

VARIA

1. On abstracts in *-iā* from locativals

Liam Breatnach has perceptively adduced¹ a set of formations, clearly early,² which he terms ‘abstracts derived directly from prepositions’. It seems to me that these derivatives are even more regular and cohesive than he implies. In every case the basis of the derivation is a locative particle, and they occur in well-matched polar pairs. It has the appearance of being a productive regular process of early date.

We do best to start with *inne* ‘the interior’. Breatnach, in a footnote, is diffident on the old and sure spelling *-nn-*; it is, in fact, the ‘lectio difficilior’, and must be accepted and respected. The definite article itself teaches us that we must not conflate the development of *nn* in proclitics with that in stressed words nor seek a flow of transfer between these two accentual classes where the conditions for analogy do not obtain. I start then from **endi* < **H_endhi*, or **ndhi*.³

We then derive this locative as an adjective **end-ino-* ‘interior’; cf. Latin *intes-t-inus*, *sup-inus*. Or else **endi-no-*; cf. Latin *inter-nus*, *exter-nus*, *infer-nus*, *super-nus*, *prō-nus*. From that adjective (whichever one) an abstract was derived, **endin-iā* > **indiniā* > **indineiā* > **ind'ine* > **indn'e* > *in'e*.

Following this vein, we may start from **eks* > *a(s)*, Latin *ex*. Apart from *acht*, Lat. *ex-ti-mus*, *echtar*, Lat. *ex-tr-ā*, we find the Latin derived adjective *exterus*; on this basis we may confidently reconstruct the adjective **eks-tero-*. Now we form the abstract **ekster-iā* > **ek(s)teriā* > **ektiriā* > **ektireiā* > **ext'ir'e* > **extir'e* > *extr'e* = *echtra(e)*.

Originally related to **endi* and *inne*, the background of *aitire* in relation to *eter* may now be clear. Just as in Latin we suppose an **enteros* (= ἔντερον) underlay *interior* and *intimus*, we form to **enter(-i)* an adjective **enter-o-*. This in turn gave the abstract **enter-iā* > **enteriā* > **ēddiriā* > **ēddireiā* > **ēdd'ir'e*. Then, under the influence of *eter*, instead of **ēdr'e* we end up with *ad'ar'e* = *aitire*. For a certain time **ekster-iā* and **enter-iā* had the surface appearance of being a popular pair, although the IE derivational status of **enter* was already differentiated.

We turn finally to *ar'i* ‘before-ness’ and *iar(s)m'i* ‘after-ness’. To the preposition/particle *air^v* there could have been an adjective **ar(i)o-*; cf. Skt *purá*. An abstract would then become **ar(i)-iā*. The IE cognates of this base are varied and perplexing. To *iar^N* 3 sg. *iarum* we may readily see an adjective **ērom-o-* < **epi-ro-mo-*; cf. Albanian *i èpërm*

¹ *Celtica* 15 (1983) 18–19.

² And so too *cen airi(u) cen iarmoi*, with its formulaic parallel, nearly metrical, repetition.

³ Cf. *Ériu* 28 (1977) 145–6 and 33 (1982) 180–81. See also *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32 (1989) 99–100.

‘upper’ < **àpirama-* < **opi-ro-mo-*. The abstract to this would be **epirom-iā* > **ēromiā* > **ērumiā* > **ērumejā* > **ēr^w əm’e* > (analogical) **ēr`əm’e* > **iarm`e*.

2. The Lepontic Vergiate epitaph

The text is now clear:

PELKVI : PRVIAM : TEV : KARITE : IŠOS : KALITE : PALAṀ

This could be ± ‘Dēvū placed the tomb for Belgos (and) he set up the stone’, on the lines of argument set forth by Lejeune.⁴ That is to say, in terms of the language of Todi⁵

ATEKNATI . TRUTIKNI . KARNITV . $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{LOKAN.} \\ \text{ARTVAŠ} \end{array} \right\}$ KOISIS . TRVTIKNOS
/Ategnātī Drūtīkni karnitū $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{logān} \\ \text{arduās} \end{array} \right\}$ Koisīs Drūtīknos /

= [Ategnātī Drūtīf.] *ur̄n̄um* *Coisis Drūtīf. frāter eius minimus locāuit et statuit (qui) ~ [ACCUSATIVE]* instead of *ur̄n̄um* to match ARTVAŠ (these readings being my conflation).

Lejeune’s excellent explication⁶ of the double predicate *locāuit et statuit* as translating the original unitary lexeme *karni-* with the contrasting complements *logā-* and *arduā-* is supported by the equation in semantic concord of PRVIAM → KARI- ≠ PALAṀ → KALI-. In fact, it seems that the Todi translation was resourceful, but slavishly literal: The translator appears to have selected Latin *locā-* as the interlingual mapping of Gaulish *logā-*. It is as if [logā-] has been spread over *karni-* in the shape [lokā-].

