel.

aesthetically motivated *1sg. abs. type biru* (§2 above) is also covered by Cowgill's eminently reasonable concession above 'that once the absolute/conjunct contrast had come to pervade the whole system of the Irish verb, it could spread to one or two forms which lacked it'.

	PIE		PC	
	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.
1sg.	*-mi/*-ō ⁷⁷	*-[o]m	*-mi/*-ū	*-[o]m
2sg.	*-[e]si	*-[e]s	*-[e]si	*-[e]s
3sg.	*-[e]ti	*-[e]t	*-[e]ti	*-t/-ed ⁷⁸
(cop. 1pl.			*e-mmesi	*e-mmes)
1pl.	*-[o]me/os ⁷⁹		*-[o]me/osi	*-[o]me/os
2pl.	*-[e]te		*-[e]tesi	*-[e]tes
3pl.	*-[o]nti	*-[o]nt	*-[o]nti	*-[o]nt

	PIC I	PIC II	
	(no sec.; -esV(-) > -isV(-))	(apocope of *-i)	
	prim.	abs.	conj.
1sg.	*-mi/-ū	*-mi-/*[-ū(-)]/	*-m
2sg.	*-[i]si	*-[i]si-	*-[i]s
3sg.	*-[e]ti	*-[e]ti-	*-[e]t
(cop. 1pl.	*e-mmisi	*e-mmisi-	*e-mmisi)
1pl.	*-[o]mosi	*-[o]mosi-	*-[o]mos
2pl.	*-[e]tisi	*-[e]tisi-	*-[e]tis
3pl.	*-[o]nti	*-[o]nti-	*-[o]nt

The table below summarises §§1–3 by giving PIC I to OIr. derivations of the personal abs./conj. forms of a typical *-e/o-* them. pres. like OIr. *be(i)rid* ‘bears’ and of the 1pl. copula. It illustrates the straightforward derivation of attested OIr. abs. and conj. forms from PC primary endings that, respectively, were and were not shielded from PIC *-i > -ø by an actual (i.e. securely reconstructed) Wackernagel enclitic attached to the verb itself (as opposed to a preceding preverb, negative etc.) only if it was clause-initial and simple.

1sg. abs. <i>biru</i>	< *birū	< *birū-ya (rel)			< *berū-yo
conj. <i>-biur</i>	< *-biru	< *-birū			< *-berū
2sg. abs. <i>biri</i>	< *birī	< *beri(h)i	< *berisi	< *berisi(-E)	< *berisi-E
conj. <i>-bir</i>	< *-biri(h)	< *-berih		< *-beris	< *berisi
3sg. abs. <i>beirid</i>	< *bereθi		< *bereti	< *bereti(-E)	< *bereti-E
conj. <i>-beir</i>	< *-bere(h)	< *-bereθ		< *-beret	< *bereti
1pl. abs. <i>bermai</i>	< *bero-mī	(cop *e-mī	< *e-mi(h)i	< *e-mmisi(-E)	< *e-mmisi-E)
conj. <i>-beram</i>	< *beroμa(h)			< *-beromos	< *beromosi
2pl. abs. <i>beirthe</i>	< *bereθeya	< *bereθī-ya	< *bereθi(h)i-ya (rel)		< *beretisi-yo
conj. <i>-beirid</i>	< *bereθi(h)			< *-beretis	< *-beretisi
3pl. abs. <i>berait</i>	< *berodi		< *beronti	< *beronti(-E)	< *beronti-E
conj. <i>-berat</i>	< *berod			< *beront	< *beronti

⁷⁷More likely *-oh₂(a) or the like with a laryngeal.

⁷⁸Probably -t after -s- but -d after a vowel (§9 above).

⁷⁹Possibly primary versus secondary *-me(m).

The above derivations obey regular historical phonological rules and are mostly direct, but in the 1 and 2pl. abs. this is only true of attested forms of the copula. Its analogical influence must be posited in the 1pl. abs., and the non-copular 2pl. abs. can hardly be other than an old relative. Both substitutions for the inherited abs. forms are well-motivated (§2 and §3) and, with or without main-clause **es* or the like, unavoidable. If 2pl. abs. *beir-the* must be a shifted relative, a similar derivation of OIr. 1sg. abs. *biru* is a feasible alternative to **birūh* < **berū-(e)s* or the like. A hypothetical particle, then, is superfluous to the PIC/OIr. absolute active endings.

