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Summary

This thesis collects, catalogues, and analyses synchronic language variation in Old Irish sources in order to investigate the possibility of Old Irish dialects. This thesis represents the first comprehensive attempt to provide a systematic overview and analysis of attested variant forms and their possible explanations, by building upon previous research discussing linguistic variation in the Old Irish corpus through the collation of prior suggestions and original findings into a cohesive collection.

The primary methodology employed in this thesis is that of collection and analysis: assembling a list of variant features and collecting examples of their occurrence from three corpora of Old Irish material, selected based on their chronological closeness and similarity of content. Variant features were identified from a thorough review of existing literature as well as original collections from the Dictionary of the Irish Language and from the material itself, during the course of the study.

The thesis dismantles the assumption that Old Irish is a language free from any variation and instead proposes understanding Old Irish as a scholastic written standard, and deviations from that standard to be viewed as slips into a different stratum of language, whether it be diatopic or diastratic. It thoroughly examines identified potential variants and discusses their functions and potential origins. This study has been successful in its aim of identifying synchronic language variation in Old Irish and, indeed, has identified a potential diatopic variant that may be used in future scholarship to further narrow down the geographic origins of a particular manuscript.
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<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIH</td>
<td><em>Corpus Iuris Hibernici</em> (Binchy 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIL</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of the Irish Language based mainly on Old and Middle Irish materials</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV</td>
<td><em>The Early Irish Verb</em> (McCone 1997b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fél.</td>
<td><em>Félire Óengusso</em> (Stokes 1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOI</td>
<td><em>A grammar of Old Irish</em> (Thurneysen 1946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGT</td>
<td><em>Irish Grammatical Tracts I &amp; II</em> (Bergin 1916; 1921-1923; 1926-1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td><em>Lebor na hUidre</em> (Best and Bergin 1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>The Milan glosses in Codex Ambrosianus C 301 (Griffith and Stifter 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>St. Gall Priscian Commentary (Hofman 1996; Bauer, Hofman and Moran 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGDS</td>
<td><em>Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland</em> (Ó Dochartaigh 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td><em>Senchus Már</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td><em>Saltair na Rann</em> (Stokes 1883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td><em>Táin Bó Cúailnge (Recension I)</em> (C. O'Rahilly 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC-LL</td>
<td><em>Táin Bó Cúailnge from the Book of Leinster</em> (C. O'Rahilly 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBF</td>
<td><em>Táin Bó Froích</em> (Meid 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thes.</td>
<td>Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus (Stokes and Strachan 1901-1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBL</td>
<td>Yellow Book of Lecan (Atkinson 1896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>The Würzburg Glosses on the Pauline Epistles (Kavanagh and Wodko 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1sg**  First person singular
- **2sg**  Second person singular
- **3sg**  Third person singular
- **1pl**  First person plural
- **2pl**  Second personal plural
- **3pl**  Third person plural
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**Introduction**

This thesis collects, catalogues, and analyses synchronic language variation in Old Irish sources in order to investigate the possibility of Old Irish dialects. While various attempts have been made in the past to explain noticeable linguistic discrepancies between individual sources, thereby suggesting, among other things, the possibility of dialects within the Old Irish record, or different registers of speech, there have been no definitive conclusions or any classification of the observable differences. The current project is the first comprehensive attempt to provide a systematic overview and analysis of attested variant forms and their possible explanations.

This study builds upon previous research discussing linguistic variation in the Old Irish corpus by incorporating prior suggestions into a collection of original findings from the corpus to be applied to the Old Irish glosses, with a view to creating a framework for identifying and classifying Old Irish language variation. Scholarship focusing on the subject has been scant, with the majority of references being somewhat off-hand, and others having quite a narrow focus.

The aim of the project is ultimately to explain linguistic and orthographic development, and synchronic variation within Old Irish that is currently not fully understood, having only been briefly touched upon thus far in scholarship. This study hopes to assist in developing a fuller picture of the contemporary usage of Old Irish by determining whether the evidence shows traces of a difference between the spoken and recorded forms of the language. Previous scholarship has posited the existence of a written standard (cf. McConne 1985, 102; Stifter 2009, 60) in which the extant material represents a prescriptive form of the language that does not necessarily reflect the contemporary spoken language, and this thesis intends to investigate this suggestion further. It is envisioned that the research will broaden our understanding of Old Irish.

**A brief chronology**

The Celtic language family of Indo-European is divided into Insular and Continental, of which Old Irish and the modern Celtic languages belong to the former. The Insular branch is further divided into Brythonic (Modern Welsh, Breton & Cornish) and Goidelic, which contains Modern Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Manx (McConne 1994, 64.)

The standard chronology of Irish is as follows, though these dates are by no means concrete: Classical Old Irish 700-900, Middle Irish 900-1200 and Classical/Early Modern...
Irish 1200-1500 (cf. Stifter 2009a, 55; Breatnach 1994, 221-222; McManus 1994, 335-337.) The beginning of Early Old Irish is typically identified by evidence of syncopation, but the distinction between Old and Middle Irish is more difficult to untangle, due to the fact that the majority of extant Old Irish sources were preserved by Middle or Early Modern Irish speakers, and thus are liable to contain Middle or Early Modern Irish scribal innovations. Features that are more prominent in Middle Irish sources and thus typically considered to be Middle Irish innovations, such as the reduction of final unstressed vowels to schwa (cf. EIV, 204) are present as early as the Old Irish glosses (cf. GOI §99; Strachan 1903a, 51-52; Strachan 1903b, 477-478; McCone 1985, 87) raising doubts about their validity as ‘Middle Irish’ innovations. Therefore, features identified as Middle Irish, such as the aforementioned reduction of final unstressed vowels to schwa and the loss of the neuter gender, that have been identified in contemporary Old Irish sources (cf. Breatnach 1994; EIV, 163-241) will be taken into consideration throughout the thesis.

The Early Modern Irish period is marked by the consolidation of the linguistic developments that began during the Middle Irish period, and the codification of these developments in the Irish Grammatical Tracts (cf. IGT.) These developments include the restructuring of the verbal system through the creation of simple verbs (cf. EIV, 165) and the replacement of the infixed pronoun by an independent one (cf. Ó Catháin 1933, 3.)

The first evidence of written Manx appears in the 17th century Book of Common Prayer (Williams 1994b, 703-704) with the first emergence of Scottish Gaelic appearing significantly earlier. The first evidence of Scottish Gaelic is preserved in the Book of Deer, a 10th century gospel book containing 12th century additions, though whether or not the Gaelic in the Book of Deer is distinctly Scottish Gaelic has been of much debate, with Strachan (1893-1894) and Fraser (1938) regarding it as Irish, and Stuart (1869) and McBain (1885) identifying it as Scottish Gaelic. Jackson’s study on the notes (1972) regards them as Middle Irish whereas Ó Maolalaigh’s more recent work (2008) firmly identifies them as Scottish Gaelic.

Further evidence for the emergence of Scottish Gaelic is found in The Annals of the Four Masters which records in the entry for 1258 that:

Conadh ann do raidh an tseinbriathar airdhirc tria san ngaoidhilcc nalbanaigh boí occa acc agallaimh na ttechadh .i. go mbiadh a domhan fein ag gach fer.

‘It was on this occasion he repeated the celebrated proverb, in the Albanian Gælic, in which he conferred with the emissaries, namely, “That every man should have his own world”’ (O’Donovan 1856, 366-367).
If taken as accurate historical fact, which O’Rahilly (1932, 162 n.3) believes we should, this would indicate that by the 13th century Scottish Gaelic and Irish were tangibly separate, though it cannot be conclusively determined if, at this stage, the ‘Albanian Gaelic’ was considered a separate language, or merely a diatopic variation unique to Scotland. Nevertheless, the fact that the Gaelic was noted as being unique in some way is significant: if there was enough divergence to be identified as specifically ‘Albanian,’ then that is indicative of variation, and evidence of distinct forms of speech. As there is no debate, however, as to the recognition of Scottish Gaelic in the 17th century it is possible that the compilers of the Annals interpolated the distinction.

Crucial to understanding the seemingly late emergence of both Scottish Gaelic and Manx is that the Classical Irish period was marked by a standardised written language that was promulgated by a Gaelic learned class, preventing the creation of texts that would have better reflected the vernacular (cf. O’Rahilly 1932, 253; Ó Maolalaigh 1998, 12-13.) As consequence, it is not until after this period, during the 16th and 17th centuries, that variation in the written language begins to appear: Scottish Gaelic emerges as a distinct language in the written record (Gillies 2009, 230;) the first evidence of dialectal variation in Ireland appears (cf. Williams 1994a, 447; O’Rahilly 1932, 249-250) and the Book of Common Prayer is written in Manx in the 17th century (Williams 1994b, 703-704.)

Historically, this evidence – or more accurately, lack thereof – has led scholars to believe that Old Irish was a period free from any variation, homogenous across Ireland, as well as into Scotland and the Isle of Man, until the 13th century (cf. O’Rahilly 1932; Jackson 1972, 74-75.) This did not preclude scholarship from noting differences within the language itself, as to be discussed further in Chapter 2, and scholars from commenting on the subject. Yet, no large-scale investigation has been done into the matter up until the present study.

**Terminology**

The term ‘Old Irish’ will be used in reference to Classical Old Irish, and ‘Middle Irish’ will be used in reference to the period of the language as outlined above (c. 900-1200) and, following convention, the phrase ‘Early Irish’ will be used in reference to features that are common to both (Stifter 2009a, 55.) Although some scholarship has moved towards the terms ‘Old Gaelic’ and ‘Middle Gaelic,’ (cf. Clancy 2011, 351 n.7)
as a seemingly more accurate term to better reflect the fact that the language was historically spoken and used also outside of Ireland before subsequently evolving into the modern Eastern Gaelic languages, I have elected to maintain the traditional terms primarily for reasons of consistency, as the vast majority of the scholarship refers to them as such, and ‘Old Gaelic’ and ‘Middle Gaelic’ are still relatively uncommon in scholarship.

The terms ‘Scottish Gaelic’ and ‘Manx’ as well as ‘Modern Irish’ will be used in reference to features that are present in the modern forms of the languages. Likewise, any references to placenames will be made using the modern names, excepting instances where the placename itself in an earlier form is the subject of discussion or being quoted.

Throughout this thesis, the terms ‘diachronic’ and ‘synchronic’ will be used. Synchronic will to refer to any variations that are already present during the period of a particular form of the language, most commonly, any variants that are present within the Old Irish period. ‘Diachronic’ will primarily refer to any changes that represents the movement from one period of the language to the other, such as the collapse of the neuter gender, often identified as a key Middle Irish development (cf. EIV, 171-175) but will also refer broadly to any developments in the language that appear to be ongoing. The focus of the thesis is Old Irish, but due to the process of transmission and the nature of our sources, ‘Middle Irish’ features will, by necessity, need to be examined to determine whether or not they can be understood as a marker of variation already present within the Old Irish period, or an ongoing diachronic development.

The term ‘variation’ will refer to more than one form that performs an identical function at the same time, whether or not there is an expected ‘good’ Old Irish form with which to compare. The term will additionally be used to refer to single form that performs diverging functions between the examined texts. In such situations, the term may refer to a diachronic development, if no sociolectal or dialectal cause can be identified.

The term ‘dialect’ will refer to the dialects of the modern languages as they are currently understood, but within the context of Old Irish this term is more difficult to define. Part of this inherent difficulty is that the distinction between a ‘dialect’ and a ‘language’ have not been adequately demarcated linguistically. The matter of mutual intelligibility is oft cited as the determining factor (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1980, 3-5,) but the fact of the matter is that different languages can be mutually intelligible, while mutual intelligibility may be limited, or may not exist, between speakers of different
dialects within the same language (cf. Voegelin and Harris 1951, 324; Greene 1972a, 168.)

Attempting to determine whether something is a ‘dialect’ or a ‘language’ through genetic relationship is also fraught with difficulties, as shared historical origins do not always correlate to mutual intelligibility, such is the case with Swiss German and German, as example (cf. Voegelin and Harris 1951, 327,) but there are also cases in which genetically unrelated forms of speech being considered variants or ‘dialects’ of another: Breton is considered by some to be a ‘dialect’ of standard French, on account of the sustained contact and influence of French, despite Breton being Celtic in origin (cf. Martinet 1951, 7-8.)

Typically, the term ‘language’ is used in relation to varieties of speech which are autonomous, while a ‘dialect’ is heteronomous. A ‘language’ is independent, with its own standard orthography, grammar and rules surrounding pronunciation, while a ‘dialect’ is dependent upon the language of which it is a part, with speakers understanding that they speak a variety of the standard (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1980, 9-12.) Although there is some level of mutual intelligibility between Norwegian and Danish, the existence of distinct ‘standards,’ and the fact the two do not rely on each other, identifies them as ‘languages,’ whereas speakers of Québécois French still look to standard French grammar and orthography as a baseline for their own language, despite the issue of mutual intelligibility being more fraught.

This is, of course, not a perfect definition, as a ‘dialect’ can become autonomous through political or social motivations, and not necessarily through any linguistic innovation or even change: Afrikaans was considered a ‘dialect’ of Dutch until it received its own grammar and orthography in the 1920s (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1980, 11.) This concept of ‘language,’ then, is likely the best for present purposes: Scottish Gaelic and Manx are considered to be distinct ‘languages’ at the time in which they are each identifiably different from Irish, when it is clear they are no longer attempting to conform to an Irish ‘standard.’ While this does not answer the question of whether the ‘Albanian Gaelic’ can be considered a ‘language,’ it conforms with the standard scholarly dating of the emergence of the languages. Therefore, for the purposes of the present study, ‘dialect’ will refer to a variety, or varieties, that are grammatically, lexically, and phonologically different from other varieties (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1980, 5) but equally, that looks to the known ‘standard’ as a baseline. Specifically, within the context of this study it will
mean a set of variations or markers that are used together in opposition to the expected forms, and that cannot be attributed to any other factor, i.e., style, register or diachronic change. While the traditional definition of a dialect does include a locality to which the dialect is linked, as is to be discussed further, this may not be a possibility owing to the nature of existing sources.

The term ‘sociolect’ will be used to refer to the language of a particular social group: the educated elite likely utilised a form of the language separate to that of the laypeople; in modern India, there is variation in speech dependent on the speaker’s caste (cf. Bright 1960.) Like dialects, there is fluidity in how ‘sociolects’ are defined, typically it is used in reference to a form of communication used by a single group – though a group may use multiple sociolects in their communication, and a sociolect may be used by multiple groups (Klein 1991, 94.)

The term ‘register’ will be used in reference to a particular stratum of a language that is associated with particular social or cultural practices. Unlike dialects which are often defined by their geographic boundaries, or sociolects which are defined by the speaker’s social grouping or class, registers are defined by their use in particular contexts: the register used for religious discourse is not the same as the register used for everyday conversation. Registers denote social boundaries within a society, separating language users into groups via their ability to recognise, use and interpret sociolects (Agha 1999, 216-217.)

The limitations of our corpus

The extant manuscripts in the Old Irish corpus represent only a fraction of manuscripts that were in existence during the Old Irish period, with the result that any evidence for linguistic variation, even at the outset, is limited. There is significant evidence that a large number of texts have been lost, between manuscripts such as Cín Dromma Snechti, that are referred to in the extant material, as well as the number of recorded decimations of monastic libraries (cf. O'Donovan 1861/1862; Ó Corráin 2011-2012) which indicate that much of what was available to contemporary authors has been subsequently lost. Before even taking into consideration the limitations of the existing manuscript evidence, there is already a significant limitation to the available material.

Additionally, the practice of copying texts precludes the assumption that all texts in a particular manuscript may contain the same linguistic features or dialectal variants.
Scribal interference, intentional or otherwise, can result in texts with a mixture of retained earlier features and scribal innovations (Thomas 1993, 21) in addition to potentially recording dialect markers that may not have been native to the scribe himself.

The brevity of some of the material – such as the concise, individual entries of the Annals that may consist of a single line – provide minute opportunity for divergent features to emerge. For this reason, the absence of any given identified feature within a text cannot be understood to be conclusive evidence against assigning a potential dialect, unless there is evidence of an alternative feature used in its place that cannot be attributed to scribal innovation. Of course, features of the language are not constant, nor necessarily ubiquitous; features may not be found in certain genres of texts, whether through a lack of opportunity or intentional stylistic choices, further paring down the available corpus. For these reasons, an approach in which each text is merely checked for the presence of certain variables cannot be employed (Thomas 1993, 25.)

Issues of class can equally not be ignored: it is well known that it was the educated class that produced the extant sources (cf. Ó Cróinín 2005b, 393,) which further limits our corpus to a single class of people (Adams 2013, 89.) Unfortunately, the authentic voices of the lower-classes are entirely unrepresented in the extant Old Irish material, with the result that in addition to having no evidence of the spoken Old Irish of the period, surviving material is limited to the written Old Irish of an educated elite, meaning that there is little evidence of the flavour of Old Irish utilised by the average speaker, whether oral or written. That being said, the educated elite, albeit a smaller community, likely were not entirely isolated from the lower classes, and their language undoubtedly was influenced by the other dialects and registers with which they interacted (Adams 2013, 847) and thus some level of lower-class interference can be anticipated, if not conclusively confirmed within the source texts for the present study.

There is already evidence of this ‘lower-class interference’ present in the extant Old Irish material, with the author of Fingal Rónáin utilising significant innovations, and indeed hypercorrections, as stylistic innovation (cf. Uhlich 2018a.) The speech of Echaid’s daughter shows more linguistic innovation than the rest of the text, with certain sections of her speech showing an innovation at the start of every sentence (Uhlich 2018a, 258,) implying that these innovations were intentionally employed. While this imitation of ‘incorrect’ speech cannot be taken conclusively as an accurate representation of ‘lower-class’ interference, or mimicry of a lower register, it is evidence that authors were
Source texts for the present study

With all these factors in mind, there are certain limitations imposed on the types of texts that can be utilised. In order to most accurately seek out variations, dialectal or otherwise, the selected texts must be as homogenous as possible in content in order to easily identify and account for lexical differences. Content, as well as origins are equally important, as it is necessary to account for register distinctions between scribes (Adams 2013, 848.) Examining texts that fall within a particular genre is crucial to minimise any variation that may occur by virtue of catering to separate audiences: the language of a law tract might be aimed exclusively at those familiar with the law and therefore contain linguistic features that are of an elevated register, while the authors of the homilies may have resorted to a more colloquial sociolect as to not alienate a broader audience (cf. Charles-Edwards 1995, 728-729.) Additionally, authors of saga or prose material may employ intentional innovations as a stylistic choice (cf. Uhlich 2018a) for dramatic effect, that may not have been deemed appropriate for other genres, such as annals or genealogical material. If texts from different genres were compared against each other, these types of distinctions may mistakenly be attributed to dialect when in reality they might be the result of a genre-specific sociolect.

In the same vein, the origins of a text may contribute to variation in that the register of a particular community might be distinct from another – though in the present case this is not too difficult a task as there is minimal surviving material from the lower-class, or uneducated segments of early Irish society.

The source texts likewise must be roughly contemporary, with as minimal chronological distance between them as possible, in order to reduce the amount of possible diachronic development between them, as although this would result in further variations, it would not be as relevant for the present study of synchronic variation (cf. Willis 2005, 106.) In order to truly make a case for dialects, a disparity based on geography, selecting texts with associated distinct regions is optimal.

The Old Irish glosses of Würzburg (Wb,) Milan (Ml,) and St Gall (Sg,) best meet the parameters just discussed: their content and style are comparable, and they are roughly contemporary. The Würzburg manuscript containing glosses on the Latin text of the
Pauline Epistles is dated around c. 750 (Ahlqvist 1988, 23) though Thurneysen (1901, 51) suggested a date of c.700 for the glosses on the *prima manus*. The manuscript of Milan, containing glosses on a Latin commentary on the Psalms, is usually dated to around the end of the eighth century, though the manuscript has been carelessly copied from an earlier source (*Thes.*, i xviii.) The manuscript containing the St Gall glosses on Priscian’s Latin grammar has been determined to have been created between October 850 and August 851 (Ó Néill 2000, 180) on the basis of marginalia that note the date of Easter falling unusually early at the end of March, which only occurred once in the ninth century. The language of the glosses of St Gall themselves contain features that are both earlier and later than the language in the Milan glosses, and Strachan consequently concluded that the glosses ‘are not homogenous, but heterogenous, coming from different sources and being of varying antiquity’ (Strachan 1903b, 470.)

The geographic origins of these texts are in debate: while McCone (1985, 96-97) proposes that both Ml and Sg retain features that could represent a northern origin, and notes a single feature of Wb (a prepositional relative with a conjugated preposition) that could potentially be of ‘broadly southern origin,’ Wagner (1982, 104) attributes a distinct ‘northern flavour’ to Sg and Wb. The geographic provenance of all three corpora will be discussed further in Section 1.4 specifically, with reference to particular potential points of origin being made throughout the thesis.

**Approach**

The primary methodology employed in this thesis is that of collection and analysis: assembling a list of variant features and collecting their presence from the three corpora of glosses and then analysing the results.

The preliminary step of this project was identifying and compiling a collection of variations within the Old Irish corpus. This process largely involved a significant amount of literature review, locating and collecting references to dialects and linguistic variation in general across the corpora of Old Irish literature. Additionally, it involved a thorough reading of both Thurneysen’s Grammar (1946) (GOI) and the Royal Irish Academy’s *Dictionary of the Irish Language* (DIL) to identify variant forms.
The dictionary collection

The first stage of collection was that of collecting variants listed within entries in DIL. These variants were listed either within the headwords themselves or within the body of the entry, either as additional forms or instances in which DIL explicitly notes that the three corpora of glosses differ, such as the conjunction *ar* appearing as *air* predominantly in MI, which is further examined in Section 3.2.2. As to be discussed further below, much of the dictionary collection did not end up being represented in the corpora surveyed in the present study. Alternatively, finding from the dictionary were the result of known developments such as fluctuations in unstressed final vowels (cf. Strachan 1903a 52-52; Strachan 1903b 477-478.)

After the collection from DIL was completed, I catalogued and categorised the forms by the features that distinguished them, including orthographic variation in addition to potential morphological or phonological variants. As examples, there were forms that showed potential metathesis *Abarche* Wb5b34 ‘Abraham’ alongside *Abrache* Wb4c06, Wb19c20, or forms that showed a voiceless consonant in place of a voiced consonant, such as *aidche* MI21c03 ‘night’ alongside *aithche* MI21c03 both genitive singulars of *adaig* (see further in Section 4.1.2.)

Any and all attestations of the collected forms, both the expected and the variant, were then identified from within the three corpora of glosses, in both their electronic database form as well as from the *Thes.* with exceptionally mixed results. The vast majority of ‘variants’ appeared to be the product of DIL’s lack of distinction between historical periods of the language, listing Early Modern Irish forms alongside Old Irish forms as example, and were therefore not represented in the three corpora of glosses, and others were minimally represented without a larger pattern.

To illustrate, the word *articol* ‘article’ is listed under DIL as ‘*articol, airtecal.*’ The second form listed in the headword is not an Old Irish form, but an Early Modern Irish one, and thus the exact form *airtecal* is not present in the three corpora of glosses. Sg does show a mild fluctuation in the unstressed interconsonantal vowel in the dative singular with *articol* Sg148b16 standing alongside *artucol* Sg198b09 but this is the only instance found of an unstressed interconsonantal vowel varying between *i* and *u* across the three corpora of glosses. Therefore, the ‘variant’ potentially implied by the dual headword is not relevant for the present study, and the further examination of the form
and its variant was impossible to link to a wider pattern of variation, as it stands in isolation.

A further example is that of *aitherrach* ‘act of repeating, repetition’ which DIL identifies as appearing -ech in MI. This word is not present in either Wb or Sg, providing no basis for comparison, and the fluctuation of -ech/-ach was not found to be part of widespread trend.

Ultimately, the majority of the types of variations collected from DIL were not represented in the three corpora of glosses whatsoever. Although the forms collected from DIL did not prove to be fruitful for the purposes of this study, they did open up avenues for investigation, and form the basis for much of what is to be discussed further down. As examples, while the interchange of *l* and *r* was investigated and found to not be particularly represented across the three corpora of glosses, *araile* and *alaile* do vary within the three corpora and are to be discussed in Section 5.4. Equally, though the representation of voiced and voiceless stops, as collected from DIL, did not have much basis, other variations not included in DIL were discovered during collections and they are discussed in various places throughout the thesis (Chapter 3; Sections 4.1.2, 5.3, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4.)

**Difficulties in identifying diatopic markers**

Attempting to identify and prove the existence of dialects, however, is somewhat problematic. The methodologies employed by the field of dialectology are, for the most part, ineffectual when applied to Old Irish; the unavailability of any native speakers who can be surveyed is an undoubted impediment, eliminating many of the strategies employed by dialectologists in identifying dialectal differences.\(^1\) Scholars of Old Irish, and investigators into its potential dialects, are instead restricted to manuscript witnesses, as well as the more limited number of stone inscriptions and loan words borrowed into other languages.

One of the primary identifiers of modern dialects is lexical variation, but in a historical context this is one of the most difficult to detect. The absence of any given word from a particular text does not indicate that the word was unknown to the scribe, as the scribe may have opted not to use it, or the context was not deemed to be appropriate; the

---

\(^1\) For relevant discussions of the difficulties surrounding the identification of dialects of historical languages, see Thomas (1993) Cain (2010, 738-748) DeCamp (1958) Bennett (1988.)
factors that would limit or preclude the use of any form, or grammatical construction must be taken into a consideration (cf. Section 2.13 in which similar difficulties within the elements of placenames are discussed.)

Thus, the only true way to identify lexical variation in historical sources is to identify two equivalent lexemes that are identical in both function and meaning, but owing to the limited range of the Old Irish corpus, this can be an exceptionally difficult task. The single definitive identified lexical variation found within the corpus during the course of this investigation was that of *oldaas* and *indaas* and they are discussed further in Section 6.5.

Orthography can be an interesting metric by which to compare different variants, as while it may not necessarily reflect a different pronunciation, it can indicate an intentional distinction, whether that be of a differing orthographic policy or evidence of diverging sociolects. A standard written language, and therefore linguistic and orthographic norms, are products of a selection of features and variants identified and promulgated by an authoritative institution as correct (Bartsch 1987, 78) and the standard can be utilised as an identity symbol for the whole population, whether it be a nation or a state (Bartsch 1987, 265-266.)

The possibility of competing or parallel standards is not unheard of: scholars of Middle Arabic have long considered it a vernacular divergence from the written standard of Classical Arabic due to writings in both existing from the same authors, but more recent study has concluded that Middle Arabic must have equally been a standard in and of itself, as the writings are remarkably consistent (Lentin 2008, 217; Blau 1981 188.) In this instance, the existence of competing standards appears to be a function of register, with authors writing differently for different audiences – a question that remains at the forefront here. In a contrasting example, the orthographic reforms of 16th century France, and the debate that surrounded them, had its basis in an argument over what was more ‘correct:’ the debate was between returning to a more Latin spelling, with the intention of orthography reflecting etymological origins, or having the orthography better match the spoken reality (de Looze 2012, 378-379.) In this example, the competing standards were not a result of register differences but instead a divergence in schools of thought over the best practice for graphically representing the language.

Although orthographic variation cannot be considered conclusive evidence of diatopic variation, it still exists as a valid form of variation, and can potentially be
identified with a particular region, or monastic school. For this reason, orthographic variants have been included in the forthcoming discussion.

**The process of transmission & scribal interference**

The process of transmission must always be taken into consideration when evaluating synchronic language variation, as many of our extant texts are the product of copyists, with the result that that the language of a particular copy of a text may not reflect the language of its scribe;² a scribe who slavishly copies the text without alteration will not introduce any markers of his own potential dialect, nor any modernisations that would update the text to the language of his own time, while a scribe less concerned about identically copying is liable to introduce innovations that are present in his own speech, therefore producing a version of the text that better represents the language of its scribe.

The two primary forms of scribe have been identified as ‘form-oriented’ and ‘content-oriented.’³ The ‘form-oriented’ will have dutifully copied, preserving the original text either out of an unfamiliarity with the language, such as the scribe of the Cambrai Homily, or out of a reverence for the language of the text itself. The ‘content-oriented,’ on the other hand, maintained the content of the text, while introducing linguistic innovations by substituting his own dialectal preferences, by either modernising or archaising, in an attempt to either ‘update’ a text, or perhaps in an effort to make the text feel ‘authentic,’ or potentially as a form of prescriptivism, in an attempt to adhere to an older standard they believe to be superior (Adams 2013, 13).

Scholars of Old Irish will undoubtedly be familiar with the latter practice of archaisation: scribes who intentionally introduced a spelling perceived to be ‘older’ – a common example being that of the falling together of -nd and -nn as -nn. This assimilation began in the Early Old Irish period, only affecting proclitics with the post-stressed change only minimally present in Old Irish (GOI §151(c)) and by Middle Irish provides us with ‘hypercorrect,’ pseudo-archaising spellings such as *cend* alongside *cenn* (McCone 1996, 141).

Additionally, scribes are capable of writing in an unnatural register – a less educated scribe may write in a higher register in order to seem important, or a more educated scribe

---

² See Willis, 2005, 107 and additionally, the discussion of the scribe of the Cambrai Homily, who was infamously described as ‘faithful, but unintelligent’ (Kenney 1993, 283.)

may intentionally lower his register in order to best suit the needs of his audience (Adams 2013, 6) or for stylistic purposes (Uhlich 2018a.) Therefore, a mixture of registers can be present within a text, and any identified features of register cannot be conclusive evidence regarding the subject of diatopic variation, only the particular register within its particular context.

Of course, even without intentional interference, scribes are liable to introduce mistakes, slips into more natural, contemporary forms of the language, and show diachronic change. The ‘form-oriented’ scribe who slavishly copies, identically, everything in front of him will provide no insight into his own language, but he will thereby retain linguistic evidence for the time of composition of the text. The ‘content-oriented’ scribe, while providing insight into his own linguistic profile and the language of his own time, removes evidence of the text’s original language – there is the potential for scribes to remove features they do not recognise as an attempt to ‘correct’ the text and imposing their own linguistic traits as well as erasing features of diachronic change in their exemplar and reverting to historical forms.

These difficulties are accurately summarised by Thomas (1993, 21:)

‘If a copyist were careless, unconstrained, content-oriented, a conscious language modifier, or writing from dictation, the transmission process would be potentially high-noise so that linguistic features attributable to the copyist might well be intermixed with those of the source.’

**Layout & structure**

This thesis is divided into six chapters. As the intention of the thesis is to examine language variation in Old Irish, it was therefore necessary to begin by discussing the possibility of variation, and the belief in a lack thereof that has predominated scholarship. The initial chapter examines the long-held theory of Common Gaelic, a proposed homogenous form of the language that is said to have existed until the 13th century, and the more recent criticism of this model. This chapter equally makes a case for the existence of linguistic variation within Old Irish as well as discussing the existence of a literary standard and the geographic provenance of the three corpora of glosses to be examined here.

Up until this point there has been no collection of all of the proposed pieces of diatopic evidence in Old Irish and the second chapter serves to collate them all into a comprehensive overview. Therefore, the second chapter reviews and investigates prior scholarship on the subject of Old Irish dialects that identify potential diatopic features,
taking these suggestions from prior scholarship of potential diatopic features and applying them to the glosses, while also examining the linguistic merit of each potential variation.

During the course of the present study, it became apparent that the three corpora of glosses showed different behaviour with regards to the treatment of prepositions and preverbs. There is extensive variation within the proclitics found within the three corpora, as demonstrated in the third chapter, and accordingly an entire chapter was needed to fully account for the variations therein and address the potential underlying causes.

The final three chapters deal with a particular corpus of glosses individually, specifically looking at features that are unique to that particular corpus of glosses in order to best demonstrate the distinctions between them. Any feature unique to a particular corpus is interesting and relevant to the present study, but the instances in which two corpora stand against another are of particular importance and are highlighted in these chapters. The fourth chapter continues to review the types of variations that have been identified in the forgoing chapters, as well as discusses the features in Sg that are significantly different from the other two corpora, as there are not many. Chapter 5 focuses on the features found within Wb that are unique to Wb, and whether they can be argued to be issues of diachrony or diatopic variation. Finally, Chapter 6 continues with the same theme, but with the focus on Ml.

This discussion is followed by a final chapter that highlights the most significant findings and the conclusions that can be drawn from them. In doing so, it demonstrates that this thesis has ultimately been successful in identifying synchronic language variation within the three corpora of glosses and indeed, has identified Ml as distinct, operating from either a different diatopic or diastratic stratum of language than either Wb or Sg.
1. A case for variation

The purpose of this chapter is to set out and examine the existing scholarship that pertains to the idea of synchronic language variation within Old Irish as a concept. This chapter will review, collate and, where feasible, expand upon suggestions of dialectal variation or synchronic variation within Old Irish specifically. The competing theories about the probable geographic provenance of the three corpora of Old Irish glosses will be examined and compared. Finally, the linguistic evidence for the suggested variants will be compiled and reviewed as a whole and preliminary conclusions will be discussed.

1.1 ‘A uniform system’

The preeminent work, *Irish Dialects Past and Present*, by Thomas F. O’Rahilly, provides an excellent overview of the dialectal variations of Modern Irish, but as he viewed dialects to be a 13th century development, he does not discuss Old Irish in much detail. To open his chapter on historical dialects of Irish, O’Rahilly (1932, 248) remarks: ‘Of dialect differences in Old and Middle Irish we know nothing, or next to nothing.’ He continues on to discuss the historic, sociolinguistic and political influences that would lead to the emergence and development of dialects in the 13th century.

This conclusion, that there was no evidence of diatopic variation up until the Early Modern Irish period (c. 1200,) has been the prevailing theory ever since, most famously having been expanded by Jackson (1951,) whose theory of ‘Common Gaelic,’ a homogenous, dialect-free language that existed across Ireland, Scotland and the Isle of Man, has largely been accepted as fact (cf. Ó Corráin 1990, 32; R. A. Breatnach 1993, 1-2; Watson 1994, 661; Watson 1997, 428; Ó Buachalla 2002, 2; Broderick 2009, 305,) with scholars integrating it into their own theories without question, and reiterating their belief in a lack of dialects until the 13th century (cf. Ahlqvist 1988, 31) The situation is perhaps best summarised by Russell (2005, 439) who remarks that ‘it has long been recognised that Old Irish was remarkably free of evidence for dialectal variation’. This belief in a lack of evidence has been a driving force behind the modern belief in a dialect-free Old Irish period, although as to be demonstrated throughout this thesis, there are observable differences within the language that call this belief into question.

---

4 Ó Buachalla does not accept ‘Common Gaelic’ as fact, but comments here on the general tendency of scholarship to unquestioningly refer to ‘Common Gaelic.’
1.1.2 ‘Common Gaelic’

Jackson’s theory of ‘Common Gaelic’ has remained the prevailing theory with regards to dialectology of Old Irish, and the article has had, even if not directly stated, a seminal influence on subsequent scholarship (cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 2.) For that reason, it was necessary to fully discuss this theory of ‘Common Gaelic’ before continuing with the results of said influence.

Borgstrøm (1938, 35) had envisioned an assumed ‘Common Gaelic,’ from which the modern languages of Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Manx had all derived. Borgstrøm’s ‘Common Gaelic’ was a hypothetical language that would necessitate reconstruction. He dates this potential language to around the sixth century, as this was during the period of immigration of Irish settlers to Scotland. Though the terminology of ‘Common Gaelic’ is the same, it does not appear as though Jackson was influenced by Borgstrøm’s ‘Common Gaelic,’ as Jackson’s own theory does not view Common Gaelic as theoretical, or in need of reconstruction but rather as a known entity. Jackson instead builds upon O’Rahilly’s (1932, 248-250) assertion of an invariant form of Irish existing into the 13\textsuperscript{th} century and proposes a dialect-free, homogenous language throughout Ireland, with Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Manx as its subsequent dialects. He (1951, 91-2) summarises his theory thus:

‘First, there is absolutely nothing to suggest that the Gaelic of Ireland, Scotland, and Man differed in any respect before the tenth century; and on the contrary, there is a body of decisive positive evidence tending to show that so far as we can tell they were identical. Second, Eastern and Western Gaelic\textsuperscript{5} continued to be one language, sharing many new developments in common, from the tenth until the thirteenth century; but at the same time there are one or two significant indications, the oldest belonging to the tenth century, which point to the beginnings of the divergence between them. Third, the final break between East and West in the spoken tongue came in the thirteenth century…The result is, then, that Common Gaelic lasted as a living tongue until the thirteenth century, and that modern Irish and Scottish Gaelic are dialects of it which replaced it, and separated from each other in the main during the late Middle Irish period.’

This hypothesis imagines that both the Old and Middle Irish period were largely free of regional variation, implying that the language would have been without dialects or local distinctions for a period of six centuries (c. 600-1200)\textsuperscript{6} and Scottish Gaelic and

\textsuperscript{5} Jackson (1951, 78) identifies Irish as ‘Western Gaelic’ and both Scottish Gaelic & Manx as ‘Eastern Gaelic.’

\textsuperscript{6} Beginning this example at c.600 does not include earlier incarnations of the language that certainly existed, such as Primitive Irish, pre-apocope and thus pre-c.500 and Archaic Irish, between apocope and syncope and thereby c.500-c.550.
Manx for an additional three centuries, an assertion that is considered by contemporary linguists to be a linguistic impossibility (cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 2; McMahon and McMahon 2005, 15) and his linguistic arguments will be discussed further in Section 2.9.

However, the primary flaw in Jackson’s argument is immediately apparent: he has extrapolated from the apparent lack of dialectal features in the written language of Old Irish that the spoken language must have been equally free from variation, up until the point at which it manifestly was not, and both Scottish Gaelic and Manx emerged as distinct languages. In his criticism of Common Gaelic, Ó Buachalla (2002, 3) neatly summarises: ‘For [Jackson,] this history of the written sources was the history of the language.’

Jackson’s arguments are tenuous at best, hardly ‘decisive,’ as he claims, as it is impossible to assert conclusively that the written language was an accurate representation of the spoken one. An obvious and immediate comparison is that of Classical Latin, which suppressed certain features that then re-emerged in Vulgar Latin: as example, the word *colaphus* ‘blow’ is used in Early Latin sources such as Plautus, but is avoided entirely by writers in the first century BCE before reappearing a century later associated with the lower-class (Clackson 2011, 252-253.) The absence of this word, along with other features that were not present in Classical Latin, demonstrates that the entire linguistic picture is not established by solely examining written sources.

While Jackson’s point of view is clear, the article as a whole is convoluted, and part of the difficulty lies in his terminology. ‘Common Gaelic’ seems to refer to both the spoken and written language up until the 13th century while he simultaneously uses the term ‘Classical Common Gaelic’ to distinguish the written language utilised from the 12th or 13th century, up until the 17th century in Ireland, and 18th century in Scotland (Jackson 1951, 75.) He contrasts this term with ‘popular Scottish Gaelic’ as the language spoken at the time in Scotland – but gives no term for either spoken Manx or Irish. He later refers to Early Modern Irish but in a different context and thus it is unclear what exactly is intended. Although he later (1983, 2) distinguishes between the written and spoken languages, cautioning that the two must be understood as distinct, this understanding is not present in this particular, more influential, article, excepting the references (1951, 75-76) to the Early Modern period. Ó Buachalla has argued that Jackson’s selection of the 13th century as the breakdown of ‘Common Gaelic’ is based primarily on O’Rahilly’s earlier statements (Ó Buachalla 2002, 3,) and this can potentially account for the
confusion present in Jackson’s article: Jackson’s own evidence does not specifically point to this date, instead falling more vaguely between the 12th and 16th centuries. He therefore had to place the emergence of colloquial language somewhere between those two dates (Ó Buachalla 2002, 5) but without providing an exact date. The unclear terminology might then be a reflex of this unclear dating.

His ability to separate the spoken from the written language after the 13th century is in sharp contrast to his failure to do so for the periods preceding it. He has apparently accepted the fact that Classical Modern Irish (or ‘Classical Common Gaelic’) was a literary standard of the language that was necessitated to meet the constraints of metrically strict poetry (McManus 1994, 335) and not representative of the spoken language, but it is unclear why he does not extrapolate the same concept of literary standardisation and apply it to the earlier stages of the language (cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 7).

Ultimately, Jackson’s theory is overly simplistic, as it does not distinguish between the written and spoken forms of Old Irish, does not accurately account for evidence of linguistic change already present in Old Irish (see Section 2.9) and fails to recognise that the literary language could not have been fully representative of the spoken language. Nevertheless, Jackson’s theory, whether explicit or implicit, is still pervasive in the scholarship surrounding the Gaelic languages.

1.1.3 Criticism of Common Gaelic

In historical linguistics it is common practice to attempt to reconstruct a single form of a language at any given stage, thus ‘giving the impression of a uniform system’ (McMahon and McMahon 2005, 15; cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 1.) In the case of Old Irish, there is no need to reconstruct to a single node as the relative invariability already present in the language as attested promotes this idea of a ‘uniform system.’ The theory’s acceptance, and the comparative lack of research on the subject of dialects of Old Irish is, on the surface, understandable: the written language bears no obvious marks of dialectal variation or variation by way of style, with Binchy (1943, 209,) albeit speaking specifically about the language of the law tracts, having asserted that ‘one will search in vain for differences in style, composition or technical terminology,’ and the process of seeking any variants out is littered with obstacles.
As mentioned, Jackson’s theory of Common Gaelic relies on the assumption that the extant Old Irish material represents the sum total of Old Irish that was in existence (cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 4.) In asserting there was no dialectal variation up until the 13th century both O’Rahilly (1932) and Jackson (1951) have presupposed that, in contrast to the old maxim, absence of evidence is indeed evidence of absence, and that the absence of written dialectal variation indicates that diatopic variation did not exist either in the written language – potentially in texts that are lost and therefore unknown to us – but as well as in the spoken language. This assumption, that the Old Irish glosses of Würzburg, Milan and St Gall, and the rest of the extant Old Irish material, are accurate and complete representations of the language spoken in Ireland during each of their respective time periods, equally tends to assume that they are evidence of a single, invariant form of the language from which all other forms of the Gaelic languages, the individual languages, and their respective diatopic variations, must be descended (cf. Ó Buachalla 2002, 4-5; Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 203-204.)

This theory is impossible to accept. At the outset, the evidence of diverging languages in the 13th century indicates that there was some level of variation already in existence, as variation cannot suddenly and dramatically occur, but develops over time; variation is the origin of linguistic change (Ó Buachalla 2002, 2.) Thurneysen (§16; §166bn; §371; §479; §485; §823) noted both the improbability of a lack of diatopic variation in the spoken variety of Old Irish, as well as posited that a number of features may be evidence of diatopic variation, namely, the fluctuation in the anaphoric pronounc -ôn and -sôn; the colour of the consonant following uptools; the doubled superlative ending -imem present only in MI; the variations in the words meaning ‘self;’ and the fluctuation between ar- air- er- ir- and aur-. All of these features will be examined at length (see Sections 2.1, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.) McCone (1985) has already shown that even as early as the glosses there is evidence of features that are more commonly attested in Middle Irish sources. As previously discussed, the practice of copying, of reproducing older texts, had the result that scribes were reliant on a literary mechanism that did not adapt to language developments, nor reflect them; ‘the fact that the educated encountered and reproduced in reading and writing archaic morphology and syntax does not mean that the archaic system was part of their speech’ (Ó Buachalla 2002, 4.) The existence of variation, both the diachronic developments regularly discussed by scholarship and the few identified
possible diatopic variants, to be discussed below, demonstrate that ‘the literary data – for any period – do not represent linguistic totality’ (Ó Buachalla 1985, 32.)

It is a linguistic reality that no language is without variation, as indeed it is an inherent quality of language (cf. Hymes 1964, 388; Boberg et al. 2018, 1.) Though some scholars acknowledge the possibility of spoken dialects that were simply not reflected in the written language (Ahlqvist 1988, 24,) and others have posited potential dialectal variants (cf. Kelly 1982; Murray 2005) – all to be discussed below – that do manifest themselves in our sources, the theory of a homogenous language remains predominant.

1.2 A Case for variation

The impression of a homogenous Gaelic language stems from the paucity of demonstrable differences in the language of texts known to be from different geographic regions. The vast majority of deviations from the understood norm can be attributed to diachronic innovations (cf. GOI §16; McCone 1985,) and therefore establishing a time period for a text is far simpler than establishing a place of origin, and scholarly discussions of diachronic developments far outnumber those of synchronic variations. Even then, within discussions of synchronic variation, the topic of ‘dialects’ is often relegated to an offhand comment, with few scholars tackling the subject head-on. Nevertheless, the dating of texts on the basis of innovations is predicated on the assumption that said innovations are indeed diachronic developments and not synchronic variations, whether they be dialectal or differences of register, and in certain instances features may be misattributed to diachrony when they are really an issue of synchrony (cf. Section 6.5 on the terms oldaas and indaas.)

It is doubtful, however, that spoken Irish would have been uniform across the country, as a language free from variation is improbable at best. Especially when taking the sheer geographic spread of Old Irish into consideration, covering much of Scotland, the Isle of Man, and presumably all of Ireland, as well as the fragmented native Irish political landscape, it seems implausible to suggest the language as a whole would be entirely homogenous (cf. GOI §16; Ahlqvist 1988, 24; Ó Buachalla 2002, 3.) The situation of early Ireland, as best expressed by Russell (2005, 439,) was a prime candidate for linguistic variation: ‘Given the multiplicity of small kingdoms, the relative difficulty of travel, and the geographical spread of the language, it is inconceivable that there were not dialects of Irish in the seventh and eighth centuries.’
Indeed, were Old Irish to be entirely free from any kind of linguistic diversity it would be unique, as there is no known language that is free from variation (McMahon and McMahon 2005, 15.) In comparison with other languages covering a similar geographic area and existing for an equivalent period of time it seems incredibly unlikely that Old Irish could remain uniform until the 13th century (Thomson 1977, 128) and if it had, it would represent an ‘unparalleled sociolinguistic phenomenon’ (Macaulay 1975, 86.) A parallel could perhaps be drawn with Latin, which has historically been understood to be a relatively uniform language for a prolonged period of time (cf. Jackson 1953, 107.) However, it has been more recently shown through reconstruction to have evidence of dialectal variation preceding the time of Christ (cf. McManus 1984, 160,) and it is currently well understood that Classical Latin represents a written standard and not an accurate reflection of the spoken language, and thus the idea of a homogenous Latin throughout the Roman Empire has been debunked (cf. Wright 1982; Adams 2003; Clackson 2011; Adams 2013.)

In terms of contemporary reference, there is additionally a tantalising note in *Sanas Cormaic* (c. 900,) an early Irish glossary containing encyclopaedic and etymological explanations of Irish words, that indicates that there are diatopic lexical variants present, specifically that the word *naire*, corresponding to the more common *éicin* ‘indeed,’ which is explained to be an outdated form, excepting in west Munster in which it is usual.

*Nairne* (no *naire*) .i. gláine no nairne amail bid naire nobeth and. senbelra din innisin .i. in[ns]aire (no in[n]aire) sin asinand 7 amail athertha écín isingnathbelra indíu la hUr- no la hIr-Mumain maxime. inde dixit in file nífil ní bus toich duit. fhil naire arint tianimchomaircther .i. fil écín olse (Stokes 1862, 32.)