There is another hint of translation. Lejeune has noted perceptively (note 78) that what is transmitted to us as *-qui on statuitqui* [ST]A TVITQUI is surely *-que* with the E incomplete by oversight, and that the stonecutter has hesitated between *X et Y* and *X Yque*. Now if the translator (or stonecutter) had Latin as his native language, or dominant code if he was truly bilingual, once he had formed a sequence with *et* he would scarcely be likely to add *-que* in the slow process of written composition (as opposed to the slurred and mis-phased speech of haste). However, a speaker with native habits like those with Lepontic *-pe*⁷ could easily add a final *-que* by slipping into the native or dominant pattern. This should tell us something about the syntax of conjoining in Todi Gaulish. It should be noticed that both Todi Gaulish ‘*locāuit statuitque*’ and Lepontic LATVMARVI SAPSVTAI-PE conjoin not just like constituents but lexemes of identical function with semantics that differ only by systematically paired features. That is, the Todi conjoined

⁴M. Lejeune, *Lepontica* (Paris 1971) 88–93 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 444–9.

⁵*Lepontica*, 31, 35 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 387, 391.

⁶*Lepontica*, 35–6 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 391–2, (a).

⁷See *Lepontica*, 74 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 430.

predicates are both identically inflected verbs of placing an object; they differ by the features of lying and standing (upright) positions. The Lepontic pair comprises dative personal recipients; they differ mainly by gender.

Let us now return to our Lepontic epitaph for which Lejeune has adduced the Todi equivalence. The content and constituent form of both are fundamentally the same; the inflectional case differences and those of the lexical content of phrases do not affect our problem here. The equation then may be drawn:

	ATEKNATI	LOKAN	KOISIS	KARNITV
	TRVTIKNI		TRVTIKNOS	
=	PELKVI ⁸	PRVIAM	TEV ⁹	KARITE
	K.T.	KARNITV	ARTVAŠ ¹⁰	(A.T.)
=	IŠOS ¹¹	KALITE	PALAM	

It is immediately clear that the formula here is

PN-Beneficiary	grave	PN-Agent	put
Agent	put-up	stone	(Beneficiary)

We must therefore seek appropriate verb lexemes for ‘put (a grave)’ and ‘put-up’ so as to resolve the graphic ambiguity of these Lepontic verbs.

For ‘put-up’ Lejeune has already made a very plausible and principled suggestion; the only merit I claim for the present discussion of this point is that it places our word KALITE in a total context throwing its features into highlight, and then makes the rest of the argument much clearer

⁸Lejeune has amply emphasised the ambiguity of this name. If the name was in fact good Celtic, a perfectly appropriate interpretation would be the dative *Belgūi*, for which we have adequate formation rules; see E. P. Hamp *Studia Celtica* 18–19 (1983–4) 128–134, and *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 44 (1991) 67–9.

⁹While *Dēyū* < **Deiuō* ← **deiuon-* is a perfectly well formed grammatical word one wonders just what ‘godly one’ [?] meant when adopted as a name.

¹⁰Meid has departed (in his paper at the Congress of Celtic Studies in Paris, 9 July 1991) from the traditional interpretation followed by Lejeune, and, following a gloss by Cormac, takes this word as meaning ‘stone(s)’. This is a very attractive proposal, but the force of *statuit* is still not negated by this reading. Indeed, a cairn of stones would still have been ‘erected’ or ‘raised’.

¹¹I agree with Lejeune that this should be a pronoun and not another name. It seems clear to me from the parallel structure to Todi that the reference of IŠOS should be identical with that of TEV. But Lejeune’s **istos* seems to me too Latinizing. It will be seen too that I cannot accept J. F. Eska’s views, *ZCP* 44 (1991) 70–73, nor the relation to Gaulish and Celtiberian there suggested; I also differ (*Études Celtiques* 27 (1990), *Varia* XL) on Greek αῶτε (*ZCP* 44 (1991) 72). What we need here is a simple anaphora, perhaps with a discourse or clausal connective – a kind of ‘and’. The anaphora could well be enclitic. A form *-so-s* (nominative) would be appropriate, from the well known IE deictic **so/sā/to-d*; cf. Gaulish *sosin*.

by the same principles. Surely Lejeune's morphological analysis¹² of these verb forms is correct as (adjusting symbols somewhat) **Kr-je/o-*, **Kl-je/o-*, on the pattern of Greek *χαίρω*, *βάλλω*, etc. I therefore concur with Lejeune in attributing KALITE as *kalite* to **kel-* 'r(a)ise', but I do not agree in including¹³ Greek among known cognates. It will be seen from my discussion,¹⁴ that I find the standard references deficient on this IE root. In fact, this Lepontic evidence becomes highly important in adding Celtic to the dialectal attestation. We now find **kel(H)-* attested in Baltic, Germanic (OE *hyll*, *holm*, ON *hallr*, *holmr*, Goth. *hallus*), Latin (*collis*, *culmen*, *celsus*), and Lepontic – an excellent Western IE distribution.

I do not, however, think that Lejeune has met with similar success for KARITE,¹⁵ which he attributes to **gher-* (> Lat. *hortus*, Ir. *-gort*). The semantics are not similarly appropriate; what is needed is a verb of putting or placing. The most neutral verbal base in Indo-European for this notion was **dheɀ-*, and I have shown elsewhere¹⁶ that the suppletive and asymmetric paradigm of IE aoristic **dheɀ-* was continued in Old Irish by *cor*, verbal noun to *fo-ceird*, the non-compound suppletive to *·cuirethar*, *·lá*. Thus the Old Irish non-subjunctive and non-preterite/perfect had transferred its base to **ker-* (: Welsh *a-gor*, Breton *di-gor* 'open').¹⁷ I therefore propose that Lepontic KARITE be written *karite* and be attributed as **kɀ* to **ker-*, which we find in Insular Celtic.