Notwithstanding a lack of convincing attestations⁸⁰ in any known variety of Celtic, a credible case might be made for an invisible enclitic posited solely to account for peculiarities on either side of ‘Wackernagel position’ in the Insular Celtic verbal complex, provided that it was functionally and formally efficient. The greater the need for special morphological or phonological pleading to justify an ‘artificial additive’ of this type, the heavier the onus upon its advocate(s) to demonstrate its utter indispensability as a lenition-blocker in OIr. main clauses. Only then would a more apposite version (ch. 6 of the novel referred to in §4) of Sherlock Holmes’s adage apply: ‘when you have eliminated the impossible whatever remains, *however improbable*, must be the truth.’

None of the current candidates were Wackernagel enclitics in PIE or Celtic⁸¹ and their *ad hoc* conversion to that class has regularly presented problems. All have proved irrelevant at best (§§2–3) and detrimental at worst (§9) to the absolute endings as well as incompatible with the lack of an inherited abs./conj. opposition in the OIr. suffixless preterite (§9). Apart from an otherwise untenable enclitic subject pronoun **is*, no candidate can have the required effect upon a following enclitic pronoun without the help of highly implausible or (see Isaac 2000) unworkable quasi-auslaut boundaries absent between it and a preceding word (§4), not to mention other problematical *ad hoc* adjustments. A particle’s sole remaining claim to efficiency, namely as an impediment to the tonic portion’s lenition, must be set not only against these serious shortcomings but also against the utter helplessness of all variants (including **is*) in the face of elision of a pretonic preverb’s final vowel before a vowel-initial tonic portion in the likes of *tadbat* ‘shows’ < **tu:adbet* in OIr. main clauses (§6). Given its inability to solve this problem at all satisfactorily and the availability of at least one viable alternative explanation for the non-lenition of consonants (§8), it is the putative particle that must be eliminated as impossible. The only loss is (Insular) Celtic’s unenviable distinction as the one major IE subfamily in which an appreciable amount of otherwise unnecessary phonology and morphology has been devised to meet the ‘fiendishly complicated’ (§4) needs of a purely hypothetical and virtually untraceable morphosyntactic component.

⁸⁰Boling’s (1972) **ed* would be an exception on account of Gaulish *buetid* (§1) but is hardly a current candidate, having been generally rejected on compelling formal grounds (§1), while Schrijver’s attempts (1997: 177–80) to conjure up a couple of traces of enclitic **et(i)* in Gaulish are questionable, to say the least.

⁸¹Again, except for Boling’s **ed* (§1), but see the previous note.

The nub of current versions⁸² of an accentual or ‘prosodic’ approach to absolute and conjunct is that (i) the early apocope of **-i* fundamental to virtually all explanations since 1975 only affected unstressed forms and (ii) (Insular) Celtic basically inherited a PIE system (cf. the Vedic exx. in §8) opposing unaccented non-initial main-clause finite verbs to accented initial and subordinate ones. Hence P(I)C init. **béreti* vs non-init. **beret* < **bereti*, but (ii) would be more convincing if, say, OIr. subordinate **co:mbeirid* ‘so that he bears’ < **k^wun(..)bereti(..)#* corresponded to main-clause *beirid* ‘bears’ < **bereti(..)#* vs *ní:beir* ‘doesn’t bear’ < **nīs(..)beret(i)(..)#*. It doesn’t, of course, and OIr. *co:mbeir* is doubly problematical, being accented as if < **k^wun(..)bereti(..)#* but apocopated as if < **k^wun(..)beret(i)(..)#*. Compounds fare even worse, because the only Vedic-style main-clause pattern was *ṖV* and so the OIr. opposition of initial deut. *PV* (*do:beir* ‘brings’ etc.) to non-initial prot. *PV* (*ní:tab(a)ir* ‘doesn’t bring’) calls for improbable and ill-motivated analogy (§8). Another major disadvantage is the limit imposed on an otherwise general apocope of **-i* capable of directly generating not only OIr. conj. forms (§§1–3) but also the ‘shorter’ dat. sg. of consonant-stem nouns. Restricting **-i* to unstressed forms entails deriving the short type from inexplicably productive endless locatives (§1). Further problems (§1 and §8) include the inapplicability of $\pm$ stress to dep./pass. abs./conj. (§9). Accentual hypotheses, like particles, simply don’t work.