*Nairne* .i. purity; or *nairne* as if it were *naire*. This is ancient language, and the *naire* is the same as if *écin* were said in the common language to-day in West [recte East] Munster *maxime*. Inde dixit the poet: “Is there aught that is pleasing to thee”? “There is, *naire*”, says he who is interrogated, i.e. “There is, indeed”, says he. (O’Donovan, s. Stokes 1968, 123)

This word is unfortunately unknown in other Old Irish sources and is therefore difficult to use as a diatopic diagnostic criterion when looking at extant texts. It does, nevertheless, appear to indicate a dialectal variation, as the implication of the entry seems to be that the usage of the form *naire* has fallen out of common parlance everywhere except a particular geographic region, and thus does not seem to be a function of register.
As the closest language both geographically and genetically, comparisons between Brittonic and Goidelic are understandable, and the existence of dialectal variation in Brittonic would indicate that it is fairly reasonable to assume that Goidelic would have developed some level of linguistic variation as well, being subject to similar external linguistic influences and having an equivalent geographic spread. Though Old Irish is often compared to Middle Welsh, which does show distinct dialect variation (cf. Thomas 1993; Willis 2005,)\(^7\) this is hardly a perfect comparison as Middle Welsh emerges roughly 200 years after the end of the Old Irish period (c.1100.)

There is little evidence of Old Welsh, but by the Early Old Irish period (c. 550) there is evidence of ‘a range of dialects’ (Charles-Edwards 2013, 76) in Late British which spanned from Brittany up into Scotland and indeed, there are indications of dialectal variation within Welsh itself, one variety of British, during the Old Irish period. Dunstan’s Classbook, a ninth century manuscript consisting of Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria* containing roughly 80 Old Welsh glosses, includes an Old Welsh gloss *ceintiru* glossing Latin *patruelibus*. This reference is to south Welsh, corresponding to modern North Pembrokeshire Welsh [kemdɛr], in contrast to the standard *cefynderw* that is similar to modern Bangor Welsh (Charles-Edwards 1970-1972, 107-108.) Although it does not follow that evidence of dialects in Middle Welsh means that there were certainly dialects in Old Irish, it certainly demonstrates that language variation is present within a roughly

\(^7\) There is additionally a Middle Welsh triad and accompanying chart that would appear to point to diatopic variation in Wales (Ab Ithel 1856, 256.) However, this triad appears to have been retrieved from the *The Myvyrian archaiology of Wales* (Jones, et al. 1870) a collation of material culled from a variety of Welsh manuscripts. Unfortunately, one of the sources for this collection was a manuscript written in the hand of Iolo Morganwg, and is the source for the ‘Third Series’ referred to by Ab Ithel. Bromwich (1969, 18) has identified that of the 126 triads of the Third Series, 84 are expansions or elaborations of triads already existing in the First Series, and the remaining she believes to be fabrications on the part of Morganwg. As his sources for the Third Series are dubious at best, (Bromwich 1969, 14-15) it seems likely that the otherwise untraceable triads were indeed fabrications. Bromwich’s (1968, 301, 309) earlier investigation would indicate that this triad, describing the dialects, is one of the triads invented by Morganwg. The chart provided by Ab Ithel is unsourced, and therefore potentially not specifically in reference to Middle Welsh dialects, and thus the dubious origins of both the triad and the accompanying chart make it difficult to accept them as any true evidence of Middle Welsh dialectal variation, despite that being their purported purpose.
contemporary language whose geographic spread was much smaller, thus adding to the implausibility that Old Irish could have remained homogenous.

Additionally, known interaction with other linguistic groups would have undoubtedly influenced the language, leading, to some form of variation, and as stated by Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 185:) ‘When one considers…the contact with other linguistic groups (e.g. varieties of British, Pictish and Norse languages) which we know prevailed before and during the Old and Middle Gaelic periods, one sees that the potential for the emergence of dialectal divergences in the pan-Goedelic area must have existed for centuries before the Early Modern era, ie. well before 1200.’

The fifth century Irish settlers of Scotland who brought their language were in contact with the speakers of varieties of Pictish and British that may have already existed, and there is evidence of British influence on Scottish Gaelic (cf. Thomson 1977, 127; Macauley 1975, 85-86) that does not appear in Irish. Equally, it seems improbable that the language spoken in Ireland, Scotland and on the Isle of Man would have seen equivalent influence and identical changes considering that the Norse influence in Scotland was far more extensive and intensive than it was in Ireland (Jackson 1962) though it was better chronicled in Ireland (Chadwick 1962, 21-26.)

Accordingly, Scottish Gaelic shows far more Norse influence than Irish (cf. Jennings 1996; Stewart 2004) and while the contact is generally dated after the Old Irish period (Schulze-Thulin 1996, 83) the evidence of this intermingling casts doubt on the hypothesis that the Gaelic languages remained a singular entity until the 13th century. The previously noted entry in *The Annals of the Four Masters* for 1258 referring to ‘Albanian Gaelic’ is important here as the fact that a distinction is drawn between the Irish utilised by the scribe in recording the encounter, and the Gaelic spoken in the encounter itself, indicates that they were unique enough to be remarkable, whether or not it can be considered evidence of a separate ‘language,’ or a ‘dialect.’ It is exceptionally unlikely that the languages would have become divergent enough to be considered separate languages in a short time frame and thus, if this anecdote is considered to be authentic, it provides evidence that the language of Scotland must have diverged from Irish earlier than the Early Modern or Classical Modern Irish period.
1.2.1 Connections to the modern Irish dialects

One of the primary objections to understanding any of the identified variations within the Old Irish corpus as evidence of contemporary dialectal variation is that they traditionally have not been able to be mapped to match the Modern Irish dialects, and these few features will be discussed at greater length further on. As expressed by Ahlqvist (1988, 26) referring to the suggestions of diatopic markers made by Thurneysen: ‘Unfortunately, however, these dialect differences seem to have left no trace in the modern language, so that their geographical implications remain unknown to me.’

This impossibility of linking Old Irish variations to modern Irish dialects is at the heart of much of the criticism of Old Irish dialectology and is the basis for scholars like Ahlqvist (1988) and Russell (2005, 441) deeming the assumption of dialects untenable: the argument of both Ahlqvist and Russell is that, while dialects are expected to have existed, features cannot be considered diatopic evidence unless they are able to be linked with features of the modern dialects. As the anonymity of our scribes limits our ability to fix a manuscript, and thereby the language of that manuscript, in a period or a dialect (Mac Eoin 1982, 113,) it is logical, therefore, to attempt to first of all find links to the modern language in order to identify a potential geographic region.

Though links to the modern Irish dialects would certainly be a boon, and a significant piece of evidence in support of Old Irish dialect variation, the argument that the lack of direct links between the two forms of the language, is not a good one.

Firstly, it is predicated on the assumption that there is a direct inheritance, a direct line of continuity, between Old Irish forms and Modern Irish forms that has not been adapted, influenced or altered, in any way. It is known that this is not the case (Ó Buachalla 1982, 429,) or at least it is not entirely the case. As discussed by Ó Buachalla (1982, 428-429) forms such as Modern Irish cloisim ‘I hear’ is not a direct descendant of ro-cluiniur, and is instead the result of restructurings of the verbal system. Ó Buachalla also argues that the Old Irish dative plural ending –(a)ib should have, according to general linguistic developmental tendencies, become more productive as a distinctive plural, and the fact that it did not demonstrate that the ‘“internal logic of a historical development,’…is not always as logical as we would like it to be and may in fact never reach its “logical” conclusion’ (Ó Buachalla 1982, 428-429.) Language does not develop exclusively on the basis of linguistic rules or laws, instead it is subject to analogical and external influence: innovations spread in a ‘criss-crossing complex fashion,’ (Ó
Modern Irish is not a perfect linguistic descendant from Old Irish, and indeed, for all of the reasons to expect variation in Old Irish, some level of divergence from an inherited form of the language is to be expected.

There is additionally the case of Ancient Greek, which provides an analogous example in which there is no continuation of historic dialects into the modern language. The four main dialects, distinguished by specific isoglosses, were developed following the collapse of a unified Greek society around 1100 BCE (Noonan 2018, 577.) These dialects flourished, diverged and developed until about the fifth century BC (cf. Colvin 2009, 37) in which Athens, and its associated dialect of Attic, rose to supremacy, becoming the geographic centre and language of education, economy and communication (Noonan 2018, 577-578.)

As Attic became the koine, the standard, it was imposed on newly established or conquered territories as the language of administration, resulting in the native dialects of occupied communities holding little status in comparison to the Koine as the default mode of expression, and it rapidly became the spoken language of the local populations out of necessity (Horrocks 2010, 88-89.) Indeed, the influence of business and administration being conducted through the Koine, and an education system based on the study of Attic authors, resulted in the local dialects being subsumed by the imposed Koine, surviving only in uneducated circles before dying out altogether:

‘As the only official variety of Greek, [the Koine] was for all practical purposes the only form of the language worth learning, and all local vernaculars, whether reflecting regional dialects of Greek still spoken by incoming soldiers or tradesmen, or the product of interference between the Koine and native languages, were increasingly perceived as no more than substandard variants of the superordinate Koine.’ (Horrocks 2010, 88-89)

When Macedon seized control of Greece during the fourth century BC, the Attic Koine was adopted for political purposes and its supremacy was solidified (Noonan 2018, 577.) As the language of government, the mandatory military service (Horrocks 2010, 88,) and the closest reflection of the literature studied in the educational system, it is unsurprising that the Koine dominated at the expense of the former dialects of Ancient Greek. Indeed, by the time of Plato, Attic prose literature is the only prose literature that survives (Horrocks 2010, 70.)
The dialects of Ancient Greek existed, there is irrefutable evidence, and yet, with the exception of a single existing dialect (Tsakonia), there are no links between the dialects of Ancient Greek and the dialects of Modern Greek. Here there is a clear case in which there is no dialect continuance between the historic and the modern forms of the language and there is no reason to assume that dialects of Old Irish could not have been treated similarly.

Old Irish, in its extant form, is very clearly a written standard as evidenced by the relative uniformity found throughout the material. Whether this standard is a ‘artificial’ one, created by the educated elite, or a dialect that was raised to the status of a standard remains to be seen.

Of course, the political situation of early medieval Ireland is very different to that of ancient Greece: one of the primary reasons cited as support for the theory of variation is the lack of a unified government or political structure in Ireland that could have imposed or enforced a standard language, in the way that Athens was able to mandate the use of Attic.

It must be posited, then, that the elevated register, or written standard, represented in the extant Old Irish material is the product of a unified educated elite, whether this ‘standard’ be the result of a register used exclusively for literary texts, the sociolect utilised by said educated elite, or a dialect spoken by the most powerful literati, or indeed an admixture of all three. This is somewhat of an obvious solution as the lack of material known to us from lower classes limits our ability to evaluate how representative the written material may have been of the common speech of the people. It is entirely possible that this standard was utterly unrepresentative of the common speech and reflects only the speech of the educated elite, whether it be reflective of a specific sociolect or the dialect region from which the elite came, or a register used exclusively in writing.

Without the political imposition and/or the lack of widespread education, it is plausible that the Old Irish transmitted to us through extant texts never became a spoken standard, in the ‘top down’ approach noted by Horrocks, as happened with Ancient Greek: if this is the case, and it did not spread beyond the educated class, that could help account for the lack of a direct inheritance, as unexpected forms in Modern Irish might be the result of the spoken variety of Irish that simply is not reflected in the written record.

---

8 Some scholars (cf. Horrocks 2010, 32; Scutt 1912/1913) treat Tsakonian as a dialect of Modern Greek, while others (cf. Campbell and Belew 2018, 138; 147; 270) would regard it as a distinct language.
At the same time, the inverse is also possible, in that if the language were to have been standardised orally, as well as in the written form, then the elimination of the original dialects could result in a lack of links to the modern forms.

As Athens rose to supremacy, so did Attic, and eventually formed the basis for the Koine. It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that a similar situation occurred with Old Irish, albeit not through political conquest, but rather the promulgation of a particular standard by educated elites. The question of whether this standard reflects only a written register that was not utilised orally, or a particular variety of speech used by the scribes cannot be answered. It is possible that extant Old Irish reflects only a written register, with the occasional slips into more natural language, and it is also possible that it reflects a sociolect of the educated elite, that may indeed have been influenced by their own dialect: as many ecclesiastical powerhouses of scholarship were based in the north (Bangor, Nendrum, Armagh etc.) it is possible that the written standard of Old Irish reflects a ‘northern’ variety of spoken Irish – with influences from local or more minor dialects making their way in (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 221; 235; 238.)

It is unclear if, via the top-down approach, the standard did indeed make its way into the spoken language, as any evidence of a historical language is restricted to the written realm. But, at the very least, the Ancient Greek model provides a good example of a language in which the historic dialects are not linked with the modern, therefore countering the argument that the links to the modern language are a necessary requirement of ‘proving’ the existence of Old Irish dialects in the first place.

Nevertheless, as mentioned, O’Rahilly’s (1932) Irish Dialects Past and Present has had a profound impact on the dialectology of Irish, with his suggestions concerning the diatopic variation of Irish having been widely accepted and persevering to this day. His discussion of diatopic variation in Old Irish is minimal, as he does not believe there was diatopic variation until the 13th century, and of that eventual dialect emergence, in his introduction he (1932, 17-18) states:

‘Of dialects in the Old Irish period nothing tangible is known…historically there were but two main dialects in Irish, a Northern and a Southern, and that each of these (but especially the Northern) was divided into two lesser dialects, which themselves (especially in later times) were not free from minor internal differences. In their latest phase the area occupied by the two main dialects will be found to have a certain correspondence with the well-known legendary division of Ireland into Conn’s Half (Leath Chuinn) and Mogh’s Half (Leath Mhogha), the boundary between which ran from Dublin to Galway Bay…Southern Irish was supreme in Laighin, as in Munster; but Midhe was
pre-eminently the battle-ground of the dialects, and nearly every important variety of Irish was spoken within its borders…'

Subsequent scholarship has seemingly accepted the suggestion of two dialects, Northern and Southern Irish, and tends to analyse variations in that context, even during the Old Irish period, despite O’Rahilly’s suggestions being for a later emergence. Ahlqvist (1988) and Wagner (1982) both discuss variation as presumed to be along a north-south axis. This distinction, at any rate does appear to be correct: Wagner (1982) presents convincing evidence for a north and south divide; Kelly (1982) identifies lexical variation between sources of known origins, one in the north and one in the south; McCone (1985) and Roma (2018; 2020) have identified features that may map to a modern division between north and south and Ó Buachalla (1988) arrives at the same conclusion, that the original schism for diatopic variation was between the north and the south, all of which are to be discussed further.

While Jackson’s (1951) theory of ‘Common Gaelic,’ though similar to O’Rahilly’s in positing a late emergence of dialects, divided the Gaelic languages on an eastern and western basis, this particular designation does not seem to have taken hold in subsequent scholarship, especially not with regard to Old Irish. This could perhaps be attributed to the fact that ‘Common Gaelic’ is concerned with the three modern Gaelic languages, and seeks to distinguish between the language of Ireland and those of Scotland and the Isle of Man. But Ahlqvist (1988,) Wagner (1982,) and Roma (2018; 2020) all include some features from Scottish Gaelic as well, albeit included in their northern divide. The potential longitudinal divide is only really maintained by Jackson. All evidence will be considered, but at the outset it appears that a distinction between Northern Old Irish and Southern Old Irish is to be expected.

1.3 A literary standard
If it is accepted that the Old Irish presented in the extant material does not accurately reflect the spoken language at the time, and that variation within the language undoubtedly existed, then the lack of variation in the written sources needs to be accounted for. The most plausible solution is that of a written standard, and potentially an associated spoken register (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 217-230.) This would imply that the extant written material represents an elevated, more conservative form of the

---

9 An example of the dialects being divided on a longitudinal basis is Green (1969) in which he refers to ‘Eastern Gaelic,’ but does not explicitly cite or reference Jackson.
language that was occasionally influenced by a more colloquial version of the language, as a way of accounting for the minimal variation that does exist. The proposition of an elevated, written standard simultaneously acknowledges the invariability of the written language, while recognising that the surviving written sources may not accurately reflect the spoken language of the time, leaving room for the possibility of diatopic variation at a colloquial level. Thus, acknowledging an existing standard, or potentially competing standards from different monastic schools, appears the best solution for the Old Irish situation.

The suggestion of a written standard that does not accurately reflect the spoken language is not a novel concept (cf. Stifter 2009, 60) although it is not one that has been strongly accepted by scholarship. Binchy (1943, 209-210) was perhaps the first to attribute this written homogeneity to the interaction between the literati, or educated elite, of Ireland who intentionally kept the language free from vernacular influence. The apparent homogeneity and the deviations from the expected forms can thus be viewed as slips into a more natural, spoken language as best expressed by McCone (1985, 102):

‘in extant contemporary Old Irish texts, to all intents and purposes the Glosses, the overwhelming majority of usages conforms to a conservative literary standard and, at least arguably, associated register of speech, while sporadic deviations from this are mostly due to occasional lapses into a basically sub-literary register approximating to popular speech.’

The ideal outcome of the creation of a written standard is as minimal an amount of variation in spelling and grammar as possible (Haugen 1966, 931) and while Old Irish certainly achieves minimal variation by way of grammar and phonology, the fluctuations in orthography especially, coupled with McCone’s noted ‘Middle Irish’ features, indicate that while Old Irish may have conformed to a literary standard, it was not as divergent from the spoken language as Classical Latin, which eventually stopped being representative of the spoken language that developed into first Vulgar Latin and eventually the Romance languages (Leonhardt 2013, 77-79.) Charles-Edwards (1995, 728) has noted that, had Old Irish been exclusively a ‘fossilised’ literary standard that no longer reflected the spoken language, then its orthography should have been the most uniform aspect of the language, and yet this is not the case (cf. Strachan 1903a, 1903b.)

10 Strachan’s articles are not primarily concerned with orthography though a number of orthographic variations are noted (cf. ‘Miscellaneous Notes’ in both.)
The concept of different registers of Old Irish has been thoroughly discussed by McCone (1989,) who has proposed it as a solution to the apparent lack of variation in Old Irish; he discusses this possibility in relation to irregular spellings of unstressed final vowels in the glosses of Würzburg, Milan, and St. Gall. He identifies the generally expected spellings as belonging to a conservative, educated register, and specifically argues that the reduction of all final unstressed vowels to schwa had already taken place in the more colloquial register:

‘The difficulty can be resolved by positing a dichotomy between what might be termed colloquial and educated registers of speech in early Ireland. This would enable generally accurate spelling of these vowels to be ascribed to the retention of distinct pronunciations in the more conservative educated register of speech arguably used by the literate, while sporadic confusions would be due to occasional lapses into a more colloquial register in which reduction to schwa had already occurred. If one wants a modern parallel there is no need to look further than the use and abuse of h in the English of England, and it goes without saying that some of the other fluctuations already discussed might be rooted in different registers of speech rather than a failure of orthography to keep pace with pronunciation as a whole’ (McCone 1985, 87-88.)

Register variations can be understood as a continuum (cf. Adams 2013, 6) along which scribes could oscillate, slipping in and out of the standard, and introducing variation that better reflects their spoken language, their personal orthographic norms, or their own conceptualisation of what was most correct. As already noted, this would appear to be the most likely case with Old Irish and understanding register this way allows for both the existence of a literary register while accounting for the existing deviations in the extant material.

Of course, understanding register as a continuum has the result that identifying register can therefore be trickier than identifying a dialect, as this fluctuation may mean that a single text or certain corpus may represent a mixture of register and dialectal variants, and may not necessarily be a perfect representation of register, or indeed a single register.

The concept of register coalesces nicely with the idea of a written standard, and it provides the best explanation for the apparent uniformity of the extant Old Irish material. Haugen (1966) has succinctly laid out the steps necessary for the creation of a standard: 1) selection of the norm, 2) codification of form, 3) elaboration of function and 4) acceptance by the community, and these steps have been explicitly applied to Early Irish
by Ó Muircheartaigh (2015, 217-230.) Although there are no explicit insights into the ways in which Old Irish was standardised, there are still indications

In considering the first step of Haugen’s model, the ‘selection of the norm,’ it seems logical to suggest that the form of the language found in the written standard of Old Irish was originally this proposed higher register of speech: the higher register existed prior to becoming the standard and eventually became the standard owing to its use in the creation of texts. The vernacular norm of an elite group is more likely to prevail (Haugen 1966, 932) and considering that it was the ecclesiastics, academics and lawyers who were responsible for the creation of Old Irish texts, it is reasonable to postulate that the Old Irish written standard represents, as posited by McConie (1989, 86-87.) a form of the language that was primarily representative of the language of the educated elite. Owing to the significant influence of Armagh during the eighth and ninth centuries, Ó Muircheartaigh (2015, 220-221) has argued that it was a sociolect of the northeast that formed the basis of standard Old Irish.

It has further been suggested that the written standard was originally a dialect that was elevated to a standard (cf. Charles-Edwards 2000, 583; Stifter 2009a, 60.) The lack of dialectal evidence in the written language would indicate that the Old Irish standard was not an amalgamation of different dialects, or a standard into which dialectal variants were admitted, unlike its descendant, Classical Modern Irish, in which dialect forms were allowed (Charles-Edwards 1995, 278.) The potential geographic origins of the three corpora of glosses, and thus the potential dialect variant that rose to prominence, are to be discussed below (see Section 1.4.)

The ‘codification’ stage of the creation of the standard is best exemplified by Auraicept na n-éces (c. 700), The Scholar’s Primer, which is functionally a grammar of Old Irish. The Auraicept is a codification of Old Irish grammar, undoubtedly intended to be used for learning (cf. Ahlqvist 1983, 19; Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 222.) Not only does the Auraicept describe the norm of the standard written language, but it provides a tool from which others may learn.

The final two steps of Haugen’s model, elaboration of function and acceptance by the community, are interlinked in the case of Old Irish (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 223-230.) Although the two processes would appear to be intertwined this is not always the case: the Cornish language, as a function of its revival, has had multiple, competing standards created all of which fulfil the criterion of ‘elaboration of function’ but none of which have
been fully accepted by the language community, with the official standard considered unsatisfactory by some (cf. Sayers 2012; George 2017.)

The elaboration of function, as discussed by Haugen (1966, 932,) refers to the ability of the written standard to be applied to a variety of purposes, as opposed to having the codified form being so rigid that it cannot be used outside of formal or restricted purposes. Finally, in order for a written standard to survive and not be eschewed as unnecessary, it has to be accepted by the populace, though as Haugen (1966, 933) notes, it need not be the entire speaker-base, but only an influential group. For Old Irish, the evidence of the acceptance as a norm and the elaboration of function are one and the same. Old Irish survives in a variety of material: poetry, narrative prose, law, religious commentary and text, as well as historical and genealogical texts.11 The language was not limited to a singular function, it was applicable to any form of writing, and its application indicates that it was accepted by ecclesiastics, academics, poets and jurists. Additionally, from what is known of the origins of texts, such as the Senchas Már (c.660-680,) which is the product of Armagh (Stacey 2007, 233,) and Bretha Nemed (c. 700,) which originated in Munster (F. Kelly 1988, 246,) it is clear that the written standard as accepted was not restricted to a single region and thus, while it may in origin be representative of a particular dialect, it was not limited to a single area.

Understanding the extant Old Irish material as the product of a unified, written standard, likely the product of an elevated register utilised by the educated elite, accounts for the relative uniformity of the language across the corpora of sources as well as acknowledging that dialects likely existed at a more colloquial level. For that reason, and the ones outlined above, it seems unquestionable that Old Irish as it is currently understood is a literary standard, and not evidence of a single, uniform language.

1.4 The provenance of the corpora of glosses

When searching for evidence of variation, especially diatopic variation, the ability to fix a manuscript in a particular geographic location would be exceptionally useful, as it would allow the ability to suggest a diatopic region. In the above section, the possibility

---

11 Charles-Edwards (1995, 728-729) would see a distinction between the language of these sources, with an ‘elevated’ Old Irish found in texts in which the scribes were demonstrating their skill with words, and ‘ordinary’ Old Irish in texts that were ‘straightforward,’ and intended for a broader audience. On the whole, he agrees with McConce’s (1985, 102) assertion that the ‘later’ forms found in the glosses are evidence of slips into a more natural register; however he disagrees that a high register would have been expected in commentary and that instead passages represent ‘ordinary’ Old Irish as opposed to ‘elevated’ Old Irish.
of the written standard of Old Irish having been, in origin, a diatopic variant that was raised to the level of the standard was mentioned, and if this were to be argued, establishing a firm geographic provenance for the material is required. For that reason, it is prudent to discuss the prevailing theories about the origins of the three corpora of glosses as they constitute the main sources for this study.

1.4.1 Würzburg

There are three hands identified in Wb, of which the *prima manus* is also believed to be responsible for the Latin text, in addition to the glosses (Breen 1996, 9; Ó Néill 2002, 230.) There is some disagreement as to whether or not the main glossator, responsible for the bulk of the Old Irish material, followed the *prima manus* (Ó Néill 2001, 34; 2002, 230-231,) or whether the main glossator preceded the *prima manus* (Breen 1996, 9,) though Breen notes there is no noticeable palaeographical evidence to suggest that the three hands were not contemporary, but theorises that due to the ‘archaic orthography’ that the *prima manus* was copied from an earlier exemplar. Considering the conflicting evidence for the dating of the different hands, in conjunction with the fact that the three hands are not linguistically datable to the same period (Thes. i. xxiv-xxv,) it seems reasonable to suggest that three scribes were working concurrently, but copying from different sources. This would imply a reasonably productive scriptorium that employed multiple scribes and had access to multiple exemplars. This idea is strengthened by the high-level of skill of the scribes (Ó Cróinín 2005b, 393) that indicates they had received an exemplary education.

In terms of locating Wb geographically, Armagh has previously been suggested on the basis of its similarities to the Book of Armagh (c. 800.) Breen (1996, 12) notes that every deviation from the Vulgate as found in Wb is equally found in the Book of Armagh, and Ní Chatháin (1987) has thus suggested that the *prima manus* shared sources with the Book of Armagh. Ó Muircheartaigh (2015, 307) has argued that Armagh was the central intellectual hub that facilitated the acceptance of the written standard, which would necessitate a productive scriptorium and rigorous monastic school that is indicated by Wb. Thus, the location for the origin of Wb as Armagh seems to be the logical conclusion.

---

12 Thes. (i, xxiv) states that Zimmer (1881) and Strachan are in agreement that the glosses of the *prima manus* were added prior to the majority of the glosses, while Stokes believes some were added afterwards.
1.4.2 Milan

ML has most often been associated with Bangor (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 138; Lash 2017, 148; Dumville 1997 28-29; McNamara and Sheehy 1973, 209) though it has more recently been linked with Iona (Clancy 2003-4, 229-230.) The evidence for provenance in Bangor, however, is stronger, on the basis of monastic relationships and internal references from the text, while the links to Iona are tentative at best.

The manuscript was brought to Milan through the monastery at Bobbio, and Best (1936, 36) maintains that there was a strong connection between the monastery and Bangor ‘as is evident from the Irish manuscripts which found their way to Bobbio.’ He equally links a Mailgaimrid cited within the glosses with Mael Gaimrid, scriba optimus ancortia, abbas Bencnair, pausait (AU 839.)

An authority on grammar, Mailgaimrid is invoked clearly three times in ML, with three other potential attestations: his name is supplied three times in full mailgaimrid ML56b33, mailgaimrid ML68c15 and mailgaimrid ML85b11; twice an m- is expanded by Stokes and Strachan as mailgaimrid ML46b12, ML85b14 and finally there is one m (ML118b08) that is not expanded by Stokes and Strachan within the text but in a footnote the reading of ‘Mailgaimrid?’ is supplied (Thes. i. 400 n. d.)

There is little doubt that the authority cited in ML is Mailgaimrid, owing to the full transcription of his name, and other scholars have agreed that this Mailgaimrid should likely be identified as the Máel Gaimrid Abbot of Bangor (cf. McNamara and Sheehy 1973, 259; Hofman 1996, 22; Lash 2017, 148.) Byrne (1984, xix) additionally links the orthography of ML to the Antiphonary of Bangor and states that they are undoubtedly the product of the same tradition.

Bieler and Carney (1972, 6-7) are sceptical of the connection with the Abbot stating that: ‘The identification of Mail Gaimrid with the abbot of Bangor of A.D. 838 (recte 839) is an example of a speculation that in time crystallizes into near certainty.’ They argue that Best’s claim (1936, 36) that Mailgaimrid is a ‘very uncommon’ name is erroneous, as there is another example of Máel Gemrid mac Indadgair of the Ciarraige in the Corpus Genealogiarum Hiberniae (O’Brien 1962, 302 n. n) and an ogham inscription Molegomrid (Macalister 1945, 229) that they suggest might be read as Maile Gaimrid (Bieler and Carney 1972, 7 n. 8.) Though the point is taken that the Mailgaimrid of Bangor is not the sole known Mailgaimrid, it does not refute the argument that this is an uncommon name, especially not as Leabhar na nGenealach (c. 1649) contains only four
attestations (Ó Murafle 2003, v: 432.) While it is certainly possible that this Mailgaimrid is different from the Mæl Gaimrid of Bangor, it seems unlikely, though arguably knowledge of an abbot and his teachings does not necessarily require that the manuscript itself be the product of his monastery.

The scribe of MI, responsible for both the Latin text and the Old Irish glossing, identifies himself as Díarmaid (McNamara and Sheehy 1973, 222; GOI, §6) and McNamara and Sheehy theorise that this is Díarmaid grandson of Áed Rón, Díarmaid hue Aedha Roin, anchorita & religionis doctor totius Hibernie who died in 825 (AU 825) and founded Dísert Díarmaíta (Castledermot) (O’Dwyer 1981, 160-163.)

Clancy (2003-4,) however, has proposed instead that Díarmaid be identified as Díarmaid of Iona, a theory supported by Ó Maolalaigh (2016, 88-89, 101 n. 39,) albeit with a rather flimsy argument (see Section 1.4.4. below for a further discussion of potential Scottish provenance.) The word erelc appears twice in MI, and nowhere else in the extant Old Irish material: ba hitemul dugníth saul conamuntair intleda 7 erelca fridaid MI30a03 ‘it was in darkness that Saul with his people used to make snares and ambushes against David;’ i.e. in ambushes.’

A similar word, which Clancy claims is the original, and of which he states erelc is a metathesized variant, elerc is found in Scottish placenames. This form appears in the Gaelic notes on the Book of Deer: Mal-Colum mac Moíl-Brigte do-rat ind Elerc ‘Mal-Coluim son of Mal-Brigte gave Elrick’ (Jackson 1972, 31.11-12, 34.12.) Jackson explains the form as coming from the Old Irish (the opposite of Clancy’s proposition,) and as later becoming Scottish Gaelic eileirig or iolairig ‘a deer-trap” i.e. a funnel-shaped defile, natural or artificial, into which deer were herded and shot down at the end’ (Jackson 1972, 52.)

F. Kelly (1997, 277) gives a perfectly plausible origin of air ‘before’ + selc ‘hunting’ and notes the metathesized form in the Book of Deer as a Scottish continuation, and mentions it in conjunction with the word tinchell, from Old Irish timchell, as another hunting-related term that was used in medieval Scotland. Clancy (2003-4, 229-230,) however, rejects this etymology, stating that preference should not be given to the form found in MI simply based on age, but rather that the Scottish form, despite appearing later, should be given priority as it is predominant. He asserts that erelc is likely a loan-word from Pictish based on its distribution as a placename in eastern Scotland and
continues to state that, as a Pictish-loan, a scribe who utilized it must have been familiar with ‘such a dialect word’ and thus concludes the scribe of MI must be Diarmait of Iona.

Clancy’s argument appears tenuous. He provides no evidence for erelc or elerc being a Pictish loan outside of its appearances in the placenames of eastern Scotland and provides no presumed original Pictish form, reconstructed or otherwise. At present, F. Kelly’s etymology is the most agreeable, and not purely because it is the only one. The proposition of air + selc concords with the significant preference of MI to render air- as er- (see Section 2.8) and thus the forms erelca and erelcaib are not unexpected MI forms for *airelca or *airelcaib. Additionally, there are other examples of a Scottish reflex metathesizing the Irish form. The Early Irish word munchille, a borrowing of Latin manicula (Modern Irish muinchille) ‘a sleeve’ appears in Scottish Gaelic as muinchill but also as moilcheann in Sutherland, mailcheann in West Ross-shire and muilchear in East Perthshire (cf. SGDS 637; Robertson 1905, 37) all areas that were formerly Pictland. There are other examples as well, including Old Irish caindel, a borrowing from Latin candela (Modern Irish coinneal) pronounced in parts of East Perthshire kənl or kənl (cf. SGDS 230.)

Thus, it seems more reasonable to interpret erelc as Kelly put forward, as air + selc, with MI showing its regular representation of the preposition air- as er- and the form having been metathesized at some point during or after its continuation into Scotland. Without any further evidence for identifying Diarmait as Díarmait of Iona, it seems impossible to place the origins of MI in Scotland, and therefore an origin in Bangor remains the most plausible assumption.

1.4.2 St Gall

Byrne (1984, xix-xx) associates the Coirpre identified in scribal marginalia in Sg with Coirpre mac Feradaig, the abbot of Castledermot co. Kildare and Timahoe Co. Laois, and connects the invocations ‘Sanctus Diormitius’ with Diarmait of Disert Diarmata (Castledermot) Co. Kildare. Ó Neill (2000, 164) equally associates Sg with Díarmait of Castledermot on the basis of the invocations to him in the margins. Flower (1948, 38) had made the same conclusion, that Sg was of Kildare provenance, based on the numerous invocations of St Brigid, which outnumber the invocations to all other saints.

---

13 Clancy does cite a ‘forthcoming’ article on the subject; however, to the best of my knowledge it has not come to fruition in the years since his article.
On the other hand, Hofman (1996, 22-23,) while agreeing with the identity of the invoked Díarmait, posits that as Díarmait was an Ulster prince and student of Bangor, and his status as a teacher and anchorite totius Hibernie that he likely would have been celebrated across Ireland. He theorises instead that Sg originated in the north of Ireland, both on the basis of the invocations to Díarmait, as well as the palaeography of one scribe, which he identifies as a northern Irish type.

However, he seems to lean more to a proposed provenance of Nendrum (Hofman 1996, 21-22) on the basis of an invocation to Mochóe, the founder of Nendrum. As Mochóe was not a principal saint, he may have only been revered locally, which would indicate a close association with the area. Hofman (1996, 22) additionally notes a potential invocation to a disciple of Mochóe, a St Finnen Maige Bile (Movilla:) ‘Vinniane fave’ on pg. 150 of the manuscript (cf. Nigra 1872, 19.) Finnen (also Finnan, Finbar, Finnia) was undoubtedly associated with Nendrum (cf. Towill 1964, 106,) but his primary association is that of Movilla (cf. Ó Riain 2011, 320-323) which lies between Bangor and Nendrum. Although he was the subject of a cult that spread throughout Ireland and to Britain (Ó Riain 2011, 322) his origins in this region are another piece of evidence to localise Sg to the north-east of Ireland, though owing to this popularity, it is not possible to localise his veneration to a specific monastery, as Hofman suggests is the case with Mochóe.

Once in Sg, an authority on grammar is cited as m.g. with suspension strokes over both letters (Sg183b03,) which Strachan and Stokes expand as Máil Gaimrid, presumably on the basis of the evidence in MI (see above,) as their only note on it refers back to a mention in MI (cf. Thes. i xviii; ii xxiii.) There is an additional mael- in Sg31b12 that is left without further expansion, and Hofman (1996, 22) cites Sg213a10 as containing another possible reference, though the name, or any abbreviation, does not appear in the manuscript or editions, and it is thus unclear as to which gloss Hofman is referring.

If m.g. is the same Máelgaimrid, taken in conjunction with the other evidence, then it would suggest a provenance in Co. Down, though between Nendrum and Bangor is debatable, as the two are geographically quite close, and as noted by Hofman, there are arguments for either. He cites (1996, 22-23) the large number of sources used in Sg as evidence of a wealthy monastery, which would indicate Bangor, but he does not believe Mochóe would have been revered in Bangor.
The short distance between the two monasteries makes it impossible to distinguish, should Hofman be correct that the hand was of a northern Irish type. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the two monasteries would have been in close contact and thus may have had access to each other’s libraries, or that scribes and scholars may have moved between the two.

Overall, the evidence for Sg is inconclusive, though a north-eastern provenance would appear to be the most likely possibility: the tentative links with Mochóe point to Nendrum; the possible invocation of Máel Gaimrid would point to Bangor and the reference to Finnen, and Hofman’s evidence of a ‘northern’ hand, also may localise Sg to that general area. Potential counterevidence is the numerous invocations of Brigid that could point to a central provenance, especially considering that the next most popular saint only receives seven invocations, in contrast to Brigid’s seventeen (Ó Néill 2000, 164 n.34.) At the same time, Brigid was a popular saint, venerated nationally and internationally (cf. Ó Riain 2011, 123-125,) and her invocations may not necessarily indicate any particular geographic links. The association with Díarmait is equally fraught with difficulties, as he would have been known in both Castledermot and Bangor and thus cannot be used to definitively determine location. However, as it is established that Díarmait originated in Bangor and founded Castledermot, it seems plausible that at least one of the scribes was trained in either Nendrum or Bangor in the same school as Díarmait, and then made his way to Castledermot, a monastery with which his home monastery had close associations (Ó Cróinín 2005, 194) or vice versa. This would satisfactorily explain the scribe’s northern-style orthography while also accounting for the seventeen invocations to Brigid, a local Kildare saint. Overall, the evidence for a north-east provenance of Sg is the strongest.

1.4.4 A Scottish provenance

In addition to the previously mentioned potential point of evidence for a Scottish provenance, there have been other suggestions as to elements that may point towards a Scottish origin. As in these instances, unlike in erelec above, these features appear across the three corpora of glosses, it thus felt necessary to create a separate discussion in which all three collections of glosses could be examined and compared.

Ó Maolalaigh (2016, 88-89, 101 n. 39) supports the association of the scribe of ML with Díarmait of Iona, suggesting both the comparative predominance of the nasalising
relative clause in MI (cf. McCone 1980, 16, 22; Ó hUiginn 1986, 63, 70)\(^{14}\) as well as the variation between final unstressed -*nn* & -*n* and -*ll* & -*l* in MI as evidence of a ‘further Scotticism’ of the corpus.

The variation of final -*nn* & -*n* and -*ll* & -*l* has been investigated by Ó Buachalla (1988) who notes that both outside of and within the context of MacNeill’s Law this variation is shown inconsistently, perhaps due to the inconsistent nature of Irish orthography. The orthographical/phonological rule in question is MacNeill’s Law which was first identified in 1909 and states:

> ‘In words of more than one syllable, when any liquid (l, n, r) is followed by a short syllable ending in l or n, the latter consonants acquire their strong value, and are written ll, nn. Thus, Conall, Domnall, Cairell as against Tuathal, Bresal, Gnáthál; the genitives Érenn, Árann, Manann, Raithlenn as against Alban, Mumen, toimten etc.’ (J. MacNeill 1908/1909, 347)

Presumably, Ó Maolalaigh is making reference to the fact that in Scottish Gaelic the distinction between the sonants in this position is entirely lost in all varieties, and consequently their spellings are in free variation regardless of historical orthography (cf. Ó Buachalla 1988, 42.) This spelling variation is present in all three sets of glosses, albeit to varying degrees, casting doubt upon the assertion that this may be evidence that MI alone is of a Scottish provenance, and the idea of this being evidence of Scottish origins in general. Wb overall contains 15 examples of this variation, all of which are -*n* in the place of an expected -*nn* cf. *forcen* Wb18c11 ‘end, limit’ for *forcenn*, *colinn* Wb10b20 beside *colinn* Wb15d14, the dative singular of *colainn* ‘body, flesh,’ in an expected MacNeill environment. This unexpected single spelling is less significant as evidence for diatopic variation as it could potentially simply be an orthographic deficiency, whereas an unexpected double spelling more strongly points to orthographic confusion, thus making Wb inconclusive in this regard.

MI contains 15 instances of -*l* for -*ll* cf. *forcal* MI43d04 for *forcall* ‘bearing witness,’ *tadal* MI25a03 for *tadall* ‘visit, visiting,’ and 37 instances of -*n* for -*nn* such as *coitchen* MI53a18 for *coitchenn* ‘common,’ *echtran* MI14a07 for *echtrann* ‘strange, foreign,’ demonstrating that this spelling variation was indeed present in MI.

The variation is more prominent in Sg, with 29 examples of -*n* for -*nn* including *inun* Sg188a06 for *inunn* ‘alike’ and *giugran* Sg64b01 for *giugrann* ‘a wild goose,’ in addition

\(^{14}\) Neither McCone nor Ó hUiginn attribute the more frequent occurrence of the nasalising relative clause in MI to dialectic variation or evidence of a Scottish provenance as Ó Maolalaigh does.
to 19 occurrences of a single, final -n in *anmann* ‘soul,’ all of which are in a MacNeill environment. Sg additionally contains seven attestations of -l for -ll, including *chial* Sg146a01 for *citall* ‘sense,’ and nine attestations of *diall* ‘declension’ with a final -l, but primarily after a palatal (cf. *diáll* Sg4b02 vs *dil* Sg50b17 but also *dil* Sg97b01.)

When it comes to the potential phonological confusion of the doubled -ll or -nn for a single -l or -n, there is significantly less evidence. There are only three instances of -ll for -l focull Ml24d30, Ml51a14 and Ml125a11 for etymologically expected *fúcull* ‘word.’ In addition to these three, there are a handful of instances of -nn for an expected -n namely *persann* Ml90a12 for *persan* ‘person.’

In Sg there is one attestation of the word *bachal* Sg229a ‘staff,’ in its etymologically expected form, despite being more prevalent throughout the Old Irish corpus as *bachall*, with an unexpected final double -l (cf. *áthas* 241.17, 341.4.) Ó Buachalla (1988, 40) cites it specifically as example of MacNeil’s Law being misapplied in Latin loans: Latin loan words show a significant amount of variation with regards to the application of MacNeill’s Law, with it appearing to be operative in some forms such as *mulenn* ‘mill’ (cf. *mulenn* Sg49b15) while appearing unexpectedly in forms such as *bachall* and *persann*. McManus (1982, 298-306) notes that MacNeill’s Law is inconsistently applied, and that the amount of variation in single and doubled unstressed -l and -n indicates that it may not have been governed by any set of rules. The result is that it is difficult to ascertain whether or not the final -l or -n in a Latin loan should be double or single, regardless of whether or not it should be impacted by MacNeill’s Law. Thus, for the present purposes, Latin loans with an unexpected -nn or -ll are not conclusive evidence as phonological confusion as they may simply be the reflex of a borrowing mechanism that is not currently fully understood.

The doubling of -n- also occurs in the cluster -rn-, having never been lenited, in both final stressed position (cf. *intsuirn* Ml121c14 of *sorn* ‘furnace’) and final unstressed position (cf. *lochairrn* Sg24a16 of *locharn* ‘lamp, lantern,’) potentially due to the development of an epenthetic vowel (cf. Ó Buachalla 1988, 40 n. 5; de Bernardo 1984, 66; O’Rahilly 1942a) and the majority of attestations of -nn for -n as given by Strachan (1903a, 58; 1903b 484) in MI and Sg fall into this category or clusters containing -rn(n)

Indeed, once one takes into consideration -n not being lenited in the cluster -rn-, and the additional understanding of MacNeill’s Law also applying following an -m- (GOI §140,) the only attestations of -nn for -n in MI are *persann* and *lecuínn* Ml55c01 of *lecca*
‘cheek,’ and there are no occurrences in Sg.\footnote{Strachan (1903b, 484) additionally lists *cucann* Sg49b15, however this is *-sn-* (cf. GOI §448) and is therefore expected -nn.} All others are either in MacNeill environments, inconclusive Latin loans, or contain an expected -nn such as in the -rn(n) cluster.

This variability and the fact that it persists into Early Modern Irish has led Ó Buachalla (1988, 42) to suggest that the alternation of -l(l) and -n(n) beyond the contexts of MacNeill’s Law, was an expanding feature of Irish. As a part of this, he posits that, in the n-stems, the -nn of certain neuter nouns such as *ab(a)inn* ‘river’ (ab) and *gobann* (gobae) ‘smith’ morphologically spread to the other n-stems,\footnote{Ó Buachalla (1982, 46-48) is of the view that Thurneysen is incorrect in applying MacNeill’s Law to short, unstressed syllables following -m- and instead would view this spread of neuter n-stem -nn as the origin of the variation in the n-stems. Nevertheless, whether one believes Ó Buachalla or Thurneysen, the result for the present study is the same, as the forms found in the glosses (cf. *talmann* MI40d16; *ammann* Sg6a06) are still explicable as expected, and not evidence of a phonological confusion.} replacing both singular and plural endings in -n with -nn. On this basis, *lecca*, in its accusative singular form *leccúinn* MI55c01 a feminine n-stem, could be understood as containing the expected final -nn of this spread.

So, the only potential evidence of phonological confusion is that of *focul(l)* in MI, and even then, *focul(l)* shows significant variation throughout Early Irish, and indeed Early Modern Irish (cf. *focull* YBL 54b8; *inna focul* Sg26a07; *focal facul* (foghulma), *focall facall* (óin phersain IGT II §17.).\footnote{IGT distinguishes between the noun and the verbal noun though Ó Buachalla does not in his citation of the material. This variation appears to only be present in the verbal noun *focal(l) facal(l)* in IGT and not the noun, unlike in Old and Middle Irish.} Outside of this form, as all other instances of -nn and -ll for -n and -l respectively are explicable through other means, especially as there is understood to be significant variation within the Latin loan words.

The evidence of -n and -l in the place of -nn and -ll is likely a purely orthographic feature. Owing to the fact that the least amount of occurrences appear in the eldest Wb, with an increased number in MI with the largest amount present in the youngest Sg, and the fact that the spelling varies even within the three corpora themselves, the conclusion drawn by Ó Buachalla that ‘the variation of l(l)/-n(n) in final unstressed syllables is a constant and expanding feature of Irish’ is the most reasonable.

The use of the nasalising relative clause has satisfactorily been explained as an expanding phenomenon during the Old Irish period (cf. McCone 1980, 22; Ahlqvist 1985, 327; Ó hUiginn 1986, 63, 70,) thus accounting for the fact that it is more common in MI than it is in Wb. On the other hand, Ó Maolalaigh (2016, 88-89) combines the increased
use of the nasalising relative clause in Ml with the proposition put forward by McCone (1985, 96-97) that the standard Old Irish formation of the prepositional relative, preposition + -(s)a + nasalisation, which continues to be the norm in Scottish Gaelic, might have originated as a northern diatopic variant that was absorbed into the literary register, as further evidence of Scottish influence. While this certainly concords with Ó Maolalaigh’s suggestion of a Scottish origin for the glosses, the rest of McCone’s discussion, and his own conclusions about geographic origins, would appear to do otherwise.

While the formation of preposition + -(s)a + nasalisation is the standard in Scottish Gaelic, it is not so in Modern Irish, in which a construction with a prepositional pronoun at the end of the relative is the predominant form. McCone (1985, 96) identified the only two examples of this structure in the three corpora of glosses (cf. GOI §507) one from Ml and one from Sg: nech suidigther loc daingen do Ml87d15 ‘anyone…to whom is established a strong place’ and ní fail ní nád-táí mo dligeth-sa fair Sg 26b07 ‘there is nothing on which my law does not touch.’

While the formation of preposition + -(s)a + nasalisation is the standard in Scottish Gaelic, it is not so in Modern Irish, in which a construction with a prepositional pronoun at the end of the relative is the predominant form. McCone (1985, 96) identified the only two examples of this structure in the three corpora of glosses (cf. GOI §507) one from Ml and one from Sg: nech suidigther loc daingen do Ml87d15 ‘anyone…to whom is established a strong place’ and ní fail ní nád-táí mo dligeth-sa fair Sg 26b07 ‘there is nothing on which my law does not touch.’