We gain a further point of interpretation from this finding: If the successor to **dheɀ-* 'put' is *kari-*, then the analysis of Prestino TETU becomes clear. This must be 'dedit' and not 'posuit'¹⁸ and to conventional **dō-* we will attribute a pre-form **de-de* ^W-*u*.¹⁹

The choice of our reading and ancestor form is not, then, arbitrary.²⁰

From the verbs we may now pass to IŠOS. I have already (note 11) stated my agreement with Lejeune that the structure of this inscription, in discourse and pragmatic terms, requires the inclusion of a pronoun in this expression; I furthermore see an anaphora as the appropriate syntactic element, and, based on our experience with the history of other languages, a form that earlier had a deictic value would be eminently acceptable. I thus propose *so-s* as a cognate of Celtiberian *šos*.²¹

¹² *Lepontica*, 90 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 446.

¹³ *Lepontica*, 91 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 447.

¹⁴ *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81 (1976) 36–8.

¹⁵ *Lepontica*, 90 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 446.

¹⁶ To appear in *Veleia* (Vitoria).

¹⁷ The IE idioms for 'open' and 'close' (OIr. *iad-*) were formed with **hɀp-* and **ɀop-* respectively together with **dheɀ-*.

¹⁸ *Lepontica*, 105 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 461.

¹⁹ *Lepontica*, 94, 105–6 = *Études Celtiques* 12 (1970) 450, 461–2.

²⁰ J. F. Eska, *Historische Sprachforschung* 103 (1990) 86–8, should be corrected accordingly in his reconstructed bases.

²¹ On the latter see *Études Celtiques* 27 (1990), *Varia* XL.

We now require an element to precede (an enclitic) *sos* to account not only for the I but also for the strengthened \tilde{S} . I propose to see here **it*, cognate with early Welsh *yt*²², Latin *ita*, Skt. *iti*, which we know to have been an IE clause-initial particle.²² In fact, in position before *s* **it* could have derived from both **itH* and **idhe > *id'* (> Welsh *yđ*). Thus the structure of

**it* - *sos* *kalite*
'and - he raised'

corresponds exactly to Welsh

y - *m* *gelwir* 'I am called'
'∅ - me one-calls'

y - *th* *elwir* 'thou art called'
'∅ - thee one-calls'

y *h-* *edewjnt* 'they left them'
'∅ - them left-they'

In the last example *y h-* would correspond to Lepontic **IT-. . Š* (cf. *SITES* < **sēd-ns*. Again we see an infixed object as a relic of the old enclitic with introductory particle:

<i>yt</i>	<i>ym</i>		<i>gwelynt</i>
'that they could see me'			
<i>ita</i>	<i>-(s)mu</i>		<i>*_uélint(i)</i> ²³
Hitt. <i>nu</i>	<i>-mu-za . . . pa-</i>	<i>ra-a</i>	<i>u-i-iš-ki-it</i>
'and - me . . .		(he)	used to send'
	: OBret.	<i>ro</i>	<i>-ino</i> ²⁴ <i>lenuen</i>
			'là ils-attachaient'
		<i>*(p)ró-</i>	<i>linesent ()</i>

But in Celtic when no object was present as an enclitic a subject concord occupied this position:

neu cheint < **nVu -s* *kántū* 'I have sung'
dybu < **to-s* *bóu* 'came'

We see the trace of this in such a relic form as *cheint*, showing spirantisation. This element, or the neuter **-d*, must be the main source of the non-lenition displayed by Welsh *yđ*.²⁵ Lepontic **it-sos* is, then,

²²See *ZCP* 37 (1979) 167-8, and references therein.

²³See my remarks on this in *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies [BBCS]* 30 (1982) 39-40.

²⁴It is difficult to reconstruct Welsh *yno(eth~d)*.

²⁵On which see D. Simon Evans, *A grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin 1964) 171 § 190.

the precise equivalent of Welsh *y (kywodes y marchawc)* ‘the knight too arose’,²⁶ *(yna) y (dywawt)* ‘then he said’,²⁷ *(y ford) y (guelyn)* ‘the way they saw’,²⁸ *y (bu)* ‘when she was’.²⁹

We are now in a position to consider the syntax of this inscription. The text may be divided into two predications:

Belgūi PRVIAM *Dēyū* *karite*

and

išos (< **it-sos*) *kalite* PALAM

The first is a canonical older IE sentence, with verb in final position and with the person of the burial – the central topic – fronted for topicalization: ‘For B. the grave D. placed’.³⁰ Presumably when an element is fronted and consequently fills the initial position, the verb as a major constituent remains in final.

The second predication continues the discourse, and therefore we have a sentence connective **i-tH* or **i-dh(e)*, both of which yield **it*. The anaphora **so-s* is therefore appropriately attached as an enclitic to this. It is then possible to place the verb at the end or to front it. If the latter is chosen the verb must be placed after the introductory complex with the sentence connective; this is the principal origin of the Celtic deuterotonic complex with infixes.

In these two sentences we see in Lepontic a mid-way development between Indo-European and Insular Celtic, or perhaps a pure specimen of Indo-European (as observed, for example, in Hittite and Anatolian, and less clearly in Indic) apt for selection by Insular Celtic.

²⁶J. Gwenogvryn Evans, *The White Book Mabinogion* (Pwllheli 1907) 398.15.

²⁷G. Melville Richards, *Breudwyd Ronabwy* (Caerdydd 1948) 12.21.