Advocates of an added particle, accentual differentiation or a triggering ‘actual’ enclitic⁸³ broadly agree in deriving PIC conjunct and absolute from PIE/PC primary endings by, respectively, subjection to and specifically conditioned protection from early apocope of **-i*. The third approach envisages generalisation of VSO order in PIC by extrapolating initial **k^wrinati* etc. (post-apocope and so regularly > OIr. abs. *cren(a)id* etc.) from **k^wrinati-sūs* ‘buys them’ etc. with an ‘actual enclitic’. Initial position for verbs had come to be monopolised by *V*-i-E* combining a clitic object pronoun’s natural gravitation towards the verb governing it with retention of inherited ‘Wackernagel’ concatenation with naturally clause-second enclitic connectives: e.g. **wo-de-sūs=k^wrinat(i)* ‘and purchases them’ > OIr. *fo-da:cren* ‘who purchases them’. A similar process is directly observed in Greek, where it also promoted unmarked initial verbs without enclitic(s) and basic VSO order (§7). This scenario, which effectively vindicates the long-recognised formal affinities of plain primary **-i* with OIr. abs. forms while avoiding pre-Cowgill functional difficulties, is appreciably more successful than rivals at producing the actually attested range of OIr. abs. forms (§§1–3 and §9).

There is no obvious obstacle to projecting the demarcative OIr. initial

⁸² Assuming that Koch (2022) supersedes Koch (1987) in cases of (mostly tacit) disagreement. Both are discussed in §1 and §8.

⁸³ Object pronouns and sentence connectives, notably OIr. *-ch-* < **k^we* ‘and’, *-d(-)* < **de* ‘and, but’, and relative **-yo*. The last of these resembles a hypothetical particle in being deduced from changes to the endings of simple verbs (e.g. OIr. *bert(a)e* ‘who bear’ < **beronti-yo*) and mutation after a pretonic preverb: (e.g. OIr. *fo:chren* ‘who purchases’ < **wo-yo=k^wrinat(i)*) but is at least directly attested in Gaulish *dugiointiio* (ODVC 247–8).

word-stress back at least as far as PIC (cf. §7, inc. n. 46, and similar developments in Celtic's Italic and Germanic neighbours; Meiser 1998: 53 and Ringe 2006: 105). This would have affected all lexical (i.e. compound as well as simple) finite verb forms, whether enclitic or not: e.g. **k^wrinati(-sūs)*, **wo-k^wrinat(i)* (> OIr. prot. *-fochrann*). Presumably, clause-initial preverbal particles such as the negative continued to bear an accent: e.g. **nīs='wo-k^wrinat(i)* (> OIr. *ní:fochrann*). A similar bi-tonic structure (e.g. **wo-sūs='k^wrinat(i)* > OIr. deut. *fo-s:cren*) may be posited for compound verbs plus enclitic(s) in the light of oppositions between uni-tonic patterns without and bi-tonic ones with a clitic infix in Portuguese (*comprará* vs *comprá-lo-á* '(s)he will buy (it)') and probably, albeit no more than vestigially, Latin (*supplico* vs *sub vos placo* 'I supplicate (you)'; §7). Since they were conditioned by a Wackernagel enclitic, such bi-tonic PIC compound forms will have been exclusively and uniquely clause-initial like simple **k^wrinati-sūs* in the previous paragraph. They will then, like **k^wrinati-sūs*, have been an obvious source for initial forms without infix as part of the PIC shift to regular VSO order: e.g. **wo(-sūs)='k^wrinat(i)* > OIr. deut. *fo(-s):cren* (cf. **k^wrinati(-sūs)* above). The attested deuterotonic stress pattern **wo(-sūs)='k^wrinat(i)* then arose as part of a broader PIC proclisis also affecting the first element of syntactically close groups such as copula + predicate, preposition or possessive + noun, preverbal particle + verb (e.g. **nīs=('wo-)k^wrinat(i)*).