There are a handful of other examples of this type of construction in Old Irish outside the three corpora of the glosses. Stifter (2015, 56, 100) has identified a further example in the Poems of Blathmac (c. 700:) nacha rultis námait lais ‘so that with it [i.e the clouds brought by God] enemies might not see […] them’ (Carney 1964, 28.323.) Stifter (2015, 100) has emended Carney’s translation to better reflect the construction, and the fact that ‘so that not’ is better expressed by conná or arná and not simply ná to ‘on account of which [i.e. the cloud] the enemies could not move (themselves)’ or ‘on account of which the enemies could not chase them [i.e. the Jews]’ depending on whether or not the infixed pronoun is understood as a reflexive. Ó hUiginn (2013, 165-166) has identified a further two, one in Tochmarc Étaíne: ar fer na feadar clainn na cenn dó ‘for a man whose kindred or race I know not’ (Bergin and Best 1934-1938, 170-171.) The second example is found in the tract Tír Cumaile (8th century:) na biat glama ann ‘in which there are no glama’18 (Mac Niocaill 1971, 82, 84.) Hoyne (2017, 81) gives a further two examples: c[é]muinter [do]-cuirter sæth fuirri do galar ‘a wife who experiences the affliction of a disease’ (CIH iii 893,) an Old Irish gloss on legal material; …fuceird mberridi [sic

18 Mac Niocaill (1971, 84 n.3) notes that glama is ‘unexplained and unidentified,’ but vaguely translated as ‘sticking plants,’ and suggests it be associated with the word glán ‘a satire which produces a blemish or blister’ and therefore indicate a plant that causes pain when touched.
mbeg cona bachuill din conair [boī fuirri] ‘he threw a little wooden chip with his staff from the road on which he was’ (Meyer 1901b, 228) in Cāin Domnaig (c. 800.)

The presence of the two distinctly Irish examples within the glosses, to which McCone ascribes ‘broadly southern origins,’ in contrast to the ‘northern’ origins of the Scottish Gaelic type construction, would indicate that the scribes of both Ml and Sg were speakers whose colloquial language utilised this prepositional pronoun construction, or else there would have been no reason to include it, as the standard ‘northern’ syntax would both have sufficed and been required. Considering the lack of this relative + prepositional pronoun formation in Scottish Gaelic, it would suggest that should this be a diatopic feature as early as the Old Irish period, then the origins of Ml and Sg can be placed within Ireland, and with Irish speakers, as opposed to from within Scotland.

If the assumption of diatopic variation were to be extended, the fact that the standard construction in Old Irish, which exists elsewhere, with the exception of these few isolated examples, would suggest that the literary standard was based on a ‘northern’ but still Irish, regional variation from which this form developed. In this case, the proposed location of Bangor as the monastery from which Ml originated and from which a literary standard was promulgated seems the most convincing.

On the other hand, Hoyne (2017) has convincingly argued that this is not a diatopic variation at all, but rather a construction that has a particular function. He has demonstrated (2017, 77-82) that in the examples above the subject (or ‘head’) of the relative clause has low accessibility, and the prepositional pronoun is used to remind the hearer/reader of the subject at hand. The entirety of his discussion will not be replicated here, but for our purposes examining the two occurrences from the glosses is relevant.

In the example from Ml87d15, hua duemar nech suidigther loc daingen dō inna āgathar ‘since anyone is protected to whom is established a strong place in which he fears nothing,’ the hearer/reader must first process the subject nech which itself is indefinite, the verb of the relative clause, an indefinite noun phrase and then a second relative clause qualifying the noun phrase (Hoyne 2017, 78.) The prepositional pronoun, then, reminds the reader of the initial subject nech before commencing the second relative clause.

The example from Sg26b07 ní fail ní nád tāi mo dligeth-sa fair ‘there is nothing on which my law does not touch,’ while not as complex as the example from Ml, too has an indefinite subject ní. An indefinite subject has low accessibility (put simply, it is difficult
to conjure up an image of what is meant,) but the fact that the *ní* of this gloss is also not real makes it even less accessible, thus further necessitating the reinforcement of the prepositional pronoun (Hoyne 2017, 79.)

Therefore, if this is *not* a diatopic variant and instead represents a specific function, namely, assisting the hearer/reader in relative clauses in which the subject has low accessibility, then this evidence is inconclusive as to origins, and cannot be used as evidence of ‘northern’ origins, or more specifically Scottish origins, of MI and SG.

### 1.5 Conclusion

The model proposed by O’Rahilly (1932) and further expanded by Jackson (1951) that Old Irish remained a uniform language up until the 13th century is implausible; it ignores evidence from within the Old Irish corpus itself, however minimal, that refers to diatopic variation. This understanding of Old Irish as homogenous, while prevalent in modern scholarship, is outdated and untenable. Instead, the preceding section has shown that Old Irish is best understood as a literary standard put forward by the educated class of medieval Irish society that shows occasional slips into a colloquial register that may have included dialect variation.

A written standard could either be defined as an entirely literary language, constructed to be universally understood and to minimise the unintelligibility by all but insiders of local developments (cf. Leonhardt 2013, 77,) or the product of a regional dialect being promoted to the level of a standard, or the collation of several dialects as in the case of Classical Modern Irish (cf. Stifter 2009, 60; Charles-Edwards 1995; 2000.)

Considering the proposed northern provenance of the three corpora of glosses, in addition to the northern associations of other narrative (McCone 2000, 119) and legal (Breatnach 2011, 42) texts, it seems likely that the Old Irish written standard originated in the north of the country (Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 220-221.) The high-level of productivity of the monasteries in the north such as Bangor, Nendrum and Downpatrick (Ní Dhonnchadha 2010, 547) and the primacy of Armagh (Charles-Edwards 2000, 426-427) provide a further basis for this idea; as the most productive and influential scholastic and monastic houses were in the north, it would be reasonable to assume that it was a northern dialect that was the most productive and eventually claimed predominance, being adapted as a standard (cf. Charles-Edwards 2000, 583.) It is impossible to say if this was a concerted effort by the northern monastic schools to impose their language, or
if it was a more natural process borne out by the higher levels of productivity emanating from the north of Ireland.

Regardless, as previously demonstrated by McCone (1985) and discussed by Charles-Edwards (1995) Old Irish was undoubtedly a spoken language and evidence of divergence from the literary standard does exist. The following discussion seeks to identify, collect and analyse these variances to determine if the linguistic situation accords with the idea of a standard written language, as well as to seek out any potential evidence of diatopic variation that may exist.
2. Prior scholarship

The following chapter intends to identify and discuss previous work dealing with the topic of dialects in Old Irish, specifically those that have identified or examined particular linguistic features that may show diatopic variation. Scholarship that has discussed dialects in a more theoretical context has been mentioned, though not necessarily thoroughly explored, in the preceding section.

This section will provide collections from the three corpora of glosses of features that have been identified but not thoroughly examined and will provide an overview of those that have been previously collected. Features that may be linked to either the Modern Irish dialects or the modern Gaelic languages will be noted and discussed, and finally, collated in order to determine if any geographic links are tenable.

In his Grammar of Old Irish, Thurneysen (GOI, §16, §166(b) n., §485) posits the possibility of dialects of Old Irish, and his remarks in these three paragraphs have been at the heart of subsequent scholarship on potential dialects (cf. Kelly 1982; Murray 2005) providing a starting point for further study.

Thurneysen’s references to potential dialect markers are as follows: some cases of the intervocalic consonant quality following ṣi §166(b) n.; the alternation between the anaphoric pronoun -ón and -són §16, §479; the doubled superlative ending frequently -imem appearing exclusively in Ml §16, §371; the variation of the initial sound, either f- or c- in the word meaning ‘self, own’ §485; and the variation of the preverb ar- as air- /ir-/er-/aur- §16, §823.

However, his suggestions have not gone uncriticised, with Ahlqvist (1988, 26) accurately describing Thurneysen’s identification of certain variant forms as diatopic markers as ‘a sort of pis-aller, to describe phenomena for which he had no other explanations,’ and this dismissive verdict has been echoed in further scholarship (cf. Russell 2005.) Ahlqvist’s own article addresses the difficulties in establishing the existence of dialects of Old Irish – focusing specifically on the absence of Thurneysen’s identified features, or even traces of these features, in the modern language, and the lack of distinct evidence linking them to geographic regions (cf. Russell 2005, 441; Ahlqvist 1988, 25-26.)

As Ahlqvist attempts to draw connections to the Modern Irish dialects he reiterates Thurneysen’s comments regarding initial mutations found in special relative forms of simple verbs – lenition is not found in Wb, only occasionally in Ml after forms of intí,
but is widespread in Sg, while nasalisation is usual but not ubiquitous in Wb, but regular in later sources until it fades again. Ahlqvist (1988, 28-29) cites two examples, one from modern Donegal Irish (is maír g a bios gan caraid)\(^{19}\) and one from a 14\(^{th}\) century grammar\(^{20}\) from co. Tyrone (cái méd criochnaigheas i n-e?)\(^{21}\) that lack lenition, and states that he considers this lack of mutation a feature of ‘some sort of either historical or dialectal continuity,’ assuming the non-mutated forms are ‘retentions’ of a feature that was ‘on the way out in standard Old (etc.) Irish.’

Although tempting to consider this a potential link between modern dialects and the Old Irish material, the issue at hand, in the Old Irish context, is more orthographical than phonological; inconsistent marking of lenition does not necessarily indicate that a form was not lenited orally, only that it was not mandatorily written. While the variation in between the three corpora of glosses in marking lenition on special relative forms of simple verbs is notable, as it could be indicative of different orthographic practice, whether the result of different scholastic standards or a tendency to more regularly mark lenition over time, in the Old Irish context, this cannot be considered a diatopic feature. In contrast, the general consensus appears to be that the variable orthographic marking of nasalisation represents an underlying phonological variation, and therefore its discussion in Section 2.11 has been included under phonology.

The subsequent chapter has sorted the discussed features as either issues of morphology, phonology, or lexicology for the ease of the reader, and the features have been collated from a number of sources which directly cited them as evidence of variation, diatopic or otherwise.

**Morphological features**

2.1. Forms meaning ‘self’

One of Thurneysen’s (GOI, §485) identified markers of dialect is that of the forms féin, féis(s)in(e), fadéin, fade(is)sin(e), fanisin, céin, cesin, cadéin, cadéi(s)sin(e) meaning ‘self, own.’ It is understandable that he would attempt to explain away the

---

\(^{19}\) The phrase referenced here by Ahlqvist is found, amongst other examples, in a footnote of another one of his articles (Ahlqvist 1978, 77 n.10.) The note provides examples of relative sentences from Gweedore Co. Donegal in which relative forms, and not just of the substantive verbs, are not mandatorily lenited.

\(^{20}\) The text itself has been edited by Ahlqvist (1987: see 11-12 for the example) and exists in only one extant manuscript, NLI G3 52rb-52vb, and thus there are no other versions with which to compare to see if this lack of lenition is equally present.

\(^{21}\) This particular example by Ahlqvist does not stand up under scrutiny. The manuscript (NLI G2 52v) has a superscript i over the initial consonant; a lenition marker above the c is therefore not expected.
variation between the forms for the words meaning ‘self,’ either beginning with $c$- or with $f$-, by attributing them to diatopic variation; there have been numerous attempts to explain them, and yet they are still not well understood.

### 2.1.1 Origins of the forms

Pedersen (1909-1913, ii 153 §490) put forward the idea that they may be a copula formation ($f$-, $fad$-) or the conjunction ‘even if’ in $cia$, $cid$ ($c$-, $cad$-) followed by a personal pronoun and then the demonstrative $sin$ as subject. Greene (1969, 93) pointed out that personal pronouns never have $-sin$ as an enclitic and rejected Pedersen’s proposal partially on that basis, though as noted by Schrijver (1997, 73) forms such as $sodain$ and $indísin$ demonstrate that $-sin$ can be attached to other pronouns, and thus notes that $-sin$ may not necessarily be in reference to the personal pronoun at all, but rather perhaps whatever element preceded it.

Greene continued (1969, 94) to propose a theory, that he states was suggested to him by M. A. O’Brien, that the first element of $faideisin$ is cognate with the Sanskrit $sva$, and the second element is a dative case of a cognate of the Sanskrit $daksīna$ ‘right hand,’ *deisen. Accepting this idea, the original meaning of $faideisin$ would have been ‘with one’s own right hand,’ and later taking the meaning of ‘oneself.’ Greene proposes that originally $faideisin$ had been utilised for all person and numbers, but as the understanding of its original meaning faded, it would be regarded as a specifically third person singular and a paradigm was created, but not completed, and he vaguely attributes the wide variety of forms to ‘variants’ and ‘analogy of one sort or another.’ He theorises that $fadéin$ and $féin$ can be regarded as variants, contracted by sentence stress, though does not explicate further.

Schrijver (1997, 74) has proposed a more reasonable origin, one that does not rely quite so heavily on analogy, confusion and contraction, that the origins of the form are $sye$- + (particle *$de$ +) (personal pronoun +) $-sin$ with $-sin$ being an anaphoric element with stress on the element preceding. The particle *$de$ is occasionally present in pronouns, such as the hypothesized *$so$-$so$ which has left traces in British Celtic, and has a known form in Gaulish of $sosin$ (Schrijver 1997, 34,) and *$so$-$de$-$so$ of $suide$ as well as *$so$-$de$-$sin$ of $sodain$ (cf. Schrijver 1997, 77.) This reconstruction, therefore, has a parallel already

---

22 Breatnach (2020, 136-137) has demonstrated via metrical evidence that both $-sin$ and the accompanying a deictic particle are stressed, which would call Schrijver’s proposal into question as $-sin$ is not functioning as an enclitic.
present in the language. His further reconstructions for the rest of the paradigm best account for the wide variety of forms, which are illustrated in the below tables.

Figure 1 Words meaning ‘self’ in Wb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Féin</th>
<th>Fade(is)sin/Fadesin</th>
<th>Fe(is)sin</th>
<th>Feisine</th>
<th>Fanisín</th>
<th>Fade(i)s(i)ne</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgm/n.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgf.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Words meaning ‘self’ in Ml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Féin</th>
<th>Fadisin/Fadesin</th>
<th>Fe(is)sin</th>
<th>Fessine</th>
<th>Fissin</th>
<th>Fadéin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgm/n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgf.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Words meaning ‘self’ in Sg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Féin</th>
<th>Fadisin/Fadesin</th>
<th>Fe(is)sin</th>
<th>Feis(i)ne</th>
<th>Cadesin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgm/n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgf.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{23}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{23} I have included here the féissna Sg144a01
As evidenced by the above tables, the third singular masculine shows the most variety, and unsurprisingly also the greatest usage, with more than double the numbers of any other pronoun across all three. There is also a marked preference for *fe(is)sin* in all three glosses: more than double all other forms combined in Mi, and accounting for over half of all the forms used in Wb and Sg.

The only form of *cadessin* to appear across the glosses is *ca désin/ca désin*, and only twice. The lack of *c-* forms in either Wb or MI is curious, as the *c-* forms are certainly known outside of the three corpora of glosses in Old Irish sources. There is *imté(i)tcad esin* ‘he himself goes traveling’ in *Críth Gablach* (c. 700) (Binchy 1941, ll. 600-601;)

*gabsi cadessin abbaith* ‘he took himself (as) abbott’ in the Book of Armagh (c. 800) *(Thes. ii 242;)* is *comadas duun chanisin* ‘it is fitting for us ourselves’ in the Cambrai Homily (c. 600-700) *(Thes. ii 246.4;)* and the five *c-* forms, including *caraid cesin a macc désín* ‘he himself loves his childish art’ in the poem *Messe ocus Pangur Bán* (c.800) (Murphy 1956, 2; *Thes. ii 293-294.*) The absence of *c-* forms in both Wb and MI can certainly not be attributed to a diachronic development and will be discussed further below (see Section 2.1.3.)

The first and second singular only uses *fadéin* and *féin*, with significant preference for *féin*, albeit with the caveat that the only corpus to use both is MI, which only has one occurrence of *fadéin* each, and is the only one to use *fadéin* at all. Despite any other possible objections to Greene’s proposed origins, his suggestion that *fadeisin* was originally used across all person and numbers before being exclusively associated with the third singular does not appear to be correct, as it is less popular than *fessin*, which Greene would consider a ‘variant.’

The inclusion of a personal pronoun in the formation by both Pedersen and Schrijver is perhaps best supported by the case of *fanisin* as it only ever occurs with the first plural. It is not entirely analogous, as the -*n-* of *fanisin* does not occur in the same place as parallel pronouns, and instead replaces the unrelated -*d-*, and Greene (1969, 94) would view this as a ‘remoulding’ of *fadeisin* to contain the pronoun and create a distinctive first plural form. If he is correct, this remoulding would have been an early development as the only attestations in the examined three corpora are in Wb, which uses *fesine* an equivalent amount.
2.1.2 Forms ending in -e

Greene (1969, 94) had suggested that the preference for forms ending in -e in the plural might be accounted for by the fact that ‘most plurals in Irish are a syllable longer than the corresponding singular.’ This idea is problematic, as it implies that at some point the language felt the need to add a syllable, on the basis of analogy to other plurals, when the language already contained an abundance of plurals that were not a syllable longer than their singular counterparts: as examples, compare the nominative and genitive plural of masculine o-stems; genitive plurals of feminine ā-stems; also, the entire paradigms of the io-stems and ia-stems are disyllabic. Surely there would be no need to add a final syllable for the sake of making plurals more distinct when distinctive monosyllabic plurals were already plentiful as, indeed, were disyllabic singular and plurals within the same paradigm. Indeed, considering that identical singular and plural forms also exist within the language – such as within the paradigms of some u-stem neuter nouns rind ‘star(s),’ mind ‘diadem(s),’ and even sometimes dorus ‘door(s)’ – while Greene’s suggestion is understandable, it is not entirely satisfactory.

Alternatively, Schrijver (1997, 77) has suggested that the -e is an unstressed allomorph of é ‘he, they’ that spread beyond the third person masculine and neuter and onto the feminine as well as the first and second plural. Albeit plausible, the fact that forms ending in -e are incredibly uncommon in the third singular masculine makes this idea somewhat unsatisfactory; Schrijver (1997, 77) gives two examples, and they comprise the only two instances of a third singular form ending in -e in the three corpora of glosses. The first of ni adoenacht fesine… Wb33c05 ‘not His own manhood’ is noted by Kavanagh and Wodko (2001, 417) as agreeing with ā-stem feminine doenacht and therefore they classify fesine as a third singular feminine. The context, however, would tend to support Schrijver, in that it is ‘his (Jesus’) own’ manhood, in agreement with the pronoun and not the noun. The other example given by Schrijver is not as clear: aggním féisne imme folhāi cesad fui ri Sg199a02 ‘its own action causes passion on it.’ The possessive pronoun a is followed by a doubled g- of gním, indicating that gním is not lenited, which would imply it is not intended to be understood as a masculine possessive, as indeed neither would the third singular feminine dative prepositional pronoun fui ri. Although the gloss is glossing ipsa, a Latin reflexive pronoun in discussing ἑαυτοῦ and αὐτοῦ, Greek reflexive pronouns, which can be ambiguous and in the case of αὐτοῦ is
typically masculine or neuter, the Old Irish would appear to have féisne agreeing with a feminine.

Outside of the three corpora, there is only a single attestation found in DIL from the epilogue of Félire Oengusso (c.800:) tria thóebán fodéne ‘through his own poor side’ (Fél. Ep. 352.) If it had originally been the masculine third singular é that then spread, more attestations of -e forms in the masculine would be expected, but are not attested. Perhaps Schrijver is partially correct, in that this was é ‘they’ that began in the third plural and spread, but it is still unclear as to why the final -e would have spread to the feminine third singular as well as to the first and second persons in Wb, as even with the third plural the basis of the spread is fairly narrow.

Within both Ml and Sg, usage of a form ending in -e is equally minimal and confined to the third person, it is only within Wb that the occurrences with the first- and second-persons plural are found. With the exception of first and second singular forms feine (cf. Meyer 1911, 90.14; Meyer 1921, 169.13) forms with the final -e are difficult to find outside of the third person. Indeed, to my knowledge there are only two extant instances of a disyllabic form with an added -e with a second singular: do thorba fadéine ‘thine own work’ from Regula Cholimb Chille (Meyer 1901, 29.28) and ní bé dot réir fodéne ‘be not under thine own guidance’ (Strachan 1904, 197 §15;)²⁴ and only one of a second plural, found only in the Lebor na hUidre version of Immram curaig Māil Dūin (c. 800:) 7 [na] gataid for sella do feraib fodeisne (Stokes 1888, 484; cf. Van Hamel 1941, I.381) ‘and do not take your eyes off your own men.’ The version from the Yellow Book of Lecan instead has fodein, which is the form given in Oskamp’s (1970, 128.29) edition (cf. Van Hamel 1941, 127.) None of the editors provide the reading from Harley 5280, and while it would thus be reasonable to assume that it had been omitted on account of being nearly identical to YBL (Van Hamel 1941, 21,) the manuscript has an entirely different reading of bodesin (Harley 5280 16v.36.)²⁵

It is therefore difficult to place the ‘spread’ of this final -e: its presence in the first and second plural in Wb is tempting to assign to diatopic variation, but the possibility of diachronic variation cannot be discounted. The relative absence of the first and second plural trisyllabic forms in other sources is interesting, as they are comparatively common

²⁴ Strachan (1904, 197 n.31) includes the alternate readings, all of which include a final -e except for the reading from RIA 23 N.10 bodeini.

²⁵ I am grateful to Truc Ha Nguyen for providing me with a microfiche copy of the relevant section in the early stages of the thesis, although the manuscript itself is now available digitally via the British Library.
in Wb: the form ending in -e is equally as common in the first plural as the one without, and in the second plural is nearly equivalent as well. It is possible that this represents an early form that fell out of use, and thus that the two examples in Regula Choluimb Chille and LU can be considered retentions of this older form.

2.1.3 c- forms

With reference to cadessin, Greene (1969) has little to say except to remark that ca-
may be the result of influence from cid esom ‘even he.’ It is with this statement that C. O’Rahilly (1976, 255) expresses agreement. She states that cadessin occasionally retains the meaning of this phrase and goes on to state, ‘There seems no doubt that cadessin, cadéin, céin are analogical formations based on fadesin, fadéin and féin.’ She then raises the question whether cadessin is the product of cid fessin, but does not answer. She further amends the translations of a handful of phrases to include this new understanding.

‘Again, torand hi frendeaire indib cadesin Sg. 150b2 is translated “a signification in the present in them themselves.” I suggest omitting “themselves” and adding “too.” Ataat tuisil indib cadésin Sg. 188a2 I should render “there are cases in them also”.’

The investigation into the distinction between forms in c- and f- was taken up by Byrne (1982, 167,) who builds upon the suggestions of Greene and C. O’Rahilly and takes the analysis further, positing that cadessin, instead of being a word meaning ‘self,’ is instead an emphasiser of both subject and verb, meaning ‘even = to wit, namely; moreover, too, into the bargain; he/she/they/too.’ Byrne provides a number of examples, but his most convincing is that of a correction of Binchy, which includes both forms and elucidates the difference between them.

‘We can see now that Binchy’s emendation of Crith Gablach, 600-601 by adding [fria thaiscidi] is not only unnecessary but misses the point. The passage (47) 598-601 reads:

Rí túaith dib feraib deac do lessaib túaith; fa-lloing túaath fadessein fria thaiscidi. Dá fher deac dano dám epscuip do lesaib ecalsa 7 túaith: im-téit cadessin (cf. CIH ii, 570).26

Binchy (1941, 38) does not supply a full translation for this passage: ‘“The túaath maintain himself (the king alone) for his private affairs” i.e. the maintenance of the king’s company is a charge on the túaath only when the king is engaged on public business…As the bishop’s position is similar to that of the king, I have supplied fria thaiscidi after im-téit cadesin (601): “he goes about alone for his private affairs.”’ MacNeill (1923, 306) had earlier provided a fuller translation of the passage: ‘The king of a tuaath (has a retinue) of twelve men (when he goes to the court of a superior king) to (protect) the interests of the tuaath; whom the tuaath itself sustains as regards their expenses(?). Twelve men, too, are the retinue of a bishop for the interests of church and tuaath in which he himself goes (on visitation.)’

---

26 Binchy (1941, 38) does not supply a full translation for this passage: ‘“The túaath maintain himself (the king alone) for his private affairs” i.e. the maintenance of the king’s company is a charge on the túaath only when the king is engaged on public business…As the bishop’s position is similar to that of the king, I have supplied fria thaiscidi after im-téit cadesin (601): “he goes about alone for his private affairs.”’ MacNeill (1923, 306) had earlier provided a fuller translation of the passage: ‘The king of a tuaath (has a retinue) of twelve men (when he goes to the court of a superior king) to (protect) the interests of the tuaath; whom the tuaath itself sustains as regards their expenses(?). Twelve men, too, are the retinue of a bishop for the interests of church and tuaath in which he himself goes (on visitation.)’
The distinction is between *fadessin* ‘himself’ (alone i.e. without his retinue) and *cadessin* ‘he too’. The additional clause is explanatory, i.e. the bishop too (like the king) makes public circuits or visitations for the benefit of both church and people, and while so engaged is entitled to maintenance for himself and his retinue of twelve.’ (Byrne 1982, 168)

Further examples can be found in the poem *Messe ocus Pangur Bán* (c.800) (Thes. ii 293-294) in which the forms with *c-* are often used with the second subject as indicated by Byrne: *bíth a menmasam fri seilgg/mu menma céin im saincheirdd* ‘my mind is at hunting (mice) my own mind is in my special craft;’ *Caraimse fos...caraid cesin a maccdán* ‘I love to rest...he himself loves his childish art;’ *He fesin as choimsid dáulin muid dungní cach oenláu-du thabairt doraí du glé; for mu mud céin am messe* ‘He himself is a master of the work which he does every day: while I am at my own work (which is) to bring difficulty to clearness.’ The latter example, containing both the *f-* and *c-* forms follows the same structure as identified by Byrne: the *f-* form is used as the emphatic for the first subject, while the second is accompanied by the *c-* form.

There are an additional two attestations within the poem that do not conform to the structure laid out by Byrne, indicating that this pairing is not obligatory: *inna línsam...im lín chéin* ‘...in his net...into my net...’; *Fuachaidsem...fuachimm chein* ‘He points...I myself...point...’ Neither of these forms necessarily carry the meaning of ‘self, own’ as they both are partnered with an emphasising pronoun – as indeed are the pairings in *menmasam...menma céin; caraimse...caraid cesin.*

There are two examples of the *c-* forms across the three corpora of glosses and both are in Sg:.i. *torand hifrecndairec indib cadesin 7 folud tairismech* Sg150b02 ‘i.e. a signification in the present in them themselves and a constant meaning;’ .i. *ataat tuisil indib cadésin* Sg188a02 ‘i.e. there are cases in them themselves.’ These are the translations provided in *Thes.* (ii. 160, 179) although C. O’Rahilly (1976, 255) would emend them from ‘themselves’ to ‘too’ or ‘also,’ respectively.

The first of the two examples follows a section comparing punctual verbs to a river, which does not have a point in the present, adding four deponent verbs noted as ‘*uocatiu,*’ all meaning ‘I call, I name, etc.’ Sg150b02 here notes that they have ‘a signification in the present,’ and they are then subsequently contrasted with durative verbs. The latter is glossing a section discussing how both the participle and the gerundive are subsumed under the category of the verb and still are seen to assume different cases (like nouns etc.) Though neither is as immediately apparent as the examples from *Críth*
Gablach (c. 700) or Messe ocus Pangur Bán, here too, the forms in c-, as indicated by both Byrne and C. O’Rahilly appear to have a better sense of ‘as well, too.’

There do not appear to be any candidates in MI and Wb that would suit this particular sense. There are glosses such as .i. errechdu indaas cechterchital dunaircechainnsom [leg. dunaircechainnsom] fesin 7 indaas dunarchechainn nach fáith aile MI64c22 ‘i.e. superior to every prophecy that he had prophesied himself, and to what any other prophet had prophesied’ which at first glance may appear to be a good candidate – the prophet in question would take the f- form and the ‘any other’ prophet could have been accompanied by the c- form. But the lack of c- form here is on account of the aile. It is not any specific prophet who has equally been surpassed, but all of them. The lack of specificity of a second subject eliminates the need for the c- form, and this tends to be the case in MI and Wb (cf. Wb12b02, Wb31c02, MI130a08.) In instances in which there are two f- forms in a single gloss (cf. MI53b11 Sg209b12) both are always attached to the same subject, further demonstrating that c- forms are related to a second subject. It is thus clear that the distinction between c- and f- forms is semantic, and not necessarily diachronic nor diatopic. This still leaves open the question of whether or not c-forms existed in the language of Wb and MI however, as there was never any context in which c-forms would have been expected to appear.

2.1.4 Form containing *de

Schrijver (1997, 78-83) has further elucidated a possible semantic difference between the forms containing the particle *de and those that do not. He suggests a special contrastive meaning that he compares to usage of the English stressed form of ‘own,’ or ‘self,’ in opposition to others. He provides examples, with his own emended translations, such as ní tabarthi díness do neoch for nach n-énirt ara foirbthetu fadesin (Wb6c19) ‘contempt is not to be shown by any one to any feeble person because of his ówn’ imperfections;’ and nì ruforaitthenair-som a firinni fadesin conid soirad dinaib fochaidib hi-robæ (MI24a17) ‘that…did not call to mind his ówn righteousness so that it might deliver him from the tribulations he was in.’

An illustrative pairing that I would add, is found in Wb: .i. frinn fanisin cotondelcfam Wb17b10 ‘with ourselves [my italics] we will compare ourselves’ and nonsamlaframmar frinn fesine Wb17b12 ‘we will liken ourselves to ourselves.’ As a cleft, the former carries

---

27 Schrijver is using the length mark here to indicate stress.
contrastive stress and the usage of *fanisin here lends credence to Greene’s (1969, 94) belief that this is a reworked *de form, compared to the non-contrastive *fesine in the latter example. Indeed, other examples of *fanisin also carry contrastive stress such as *isairi is *indoçál crisit pridchimme arnipridcham arnindoçbaíl *fanisin Wb15b17 ‘therefore it is Christ’s glory we preach, for we preach not our own [my italics] glory.’ This is in contrast to other, decidedly non-contrastive examples such as *adbeir fornairchinnech féisne hi tossuch Wb5a11 ‘your own leader says it at first.’

Schrijver acknowledges (1997, 81) that this contrastive meaning is not entirely consistent, and that there are examples in which *fadesin is not necessarily contrastive, and he provides, with the Thes. (i. 69) translation *i. labrad huallach 7 chaintoimentenach dib *fadesin Ml31b10 ‘proud and self-complaisant speech concerning themselves’ glossing magna in necesse est enim ut se magna loquantur quibus est familiare menadcium ‘for those who normally lie of necessity speak highly of themselves.’ A contrastive interpretation here is possible, but not required.

He further notes that *fessin sees contrastive use in both Wb and Ml, such as *mad cumme imned ácheli et aïmned *fessin Wb20c06 ‘if his fellow’s tribulation and his own tribulation be the same’ and is the preferred form by the time of Sg. Although *fadesin does occur in a contrastive statement, it only occurs once: *dialuc *fadesin l doluc infinite Sg154b01 ‘to their own place or to the place of the infinitive.’

It would appear then, that this semantic difference was already muddled by the time of Wb and that forms with *de were slowly being subsumed by those without during the Old Irish period, accounting for limited occurrence in Sg, though they were not eradicated entirely as they continued to exist in Middle Irish. The entry *fadéin in DIL notes that *fadesin, *fes(s)in, *fesne and *féin continue in use but indiscriminately, losing the distinction of person, number and gender, and cites other forms such as *fodéne (bo-, ba- bu-) as well as *fadessin (fo-, bo-, bu-) like the form found in Harley 5280 noted above. There are indeed occurrences of -de- forms in the Leabhar Breac (c.1100-1350:) cf. atchonnccatar buden; amal chomaides-som *fodéin (Atkinson 1887, 108, 5310.)

Therefore, the alternation of forms beginning with c- and f- are ineligible as a candidate for displaying a diatopic variation, having been shown by Byrne to be semantically different, as is the case with the variation between the forms containing the particle *de such as fadeisin and those that do not, such as *fessin.
Within Wb alone there is a minor variation within the presence of first plural and second plural forms ending in -e. These forms see limited use outside of the third person both within the three corpora of glosses as well as outside of it, with only one other respective attestation of the trisyllabic second plural and two of the second singular able to be found. While the possibility of this being a diachronic feature certainly cannot be discounted, as it exists solely in Wb, it can also be understood as an innovation not shared by later sources.

2.2 tige, taige and tech

The lexeme tech or teg has two forms in all singular cases: tech and teg in the nominative and accusative, tige and taige in the genitive and tig and taig in the dative, and had therefore been put forward by Wagner (1982) as potential evidence of Old Irish diatopic variation. In the instance of the nominative and accusative, the alternation in the final consonant is the analogical replacement of the guttural spirant during the seventh century, as discussed further in Section 2.9.2 (cf. McCone 1996, 134.) Here, the original form is that of teg < *teγah < *tegos, but the voicing of palatal -ch after unstressed vowels in other forms, alongside the retention of neutral -ch as it was not voiced, created a pattern of paradigmatic alternation that was then generalised to other forms with an originally neutral unstressed -g being replaced by -ch. With the result that this particular form, with an original -g after a stressed vowel, became tech by analogy, potentially aided by the existence of compounds like ríg-thech ‘king’s house’ (McCone 1996, 134.)

This alternation is not the diatopic feature discussed by Wagner, rather the vocalic variation found within the genitive and dative forms. Wagner (1982, 101-102) points out the fact that the Old Irish dative forms (tig and taig) have survived in Munster, East Ulster, Scottish Gaelic and Manx, as they have replaced the nominative form: tigh in Munster, taigh in East Ulster, Scottish Gaelic and Manx. He likewise mentions how the dative form has survived in all areas, as it is also retained in the adverb astaigh, istigh, which are found in Donegal and Connacht – areas in which the dative has not replaced the nominative. In the modern Gaelic languages tigh/tighe is confined to the Munster and

---

28 Hughes (2015, 166-169) discusses the repercussions of this fluctuation in the later language, specifically with regards to the demise of the neuter gender in Middle Irish, resulting in the masculine in tech, creating a ‘homonymic clash’ with in t-ech, ‘the horse.’ However, Hughes (2015, 170) does not take the nominative tech found in the glosses (cf. Wb33a02; Sg64a07) as evidence of this paradigmatic fluctuation, rather as the accusative used as a ‘neo-nominative,’ as early as Old Irish.

29 Cf. Ó hUiginn (1994, 573, §3.30) who notes teach, ti /ti/ and tigh / tí/ are all found in the modern Connacht dialect.
Connacht areas, while *taighe/taigh* is found in Scottish Gaelic and Manx, with both forms found in Ulster (cf. LASID i 147; Wagner 1982, 104; Ahlqvist 1988, 30.) The presence of both variants within Ulster is understandable, as Ulster constitutes the ‘border’ between Scottish Gaelic and Manx on the one hand, and Irish on the other. Wagner mentions that the *taig* forms have been considered secondary, pointing to Thurneysen’s (GOI §338) statement that they ‘have probably been influenced by *maige, maig,*’ and then concludes that the dative form is most likely an indicator of diatopic variations that existed in Old Irish, as he finds it difficult to believe the ‘secondary’ set of *taig, taige* would have been present in Connacht and Munster and replaced by *tig, tige* (Wagner 1982, 104.)

Ahlqvist (1988, 29) cites the Greek cognate *tégos* as evidence that the forms with non-palatalised *t(a)*- are innovations, but McCone (1991, 8 n. 28; 1994, 79; 1996, 111) posits that instead unless the subsequent syllable contained y, -e- was lowered to ae when preceding γ or γ” that was itself followed by i or e. This would have occurred prior to stressed raising e > i and resulted in paradigms such as *lige ‘lying’ < *ley'-iya-n < *legyo-m; accusative singular *daig <*dæw'ih < *deyw'ih beside genitive singular *dego <*dew'ōh. This would create an original paradigm in which the expected outcome of the dative singular would be *taig <*taγih <*teγih <*tegis < *tegesi, the nominative and accusative should be *teg < *tegos < *teyah, and the genitive singular *tige <*tiy'ayah <*teγiyah < *teγiyah < *teγiyah < *teγiyah < *teγiyah < *teγesos < *teγesos. McCone (1991, 8 n.28) had additionally theorised that an analogical levelling of the paradigm resulted in the emergence of dative *tig* and genitive *taige*, respectively, within two divergent paradigms, of which the former was a southern and the latter a northern development, based on the evidence of the modern languages.

This understanding of *taige* as a diagnostic northern form and *tig* as a southern form has been echoed by other scholars, and Ahlqvist (1988, 30) argues that this is evidence for the northern origin of Wb. But Wb conforms to McCone’s proposed original paradigm, with a genitive *tige* Wb7c09, and the four dative occurrences of *tech* in Wb are of the *t(a)*- form: *hitaig* Wb9b23, *itaig* Wb23b09 (twice,) and *hitaig* Wb33a06. Sg contains only two forms of the lexeme, *tech* in the nominative once Sg64a07 and then a genitive *taigæ* Sg66a19. Ml contains two of innovatory dative singulars (see below,) as well as four plural forms: three accusative, and one dative all of which are the phonologically regular *tige, tigib.*
Within the plural paradigm, there is no analogical innovation to *ta-* in Old Irish. In Modern Irish, Wagner (1982, 101) cites *tighthe* as a plural form for Munster, with no mention of case; for Ulster *taighthe* as a nominative plural and *taightheach* as the genitive plural; *taighean* and *taighthean* as the nominative plural for Scottish Gaelic, noting that in Southern Scottish Gaelic the genitive is identical with the nominative, and for Manx he gives the form *taighean* as a plural. With regards to Connacht, he gives the plural *tigthhe* as the nominative and notes later in the article (1982, 108) that the ending of the old dative plural was generalised as a plural ending, resulting in forms such as *tighthibh*.

MI has two dative singular forms, and both show the purported ‘southern’ innovation: *tig* MI57c07 and *tig* MI120d02. Although it is tempting to take the evidence of both the expected *taigh* and innovatory *tigh* in Ulster (cf. Ahlqvist 1988, 30) as an explanation for this ‘southern’ form appearing in a manuscript potentially associated with the northern Bangor, the vast gulf of time between the modern Irish dialects and the evidence from MI would make it difficult to justify.

The evidence from additional sources, of contemporary origin but in later transmission, shows this mixture of ‘southern’ forms in northern sources and vice versa: the second recension of *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* (10th-11th century) (Knott 1936, 525) has the innovatory ‘southern’ dative form, *tig*, and is from the Yellow Book of Lecan, which is associated with Sligo (cf. Ó Concheanainn 1974;) the *Liber hymnorum* (7th-8th century) (Thes. ii 336.1) has a dative *taig* and has northern associations (Bernard and Atkinson 1898, i, xv;) the text, ‘The Monastery of Tallaght’ (c. <840) (Gwynn and Purton 1911-1912, 162.29) additionally shows a dative *tich*. A later text, definitively Middle Irish, *Saltair na Rainn* (c. 988) (cf. Mac Eoin 1961) contains both a dative *tig* (SR 2930) and a dative *taig* (SR 3517.)30 The exact provenance of the manuscript in which it is contained, Rawlinson B 502 has been contested (cf. C. Bretnach 2003, 2005, 16-22; Ó Riain 2008,) owing to the large amount of material concerning Leinster, it was likely produced there (Meyer 1909, iv.)

This would appear to corroborate the idea that the dative *tig* was a ‘southern’ innovation, as the competing forms in *Saltair na Rainn* (c. 988) can be attributed to copying and are not metrically confirmed; the expected *taig* is the historical spelling,

---

30 Neither of these forms can be confirmed by metrics: *tig* is not in rhyme, and while *taig* is superficially in a rhyme with *somennaig*, by the Middle Irish period the ‘weakening of unstressed vowel variation’ resulted in rhymes between forms with internal vowels after differently coloured consonants (Murphy 1961, 31-32 n.3) such as *istech:teglach* (SR 6130) and *deis:Parduis* (SR 7782) that Murphy describes as ‘very weak rimes.’
while *tig* is an innovation on the part of the scribe that better reflects his speech. Difficulty arises, however, when the genitive *in taiga* from *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* 10th-11th century (Knott 1936, l. 370) is considered, as the text contains both the innovatory dative – attributed to the south – and the innovatory genitive – attributed to the north. The solution is nevertheless fairly simple: while the recension contained in the YBL, the one that forms the basis of Knott’s edition (Knott 1936, xiii; O’Connor 2013, 29,) is believed to have been based on an original Leinster tradition (cf. Knott 1936, x-xi; Charles-Edwards 1999, 40-43; O’Connor 2013, 318) it has been demonstrated that the text itself is a compilation of three different sources (Thurneysen 1921, 625-626; West 1999, 434-435; O’Connor 2013, 38-39.) The result of this compilation is an admixture of Old and Middle Irish features, contradictory passages, doubled passages and inconsistent details (cf. O’Connor 2013, 37-50.) Indeed, Thurneysen (1921, 627; cf. Knott 1936, vi,) argued that the presence of Ulster characters in the text were not original and had been inserted by the compiler. It is not unreasonable to theorise, then, that the presence of both the ‘southern’ form and ‘northern’ form may also be the result of the composite nature of this text: just as Old and Middle Irish forms were mixed within the text, so too were markers of dialect.

Although unable to be stated definitively, owing to the previously mentioned obstacles of the scribal tradition and the inability to fix a manuscript in a particular region, the evidence of Old Irish would appear to concord with the Modern Irish diatopic variation, and the proposition that the innovatory forms in the paradigmatic alternation within the lexeme *teg* were the result of competing, diatopic traditions.

Even if the geographic origins of the two forms were not to be accepted, the fact that MI (twice *tig*) and Sg (once *taiga*) contain diverging innovatory traditions demonstrates there was a certain level of variation existing within the language during the Old Irish period, with the caveat that in this particular instance the body of evidence is fairly minor. For the purposes of the present study, the attestations in Wb adhere to the phonologically expected paradigm and thus are inconclusive, and while the occurrences in MI and Sg would appear to be representative of differing dialects that eventually may have produced the variation in the modern Gaelic languages, at the very least they evidence competing innovations.
2.3 ní and nícón

The negative particle nícón has additionally been posited as evidence of diatopic variation (Wagner 1986, 1,) as it exists in contrast to the more common form ní, and corresponds to the modern Scottish Gaelic negative cha, which also occurs in Ulster (Ahlqvist 1988, 27).

Thurneysen (GOI §861) explains this construction as a form of the negative particle and the conjunction31 co n- meaning ‘(it is) not that’, and therefore a counterpart to ní nad. He acknowledges, however, that the lenition following nícón calls this theory into question and suggests the lenition arose through analogy to ní-ro. The derivation from ní with co n- is taken as an absolute by Wagner (1967, 304), with which Greene disagrees. Greene’s (1969, 90) initial objection is the lack of nasalisation, which would be expected after conjunction co and only occurs once in the glosses: nícón dét MI53a17, albeit this is not a regular nasalisation: if the nasalisation is demonstrated by the representation of the t- as -d-, there is no need for the -n of nícón – indeed, there would not normally be an -n nasalising a -t-(see section 2.10.5 for further discussion of this particular form.)

Greene’s second objection is that nícón is only followed by an infixed pronoun thrice in the glosses and only ever in MI, one attestation of which (nícos fúar-sa MI57d03) shows a Class A infixed pronoun, which is otherwise not attested with co n- in the glosses. Nícón is, however, followed by an infixed pronoun in other sources outside of the glosses, primarily Middle Irish sources such as nochomtha in Saltair na Rainn (SR 2088) and nuchumtha in the Book of Leinster recension of Táin Bó Cúailnge (TBC-LL 801.) There are two instances in Táin Bó Froích, however, which has been dated to the eighth century (Meid 1967b, xxv)32 that would indicate that this usage with the infixed pronoun is not a later development: nícos tánic riam 7 nícos ticfa (TBF §4.43-4.44) The fact that the forms in Táin Bó Froích are the same type, (a third-plural Class A) as the nícos-fúar-sa found in MI57d03 provides further support to Greene’s objection. There are two additional infixed pronouns with nícón in MI: ní condrobae som MI41a05; ní condabia MI69a08 (cf. GOI §420) and a further nícos-tair in the poem Aithbe dam bés mora or Caillech Bérri (Murphy 1956, 80, §30.)

31 Breatnach has argued that this is the preposition and not the conjunction, as it has been historically understood, based on the evidence of the rare parallel structure of ní for (Breatnach 2017, 232.)
32 Meid has a subsequent edition (Meid 2015) however, he neglects to provide any dating for the text, and only minimal linguistic discussion (Kobel 2017, 490.) The text is undoubtedly Old Irish (cf. Meid 1967a, 39-41; Kobel 2017, 490) but this particular dating to the eighth century is not mentioned specifically in the updated edition, although Meid (2015, 9, 30) does identify it as Old Irish.
Greene (1969, 90-92) further objects to Thurneysen and Wagner understanding Old Irish’s *co n-* as an explicative conjunction synonymous to its Middle and Modern Irish continuation *co n-, go n-*, which take on a similar function to Old Irish’s nasalising relative clause. He continues to express that explicative *co n-* is not well-attested enough to make its function as the origin of *ní con* plausible and instead suggests connective *co* is a more probable alternative (92):

‘The preterite *co n-accae; ní accae* had a lexically meaningless preverb, and there existed beside it in the language a large number of perfects such as *ro gab; níro gab* where the preverb *ro* of the positive was attached to the negative particle *ní*. The form *nïro gab* is itself an innovation (“movable *ro*” see Thurneysen Gramm. § 528) and *nïro* is followed by lenition. On this pattern it is easy to see how *co n-accae* and *co cúalae* evolved new negative forms, *nïcon accae* and *nïco cúalae*, and this highly distinctive negative particle then spread to other verbs. The form *nïcon* would have been ambiguous as to mutation, but naturally took the lenition associated with *nïro*; the other form *nïco n-* survived long enough to account for such sporadic cases of nasalization as *nïcon dét*.’

Greene continues to state that *nocha* became the standard form of ‘Eastern Gaelic’ and vanished in areas of Ireland without predominant Scottish influence. While attractive, the basis of Greene’s theory is too narrow to satisfactorily account for why a new negative particle would spread beyond such limited constraints: indeed, the proposed origin only concerns two fairly common verbs. It would also necessitate arguing that the proposed semantic difference (see further below) between *ní* and *nïcon* was subsequently supplied, possibly as a means of validating said spread. The spread of a second would simply be redundant, unless the two were distinctive in function or meaning. It would instead be more logical to posit a semantic or functional difference from the outset, with a plausible candidate having been put forward by Breatnach (2017) who theorised that a parallel form be found in the construction *nité for*, the negative particle followed by the preposition with a possible meaning of ‘neither, also…not, in addition….not.’

A further proposition has been put forward by Lambert (2014, 106) who does not agree with either Greene or Wagner and instead posits that *con-* be understood as a perfective particle, as seen in a few perfective preterites such as *ad-condairc*. He argues (2014, 126-128) that this perfective particle was likely identical to the preposition *köm*

---

33 Although not explicitly stated by Greene, he is likely using Jackson’s (1951) designation of ‘Eastern Gaelic’ to mean Ulster Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Manx.
‘with,’ and while originally identical to the *kon as discussed by Greene and Wagner, holds a semantically different meaning.