²⁸I. Williams (ed.), *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (Caerdydd 1930) 51.25.

²⁹ibid., 50.8. I assume that **idhe > *id(h)* → **id-s# C > *i(d)# C > y# C*. Hence non-mutation with [+ voice] when the then final **d* was absorbed.

³⁰On the *t*-preterite of Gaulish and Lepontic see most recently J. F. Eska, *Historische Sprachforschung* 103 (1990) 81–91. K. H. Schmidt is certainly correct in his derivation of these forms from the IE imperfect; this penetrating perception is perhaps the best of Schmidt’s many imaginative contributions. It is the only principled way to explain these presential derivative stems, and the employment of Watkins’s (properly Benveniste’s and Kuryłowicz’s) extrapolation from the unmarked 3 sg. is reconstruction at its best. I further believe that the 3 pl. -VS must be not a noun but an adjectival plural as if it were for the speakers a predicate participle. The most likely value to assign it would be *-ūs*, as though a nominative pl. < thematic **-ōs*; *-ūs* could be taken as an active participle to an intransitive verb. The singular *-ū* would then be parsed as a nominative of an individuating *-on-* stem (= Lat. *Catō*).

3. *śṛṅkhāṇīkā*³¹

Nasal bases and nasal presents in Celtic

T. Burrow has suggested resourcefully³² that this word for ‘mucus’ goes back to an etymon in **s-*; he adduces the later Pkt. *simghai* *sumghai*, Hi. *sūghnā*, assuming a voicing of *kh* to *gh* after nasal as a north-western dialect feature. He then attributes the Indic **srṅkh-* to **srenk(h)-* comparing Gk. ῥέγγω ~ ῥέγω.

On the basis of the Celtic and Armenian, as well as the Greek, evidence, I have offered a revised reconstruction of the etymon to account for a greater range of forms in closer accord with the known rules of IE phonology and word-formation.³³ The root I have proposed is **sregh-*, with nasal-infix formations also occurring, to give **srengh-*.

I therefore suggest that instead of following Burrow’s excellent reasoning in the direction he sets forth, we take the Sanskrit forms as a result of back-formation from the Middle Indo-Aryan, of which we have a good attestation. The Pkt. *si/umghai* would then continue directly Indic **srṅgh-* ← **srengh-*; and once again we see how valuable Middle Indic forms can be for our exact understanding of Indo-European.

This finding leads me to reinspect my reconstruction of the root. I had considered the root to be **sregh-* principally on the evidence of the Celtic, which I reconstruct as Breton *fri*, Cornish *fry* ‘nose’ < **sreg(h)-*, Corn. *frīg* ‘nostril’ < **sregg-*, Welsh *ffroen* OIr. *srón* ‘nose’ < **srog(h)-nā*. Then the remaining forms I presumed to result from n-infixation: Gk. ῥέγγω < **sre-n-gh-*, Mid. Ir. *srennim* ‘snore’ < **sre-n-gh-n-*, Armen. *ṛngun-k’* < **srongh-on-*, Welsh *ffriw* ‘face, nose, forehead, head’ < **sreng(h) y-*. It is, however, true that if the nasal originated in a present infix (even if subsequently generalized throughout the paradigm) we might expect a Greek extension in *-αv-*, which is regular for old nasal-infixed presents, and the Armenian might be expected to show an extension but lack the internal nasal entirely, as it regularly does in such verbs;³⁴ besides, the verb is lacking in Armenian. Such an

³¹The following item, the content of which is of obvious Celtic interest, was first published in 1976 as a contribution to *Philologia Orientalis* 4 (in memoriam George V. Tsereteli). Since in that setting it may have escaped the notice of Celticists, it is reprinted here at the request of the editors of *Celtica*. In this reprinting I update and complete the cross-references to the literature and add a few references of later date. Otherwise the content remains unchanged. I take this opportunity to renew my tribute to G. V. Ts., a great scholar and an unforgettable human being of truly marvellous warmth and generosity even exceeding, if possible, that of my valued Georgian friends then living in circumstances which we must never allow to be repeated.

³²*Kratylos* 15 (1970 [1972]) 54–5.

³³*Ériu* 25 (1974) 275–8; *Baltistica* 10 (1974) 69–72; *Études Celtiques* 14 (1975) 461–6.

³⁴See my article in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 89 (1975) 100–109 on nasal presents in Armenian.

assumption of a nasal present also makes it somewhat harder to envisage the misinterpretation of the Greek perfect as if it were an aspirate perfect, an assumption which I require in order to explain the genesis of the alternate form $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\omega$ with *-k-*.

The Indic evidence now gives us additional and highly valuable testimony (in a nominal formation!) for the presence of the internal nasal; indeed it now looks much more likely that the root originally had an inherent nasal. This view, moreover, is not reached merely on the accretion of yet one more item to the list of forms and dialects showing the nasal, as if such issues were settled by simple parliamentary vote of attestation. Rather, the assumption of an inherent nasal makes the Greek, Armenian, Indic, and Welsh (*ffriw*) formations, more readily and directly explicable; otherwise each of these would require special and separate motivation.