That leaves the failure of vowel-final 'P (> proclitic P) at the head of a main clause to lenite a following I(nfixed pronoun) or (if no I) 'P or (if no I or 'P) 'V, bearing in mind that a particle only works at all efficiently with consonant-initial 'P or 'V and has so far signally failed to account for the lack of *h-* before vowel-initial 'P or 'V. An explanation was proposed (§8) for the puzzling use of I as the 1/2sg./pl. passive subject (I^S) in OIr., British and hence PIC, although it had hitherto consisted solely of enclitic object pronouns (I^O) and a form of the verb 'to be' would normally be expected to express person with a verbal adjective like **aγtos* 'driven' turned passive preterite, as Cowgill pointed out (§8; cf. Lat. *actus sum/est* 'I/he was driven'). This started from accompanying personal forms of **e(s)-* 'to be' and neg. 1sg. **nīmm* (< PC **nīmmi* < **nēsmi*) as a trigger for their replacement first by similar 1sg. I^{O>S} **-mm(e)* (**-mm* 'V-, **-mme* 'C-), then 2sg. **-tt(u)* and 1/2pl. **-nnos/*-swes*.

The system of **nī(s)* + mostly geminated 1/2sg./pl. I^S that arose thereby in the neg. pass. pret. was liable to motivated spread in two directions: (a) throughout the passive to provide it with 1/2sg./pl. forms distinct from corresponding deponent actives, and (b) throughout the main-clause negative system because **nī(s)* was more strongly characterised than inherited **ne*. When (b) brought **nī(s)* + **-mme/*-ttu/*-nnos/*-swes* into the active system as I^{S>O} beside old non-neg. I^O **-me/*-tu/*-e(n)/*-siyan/-nnos/-swes/*-sūs*, the former needed and acquired 3rd-person I^O forms, namely sg. n./m.) **-e(n)* and (with characteristic double consonance) f. **-ssiyan*, pl. **-ssūs*. Both sets, which already shared **-nnos/*-swes* with CC-, were then homogenised as **-mme/*-ttu/*-e(n)/*-ssiyan/*-nnos/*-swes/*-ssūs*. When new initial forms without I were created, these naturally adopted the same shape (CC-, and

h-less *V*-) after a vowel-final preverb as the enclitic pronouns had: **to*=*ttēgont* > OIr. *do:tiagat*, **ro*=*ssliχtos* > OIr. *ro:slecht* 'has been cut down', **to*=*are-beret* > OIr. *tairbir* 'inclines' and so on.

This scenario is corroborated by its ability to resolve two other problems as well as unmutated 'CV- and 'V- after vowel-final pretonic P in OIr. main clauses: the curious use of 1/2sg./pl. enclitic subject pronouns in the passive and the generalisation of originally copular neg. **nīs* > OIr. *ní* in non-imperative main clauses. Just inserting an element *VC(i)* to block lenition has proved to be by no means as straightforward or effective as it should be, and tricky to intractable problems confronting an elusive particle mean that a generally much less problematical alternative does not have to be as efficient as the particle in the latter's one area of strength as a supposed blocker of lenition on a consonant-initial tonic portion. The hypothesis supported here has the advantage of being based on actual rather than, in effect, artificially engineered enclitics and needs to be no more than adequate as an explanation of unlenited tonic *C*-, since it can at least match a particle otherwise and, indeed, decisively outperforms it with regard to OIr. abs. deponent endings and the lack of *h*-before tonic *V*-.

ABBREVIATIONS

- EIV* McCONE, KIM 1997: *The Early Irish Verb* (Maynooth).
GMW EVANS, D. SIMON 1964: *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin).
GOI THURNEYSSEN, RUDOLF 1946: *A Grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin).
KPV SCHUMACHER, STEFAN 2004: *Die keltischen Primärverben: Ein vergleichendes etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon* (Innsbruck).
LexWb. KAVANAGH, SÉAMUS 2001: *A Lexicon of the Old Irish Glosses in the Würzburg Manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul* (Wien).
ODVC McCONE, KIM 2006: *The Origins and Development of the Insular Celtic Verbal Complex* (Maynooth).
 (Free download at <https://kimmcccone.org>).
RelChron. McCONE, KIM 1996: *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change* (Maynooth).
 (Free download at <https://kimmcccone.org>).
Thes. STOKES, WHITLEY and STRACHAN, JOHN 1901–3: *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus I/II* (Cambridge).
VKG PEDERSEN, HOLGER 1909–13: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen I–II* (Göttingen).