Although the divergence between nícon and ní would provide a possible link to modern dialectal variation, the evidence within the collections of the glosses is not conclusive. The below collection distinguishes between occurrences of ní as the negative of a copula, and ní as the negative particle, as nícon never appears with the copula in the Old Irish glosses (cf. GOI §186.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ní ‘not’</th>
<th>nícon ‘not’</th>
<th>ní ‘is not’</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the argument for nícon being a marker of dialect is a convincing one, in three corpora of the glosses at least, it is both a relatively uncommon form and one that is used equally infrequently across all three, as evidenced by the chart above. Of the total occurrences of ‘not’ across the three corpora, nícon is only utilised 4% of the time in Wb, 13% of the time in Ml and 3% of the time in Sg.

Although by number of forms alone this does not appear to point to a diatopic variant against a standard ní, nor a diachronic one, as the distribution within the corpora (ie. the highest number of forms in Ml, the least in Sg and Wb in the middle) concord with their individual sizes, the significantly higher percentage of usage in Ml may point to an individual preference: as neither the oldest nor youngest corpus, any distinctive preference in Ml cannot be attributed to diachronic change, and other factors must be considered.

This relative infrequency of use, and indeed, the existence of two concurrent negative particles can be accounted for based on Lambert’s theory of semantic difference: Lambert (2014, 123) posits that in cases where nícon is used before the future, the present subjunctive, or the perfective past, that this negation was understood to be long-lasting, perhaps for eternity, whereas with the preterite it was limited to a certain length of time.34

34 The examples cited by Lambert for this fixed period of negation are all from Gwynn and Purton (1911.)
With regards to usage with the present tense, Lambert (2014, 124-125) remarks that ‘some’ of them are used to translate a Latin future, and states that ‘from the beginning nícon was not the negation of a punctual event, but a negation inscribed by the length of time, beyond the limits of actuality and present reality.’ If we accept Lambert’s suggestion of a semantic difference, then it certainly would explain the less frequent usage of the particle nícon across the collections of glosses and their relatively similar usage.

His argument for a durative negation, one that has a specific amount of time attached to it (whether that be everlasting, or existing for specific period of time,) certainly seems to be evidenced by the examples from both Wb and MI, with occurrences such as arnaconroib dethiden forneuch act told dê dodénum Wb1511 ‘that no care be on anyone save to do God’s will’ and ní con bia cumscurud foropianad bithusuthin innani ingrennat innafirianu MI26d12 ‘there will be no change in the everlasting punishment of those that persecute the righteous.’

Lambert’s assessment does not include the examples from Sg, though these fit as well. The best indication of this durative usage comes from the gloss in which there are two attestations: i. ní conétada dírsuidigud rainn saindilis no bed indiruidigud semper nisi participium. l niconfil nach raímn nád techtad cetnidetaid nisi participium. Sg188a04 ‘derivation did not obtain (any) peculiar part (of speech), to be always in derivation, except the participle, etc. Or there is no part of speech that has not a primitive-origin, except the participle.’

The first example in nícon-étada, nícon with either the preterite or perfect third singular of ad-cota, shows the specific, limited length of time noted by Lambert, and the second example in niconfil, has nícon followed by the present indicative of the substantive verb, which Lambert notes can be used with a future meaning (cf. Ó Buachalla 1977, 107-125.) Even without this future meaning, the negation extends ‘beyond the limits of actuality and present reality’ (Lambert 2014, 125.)

A second gloss shows nícon used with a future tense and again demonstrates a negation with a specific duration of time: air ni conbiasom manibé aní huanaithgnintar

---

35 ad-cota is a telic verb (cf. EIV 118) and resists augmentation in Old Irish as a compound of -tá, and already containing the ‘quasi-augment’ of -cum- (cf. EIV 145, 189) with the result that this form can be either perfect or preterite. Either way, in the context of this discussion the outcome is the same, as telic verbs inherently carry a sense of ‘completion’ (EIV 113,) and therefore the sense of a specific point in time. Whether understood as perfect or preterite, the outcome here is the same and suits Lambert’s theory of semantic difference.
‘for it will not exist unless there exists that from which it is recognised and named.’ The third and final gloss, and fourth attestation of nícon in Sg, also shows this extended negation, without an end: ní contalla obbad fair itir Sg90a02 ‘it does not admit of refusal at all.’

Overall, there does not appear to be any particular preference for or distinction within the usage of ní and nícon between the three corpora of glosses, with all three utilising the form in equally limited contexts. This existence of dual negative particles has been neatly shown by Lambert to be the result of a semantic difference, thus eliminating it as a candidate as a diatopic variation, as its existence is not (yet) the result of diverging dialects, but rather a divergent meanings and use.

2.4 spirit and spiurt

In the Appendix to his article on a chronological study of Latin loanwords, McManus (1983, 70-71) discusses the development of ‘the bewildering variety of forms’ that the Irish borrowing of Latin spiritus ‘spirit’ takes. Ml and Turin (c. 700) (Thes. I 713-714) use the form spiurt gen.sg. spiurto while Wb. has nom.sg. spirut gen.sg. spirito/spirto, with one instance of spiruto, and there is a lack of any attestation within Sg.

McManus (1983, 71) discusses how the form spirut was an attempt by analogy to the pattern of dorus/doirseo ‘door’ to regularise the irregular gen.sg spi(u)rtó of the original borrowing from Latin *spiritus, spi(u)rt: as an explanation for the nominative spirut, McManus proposes that spi(u)rt did not develop a regular gen.sg *sperto, resulting in a faulty paradigm, thus beginning a process of reconstruction. Part of the basis of his argument is the fact that Wb’s nominal form runs contrary to its adjectival forms: with the exceptions of spiritáldib Wb27a29 and spiritide Wb22a28, the adjectival forms contain the monosyllabic form spi(u)rt (cf. spirdáldi Wb11a19; spírtáide Wb15b2,) pointing to its existence at the time of writing (McManus 1983, 71.) The monosyllabic variant likewise appears in the genitive singular eight times (cf. spirto Wb5d18, Wb12a11) while the genitive singular inspiruto Wb9c30 appears once, and spirito (cf. Wb12d21, Wb14c42) occurs twelve times.

McManus concludes by stating that he believes Ml and Tur preserve the older forms: the hypothetical Vulgar Latin *spiritus < spíritus would have become *spirit or potentially *spiruut in Old Irish, but certainly not spirut. This is in contrast to the presence of the more innovative forms in Wb, which is potential evidence of a regional delay in
the acceptance of *spirut/spiruto* in becoming the standard, which would indicate a
diatopic variation. Outside of MI and Tur, there does not appear to be any attestations of
the *spiurt* form, and Sg has no attestation of the word in any form.

As above, with the lexeme *tech*, though there be minimal attestation of the form, the
preservation of the proposed earlier form in MI/Tur marks an interesting variance from
the older Wb, which contains the innovatory form.

2.5 The superlative *-imem*

Thurneysen theorised that the doubled superlative *-imem* might be a potential marker
of dialect, as the feature appears exclusively in MI,36 with the text showing no particular
preference for either the expected single or the doubled form with only slightly more
instances of the standard form. MI contains 16 examples of the expected superlative
ending, 13 clear cases with the unique doubling in addition to three further cases to be
discussed below. The lexeme *úasal* ‘high’ is the only one to show both doubled and
singular forms clearly: *huaislimem* MI28d14 and *ata huaislem* MI116a11. There is also
dilgedchimem MI131a03 ‘most forgiving,’ and a possibly doubled *dilchimem* [leg:
dilgedchimem] MI93a17.

Ó Muircheartaigh’s comprehensive discussion provides a different count for the
number of forms showing the expected -*e/am* ending, 13 as opposed to the 16 collected
here. Reviewing his collection reveals that the glosses ised asmaamsrec latuisstistidi [leg.
tuistidi] 7 choimdeda primiti aclainde 7 primiti atoruMI99b05 ‘it is that that parents
and masters most love: the first-fruits of their children and the first-fruits of their fruits’
and *huare it hé ata huáslem ánd* MI116a11 ‘because it is they that are most exalted there’
have not been included in his table (Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 132-133.) There are
additionally two glosses with two instances each, MI156b22 and MI92c05: *honaib*
toisechaib i. huaneuch as aircendam 7 as errindem cecha soimige MI56b22 ‘from the
leading things, i.e. from what is first and highest of ever prosperity;’ *amal asned as moam*
serc linnai adchotadsam triar saithar saindiles sic ised as moam serc ladia maicc israhél
frissarusaithraigtestor oc a tuididen di cech immiuMI92c05 ‘as that which we have
obtained through our own labour is that which we have most love for, so God has most
love for the Children of Israel, for whom He had laboured in leading them from every

36 There is an additional attestation found within the *Poems of Blathmac* (cf. Carney 1964, 120; Stifter
2015, 84 n.120; Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 137-138) but this was unknown to Thurneysen and thus was not
mentioned in his discussion of the forms.
trouble.’ It is possible that one of the two occurrences in MI155b22 was overlooked, or, in a more likely case, as both of the cases in MI92c05 are of moam that they were counted together. If so, while a valid system of counting independent examples, it is not indicated in the article.

Albeit a minimal distinction, it is an important one nonetheless, as instead of appearing to have a preference for the doubled superlative, MI instead has either an equivalent number – if the contentious three forms to be discussed below are included – or shows a minor preference for the standard form.

The absence of this feature from anywhere else in the extant Old Irish corpus, or any connection between it and the modern language, make understanding it as a feature of dialect somewhat problematic. While its absence from other sources does not negate its existence, without corroborating evidence from other sources it would be difficult to suggest it as a feature more widespread than MI alone. Though it is not impossible that MI (and Blathmac included) represents a dialect in and of itself, it would be far more likely to consider this doubled superlative ending a feature of a particular register or scribal school, as it does not appear to be a function of spoken language, but rather an exclusively written feature.

Indeed, it could be suggested that this is a mere code-switching slip on the part of our scribe. The Latin superlative is comprised of the adjective + issimus -a -um with an affective gemination of s from *-isymo/ā-. The majority of endings in -er show a phonologically regular superlative of -errimo, via syncope and assimilation of *rs to *rr from *-(e)r-isymo, such as celer ‘swift’ celerimum <*kelerisomo-. Six adjectives with superlatives ending in -illimus -a -um also continue *-isymo- with syncope and assimilation eg. facilis ‘easy’ facillimus <*fakilsomo- <*fakilsamo- (cf. Greenough & Allen 1903, 55; Weiss 2009, 348, 349.)

With this in mind, the extraneous -im of the doubled superlative could be seen as a subconscious, or mostly subconscious, Latinism on the part of the fluently bilingual scribe, although this in itself is an unsatisfactory proposition, as the near equivalent rate of occurrence of the two forms would indicate an intentional, conscious practice performed by scribes with ‘a high degree of metalinguistic awareness’ (Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 140.) An intentional inclusion of the similar -im- would thus be far more likely than suggesting a repeated error. Therefore, the theory put forward by Ó Muircheartaigh
(2018) that this is an intentional modelling on the accusative superlative endings of Latin would seem the most likely.

One of the three contentious -imem forms is that of indfoircimi [emended to indfoircimim by Ascoli, see Thes. i, 204, n. b] Ml61b17. Binchy (1950) has argued that as the form foircimi appears in the manuscript, it has been unnecessarily emended by editors of the Thesaurus, as not only is forgu a noun, and not an adjective, but the superlative of forgu is superfluous as forgu means ‘choice,’ or ‘pick’ and is thus in essence already used like the superlative of maith. He indicates that perhaps this form was modelled on the Latin optimum and optimi (which in Ml61b17, foircimi is glossing.) Ó Muircheartaigh (2018, 134) agrees with the idea and considers it to be justified. This theory certainly seems reasonable, and thus this occurrence of the doubled superlative ending -imem can be understood as editorial interference.

Thurneysen (GOI §371) had attributed two of the contentious forms that appear to contain a ‘doubled’ superlative saibibem Ml3a05 ‘most crooked’ and foiRsingigem [leg: foiRsingem according to Thes. i., 229] Ml67d04 ‘most ample’ as scribal error, but offers no further explanation. With regards to saibibem, the potential error here could stem from the confusion between a lenited b and lenited m, albeit an unusual one. Alternatively, Ó Muircheartaigh (2018, 135) has astutely suggested that saibibem be a morphemic mismatch on the part of the scribe, an attempt to correlate the -bVbVm of saibibem to the -sVsVmi of peruersisimi that it glosses with the reduplication of the final stem consonant. The final debatable occurrence forsingigem, on the other hand, which glosses latissimam cannot have undergone the same process, and thus there is no other suitable explanation than the original one: that of scribal error. This would appear to be an eye-slip, placing a -g- in place of the -m-, as this is the simplest explanation: a scribe accidentally writing forsingigem in place of forsingimem necessitates the replacement of -m- with -g-, whereas the corrected reading from the Thesaurus, forsingem, would require the scribe to have inserted a mistaken -ig-.

All except one of the glosses that contain the expected superlative form are comprised of, at minimum, a few words, often a sentence, with some being significantly more substantial (cf. Ml55c01). The gloss dilgudchem Ml131a03 is the only one to consist of a single word, and it glosses indulgentissima, another superlative.

Of the forms with the doubled superlative ending, there are nine occurrences that both comprise the majority, or entirety, of the gloss and are directly glossing a Latin
superlative: *huaislimem* M128d14, *dirgimem* M149d05 ‘most straight,’ *cossacarthimem* M150c16, *foirsingigen* [leg: *foirsingem*] M167d04 ‘broadest,’ *donaib sommaimem* M168d06 ‘to the richest,’ *duthuichsimen i. duaid* M171b21 ‘Your most acceptable, i.e. David’ *a dilchimem* [leg: *dilgedchimem*] M193a17 ‘Oh most forgiving,’ *brithem firianamam* M194b06 ‘a most righteous judge,’ *firthacuirsimem* M1106b15 ‘most objected,’ *sechis sonairtimem* M1116a07 ‘that is, strongest.’ The remainder of the attestations occur within longer glosses. The only exception to this is that of *cuimrimem* M162b11 ‘shortest,’ which does not gloss (either directly or indirectly) a Latin superlative but *breuiculi* ‘very short’, though paralleled by a formal superlative in *atque pulcherrimi* ‘and most beautiful,’ and comprises the entire gloss.

The purpose behind utilising this Latinate formation was potentially pedagogical: an artificial Old Irish form used to illustrate the specific Latin formation. This is not an unreasonable assertion, as glossing is intended to elucidate concepts and aid the reader, and outside of glossing there is evidence of Old Irish having been used as a means to illuminate Latin material. The Old Irish portions of the Cambrai Homily can be viewed as a method of explicating the Latin portions to an audience that did not have a fluent grasp of the Classical language (Ó Néill 1981, 144.) This explanation, in this particular instance, does not appear to be entirely tenable: not every attestation of the *-imem* ending appears glossing a Latin superlative following the *-VmVm* pattern, such as *dirgimem* M149d05 glossing *equissima*; *sonairtimem* M1116a07 glossing *durissima* and, of course, the *cuimrimem* M162b11 that does not gloss a Latin superlative at all: *breuiculi*, which is, however paired with superlative *pulcherrimi*. If it were intended as a pedagogical teaching tool, it would not account for the usage beyond illustrating the formation of the intended Latin superlatives (Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 140-141.)

Another potential motivation is that of Isidorian etymology, which is unlike modern etymologies in that it is more philosophical in function and form (Baumgarten 1983, 225.) Its typical appearance within Old Irish tends to resolve multi-syllabic words into separate words, with a variety of potential etymologies, all considered equivalently correct (cf. Russell 2008, 7; Breatnach 2016a, 123-124) with the intention of highlighting points of similarity between Irish and other languages (cf. Section 2.12.) Ó Muircheartaigh (2018, 141) acknowledges that the constrained context of these doubled superlatives casts doubt upon this theory, and indeed, considering that certain attestations do not gloss a similarly structured Latin superlative, positing that these forms were the product of either
pedagogical practice or Isidorian-style etymology both with the intention to highlight similarities between Old Irish and Latin, is troublesome. The ‘spread’ of the doubled superlative outside of contexts in which it would make sense is still not fully explained. While there is undoubtedly an intentional Latin influence here, which Ó Muircheartaigh has astutely observed, the explanation of motivations is not entirely satisfactory.

Ó Muircheartaigh (2018, 136) has additionally noted that many of the doubled superlatives are used attributively, such as Ml3a05, Ml73a09 and Ml94b06, which is in contrast to their normal usage in Old Irish (cf. GOI §232-232, §367.) This is a clear Latinism that is used only with the doubled superlative, which had previously been observed by Carney (1964, 120 n. 139) with regards to the only occurrence of this doubled superlative ending found outside of MI, appearing in verse 35 of the poems of Blathmac (8th century,) which is equally substantivised: ba fin foircimem iar sin ‘it became the wine that was best’ (Carney 1964, §35.) Carney himself had emended this ending from the manuscript foircemh in order to suit the metre, and as forcimem is otherwise attested (Ml73a09, Ml73a10) it seems a rational emendation. On the basis of this unique morphological form and the unusual attributive usage, Ó Muircheartaigh (2018, 137-138) would see this as evidence of a shared scholastic background between the scribes of MI and Blathmac, bolstered by the associations of Blathmac with south-east Ulster (Carney 1964, xiii-xv,) and MI’s own association with the monastery of Bangor, located in east Ulster (see Section 1.4.2.)

This conclusion of intentional Latin influence would make a purely diatopic argument for the doubled superlative of MI tenuous at best, as there is no indication that this feature was present in the spoken language, and that this was not purely orthographic imitation of the Latin forms. While Bisagni and Warntjes (2007, 29) would view this type of code-switching from Latin to Old Irish, especially in the didactic contexts discussed above, as having occurred ‘more frequently’ in the spoken language and thus influenced the writing, this is more likely to be referring to the type of translation or elucidation demonstrated by other glosses37 and not by this visual copying of the Latin grammatical formations.

37 Glosses such as indaas MI23c22 ‘than’ glossing Latin quam are the ‘translation’ type of gloss acknowledged here while .i. is ed as doig liun is indisiu bid exaggeranter dauintad anemfasses asbeir som .i. dubeir som duilumugad aasindis en as nulliu oldaas ant adfet som amal dunadadbat som sis on MI89d06 ‘it is this that we deem probable here: that it would be exaggerenter that would render the emphasis that he uses, i.e. to exaggerate his declaration he puts what is more than the thing that he speaks of, as he shows it below’ glossing emfasses is commenting on, and elucidating further the Latin text.
Additionally, while there are no occurrences of the -*imem* suffix in Wb or Sg, the primary context in which this ending occurs – that is, as the entirety of the gloss translating a Latin superlative – needs to be examined in order to determine whether or not Wb or Sg had any cause to use the -*imem* ending. There are eight overall superlatives in Wb and only five in Sg. In Sg, there is only one attestation of a superlative in which it is the entirety of the gloss and that is *tóisigem* Sg42a03 ‘first, foremost,’ glossing the Latin *primus*, a superlative form of an absolute preposition. It does not, however, follow the pattern of -*VmVm* that would have necessitated the explication using -*imem*, but as discussed above, neither did all of the occurrences in Ml.

There is an additional attestation of a single-word superlative glossing *primus* in Wb: *innáam* Wb1c20 ‘the greatest’ or ‘most greatly’ glossing *Iudei primum*. This gloss in and of itself is a mirror-image of the Latin adverb *primum* by using an adverbial formation with *in* (cf. Uhlich 2020, 203-204.) There is additionally a single-word gloss containing a superlative that glosses a Latin superlative and that is *oam* Wb13b04 ‘youngest,’ glossing *ego enim sum minimum apostolorum* ‘For I am the least of the apostles,’ specifically *minimum*, the irregular superlative of *parvus*.

The evidence is scanty; there are a minimal number of superlatives within both Wb and Sg to begin with, and there are only three good attestations of a single-word gloss illuminating a Latin superlative, and those superlative does not follow the -*VmVm* pattern that inspired the doubled superlative ending. It would seem that there were simply no contexts in which Wb or Sg had the opportunity to demonstrate their use of this form – should it have existed. At the same time, Blathmac was able to use this ending, if Carney’s emendation is taken to be correct, without a corresponding Latin superlative but in a Latinate construction, although he was operating under the constraints of metre, and this may have forced his hand. There are equally attestations of the doubled superlative ending within Ml that are not a single-word gloss translating a Latin superlative formed with the corresponding ending, and thus it would seem that this context was not exclusive – in which case Wb and Sg had opportunity to demonstrate their usage of the form.

It would appear that the possibility of -*imem* being indicative of a diatopic variation is not viable, as it is a stylistic variant based on the Latin superlative formation. This does not eliminate the potential of a regional variation borne out by a particular school of thought or educational practice, and without attestation in either Wb or Sg this could be argued to be the case. The doubled superlative ending here can tentatively be posited as
evidence of different stylistic or scholastic norms within MI, especially owing to the lack of this feature outside of the manuscript, but cannot be conclusively stated as such.

Phonological

2.6 The colour following ũ

With regards to the colour of the consonant following ũ, Thurneysen (GOI §166bn.) states:

‘After ũ, however, there are other examples where the change of quality is difficult to explain by analogy; eg. cuicce ‘to her’ Wb. beside cucae Sg. (§433); gen sg. suibi\(^38\) Ml. 47d2 beside nom. sg. subae ‘jubilation’, dat. subu; cluiche ‘play’ (cluichech ‘playing’ Sg., cluichigidir ‘plays’ Ml.) Possibly diatopic differences played some part here.’

This paragraph (GOI §166) is discussing the quality of single consonants, including those originally geminated. He notes that labials (b, p, f, m as well as mb) and the gutterals (g, c, ch as well as ng) in syllabic anlaut when preceded by á, ē, ũ and also ūa (< ō) are not palatalised. He continues that at the beginning of an unstressed syllable ending in a non-palatal consonant, single (and formerly geminated) consonants are not palatalised before original palatal vowels unless preceded by a palatal vowel or originally followed by j.

Greene (1973, 127) has noted that this does not contradict Thurneysen’s earlier (GOI §157) statement that ‘every consonant was conditioned by the following vowel, being palatal before i and e, neutral before a and o and u-quality before u’ if depalatalisation is assumed to have taken place in the former cases. Greene (1973, 128, 135) continues to argue that as opposed to a period of depalatalisation, palatalisation gradually spread beyond the conditions in which it originally occurred. He acknowledges that a ‘rising tide’ of depalatalisation (GOI §166(b)n.) is certainly possible, but that a period of depalatalisation followed by a spread of palatalisation is unlikely, and that palatalisation more plausibly began in particular conditions and then expanded.

If this is understood to be the case, then the seeming variability of the colour of consonant following ũ would be hardly diatopic, but diachronic, unless a regional delay in adopting palatalisation could be identified. Before drawing conclusions, it is worth reviewing the process of palatalisation.

\(^{38}\) Bergin (1907, 75) suggested that suibi Ml47d02 be considered scribal error, as a palatal vowel does not affect b after o or u.
The first palatalisation affected single consonants (as well as mb, nd and ng) either between two palatal vowels, or between any short vowel, and *ī/ī, except *a (Ia) as well as all consonants and consonant groups before *ī (Ib). Following *o and *u there was no palatalisation of guttural or labial consonants, after *a/*o there was no palatalisation before *ē̆ and after ā/ō there was no palatalisation (cf. rádaid ‘says’ < *Rāδiθ’i < Rāδi:θ’i; McCone 1996, 117,) with the exception of non-guttural, non-labial consonants followed by *i/i (cf. túaithe < *tōθ’i̯āh and ógæ *ōγi̯a; McCone 1997a, 304-305.) The second palatalisation (II,) of an initial consonant or group of consonants preceding a stressed *e/ē or *i/i, and the third palatalisation (III) occurred after apocope and affected all single consonants and consonant groups excepting cht followed by a palatal schwa (from the falling together of e, i and u, if followed by a palatalised consonant (cf. Greene, 1973 134) in second (and fourth) syllables that were subsequently lost by syncope (cf. McCone 1996, 116-119.)

To continue with Greene’s (1973, 135-136) theory of advancing palatalisation, he discusses the verb *tugaithir, and how it must have had a neutral -g- when preceding a vowel, as evidenced by the corresponding noun tugae ‘act of covering,’ but was palatalised when it preceded a consonant after syncope, such as in the passive tuigthir. In Classical Old Irish, the stem tuig- has been generalised, a process that which also explains the doublet tugaeltuige, and the similar lugaelluige ‘swearing.’ He likewise suggests the Middle Irish forms gen. sg. of long, luinge ‘ship’ as compared to Old Irish lungae as evidence for this spread of palatalisation.

This theory, of the rise of innovatory palatalisation coalesces nicely with McCones’s proposed conservative written register. The existence of doublets such as tugaeltuige could be seen as evidence of the conservative register of written Old Irish maintaining non-palatalised forms, with the occasional scribal slip into a spoken palatalised form.

Outside of the examples identified by Thurneysen, there does not appear to be any real evidence of this variation elsewhere in the glosses, as his sample identifies nearly all the forms found across all three collections of glosses, with the exception of chucae Sg191a02. Considering that there does not appear to be any other trace of this possible variation within the three corpora of glosses, it felt prudent to examine what consonant colour was expected in the examples identified by Thurneysen.

Macbain (1911, 351) in his dictionary of the Gaelic language, under the entry for modern subhach, cites an origin of Old Irish sube and an origin of ‘*so-bv-io’ from the
root *bu* ‘be.’ Uhlich (1989, 131-132,) in a wider discussion on ogham intervocalic -v-, identified essentially the same origin of *su-by-ijo* with the root *bhy* ‘to be’ and the prefix *su*- ‘good.’ The proposed etymology seems reasonable enough, although with the round vowel, the palatalisation of the labial is still unexpected. But, Thurneysen’s example of *suibi* MI42d02 is the only palatal attestation in the three corpora of glosses, and, indeed, there is only a single other palatal attestation noted in DIL, found in the YBL version of the Táin Bó Cúailnge: *ba suib sligi* (Strachan and O'Keeffe 1912, l. 1499) ‘it would be a joyful expedition’ which is otherwise attested as *bá suba sliged* in Lebor na hUidre (LU 5966;) *(Ba) shubh slighe* in the O’Curry manuscript (Ó Fiannachta 1966, l. 800;) and *suba sliged* in the LL version (TBC-LL 1829.) C. O’Rahilly (1976, 173) translates this as ‘a joyful expedition,’ and DIL posits this is perhaps a compound form, while Ó Concheanainn (1983, 180) proposes that the redactor did not understand the expression. With only two attestations of the palatal form and no alternative etymology that would explain the palatal labial, perhaps Bergin’s (1907, 75) point that *suibi* be understood as scribal error, by inserting the wrong glide while copying, is the most plausible.

There is little known etymological information for *cluiche*. Macbain (1911, 90) and LEIA (C-127) provide an origin of *klokjo [klokiyo]* but again, this does not account for the palatal colouring as the expected, undoubtedly neutral *clochae* is never once attested across the Old Irish corpus. There is, however, always the possibility of *k"likiyo* as the preform (Schumacher 2004, 436.) While the reduction of the labial element *k"* and *g"* to *k* and *g* respectively took place in the sixth century, before that happened *i* and *a* were rounded to *u* and *o* respectively, albeit at different times, after either *k"* or *g"* eg. *coire > k"aryos; cruth > k"ritus*. Based on evidence such as *k"rena-* yielding *crenaid* and not *k"rina* yielding *crunaid*, this rounding must be dated after lowering. In which case, as it did not contain an original *-u-*, *cluiche* would be regularly palatal, as it contained a single intervocalic consonant between two palatal vowels: *-k-.*

With regards to the final example provided by Thurneysen, *cuicce*, the third singular feminine prepositional pronoun of the preposition *co*, as a syncopated form, a non-palatal consonant (eg. *cuae*) would indicate that the lost vowel was an *a* or an *o*, whereas the palatal consonant would indicate a lost *e* or *i*. Forms such as *cucae* Sg14b04 and *chucae*

---

39 This slip is relatively common and has been dubbed ‘orthographische Palatalisierung’ by Uhlich (1993, 39f., §30.)
Sg191a01 would appear to support the former, while forms such as *cuicce Wb9d05 would appear to support the latter.

McCone (1993, 173) has argued for an original Proto-Celtic of *kʷun-ke- in which case the syncopated vowel would be -e-, regularly explaining the palatal third singular feminine, though creating an expected third plural *cuicciu. The third plural cuccu, could still be regular, however, particularly when compared with the prepositional pronouns of im *ambi, the third singular feminine impe and the third plural impu, which show regularly different colours.

The origin of impe might be ambi-sijan as per GOI (§451,) however Schrijver (1997, 36-38) has noted that *si(j)an would never have yielded the anticipated (š)e > -e (impe, inte, airre, cuicce) but rather -i. Instead he posits an alternative *sosān > *sohan > *(h)oen > *(h)ēn > *(h)e that, as he states, ‘offers no serious problems’ (Schrijver 1997, 37.) The third plural is from *ambi-so(so)ns (cf. Schrijver 1997, 38-39) and the outcome is undoubtedly neutral, and cuccu beside cuicce could be accounted for similarly, with regularly occurring different colours.

Indeed, in a paradigm such as co, which shows both syncopated and unsyncopated forms, alternation between expected (cuicce) and unexpected (cucae) forms can be attributed to paradigmatic levelling, such as between cuccum and cuicce, and therefore do not necessarily have a morphological basis. This would appear to be the most plausible explanation for cuicce beside cucae and thus, with all of the examples set out by Thurneysen reasonably explained, the ‘alternation’ of colour following ū does not appear to be a valid candidate for dialectal variation.

2.7 The anaphoric pronoun -són/-ón

The anaphoric pronoun -són and its lenited counterpart -ón is neuter, enclitic and unemphatic. Thurneysen’s suggestion (GOI §16, §479) that it may be a marker of dialect is based on the scarce occurrences of -ón within Sg. Russell (2005, 440-441) deems this feature, along with all of Thurneysen’s other suggested diatopic markers, ‘unprovable’ as they do not align with any Modern Irish dialect features. Although the desire to link the Modern Irish dialects to Old Irish variant features is understandable, it is problematic. It leans too heavily on the idea that a lack of later evidence indicates a lack of earlier existence, but also necessitates imagining the dialects of Irish, from Old to Modern, as an unbroken chain. At the outset, this idea seems already improbable, but even analogues
demonstrate the flaw here: the dialects of Ancient Greek, which are well-known and well-attested, have little to no continuity with the Modern Greek dialects, as with the exception of Tsakonian, none of the latter are directly descended from the former (Brixhe 2007, 498.) To consider the existence of historical dialects ‘unprovable’ on the basis of a lack of analogous modern diatopic forms would erase the existence of the Ancient Greek dialects (see Section 1.2.1.)

Ahlqvist (1988, 26) considers the different levels of usage of -són and -ón ‘significant’ and is more accepting of this feature as a marker of dialect, but ultimately agrees with Russell: ‘unfortunately, however, these dialect differences seem to have left no trace in the modern language, so that their geographical implications remain unknown to me.’

All three scholars appear to be relying on an article by Hessen (1914,) where he presents the evidence for Sg (4 -ón to 80 -són) and comments that it is in opposition to Ml specifically. Unfortunately, Hessen does not provide any numbers or examples for Ml, only to state that he has collected nearly 700 forms of both -ón and -són (Hessen 1914, 2) and he neglects to mention Wb entirely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ón</th>
<th>-són</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>5⁴⁰</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following a full collection of the feature from within the corpora (see Figure 5 above) it is clear that all three texts prefer -són, though neither Wb nor Ml prefer it as dramatically as Sg (see Appendix III) with Wb preferring -són 58% of the time, Ml 59% and Sg 94% of the time.

Both forms appear to be used identically, without any obvious indications as to why one would be preferred over the other, as there are no contexts in which one appears and the other does not. It therefore felt necessary to investigate whether or not there were any differences in usage, and there were two particular potential criteria that were explored.

⁴⁰This collection did find an additional occurrence that was not noted by Hessen, but as he does not provide his collection it is unknown which example is the ‘new’ finding.
Thurneysen (GOI §479n) had posited that Wb and Ml ‘generally’ use -ón after an emphasising pronoun containing s-, as a particular context in which it can be found, and thus it was necessary to examine whether this context was a factor in the different rates of usage. Of the 32 examples of -ón in Wb, only 13 are used after an emphasising pronoun containing s-\footnote{Wb3b31, Wb5d37, Wb8a13, Wb8c03, Wb12b05, Wb13a31, Wb13d17, Wb18a19, Wb21d03, Wb22d19, Wb23c22, Wb23d11, Wb27c18} and there is only one example of -són used after an emphasising pronoun containing s-: contaneccarsa són Wb14c140 ‘though I had power to do that.’ Though Ml overall shows more examples of -ón following a pronoun containing s- there are still only 27,\footnote{Ml21b06, Ml31b05, Ml37c02, Ml38b05, Ml38b07, Ml44b31, Ml44c24, Ml44d16, Ml45b02, Ml45b13, Ml53a02, Ml53b15, Ml58b05, Ml68a15, Ml69d02, Ml73d06, Ml89a06, Ml93d08 Ml101a01, Ml103c15, Ml112b08, Ml127a05, Ml127b01, Ml131b11, Ml136c07, Ml138a10, Ml145c08} but unlike Wb there are no examples of -són following a pronoun containing s-. Sg has only two examples of either -ón or -són following an emphasising pronoun containing s- and both are with -són: ni bí sem són Sg203a27 ‘that is not’ isser a aicnedsom són Sg207a05 ‘this is its nature’.

While both Wb & Ml prefer -ón over -són after an emphasising pronoun containing s-, it is certainly not limited to this context and therefore it felt prudent to examine whether or not there might be other contexts in which -ón regularly appears.

As -són is presumably the unlenited form of -ón (cf. GOI §447,) contexts in which it would have been lenited are relevant, as this could have contributed to the presence of either form: if all of the attestations of -són appear in contexts where lenition is not expected, while -ón appears only in contexts in which lenition is expected, then the different rates of usage would point not to particular preference in any corpora but rather would indicate regular representation of a lenited vs unlenited form. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be the case as both are used in contexts in which lenition would not be expected.

In Wb, as example, most occurrences of -ón would not contain lenition. There are 12 occurrences of ed ón, i.e. where ón follows a pronoun which does lenite (cf. Wb9b19, Wb23b31, Wb30d05.) There are no occurrences of ed són. As mentioned, there are 13 attestations following an emphasising pronoun with s- and a further two attestations (Wb8c03, Wb17b07) following the emphasising pronoun -ni. In none of these instances would lenition be expected, as -ón follows either a prepositional pronoun and the emphasising pronoun, or a verb and the emphasising pronoun. As noted by Thurneysen,
(GOI §233.1) lenition does not occur after verbal forms, excepting particular forms of the copula, which are not represented in the collection of -ón. There is additionally de iudeib ón Wb31b15 ‘that is of the Jews,’ in which no mutation is expected following a dative plural and sechis spés ón Wb25c07 ‘that is, spes,’ which is inconclusive on account of -ón following a Latin word.

There are two attestations iarforcitul ón Wb16a14 and isinprecept ón Wb25c25 ‘namely, in the teaching,’ both dative singulars of a neuter o-stem and feminine ā-stem respectively, where lenition would be expected and stand against examples such as in doprecept són Wb18d02 ‘to teach,’ also dative singular, or gráid són Wb28c06 ‘ordination,’ genitive singular neuter o-stem, another instance where lenition is expected. There is additionally firthrebaire són Wb5d29 ‘true prudence,’ a nominative singular feminine ia-stem, where lenition would also be expected but does not appear to be present.

In MI, -ón occurs in many contexts in which no lenition is expected: such as a chomallad ón MI76a15 ‘fulfilling’ where the preceding noun would cause nasalisation as a masculine u-stem in the accusative singular, and hiflaith on MI47b16 ‘into the kingship’ a feminine i-stem accusative singular, where nasalisation is again expected.

There are, of course, leniting contexts such as mét inchumachtai ón MI64d07 ‘the extent of the power,’ a neuter io-stem in the genitive singular and scith ón MI103b04 ‘weary,’ a feminine a-stem adjective in the nominative singular. There are three examples of ed ón in MI (cf. MI90c12 MI102c05, MI115b17) and no instances of ed són.

-són appears in a variety of contexts in which lenition would not be expected such as incomallad són MI14c14 ‘the fulfillment,’ where the preceding noun does not trigger lenition as a nominative singular u-stem masculine. There are also occurrences where lenition should occur pen són MI16a06 and apstalacht són MI37d16 ‘apostleship’ both feminine ā-stem nominative singular; such as natireson MI37d02 ‘the lands’ an s-stem nominative plural; gnimai de són MI112d07 ‘the works of God’ and do doinacht maic són MI128a16 ‘that is, to the Manhood of the Son’ following the genitive singular of a masculine o-stem.

Sg on the other hand, only has one instance of -ón in a lenited context: noch ni ed ón Sg161b08 ‘but it is not.’ This is the only occurrence of ed ón in Sg and the other two are both with -són: issed són Sg11b04 issed són Sg71a16. Of course, -són occurs both in contexts where lenition is expected – dé nemdai són Sg39a22 ‘that is, heavenly gods,’
the nominative plural of a masculine io/ia-stem adjective, and comšreth són Sg47a01 ‘this is a <derivative> formation,’ following a feminine ā-stem in the nominative singular – as well as in contexts where no lenition is expected such as iscosmailsón Sg11a01 ‘this is alike’ where cosmail triggers nasalisation as a nominative singular neuter i-stem adjective.

It thus does not appear that mutation is a viable explanation for the increase usage of -són over -ón; as both appear in contexts in which lenition is both expected and unexpected, it therefore cannot be concluded that -ón was used only in leniting contexts, thus limiting its use.

Instead, it would seem the most logical explanation is that of diachrony: -són is already the preferred form in Wb, with Mi showing a significant increase in its preference and finally with Sg showing comparatively few attestations of -ón altogether. Although -ón is the preferred form following emphasising pronouns containing -s in both Wb and Mi, by the time of Sg this is no longer the case. Perhaps most strikingly, even in the phrase ed ón which is consistent throughout both Wb and Mi, Sg continues to prefer -són, demonstrating that by the time of Sg -són was undoubtedly the preferred form.

### 2.8 ar- er- ir- aur-

Regarding the preverb ar- Thurneysen (GOI §823) notes that it is alternatively ar- air- er- ir- aur- and remarks that ‘there are two main [meaning stressed] forms of this preposition in our sources: air with palatal, and er or (in Wb.) ir with neutral r: both forms lenite. They often interchange in the same word and sometimes in the same text.’ He continues to note that this particular variation is marked only by the differing preferences for er- in Mi and air- in Sg. To be discussed further below, the etymological origins of this form are not straightforward: while air- can naturally be derived from *are, er- and ir- cannot, and they equally cannot derive from *peri as not only do they both contain a then-unexplained neutral consonant, but there would be expected raising in er- (cf. GOI §823n.)

Of the forms, aur- has been demonstrated, in this instance, to be the result of analogical spread from the phonologically regular *ar(e)-uss-. Uhlich (1995, 30-31) has shown that from *are-yo there are two possible phonological outcomes: the first possibility is that the *-y- was preserved after the morpheme boundary until after syncope. This resulted in a vowel following the -r- being retained post-syncope, as in
airichill ‘preparing,’ the dative verbal noun of air-foichlea < * areyoxell. The second possibility is that the *-u-, as it follows an unstressed vowel, was lost at some point predating syncope, as in airde < *are-[y]eidiyo. This would result in the second preverb *yo leaving no trace in Old Irish as both *are-C- and *are-yo-C would result in airC, with lenition of the subsequent consonant.

From *are-uss the expected outcome is aur- > ur- without following lenition: the *u of *uss was lost by syncope, as demonstrated by the form aurtach ‘celebrating,’ the verbal noun of ar-utaing <*ar(e)-uss-doigo-. There is additionally the form aururas ‘haste,’ which retained the -u- post-syncope <*ar(e)-uss-ress. In order for the -u- to be retained, it had to have been subject to compensatory lengthening, which occurred before l, n and r (GOI §849a,) with the result that the ū remained, as long vowels were not regularly victims of syncope. Thus *are-yo- and *are-uss- developed to to air(e/i)Cʰ and aurC- respectively, and were phonologically distinct.

Uhlich continues to demonstrate that the usage of variant aur- gradually expanded beyond its original range. When air- came to stand before a neutral consonant it was assimilated to ar- but was generalised to aur- while retaining the original lenition of the following consonant from a(i)r- as evidenced by the form aurtach.

The presence of aur- in the three corpora of glosses is minimal: both Ml and Sg only use it once respectively, aururas Ml2a03, do-aurchanaim Sg60b12 ‘I foretell’ and there are two examples in Wb within the same gloss: arnach naurlchissed som ‘he might not be hindered’ and aurlam Wb8a04 ‘to be ready.’ There is additionally aurlatu ‘obedient’ within Wb, attested 8 times in total with aur- which would appear to be a historical aur- and the product of *are-uss-. indaurlatath Wb3b17; aurlatu Wb3b14; aurlatu Wb6c27; aurlatid Wb6d16; aurlatu Wb7c15; aurlatu Wb14a31; intaurlatu Wb27c03; aurlatu Wb33c07.

Thurneysen (GOI §823) identifies naurlchissed Wb8a04 and its usage of aur- as ‘not etymologically justified,’ and since this is the past subjective of ar-coat < *are -kom-yed, he is correct in that this is evidence of the analogical spread and not a genuine occurrence of aur-.

The other attestation of aur- in Wb, that aurlam Wb8b04. An origin of <*are-uss-lâmo would have seen compensatory lengthening of the *u preceding an l, as in aururas above, and would not have been a victim of syncope, which would appear to exclude *are-uss as an origin, especially when compared to the analogous adblam < *ad-yo-
lāmo-, which would point to *are-yo-lāmo. Even so, aurlam itself must be analogical, as both *are-yo-lāmo and *are-lāmo would result in *airlem, which could subsequently be remodelled on *lām, resulting in *arlam and thus aurlam (Uhlich 1995, 30-31.) Elsewhere within Wb, the word appears once in a nominative plural as airlama Wb3d12, with twelve remaining attestations of ir- (cf. irlam Wb1b09, irlaim Wb4b21, irlamu Wb11a07.)

The example do-aurchanaim Sg60b12, the first singular present indicative of do-airchain potentially descends from either *to-are-ro-kan- or *to-are-yo-kan- (cf. Pedersen 1913 ii, 480; GOI §823.) Thurneysen theorises that as *yo and *uss were often confused, that there is the potential for the origins of do-aurchanaim to be *to-are-uss-kan, which would result in the aur- not being analogical, but phonologically regular, albeit with analogical lenition.

Having already shown the instances of aur- in the glosses, it has been omitted from the following table (Figure 6 below) illustrating the occurrences of air-/er-/ir. The findings are in line with those of Thurneysen, though the situation it is more interesting than he alludes to in his comments (see Appendix IV.)

Wb and Sg show a marked preference for air-, with only a handful of occurrences of er-, whereas Ml favours er-, though by no means infrequently uses air-. Wb is the only one to show ir-, though not with any particular preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>air-</th>
<th>er-</th>
<th>ir-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criticisms by Russell (2005, 441) and Alqvist (1988, 26) that Thurneysen prematurely labelled these features as diatopic evidence would appear to be, unfounded.45

43 There is additionally a form aslam Wb3d11 that Strachan and Stokes emend to asairlam, presumably on the basis that air- is often written as a compendium, and thus only one ‘character’ to be omitted. But I have opted to exclude it from discussion here, as it cannot be known for certain what was intended.

44 This collection does include instances of air- with suffixed prepositions, as in §823c, Thurneysen notes that there is variation similar to what has been discussed from §823a

45 The argument put forward by both scholars is that, without the ability to fix these proposed diatopic features to a particular dialect in Modern Irish, it cannot be considered a diatopic variant in Old Irish, and therefore his suggestion was dismissed. Ó Maolalaigh (2003) did undertake an examination of this
The distinct preference for *er-* in Ml, its relative infrequency in the other two corpora, and the presence of *ir-* in Wb, while absent in the others, demonstrates a certain level of variation: Ml stands in opposition to the other two corpora in its preference for *er-* with a neutral *r-*, and further variation within the neutral *r-variant found in Wb with its own preference for *ir-*. The colour of the consonant following this preverb has generally been regarded as palatal following *air-* and neutral following *er-* *ir-* *aur-* but this does not appear to entirely be the case. Thurneysen (GOI §823 D n.) has noted the possibility that this preverb may have been merged with another *peri* in an early stage, as both *er-* and *ir-* cannot derive from *are-*, but also cannot directly descend from *peri- as their *r-* is neutral, and there would be raising expected in *er-*. This would certainly account for the fact that a number of forms containing *er-* and *ir-* have a subsequent palatal consonant colour. Across all three corpora of glosses, *air-* is consistently followed by palatal colour, but none of the three corpora of glosses show exclusively neutral colouring following *er-*, and neither does *ir-*. None of these occurrences appear to have been analogically changed to be neutral: they are more regularly occurring with the palatal *air-* and in some cases both the ‘neutral’ and palatal form exist within the same corpora.

Sg, with the least overall number of attestations, shows the least number attestations of *er-* with palatalised *r-* with a paltry four occurrences: *innheret sin* Sg148a06 ‘in that time’ of *airet* (*ari-fot*); *érchintiu* Sg152a04 ‘more definite’ of *airchenta > airchenn; an-*erchre* Sg193b07 ‘wanting, deficient’ *treerchre* Sg197b09 ‘through ellipsis’ of *airchra > verbal noun of *ara-chrin *are-krin. Although not many, as there are only 18 total occurrences of *er-* within Sg, this accounts for 22% of total occurrences of the variant.

Ml contains 89 attestations of *er-* that would appear to be, or would be expected to be, palatal. Unfortunately, spellings without glide vowels are relatively common in Old Irish, and thus examples such as such as: *inerbirt* Ml56a13 ‘enjoying’ of *airbert; ermitiu* Ml22a04 ‘reverence’ of *airmitiu; duerchissecht* Ml63d10 ‘for compassion’ verbal noun of *ar-cessi *are-kess-* are inconclusive, as a glide may simply be missing. There are, however, 29 attestations that would appear to be definitively palatal, some of which

preposition/preverb in the Modern Irish dialects as well as in Scottish Gaelic. His findings do not neatly map to the Old Irish variation noted here: he states that the short reflex of *air-* is usually /u/ in both Scottish Gaelic and Ulster Irish, while it is /o/ in Connacht, with both forms being found in Munster (Ó Maolalaigh 2003, 164) though there are exceptions, such as developments to /el/ and /el/ that he notes in the paper: cf. oiread with /er/ /er’/ /er/ in some Donegal and Connacht dialects (Ó Maolalaigh 2003, 164-165.)
include glide vowels such as \textit{n-eirbirt} MI56a19 of \textit{airbert}; \textit{inna eirithcha} MI101d03 ‘the cups’ of \textit{airedech}; \textit{erriu} MI116d05 a third plural prepositional pronoun; and \textit{araneirstar} MI118d10 ‘because of which it should succeed’ of \textit{ar-neat}. The majority of these examples follow the pattern of \textit{erCeC}, with a final neutral consonant and the spelling of the schwa as -e- indicating it is between a palatal consonant and a neutral consonant: \textit{trierchellad} MI57a02 ‘through robbery;’ \textit{erbertae} MI101d02 ‘enjoying.’ As MI is a far larger corpus, the higher number of attestations (and the fact that MI overall significantly prefers \textit{er}-) makes it unsurprising that it equally shows a higher relative frequency of possibly palatal \textit{er}- variants, with 38\% of them potentially being palatal, but only 12\% of them appearing to be conclusively palatal.