A consideration of Mid. Ir. *srennim* in the light of this finding helps to elucidate one of the more difficult types of verb-formation which Irish attests for us. Thurneysen³⁵ simply lumps together under present class B I (Strachan's class A 1) certain verbs in *-nn-*, noting that fact but offering no explanation beyond a few IE comparisons: *ad·greinn* 'persecutes', *as·gleinn* 'discutit', *fo·gleinn* 'learns', *do·seinn* 'pursues', Archaic Ir. *ro·geinn* 'finds room in'. The most recent careful discussion of verbs in this configuration is that of the late Marie-Louise Sjoestedt.³⁶ I find her general conclusions on this set of verbs unsatisfactory because she assumes as roots for nasal infixation shapes which rely on unmotivated extension of simpler IE roots by extra consonants; thus for *·gleinn* 'swallow', *brenn-* 'bubble forth', and *srenn-* Sjoestedt (23) posits freshly extended roots **gled-*, **bred-*, **sred-*, which are not supported by attested formations elsewhere and which only give rise to additional needs for explanation.³⁷

It seems to me that three classes of explanation are required for this configuration of verb stem in Irish, none requiring more assumptions than we already need for Indo-European and for Irish.

(1) The correct solution for *for·diuclann-* 'swallow, gulp', i.e. *for·dī-od-glenn-* or *for·dī-uss-glenn-*, was given long ago by Marstrand, ³⁸ who, however, analysed the underlying form incorrectly as *·dī-fo*. He posited a nasal present of the root seen in *gel-·geil* 'devours', whereby

³⁵ *A grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin 1946) 353.

³⁶ *L'aspect verbal et les formations à affixe nasal en celtique* (Paris 1926) 14 and passim.

³⁷ See now my argument against Wurzelweiterungen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 90 (1985) 66–9, esp. 66–7.

³⁸ *Observations sur les présents indo-européens à nasale infixée en celtique* (Christiania 1924) 30. Cf. also *BBCS* 26 (1975) 138 on Welsh *dichlyn*, referred to below, and *BBCS* 30 (1983) 289 on another Welsh *dichlyn*.

.glen in composition would quite regularly give *.glenn* by MacNeill's law.³⁹

Marstrander attributes to *brenn-* a pre-form **brend-*, but that actually suffers from the same deficiency of unmotivated extension that Sjoestedt's **bre-d-* does. The root here is clearly **bheru-*, as seen in Lat. *ferueō*, Ir. *berbaim*, Welsh *berw berwi*, Breton *berv birviñ* 'boil'. Sjoestedt has moreover appositely compared (23) Goth. *brinnan* with *-nn-* < **nu-*. Surely we must then somehow start off from **b(h)re-n-u-*, which may well in turn be refashioned from **b(h)ṛ-n-u-* just as we have OIr. *sernaid* instead of the vocalism expected, which we actually do find in Welsh *sarnu* 'strew'.⁴⁰ It seems that the main motivation for positing a dental extension to this root in the past has been the desire to account for the verbal noun *bréisiu*; it is quite true that neither **breu-* nor **bren-* will accomplish this. However, when we recall that another notable original present in *-nu-*, *ro-cluinethar* 'hears', Skt. *śṛṇu-*, took an *-s-* suffix (and particularly in the verbal noun), we may well be justified in deriving *bréisiu* from **bren-s-tiō* or the like at a relatively late date. With the above arguments in mind I would then trace *do-eprinn* from *to-ess-brin* by MacNeill's law, and this in turn from **(to + eks-)b(h)renu-*.

Therefore we see that in the recent prehistory of Irish one significant contributor to these presents has been the action of MacNeill's law on nasal finals.

(2) Thurneysen (353) thinks that *sennid* 'plays (a musical instrument)' has been attracted into this class by *do-seinn* 'pursues'; it must surely be the inverse. I have shown, I think,⁴¹ that **syen-* 'chase' (> *do-seinn*) fell phonetically together with **syenH* 'sound' (: Lat. *sonāre*) in paradigmatic positions before vowels. Now to account for the consonantism of *sennid* we must assume a nasal present somewhat on the lines of *benaïd*, *crenaïd*, *tlenaïd*, or *sernaïd*. That is, the pre-form must have been **syṅ-n-H-*, which then like other verbs, was revised to **syen-n-H-*.⁴²

Now it is claimed⁴³ that *ara-chrin* 'decays' is an old *-n(e)u-* present. But this theory fails to pay sufficient attention to the most important related adjective,⁴⁴ *crín* 'rotten'. Since the latter must reflect *krē-no-* the root is seen to be **kreH_{e-}*, and the present must therefore be derived from **kr-né-H_{e-}* **krnē-*, which was refashioned to **krenē-* > **krenī-* **krinī-* > *.crin*. In other words, Irish, confirmed by Welsh *crin* 'withered' and Breton *krin* 'dry; dead wood', provides valuable testimony to

³⁹For a phonetic explanation of the latter see my article on the subject, *Ériu* 25 (1974) 174–80.

⁴⁰On this last point see my article on *barnu brawd*, *Celtica* 11 (1976) 68–75.

⁴¹*Lingua* 34 (1974) 229.

⁴²For the development of a similar sequence and configuration see *Ériu* 24 (1973) 160–62, and for my analysis of the IE dialectology of the nasal present formation of **jnH^o-* see the most recent issue of the *Annual of Armenian Linguistics*.

⁴³Marstrander, 13; Sjoestedt, 36; Thurneysen, 357 § 552.