REFERENCES

- BEEKES, ROBERT S. P. 1995: *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia).
 BOLING, BRUCE 1972: 'Some problems of the phonology and morphology of the Old Irish verb', *Ériu* 23, 73–102.

- BORGSTRØM, CARL 1933: 'The absolute and conjunct terminations of Old Irish verbs', *Hermathena* 23, 54–64.
- BREATNACH, LIAM 1977: 'The suffixed pronouns in Early Irish', *Celtica* 12, 75–107.
- BUDASSI, MARCO and ROMA, ELISA 2018: 'On the origin of the absolute vs. conjunct opposition in Insular Celtic', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, 293–337.
- CARNIE, ANDREW and GUILFOYLE, EITHNE 2000: *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages* (Oxford).
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE 1961: *Morphologie historique du grec* (Paris).
- CHAPALLAZ, M. 1979: *The Pronunciation of Italian* (London).
- COWGILL, WARREN 1975: 'The origins of the Insular Celtic conjunct and absolute verbal endings', in Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung, Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden), 40–70.
- , 1975b: 'Two further notes on the origin of the Insular Celtic absolute and conjunct verb endings', *Ériu* 26, 27–32.
- , 1983: 'On the prehistory of Celtic passive and deponent inflection', *Ériu* 34, 73–111.
- , 1985: 'The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European', in Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien – Funktion und Geschichte, Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden), 99–108.
- DE HOZ, JAVIER 1997: 'When did the Celts lose their verbal *-i?', *ZCP* 49–50, 107–17.
- DELBRÜCK, BERTHOLD 1888: *Altindische Syntax* (Halle).
- , 1900: *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, Part 3*, vol. 5 of Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Strassburg).
- DILLON, MYLES 1943: 'On the structure of the Celtic verb', *Language* 19, 252–3.
- , 1947: 'Celtic and other Indo-European languages', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 46/1, 15–24.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 1994: *Ergativity* (Cambridge).
- ERNOUT, ALFRED 1953: *Morphologie historique du latin* (Paris).
- ESKA, JOSEPH 2010: 'Where have all the object pronouns gone? The growth of object agreement in earlier Celtic', *ZCP* 57, 25–47.
- GARCÍA-CASTILLERO, CARLOS 2014: 'De-adjectival preverbs in the Old Irish verbal complex: a synchronic and diachronic study', *ZCP* 61, 57–100.
- , 2015: 'The type *táinicc* in the Old Irish glosses: affix ordering, frequency and phonotactics', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113, 76–104.
- GONDA, JAN 1959: 'On amplified and similar structures in the Veda', in idem, *Four Studies in the Language of the Veda* ('S Gravenhage), 7–70.
- GREENE, DAVID 1973: 'Synthetic and analytic: a reconsideration', *Ériu* 24, 121–33.
- GRIFFITH, AARON 2011: 'The genesis of the animacy hierarchy in the Old Irish *notae augentes*' in Thomas Krisch and Thomas Lindner (eds), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog, Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indo-*