The majority of palatal occurrences, outside of those with \textit{air-}, that occur within Wb occur in \textit{ir-}, the only two appearing in \textit{er-} are that of \textit{erriu} Wb9c08 and \textit{erriu} Wb11a20 which are both third plural prepositional pronouns. As there are only 10 appearances of \textit{er-}, this means 20\% of them show palatal colour. With regards to \textit{ir-}, Wb has 22 attestations (35\%) that would appear to have palatal colouring such as \textit{conirmissid} Wb27c29 ‘so that you may attain’ a form of \textit{ar-midethar} *\textit{are-mid}; \textit{irnichthe} Wb17a05 ‘supplication’ from \textit{airnigde} the verbal noun of \textit{ar-neget} *\textit{are-ni}; \textit{irchlige} Wb22d18 ‘a warding off’ the verbal noun \textit{airchlige} of \textit{ar-clich} *\textit{are-klich}. Within \textit{ir-}, all ‘palatal’ examples follow a pattern of \textit{irCiC}, which again necessitates questioning whether or not a glide has simply been omitted; nominative singular \textit{irnigde} Wb4a27 stands beside cases such as \textit{hirnaigde} Wb4d20 and \textit{ernaigde} MI38c11, also both nominative singular.

The inherent difficulty is that, for many of these forms, the regularly expected quality of the \textit{r}- is palatal; the expected outcome of *\textit{are}- and syncopation is that the \textit{r}- will be palatal, unless in the combination *\textit{are-us}, as discussed above. Thus, forms like \textit{irnichthe} in Wb, of \textit{ar-neget} *\textit{are-ni} would be expected to have a palatal \textit{r}- and so positing that all seemingly palatal forms of \textit{er-} and \textit{ir-} have omitted glides, while retaining a strictly neutral \textit{r}- does not seem reasonable.

Instead, perhaps the most reasonable explanation is analogical confusion between two originally different forms, one with a palatal \textit{r}- and one with a neutral \textit{r}-, as this proposition would potentially account for the ability of both \textit{er-} and \textit{ir-} to have both palatal and neutral colouring.

The possibility of the merger of *\textit{are}- with *\textit{peri} thus appears to be a tempting solution. Marstrander (1962, 210) has theorised that the lexeme \textit{aires} ‘a tryst’ has become
confused, or fallen together, with ‘faith.’ Though he does not provide any justification, the assumption likely arises from the spelling of iress > *ferissā with air- in MI: airis (twice) MI142b03; airis MI97d10; arais MI97d13 and derived adjective airesach MI48a16. This confusion is not present in either Wb or Sg. It seems unlikely to posit that aires and iress were ‘identical,’ as stated by Marstrander, as on a purely lexical level the meaning is far too disparate to fully accept the notion of them being the same. Instead, this should potentially be taken as evidence of the merger between *peri and *are- as, while MI has no trace of ir- in the place of air-, this confusion can be viewed as an indication that the preverbs were, at least marginally, pronounced and understood to be the same at this stage. Unfortunately, this merger is not entirely satisfactory as er- cannot regularly derive from *peri- alone as raising would be expected, and does not account for neutral er- and ir-.

As a result of u-affection, au on its way to becoming u passed through an intermediate stage in which various spellings were employed to represent this transitional sound. The neutral er- and ir- could then be understood as manifestations of this ‘unspellable’ sound that was originally aur < *ar(e)-uss. As aur- began to be generalised beyond its original contexts, perhaps so too were its byforms, contributing to the spread of er- and ir- before a neutral consonant. If a merger with *peri is also to be posited, there may then have been two competing ir- one with a palatal and one with a neutral -r- depending on context, with er- spreading to include these contexts analogically. This theory is perhaps too convoluted to be entirely satisfactory, as it necessitates a heavy amount of analogical confusion.

This particular variation is unlikely to be a purely orthographic error, as fluctuation in stressed vowel spellings is relatively uncommon. Outside of this particular instance, none of the three corpora show any other consistent variation in stressed vowels. It is unclear to what extent this was realised phonetically. On the one hand, stressed vowels are fully pronounced and thus a fluctuation within words would seem to imply that the pronunciation was similar enough that the varied spellings were permissible. On the other hand, the preference in MI for er- and the existence of ir- in Wb and Wb alone would imply that the forms were not fully interchangeable phonetically, indicating a preferential spelling that more closely resembled a particular pronunciation. The latter theory would imply that there was a set standard of Old Irish against which the scribes were operating.
by writing their preferred forms, as otherwise there would not be any variation within the three corpora themselves and instead a single form would be the only one.

Regardless of the motivation, which is not possible to ascertain, the three corpora of glosses show distinct variation in their representation of the particle *ar*-. Although not entirely decisive as a diatopic marker, as whether or not this definitively represents a distinction in pronunciation, it undoubtedly represents a variation within the three corpora of glosses that cannot be attributed entirely to diachrony: while the preference of Wb for *ir-* over *er-* could be viewed as an older feature that was no longer present by the time of MI or Sg, the fact that MI stands in opposition to both the older Wb and the younger Sg in its preference for *er-* over *air-* demonstrates a preference that cannot be attributed to chronology alone.

### 2.9 Jackson

The difficulties with Jackson’s proposed theory of Common Gaelic as a whole have already been discussed (see Section 1.1.2) but it is prudent to discuss some of the features that he identified as being potential markers of the divergence of his ‘Common Gaelic’ into the Gaelic languages. As mentioned, Jackson (1951, 82) states that the 10-13th centuries are the time in which first divergences between the Goidelic languages appear, and when his proposed ‘Common Gaelic’ begins to break up.

His evidence (1951, 80-83) for their continuing to remain a monolith comes in the form of the phonetic changes taking place in Irish between the fifth and tenth centuries that are also present in Scottish Gaelic and Manx. Some examples include, but are not limited to: apocope, initial *w-* becoming *f-*, and assimilation of original consonant groups such as of *ln* and *nl* to *l*, all of which are phonological features that significantly pre-date Old Irish sources. Jackson subsequently gives a list of Middle Irish developments that are reflected in the modern languages, such as loss of the deponent verbs as a distinct category within the verbal system, irrespective of a few individual endings which survived in the new system in form only, and the demise of the distinction between the deuterotonic and protonic of compound verbs. Presumably, the existence of these developments within the modern languages and their appearance during the Middle Irish period are what helped shape his 10th century dating for the end of Common Gaelic.

Jackson’s (1951, 86-87) oldest datable break between the languages is that of disyllabic words with hiatus, as in Old Irish *oä* ‘grandson,’ *bruäch* ‘edge’ and *fiäch*
‘raven’ becoming monosyllabic ó, brúach and fiach in Ireland in the 10th century, but remaining disyllabic in Scottish Gaelic (Jackson 1951, 86). He also notes that in Scottish Gaelic palatalised gh in unstressed syllables became ch, a feature which he states occurred briefly in Middle Irish but died out. Furthermore, he argues that the shortening of unstressed long vowels, which occurred in Scottish Gaelic and Manx, only appears in northern Irish dialects, which he attributes to later influence from Scotland. Both of these latter examples he dates as occurring around the 12th century.46

If there were evidence of this divergence in the extant Old Irish material, it would be exceptionally relevant to the subject at hand, as not only would it be evidence synchronic variation, but equally diatopic divergences leading to the modern Goidelic languages. If identified, these could be used to identify texts as being of either Irish or Scottish provenance, and thus the merit of Jackson’s claims has been investigated in further depth below.

2.9.1 Hiatus

One ‘break’ identified by Jackson (1951, 86) as having occurred in the 10th century is the loss of hiatus in stressed words from disyllabic to monosyllabic in Ireland, while the hiatus was ‘mostly’ retained in Scottish Gaelic. He notes that Manx does not retain the hiatus but suggests that perhaps it was contracted later. The retention of hiatus in Scottish Gaelic but not in Irish is well-known (cf. O’Rahilly, 1932 14-4; Gillies, 2004,) and if there was evidence of a tangible break between the two in the Old Irish period, it would be strong evidence of synchronic variation, specifically diatopic variation.

Unfortunately, the assertion that the contraction of hiatus occurred in the 10th century is not entirely correct: there is evidence of the contraction of hiatus having occurred earlier. Carney (1964, xxix) has claimed that in ‘certain dialects of Old Irish’ hiatus vowels were contracted before the middle of the eighth century. His evidence comes from the Poems of Blathmac (c. 700,) in which forms such as deëc and döib have been contracted to monosyllables in order to suit the metre. Indeed, Stifter has noted (2015, 46)

46 Though later than the focus of the present study, it seemed relevant to note that Jackson’s dating of the shortening of unstressed long vowels is based on the ‘evidence’ of mormar for mormaer in notitiae in the Book of Deer (Jackson 1951, 87-88.) Jackson (1951 88; 1972, 149-151) believed the language of the Book of Deer was Middle Irish, which he equates with Common Gaelic, and cites the language of the Book of Deer as evidence that Common Gaelic was still prevalent at this stage. It is well accepted however, (Ó Maolalaigh 2008) that the language in the Book of Deer is Scottish Gaelic, though one could argue the language here reflects a Scottish variety of Irish and not the origins of the ‘language’ of Scottish Gaelic. The shortening of unstressed long vowels has also been dated by Ó Sé (1989, 169) as having occurred around the 9th/10th century at the same time as the reduction of unstressed short vowels.
that Carney inserted hiatus into the poem more liberally than necessary, and by his count there are 67 instances of hiatus alongside 61 occurrences of contraction. This is a clear indication that contraction had already begun at this stage and was an option liable to be exploited by Blathmac, and potentially other poets, if necessary. At the same time, this does not indicate that contraction had taken place throughout all dialects or registers of Old Irish, as put forward by Carney, since certain strata of the language may have had contraction, while others retained hiatus. Indeed, the \textit{Félire Óengusso} (c. 800,) which is later than Blathmac, is consistent in its usage of hiatus forms (cf. Carney 1983, 195; Stifter 2015, 74) but there is also evidence of contracted form in the sections less constrained metrically (Carney 1983, 195.)

By the period of the three corpora of glosses, forms that show contraction exist alongside forms that would appear to retain it: hitat Ml42b10 ‘they are’ beside ataat Ml55d11; impuuđ Sg202b08 ‘anastrophe’ beside impúđ Sg106b10; leu Wb1d15 is ‘presumably’ disyllabic while lėu Wb30c11 ‘must reflect’ a monosyllable (McCone 1985, 88); the spelling cóir Sg40b07 ‘right’ or cóir Ml69d12 implies a contracted form of coir, as opposed to coair Ml48a08 (Bergin 1907, 84.)

McCone (1985, 88) has cited forms of the substantive verb such as ataa Wb26b31 and -bii Wb28b25 for expected attá Wb4b11 and -bl Ml103c03 as evidence of hypercorrect spellings, and notes ‘compromise’ forms such as atáa Wb6a19, in which there is both a length mark and the doubling. These spellings are a hold-over from an earlier orthographic norm, in which length was indicated by doubled vowels (cf. GOI §27) and cannot be taken as evidence of hiatus.

Most of the forms in Wb are spelled in this ‘compromise’ way, such as bées Wb11b06 for bés or bāas Wb4a11 ‘death’ for bás, tűr Wb29d23 ;and’ for tűř or rūn Wb12d44 ‘secret, mystery’ for rún. Although minimal, there are also examples without the length mark in forms which the vowel is doubled such as sciith Wb18a02 ‘tedious’ for scíth, ceneel Wb28b01 ‘kindred’ for cenél and dreecht Wb5c02 ‘part, portion’ for drécht.

At the outset, orthography tends to be more conservative than the spoken language. Without metrics to inform pronunciation, any perceived ‘good’ retained hiatus spelling might simply be orthographic convention, retaining an earlier spelling despite it no longer representing the spoken reality. Thus, the existence of a spelling unambiguously indicating contraction is a diagnostic criterion for determining that hiatus had indeed been
reduced, rather than forms that appear to retain hiatus being evidence that hiatus was still pronounced.

As all three corpora of glosses show evidence of contraction, this indicates that contraction was, at the very least, an optional pronunciation if not the standard pronunciation in their spoken language. As discussed in Sections 1.2.1 & 1.3, the compilers of the three corpora of glosses, and presumably Blathmac, were highly-educated, and potentially were able to speak in and understand an innovative register that had contracted hiatus, as well as a more conservative register that had retained hiatus. There is always the possibility that certain spoken registers retained hiatus for longer, but the evidence from the written material strongly indicates that contraction had already taken place by the eighth century.

2.9.2 gh and ch

The merger of palatalised gh and ch is summarised by Jackson (1951, 86):

“In all Scottish dialects except in the south-west palatalised gh in unstressed syllables became ch, as in doilich from older doiligh. In Middle Irish ch sometimes occurs in this position in the eleventh and twelfth centuries but it did not last beyond the twelfth; the older gh reasserted itself from them on, as in modern Irish doiligh.”

He continues (1951, 86-87) to cite culaidh, which remains culaidh in both Irish and Scottish Gaelic as evidence that this change occurred before the 12th century, when palatal -dh became -gh, as otherwise -dh would have equally become -ch in Scotland. By his estimation, this feature thus dates to the 11th century, completed in Scotland by the 12th and ‘dying stillborn’ in Ireland at roughly the same time.

Unfortunately for the reader, he provides no citation or evidence of this ch in Middle Irish, as that would better support his conclusions. If forms utilising ch were isolated to a particular text, it might indicate a preference in a certain set of material, be a potential dating criterion or, as for the relevant purposes of this study, indicate a potential geographic region and associated dialect.

Any attestation of -ch in place of an expected -gh in a Middle Irish text, would have been exceptionally useful in supporting Jackson’s claim as it could have been argued to be evidence of this disparity developing within his ‘Common Gaelic,’ and a movement towards the Scottish Gaelic type. Instead, he confusingly asserts that the feature appeared in Middle Irish in the 11th and 12th centuries before disappearing in subsequent Irish but
having survived in the subsequent Scottish Gaelic. While elsewhere he considers Middle Irish and ‘Common Gaelic’ to be synonymous in the 12th century Book of Deer (cf. Jackson 1951, 88; Jackson 1972, 151,) here he distinguishes Middle Irish specifically, and appears to argue that Scottish Gaelic had already diverged (at least in this regard) by the 11th century and is no longer identical to Middle Irish, or ‘Common Gaelic.’ Without any lines of investigation proposed by Jackson, it is unclear to what exactly he was referring.

Thurneysen states that in Old Irish, there is ‘complete confusion’ (GOI §130) of voiced and voiceless consonants in final position, and while consonant colour can affect whether a spirant is rendered voiced or voiceless, with -g being the preferred option for the palatal spirant, the other may also appear: *coibdelag* Wb9c32 ‘relative’ beside *coibdelach* Wb27d02; *chailich* MI30c17, genitive singular of *cailech* ‘chalice’ beside *challig* MI94c10; *iressig* ‘faithful’ beside *iressich* (GOI §130.) His comment is overly broad, as ‘confusion’ would imply that the variation was entirely free in final position, when it is in fact dictated by colour, and more specifically, primarily occurring after an unstressed vowel. This is not so much free variation or ‘complete confusion’ as it is phonemic neutralisation, as it leads to palatal -g and neutral -ch following an unstressed vowel, regardless of the original spirant.47

McCone (1994, 87 §10.1; 1996, 132-134) argues that this voicing of palatal -ch to -g in auslaut after an unstressed vowel or between unstressed vowels (cf. GOI §128-§129) occurred in tandem with the voicing of the dental fricative between unstressed vowels and voicing of dentals on word boundaries, which he dates to the seventh century. The result was morphophonemic variation within the inflectional system, with examples such as nominative singular *pecthach* ‘sinful’ alongside genitive singular *pecthaig*. Thus, with this alternation present and integral to the paradigmatic system, broad -ch was liable to replace a broad -g by analogy.

This alternation between -ch and -g, while not particularly common, was still present in Middle Irish (Breatnach 1994, 229, 2.6,) with examples such as *dabaich* ‘tub, vat’ (LL 38562) beside *dabaig* (LL 38560.) These can viewed, as suggested by Breatnach, as a

47 Thurneysen’s few stressed examples are only sporadically attested, as opposed to the occurrences after an unstressed vowel. For that reason, it is difficult to determine whether these were exclusively orthographic hypercorrection or if they reflected a spoken reality. Indeed, as noted above in Section 2.2 the pronunciational alternation in the paradigm of *tech* was likely aided by the existence of compounds, which contained this development in unstressed position (cf. McCone 1996, 134.)
continuation of the Old Irish, as many of the cases contain the originally voiceless sound, and thus do not reflect the proposed ‘Scottish Gaelic’ innovation.

This is potentially the type of variation Jackson was referring to as his evidence for the Scottish change of unstressed palatal -gh to -ch as having appeared in Middle Irish, though it would appear more likely that, at least in the Irish context, this was a variation limited to orthography and not evidence of a potential Scottish sound change. Indeed, as there are some attestations of this interchange continuing to occur in Early Modern Irish (McManus 1994, 354, 2.15,) if this fluctuation between the spelling of the two spirants is the evidence that Jackson relied on when asserting that -gh became ch, his proposition that it vanished from Irish in the 12th century appears to be unfounded.

Certainly, written historical evidence for this change in Scottish Gaelic itself is somewhat limited. While this distinction between Scottish Gaelic and Irish is well-known in the modern period, the heavy influence of Irish standard writing (Diack 1922, 150) limits the ability to ascertain whether words are represented phonetically, and evidence from place-names, personal names and Scottish Gaelic sources show gh and ch in alternation into the 17th century (Ó Maolalaigh 2008, 234-237.)

The single form cannech in the Book of Deer is the only instance of the voiceless palatal spirant in unstressed position in this source, and can be viewed as either scribal error (perhaps a nominative in place of a genitive) or an indication of the current pronunciation, with the 16 other attestations ending in -g indicative of an adherence to an Irish standard of writing (Ó Maolalaigh 2008, 233-234.) As Jackson has not provided citation for Middle Irish forms showing a change from -gh to -ch, it is possible that he was referring to the known fluctuation in spelling between palatal spirants, which by the Old Irish period had been voiced to g.

It does not logically follow, however, that pre-Old Irish palatal unstressed -gh was devoiced to -ch for a period of time before the former -gh had been restored – by whatever mechanism. It equally seems unlikely to propose that in pre-Scottish Gaelic the inverse occurred: that -ch was voiced to -gh only to then be further devoiced back to -ch.  

---

48 As per Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 233-234) the attestations are: cósreg (AI1.), roalseg (AI2.), rothidhaíg (AI4.), cathraíg (AI5.), cathraíg (AI6.), dorodloeg (AI8.), chadraíg (AI16.), tolóséig (AI6.), dabég (AI12.), laloíg (AI14.), thóisíg (AI18.), cóbrig (DIII2.), muredig (DIII10.), cennedig (BV13.), cænnaig (BV16-17.), stíthíg (CV18.)

49 Diack (1922, 150) specifically objects to this, stating ‘otherwise we should have to hold that in Scottish Gaeldom ch universally became gh and finally silent, as in Irish, and that at a later period the original ch was (except in the southern fringe) universally restored.’ Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 238) has noted that this argument cannot be fully correct: while elsewhere he agrees that ch should not have been voiced and then subsequently devoiced, the particular suggestion that -igh was rendered /i/, is ‘objectionable,’ as
Instead, the proposal by Diack (1922, 150,) and supported by Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 235,) that in Scottish Gaelic the shift from voiceless to voiced simply did not occur, and that Scottish Gaelic retained the unvoiced palatal guttural spirant, seems the most reasonable.

The predominance of an Old Irish written standard, and indeed the inherent fluctuation within said standard owing to variation within the inflectional system and its resulting analogical forms, could have masked this development in sources of Scottish origins. It does not appear, however, that this divergence was as late as the 10th century, as claimed by Jackson.

In a sense, Jackson was correct that certain features were present earlier in the language than his advocated 13th century break, however, he was incorrect about their dating, and possibly incorrect about them being representative of significant breaks in the language. While it is true that -igh -ich are treated differently in Scottish Gaelic and Irish (Ó Maolalaigh 1999,) it is more plausible to understand their divergence as an Irish innovation that was not shared by Scottish Gaelic: -ch became voiced in the Irish dialects, while remaining unvoiced in the Scottish, as opposed to one dialect undergoing a significant change only to reverse course.

With regards to the reduction hiatus, it was certainly already present during the Old Irish and while it may not have been a widespread reduction, but a localised feature, or a feature of a particular register, it certainly did not occur as late as the 10th century. Therefore, Jackson’s suggestions, as he undoubtedly would have suspected, do not represent any significant variation, diatopic or otherwise, within the Old Irish glosses - albeit not quite in the way he expected.

2.10 -so/-sa

Stifter (2015, 94) poses the possibility of a diatopic marker in the Poems of Blathmac in the form of the demonstrative pronoun -se. Stifter notes that in the poems -se occurs 16 times, without a single instance of its allomorphs -so/-sa.

This statement, unfortunately, is not entirely accurate. Uhlich (2018b, 64) points out that the synchronic allomorphy Stifter is referring to only occurs in the enclitic form of the demonstrative, and not the stressed – a distinction Stifter fails to make in his discussion. Uhlich (2018b, 65-67) continues to demonstrate that all but one of the viewing ch as having been derived from earlier gh relies on gh being pronounced, and understood, as a consonant.
examples given by Stifter are stressed, as illustrated either by the constraints of grammar or by metrics. The only truly enclitic example given by Stifter is that of an tréde-se, which contains the expected enclitic -se following a palatal auslaut.\(^{50}\)

Despite the basis of the suggestion being flawed, a collection (see Appendix V) of the enclitic demonstratives in the three corpora of glosses was undertaken in order to determine whether or not a case could be made for potential diatopic markers, as per Stifter’s suggestion. As this allomorphy only occurs in the enclitic form, this collection excludes stressed forms of the demonstrative, including those attached to the deictic particle (cf. Uhlich 2018b, 65; Breatnach 2020).

As the largest corpus, it is unsurprising that MI contains the most examples. As can be seen in Figure 7 below, there are 156 occurrences of an enclitic demonstrative, with -so overwhelmingly being the most popular with 89 occurrences. There are 32 instances of -sa and 25 of -se. There are also eight instances of -seo and a single occurrence of -sea, all nine of which occur after a palatal auslaut. Of the 32 occurrences of -sa, 31 follow the expected neutral consonance. -se always occurs after a palatal auslaut. As well as being the most frequent, -so shows the most variation, with 62 of the 88 forms occurring after a neutral consonant – meaning there are more instances of -so following a palatal consonant than of the expected -se.

Figure 7 -so -sa -se in MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-so</th>
<th>-sa</th>
<th>-se</th>
<th>-seo/-sea</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palatal auslaut</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral auslaut</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sg has the fewest instances with only 48 examples, as seen in Figure 8 below. Once again there is a nearly even distribution of -sa, with 14 occurrences, and -se, with 10. The remaining 24 enclitic demonstratives take the form of -so. Neither -se nor -sa deviate from expectations, as they both always occur after a palatal consonant or neutral

\(^{50}\) Blathmac §91 additionally contains cen hí sé which utilises the original accusative form (following cen) which stands in opposition to the three corpora of glosses who have otherwise generalised the dative form sīu after í. It would be impossible to posit that this is a divergent innovation on the part of Blathmac on the basis of a single example, and thus may be an archaism, but is in contrast to the glosses who have the shared innovation of the dative form.
consonant respectively. Here -so shows more variation, with only 13 instances of it following a neutral consonant; -so occurs with a neutral one less time than -sa and only once more with a palatal than the expected -se.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 8 -so -sa -se in Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal auslaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral auslaut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wb (Figure 9 below) contains 76 examples in total, with 44 instances of -so, 21 of -sa, seven of -se and four of -si. While -se always occurs with the expected palatal auslaut, -si has a single occurrence with neutral consonance, in fogur si Wb12d05, making the majority of use consistent. -sa only occurs with a palatal three times, whereas -so has 30 instances of use following a neutral, once again showing more examples with a palatal auslaut than the expected -se.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 9 -so -sa -se in Wb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal auslaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral auslaut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the unusual -si present four times in Wb,51 which merit further discussion. Pedersen (1909-1913, ii. 186) implies that this is evidence of confusion of final unstressed vowels. Although the reduction of final unstressed vowels to schwa is a feature commonly associated with the movement to the Middle Irish period (cf. McCone 1985,) as previously noted, a number of these ‘Middle Irish’ features are already present in the

---

51 There is additionally is mút si Sg17a03 which the electronic database (Bauer, Hofman and Moran 2017) parses as being this enclitic demonstrative, however, this does not appear to be the case, as the demonstrative sense does not quite fit in context (.i. is mút si am quanquam .i. cinud .l is mút quanquam. adas. Sg17a03 ‘i.e. it is a mute indeed quanquam = although, or: it is a mute, quanquam = all the same’) and there is an analogous is mútsi arachuistidi Sg6a19 ‘it is a mute as far as that goes’ which has the -si parsed as the emphatic third singular feminine pronominal, which appears to make more sense in the above context.
Old Irish period, including in the three corpora of glosses (cf. GOI §99; Strachan 1903a; Strachan 1903b; McCone 1985.) In the case of Wb, it is an outlier as there is otherwise an absence of more widespread incorrect final vowels within Wb (cf. Strachan 1903a, 51-52.) This could potentially be resolved by positing a rigid adherence to an orthographic standard, which precluded the inclusion of these unstressed reductions, but this may be an overreach.

Instead, there is always the possibility that these are errors in need of emendation to -sin. The difference between -sol/-sa/-se and -sin is context: -sol/-sa/-se tends to be presumptive, referring to something yet to be mentioned, whereas -sin is resumptive, anaphorically referring to something which has been previously mentioned (cf. GOI §475.1.) Three of the instances in Wb are undoubtedly anaphoric: ni ʃiʃ tra belre issin [biuθ so] cenfogur. 逵. cetorbe dáiβsi didiu infogur si mani fessed inni bess fonfogursin Wb12d05 ‘there is not, then, a language in this world without sound, that is, what profit to you then (is) this sound unless ye know the sense which is under that sound?’ with the fogur si here clearly referring back to the already the previously mentioned fogur within the gloss itself, and indeed paired with a second -sin; nosinguidsom didiu arnarobat leu inpechtisi Wb25b09 ‘... he beseeches them, then, that these sins may not be with them’ with a litany of sins referenced in the preceding part of the Irish gloss, and ‘unsteadiness and indolence,’ are the sins to which the -si[n] refers and mabeid ní aratectha uidua maccu 逵. tuis tidi it cairigthi inmaicsi et intuistidi cendethidin dissi Wb28d22 ‘i.e. if it be that uidua has children or parents, these children and the parents are to be blamed when they do not take care of her’ where the emphasised ‘children’ are here the children referred to earlier in the gloss.

The final example is not so clearly anaphoric: ni luct corint nammá dianduthraccarsa amaithsi Wb14b06 ‘it is not only to the folk of Corinth that I wish this good.’ Unlike the other three glosses, there is nothing within the gloss itself to which the emphasised ‘good’ could be referring. Indeed, as a gloss on 2 Corinthians 1:1 there is equally nothing preceding the gloss in the Latin that could be considered the ‘good’ to which the gloss refers: Paulus, apostolus Iesu Christi per uoluntatem Dei, et Timotheus frater, aeclesiae Dei quae est Corinthi, cum sanctis omnibus qui sunt in uniuersa Achaia6 ‘Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, To the church of God in Corinth, together with all his holy people throughout Achaia.’ The following verse, however, 2 Corinthians 1:2 continues Gratia uobís, et páx a Deo Patre nostro et a
Domino Iesu Christo ‘Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.’

The Latin context of this gloss provides a clear presumptive ‘good’ to which the glossator was referring: the grace and peace from God – not yet mentioned in the verse being glossed – are being applied to not only the church in Corinth but everyone in Achaia. Thus, this could be regarded as a legitimate occurrence of -se, and not a mistake for -sin. Alternatively, it could be argued that the glossator may have unintentionally placed the gloss too early.

All three collections of glosses show a marked preference for the demonstrative -so: in both Ml and Wb -so makes up more than half of the overall instances of the demonstrative and in Sg -so is just under half. This demonstrates a distinct preference for -so over both the other neutral option of -sa, but also over the expected palatal -se: across all three collections of glosses -so is used more frequently following a palatal auslaut than the expected -se. As some examples: indepistil so Wb3b20 ‘this epistle;’ indfirso Wb5a05 ‘these men;’ isind insci so Wb6a26 ‘this word;’ andedso Wb10d08 ‘these two things;’ indinaimso Ml16c05 ‘this time;’ ininsciso Ml28b11 ‘this speech;’ lasna doini so Ml69b03 ‘with these men;’ andeso [leg: andedeso] Ml74b01; innéitso Sg1a03 ‘so much;’ na teora litreso Sg10a12 ‘these three letters;’ innainneso Sg30a14 ‘this quality’ innacomchutrummaichthiso Sg39a10 ‘these comparisons.’

In both Wb and Sg, the choice between -so and -se in palatal auslaut appears to be in fairly free variation, as there are instances of -so following a palatal auslaut alongside the exact same lexeme with the expected -se: a ndédeso Sg28b08 beside andédeso Sg28b13; anuileso Wb15d13 ‘all this’ beside anuilese Wb16c08; innéitso Sg1a03 beside méitse Sg7a09; isintendoiminse Wb16d07 ‘this text’ alongside trisintendoiminso Wb10b19.

Unlike its counterparts, Ml does not contain any attestation of fluctuations within the same word: while there are forms that have an unexpected enclitic (intintendoinso) alongside those that occur with the expected one (uilese,) there is no fluctuation within words as seen in Wb and Sg: testimin, despite its final palatal consonant is always followed by -so eg. Ml38c03, Ml44b10, Ml61b16, Ml101c06 in contrast to the intintendoinse of Wb16d07; all attestations of déde appears with -so (cf. Ml65a02) with the
exception of *andedeseo* MI17b26, which appears to show a glide vowel, a feature unique to MI.  

The world *salm* ‘psalm’ appears always with *-so*, even in instances when paradigmatic colour changes have occurred, resulting in a palatal auslaut: the expected *insalmso* MI107b01 MI109b02 MI138d01 *salm so* MI110d06 and *in salm so* MI11d07 occur alongside *int sailm so* MI102c05 *int sailm so* MI103b06 *insalmaib so* MI138c15 *int sailm so* MI139a07. It is unclear what exactly this indicates. This could be perceived as evidenced of a fossilised, standard form of the enclitic: perhaps *salm* and *-so* were associated, regardless of the quality of the auslaut. If this is considered to be the case, that *-so* were an original standard form, then the odd *-seo/-sea* forms, all of which follow palatal auslaut, could be viewed as an attempt to reconcile the palatal auslaut with the standard *-so* form by way of the insertion of a glide, as opposed to using the less frequent *-se*.

It is clear from the evidence that *-so* and *-se* following a palatal auslaut were in fairly free variation throughout the three corpora of glosses. Within Wb and Sg, the forms are used interchangeably even when attached to the same lexeme, and though MI does not contain any attestations of alternation between occurrences of the same lexeme, it contains occurrence of *-so* being utilised alongside palatal auslaut. Although there are no attestations in the three corpora of glosses of *-se* following a neutral auslaut, this is undoubtedly possible as the three are, in origin, different forms (cf. Schrijver 1997 23-25) and indeed, the first singular emphasising pronoun *-sa -se* does have two attestations of neutral *-se* (cf. GOI §403; Thes. ii 48.5 *sibra-se* [leg. *sibsa-se*]; Thes. ii 245.6 *numsecethse*) and may be analogous.

Stifter (2015, 94) theorised that Blathmac’s poems contained attestations that could be viewed as evidence of a period in which the enclitic demonstratives were in free variation, or evidence that could be viewed as an indicator of diatopic variation. The evidence as presented by Stifter does not warrant this conclusion, as his discussed evidence only provides one enclitic example, which conforms to the expected distribution. Similarly, the evidence from the collections of the three corpora of glosses does not indicate diatopic variation, as none of the collections of glosses show an individual preference, and instead use *-so* rather liberally. This would suggest that either

---

52 Schrijver (1997, 18) does note that this glide vowel is present in MI; he states that it ‘occurs after palatal consonants and vowels from MI onwards.’ While the forms with glides do appear in later sources, at least within the three corpora of glosses, it is a feature unique to MI.
the enclitic -so is a fossilised spelling from a time when -so could accompany either palatal or neutral auslaut, as perhaps indicated by the adherence of MI in using -so with the noun salm regardless of final colour, or that during the period of the three corpora of glosses the forms -sol/-sal/-se were in free variation.

2.11 The system of nasalisation

The system of nasalisation, one of the three word-initial mutations known to scholars of Irish, functions differently in Scottish Gaelic. In both languages, voiceless stops are voiced, though Scottish Gaelic has three main dialectal manifestations of nasalisation. In one (Ó Maolalaigh’s Type A) the voiceless stops are voiced, with retained aspiration, while the voiced stops, now generally with voiceless realisation, are voiced. In another (Ó Maolalaigh’s Type B) voiceless stops are nasalised with aspiration, while voiced stops are nasalised. In the third (Ó Maolalaigh’s Type C) voiceless stops are voiced and merge with the inherited voiced stops. The Modern Irish method of nasalisation, in which voiced stops are fully nasalised, does not appear in the majority of Scottish Gaelic dialects. It does occur in Type B, albeit in a slightly different form; Ó Maolalaigh (1996-1996, 160) states that the nasals are not articulated in the same way as Modern Irish nasalisation, with the nasalisation of Type B (Type C in the referenced article) denasalising at the end with a short oral stop.54

Undoubtedly, the Gaelic manifestations of the mutation share a common origin, whether it be a system which evolved in two different directions, or in which one is a development from the other. As the historical progenitor of both languages is Old Irish, scholarship has previously regarded the Scottish Gaelic system to be a development from the Irish (cf. Watson 1994, 674.) Thus, the earlier understanding of the development of nasalisation in Scottish Gaelic has been that it was, at one point, identical with the Old Irish system, and diverged at a later date. This is certainly the view taken by O’Rahilly

---

53 In Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 244) he has re-labelled the three types of dialects, so that they are titled differently from the three categories laid out in Ó Maolalaigh (1995-1996, 159–60.) Here I have chosen to use the 2008 designation as it is the more recent. For clarity: 1995-1996’s Type A = 2008 Type C; Type B is now Type A and thus Type C is now Type B.

54 Ó Maolalaigh notes (2008, 244-245, cf. 248) that not only is Type B marginal, appearing in Lewis, in certain northern dialects of the Isle of Skye and the Isle of Raasay, but that it is a secondary development of Type A and not related to the Irish type. This is the same conclusion as that reached by O’Rahilly, on the basis of verbs such as dug and dig in which an original eclipsed t- is now treated as an original d- by the language (gu’n dug) and word-initial b- d- and g- in which phrases such as an dath are pronounced with the stop eclipsed ie. ‘an uhh’ (O’Rahilly 1932, 154,) though the possibility that this development happened secondarily, with the eclipsed t- (now d-) adapted to the new system, cannot be discounted.
(1932, 154-155) who interpreted the nasalisation in Old Irish as resulting in the voiced consonants \(b\), \(d\) and \(g\) in nasalising environments being pronounced as \(m\), \(n\) and \(\eta\). From this basis, he theorised that this nasal consonant has been reinterpreted as belonging to the preceding nasalising word, while shielding the subsequent consonant from mutation: that is, instead of the nasalisation being understood as a mutation, it was reassigned to the preceding word which caused it, and the originally mutated word no longer showed nasalisation.

Ó Maolalaigh (1995-1996, 161) has pointed out this does not satisfactorily explain the lack of Scottish Gaelic nasalisation following particles whose consonantal coda is not a nasal, and argues that O’Rahilly’s theory is too narrow a base to suggest an analogical spread, and would prefer that the system be viewed as having developed in divergent ways, potentially before or during the Old Irish period.

2.11.1 Eclipsis vs nasalisation

Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 244-245) identifies the primary difference between the system of eclipsis in Modern Irish and nasalisation in Scottish Gaelic as the treatment of the original voiced stops \(b\), \(d\), \(g\): in the majority of Scottish Gaelic dialects the voiced stops are generally voiceless and subsequently voiced in ‘‘eclipsis’’ environments,’ while in Modern Irish they are replaced by a nasal.

The distinction he draws between the terms ‘eclipsis’ and ‘nasalisation’ is that in the Modern Irish system, the original sound is ‘eclipsed’ or replaced by the new sound, whereas in the Scottish Gaelic system the sound has an addition, not a replacement, that may be a nasal itself or caused by contact with a nasal auslaut. The second difference he identifies between the two modern languages is that nasalising particles in Scottish Gaelic always have nasal codas, excepting some diatopic variants of the first and second plural possessives, \(ar\) and \(bhur\). In Modern Irish, nasalising particles can have consonantal or vocalic codas, and particles with nasal codas ‘do not necessarily’ cause nasalisation (Ó Maolalaigh 1995-1996, 160-161.)

It is generally accepted that voiceless stops were voiced by nasalisation in Old Irish (cf. GOI §236.1; Quin 1975, 9; EIV, 244) and Ó Maolalaigh does not differ in this regard, stating that this voicing of the voiceless stops existed at the beginning of the Old Irish period, but that the eclipsis of voiced stops was carried out in a later, second stage. He

\[55\] Here Ó Maolalaigh states that this is common to Types A & C. Type B, however, nasalises.
dates the voicing of voiceless stops to the Primitive Irish (c. 400-500) period, and the
eclipsis of voiced stops to a later ‘post-Primitive’ date (Ó Maolalaigh 1995-1996, 160-
163.) His dating is likely based on the sixth century arrival of Irish settlers into Scotland,
as he concludes that the language introduced to Scotland may not have included the
eclipsis of voiced consonants, but that this first stage was likely shared by all varieties of
Gaelic. Ó Maolalaigh is somewhat unclear here about his distinction between ‘eclipsis’
and ‘nasalisation.’ He refers to the ‘eclipsis of voiced consonants’ in early Scottish
Gaelic, by which he presumably means eclipsis in the Irish sense, where the voiced
consonant is entirely replaced by the nasal. But this would bypass his concept of
‘nasalisation’ entirely, wherein the voiced consonant is affected by an auslauting nasal,
but not replaced.

He posits (1995-1996, 163) that ng, nd and mb are what are known as prenasalised
consonants: ‘a sequence of nasal and non-nasal segments with the approximate combined
duration of “simple” consonants.’ Although the inclusion of the terminology
‘prenasalised consonants’ is innovatory, the rest of this proposal, the phonetic realisation
of Old Irish nasalisation in which the nasalisation and consonant were pronounced as
clusters and not as a single element, has been the subject of prior study and is to be
discussed further below. These ‘prenasalised consonants’ are unstable, liable to lose their
nasalisation or indeed their original consonant, and be simplified to either one of its
elements, which could potentially explain the divergence in Irish and Scottish Gaelic: at
a certain early stage, Old Irish reduced these phonetic clusters to the nasal,56 while
Scottish Gaelic reduced the clusters to the stop. Ó Maolalaigh (1995-1996, 166-167)
argues that, in contexts in which a prenasalised consonant occurred post-vocically, the
juncture between the nasalising particle and the nasalisation itself was shifted, with the
nasal element reassigned to the nasalising element: instead of a n-, as example, the
nasalisation was shifted to create an.

He states (1995-1996, 167-168) that the split between the Irish and the Scottish Gaelic
systems ‘presumably’ took place during the Old Irish period.57 Despite this assumption,

56 GOI (§151c) states that the assimilation of nd to nn in proclitics began in the archaic period, citing
the article ina beside inna and donaib beside dundaib. Uhlich (forthcoming) has argued convincingly that
it was only during Middle Irish that this assimilation occurred when preceding a stressed syllable. This is
partially based on the consistent retention of the -nd in the article well into Middle Irish (cf. Bretnach
1994, 259 §7.7; Roma 2013, 255; Uhlich 2014, 160.)
57 While Ó Maolalaigh here does state explicitly that he believes the divergence between the Irish and
Scottish Gaelic systems of nasalisation occurred during the Old Irish period, but it is possibly more correct
to amend this to Middle Irish, see below.
he does not provide any examples from Old Irish, any suggestions of how this may manifest, or any reflexes. He provides no evidence for the proposed loss of voicing and cites the ‘non-eclipsis’ of /b/ /d/ /g/ in Old Irish (Quin 1979/80) as though the lack of orthographic representation definitively indicates there was no spoken nasalisation. His most agreeable suggestion is that of the reanalysis of the prefixed nasal as being a part of the preceding word, thus widening the analogical base of a new nasal codas from pre-vocalic nasalisation alone, as there is possible evidence of a similar development in Scottish Gaelic: \( sa \ m\text{-}bith \rightarrow sam \ bith. \)

2.11.2 Dating the potential split

At the core of Ó Maolalaigh’s (1995-1996, 162) argument is the assumption that the orthographic \( ng, nd \) and \( mb \) in Old Irish represent phonological clusters in initial position. However, Ó Maolalaigh neglects to provide any justification or reasoning for this presumption. Evidence from Old Irish would have been crucial in strengthening his case and would have provided a basis for examination for the present study. Establishing whether or not there is evidence for the survival of the stop is integral to determining the possibility of an early divergence. Proclitically, the assimilation of \( nd \) to \( nn \) and \( mb \) to \( mm \) begins in the archaic period (GOI §151-§152) and by the time of Wb, \( inna < inda, donaib < dundaib, imm- < imb- \) are already consistently written. After an unstressed syllable, \( \text{Félire Óengusso} \) additionally has \( \text{légend} \) rhyming with \( \text{Érenn} \) (Fél. Sep 26, 196, C.) Following a stressed vowel, these clusters are retained in Wb, but are in variation within MI, demonstrating that this reduction must have taken place around 800.

When preceding a stressed vowel, the situation in which nasalisation occurs, the evidence is not as clear. The remarkably consistent spelling of the article, \( ind \), well into the Middle Irish period (Breatnach 1994, 259, §7.7) would indicate that the sounds were distinct at least throughout the Old Irish period. Certainly, the spellings in Middle Irish can be viewed as historical retentions, but the regularity of \( ind \) throughout Old Irish suggests that the cluster /\( nd /\) was retained between a proclitic and a stressed vowel, at least during the Old Irish period (cf. Uhlich 2014, 160; Uhlich forthcoming.)

There is decent Middle Irish evidence for the full assimilation of nasalised clusters into the nasal in the form of attestations of the nasalised consonant. These are

---

58 McCaughey (1971, 30-3) has argued that \( sam \ bith \) originated with an Irish style eclipsis \( sa \ mbith \) with a reassignment of the nasalisation.
demonstrated by the nasalisation before vowels being optionally written as \textit{nd}, such as \textit{and-uili} (SR 953) or in instances where the nasalised consonant is eliminated entirely, with only the mutation remaining: \textit{dā n-erntar hé} (LL 31759) for \textit{nderntar}; \textit{co n-igsed} (LU 2251) for \textit{ndigsed}; \textit{ar nín} (LL 39249) for \textit{ndin}; \textit{mād dā mmāmar} (LU 10885, 10936) for \textit{mbāmar} (Bretnach 1994, 238, §4.10.) Therefore, the assimilation of nasalised clusters into simply the nasal, and the break between Early Irish and Scottish Gaelic, can be roughly attributed dated to during or prior to the Middle Irish period (c. 900-1200.)

There is no debate as to whether the voicing of voiceless stops was shared between the two branches (cf. Ó Maolalaigh 2008, 246,) and thus the concern is not whether or not there is evidence of the full eclipsis of these stops,\textsuperscript{59} but rather whether or not there is evidence of a nasal codas before them.

When examining the evidence from the Book of Deer, Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 249-252) cites five, potentially six, examples of nasal coda before consonants that were not original voiced stops, as well as evidence that the preposition \textit{i}(n) and the third plural possessive pronoun show signs of having developed a final nasal in preconsonantal position, indicating that the Scottish system of nasalisation was in place by the 12\textsuperscript{th} century.

Considering the attestations of new nasal codas in the Book of Deer, the Middle Irish assimilation of nasalised clusters into simply the nasal, and the Scottish reassignment of the nasal element and reduction of the cluster to the stop, the split between the Irish system of nasalisation and the Scottish can be dated as having occurred during or prior to the Middle Irish period, later than the ‘presumed’ Old Irish dating by Ó Maolalaigh (1995-1996, 167-168.)

\textbf{2.11.3 Old Irish evidence of ‘eclipsis’ or evidence of nasal codas?}

On the other hand, there are examples of what appears to be full nasalisation, eclipsis in the Modern Irish sense, within the corpora of glosses, which could potentially shift the dating of this break as earlier. Typically, nasalisation is expressed with the \textit{n} prefixed to \textit{d}-, \textit{g}- and vowels, \textit{m} prefixed to \textit{b} and the voiceless stops not showing orthographic representation of nasalisation (cf. GOI §236.) At the same time, there is evidence of nasalisation being spelled orthographically (cf. GOI §236; Strachan 1903a, 54-55) primarily on voiceless stops: \textit{con dánicc} Wb3c27 ‘until it came’ beside \textit{con-tanic}

\textsuperscript{59} Middle Irish evidence of this full ‘eclipsis’ of consonants certainly exists cf. \textit{co gōe [cōē] of caí} (SR 2078) (Bretnach 1994, 238, §4.10.)
As noted by Thurneysen (GOI §236) these orthographic spellings occur primarily subsequent to a nasal, which Ó Maolalaigh argues may be evidence of an original nasal segment of the Scottish Gaelic type.

The form *gondísad*, given by Jackson (1972, 157-158) as the third person singular past subjunctive of *tic-* ‘to come,’ (Old Irish: *do-icc*) normally *tísad* but here nasalised, can potentially be viewed as evidence of nasal codas. In Jackson’s own discussion of nasalisation (1972, 142-143) he argues that this is not evidence of the ‘Sc[ottish] G[aelic] type’ of nasalisation as he would read it as *go ndísad*, with nasalisation, *n-* still present. Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 257,) on the other hand, notes that it is impossible to know if this cluster is pronounced *nn*, with a fully assimilated sound, or *nd*. If the latter were to be the case, he would argue the nasal segment had been reassigned to the nasalising *gon* in an instance of the Scottish system. To understand the cluster as being pronounced *nn*, he proposes that *dísad*, originally *tísad*, be viewed as a new underlying form, in which the *t-* had been voiced during the shared period of nasalisation, similar to the proposal by O’Rahilly (1932, 154) regarding the verbs *dug* and *dig*, whose original *t-* was later understood as a *d-* after nasalisation had taken place.

In support of this claim, Ó Maolalaigh cites e.g. *ɔdísed* Wb25a06, stating that this type of ‘fossilisation’ usually occurs after -n (GOI §236.2.) Better examples would have been *condartar* Wb4a18 ‘that it may be given’ (*do-beir*), *condositis* [leg: *condodsitis*] Wb5b11 (*do-tuit*) ‘so that they should fall’ or *conduaid* Wb21a08 ‘you may understand’ (*do-ucci,* all of which clearly have the *con-* written, as opposed to *ɔ*, which can optionally stand for either *co-* or *con-* (GOI §896.2.)

---

60 Feuth (1982, 91) would regard this particular attestation as a writing error owing to it being the only evidence of a voiced stop written as a single sound, and not as a cluster (*mbec.*). Uhlich (2019; forthcoming) has explained the unexpected nasalisation of *nand* as evidence of a phenomenon in which nasalisation has been transferred from the nasalising form at the beginning of the phrase to the third word in parallel to the expected nasalisation of the second. He provides analogous examples of *Loch nEchach n-an* (LL l. 28572) in which both the second and third words of the phrase are nasalised as in our example; *in túaig nimi n-ildathaig* (SR 2628) and *fis fuerell ʃ diged rechto ndé* Wb46c08 in which the nasalisation cannot be orthographically represented on the second word; and *déde didiu nand* Wb1a05 in which the nasalisation has skipped the preceding *didiu*. 103
2.11.3.1 co vs con

In assessing the validity of Ó Maolalaigh’s supporting evidence of òdísed, it first must be established whether or not, in this instance and similar, ò can be understood as co- or con-. If the evidence is examined under the assumption that ò is orthographically written as d- after an -n-, then there are arguments to be made for understanding ò as con-.