⁴⁴Marstrander, 42–3; Thurneysen, 437 § 704.

the colouring of laryngeals in '9th class' nasal presents by distinguishing through the surface root vocalism $*-n(e)H_a-$ or $*-n(e)H_o-$ (class B IV) from $*-neH_e-$ (class B V). This distinction must also be the motivation for the residual difference which we see in British participles and nominalizations glimpsed through Welsh *crin* < $*kr̥i-no-$ from apparent $*kr̥eno-$, but *sarn* 'pavement, *strāta*' < $*strn-$ (taken from the present stem) and *ystrad* 'valley' < $*strato-$ < apparent $*str̥oto-$ = *strH_o to-*. Old Irish class B V is thus seen to be a mixed collection of the residues of $-nu-$ presents (*do·lin* 'flows': Welsh *llanw* 'tidal flow', *ro·cluineithar* 'hears', and, probably attracted by the last, *ad·gnin* 'knows') of $-neH_e-$ (*ara·chrin*) and of the 6th class (*ro·finnadar* 'finds out': Skt. *vi-n-d-ātī*).⁴⁵

Now that we understand the background of *ara·chrin*, we see that we are justified in carrying our reconstruction of *sennid* one step farther: To account for the entry of this verb into class B I it seems most likely that its early form was $*su(e)n-n-H_e-$; if it had terminated in H_a it is likely that it would have found its place in class B IV, and if it had been originally thematic it might have vocalised like *marnaid·mairn* 'betrays' and *at·baill* 'dies'. Hence another source of our subclass is a $-n(e)H_e-$ present of a nasal root.

(3) There can be no doubt that *ro·geinn* inherits an inherent nasal in its root; that is shown clearly by $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\delta\alpha$, the perfect to $\chi\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$. Therefore Lat. *praeda* beside *praehendō* and the Albanian preterite *gjeta* (unless from a zero-grade $*g(h)nd̥i-$) beside the present *gjindem* 'je me trouve' must be regarded as secondary formations. The root here is $*ghend-$: this is presumably what Thurneysen means (353) by 'a primary form $\eta dn-$ '.

Sjoestedt (15), while comparing Old Church Slavic *gl̥d̥ěti*, declares that *·gleinn* 'examine, look' has a nasal infix, while Marstrander (32), who compares *gl̥da-ti* but also adduces the substantive *gl̥és*, includes this in his group with inherent nasal. Marstrander is certainly right, on the available evidence. I have enlarged upon this argument also from the Welsh side in my note on *dichlyn* 'choose, investigate'.⁴⁶

The root of *·greinn* (: OCS *gr̥d̥q* Lat. *gradior*) is less easy – Sjoestedt (15) opts for the infix solution, noting that Slavic has generalized the nasal. Marstrander (32), noting the Slavic infinitive *gr̥esti* in addition to the Ir. *gr̥és*, correctly concludes that this root must have an inherent nasal within Irish. Yet he also offers valuable evidence (33) from Munster dialect which points to the earlier IE situation indicated by the Latin and Avestan cognates. Whatever the exact IE situation, it is clear that at least an alternant persisted in Irish with an inherent nasal; an underlying Irish *grend-* is therefore required.

⁴⁵For recent statements on this theme see my remarks, *Études Celtiques* 25 (1988) 128–30, and a note to appear in *Ériu*.

⁴⁶*BBCS* 26 (1975) 138.

Finally, Marstrander adds to the dossier (32) Mid. Ir. *scennid* 'jumps', which probably belongs with these even though we do not have it attested early enough to tell whether it was originally *-nn-* or *-nd-* in Old Irish. This is to be paired with Lat. *scandō*, with a stable *n*.

For such of the above as Marstrander discusses he concludes (32), correctly in my opinion, that the roots all terminate in inherent nasal + dental. On this point Sjoestedt's analysis was a step backward. Then Sjoestedt suggested (15-16) that the *-nn-* resulted normally from simple **-nd-* in atonic position, and with no nasal extension. But Marstrander had already disposed of that (32) by pointing to *ro·finnadar*, which never moves to atonic position, i.e. prototonic syntax; Sjoestedt was instead obliged (17) to explain the consonantism of *·fynn-* as analogical. Moreover, we now have an important accretion to the argument in the form of *ro·geinn*.

Sjoestedt seems also to draw (15) either from Marstrander's argument or from a compounding of that with her own insistence on seeing infixes in these stems, the objection that an otiose double affixation is being imposed by assuming that these clusters require a final **-n-*. That was not Marstrander's theory, and it seems to me that he was perfectly correct in this respect. In sum, I draw the generalization: this third subclass which we have been discussing comprises roots with inherent nasal + obstruent which have been extended by a nasal suffix. I now reverse this to form the following *hypothesis*: the way to form a nasal present in Proto-Celtic from such roots was to add such a nasal suffix; i.e. there was no room internally in such roots for a distinctive infix.

If the hypothesis just framed is correct, it is now possible to reduce somewhat the ambiguity which I pointed to in the analysis of OIr. *fennaid* 'flays'.⁴⁷ Of all the possibilities there mentioned it seems that *fennaid* can be only a denominative from a nominalization in *-no-* of the roots **ues-* 'kleiden' or 1. **uendh-* 'flechten, winden'.