- germanischen Gesellschaft, 21.–27 September September 2008 (Wiesbaden), 182–91.
- , 2020: ‘The “Cowgill particle”, preverbal *ceta* “first”, and prepositional cleft sentences in the Old Irish glosses’, in Elliott Lash, Fangzhe Qiu and David Stifter (eds), *Morphosyntactic Variation in Medieval Celtic Languages, Corpus-based Approaches* (Berlin and Boston), 239–68.
- HEMON, ROPARZ 1975: *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton* (Dublin).
- HOLTON, DAVID, MACKRIDGE, PETER and PHILPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE 2012: *Greek, a Comprehensive Grammar* (Abingdon).
- HORROCKS, GEOFFREY 2014: *Greek, a History of the Language and its Speakers* (Chichester).
- HUEHNERGARD, JOHN 2011: *A Grammar of Akkadian* (Winnona Lake, Indiana).
- JORDÁN CÓLERA, CARLOS 2004: *Celtibérico* (Zaragoza).
- ISAAC, G. R. 1993: ‘Issues in the reconstruction and analysis of Insular Celtic syntax and morphology’, *Ériu* 44, 1–32.
- , 2000: ‘The most recent model of the development of absolute and conjunct flexion’, *Ériu* 51, 63–8.
- , 2001: ‘The function and typology of absolute and conjunct flexion in early Celtic: some hints from Ancient Egyptian’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99/1, 147–70.
- , 2007: ‘A new conjecture on the origins of absolute and conjunct verbal inflection’, *Ériu* 57, 49–60.
- KATTÁN-IBARRA, JUAN and POUNTAIN, CHRISTOPHER 1997: *Modern Spanish Grammar, a Practical Guide* (London and New York).
- KIM, RONALD 2002: ‘The distribution of the Old Irish infixed pronouns, Cowgill’s particle, and the syntactic evolution of Insular Celtic’, in M. Southern (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives* (Washington DC), 151–76.
- KLEIN, JARED 1992: *On Verbal Accentuation in the Rig Veda* (New Haven).
- KOCH, JOHN 1987: ‘Prosody and the Old Celtic verbal complex’, *Ériu* 38, 143–76.
- , 2022: ‘The Neo-Celtic verbal complex and earlier accentual patterns’, *Studia Celtica* 56, 29–62.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 1979: ‘The Old Irish absolute and conjunct endings and questions of relative chronology’, *Ériu* 30, 35–53.
- KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY 1964: *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European* (Heidelberg).
- LAMBERT, PIERRE-YVES 1994: *La langue gauloise: Description linguistique, commentaire d’inscriptions choisies* (Paris).
- , 2000: ‘La tuile gauloise de Châteaufort (Seine-et-Marne)’, *EC* 34, 57–115.
- LAUSBERG, HEINRICH 1972: *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft III: Formenlehre* (Berlin and New York).
- LEJEUNE, MICHEL 1987: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris).
- LEWIS, HENRY 1946: *Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol* (Caerdydd).
- LUCHT, INA 1996: ‘Doppelte Markierung des Akkusativs beim Transitivity im Altirischen’, *ZCP* 46, 80–118.

- MAIDEN, MARTIN and ROBUSTELLI, CECILIA 2013: *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian* (London and New York).
- McCONE, KIM 1978: 'The dative singular of Old Irish consonant stems', *Ériu* 29, 26–38.
- , 1979: 'Pretonic preverbs and the absolute verbal endings in Old Irish', *Ériu* 30, 1–34.
- , 1980: 'The nasalizing relative clause with object antecedent in the Glosses', *Ériu* 31, 10–27.
- , 1981: 'Final /t/ to /d/ after unstressed vowels, and an Old Irish sound law', *Ériu* 32, 29–44.
- , 1982: 'Further to absolute and conjunct', *Ériu* 33, 1–28.
- , 1986: 'From Indo-European to Old Irish: conservation and innovation in the verbal system', in D. Ellis Evans, John G. Griffith and E. M. Jope (eds), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies held at Oxford from 10th to 15th July, 1983* (Oxford), 222–66.
- , 1991: *The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish Nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures* (Innsbruck).
- , 1992: 'Relative Chronologie: Keltisch', in R. S. P. Beekes (ed.) *Relative Chronologie, Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 1987* (Innsbruck), 11–39.
- , 1993: 'Old Irish *co, cucci* "as far as (him, it)" and Latin *usque* "as far as"', *Ériu* 44, 171–6.
- , 1994: 'Zum Ablaut der keltischen *r*-Stämme', in J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In Honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft 26–28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen* (Wiesbaden), 275–84.
- , 1995: 'Der Präsens Indikativ der Kopula und die Relativendung -s im Altirischen', in Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm and Norbert Oettinger (eds), *Verba et structurae, Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag* (Innsbruck), 123–33.
- , 1997: 'Delbrück's model of PIE word order and the Celtic evidence', in Emilio Crespo and Jose Luis García Ramón (eds), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy, Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft Madrid 21–24 de septiembre de 1994* (Madrid and Wiesbaden), 363–96.
- , 1999: 'Old Irish *do:uccai, do:ratai*', in Heiner Eichner and H. C. Luschützky (eds), *Compositiones indogermanicae in honorem Jochem Schindler* (Praha), 355–64.
- , 2000: *Echtrae Chonnlaí and the Beginnings of Vernacular Narrative Writing in Ireland: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Notes, Bibliography and Vocabulary* (Maynooth).
- , 2003: 'Old Irish *na nní*: a case of *quid pro quo*?', *Celtica* 24, 168–81.
- , 2015: 'Unstressed vowels and consonant quality in Old Irish: *u* or non-*u*?', in Liam Breatnach, Ruairí Ó hUiginn, Damian McManus and Katharine Simms (eds), *Proceedings XIV International Congress of Celtic Studies, Maynooth 2011* (Dublin), 109–35.
- McMANUS, DAMIAN 1991: *A Guide to Ogam* (Maynooth).