Forms such as òdarlicthe Wb15c13 ‘so that it be let down’ from do-léici; òdarta Wb28b31 ‘so that [he] may bear’ from do-beir; òdanicc Wb3c27; and òdardad MI77a07 MI98b08 of do-beir can theoretically be viewed as evidence of a new underlying form in which (i) ò was voiced to d-; (ii) fossilised as a d-; and (iii) subsequently ‘re’-nasalised as nd. This theory would appear to find support in forms such as conducaid Wb21a08 (do-ucci) induccatar Wb9b19 (do-beir) in tain diágra-mni Wb3a15 ‘when we undergo’ (téit); co-n-dárbaist MI101c06 ‘so that you may show’ and condárbast MI95b06 (do-adbat); conducthe MI51d01 (do-ucci); and conducad Sg17a05 (do-beir) in which the -n- is expressed in full before the nasalised t-.

To counter, there are forms that retain the original t- when preceded by ò as well: òtanic Wb3a01 òtanicc Wb29b02 (do-icc;) òtuairits MI54a18 ‘that they would be crushed’ (do-fúaire) ò-tall MI58c06 ‘to take off’ (do-ella) òtanaic MI82d09 ‘until it came’ òtuichesmais [leg. òtuidchesmais] MI93b05 (do-tét.) There are no occurrences of ò t- found within Sg, but there are two attestations of ò preceding a nasalised d-in òndenta Sg9b02 ‘so that it should be made’ òndárbastar Sg211a10 ‘which was demonstrated,’ in both cases the n clearly represents the nasalisation which indicates ò can be read therefore as co-, as if understood as con- there would be no need for the additional nasalisation: to compare, there is also òdéní Sg32a03 ‘so that it makes’ beside condéni Sg191a03.

There are no occurrences of con t- written without abbreviation in any of the three corpora of glosses, with co t- being usual (cf. cotaised MI121b01 of do-tét,) though there are examples from the Book of Armagh: contultatar (Thes. ii, 240.25;) contorchartar (241.1;) contísed (242.6;) and contubart (242.20.) Thus, the evidence as to whether ò should be read as co- or con- in this context is inconclusive, as there is no strong indication, in any of the three corpora of glosses, that ò specifically indicated either form.
2.11.4 The issue of the nasal segment

Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 257) would seem to imply that the -n before an original t- written as d- should be viewed as evidence of a nasal segment that has been reassigned, by comparing these ‘fossilised’ forms to the aforementioned gondísad.

Against this particular proposal stands the evidence of other voiceless stops written phonetically in nasalising contexts in which there is no possible nasal coda: nach gein Wb7a11 Wb24d11 (cían; hore déte Wb11d07 (téit;) amal dete MI93b12 (téit;) nad-desta MI94c10 (do-esta). These forms demonstrate that the ability to write a stop phonetically was not limited to contexts with a preceding nasal segment and detracts from the theory that this be evidence of a proto-Scotticism.

This supposition is additionally difficult to accept in light of a more straightforward explanation. There is the possibility that these were an etymological or expository spelling, used for didactic purposes. There are examples of nasalisation before r spelled as n- (Uhlich 2006, 40-42) such as conrucca Wb12c32 and conropu MI67c09, and there are numerous other attestations before consonants other than d- and g- in which the nasalisation appears. These occur primarily when a nasalising monosyllabic conjunction is followed by ro-, which then likely spread. Most notably is corricci se i. conricci innaimsir hitaam Wb9a09 ‘until [you reach] this, i.e until the time in which we are,’ utilising the spelling with -n- to highlight the regular phonetic form.

Uhlich (2006, 40-43) has provided a number of attestations of this potential etymological spelling following monosyllabic nasalising conjunctions, a, co and i especially when followed by ro-, from across the corpus of Old Irish extant material. Outside of this collection, there are fairly limited occurrences of these conjunctions being spelled as an, con and in outside the normal rules of nasalisation.

There are nine potential instances of the conjunction aN ‘what, which, that’ written as an between Wb and Ml, with no occurrences in Sg. In Wb there are the three occurrences identified by Uhlich (2006, 40) preceding ro:- anrochlúinetar Wb11b06 anroscríbus Wb20c18 anropridchissemni Wb26b06. There are anrofiugrad Wb15a34 and anrogadammar Wb15c22 which are both noted in Thes. (i. 600 n. b; 602 n. b) that might be arrofiugrad and arrogadammar respectively. In Ml there is anrochluinemmar MI112b13 cited by Uhlich (2006, 41) as well as anrunainraccaigestar MI62b21 before ro-. There is additionally the form ancondammuchaitisse MI39d11 in which, as Uhlich
identified, the spelling has spread beyond \textit{ro}-. There is also the unexpected \textit{anfundali} MI111a08. There are no examples present in Sg.

The most occurrences of a form with this \textit{-n} occur with the conjunction \textit{co(n)}-, which, as mentioned by Uhlich (2006, 40 n.56,) is likely due to the use of the previously discussed abbreviation. Excluding the forms utilising the abbreviation, as they are inconclusive, as well as excluding forms that show regular nasalisation, Wb contains the most examples of \textit{con-} with 23, MI contains 14 and Sg has only 10. Considering the overall number of instances of \textit{coN}, these account for 9.6\% of the total attestations in Wb, 5.6\% of total attestations in MI and 12.5\% of total attestations in Sg.

In Wb there are \textit{conrocha} Wb6d01 \textit{conricci} Wb9a09 \textit{conrucca} Wb12c32 as identified by Uhlich (2006, 40) as well as \textit{conrufailnither} Wb1a09 \textit{conróbad} Wb6d06 \textit{conrochomalinid} Wb7c10 \textit{conroib} Wb12b12 \textit{conrucca} Wb12c32 \textit{conroadamrigther} Wb12d29 \textit{conrobad} Wb16c05 \textit{conroigset} Wb16c23 \textit{con roib} Wb18b22 \textit{conrochomalinid} Wb23b40 \textit{conrí} Wb24a17 \textit{conroib} Wb26d22 \textit{conroib} Wb27c20 \textit{conromíccad} Wb28a10 \textit{conrobad} Wb28c18 all before \textit{ro}-. There are additionally two occurrences before \textit{f-} in \textit{confestar} Wb12c38 and \textit{confesatar} Wb26d23, one before \textit{s-} in \textit{consoibat} Wb30c13, and once before \textit{c-} (\textit{conco})muir Wb24a17. Then there are the two occurrences mentioned above, of \textit{con-} spelled before an original \textit{t-} that has been spelled phonetically with the \textit{d-}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{con dánicc} Wb3c27 (\textit{do-icc})
\item \textit{conducaid} Wb21a08 (\textit{do-ucci}).
\end{itemize}

MI contains the \textit{conrupa ladia} MI67c09 noted as well by Uhlich, in addition to \textit{conrusleachta} MI53d11 \textit{conrecam} MI83c03 \textit{conraincataer} MI90d20 \textit{conrubu} MI99a02 \textit{conráélsa} MI41d11 all preceding \textit{ro}-. There are three occurrences before an \textit{f-} (\textit{confestar} MI51b10 and \textit{confresced} MI136d01 \textit{confolmaissiur} MI50d08,) as well as two preceding a \textit{c-} (\textit{concumaisón} MI32d15b \textit{concu} [leg: \textit{concum}] MI129b06 both \textit{con-icc}.) Then there are the three instances of \textit{con-} before an orthographically nasalised \textit{t-}, as discussed previously: 

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{co-n-dárbaís} MI101c06, \textit{condárbastar} MI95b06 and \textit{conduckthe} MI51d01.
\end{itemize}

Unlike the other two corpora, while Sg does contain three instances of \textit{con-} preceding \textit{ro-} (\textit{con roib} Sg4b01 \textit{conrop} Sg203b08 \textit{conro thinoll} Sg66b23,) the majority occur before \textit{f-}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{con format} Sg21b14 \textit{con festa} Sg26a06 \textit{confail} Sg88a03 \textit{con fil} Sg160b02 \textit{confoilsiged} Sg197b10; and there is a single attestation of \textit{con-} before an original \textit{t-}:
\item \textit{conduced} Sg17a05.
\end{itemize}
With regards to the conjunction $i^N$ only one instance of irregularly present $-n$ was found across the three corpora of glosses *inrochomallad* M1122d07, which once again appears preceding a *ro*.-

Ultimately, the explanation of a Scottish Gaelic type nasal codas is not entirely satisfactory, as there is evidence of phonetic spellings without a preceding nasal, and the possibility of $-n$- being used as an expository tool to highlight nasalisation. In the instance of $d^N$ and $i^N$, attestations outside of those occurring before *ro*- are incredibly limited, and even including those that precede *ro*- are fairly minimal and can be attributed to a spread beyond *con*- and *ro*-. Although the reach of *con-* has spread further beyond *ro*- than the other two conjunctions, this is undoubtedly on account of the abbreviation (cf. Uhlich 2006, 40 n.56.) Specifically, in the instances discussed above in which *con-* is followed by a phonetic *d*- this would indicate that the form utilising the *n*- is doing so as a part of an etymological spelling, highlighting that it is a nasalisation that has caused the subsequent *d*-.

### 2.11.5 *nícon dét*

There is additionally the issue of *nícon*, which Thurneysen (GOI §861) noted nasalised $t$- to *d*- in MI while leniting in both Wb and Sg. As evidence for stating that *nícon* nasalises in MI, Thurneysen cites the form *nícon dét* M153a17, which Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 257) had equally cited as evidence of a ‘fossilised’ form that had been nasalised from /t/ to /d/, reinterpreted as having a new radical *d*- and then potentially nasalised as the *d*.-

Despite the assertion in the *Grammar*, there is minimal evidence for *nícon* nasalising in MI. Thurneysen (GOI §896 n.) had additionally offered the example of *conaconnarmadatar* M154d17, which he read as *conacon·n-ármadatar*, though *Thes.* (i.

---

61 The preposition *i* however, has a few instances of seemingly irregular nasalisation, generally within a formula of describing how one letter changes into another cf. *is follus nach b. in s.* Sg16b05 ‘it is clear b (does) not (change) into s…’ This is undoubtedly the preposition and not the article owing to the nearly identical phrase in the Latin *…non motauerunt b. in s.* In this particular gloss it occurs twice before *s*, in both Sg23b07 and Sg24a01 it occurs before *r*. It could theoretically be argued that these are regular nasalisation, if these are understood as containing the respective phonetic values /ɛs/ and /ɛt/, being the Latin letter names as opposed to the sounds /s/ and /t/, in which case *i* would be preceding a vowel sound. This would require that the scribe use the Latin names for the letters, as opposed to the Irish, and while plausible, cannot be argued definitively. A similar argument could be made for the preposition *co* in in *ni·bi acumbo hísin in diuittius con·m. sed cubo* as. reliqua, Sg22a09 ‘…that *cumbo* does not occur in simplicity with *m*, but *cubo*, *cubas* etc.’ in which case *co* could either be preceding the phonetic /m/ or the Latin letter name /ɛm/, the former would not be regular nasalisation but the latter would be. This cannot be the case in *ni et in .ris* Sg99a01 ‘it is not *er* into *ris*’ in which *in* appears before an *r*- of a Latin word.
176 n. f) would propose this be read as conná irmadatar, thus suggesting a spelling error, specifically a doubling of the form con(n)a, citing Wb5b02 as reference: conaconnarmadatar degcomairli Ml54d17 ‘so that they did not attain to good counsel’ compared to niirmadatar firinni trirad Wb5b02 ‘they attained not truth through grace.’ Thurneysen’s reading would be slightly different, as he considered it to be a form of ad-midethar ‘aims at, essays’ thus ‘so that they did not aim at good counsel.’ Although the suggested comparable gloss from Thes. is not entirely analogous as the content is not quite the same, Thurneysen’s interpolation is not entirely satisfactory either.

The mutational effects of nícon and its derivatives thus need to be examined. The origins of nícon have been discussed previously (see Section 2.3) and will not be repeated here, but elsewhere nícon regularly lenites. Unfortunately, within Ml there are no occurrences of forms where lenition would be expected to be written, but within Wb there are examples such as níconchoscram Wb2b21 and níɔ chechrat Wb30c04, and within Sg there is niconfīl Sg188a04.

The derivatives of nícon, con(n)ac(c)on, arnacon, connachon, arnachon are not at all well-attested across the three corpora of glosses, and the few occurrences that do appear are not conclusive as to what, if any, mutation is caused: nadchonricthar Ml33d10 is inconclusive as the relevant element precedes an r-; in arnaconimthimchelltar [leg: arnachanimthimchelltar] Ml69b07 it precedes a vowel and no mutation is indicated, but in theory it could be argued lenition was understood. Con(n)ac(c)on appears to lenite, which accords with the evidence of nícon, based on a few occurrences preceding a b- in which no nasalisation is indicated (cf. ɔnacconbeth Ml103d09,) it does not precede any other consonants that could show lenition (cf. connaconrobae Ml80c09.)

With only the other evidence of nícon dét as validation for believing nícon/nacon was nasalising in Ml, it seems tenuous to suggest that this was intentional and not a minor copying mistake. As this would not appear to be a context in which nasalisation is expected, there is no basis for purporting that this be a ‘fossilised’ form that was nasalised from /t/ to /d/, subsequently understood as an inherited /d/ that was then nasalised according to regular phonology, theoretically with the nasal segment reassigned. If nícon had been found to nasalise, then perhaps there could have been an argument for a new nasal coda, but this is not the case. Instead, there is always the potential that, instead of this being a fossilised form as proposed by Ó Maolalaigh (2008, 257,) this is evidence of
contact nasalisation of the Scottish Gaelic type: that it is not nícon that has nasalised, but rather the -n of nícon that has caused the nasalisation of /t/ to /d/.

There is another gloss that shows an apparent unjustified nasalisation that can potentially be ascribed to a nasal coda: fornóin ē deilb Sg201b06 ‘according to one paradigm.’ A similar gloss, far nóenėdeilb Sg90b02 ‘according to the same paradigm’ appears to have deilb in the dative, on the basis of the parallel far cētnu dīull Sg90b01 ‘according to the first declension’ which clearly utilises the dative. As such, there is no reason for the deilb of Sg201b06 to be nasalised, excepting the possibility that the nasalisation was caused by the preceding nasal.

It is interesting to note that the manuscript of Sg does not present this second n as it is replicated by either the Thesaurus or the electronic edition, and instead has fornóinn with definitive space between this and deilb. In this instance, it could be argued that the punctum delens is not to indicate nasalisation (as it is presumed to do in the case of nóenėdeilb Sg90b02 in which only one -n is present) and instead was used as a genuine mark of deletion indicating a mistaken second -n.

Therefore, outside of the isolated example of nícon dēt, there does not appear to be any other feasible evidence for arguing the presence of a proto-Scottish Gaelic nasal coda within the three corpora of glosses. As previously discussed, the orthographic spelling of the voiceless stops is not isolated to contexts in which they are preceded by a nasal, and even then, the majority of examples occur following the element co-.

While the spelling of -n in nasalising contexts against standard orthographic norms could equally be posited as potential evidence of early evidence of this Scottish Gaelic nasal segment, its presence across all three corpora of glosses as well as the rest of the Old Irish corpus (Uhlich 2006, 40-42) casts significant doubt upon this possibility. Therefore, the most agreeable and more likely scenario would appear to be that these etymological spellings were just that – expository spellings, without an underlying spoken reality that developed to a nasal coda.

---

62 In her discussion of this gloss, Roma (2020, 190) remarks that this is unusual as óen regularly forms compounds. This has been shown to not be the case by Uhlich (forthcoming,) citing evidence such as from Carney (1964 129 n.345; 163; §41; §87) O’Brien (1955, 51:) (cf. GOI §130,) that demonstrates that óen was not required to form compounds.
2.11.6 The representation of nasalisation

Roma (2018; 2020) conducted an investigation into the representation of nasalisation in the three corpora of glosses and determined that there is a certain level of variation between them. Roma is a proponent of the theory that there is evidence of proto-Scotticisms in Old Irish in the form of nasalisation, in part pointing to the fact that Sg very regularly spelled an expected nasalisation following a nasal, which she would view as a reassigned nasal segment. (Roma 2020, 190.)

To contrast, following a nasal Wb only shows nasalisation once, on a genitive (Roma 2018, 6,) while Ml has 19 attestations (Roma 2018, 9) compared to 17 and 26 instances respectively, without indication of nasalisation. On this evidence, Roma (2020, 189) theorises that Sg and Ml may be evidence of later dialect distinctions, possibly with Sg showing an early Scottish Gaelic variety, while Wb represents a more conservative variety of nasalisation in which there was a lower frequency of nasalisation between consonants and across phrasal boundaries. She views (2018, 12) phrases such as rad ſné Wb7d03, which stands against four instances of the exact same phrase without noted nasalisation (Wb3d16, Wb12d20, Wb13b06, Wb21c20,) as evidence of nasalisation ‘creeping in.’ Roma does not appear to consider that this may be an orthographic phenomenon, and not a phonetic one: it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that, rather than nasalisation phonetically spreading, the orthography was not yet consistent, similar to how (as discussed above) voiceless stops typically do not show nasalisation but occasionally appear with phonetic spellings.

The basis for Ó Maolalaigh’s (1995-1996) proposed loss of nasalisation following consonantal codas presupposes the loss of interconsonantal nasalisation (GOI §237.) At least within the context of the three corpora of glosses, this assumption has proved to be implausible, as Roma (2018; 2020, 186-187) has demonstrated that after stressed nominals, interconsonantal and intervocalic nasals are not found at the same frequency, as the presence of nasals between vowels, or at least orthographic representation of them, increases over time, with Wb being the least consistent, Ml fairly consistent, and Sg incredibly consistent in showing them.

Roma (2020, 186) continues to note that the assumption that Wb lacked either phonetic or orthographic nasalisation generally cannot be supported by further evidence, specifically in that Wb is consistent in showing interconsonantal nasals in the interior of words. She provides the examples of frecndaire, aisndís (aisndisse, aisndissi), forngaire
and túailinge (túailngigidir, túailngigiud, túailngigthe) in which, in all attestations, Wb shows the nasal. Thus, clusters arising from syncope (cf. Feuth 1982; Ó Maolalaigh 1995-1996, 164) do not behave the same across a word boundary, even in similar phonetic contexts.

The increasing frequency of the representation of nasalisation indicates a change over the course of the Old Irish period, whether it be purely orthographic or indicative of an underlying phonetic reality. Nevertheless, the relative lack of orthographic representation of nasalisation in Wb has it stand in opposition to the other two corpora, just as Sg uniquely consistently marks nasalisation following a nasal. Ml is additionally distinct from the other two corpora in that it has seven attestations of nasalisation of a proclitic preposition, an entirely unexpected context (cf. Roma 2018, 12; 2020, 187 n.7), such as is bec ñ di dechur fil etarru Ml72c09 and condaig loc ñ dia [sic MS] diaditin Ml110d10. This type of nasalisation is entirely absent from the other two corpora.

The results of Roma’s (2018; 2020) investigation provide intriguing indications of synchronic variation, namely that all three corpora of glosses treat the representation of nasalisation entirely differently. Although none of the three provide a clear path towards the proposed formation of Scottish Gaelic (Roma 2020, 189) as put forward by Ó Maolalaigh, the evidence from Sg can potentially be viewed as a similar, or as an early stage of the development that resulted in the nasalising nasal coda.

The evidence for positing that the break between the Irish type of eclipsis and the Scottish Gaelic type of nasalisation occurred during the Old Irish period as found within the three corpora of glosses is unclear, and somewhat contradictory. Roma’s study (2018; 2020) has clearly demonstrated that the three corpora of glosses all represent nasalisation in diverging ways and has plausibly argued that Sg may show evidence of Scotticism. While the evidence itself is open to interpretation, the most salient point to the present investigation is that the three corpora represent nasalisation differently, indicating a level of synchronic variation with regards to the representation of nasalisation. Although this cannot definitively be linked to dialects, or a potential divergence in the language into distinct branches, as the extent to which the orthography represents the phonology is unclear, it undoubtedly demonstrates that there were competing ways of orthographically representing nasalisation at the very least, if not competing phonological realities.

The evidence of co-/con- and its potential as an indication of an existing nasal coda is equally unclear, as many of the attestations of the form are abbreviated, and not written
in full. The evidence from a and i, and the relative lack of an and in can perhaps indicate that the frequency with which con- is present can be attributed to the abbreviation, and that all three are better understood as a didactic tool for highlighting the nasalisation, as it is used following monosyllabic conjunctions, often with ro-.

An argument against this notion is the form nícon dét which, if nícon has not nasalised -tét, has to be explained as either a reinvented form of the verb (déit) that otherwise has no presence in Old Irish (or indeed Scottish Gaelic) or as mere scribal error – the latter being a particularly unsatisfactory proposal. With the exception of this form, nícon and its derivatives appear to lenite and thus there is no way to explain an underlying nasalisation that would then be reinterpreted as an inherited d-, ‘re’-nasalised as such with an accompanying reassigned nasal segment. Thus, outside of the aforementioned possibility of scribal error, the only remaining explanation for nícon dét is that of contact nasalisation caused by the preceding nasal coda, making it the only strong piece of evidence of a proto-Scottish nasalisation in the three corpora of glosses.

Lexical Features

2.12 Kelly

Kelly’s survey of the usage of uncommon animal terms is one of the few scholarly works to focus exclusively on a discussion of the possibility of dialects of Old Irish. Kelly believes that traces exist in the written language and agrees with O’Rahilly’s (1932, 17-18) two dialect model, in which there was a dialect division between the northern part of Ireland and the south, though O’Rahilly never identifies this twofold model as having existed during the Old Irish period. Kelly identifies a handful of rare terms for animals that she does not believe can be attributed to an older stratum of vocabulary, as their more common equivalents are equally attested in the earliest texts, but that these less common terms are derived from a southern dialect (Kelly 1982, 86).

This conclusion is drawn from the occurrence of five of her identified rare terms in the Bretha Nemed group of law texts, which Binchy (1958a, 51-54) has located as being from the south, and in favour of which Bretnach (1984) has added further evidence. The ‘final redactors’ (Bretnach 1984, 441-442) of the Bretha Nemed have been identified as three men: Báethgalach hua Búireáin, Forannán and Máel Tuile. The kinsmen are named in a poem from the Book of Uí Maine (cf. Macalister 1942, 83ra58–83vb6; Bretnach 1984, 439-440,) which identifies the compilers of the Bretha Nemed.
Báethgalach is equally found attributed as an author in the Book of Ballymote (Stokes 1901, 16.13,) and the three men are referred to in the *Uraicecht Becc* (CIH v 1596.7ff.) The only independent copy of extracts of the text are in the hand of Dubhaltach Mac Fir Bhisigh, which identifies their part in the compilation of *Bretha Nemed* as having been conducted during the reign of Cathal mac Finguine (721-742) in Munster (Breatnach 1984, 442-444.)

Kelly identifies seven pairs of words, found in the table below each of which contains a ‘standard’ form, and a ‘rare’ form, which she has collated from glossaries in which the ‘rare’ form is glossed by the ‘standard’ form, and she argues that these are not older forms but diatopic variants.

From the *Bretha Nemed* group of texts Kelly identifies five of her ‘rare’ forms, leading to the conclusion that these ‘rare’ forms are from a southern variant that was underrepresented in the material; this particular finding coalesces nicely with the prior suggestion (see Sections 1.2.1, 1.5) that the ‘standard’ of Old Irish was based on a ‘northern’ variety promulgated by powerful monasteries such as Nendrum, Bangor and Armagh. Of the unusual forms, cremthann and cadla do not appear in the *Bretha Nemed* texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Standard’ Old Irish</th>
<th>Rare term</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bó</td>
<td><em>ferb</em></td>
<td>‘cow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ech</em></td>
<td><em>marc</em></td>
<td>‘horse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mucc</em></td>
<td><em>feis</em></td>
<td>‘pig’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cáera</em></td>
<td><em>cethnat</em></td>
<td>‘sheep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gabor</em></td>
<td><em>cadla</em></td>
<td>‘goat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sinnach</em></td>
<td><em>cremthann</em></td>
<td>‘fox’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dam</em> (allaid,) oss</td>
<td><em>sêd/sêg</em></td>
<td>‘deer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three corpora of glosses are regrettably limited in their usage of zoological vocabulary; references in Wb are especially scant. None of Kelly’s identified rare words appear in the glosses, albeit there is a derivative to be discussed further below: neither *sinnach* nor *cremthann* never occur in any of the collections of glosses, and *bó* appears
only once in both Ml (bai Ml2b11) and Sg (inna bao Sg22b11) and never in Wb. Sg is
the only collection to have any reference to a goat, in which gabor is used only once
(Sg37b03) and the other two references use the term heirp (Sg48a10, Sg61a13,) that is,
erp ‘she-goat,’ once glossing capra ‘she-goat’ and once glossing dáma that is, damma
‘deer.’

There is no mention of sheep in Wb, but Ml has cairchaib twice (Ml100b15, Ml100b18) and Sg has cairchuide (Sg37b08.) Sg has five occurrences of the noun mucc (Sg26a01, Sg26a02, Sg47b01, Sg94a03, Sg214a04) and one occurrence of the adjective mucde (Sg37b09) ‘swine-like.’

There is no mention of sēl/sēg in any of the three corpora, though dam to denote a
deer, or a stag is used only three times across the glosses. Ml has two references dumu
alti (Ml48d09) and dam n-altae (Ml121c19), and Sg has the adjective damde (Sg37b04)
‘deerlike.’ Sg also contains damthóbae (Sg68b11) ‘ox-cutting’ and Wb’s two references
are both as oxen (daum Wb10d08, daim Wb10d06.)

Ml has four explicit references to horses using the word ech: ech Ml16b11, ech
Ml16b12, milib ech Ml43d01 and echaib Ml43d03. Sg has no explicit references to
horses, however, but three terms related to horses and containing the element ech: echaire
‘horsekeeper’ Sg33b03, echlas ‘horsecloth’ Sg33b05 and echaire ‘horse-groomer’
Sg62b06.

As previously mentioned, none of the glosses contain the ‘rare’ word marc. However,
Ml contains marcachu (Ml34c10,) glossing the Latin ascensores, ‘riders.’ Sg also has
marcach (Sg50a23) and the adjectival form marcachde (Sg54b01.)

The term has not garnered much scholarly attention (cf. Krogmann 1936.) This is the
word marc with a suffixed -ach, from the Proto-Celtic *markākos, cognate with Old
Welsh marhauc, Middle Welsh marchawc and Old Breton marcoc and the ancestor of
Modern Irish’s marcach, denoting a horseman or a rider. At first glance, the existence of
this word appears to be evidence for diatopic variation within the glosses. However, the
possibility that marcach was simply the standard or preferred word for a rider, or a
horseman, and not formed from a diatopic variant, cannot be discounted. Therefore, in

63 The DIL entry for eirp references the entry for ferb, Kelly’s rare term for cow as there are scattered
examples of ferb meaning ‘deer,’ such as Cath Finntrága (Meyer 1885, 562.) This is unsurprising, as the
labelling of animals seems to be fairly loose: cf. dam meaning both an ox and a stag, eirp being used both
as she-goat and to gloss Latin dama.
order to make a true comparison, it must be determined whether or not a similar form – perhaps *echach – is present within the glosses, or elsewhere in the extant corpus.

There does not appear to be an attested *echach that could be considered an immediate parallel. There is the term echlach that has the meaning of ‘messenger,’ the secondary meaning given for marcach in DIL, and attested elsewhere in the Old Irish corpus as ‘messenger’ in texts such as in the Táin Bó Cúailnge (TBC 1673) and Serglige Con Culainn (Stokes and Windisch 1880-1909, i. 225.) With regards to echlach, as an á-stem it is likely comparable to óclach and midlach, thus comprised of ech-lach.

Echlach does not seem to be synonymous with marcach, which would eliminate it as a diatopic variant, as its meaning appears to be more closely related to that of ‘messenger’ and not ‘horseman.’ O’Rahilly (1921/1923, 15-16) discusses echlach, specifically within the phrase eachlach urláir, which is found within the Acallam na Senórach (c. 1200) (Stokes 1880-1909, iv. ll. 586-587,) and cites Meyer’s edition of Cath Finntrága (15th century) (an Early Modern Irish text) and its usage of echlach that Meyer (1885, 35) translates as ‘horseman.’ He continues on to agree with O’Grady’s (1885-7, 647) assessment of the phrase in this context as ‘a mounted messenger belonging to the teaghlach (household),’ whom he contrasts to the teachtaire siubhail, also mentioned in the text, who is a foot messenger. O’Rahilly (1921/1923, 15) continues to state that echlach means ‘little more than “messenger,”’ and equates its later usage as a synonym to giolla, ‘servant, attendant.’ From this brief assessment, it would seem as if echlach is not an equivalent to marcach, in the sense of being a horseperson, as it lacks any attestations of usage where it could indicate an equestrian, and therefore its usage cannot be compared.

To return then to the three corpora of glosses, without any attestations of other words for ‘horsemen,’ other equestrian references were sought, with none being found within Wb. Sg on the other hand has two occurrences of the word óinechaid Sg50b02 and óenechaid, Sg55b07. In both instances, óinechaid glosses the Latin eques in the phrase eq(u)us eques. The glosses marcach Sg50a23 and marcachdae Sg54b01 gloss the equester64 of the phrase eques equester. It would seem that marcach here is a more general term while óen-echaid is more specifically a rider.

---

64 Thees. ii 104 indicates marcach Sg50a23 is glossing the eques of this phrase. The digital edition (Bauer, Hofman and Moran 2017) indicates that the gloss is on equester. The manuscript copy was consulted (St. Gallen, 50a39) and the gloss is clearly and definitively over equester. It is unclear why this is not clearly indicated in the Thees. It would certainly make sense if marcach were to gloss eques and marcachdae, equester as that would be the noun glossing the noun and the adjective glossing the adjective,
Evidently a compound of the numeral óín/óen and echaid, neither óinechaid nor echaid has an entry in the dictionary, though it appears under the DIL entry for oen IV. Outside of these two occurrences in Sg, nearly every reference to the form echaid is in relation to these two glosses (cf. Ascoli 1879, III. lxviii; Pictet 1864, 312; Zeuss 1871, 301) the only exception being the form ó[e]nechdae, listed together with óenechaid in DIL, from Sanas Cormaic (Meyer 1907, 96, §1082)

The case of MI is substantially more complicated. The only other reference to a rider in any of the collections of glosses appears in MI43d01.

HI IN CURRIBUS, ET HII IN EQUIT. adrogantia omnis Assiriorum fuit in equis et in curribus, quod etiam uerbis1 Rabsacis apparuit.

‘Some in chariots and some in horses. The pride of all Assyria was in horses and in chariots as it is evidenced by the words of Rabshakeh?’

1. .i. intan asrubart sum frimmaccu israhel imbói dioinachdaib leu robeth fordib milib ech.

‘when he said to the sons of Israel, whether they had riders sufficient to mount two thousand horses.’

The translation, ‘riders’ certainly makes sense, but the word oinachdaib poses somewhat of a puzzle. There do not appear to be any references to this form outside of quotations or translations of this particular gloss, without any particular treatment of the form (cf. Ascoli 1879, III. lxviii.) The word appears under the headword ainech in the dictionary, and the entry consists of a reference to O’Clery’s Irish glossary that reads, ‘aineach .i. marcaigheacht ech,’ a reference to the headword óenach, and ending with a reference to this gloss. From the outset, this is problematic: neither ainech nor óenach contains a -d that would account for the dental found in oinachdaib. There is a potential solution in proposing the origin of this -d- derives from the adjectival suffix -d(a)e (GOI §347–§348,) which would mean something like ‘óenach-y’ or óenach-related.65 This does not seem to suit the context of the gloss found in MI, which seems to function as a

and this is the impression given in the Thes., but this is unfortunately not the case based on the manuscript evidence.

65 There is an entry in DIL for such a term: oenachda ‘pertaining to an “oenach” or public contest; as subst. m. a participator (? president or judge) in such.’ There is a single citation that is inverted in DIL from how it appears in the text: unde dicitur agonithetas? principes belli .i. na haenachdu (Stokes 1860, 137 n.45.) Thus no horse-related context here.
noun or, as parsed in the digital edition of the corpus, a substantivised adjective (cf. Griffith and Stifter 2013.)

Even with a cursory understanding of the word Óenach, the gulf between the meanings is eminently clear: Óenach is a location, frequently the location of a large gathering, or an occasion (cf. Binchy 1958b.) not a term for a rider or a horseman. The only direct reference to horses within the entry itself comes from Sanas Cormaic: oenach i. āine ech (Meyer 1907, 86; 1002) translated by O’Donovan (1868, 127) as ‘contention [?] of horses,’ ‘delightfulness of horses’ or ‘swiftness of horses.’ DIL simply has ‘horse-races.’ The reference seems to be about a horse race, and not a rider, although certainly one could argue that a derived adjective meaning something along the lines of ‘Óenach-man,’ referring to the type of person who was present or integral to an Óenach, in which there are horse races, is plausible.

It seems most reasonable to understand the entry in Sanas Cormaic as an example of belrae n-etarscartha, a medieval etymological analysis ‘using phonetically similar and semantically suitable linguistic forms, either by direct “derivation” or through an intermediate stage,’ (Baumgarten 1983, 226) that breaks multi-syllabic words into separate words which phonetically mirror the syllables (Binchy 1943, 90). These types of etymologies tend to emphasise a particular semantic aspect of the word (Russell 2008, 7,) and in this instance it would appear to be referring to a horse-race as something that takes place at an Óenach.

de Bhaldraithe (1995, 173) discusses the word aineach (see DIL s.v. 1 ainech) as having been misinterpreted in multiple 17th-19th century glossaries, stemming from a gloss in O’Clery’s glossary: aineach i. marcaigheacht each ‘horsemanship’ (Miller 1879-80, 361.) He argues that O’Clery mistakenly linked the words aine ech from Cormac’s gloss on Óenach. O’Clery’s entry for aonach seems to clarify things somewhat: aonach i. áineach i. áit amhí marcaigheacht go hán, no gú háoibhinn ‘a place in which there is horsemanship nobly (án) or beautifully’ (Miller 1879-80, 366-367.)

Overall, de Bhaldraithe’s assessment, that O’Clery has mistakenly linked ainech and Óenach, appears to be correct, as the sense of ainech as presented by O’Clery’s glossary does not quite seem to match with Óenach. The form does not match either, for that

66 There is also a mention of horses in a phrase from the Metrical Dindshenchas (iii 350.23) fer ro chóemaig na cleusa ic gním Óenaig ech-thressa ‘the man who cherished feats of skill, holding a meeting for horse-fights.’ In this instance Óenaig is used in its usual sense, as a meeting, and not specifically as the ‘horse-fights’ themselves. The equine activity is merely something that occurred at the Óenach.
matter, especially with regards to the palatal -n- of ainech and neutral -n- of óenach, whereas the idea of a place in which to ride horses is more congruous with the general sense of the word.

This leaves us with the matter of oinachdaib. The Milan Glosses Database (Griffith and Stifter 2013) lists this as a substantivised form of the adjective óenachdae and explains it as ‘as pertaining to an oínach, a jockey, horse racer, a rider.’ This certainly accounts for the -d-, but remains unsatisfactory; as discussed, there are no direct attestations of óenach being specifically related to horses or riding, although horse-racing was certainly one of the activities undertaken at an óenach (Binchy 1958b, 124.) Understanding óenachdae as someone typically present at an óenach therefore being a rider, does not entirely make sense, as equestrian activities were not the primary function nor focus of an óenach; indeed, taking the reference from the Metrical Dindshenchas (iii 350.23) fer ro chóemaig na cleasa ic gním óenaig ech-thressa ‘the man who cherished feats of skill, holding a meeting for horse-fights’ in which it is specified that equestrian activity would take place at this particular óenach, would imply that horse-related activities were not inherently a part of every óenach.

Although it is not impossible that the presence of equestrian activity at the óenach lead to an ‘óenach-person’ being associated with a rider more generally, the fact that this substantivised adjective appears only once in the Old Irish corpus, in this reference in MI, when there was a perfectly good alternative noun marcach, meaning ‘rider’ or ‘horseman’ already available (cf. MI34c10, MI72b28) makes this theory not entirely plausible.

It is also possible to understand oinachdaib as the dative plural of oínechaid, a form that is otherwise attested in Sg. The phonologically regular form would be *óenachaid, with the undoubtedly neutral n followed by the expected neutral representation of schwa: -a-. The form oínechaid as found in Sg, then, could be explained as a reinsertion of the -e- from ech, with a subsequently reinterpreted palatal -n- to accord with the ‘reinstated’ -e-. It will necessitate a further study of syncope patterns of agentive formations with -id before being conclusive – but, in my opinion, it appears to make better sense than understanding it as óenach.

---

67 Binchy (1958b) discusses the function and activities of the óenach at length, and while horse-racing is certainly mentioned, it is only one of a number of activities including trade, other games, athletic competitions, lawsuits and marriage arrangements.

68 Ascoli (1879, III. lxviii) has this word & gloss cited under the entry for -ech, specifically alongside both occurrences of oínechaid under a heading of -echid.
Equally, as noted by Thurneysen (GOI §109) trisyllabic words that, by way of inflection or a formative suffix, have an additional syllable often syncopate the vowel of the third syllable by analogy with disyllabic words, and he cites examples such as the dative plural *cumachtgaib of *cumachtach. There is further evidence of this type of analogical, irregular syncope pattern in denominative verbs (Ó Cruialaoich 1997.) While in denominative verbs with regular syncope pattern in denominative verbs (Ó Cruialaoich 1997.) While in denominative verbs with regular syncope patterns, such as cos' mill'ig'mmer Sg211a14 < *cosqua-li-hay-i-mmor-, syncopation of the final vowel of the denominative suffix when the personal ending had been added is found, in verbs in which the final vowel of the suffix is not in a fourth or sixth syllable, the expected formation is never found: ammnigther Wb21a14 for expected *ainm'ni'gethar; daingnigthe MI47c08 for *daing'ni'githe; ro ainmnichthe Sg31a05 for ro ainm'ni'githe (Ó Cruialaoich 1997, 240-241.)

With that in mind, *oinachaid can potentially be understood as having syncopated the schwa of its final syllable, -ai-, when it became tetrasyllabic with the addition of the suffixed dative plural ending. Whether or not words that were trisyllabic were, on account of being a compound, treated as disyllabic or trisyllabic with regards to syncope patterns merits further investigation, but there is already substantial (cf. Ó Cruialaoich 1997) evidence for analogical syncope patterns, that indicates this proposition is not outside the realm of possibility.

Ultimately, marcach, and associated terms appear to be more commonly occurring in Old Irish, as well as leaving traces in the modern language. The only other competing terms to be found appear to be less common, and thus despite being formed from one of Kelly’s identified rare forms, it is not possible to determine any geographic or diatopic relationship from the three corpora of glosses, meaning that Kelly’s are not supported by the texts analysed here. That said, the fact that the more common animal words discussed by Kelly have their origins in a ‘northern’ dialect, bolsters the prior theory that the standard of Old Irish retained in our extant corpus represents the language of the north of the country, as it contained a number of wealthy and powerful ecclesiastical institutions (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 221.)

2.13 Murray

Murray (2005) conducted a study of potential dialect evidence in onomastics, looking at lexical forms that appear in placenames and their geographic distribution. He states,
‘[Placenames] is a very good field in which to examine questions of dialect because many early placenames can be geographically located and, as is well known, placenames are liable to fossilise early forms of the language’ (2005, 101). In a footnote, he mentions the retention of the element -tocher in the Scottish Gaelic placenames Duntocher and Kintocher, containing the word tóchar, which is no longer used in speech. Murray (2005, 106) concurs with prior scholarship in that written Old Irish was standardised but acknowledges the existence of dialect features and notes that beyond describing them as ‘nuances of dialect,’ not much more can be stated. His designation of ‘nuances of dialect’ is itself a quote from Jackson (1951, 79). Neither author provides an explanation of what is meant by ‘nuances of dialect,’ and it feels a somewhat overly cautious way of agreeing with the existence of dialects, without committing to any particular evidence of their existence. A ‘nuance’ of dialect would, by nature, be a dialect distinction itself: a feature is either a diatopic variant or it is not.

The original quotation by Jackson is his only concession to the possibility of dialects in the Old Irish within his theorising about Common Gaelic. He states that there is no evidence of separation between his ‘Eastern’ and ‘Western’ Gaelic before the 10th century, but not properly until the 13th:

‘O’Rahilly has made it clear that the modern Irish dialects did not really begin to come into existence before the thirteenth or fourteenth century at earliest; until that time we must suppose Irish to have been a homogenous language throughout the island except for such small local differences and incipient nuances of dialect as are bound to occur over such a comparatively large area’ (Jackson 1951, 79.)

The quote itself is contradictory – the language was homogenous except for ‘nuances of dialect,’ and the choice of the word ‘nuance’ here, can be viewed as a way of minimising the influence and existence of dialects, as outright acknowledging them calls into question the proposed homogeneity of the language, and the accompanying assertion that there was no variation in the Gaelic language pre-13th century. It is unclear why Murray included this quoted phrase, and what was intended: perhaps his hesitation in outright referring to the existence of Old Irish dialects was owing to the inability to fix any particular feature, or collection of features, to a specific geographic location.

Murray’s study identifies a number of words whose usage in placenames is mainly restricted to a particular region. He notes (2005, 101) that early placenames can fossilise earlier forms of the language and states that this is a good reason to examine placenames as evidence of dialect. While at first glance this explanation appears logical – the fixed
location of a placename provides a geographic region with which a potential dialect can be associated – there are inherent difficulties in assuming diatopic variation from the evidence of placenames. The absence of a particular placename, or a particular element located within a placename, in a different region is not evidence that the placename or placename element did not exist in the spoken language. The people occupying the other region may have been familiar with the term and opted not to utilise it as a placename for any number of reasons. The implication that the absence of a particular element in the placenames of a region means that the element was unknown in that region is far too simplistic, as it ignores the numerous other factors that are involved in the creation and identification of placenames. Unless two competing elements are identified and linked to separate geographic regions, elements in names alone cannot be definitive evidence of dialect variation.

An illustrative example is that of *cathair*, which Murray states is found spread across Galway, Clare, Mayo, Limerick, Kerry and Cork – exclusively in the west of Ireland (Murray 2005, 104.) This word is in no way a diatopic variant, and was undoubtedly present across the island, even though its presence in placenames is limited to the west of Ireland. Unless Murray would argue that *cathair* was, at one time, a localised lexeme limited to the west of Ireland, considering it a marker of dialect is not a reasonable conclusion. Instead, the localised presence of *cathair* can be attributed to other origins: both *cathair* and *caísel* tend to have been reserved for stone-built ring enclosures. These types of buildings predominate in the west of Ireland where stones were abundant and the ground was unsuitable for digging, whereas they were less common in marshy areas, where instead *crannóga* were more popular (Ó Corráin 2005, 551.) The larger presence of *cathair* in the west, then, may not be the result of dialect, but rather different building practices dependent on local materials and its associated terminology: *cathair* was not used as frequently in placenames in the east, as the building-type typically associated with *cathair* was not as popular.

Murray provides a number of other examples of potential geographic restrictions for his identified terms: the compound *muirból* (Murlough) is most commonly used in Ulster and Scotland, and the element *cobfán*, generally spelt *cabán* (Cavan) is primarily found within Ulster, or in counties bordering Ulster. The term *accomól* (Uggool, Ugoon) and *cathair* is spread across counties Galway, Clare and Mayo. *Mell*, anglicised as Maul, is restricted to Cork and Kerry while *sód* is the most geographically contained, occurring
only along the southern stretch of the Shannon between Lough Derg and Limerick. His example of *imblech* (Emlagh/Emly) is noted to be a common element in placenames, albeit with little representation in Ulster, as is the case with the less common *irrus* (Erris) which is also not found in Ulster (Murray 2005, 103-105.)

There are difficulties inherent in these examples. In addition to the above discussion of *cathair*, the form *muirbolc* is not attested anywhere outside of placenames, and thus it cannot be stated that the *Muirbolc* regions had the corresponding appellative lexeme in opposition to others. As the name appears to refer to an inlet, or a small bay (cf. Murray 2005, 101) its absence in landlocked counties is hardly surprising, and its absence in other coastal areas does not indicate that the lexeme was unknown to them, but rather that they elected not to use it.

The only way to properly conclude that placenames are a function of diatopic distinction, and not the result of different motivating factors in producing placenames, would be to identify two identical, or even relatively similar, competing appellative lexemes found within placenames that are each specifically preferred in a particular geographic region.

Murray does not directly draw conclusions from his findings. He states (2005, 104:)

‘We can only use the earliest written form of the placename as evidence even though many of these names have, quite probably, a longer history behind them. Thus, arguments most *[sic]* often be constructed on partial evidence.’ He then continues to conclude the paper by stating that, ‘placenames would seem to offer the most hope for geographically locating possible dialect features in medieval Irish vocabulary’ (Murray 2005, 106) which, considering the limitations discussed above, is an overextension.

The absence of certain placename elements in a particular region is not evidence that the element itself did not exist in that region, and the conclusion that placenames provide the ‘most hope’ for identifying diatopic features is unconvincing, especially considering his prior statement that arguments must be based on partial evidence.

Unfortunately, but not unsurprisingly for the purposes of the present study, the placenames identified by Murray and their corresponding lexemes are not of any particular use. The collections of glosses do not contain Irish or Scottish placenames, and the majority of the mentioned elements are not present in any of the collections of glosses. The only two exceptions are the words *accomol* and *cathair*, which appear in all three collections and therefore there is no indication of variation.
2.14 pail & engraic

In an analysis of the language of the poems of Blathmac, Stifter touches upon the possibility of diatopic evidence in the poems, beginning with a discussion of lexemes that are unique to the poems.

His first offering is pailt, as found in the compound palpálám, addressing the non-palatalised -lt- as regressive [sic recte for ‘progressive’] assimilation (Stifter 2015, 54.) The loanword pailt is of British origin, *palt and is mainly attested in North and East Ulster, specifically Rathlin Island, Antrim and Inishowen, most of which are areas traditionally associated with the East Ulster dialect. Stifter (2015, 55) remarks that the word is not otherwise found in Irish until the 19th century, though it is found in both Scottish Gaelic and Manx. They are unique to the poems, and there is no trace of pailt or palpálám in the glosses.

Pailt and palpálám have a few potential synonyms that can mean ‘plenty, abundance,’ though even with regards to identifying synonyms, the exact nuance of meaning may not be identical and thus speak to a preference for one form over the other that is not indicative of diatopic variation. Additionally, the limited attestation in Blathmac provides little with which to compare. The only occurrence appears as ba palpálám fial in fodloir (1. 134) translated by Carney as ‘the distributor was generous-handed and bountiful’ and by Stifter as ‘the distributor had a hand of plenty and was generous.’ Although a few potential synonyms may be identified, the only one which regularly appeared predicatively with a copula was that of imdae: cit imdi farforcitlidi Wb9a12 ‘though your teachers be abundant;’ combat imdiforcaíngníme Wb26c08 ‘so that your good deeds may be abundant;’ roptis imdai piana donaib anmanaib…Ml15c08 ‘punishments to the soul would be abundant…;’ nírbu imdæ Ml46c19 ‘he was not common;’ condib imdu de torand innaoforgnúso Sg198a04 ‘so that the sign of the figure may be the more abundant.’