It is time now to return to *srennim*. After the above survey of the formation rules of class B I verbs in *-nn-* we are in a position both to clarify the nature of this root and to make the firmer argument which we have just been reviewing. I have already criticised Sjoestedt for her loose use of Wurzelerweiterungen; but in the case of *srenn-* and its alleged cognates she permits herself no less than **s(t)rek-*, **s(t)rekh-*, **s(t)red-*, **s(t)ret-*, and **steru-*. Part of the error here is actually the attempt to include also the etymon of 'sneeze', Welsh *ystrew*, Lat. *sternuō* etc.: Welsh also has the form *trew trewi*.⁴⁸ These cannot be related to our root, since Welsh (and Cornish and Breton) shows clearly that **sr-* > *ffr-* while **str-* > *(y)str-*. Instead, we may see a contamination of the

⁴⁷*Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12 (1969) 160-61.

⁴⁸For the [then] latest discussion of these see J. E. Caerwyn Williams, *BBCS* 24 (1972) 54-5.

root which produced *ffroen* by this root for 'sneeze' (perhaps **pstreu*⁴⁹ the result being the competing etymon seen in Welsh *trwyn*, OCorn. *trein*. Sjoestedt's permissive reconstruction loses the ability to explain the genesis of both *ffroen* and *trwyn* existing side by side. Moreover, it is only by this manipulation of root extensions that Sjoestedt is able to postulate the basis for a nasal infix in *srenn-*.

Marstrander, who did not consider this root in his work, states (32) that roots in *-ng* never take an additional extension/affix in *-n-*. So far as his material reached that was true, and therefore he was driven to a more sensitive argument to show that the *-nn-* cluster did not result from simple unstressed *-nd*. But now in light of our present root we may state explicitly that the result of **-ng(h)n-* was also *-nn-*, and that velar finals could indeed take the nasal suffix. Thus *srennid* has great confirmatory value for Irish grammar.

Furthermore, on the basis of the generalization reached above we may now assert that because of its class membership in the Old Irish verb system *srennid* can be derived consistently not from a nasal infix but only from a segmentation **sreng(h)-n-e/o-*. The IE root was therefore **sreng(h)-*.

This result means that the Celtic reflexes of proximate **sreg-* result from a productive reanalysis of stems as if they were nasally infixed. It is noteworthy that this happened within Celtic, where nasal infixes were still very much alive and the derivatives of this root were obviously numerous.

We may finally return to *śrṅkhāṅikā* < **srṅghāṅikā*, for which I think we can now give a clear analysis. It is easy to segment in this word for 'mucus' a suffix of appurtenance **srṅghāṅ-ikā* < **srnghon-ikā* 'of the nose, pertaining to the nose or nostril'. The formation of the first element is now seen to agree perfectly (but for the ablaut) with the Armenian *ṛngun-*'k < **srongh-on-*. Moreover, we may now understand OIr. *srón*, Welsh *ffroen* < **srog(h)-nā* as a thematized derivative of this n-stem, either with dissimilation of the nasals or – more likely – refashioned on the model of the newly extracted Celtic **sreg-* which has just been explained above. From these three dialects in the far East and West and in the Caucasus we recover an IE lexeme **sr(o)ng(h-on-* 'nostril' or 'snout', vel sim.

⁴⁹Note in reprinting: in *BBCS* 30 (1983) 292, I repeated this with **pstreu-* > **streu-*, (: Irish *sreod*, i.e. *sreōd* < **streu-etu-* and **ptreu-* (> *trew*); but in *Revue des études arméniennes* 17 (1983) 5 (too late for *BBCS* 30) I showed that Arm. *ṗrṅkam* etc. must point to **spter-u-*; on Greek *πάρουσαι* see also *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 6 (1985) 51. The most likely reconstruction must therefore now be seen as **sptreu-* (> **streu-*) ~ **ptreu-*, explained most simply with 's-mobile'.

POSTSCRIPT 1991

In **sr(o)ngħ-on-* we may probably now, along lines of *Bremenio* and OIr. *gobae*,⁵⁰ see an ancient agentive formation on the base of *srennid*, *‘snore-r, snort-er’.

Because I do not see the likelihood that I shall soon have the time to develop, in more detail, for publication an analysis which I worked out about fifteen years ago and sent in abstract form to a symposium in Poland, which I was subsequently not able to attend, I now present that abstract here for what it is worth, as a pendant to the above paper.

FROM PHONETIC CHANGE TO NEW FORM CLASSES

My object is to set forth at some length the growth of some intricate distinctions of form class (verb morphology), together with incipient semantic distinctions, by the simple divergence of what began as a conditioned phonetic variation in the selfsame single inflexional structure. The structure whose history will be traced is that of the Indo-European nasal-present (in particular, a late dialectal version thereof) to the descendent formations seen in Celtic and especially in Old Irish. My account will not conform to any current standard theory, and this in two respects: certain of the Celtic classes have not to date been recognized as having the background which I attribute to them (*sernaid* = *sarnu*, *tlenaid*; *sennid*; *do·eprinn*; *ara·chrin*; *do·lin*; *at·baill*; *·gleinn*, *ro·geinn*, *srennid*; *gallu*); it does not seem to have been noticed that the allocation of these roots to morphological classes has been made solely on the basis of the identity of the specific sounds which found themselves in sequence. In this double respect, my exposition is intended to serve also as a substantive contribution to the history of IE nasal-presents and of Celtic verb classes. It will be clear that I owe much to the ground-breaking monographs of M.-L. Sjoestedt and, even more, of Marstrander; but it will be equally plain that I diverge in important respects, and entirely in the main principle and point of my analysis.