- , 1994: ‘An Nua-Ghaeilge Chlasaiceach’, in Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó Háinle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach (eds), *Stair na Gaeilge in Ómós do P(h)ádraig Ó Fiannachta* (Maigh Nuad), 335–445.
- MEID, WOLFGANG 1963: *Die indogermanischen Grundlagen der altirischen absoluten und konjunkten Verbalflexion* (Innsbruck).
- , 1997: ‘Zur Syntax des Verbums im Keltischen unter besonderen Berücksichtigung des Festlandkeltischen’, in Emilio Crespo and José Luis García Ramón (eds), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy, Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft Madrid 21–24 de septiembre de 1994* (Madrid and Wiesbaden), 397–406.
- MEILLET, ANTOINE 1937: *Introduction à l’étude comparative des langues indo-européennes* (Paris).
- MEISER, GERHARD 1998: *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt).
- MULCHRONE, KATHLEEN 1939: *Bethu Phátraic, the Tripartite Life of Patrick* (Dublin).
- Ó HAODHA, DONNCHA 1978: *Bethu Brigitte* (Dublin).
- PALMER, LEONARD 1954: *The Latin Language* (London).
- RIEKEN, ELISABETH 2005: ‘Hethitisch’, in Michael P. Streck (ed.), *Sprachen des Alten Orients* (Darmstadt), 80–127.
- RINGE, DON 2006: *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic* (Oxford).
- RIX, HELMUT 1976: *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre* (Darmstadt).
- SCHRIJVER, PETER 1994: ‘The Celtic adverbs for “against” and “with” and the early apocope of *-i’, *Ériu* 45, 151–89.
- , 1995: *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam and Atlanta GA).
- , 1997: *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles* (Maynooth).
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, PATRICK 1984: ‘The double system of verbal inflexion in Old Irish’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82, 138–201.
- SKOPETEAS, STAVROS 2016: ‘Information structure in Modern Greek’, in Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Inshihara (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure* (Oxford), 686–708.
- SMYTH, HERBERT WEIR 1920: *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge MA).
- STERN, LUDWIG CHR. 1910: *Epistolae Beati Pauli glosatae glosa interlineali, irisch-lateinischer Codex der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek in Lichtdruck herausgegeben und mit Einleitung und Inhaltsübersicht versehen* (Halle).
- STOKES, WHITLEY 1905: *Féilire Óengusso Céili Dé: The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee* (London).
- VENDRYES, JOSEPH 1911–12: ‘La place du verbe en celtique’, *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 17, 337–51.
- WACKERNAGEL, JAKOB 1892: ‘Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung’, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 333–436.
- WATKINS, CALVERT 1962: *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb* (Dublin).

-
- , 1963: ‘Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb’, *Celtica* 6, 1–49.
- , 1969: *Indogermanische Grammatik, Band III: Formenlehre, Erster Teil: Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion* (Heidelberg).
- , 2004: ‘Hittite’, in Roger D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages* (Cambridge), 551–75.

KIM McCONE

Maynooth