With no attestation of imdae within the poems of Blathmac, it could be argued that this is evidence of diatopic variation in which Blathmac preferred pailt/palpálám to the imdae of the three corpora of glosses, but with such minimal attestation of Blathmac, and the associated limited opportunities to either use pailt further, or utilise imdae, it seems far too tenuous to consider them as a feature of dialect, unless Blathmac is considered to
represent its own particular dialect. Although, as discussed in Section 2.5, there is tentative evidence to suggest that it is of the same provenance as MI.

Stifter (2015, 55-56) continues to discuss the lexeme gráic “place, abode,” that otherwise does not occur as a simplex in Early Irish but reappears in Modern Irish as gráig and gráigán. As a placename, there are 130 records of gráig or gráigán nearly exclusively in the southern half of Ireland. The glosses, as discussed above, show no evidence of Irish placenames.

However, the element grá(i)c appears in the compound engraic, which Stifter notes occurs almost exclusively in MI and Sg, and primarily in its derivatives used as grammatical terms for pronouns: engracugud and engraicigidir. He states that while the toponomastic usage is limited to the south, albeit with one attestation in Monaghan, the appellative usage as grammatical terms in the glosses does not necessarily contradict Blathmac’s northern roots, as McCone (1985, 97) has suggested a northern origin for both Sg and MI. Stifter is correct, in that Wb contains no occurrences of engraic, or the form gráic in isolation, whereas MI has two: engraic MI38c19 and engracud MI114a04. Sg, a text primarily concerned with grammar, has thirteen occurrences: engracus Sg12a04, Sg61a05; engraic(c) Sg30b16, Sg200b10, Sg204a07; engra(ic)cigidir Sg193b05, Sg200b10; engracogud/engracugud Sg197a01, Sg198a09; nengraicigedar Sg197b02; engraicicthe Sg198b08; noda-engraicigetar Sg198b08; nengraicigetar Sg200b05.

Without other attestations of element engra(i)c, it would be tenuous to consider this form a marker of dialect. Lexical diatopic variation is one of the most difficult to identify in the Old Irish corpus, as in order to confidently identify a word as being diatopic, it would necessitate the identification of an equivalent word, used in nearly identical function and meaning, that could be proposed as either another dialectal variant or perhaps the ‘standard’ word. Without the ability to do so, the absence of a lexeme in a particular source is not evidence of a dialect in which said lexeme was not present or was not preferred, but rather the absence of a context in which a particular lexeme may be used.

---

69 Only two other attestations of the form have been found: ængreicc, glossing the adverb ‘vix’ which according to Stokes (1892, 247) is a mistake on the part of the scribe for the nominative of vicem, vice, and a single reference gebes ingreic. i. greim na ceithre n-ernaili du remendaib ‘will take the place i.e. the function of the four parts in declensions’ in Auraicept na n-éces (Calder 1917, 1722.)
With that in mind, no form that is directly analogous to the non-verbal *engraic* has been found. It is predominantly used in the sense of replacement: *inengraicc anmmae aitherrecht* aithgthi Sg30b16 ‘in place of a patronymic noun,’ but a direct equivalent against which to compare usage has not yet been found.

**Conclusions**

Features identified by previous scholarship as potential evidence of diatopic variation within the Old Irish corpus, or indeed synchronic variation as a whole, has yielded mixed results, albeit with the overwhelming conclusion that variation did exist.

Certain previously identified possibilities such as the anaphoric pronoun *-són/-ón* and the enclitic demonstrative *-so/-sa/-se* have not been shown to be unique or preferred to any particular corpora, and instead have been identified as showing equivalent usage amongst all three corpora of glosses, with a potential for a chronologically increasing preference. Semantic variation has, unfortunately, had too few attestations to draw definitive conclusions, and other proposed variations such as the variation in *níc* and *ní* and *fadessin* and *cadessin* have been shown to have semantic distinctions.

There are, however, some variations that are able to be considered potential diatopic variants, or at least, point to differing origins for the three corpora. Although the difference between the forms meaning ‘self’ have been shown to contain slightly different semantic meanings, Wb is the only of the three corpora to have an unexpected form with an additional syllable present as a final *-e*. The variation in the proclitic *ar/-er/-ir-* shows a unique *ir-* in Wb that does not appear in the other two corpora, and a distinct preference for *er-* in Ml that is not otherwise shared. Ml too has the unusual *spiurt* in place of the expected *spirut*.

The variability in the representation of nasalisation, whether it be pronounced or orthographic indicates differing scholarly practices, as does the doubled superlative ending *-imem* apparent only in Ml.

The only identified variation that can potentially be mapped to distinct geographic origins is that within the paradigm of *tech*, in which Ml appears to show a ‘southern’ variation in contrast to the ‘northern’ variation present in Sg. Whether or not the locations of these alternative paradigms are believed to be accurate, the fact that Ml and Sg both contain a divergence from the expected paradigm that is not shared between them, indicates that there undoubtedly was variation present between the Old Irish corpora,
disproving the previously held ‘homogeneity’ of the language (cf. O’Rahilly 1932; Jackson 1972, 74-75.)

At the outset, when examining only variations previously identified in scholarship, it is clear that there is synchronic variation within the Old Irish corpus, though the full extent of which, and the possibility of dialects, is not completely clear.
3. Preverbs & prepositions

The investigation of this chapter was largely instigated by the collections of forms from the Dictionary, from which it became apparent that there was a significant variation in forms of preverbal particles. From there, a thorough examination of preverbs and prepositions was undertaken and much of the results are present in this current chapter. As there was an extensive amount of variation found within all three corpora of glosses, and all within the same general context of preverbs and prepositions, it was necessary to dedicate a single chapter to the discussion of them all.

The purpose of this chapter is to identify, outline and discuss instances of phonological variation within the preverbs and prepositions found in the three corpora of Old Irish glosses. Some discussion of phonological variation already exists but generally tends to focus on either a single element (cf. Stifter 2014; Lash 2017) or discusses a handful of elements (Armstrong 1976) with a more narrow scope. This chapter will not rehash or reiterate points that have already been made, but expand where possible and discuss variation that has thus far received little or lesser attention, in order to determine the extent to which variation is present in the three corpora of glosses.

In his discussion Thurneysen (GOI §819) separated the prepositions (including preverbs) into four categories based on their positions, as they take different forms depending on their position and their function. His categories are a) in close composition under or after the stress, such as verbal compounds b) pretonic position, specifically the first element of a deuterotonic verb c) pretonic, functioning as a preposition and causing a dependent case and d) stressed in a prepositional pronoun.

These can equally be divided into two categories: tonic forms in which the preposition or preverb is stressed, ie. Thurneysen’s categories A and D; and pretonic forms, non-conjugated prepositions and those preverbs that are the first element of a deuterotonic verb (Griffith 2016, 55,) i.e. Thurneysen’s categories B and C. For the purposes of the discussion here all of these distinctions will be taken into consideration, though there is particular emphasis on the significant variation found within the pretonic positions.

3.1 Minor variations

In the course of the investigation resulting in this chapter, a number of variations were discovered. While the majority, to be discussed further below, were rather extensive and, in certain cases, demonstrated a particular preference on the part of a single corpus, a
couple were more minor in scope and less easily mapped to a particular set of glosses. Nevertheless, as the intention of the study is to catalogue all discovered instances of synchronic variation, these minor variations from expected forms have been included in this initial section.

3.1.1 ad

The preposition ad, possibly from the Proto-Celtic *ad (Matasović 2008, 24) or potentially derived from the noun *ado- (cf. Vendryes 1925, 402-403; LEIA A-13) is for the most part regular within the three corpora of glosses. In pretonic positions it regularly appears as ad though as noted by Thurneysen (GOI, §822,) it is often delenited before a d, such as in ad-daim ‘acknowledges’ with attestations of at[ajim Ml42b26, ataimet Ml131d16 and ataimet Sg33a25, or delenited and devoiced before a t, such as in ad-treba ‘inhabits’ which has attestations of atreba Wb16a17, atreba Ml63b09 and atreba Sg35b05. In all three corpora it is more common to have the -d assimilated than not when followed by a t- or a d-, as in atoibim Sg145a02 (ad-toibi ‘adheres’) and atlurchur Wb3b19 (ad-tluichedar ‘to thank’) compared to addanigfea Ml112c03 (ad-dánaigedar ‘remunerate’) ad déicider Ml43a19 (ad-déici ‘regards.’)

When not directly followed by a subsequent t- or d-, it is regularly still written as ad-in pretonic position; however, there are a couple of exceptions in Wb in which the -d has still been delenited: atruirmed Wb2c06 (ad-rími ‘counts’ with a perfective ro; atroilisset Wb4c15 (ad-roilli, ‘deserves’beside adroilisset Wb4c35; atrothreb Wb26d03 (ad-treba beside adrothreb Wb27a12.)70 It is interesting to note that, with the exception of Wb2c06 in an adverbial cleft, the preceding attestations are all relative.

There is mild confusion between ad- and ess-, presumably owing to the fact that they are identical before an infixed pronoun and leading to ad- being occasionally replaced (GOI §822b.) All three sets of glosses show a handful of examples of this confusion: as-rollfe Sg66b19 (ad-roilli,) asinchobra Wb10b18 (ad-cobra ‘desires’) and as-gniintar Ml108b04 (ad-gnin ‘knows’) as examples.

As noted by Thurneysen, in tonic positions the consonant is often assimilated to a following consonant of b c d g t m s, i.e. -accai Ml25b14 of ad-cf ‘sees.’ This is consistent

70 There are five additional forms, including one in Ml, atroilli Ml51d12, atchí Wb6c17, atchísíde Wb24c03, atchísíde Wb25a37 (ad-cf) and atroilli Wb2d13 (ad-roilli) which Pedersen (1898, 409) understands to be without an infixed pronoun; however, they are better understood with an infixed pronoun (cf. Kavanagh 2001, 35; Lucht 1994, 86; GOI §421.)
across all three corpora, and there are no interesting deviations from the expected forms in these particular contexts.

Overall, in tonic position there are only a few fluctuations. In MI, in the verb *do-aidbir* (*to-ad-uss-ber*)\(^{71}\) ‘displays’ there are three instances in which the vowel is e and not a: nabeledbarad MI19c18, donedbarad MI23a04, amal dunedbarar MI123c04. The expected outcome of *to-ad-uss-ber* is *do-audpair/-audbair*, and ad-uss- with resulting u-affection would become aud- > id- or ed-. There is only one example if -id- within MI: tidbarthae MI76a16, alongside tedbarthae MI47a05. All other attestations of this preverb in tonic position are always a- (cf. *dunaidbditis* MI39c35 of *do-adbat* ‘shows,’ as example.)

In Wb there is only one attestation of *do-aidbir: nitidbarid* Wb3b11. This is the only attestation of the verbal form with the preverb rendered as -id- and not -ad- that I have been able to find, though the verb overall is not particularly well attested. The only other irregularity in Wb shows the same tonic -id- instead of -ad: conidbarat Wb1b20 (*ad-opair* ‘sacrifices.’)

Although somewhat minor, the investigation into ad- has shown that Wb and MI contain deviating innovations in their rendering of an original au-, in that MI prefers -e-, albeit containing an -i-, while Wb has only -i-. On its own, it is not significant, but it is similar to the preference of er- in MI, and the use of ir- in Wb, in which it was argued that perhaps er- and ir- were originally aur- (see Section 2.8.)

### 3.1.2 for

The preverb for- is noted by Thurneysen (GOI §838 A, B) as occurring as for- or fur- in tonic positions and while usually for sometimes as far- and fur- in pretonic. It seemed relevant to examine the frequency of these variants and the situations in which they arise.

There is only one instances in Sg in which for- does not appear as for-: in a relative clause in far-dingrat Sg26b13 (for-dingair ‘expresses’) Wb too only contains a handful of cases of far-, one of which is relative, farchongrad Wb32d09 of for-congair ‘commands;’ one of which contains an infixed pronoun, cofardumthésidese Wb7a12 of for-tét ‘helps;’ and two of which are not relative, do not contain an infix and are not preceded by another element: farcongair som Wb13a27 of for-congair ‘enjoins’ beside

---

\(^{71}\) I have opted here to use the form found in DIL, though it is worth noting that in the digital editions of both Wb and MI the headword is listed as *do-aidbiur* and *do-adbair* respectively.
forchongair Wb15a26 and farcommucuir Wb19c03 of for-cumaing ‘is created’ beside forcommucuir Wb22b08.

MI contains a very minimal level of variation, with only three attestations of far- and one of fur-: following a second element cofarcanat MI45b18 and cufarcan MI68c15 from for-cain ‘teaches’ and one containing an infix faridgellad MI131d12 as well as foraithminedar 7 furaitghmenter MI17b23, both of for-aithminedar ‘commemorates,’ in which neither is relative.

Although there is some evidence of variation within the contexts of relative clauses, following another element and with a subsequent infixed pronoun, there does not appear to be any particular preference or noticeable discrepancy between the three corpora of glosses, and the evidence is fairly minimal.

3.2 ar

As previously discussed, in tonic positions there is significant fluctuation between ar- air- er- and ir- (see Section 2.8) with MI showing a distinct preference for er-, and while Wb and Sg both do prefer air-, Wb additionally has the form ir- which does not occur in either MI or Sg. There does not appear to be any dictating condition or context that causes any of these particular forms, as investigated above.

3.2.1 Preposition ar

There are multiple examples in both MI and Sg of air as the preposition preceding an article: air innadamrugud MI61a15 ‘for the wonder’ airnaih fualascachaidh MI48c22 ‘for the twigs.’ In total MI has 14 instances of air before a definite article.72

MI also has one occurrence of air- before an article in the conjunction arindí – the preposition ar + the dative singular article + the deictic pronoun i. There are 11 total attestations of this form in MI, only one of which shows air- MI31b17 airindi. Of the 30 instances of arindí in Sg, however, 16 are airindi.73 In this particular case it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that ar- was orthographically influenced by the following article ind and the i-, resulting in the seemingly palatal -r-.

---

72 MI27c16 MI46b02 MI53a15 MI54c04 MI60a06 MI61a10 MI66c06 MI90a11 MI98b11 MI11d09 MI138d02 MI144d07
73 Sg27a02 Sg31a06 Sg33a03 Sg33a04 Sg33a07 Sg33a08 Sg33a14 Sg33a21 Sg33a28 Sg33a30 Sg33a31 Sg33b04 Sg35a12 Sg35b05 Sg161b05 Sg33a07.
There are no other instances in Sg of the preposition in any other form than the expected *ar* and Wb has no notable variants. MI however has four instances of *air* with a subsequent dative: *airchiunn* MI27a06 ‘afterwards’ *aircech ceneliu* MI51c02 ‘for every kind’ *air lani* MI94c09 ‘for the fullness’ *airmeit* MI94b23 ‘for the greatness.’ As *airchiunn* MI27a06 and *airmeit* MI94b23 are the only examples where *air* is followed by a palatal consonant, it does not seem tenable to posit that this form is due to context influence.

MI additionally has two instances in which the preposition is spelled as *er*, possibly related to the overall preference for *er-* in tonic positions: *ciaerniu* MI47b01 ‘what is for anything?’ and *tobarthaid erdiubartach* MI122a16 ‘dative for ablative.’ These are the only two instances of the preposition being spelled with a different vowel in a pretonic position.

### 3.2.2 Conjunction *ar, air*

In his discussion of the conjunction *ar, air*, Thurneysen (GOI §906) does not have much to say regarding its variation outside of noting the two forms, though he refers back to the previously discussed §823, as well as §168, in which he discusses how proclitics tend to be depalatalised, which is potentially the origin of this variation.

While in tonic positions MI heavily prefers *er-* over *ar-* and even *air-*, in the conjunction MI has a distinct preference for *air* with the seemingly palatal final consonant, while Wb and Sg prefer *ar*. Thus, in tonic position as well as with regards to the conjunction, MI stands against Wb and Sg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>ar (conj.)</em></th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ar</em></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>air</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Figure 11 above, Wb contains very few instances of *air* and it is not dictated by any particular context, as *air* is found followed by both palatal and a neutral auslaut and comparable instances with *ar* also exist. Thus, *air* is likely not a secondary variant constrained to a particular context, but more likely the original palatal form that could be optionally depalatalised by destressing: *airisdia* Wb1a01 ‘for he is
God’ beside arisdígal Wb2c17 ‘for it is vengeance;’ airrofetar Wb9b17 ‘for I know’ beside arrofetar Wb16d07; air ní díúb less Wb13a16 ‘for it is not of them’ beside ar ní dond Wb10a14 ‘for he is not here;’ bainse dún epert gue airintí labrathar indiunni Wb14c29 ‘it were hard for us to utter falsehood, for He that speaketh in us’ for which a counter example with ar is not attested. Thus, air and ar appear to be interchangeable.

The two appear to be interchangeable in MI as well, with occurrences such as aris cosmail MI50a10 beside airis gnáth MI40c01 ‘for it is usual’; arataí MI110d15 ‘for you are’ beside airataat ‘for they are;’ MI3a14 ardufesatar MI24b19 ‘for they will be punished’ beside air duroimnibetar MI77a12 ‘for they will forget;’ arníecen MI127d08 ‘for…is not necessary’ beside air ni bi firian MI128d03 ‘for…is not wont to be just’

Sg equally does not show any apparent restrictions on the usage of air in place of ar as the forms appear before all manner of forms and with no regard for – and therefore no influence from – the colour of the following consonant: airbit Sg4b01 ‘for they will be’ beside arbib Sg187a02 ‘for it will be;’ air issainred Sg64a08 ‘for the peculiarity’ and air is airdíxa Sg7b14 ‘for it is lengthened’ as well as ar issed file Sg140a03 ‘for this is what it is;’ air do-soat Sg209b08 ‘for they convert’ beside ar do-fuasalcat Sg19a01 ‘for they resolve;’ air tecmaing Sg212b09 ‘for it sometimes happens.’

As the two forms appear to be interchangeable across all three corpora of glosses, it would appear that the choice of ar or air was entirely down to preference, in which case MI has a different preference from the other two corpora of glosses.

### 3.2.3 Preverbal ar-

GOI §823(b) states that the preverb ar- is always ar, and there is only a single instance of the preverb that does not appear as ar- and it is in Sg in a relative clause: ní air-icc aicned Sg137b04 ‘a thing which nature finds.’ Neither Wb or MI show any indication of the pretonic preverb as anything other than ar-. As this is the only instance across all three, it is difficult to draw any phonological conclusions. Instead, owing to the preceding -i of ní and the subsequent -i of -icc it seems more likely than this is an orthographic slip on the part of the scribe, possibly aided by the existence of the visually similar negative ní airicc ‘does not find’ utilising the prototonic form.
3.2.4 Summary

Overall, there does not appear to be any particular context in which ar- or air- is preferred in pretonic position in the three corpora of glosses. The interchange appears to be the result of a particular preference, just as the forms in tonic position air- er- ir- also indicate a distinct preference within the three corpora of glosses.

In the tonic forms, Ml stands against both Wb and Sg in its distinct preference for er-, while Wb additionally shows the form ir-. In pretonic position, while there is minimal variation in the preverb, the preposition shows a few variations, namely the form airindí that appears in both Ml and Sg with a palatalised -r. Ml equally shows air as a preposition a few other times in which the colour of the subsequent consonant cannot have been an influencing factor. Ml also contains two occurrences of the preposition as er, likely influenced by the overall preference for er- in stressed position.

In the conjunction, Ml again is in stark opposition to the other two corpora of glosses in that it heavily prefers the seemingly palatal air over the neutral and expected ar, though both forms are known in the other two corpora. With regards to the preverb ar- it seems clear that the three corpora of glosses were operating with optional different systems, with Wb being the only one to show the fully tonic ir- but otherwise according with Sg in a preference for tonic air- and conjunction ar. Ml on the other hand, is distinct in that it prefers the preverbal er-, has minor fluctuation with the prepositional form, and distinctly prefers the conjunction air.

3.3 eter

The original form of the preverb eter ‘between’ is derived from a Celtic *enter or perhaps *anter resulting in *éter (cf. McCone 1996, 106-108; Kim 2000, 169) with a shortened e- in pretonic positions and that short e- spread to tonic forms (Griffith 2016, 57; GOI §835.) In the three corpora of glosses there are only three occurrences of eter where the e is marked long and two of which are in Wb, hétarcerta Wb12d22 and étir Wb25d26, with one in Ml étrunn Ml28c28, the last two of which are prepositional pronouns. Considering the overall inconsistency of marking vowels as long, while it would appear that the vowel is regularly understood to be short (despite the expected é-) it cannot be considered definitive.

Thurneysen (GOI §835) attributes the presence of the form étir with the palatal -r to the spread of the prepositional pronoun third singular masculine form, noting that the
expected *eter remains in pretonic contexts. An anaptyctic -a- developed before consonants as the second vowel is lost by syncopation often when fully stressed: *etar (cf. GOI, §112.)

This tonic *etar is non-palatal, and to account for this, Griffith (2016, 59-60) has argued that this has to be on account of depalatalisation. Although he generally agrees with Greene’s (1973) proposal that palatalisation grew, as opposed to there being widespread depalatalisation, Griffith states that it is ‘unavoidable’ in this context: he argues that pre-syncope *ed’er, the analogically shortened version of expected *ēd’er, would have undergone syncope to become became *ed’r̥. Following anaptyxis, Griffith had previously (2007) argued that syllables of a similar shape (CVRC) to *etar would have a final neutral cluster, and this is indeed the case in this context. However, he had previously (2007, 46) stated that a dental consonant preceding an anaptyctic vowel would be palatalised if the following syncopated vowel had been lost after it, which would result in a form with a palatal -t-, which is not present in tonic *etar. To account for this, Griffith argues that as the post-syncope form *ed’r̥ did not have a consonant cluster to which palatalisation could be spread, as in *et(a)ir, and it was therefore a unique form, containing a single palatalised consonant followed by a non-front/non-palatal vowel, and was subsequently depalatalised: ‘I therefore argue that single palatalised consonants were depalatalised when they preceded a non-front vowel. I see no convincing way to avoid arguing for depalatalisation in this case’ (Griffith 2016, 60.) He likewise suggests an analogical influence of the third-plural prepositional pronoun *etarru, as the preposition would likely have had more plural referents than singular as it means ‘between.’

There is additionally variation in the initial vowel, with all three corpora of glosses showing forms of *itar/iter/itir. These forms are more prevalent in pretonic position; however, they are hardly predominant. McCone (1996, 107-108) regards this form as a natural development from unaccented *enter > *inter > *ider > *itar and compares it to the third plural of the copula *it < *idi < *inti < *enti. However, the presence of such a number of variant forms (eter/etir/etar/itar/iter/itir etc.) makes them poor evidence for positing a natural outcome of *enti > *id-. Additionally, the relatively few attestations of the forms beginning with i- across the three corpora of glosses makes it difficult to understand *itar and related forms as the natural outcome. Lash (2017) has theorised that the variants with an initial i- are later, developing during the Classical Old Irish period.
and eventually becoming more prominent in later sources, albeit still not particularly favoured.

The basis of his premise is a combination of the fact that there are more variants in *i*- in Sg (and a collection of other minor glosses) than in Wb and Ml but also a comparison with the form *ceta*. He argues that *ceta* became more commonly spelt as *cita* by the late-eighth century while *etar* began appearing more often with its *i*-variant in the ninth century. He notes that the *i*-variant is more likely to occur in pretonic complexes and that this is ‘unsurprising’ as *ceta* too appears as *cita*, with the *i*-variant in pretonic complexes. For present purposes, this is exceptionally relevant as the raised vowel -*u*—for -*o*—also often appears in pretonic complexes.

It is true that Wb and Ml combined contain only five occurrences of *it*- beside 239 of *et*- and Sg and the other minor collections have 20 occurrences of an *i*-variant beside 120 instances of an *e*-variant (Lash 2017, 150-151) showing an increased potential for the *i*-variant. Equally, while Sg and the later glosses show more occurrences of *cita* than *ceta* than in Wb and Ml, Sg and the other minor glosses have only 11 attestations while Wb and Ml combined only contain nine (Lash 2017, 153.) Overall, the evidence is minimal. While there is undoubtedly an increase in the usage of *i*-variants in Sg, their presence is still minor at best.

The form itself, *céta* has very limited application within the three corpora of glosses: it has four attestations in Wb: *cetaruchretri* Wb7b11 ‘first believed’ *cetabiinn* Wb12c08 ‘I used to feel’ *ciaturuchreitset* Wb14a29 ‘first believed’ *cetathuidchetar* Wb21c05 ‘first have come,’ as well as three attestations of the verbal noun of *ceta-bi*, *cétbuid* ‘feels, perceives’ Wb18d09 Wb24b24 Wb33c18. In Ml there are 11 attestations all of which show the form *cita*- and only one in Sg3a01 which also shows the form *cita*- . The evidence is severely limited across the three corpora and while it is understandable to propose that the movement from *ceta* to *cita* was a diachronic one, the minimal evidence makes any conclusions tenuous at best, especially as the absence of attestations of the second form in any of the three corpora could suggest a synchronic preference and not a diachronic development.

Returning to *etar*, there are a variety of forms with *et*- within the three corpora of glosses, as evidenced in the below Figure 12 and Figure 13. In Wb there are only two

---

74 There is an additional *et-gne* Wb33a11, a nominal compound, which has been expanded as *etergne*, although there are numerous attestations of forms with *etar*- (cf. *etargne* Wb8c02.)
examples of a tonic *eter*, both times as a prepositional pronoun used adverbially *conibé eter* Wb9b02 ‘so that he may not be at all;’ *ní dergemarni eter* Wb15b23 (*a prima manu*) ‘we are not at all forsaken.’

Otherwise, in tonic position *etar* is significantly preferred such as *etarcertar* Wb13a06 ‘be interpreted’ a passive imperative, and in nominal complexes such as *etarcne* Wb23c19 ‘knowledge,’ *etarcert* Wb27a10 ‘an interpretation’ and *etarscarad* Wb15c12 ‘separating.’ There are eight attestations of a tonic *etir*, one *étir*, and they are all the third singular masculine/neuter prepositional pronoun (cf. *etir* Wb5a03 Wb28b03; *étir* Wb25d26.)

In pretonic position *eter*, and the abbreviated form *et-* are by far the preferred forms with 17 attestations of the former and 11 of the latter, with only two pretonic *etir*75 - *etirtuaith* Wb28d25 ‘among lay-folk;’ *etirtuaith* Wb28d31, beside *etertuáith* Wb28d27 and one *itir* - *itirroscar*(sat) Wb5b34 ‘who have separated,’ with no occurrences of a pretonic *etar*. There does not appear to be any dictating context that would necessitate each form, and the above evidence of *etirtuaith* beside *etertuáith* indicates that the forms were essentially interchangeable.

In *Ml*, *eter* appears only once in tonic position *etercert* Ml2d02 ‘an interpretation’ and never in pretonic. *Etar* is the predominant tonic form, cf. *duetarrat* Ml30c06 ‘it encompasses,’ *doretarracht* Ml33c20 ‘it was understood,’ *naruetarscara* Ml54d05 ‘may not part,’ *etartetarcur* Ml32a25 ‘intercession’ *inruetarscara* Ml91c01 ‘it had departed’ as examples. Outside of the 3sg. m./n. prepositional pronoun which is regularly *etir* there is only one tonic *etir*: *etirscarthe* Ml47a11 ‘separated.’ In pretonic positions, Ml is remarkably consistent in preferring the form *etir* with only four exceptions beginning in *i*-: *hitar nadoinmecha* Ml38a12 ‘among the adverse;’ *oldaas itir ndadibed* Ml45c06 ‘than that he should destroy them;’ *antirnuara .i. ánanas* Ml71b05 ‘when it cools i.e. when it ceases;’ *itir dóíni 7 idlu* Ml138c01 ‘between men and idols.’

*Sg* shows a wider variety of pretonic forms overall with more variations beginning with *i-* generally. In tonic position, with the exception of the 3sg. m./n. prepositional pronoun which 5 times is attested as *etir* and once as *itir*, the tonic form is always *etar* cf. *issi ind etarceirt* Sg207b09 ‘it is the interpretation;’ *ni etargeiuin* Sg197b10 ‘for he knew not.’ In pretonic position, as a preverb there is one attestation each of the three forms in

---

75 There is also *etir maith* Wb8c20.
“e-: eter-gaib Sg14b04 ‘interposes’ etar-scartar Sg157b10 ‘they are separated’ and ciaetir-scartar Sg73b02 ‘though they are separated.’

At the same time, in other pretonic positions Sg tends to prefer etir, though it does show the most forms of the three corpora with it-: hiter remsuidigud 7 foacomol Sg18a02 ‘in both anteposition and subjunction;’ hiter in ainmnid 7 ingenitin Sg20b09 ‘both the nominative and the genitive;’ hiter a 7 x Sg68b04 ‘between a and x;’ iter huathad 7 hilar Sg162a06 ‘both in singular and plural;’ itar indi brethir Sg203a16 ‘between these verbs;’ hitar hothad 7 hilar Sg203b09 ‘both in singular and plural;’ hitar remšamugud 7 foacomol Sg212a15 ‘both anteposition and subjunction;’ hiter con 7 cum Sg218a05 ‘between con and cum.’

Figure 12 Pretonic etar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretonic etar</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>Ml</th>
<th>Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Étar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Éter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ét-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Tonic etar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonic etar</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>Ml</th>
<th>Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Étar-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Éter-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étir-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ét-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>øtar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itir-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76 The collections in both Figure 12 and Figure 13 resulted in the exact same findings as Griffith (2016, 55-56.) There were no discrepancies between my collection and his.
All in all, there are some key distinctions between the three corpora of glosses. While in tonic position the form *etar* is preferred by all three, in pretonic position there are some variations. Wb adheres to the form of *eter*, while MI prefers the form with the palatal -*r* by a significant margin. Though Sg is more varied overall and shows more attestations of the abbreviated form *et*- than any other, the closest preference is for *etir*, though amounting to only 9 cases. In pretonic position MI is the most consistent, with the significant preference for *etir* while Wb and Sg show a wider variety and less of a distinct preference for any one form. Considering the tendency of particles to be depalatalised in proclisis, the presence of *etir* as the predominant pretonic form in MI, and to an extent in Sg, is surprising and speaks to a certain level of analogical spread, attributed in part by Griffith (2016, 62) to the presence of the prepositional pronoun 3sg m/n. *etir*.

Overall, there appears to be a fair amount of analogical influence in this preposition/preverb, *etar*, especially in pretonic forms.

While it is difficult to determine whether or not this variation can be attributed to orthography alone – as the identical contexts indicate the forms *etir* *eter* *etar* etc. were largely interchangeable in pretonic position but the existence of forms *itir* *iter* *itar* cannot be attributed exclusively to orthographic variation – it is clear that there was some level of preference involved.

### 3.4 tre

The preposition *tre*, from Proto-Celtic *trē*, is consistent in its tonic positions across all three corpora of glosses, without any variation of forms (cf. GOI §856.) The pretonic forms, however, are distinctly different in Wb and Sg from those in MI.

Wb uses *tre* and *tri* somewhat interchangeably, but with a minor preference for *tre*, as seen in Figure 14 below. Wb across the board tends to show a significant amount of variation without distinct preferences for any particular form. Sg as well has a preference for the form *tre*; however, with only 13 occurrences of *tri*, it gives it a more significant preference than Wb. Both are in contrast to MI which has no occurrences of pretonic *tre* whatsoever.
Other preverbs are consistently spelled in the forms with the relative particle, regardless of any other written preference. With tri, however, Wb uses both forms, though with a preference for tre: tresaníccatár hílí Wb27c20 ‘through which many may be saved’ beside trisambí Wb3d21 ‘through which is’ with four total tre-. Similarly, with combinations with 3rd person and 1st plural possessives Wb shows variation: triagníssi Wb10a03 ‘through her companionship’ beside treagnímosom Wb29d29 ‘through his deeds’ and trebarnimradud Wb27a01 ‘through thinking of you’ beside tribarnebconabtheitisí Wb9d24 ‘through your incontinence’

Sg unsurprisingly has the fewest examples and thus the least by which to compare and as such its usage of tri is harder to definitively categorise as there are only a few instances of particular occurrences: trísa ñacomoltar Sg215a12 ‘by which is joined’ is the only example with a relative particle, and there are equally only three examples of a possessive pronoun all of which take the form tria: tria folud feisin Sg211b05 ‘by its own substance,’ triatimdirecht Sg35a02 ‘through their service’ and tria nem Sg3a11 ‘through their doubling’ showing the expected raising in hiatus.

In other instances, tri does not seem to be relegated to particular situations or limited to any particular formation, i.e. it is not limited to accompanying a palatal consonant, which could perhaps have influenced the choice of spelling of the preposition, nor are any of its occurrences exclusive to tri, as they are equally found with tre: tri immaircidetáid Sg213b08 ‘it is through the consequence’ tri atarcud Sg197b04 ‘through anaphora’ tre intśamail Sg6a11 ‘through imitation.’ They are used interchangeably, with tre or tri appearing before an identical form: tri dígbail Sg188a08 ‘through diminution’ beside tredígbáil Sg9a13 ‘through taking away;’ with the article trisinín genitin Sg209b31 ‘through the genitive’ alongside tresín brethir Sg138a01 ‘by the verb;’ tríthóbae Sg195b01 ‘through concision;’ tríthóbae Sg201b03 but equally there is trethóbae Sg118b02.

As noted above, Ml contains both the most occurrences of the preposition and preverb but equally shows no variation. It is consistent in its usage of tri in all contexts. Once
again, this is another particular preference on the part of ML that is not shared by either Wb or Sg.

3.5 de & do; o & u vocalism

Unstressed short vowels in the interior of words are known to be dependent on their contexts, and specifically with regards to o it has a tendency to become u, thus resulting in a consistent fluctuation between -u and -o (GOI §101) and this variation is found across all of the prepositions and preverbs containing this vocalism: do, to-, fo(-), no-, ro- as well as *di despite it not having an etymological round vowel (Stifter 2014, 213.) The following section discusses all of these, and their behaviour within the three corpora of glosses, with particular attention paid to contexts in which there is fluctuation in the round vowels. As both to- and di are often confused, and given the fact that the primary irregularity in di is the fluctuation between -o and -u, it has been included in the forthcoming discussion.

3.5.1 Preverb do- (*to-)

The preverb do- has historically been traced back to Proto-Celtic *to- and has been shown to be distinct from the prepositional form (cf. Holmer 1933; Dillon 1961-1963; 1972.) It has been previously suggested that the original vowel of *to- was -u-, and therefore the original form was *tu- (cf. GOI §855; Wagner 1972, 39-40; Schumacher 2000, 33-34) and Schrijver (1995, 17 n.2) has argued much the same, on the basis of the presence of tu- in both the Wb prima manus and the Cambrai Homily, as well as a comparison with *su- and its coalescence with a following vowel, and the Middle Welsh tywyssawc ‘lord’ which he claims must have come from *tu-wissāko- as *to-wissāko- would have resulted in *tewyssawc. Eska (2007, 199-200) accounts for the existence of both *to- and *tu- as allophonic variation in hiatus position with a subsequent front vowel, with the distinction between them eventually becoming lost.

Schrijver’s evidence has been rejected by subsequent scholarship. The elision of *su- before a following vowel cannot be conclusive evidence as *ro- from historical *pro does the same (Eska 2007, 196,) and thus it seems perfectly plausible that *to- would behave the same way. The fact that fo- < *yo coalesces to create a long vowel or a diphthong can be attributed to the fact it did not have a grammatical function, was simply lexical and ‘thus subject to different analogical influences’ from *ro and *to (Stifter 2014, 211.)
Additionally, Schrijver’s argument of the evidence of *tywysauc is contradicted by his own suggestion (cf. Schrijver 1995, 342; Sims-Williams 2003: 151 n.902; Stifter 2014, 210) that the sequence *uai (*tu-wissāko/*tu-ŷissūko) would have become *uai, which would then have undergone i-affection resulting in **teũiss-. This would have occurred in both the traditional *to-wissāko/*to-ŷissūko and the proposed *tu-ŷissūko/tu-ŷissūko resulting in the expected *teũysauc (Stifter 2014, 210.) Schrijver (1995, 342) also states that a first vowel *y cannot be derived from original *u but has to have been reinstated by analogy. Thus, regardless of whether the particle was originally *to- or *tu- the result is the same, and therefore two of Schrijver’s three points of evidence are easily refuted.

Schrijver’s argument, of the evidence of tu- in Wb I and the Cambrai Homily as evidence of the original form, is equally difficult to accept. Primarily because while tu- does indeed exist, to- equally exists. In Wb I, túercómlássát Wb7a07 ‘they have put together’ stands alongside a preverb to- in toncomra Wb14b23 ‘so that it tires us.’ Schrijver (1995, 17 n. 2) attributes the -o to lowering caused by the infixed pronoun *nes or *nos though forms like dunnánic Wb25a21 would require an explanation of why lowering did not occur in the exact same situation. These two examples are the only instances of to-/tu-, elsewhere in Wb in pretonic positions the form is regularly do-/du-. Mi and Sg each have a few examples of this spelling: tororandsom MI29b08 ‘he has signified’ torogarthar MI43b15 ‘may it be called’ tochorad MI44a19 ‘who turned’ tofoxlaitis MI47a13 ‘they used to drag’ tober MI126b04a ‘which he inflicts’ torrimi MI130c01 ‘he enumerates’ toforsailced MI131d01 ‘has been loosened;’ todđiusgat Sg7a10 ‘they awaken’ to-duřgim Sg24a02 ‘I provoke’ to-túrgimm Sg60b10, with only tunuic MI51c26 ‘which he has put’ showing evidence of *tu, though these being younger glosses, if the form did change from *tu > to- then the preferred use of the -o form is not necessarily diagnostic evidence of the original vowel. Additionally, as to- eventually became a popular archaising spelling among later scribes, including in hypercorrect cases (cf. McCon 2000, 32-33,) these occurrences may not be evidence of an original form, but rather later intervention

---

77 Thes.(i, 592) and Kavanagh and Vodko (2001, 868) do not provide a translation for this gloss. Ó Néill (2001, 237, n. 24) supplies the translation that is used here. There is no translation of this form in DIL (s.v. do-comra.)
78 Lowering before *nes is only permissible if e is capable of causing lowering. This is not the case in the standard understanding of Old Irish phonology (McCon 1996, 109-115) though Kortlandt (1979, 42-47) does allowing for the lowering of *tu- before e.
79 MI additionally has the forms tuicais MI56a13 tuic som MI67a08 tuccad MI71c09 of do-beir, all of which, while independent, appear to be contracted deuterotonics.
However, the two forms in the Cambrai Homily (Thes. i, 247.17, 247.19,) *tuthegot* ‘who resort,’ and *tuesmot* ‘who pour’ are likewise unconvincing, as both are relative and thus historically contained the relative particle *jo* which may have caused lowering from *tu* to *to* if lost particles were able to exert raising or lowering effects (Stifter 2014, 222.) Alternatively, *tuesmot* can be understood as due to raising in hiatus (Eska 2007, 199) which would leave *tuthegot* as the result of analogy, or evidence of an original *tu*. There is evidence that the relative particle did exhibit some effect on preverbs, though it is unclear what exact mechanism had an effect, and this will be discussed throughout the rest of this chapter.

If the vowel were to have originally been -u then in tonic position there should be some evidence of this, and both within the three corpora of glosses and beyond them in the wider scope of the Old Irish corpus this evidence does not exist. *tu* would have remained as *tu* if followed by e,\(^80\) i or u whereas *to* would remain *to* either before an e or before a consonant cluster or voiceless consonant, while being raised to *tu*- before i and u if there was a single voiced consonant between them (cf. McConé 1996, 109-115.) However, no such evidence for *tu*- exists.\(^81\) Schrijver’s theory then, of an original *tu*- cannot be considered valid and an original *to*- must be assumed.

3.5.1.1 Tonic position

The glosses do show some fluctuation with regards to the spelling of *to* as *ta* in tonic positions: much of the protonic forms of *do*-beir such as *diatabarr* ‘unto whom...is given’ Wb17a03 beside *aratobarr* Wb12d29 ‘for which...is given’ and *nitaibre* Wb29a22 ‘thou shalt not confer’ beside *nitoibre* Wb29a20; and *toschid* Wb10d18 beside *tasgid* Wb29a13 the verbal noun of *do*-osaig ‘the act of giving sustenance,’ as well as *tascide* Ml20a11. In forms from *do*-rat and other verbs that contain an -*a*- in the following syllable, this can be explained as influence from the subsequent -*a*- (Armstrong 1976, 61-62) just as is seen in the fluctuation with *ro*-fra- (-*ragbtha* MI36b24 of *ro*-gabtha cf. GOI §82,) but in the examples listed above, there is no subsequent -*a*. Thurneysen (GOI §82) has suggested that the forms from *do*-beir be considered due to an analogical spread, from forms like the perfect -*tarat*, of *do*-rat, and suggests a similar explanation for *targabál*.

\(^80\) Kortlandt (1979 42-47) would see *tu* lowered before an e.

\(^81\) For a fuller discussion see Stifter (2014) who identifies a variety of forms that can only be explained with preverb *to*.- *tabart* (*to*-bertā) which should have remained *tu*-, unless following Kortlandt’s phonology; *tobrūchtad* ‘gushing forth’ (*to*-brūχtātus) which, had it been *tu*-, has no reason to be lowered, as examples.
‘transgression’ (also present in MI22d24 MI70d06 MI71b03) from *do-ro-gaib which appears alongside *torgabál in MI15c11 MI58a19 etc. The same solution can perhaps be applied to the only phonologically irregular ta- in Sg dotharbaíd Sg193a03 ‘to advantage’ from *to-ro-bae (GOI §852.) He likewise suggests that *tasgíd *to-ad may have replaced a *to-oss that resulted in toschid, and that the taiscéád of MI90c01 ‘exploration’ from do-scéáid may have been understood as originating from to-aith.-

Forms such as taraisse MI27a06 ‘fitting’ alongside toraisse MI130d06 and tarasin MI30d08 ‘trust’ alongside toraisin MI108b11 he ascribes to analogy with the form tairissem *to-air-seissam ‘standing fast’ (GOI §82.) Regardless, the fluctuation of to- and ta- in tonic positions is not well understood, and while it very likely first arose phonologically in particular contexts, its subsequent spread may be the result of analogy.

### 3.5.2 Preverbal du- in both preverbs do- and di-/de-

There is no fluctuation between di- and de- in pretonic contexts in any of the three corpora of glosses. The majority of variation is found in confusion with the preverbal do- and within that confusion there is variation between do- and du-. Owing to the fact that this is the primary variation in both preverbs and, as to be demonstrated below, the triggering contexts of both tend to be the same, it was necessary to discuss them together, in order to give the most complete picture.

Sg is, of the three corpora of glosses, the most regular, mostly commonly showing preverbal do- for di-. The only instances of du- in Sg occur in the verb do-ella (*di-ella-) and both are following má: madu-ellatar Sg4b01 ‘if they be declined’ madu-ellis Sg4b04 ‘if they were declined.’ Throughout all three sets of glosses má is regularly, but not constantly, followed by the raised vowel -u, including in other particles such as ro-/ru- and no-/nu-, as when preceded by another element, -o is liable to raise to -u when under a minimal amount of stress (GOI §101.) Additionally, there is the possibility of raising in hiatus when preceding another vowel. Therefore, the occurrences in Sg are not unexpected.

Following other conjunctions such as cé/cía, amal and a and especially in relative clauses, the vowel of do (whether for original to- or di-) seems to have been liable to some variation, though Wb still prefers do- with only 30 occurrences of pretonic du- in Wb, 31 if the previously discussed example of túercómlássát Wb7a07 is included. Examples such as andurairngert Wb5c09 beside andorairngert Wb31a07 ‘he will not
The situation in Ml, however, is completely different. While it does still hold that following a conjunction and in a relative clause do- is more likely to be du- Ml has a significant preference for the form du-. Between both the preverbs do- and de- Ml has 544 attestations of du- beside 396 attestations of do-. The preference exists for both preverbs, with di- showing 201 occurrences of du- compared to 124 do-, and with do- having 343 attestations of du- beside 272 of do-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>do vs du in both do- and di-</th>
<th>do-</th>
<th>du-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do-</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking first at di- some of the instances of du- could be attributed to some sort of influence from a subsequent high vowel, such as dugni Ml39c02 of do-gni (*di-gni.*) This
is not, of course, standard Primitive Irish raising as a pretonic preverb is unstressed and therefore not liable to be raised (cf. McCone 1996, 109-115.)

Thus, if the idea of ‘raising’ were to be accepted, it would have to be on the basis of some later influence of a subsequent high vowel in an imitation of raising. But forms with _du_ do not only occur with verbs whose root have a high vowel, forms such as _coduema_ Mi53c02 ‘so that [he] might protect’ of _do-eim_ *di-em, dumdontaese_ Mi62c18 ‘I was consoled’ of _do-dona_ *di-don- or _amal durogaib_ MI34d18 ‘as he has removed’ from _do-gaib_ *di-ro-gaib- cannot be explained by influence from a subsequent high vowel.

There are, however, certain conditions in which _du-_ is more likely to appear, just as in Wb, such as following another element, primarily conjunctions such as _a, amal, ar, co, ma_ etc.: _andurigni_ Mi24c08 ‘that which… had done’ of _do-gní; amal durolgisu_ Mi124a09 ‘as You have forgiven’ from _do-luigi_ *di-luig-; _codufess_ Mi44a09 ‘so that you might avenge’ of _do-fich_ *di-fich; _ma durosced_ Mi129b13 ‘if he had excelled’ of _do-róscai_ *di-ro-us-cuich- as examples. Equally with a following infixed pronoun _dunosced_ Mi33c05 ‘that he would distinguish himself’ of _do-róscai; dusngní_ Mi29a03 ‘he applies it’ from _do-gní; dunem ni_ Mi62d04 ‘protect us’ of _do-eim; dusrale_ Mi23c16 ‘he put them’ of _do-cuirethar_. Yet, _du-_ is very common in relative clauses, which often is preceded by a conjunction of some kind but not always: _aní durigni_ Mi39b02 ‘that he did’ _do-gní; duluget_ Mi56a20 ‘who are forgiving’ _do-luigai_ *di-logí-; _durig_ Mi28a19 ‘whom he strips’ _do-ríg_ *di-ríg-.

None of these particular situations appear to have _du-_ as mandatory, as they all stand beside equivalent forms in _do-_ such as _amaldorolgis_ Mi125a12 ‘as You have forgiven’ of _do-luigai; a relative dogniín_ ‘which I used to make’ Mi136a08; as well as _codobemthar si_ Mi53b15 ‘that you may be protected’ of _do-eim, which has a conjunction and contains an infix.

Just as these conditions do not appear to mandatorily cause _du-, equally, du-_ is not exclusive to them as forms like _duluichfea_ Mi128c06 ‘He will forgive,’ _dubidcet_ Mi93d11 ‘they pelt,’ _dugén_ Mi69a21 ‘I will do,’ _dúfich_ Mi123d08 ‘he punishes’ _duscmat_ [leg: _dusecmart_] Mi103d04 ‘he slew’ all appear as main clause forms without preceding conjunctions or infixes.