I summarize below in tabular form the classes which I discriminate, with examples sufficient to indicate the crucial situations and the reconstructive argument which I employ. The main stages of reconstruction are given to show the essential changes which must have taken place to preserve the identity of the root and the observed individuality of the paradigm. The membership in Thurneysen's verb classes is indicated to link these sets with traditional analyses; to set forth the object of the present discussion these sets are then subdivided and regrouped on the basis of the reconstructions.

⁵⁰See *BBCS* 35 (1988) 53-4, *Studia Celtica* 22-3 (1988) 7-9, 24-5 (1990) 139.

B IV (Forms in the first column are Old Irish unless otherwise specified)

1. CRENAID	<*K ^w RINĀTI	—	<*K ^w RI-NE-H _a -
W. prynu, Corn. prene			
(SERNĀID) W. SARNU	STARNĀTI	—	STR-NE-H _o -
: (Lat. sternō) Alb. shtrinj, Skt. strṇāti, Av. stərənāiti			
·GLENN 'devour'	-GLINĀT	<*GALLĀT	G ^w HL-NE-H-
*·glen (by MacNeill's law)			
TLENAID	TLINĀTI	TALLĀTI	TL-NE-H _a -

B I

2. DO·EPRINN 'bubbles forth' *·ess-brin	-BRENU-	(BARN(E)U-)	BHR-NE-U-
3. SENNID 'sounds' : Lat. sonāre (*ə)	SŪENNĪ/e-	SŪANNĪ/a	SŪN-NE-H _e -

B V

4. ARA·CHRIN	-KRENĪT	KARNĪT	ĶR-NE-H _e -
: crin < *krēno-			
W. GALLU, C. GALLE	—	GALLĪT	GL-NE-H _e -
3sg. geill gyl, Bret. guell : Lith. galiù gālime			
DO·LIN 'flows' } W. LLANW }	LINU-	{ LANV- < PLə-NE- < PL-NE-H _e - LI- ~ ALLU- < L(E)I- ~ (P)L-NE-U-	
cf. strṇōti, stərənaoiti			
5. ·CLUINETHAR	KLUNE-	KALL(E)U-	ĶL-NE-U
6. RO·FINNADAR	ŪINDNE- (cf. 8) —		ŪI-N-D-Ē-
Bret. 1sg. gunn : Skt. vi-n-d-āti			

B I

7. MARNAID ·MAIRN	MARNETI	—	MR-Ne/o-
AT·BAILL	-BALLET	—	G ^w L-Ne/o-
W. aball 'destruction'			
W. CRYN(U)	KRINET	—	KRI-Ne/o
: OBret. crihot, crit (W. cryd) 'tremble'			
8. ·GLEINN 'examine'	-GLENNET	GLENDNET	GLEND-Ne/o-
W. dichlyn : Slav. ględĕti			
RO·GEINN	-GENNET	GENDNET	GHEND-Ne/o
χαυδάνω			
SRENNID	SRENNETI	SRENGNETI	SRENGH-Ne/o
ῥέγω			
9. LÉICID 'leaves' (This type requires a discussion apart)			
10. BONGID, CON·BOING	—	<*BONGET(1)	<*BHO-N-G-e/o-
verbal noun COMBACH			
FO·LOING	—	-LONGET	LO-N-GH-e/o-
W. go-lo 'cover'			
W. 3sg. TWNG	—	TONGET	TO-N-G-e/o-
Corn. TE, 1sg. TOF	—	TOGĪT	TOG-EIE-
FOR·DING 'oppresses',	—	DINGET	DHI-N-G-e/o-
: W. gorddwy 'oppression', θιγγάνω, Lat. figō			
CON·UTUINC ·UTAING 'builds'		UD(s)-DINGET	DHI-N-ĜH-e/o-
vn. CUMDACH, τεῖχος, Lat. fingō			
(Note the disambiguation of the two last by means of preverbs.)			

We are now in a position to summarize the characteristics of the above tabulation. A careful inspection of the numbered classes (as opposed to the classes of Thurneysen) reveals the following correlations: (R = liquid; H = laryngeal; D = voiced obstruent; N = nasal infix element; the fate of the voiceless obstruents in these circumstances requires a special excursus.)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---|---|---|------------------|--|
| 1. | *R | + | N | + | H _{a/o} | (more exactly *R(i), at least here) |
| 4. | R | + | N | + | H _e | also probably *R(i), perhaps conflating with § 5 |
| 3. | n | + | n | + | H _e | |
| 2. | r | + | N | + | u | |
| 5. | l | + | N | + | u | |
| 10. | o/∅ | + | N | + | D | |
| 6. | ∅ | + | N | + | D | ´ |
| 9. | V | + | N | + | T | |
| 7. | R(i) | | | - | N | (thematic) |
| 8. | nD | | | + | N | (thematic) |

It is clear that there were just two rules, both phonologically conditioned, in the stage from which all these formations were derived: (a) if the root terminated in R(i) or contained medial n, N was affixed as a thematic suffix; (b) otherwise N was infix before the final segment of the root. Of all these classes, the only one whose state was not originally predictable solely on a phonological basis was 6 (i.e. the Sanskrit 6th class). A subsidiary rule was necessary for the vocalism of 10.

The fragmentation into the multiple and revocalized Celtic classes, and the observed Old Irish débris, is simply the result of conditioned phonetic change.

ERIC P. HAMP

University of Chicago