The situation is not made any clearer by forms that were originally *_to, as they show even more preference for_ du-_ and again in similar contexts: following a conjunction, _du-_ seems to be preferred in MI with examples such as _andumerchain_ Mi15d10 ‘when he
prophesies’ of *do-airchain*; *amal dunedbar* MI123c04 ‘as...is applied’ from *do-adbat*; *ciadurat som* MI94c17 ‘though He has inflicted’ from *do-beir*. It is also prevalent in the relative: *dugaithatar* MI31c25 ‘who are deceived’ from *do-gaítha*; *duninchanar* MI76a18 ‘that they chant’ of *do-inchain*; *duindnaig són* MI59c11 ‘who gives’ of *do-indnaig*. Forms containing infixed pronouns are also liable to showing *du-*: *dusfeded* MI97c05 ‘it used to lead them’ from *do-feid*; *dundicfitis* MI68a01 ‘that [they] were thus to come’ of *do-icc*.

Again, however, forms with *du-* are not exclusive to these contexts, forms such as *duaircibed* MI29c11 ‘it would cause’ from *do-airchain*, *durat* MI48a21 ‘[it] inflicted’ of *do-beir*, *duesta* MI71c19 ‘is lacking’ of *do-esta*, and *duimechella son* MI67d08 ‘it surrounds’ from *do-imchella* all appear without being relative or having a preceding conjunction or subsequent infix. Again, there are forms in *do-* in all of these contexts and regularly within the same verbs such as relative *duroigasu* MI138b08 ‘whom you have chosen’ *dorogad* MI124c13 ‘that he had been chosen’ both from *do-goa*.

It is unclear what to make of the variation between *do-* and *du-*: It would appear that this variation is a later one that only occurred once the contexts in which the original preverb was in tonic position had already been established. It is also unclear to what extent this feature is merely an orthographic preference, as without phonological evidence of a clear *-u* but equally limited contexts in which a *-u* could be considered to be the result of influence from phonological context, the reasoning is uncertain.

It does appear to be certain that this is not a diachronic variant, however, owing to the significantly reduced status of *du-* in Sg. The minimal presence in Wb could indicate a feature that was on the rise and had become almost fully realised in MI, but to then suggest that it almost entirely retreated by the time of Sg is implausible. The fluctuation of *-o* and *-u* does appear elsewhere in Sg (see sections on both *no-* and *ro-*), and thus it does not seem likely that Sg was adhering to a more conservative standard in which *-o* was preferred and the two *du-* were merely slips.

It would be tempting to try and conclude that *do-* was optionally raised to *du-* in pretonic position when there was an intervening element between the preverb and its following verb, and that this then spread by analogy to other positions, such as following a conjunction. Considering that many of the conjunctions that tend to precede this raised form of the preverb optionally or regularly cause a nasalising relative clause, a nasalising relative particle would appear to be the most likely candidate for the original trigger. But, as noted above, this explanation is predicated on the assumption that unstressed
vowels be liable to be raising, which they are not, in our standard understanding of raising during the Primitive Irish. Additionally, as previously mentioned, the relative particle *jo would have caused lowering, and not raising (Stifter 2014, 222.)

Some infixed pronouns such as *nes or *nos would also have caused lowering, so the existence of the raised vowel with them demonstrates that that cannot be a viable explanation, and thus there is no argument to be made there either, even if the possibility of pretonic raising were to be plausible. Perhaps the possibility of raising in hiatus created the two allomorphs, as proposed by Eska (2007, 199-200), with the distinction eventually being lost, is the most plausible explanation, though it is not quite a perfect explanation as the consistent presence of du- (or, more generally u-, as to be shown further below) in a relative clause would appear to be significant.

As the preverb was undoubtedly *to- and not *tu- then raising has to be accounted for here, but only in pretonic positions, and most commonly a) in relative clauses b) following conjunctions and c) with an infixed pronoun. The reasoning behind this seeming raising of the preverbal vowel is unclear, especially as it does not appear to have been a productive allomorph in tonic position, not even in MI in which the variant with the raised vowel is heavily preferred. Nevertheless, regardless of the explanation, MI here is significantly different from both Wb and Sg, and thus the possibility of this being a diachronic variant has to be dismissed. This must, therefore, be considered evidence for some level of synchronic variation that was present in Old Irish, but obviously preferred by the scribes of MI.82

3.5.3 Preposition di/de

When combined with the relative particle both di/de and do are consistently dia in the three corpora of glosses, and Thurneysen (GOI §832) notes that this is likely due to the confusion between the two forms. Although there is evidence of an original doa/dua in other sources (cf. Hull 1954, 227-228; 1956, 254-256) these do not appear in the texts examined in this study and thus combinations with the relative particle have been excluded from the below tables.

All of the prepositional pronouns are consistently spelled with the expected vowels, with the exception of a handful of examples in the 3rd singular masculine & neuter.

---

82 *Messe ocos Pangur Bán* (Thes. ii, 293-294) equally prefers -u: mu menma; dufuit; mu rosc; dungni etc.
With regard to the preposition *di/de*, all three sets of glosses show a marked preference for the form *di* in pretonic position, with a handful of other forms present. With regards to the origins of this form, stressed *dí* corresponds to the Latin *dē*, which potentially points to an original Indo-European *dē* that either became a Celtic *dí*, or with proclitic shortening *dē* that then analogically spread, yielding stressed *de*- (cf. Sommerfelt 1920; Griffith 2016, 57 n.7.)

Ml, however, is the only one to show the form *du* which occurs 61 times, as can be seen in Figure 16 below, and this can hardly be considered to be insignificant.

![Figure 16 Pretonic *di*](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretonic <em>di</em></th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>Ml</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>di</em></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dí</em></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>de</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>do</em></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>du</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wb is consistent in its usage of *di* in pretonic position, albeit showing some confusion with *do*. There are only four other pretonic prepositional occurrences: *de iudēib* Wb18d06 ‘of the Jews’ *de iudeib* Wb31b15 beside *diudeib* Wb4c40; *demaid* Wb21d11 ‘of good’ beside *dimaiith* in the same gloss, and combined with the article *dendserc* Wb25b07 ‘of charity’ beside *dindeacht* Wb12c13 ‘of the Godhead.’

In tonic position before a prepositional pronoun, it is equally consistently *dí* with the exception of I *3rd* singular masculine and neuter which are consistently *de*, with 19 attested forms. *I*

As to be expected, as the smallest corpus Sg has the lowest number of forms. In the prepositional pronouns all forms are as expected, and there are nine pretonic instances of *de* such as *dedliguth* Sg26b07 ‘of the law,’ *de drochdub* Sg214a ‘from bad ink’ beside *didanaib* Sg156b04 ‘from arts;’ *dechenéul* Sg203a20 ‘of the genus’ beside *dichlaind* Sg33a13 ‘of the children.’ While Sg does have a preference for *di*, *de* is certainly present,

---

83. *dí söínmechaib* Wb4b5
84. Although consistently written without the length-mark in the three corpora of glosses, Breatnach (2003, 135-136) has demonstrated that this form is metrically proven to be long: *dé*.
85. There is additionally *cide* Sg3a09, which I have excluded here as whether or not *de* should be understood as pretonic or tonic is up for debate: Thurneysen (GOI §460) would read this as a Latinism, with the interrogative pronoun followed by the prepositional pronoun, *dé* making it tonic, whereas Hofman (1996, II 12) would emend it to *ci-de én*, in which case it would be pretonic.
though predominantly in tonic formations, with 23 attestations of 3rd singular masculine and neuter prepositional pronouns.

Ml shows the most variation, and the highest level of confusion with the preposition *do* with 29% of the total attestations being either *do* or *du*, compared to 17% in Wb and nearly 2% in Sg, albeit with neither showing any occurrences of *du*- . While the majority of forms with affixed possessives are of the expected *di*- formation it does also have *dut moladsu* Ml53b08 ‘from praising you’ and *dot gnímaib* Ml56c08 ‘of thy deeds’ Ml56c08 beside *dit ditinsiu* Ml110d12 ‘concerning Thy protection’ demonstrating the forms were in free variation.

The *du* present in Ml is interesting both in that it has a relatively high frequency compared to the other forms, and also because this higher frequency is exclusively present in Ml. It shows a high level of confusion with the preposition *do*, which while present in the other sets of glosses, does not appear to be as extensive. The 61 occurrences of *du* appear in similar instances as those of *di*: *du doiri babilone* Ml139a06 ‘of the Babylonian captivity’ alongside *airis didoiri bababilone* Ml139a08 ‘for it is of the Babylonian captivity;’ *ciddusin* Ml43a17 ‘even hence’ beside *cid disin* Ml48c01 ‘even from that;’ *dumsoirad dilamaib munamat* Ml90c18 ‘…to deliver me from the hands of my enemies’ beside *in damsoirthae dulamaib munat* [leg. munamat] fanaic Ml91d04 ‘whether I might be delivered from the hands of my enemies or not;’ *robói dam do dia* Ml108a05 ‘which I had had from God;’ *duécnduch di dia* Ml72b05 ‘to blaspheme God,’ as examples. The latter occurrences demonstrate, as above, that within Ml the forms were in rather free variation.

This indicates both that *de* and *do* were regularly confused by the scribes of Ml, more so than in either of the other two corpora, and that Ml shows a preference for the form *du* with regards to the forms usually ending in -*o*. Overall, original and expected *di* is the preferred form, with Ml showing the widest level of deviation.

### 3.5.4 Prepositional *do*

As there was already fluctuation between *do* and *du* with *de*, it is unsurprising that there is equally fluctuation with *do*, especially in Ml, which shows a significant level of variation between the forms *do* and *du*. In tonic positions the forms show fairly consistently *do*- , with a few exceptions to be discussed below. Instances occurring with both the relative particle and the possessive have been excluded from the numbers here,
as both are consistently the form *dia*, with both forms having adopted the vocalism of *di-/de-*, potentially on account of raising in hiatus. As previously noted, there is evidence of an older *doa/dua* in texts such as ‘The Saga of Fergus Mac Léti’ (Binchy 1952) *Críth Gablach* (Hull 1954) and ‘The Monastery of Tallaght,’ (Gwynn and Purton 1911-1912) and *Tochmarc Emire* (Hull 1956, 254-256) that has not survived within any of the three corpora of glosses.

![Figure 17 Preposition do](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>Ml</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>do</em></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>du</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>di</em></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>to</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most notable variation for this preposition is the nearly equivalent usage of *do* and *du* in Ml, as represented above in Figure 17, with no attestations of *du* in Sg and only a few in Wb. There is clear confusion between *de* and *do*, as seen both here in Figure 17 and above in Figure 16.

In Wb *du* shows no preferential use in any particular context: *dubáas* Wb5c14 ‘of death,’ *dunbráthir* Wb10c13 ‘to the brother’ *nidunachoipred* Wb10c22 ‘not for any other operation’ *dundidbairt* Wb15d20 ‘for the offering’ *masuduréir* Wb20b16 ‘if [ye] are subject’ *du abracham* Wb33d10 ‘to Abraham.’ As already noted, *o* has a tendency to become *u* when immediately preceded by another element, usually a conjunction or another preposition, which does not appear to be the case in all of the examples above. In Wb eight occurrences of *di* precede the form *alaile* (cf. *taibreclcachairmitindialailiu* Wb5d16 ‘let every one give honour to the other’) without any attestations of *do alaile*. A raised vowel here, in hiatus, is to be expected but the natural raising of *o* is *u* and thus this is likely further confusion with *di*. The others are found in only two further glosses, four times as *dineuch: imethidnea saeculi i. doguiile dineuch adbaill et dineuch nad etar et dineuch bis la nech and bí lat so* Wb16b11 ‘concerning (the) anxieties saeculi, even grief for what perishes, and for what is unattained, and for what some one hath which thou hast not;’ and *primum dineuch foiter cuciubsi* Wb17a11 ‘primum to anyone who sent to you.’

The usage of *do* and *du* is essentially interchangeable within Ml, with no preference for context or influence from a following vowel as there exists *dudia* Ml79b08 ‘of God’
as well as do
dia MI17b10, duassaraib MI72d08 ‘of the Assyrians’ alongside do
assarib
MI34c11 and examples such as dochách MI102a10 ‘by everyone’ beside attestations such as
dochách MI130c06. MI additionally has two instances of to in the place of do: toneuch
MI46c24 ‘to him’ totórmuch MI43d27 ‘for adding.’

All of the occurrences of di for do in Sg occur preceding alaile (cf. Sg189a07,
Sg212b03, Sg217a06, Sg220a03) and all with the meaning ‘to the second/to another.’
The majority of attestations in MI are also dialaile (cf. MI26b20) but there are three
combined with the article dindfaíti MI21c03 ‘to the gladness;’ dingnim MI113d03 ‘to
the deed;’ and donchomthururus 7 dind fresngabail MI56b01 ‘to the incursion and
ascension,’ with a parallel with the correct do. There is additionally difoxul cecha
frithoircne MI134a03 ‘to take away every offence.’

There is clearly a fair amount of confusion between the prepositions do and di, though
more present in the usage of di. MI, however, shows a significantly higher number of
occurrences of the form du, in opposition to Wb and Sg.

Within the prepositional pronouns there are equally some fluctuations in the stressed
vowel, beyond the expected variation between the original stressed dú- and the originally
proclitic, shortened do- that analogically spread into the paradigm of the prepositional
pronoun (cf. Griffith 2016, 57 n.7.) Wb has one dam in ishóisín conuie dam farsercc
Wb4b29 ‘it is from old to new that I have had love for you’ against 60 other attestations
of dom. The 2sg on the other hand has a wider variety of forms with a near equivalent
number of attestations of dut and deit, as well as forms such as detsiu Wb5b29 dit
Wb5b32 and détso Wb6c07. The contexts are essentially interchangeable (cf. ní ansu
defit quam christo arrocées side móór nimnith doaurlatu patri Wb6c27 ‘it is not harder
for thee quam Christo, for He had suffered much tribulation to obey the Father’ beside
niba anse duit iar neurt insiprito nóib Wb29d21 ‘it will not be hard for thee according to
the strength of the Holy Ghost.’)

The two forms dit Wb5b32 and Sg179a04 can be understood as further confusion
with the preposition di. As discussed above, the two appeared to be widely and regularly
confused proclitically and thus a minor amount of confusion within the tonic formations
is perfectly understandable.

MI deviates the furthest from the expected paradigm of the prepositional pronoun: it
has 59 occurrences of the 1sg dam beside only 4 of dom MI22d05 MI47c04 MI55a19 and
MI118a05. There are two irregular occurrences of the 3sg masculine do: corub
mesraigthe dau fulach afercae MI32d04 ‘that the endurance of His wrath might be moderated for him’ and cein nadhdbid fortacht dé desom ní boí ní nogabad dibsom tabart fochaide foir MI33a05 ‘as long as there was not the help of God for him, there was not anything that could have prevented them from inflicting tribulations on him.’ The former is likely an earlier spelling of dó, a successful hypercorrection, while the latter can either be attributed to the confusion with di or, as it immediately follows dé, may be an error for dosom.

With regard to the 2sg, MI shows a distinct preference for the form dait, with only 5 attestations of duit: MI44b23 MI44c19 MI56a01 MI92a20 and MI103a06 and 2 attestations of deit MI91b16 MI129d22. As with the other corpora, there does not appear to be any contextual reason for the choice of these particular variants and MI’s preference for dait, as well as its distinct preference for dam in the 1sg is interesting in that Wb and Sg each only have one attestation of one of them (dam Wb4b29 and dait Sg2a07.) This would appear to be a particular linguistic trait of MI. The full figures for the forms in all three corpora can be seen in Figure 18 below.

Sg is by far the most consistent with only two fluctuations: dait Sg2a07 and dit Sg179a04 for the expected 2sg duit. Otherwise, all forms are as expected: dom, duit, do, di, dun, duib doib. There is nothing in the particular contexts of these deviations that could explain their variation: cid bec cid mar ind inducbál ó dia tar hési denmo ind libuir bith má de do buith dait-siu hi coimthect oco Sg2a07 ‘whether the glory from God for making the book be small or be great, it will be greater from thy being associated in it;’ ní thabur dit [leg: duit] ón Sg179a04 ‘I do not give this to you.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>duit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dait</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 fo

The preposition/preverb fo undoubtedly contained an original -o, coming from *upo, though between a particle and a verb it shows the same tendency as do- (see above) and ro- and no- to develop a -u in pretonic position, and often to raise o > u in tonic position depending on the height of the subsequent vowel.

3.6.1 Preverbal fo-

There is a tendency for the vowel of fo- to coalesce with a following vowel in tonic positions, fo-acaib becoming -fäcaib, though more regularly it creates a diphthong: fo- followed by an a turns to fâ- while fo- coalesced with an e or i becomes foilée- (GOI §837.) This is unlike to-/ro- as they often do not create a diphthong or a long vowel and instead simply coalesce (do-adbat, -tadbat) Stifter (2014, 211) has attributed this to the fact that ro-/to- likely had more grammatical functions while fo- was simply lexical and thus, while similar, they were subject to different analogical influences.

In Sg, there is minimal evidence of an unexpected fu-. In fact, evidence of fu- at all is nearly non-existent, with the only tonic evidence being the result of regular Primitive Irish raising, or the coalescence resulting in a long vowel: do-fúairec ‘crushes’ from *to-fo-org and do-fúasailci *to-fo-usssléic show the expected coalescence of fo- with a subsequent o or u to ó or úu, as does the form fu-fuasna ‘agitates, disturbs’ Sg p. 112 (Thes. ii, 290.4). This is the only instance of a pretonic fu- in Sg and it is not in a relative, preceded by a conjunction or containing an inflex. It is not found within the glosses, however, but is contained in the poem is acher ingáith innocht, and there does not appear to be any of the expected conditions for this apparent raising. Perhaps it is visual influence from the fu- of -fuasna, or perhaps this is the result of the same type of spontaneous raising in proclisis that has been seen in other forms, such as with do-.

Wb additionally has a few tonic forms that appear to be regularly accounted for by raising, such as nifuirmi Wb8c01 ‘is not set’ of fo-ruimi which can be understood as deriving from *u-ro-rumī (Hamp 1984, 201) and thus the -o would be regularly raised in stressed positions by the subsequent -u-.

---

86 There is additionally do-fuiben which Pedersen (1909-1913, ii, 462) takes as *to-fo- with benaid < *binai which would include a reason for raising. However, Russell (1988, 99) has suggested that it is better understood as a compound of uss- and ben- rather than fo- and ben- and posits *to-usslben as an origin, in which case this form would not contain fo- at all.
There is also the case of **fo-loing** which shows both *fo-* and *fu-* in tonic position with *arafulsam* Wb14c02a ‘that we may endure’ but *nádfochomolsam* Wb14b15 ‘which we cannot endure,’ as example. There is additionally the imperative *fulget* Wb20c05 ‘support ye’ (prima manus.) The verbal noun is predominantly *fulang* Wb17c26 Wb25d09 Wb14b18 with a single *folog* Wb17b23 (prima manus.) As *folog* is written in the *prima manus* it has been considered the older form, originally *folach*, but that it was assimilated to the verb resulting in *fulang* and a distinction between the verbal noun of *fo-loing* and the verbal noun *folach* of *fo-luigi* (Bergin 1938, 221.) This verb is perhaps from a root of *-*folung-* (Hessen 1913, 46-47,) in which case stressed raising of *o* to *u* would be expected, and Bergin would attribute the different forms to different roots, agreeing with Hessen that -luing derives from *lunget* and *folog, folach* originating as < *uo-log-o.*

Furthermore, there is the case of **do-futhraccair**, of which there is both *dofuthractar* Wb20c23 ‘they desire’ and *dofuthrisse* Wb32a09 ‘I could wish’ beside *doduthractar* Wb26b01 ‘who wish’ and *doduthris* Wb20b09 ‘I should wish’ respectively. If it derives from *di-*fo-trac (cf. Armstrong 1976, 57; EIV, 415) there should be no element of raising here. The expected outcome of *di-fo* is more regularly *díu-* , potentially adapted from *di-uss*, and the forms in *fu-* then, must be based on the forms with *díu-* (Armstrong 1976, 58,) and Armstrong suggest we understand the *díu-* as deriving from an early treatment of *di-fo* (Armstrong 1976, 60.)

MI too shows a number of forms in which there is *fu-* in tonic position: forms like *dufutharctarsom* MI49a17 ‘they wished’ of *do-futhraccair* and the various forms of *fo-loing* such as *connach ful* MI57d15 ‘so that he may not endure it’ *nad fulaing* MI77d03 ‘which he does not endure’ *ni fulgam ni* MI77d06 ‘so we do not endure’ and *annad fulngat* MI122a08 ‘when they do not bear’ and their inherent difficulties have been discussed above. The relative *arna furastar* MI15b11 ‘lest it be stained’ of *fo-roind* could perhaps be explained as regular stressed raising if it is understood as having derived from *fo-rud-* but in that case, the form *niforondar* MI35d08 ‘it is not stained’ would have to be explained.\(^{87}\) Equally, forms such as *ní fuidema* MI56c09 ‘will not suffer’ of *fo-daim* cannot be phonologically explained.

---

\(^{87}\) The form *ní fuidema* MI56c09 of *fo-daim* has been suggested by Thurneysen (GOI §647) to either have been written for *foidema, as stressed fo-* becomes *foi* before a reduplicated syllable (GOI §660,) in which case the diphthongs -oí- and -uí- have the same phonological value (cf. Cowgill 1967, 134-137; Uhlich 1995, 15-16) or with stressed *fo-* becoming *fu-* before a palatalised consonant, as evidence of the early spread of the ë-future,
Turning to the pretonic evidence, Wb contains only 10 instances of a preverbal *fu*—
*fundaiter* Wb33b19 ‘are divided’ of *fo-dáli* and *fuddera* Wb33c12 ‘causes’ from *fo-fera*
beside *fodera* Wb3c33. As noted by Thurneysen (GOI §425,) *fo-fera* contains a petrified
infixed pronoun, best seen in Wb33c12, which he analyses as *fu-d-dera*, as it contains an
additional, functional infix: ‘that causes it.’ *Fo-fera* also has the relative form *fuera*
Wb33b13, and the perfect *fuarua* Wb2a18 beside a relative *foruar* Wb8b05, and *fo-cheird*
shows a relative *fucertar* Wb34a02 ‘is cast’ as well as *fuscerdam ni* Wb34a02 ‘let us cast’
which, although it is an imperative⑧ contains an infix and thus the preverbal is still
unstressed (cf. GOI §38.)

MI on the other hand, while it does not show the substantial preference for *fu*- that it
certainly showed for *du*-; MI has significantly more forms with *fu*- than Wb and Sg, with
slightly over a third of all attestations of *fo-* being *fu-*, with 124 of the former and 61 of
the latter. As with *do-* many of the pretonic forms are found following another element
such as *mafuroilissemni* MI00d08 ‘if we have deserved’ of *fo-slí; lase futabair* MI40d02
‘when he places under’ of *fo-tabair; amal fufulsni* MI66d17 ‘as it is perturbed’ of *fo-
fúasna;* containing an infix such as *fudalibsea* MI78a10 ‘I will distribute’ of *fo-dálí;* as
well as in relative clauses such as *fuluinn* MI140b08 ‘that I would fly’ of *fo-lúathar* and
*fuchertat* MI93a25 ‘[they] who put’ of *fo-ceird.* There are also forms such as *fu-ciallathar*
MI114b03 ‘He provides’ which are not relative, do not contain an infixed pronoun, do
not have any possibility of raising in hiatus and are not following another element. As
with *du-* these situations do not exclusively contain forms in *fu-* with examples such as
*cofucrothad* MI23b14 ‘that he should shake,’ beside relative *focrothad* MI64a06 ‘that it
shook’ of *fo-crotha* and *lasse fungensa* MI78d02 ‘when I will serve’ beside *fongniat*
MI112b04 ‘that they serve of *fo-gní.*

As discussed above, some of these forms could perhaps be attributed to some kind of
analogical raising owing to influence of a following high vowel, but not all, and as the
relative particle as well as some infixed pronouns should have caused lowering, there is
no phonological reason for these forms to be *fu-.*

It is unclear how to interpret the situation with *fo-*. MI undeniably shows a distinct
preference for pretonic forms with *u-* against Wb and Sg, indicating that this was a
particular preference of MI as opposed to a diachronic feature. However, in the case of

⑧ With the exception of the future, *fo-ceird* does not normally form dependent forms, but can be shown
to do so here as demonstrated by Bergin (1932, 137.)
fo-, which certainly had the vowel -o and thus seems fair to compare with *to-. Wb has some minor evidence of irregularity and forms with fu- while there is a singular occurrence in Sg, while MI has slightly over a third of all attestations of fo- showing fu- but hardly enough to confidently posit a preference.

As with do- it seems unreasonable to suggest that this was a feature that started, gained traction and then entirely died out, partially because the chronological distance between Wb and MI is not so significant that a feature could reasonably gain significant traction in the language only to rapidly disappear entirely, but especially as Sg is known to contain glosses which are significantly earlier than the manuscript itself and thus, were this a feature that were present earlier in the language, some evidence of it would be expected to be present, unless an incredibly meticulous scribe who chose to exclude every unfamiliar instance of fu- found in his exemplars, bar one, is to be imagined. That would imply a significant level of scribal interference which does not accord with the other, older evidence found in Sg; a meticulous scribe would be expected to remove other unfamiliar diagnostic features as well.

3.6.2 Prepositional fo

The preposition fo shows this same preference on the part of MI: Wb and Sg each only contain one attestation of the spelling fu, while MI contains 56. MI does not prefer fu to fo, similar to how it does not prefer prepositional du to do, but it still comprises a little over 40% of the total usage, as in Figure 19 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single fu of Wb is *fuchésad* Wb33a12 ‘passively’ used immediately after *fodiuscartach* ‘deponentially’ in the same gloss, and with a directly comparable *fochésad*

---

89 Kavanagh (2001, 435) has identified the gloss fades no fathuaith Wb29a21 as containing two instances of the preposition as fo-. Alternatively, this can also be read as part of an adverb of place (GOI §483.)
Wb13d21, and the single fu in Sg fudeud Sg93b08 ‘at last’ has a parallel in fodead Sg153b06.

As with do/du, the other preposition discussed above, MI uses fo and fu identically, and with many parallels between the two: fomám ndoinachtae MI25d14 ‘under the yoke of humanity;’ fumám nasar MI72b03 ‘under the yoke of the Assyrians;’ fudí MI46a24 ‘twice’ fudí MI77b11; fuchetoir MI90d12 ‘at once’ fochetoir MI96c10; fobith MI27c15 ‘because’ fobith MI30a09; fuchossa MI67c02 ‘beneath his feet’ beside fochossa MI89d15. There are no significant differences in context, and indeed all of these phrases are consistently found with fo within the Old Irish corpus cf. fo mám Wb3c38 ‘under the yoke’, SR 4545; fo dí Wb24c22 ‘twice’; fó chetóir LU 9127 ‘at once’; fobíith Wb9b19 ‘because’; fobíithin (Gwynn and Purton 1911-1912, 129.1; fo chosaib from the YBL Táin (Strachan and O'Keeffe 1912, 453.) There are only three exceptions that were found, namely: fubíthin (Thes. Ii, 240.19) fubíth (Thes. Ii, 13, 18d02) and fucetuair in the Life of Brigid (Plummer, Fraser and Grosjean 1931, 6, §17)

The single attestations of fu in Wb and Sg are not easily accounted for, but their identical usage with fo indicate that the two were interchangeable. In MI, again, the forms are clearly interchangeable as evidenced by the fact that fo and fu are used in identical contexts, and though it may not be a definitive preference, it is certainly a relative one when compared to both Wb and Sg.

3.7 ro

The situation with ro- is significantly more complicated than the other preverbs that have been discussed thus far, on account of its ability to perform multiple functions. The preverbal particle ro- can combine with any type of verb to express special verbal functions, such as an anterior completion, or an element of possibility. The particle ro- can be preverbal, immediately preceding the verbal root, adding a further preverb to compound verbs and turning simple verbs into compounds; it can be prevocalic, occurring in the stressed portion of the verb before a vowel-initial preverb and liable to be used in compounds already containing preverbal ro-, as well as in replacement of other preverbal augments; ro- could also be proclitic, functioning as a conjunct particle which could be attached with another conjunct particle in proclisis without affecting the stressed portion of the verb (cf. GOI §; EIV, 147-162; McCone 2005, 122-125.)
In origin *ro-* comes from *pro* and thus contain an original -o vowel, though -o does have a tendency to become -u in many of the same circumstances as discussed above. As with the other previously discussed particles ending in an original -o, the change to -u tends to occur in certain key positions, and also appears in tonic position, though, as before, the tonic occurrences that are attested are likely the cause of regular raising: doruirim Mil36b06 ‘it enumerated’ of do-rími; lase foruillecta Wb7d09 ‘have been smeared’ of fo-slig as examples.

In Sg there are minimal occurrences of ru-, only 28 in the entire corpus, with the vast majority in tonic position and therefore the product of regular stressed raising (cf. ata-ruirmiset Sg188a01 ‘they have reckoned them’ of ad-rími; nírubai Sg7b03 ‘it cannot be’ of the substantive verb.) There are very limited proclitic forms, in which it does not appear to be taking any stress, with only the two isolated examples arinrusamlasatar Sg112b04 ‘for they have imitated,’ following ar, and cerúbé Sg163b06 ‘that there should be’ following cía. There is a single ambiguous example in ní rubi Sg21b13, in which the ro- could be proclitically attached to ní, and therefore níru bí, or it could also be in tonic position as in ní rubai, as found in Sg7b03. As the context would better suit the substantive rather than the copula, it seems more likely that this is ní rub(a)í: i. ar ni-rubi tinfeld ar belaib x. 7 n. reliqua Sg21b13 ‘i.e. for there cannot be aspiration before x and n, etc.’

A similar question is raised in Wb, in which ru- appears with the copula four times: rubu Wb33a05 ‘had been’ rupu Wb33a11 rupsa Wb33a12 rupusi Wb33a22; and a single usage with the substantive verb nirubi Wb11c17 that again raises the question of nírubí or ní rubai. Considering that elsewhere in Wb there are only two attestations of what appears to be níru – níruanus Wb14d29 ‘I have not remained’ of anaid and niruthógaitsam Wb16a22 ‘we have not deceived’ of do-gaítha neither of which appears to be taking any stress – and more consistent attestations of níro (cf. nirogabsam Wb24d02 ‘we have not taken’) it seems more likely that this is ní rub(a)í with normal raising.

There are 19 other forms following another particle, such as a conjunction such as cerudbói Wb4b13 ‘though [he] was’ cerudglanta Wb4a06 ‘though it should have been cleansed’ marudpredchisem Wb10d09 ‘if we have preached’ marudscarsi Wb27a30 ‘if ye have separated;’ marudchoiscset Wb28c07 ‘if they have corrected’ of con-secha both following má and carrying an infix.
There are also 14 pretonic forms in a relative, as example *arrudérgestar dia* Wb4c13 ‘which God hath purposed’ *rulaimur* Wb17c21 ‘that I dare,’ or a prepositional relative in the case of *irrufolhnastar* Wb13b29 ‘wherein He has reigned,’ and those that contain an infixed pronoun cf. *rasmbóí* Wb33a11 ‘they had it.’ As seen previously, these contexts with *ru-* are not exclusive as forms such as *arrupridchad* Wb14d23 ‘what has been preached’ occur alongside *arropridchad* Wb18b7, or relative *rumboi* Wb33b01 ‘that he has been’ beside *rombói* Wb15a29.

Wb does not have any particular preference for *ru-* in the contexts that have been discussed previously, but it tends to be mostly relegated to these contexts (in a relative, carrying an infix, following another particle) as the only two attestations of forms outside of these contexts with a proclitic *ru-* are *rufes* Wb33c07 ‘has been known’ (beside *rofess* Wb23b09) as well as a *rumúgsat* Wb5a24 ‘they have smothered’ of *múchaid*.

MI contains the highest number of attestations of the form *ru-*, with nearly a third of all attestations of *ro-* appearing as *ru-*. Even accounting for the number of tonic, and therefore naturally raised occurrences, 55% of the total attestations of *ru-* in MI are in pretonic position, showing a much higher level of preference for *ru-* in pretonic positions than either Wb or Sg.

As before, *ru-* is particularly prevalent following other elements such as *amal rundgab* MI16d04 *amal rumbói* MI31a03 ‘as was’ *ciarudboi* MI2a03 ‘though there has been’ *arrucestaigser* MI2d03 ‘when you disputed’ *dorrubide* MI40d09 ‘that he has cast’ *nadruchumgab* MI20a07 ‘that he had not extolled,’ as well as forms in the relative cf. *rundláth* MI33a17 ‘which it had made close.’ There are also forms following the negative particle that appear to be proclitic: *níruthochurestar* MI18d06 ‘had not invited’ *niruforaithmenairsom* MI24a17 ‘he did not remember’ *ni ruflescachtar* MI26b25 ‘they had not expected.’

There are also a handful of forms in which there is no preceding element, no relative and the *ro-* remains pretonic but is raised to -*u*: cf. *inrufill* MI33c11 ‘it has ensnared’ of *in-filli*; *dorumenatar* MI35b18 ‘they thought’ of *do-moinethar*; *dorulin* MI64c18 ‘it flowed’ of *do-lín*; *adrichoissén* MI69d04 ‘he strove’ of *ad-cosnai*.

As to be expected, *ru-* is not exclusive in these contexts as *ro-* does equally appear (cf. *romgab* MI132c08 ‘has seized me’) and is the preferred form, but MI once again contains far more attestations of the pretonic variant with the raised vowel than either Wb or Sg.
3.8 *no-*

The particle *no-* is a conjunct particle that carries no inherent semantic meaning. It is used exclusively with simple verbs and is used as a vehicle for an infixed pronoun, as a preverbal particle in the imperfect indicative, conditional and past subjunctive and as a relative marker. It is an exclusively pretonic form and thus is unlike the preverbs that have been discussed above. Nevertheless, it does see the same fluctuation in *no/*nu* that appeared in *do/*du-, *fo/*fu- and *ro/*ru-. Unlike *do- fo- and ro- the original etymological vowel of *no- is not so clearly *o- and is more likely to have been *u-.

The general scholarly consensus tends to be that the original form was *nu, cognate with the Hittite *nu and identical with the original, Proto-Indo-European adverb for ‘now’ (cf. Dillon 1947, 22-24; Watkins 1963, 13-15; McCon 2006, 272.) Schrijver (1997, 160-161,) however, has advocated for understanding the form as originally *noye and cognate with the Middle Welsh neu. Stifter (2014, 220-221) has discussed both potential origins and both of their respective pitfalls: while forms such as nummeratsa MI140c01 ‘they will reveal me’ containing the infixed pronoun *mū can be viewed by supporters of *nu as containing the original vowel, understanding an original *noye would necessitate arguing for the potential of proclitic raising outside of stressed syllables as discussed above (cf. pgs 137-138.) On the other hand, forms like nundammoraese MI70c11 do not contain any element that could be viewed as causing raising, thus excluding the possibility of an original *noye while equally being untenable as an original *nu if either Kortlandt’s (1979, 42-47) theory of lowering before e across a non-palatalised consonant or Stüber’s (1998, 50-52) theory of u falling together with o before an unlenited nasal or a cluster of a nasal and a stop are to be followed, though if one believes neither of those theories then an original *nu could still be understood. Stifter (2014, 221) posits a ‘sporadic raising’ in front of a nasal as a way of accounting for the difficulty, though as to be discussed there are occurrences not before nasals that are equally raised, as well as in *du-, *fu- and *ru-. If that is the case, sporadic raising before a nasal followed by a sporadic analogical spread to other contexts would have to be argued.

Although the argument for *nu is stronger, despite the seemingly contradictory evidence, *nu- is far less commonly attested. If Stifter’s (2014, 222) theory of particles, like the relative marker, being liable to cause vowel affection is to be believed, then the fact that *nu- is far less common than *no- could be attributed to the fact that *nu was regularly subject to lowering, such as when followed by the relative particle or by certain
infixed pronouns, and perhaps the lowered form spread by analogy to instances when *nu- could have been phonologically retained. The fact that in Sg *nu- is never found in a relative, and it is found only once in a relative in Wb, might be viewed as evidence of *nu being lowered before the relative particle, though the form *nu- is extremely uncommon in both and its absence in relative clauses may be better attributed to its relative infrequency overall.

Despite the original vowel more likely being -u as opposed to -o, instances of *nu- occur in much the same situations as du- and fu-, generally following another element or containing an infix though only once in a relative clause between Wb and Sg. As before, MI contains significantly more forms with -u, both relative to its own occurrences of no- generally and in comparison with Wb and Sg.

Sg overall only has 7 attestations of *nu- and all of them follow either cía or má: cinud Sg17a03 ‘although’ manubed Sg31b21 ‘if it existed’ manubed Sg32a01 manutoltanaiged Sg72b06 ‘if it had been pleasing’ cenud sluindi Sg197a11 ‘although it signifies’ manudchinni Sg197a12 ‘if it determines’ cenud fil Sg209b29 ‘although there are.’ There are attestations of no- following cía such as cenobed Sg162b02 ‘that should be’ and cenodchosmailgetar Sg212b02 ‘though they are alike’ indicating a raised vowel is not necessitated by the conjunction, though the only attestations of má followed by no- are the ones listed above. There does appear to be a preference for a raised -u following má with other particles, just with no- specifically there is minimal evidence. Following other conjunctions, such as amal, Sg does tend to use forms with -o such as amal donadbat Sg6b25 ‘as it displays (it)’ and amal nobed Sg32a01 ‘as if it were’ and amal rongab Sg65b03 ‘as for instance,’ a conjunction which within Wb and MI had optionally been followed by du-. In contrast with the 7 attestations of *nu-, Sg contains 53 attestations of no-.

Wb has 11 attestations of *nu- and only one of them is in a relative clause, though it follows another element: annupridchim Wb8d26 ‘what I preach.’ Otherwise, it regularly follows either má or cía, or optionally contains infixed pronouns: cenutad Wb4a10 ‘though ye are’ manubbaitsimse Wb8a01 ‘if I baptise you’ cianubed Wb12b02 ‘though it should be’ cenuslabratar Wb12d28 ‘though they speak’ manudubfeil Wb19c20 ‘if ye

---

90 There is the additional nu dubgothisi Wb5c01 that Strachan and Stokes (Thes. i 529 n. b) have emended to nundubgithesi and the entire gloss of which is difficult to read. While the editors of the Thesaurus have suggested this be a relative clause, without further context of the accompanying gloss it would be disingenuous to include it as a known relative.
are’ manudectid Wb23c11 ‘if ye have these’ manumgaibi Wb32a16 ‘if thou takest me’ manuddlegar ní do Wb32a18 ‘if aught is owing from him’ manud fel Wb11c01 ‘if there is.’ With the exception of annupridchim Wb8d26 nu-is not otherwise attested following another element that is not má or cía.

MI on the other hand has 175 attestations of no- compared with 73 attestations of nu-, which means that 29% of the overall attestations of the particle no- appear as nu-, which is a significant increase in the number of forms with nu-over that found in either of the other two corpora of glosses. The attestations of instances of nu- in MI is much more akin to those of du- and fu-, and they occur in more widespread conditions than those found in both Wb and Sg. In MI nu- can be found after another element anundlina MI19b05 ‘when it fills it’ annunadbartaigfesiu MI48a12-13 ‘when You will oppose;’ amal núntet cách MI77a14 ‘as each goes to it’ amal nummesur MI94b08 ‘as I will judge;’ lasse nundundaingnichfe MI78c06 ‘when You will strengthen us;’ cianudchanar MI135a06 ‘although it is sung’ cianutiastais MI117d03 ‘even if they should go;’ conucoined MI32b13 ‘so that he used to lament’ conuruiccaiged MI25b10 ‘so that he might confound;’ ma nubeth MI30b04 ‘if it were’ manucomallainn MI131d19 ‘if I had fulfilled;’ 7 nundfoilsigedar MI42b18 ‘and manifest Him’ 7 nupectaigtis MI74c03 ‘and they used to sin.’

With the exception of cía and má with both of which the raised form are preferred across all preverbs, these conjunctions do not exclusively use nu-: lasse nomseimigthethese [leg: nomseimigthese] MI88a11 ‘when I used to be attenuated;’ anonda imbide MI112b17 ‘when you are hedged round;’ amal nongnetis ón MI30a04 ‘as though they did.’

As before, nu- is consistently but not exclusively found with infixed pronouns with forms like nundagebtis MI34c08 ‘that they would capture them’ beside nondalagaba [leg: nondalámgaba] MI43a02 ‘that he take them’ nudaerbtais MI46d12 ‘who used to entrust themselves’ beside forms like nodneirbea MI51b10 ‘that shall trust.’ Many of the forms containing infixes are also in relative clauses, but MI has a few occurrences of nu-in relative clauses without any infixes: nunailte MI39a19 ‘that he be struck;’ nufailtiger MI46b16 ‘that I rejoice;’ nuradinse MI74c03 ‘that I used to speak;’ nubitis MI85d07 ‘who used to be.’ Forms in no- also appear in the relative nombatis MI40a02 ‘that they die;’ no caraim MI79d01 ‘by which I love;’ nobitis MI86d06 ‘that used to be.’ There are also
forms containing infixes that are the main clause verb: *nummeratsa* MI140c01 ‘they will reveal me;’ *nuntualingigedar* MI146b02 ‘he deems us worthy.’

MI additionally has two forms that do not fit into the above categories: there is one form following an adverb *intan dano nunanad* MI83a04 ‘when, moreover, it used to rest’ and there is one main clause verb that does not carry an infix nor follow any conjunction: *nudianaigtis* MI54d15 ‘they used to hurry.’

Overall, it is clear that *má* and *cía* required, or at the very least heavily preferred, to be followed by a subsequent high vowel, and that forms carrying an infix had the optional ability to become -u. Despite the fact that they do not share the same etymological vowel, MI for the most part treats the particle *no-* in the same way it treats both *do-* and *fo-* in that the vowel was optionally made high in all contexts – a situation that did not occur in either Wb or Sg in which the high vowel is generally restricted to certain conditions.

It does not seem unreasonable to propose that the existence of *nu-* contributed to the variation between -o and -u in other pretonic particles. Forms such as *do-* and *ro-* with their etymological -o would not have been subject to raising as unstressed forms, and would not have been subject to lowering by virtue of already having a low vowel, whereas *nu* would have been liable to be lowered, thus creating contexts in which a pretonic particle would show fluctuation between -o and -u. Especially if original proclitic vowels are believed to have contributed to vowel affection, that could explain the lack of *nu-* in relative clauses in both Wb and Sg, as *nu* would have been regularly lowered in a relative, and the presence of *nu-* in relative clauses in MI could be attributed to subsequent analogical spread. The usage of *no-* as a relative marker would have made it a relatively productive and common form, providing an analogical base for the confusion between it and other pretonic particles with an etymological -o.

Conjunctions like *má* and *cía* with which the raised vowel appears to be preferred may not have exerted any true raising influence, but would have simply been contexts in which *nu* retained its original vowel, leading to analogical influence in which forms like *do-* and *ro-*, which already were possibly subject to raising in hiatus and thus had a raised allomorph, began to optionally use the raised allomorph in contexts in which *nu* had been retained due to a lack of lowering – such as with certain infixed pronouns such as *mū*. At a certain point, both the raised and lowered forms would have become interchangeable and the distinction between them could be lost and *nu* could have been
reinterpreted as no- on the basis of other, similar pretonic forms that were not functioning in similar ways in similar contexts but that retained their original -o.

It does not seem coincidental that the contexts in which forms with an original -o become -u, and a form with an original -u remains -u while optionally becoming -o in other contexts, are the same. Ultimately, regardless of the reasoning behind it, it appears clear that no- and nu- were interchangeable, and more commonly used interchangeably in Ml than in Wb and Sg, indicating a particular preference in Ml that did not exist in Wb and Sg.

3.11 Possessives

As other proclitics that end in both -o and -u have showed a significant level of variation and have been shown to have preferred forms in Ml, it was prudent to equally examine the possessive do which, albeit from a different origin, was also *to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do (possessive)</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>Ml</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tó</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sg has only three instances of the possessive at all, as seen in Figure 20 above, a lenited t- which occurs before óenur, thóinur, one combined with a preposition it chóimthecht, both within the same gloss: Absoluta i. huatusailthecha huasaingnúis ar intan asúnir so .ego dico l tu dicis ní sluindi so hisuidiu naíd eper nach aile it chóimthecht. INtain immurgu asúnir siu .ego ipse l egomet is saingnúis duí so thóinur hisuidiu indepét 7 ní erchondla nach persan aile frit. Sg208b05 ‘absolved from a special form, for when thou sayest ego dico or tu dicis, thou dost not signify herein that no other says it in thy company. When, however, thou sayest ego ipse or egomet the saying is a special form to thee alone in this, and no other person converses (?) with thee.’ There is additionally a single do: do chuil Sg229a ‘your corner.’
Wb has one instance of a lenited t- as well, also preceding thóenur: ni tussu thóenur ciatbere Wb5a28 ‘not thou alone, though thou say it,’ and this would appear to be a set phrase as thóenur equally appears in Fled Bricrenn: rosoichi-siu thóenur ‘you attain alone’ (Windisch 1884, 11); and also in Serglige Con Culainn: Úair mād messi, ní fil cuit do nách ailiu inniumsa acht duitsiu thóenur (Dillon 1953a, 3.55-3.56) ‘while as for me, there is no share in me for any other save for thee alone’ (Dillon 1953b, 49.) The instances of t are found in expected contexts such as when combined with a preposition and preceding a vowel occtadrad so Wb5a25 ‘your worshipping’ i.e. ‘worshipping you’ dartéssi siu Wb31d13 ‘in thy stead,’ or combined with a preposition preceding a consonant: cut séitchi Wb10a29 ‘with your wife’ itsenmathir Wb29d11 ‘in your grandmother’ ditgnímaib Wb31c08 ‘from your works’ dotmutintir Wb32a1 ‘to all your household’ itduilib Wb32c06 ‘in your creatures.’

Wb contains three attestations of do preceding a vowel do hiresso Wb29d13 ‘your faith’ as well as doimchomarc Wb31d18 Wb32a29 ‘your salutation.’ There is a single example of do followed by an f- dofoirbtheta Wb28d11 ‘your perfection.’ The only attestation of an abbreviated form before a vowel without a preceding preposition (that would equally have caused elision) is the previously mentioned thóenur.

In Ml the form t is found following prepositions as well as preceding vowels: dut moladsu Ml53b08 ‘from praising Thee’ and tecndachsu Ml91a03 ‘to blaspheme Thee,’ as examples. The forms du and do appear to be interchangeable but with a preference for du.

Five of the 33 occurrences of du occur after a preceding preposition: ac duguiiusiu [leg: duguidisiu] Ml22a05 ‘praying to You’ oc du dibirciud su 7 oc du chaned Ml58c06 ocdumoladsu Ml81a01 ‘who is pelting you and reviling you.’ With the exception of cenduchumachtaesiu Ml50a06 ‘without your power,’ which would not normally elide a possessive, the other four attestations occur with oc – which does show an elision in Wb. There are no occurrences of do following a preposition.

However, the rest of the attestations of du are not following a preposition: dugude Ml62c17 ‘your prayer’ dusercaesiu Ml92b01 ‘your love’ du frecur cheill siu Ml106d03 ‘your worship’ du chuimlengu Ml112b08 ‘your contests’ du frecur ceillsiu Ml132b03 ‘your worship’ du insudighisiu Ml30b05 ‘your decrees’ dugnuissiu ón Ml38b07 ‘your countenance’ dusciath Ml39c21 ‘your wings’ duremdeicsius Ml55d23 ‘your providence’ duindubálsu Ml66b03 ‘your glory’ duthuíchsimem [leg: -thuicsimem] Ml71b21 ‘your
most acceptable’ *duthnae* [leg: *duthimnae*] MI74d05 ‘your commandments’ *duthrocairi* MI86c02 ‘your mercy’ *dufrecndarcussu* MI87b03 ‘your presence’ *dufortacha* MI93d04 ‘your help’ *dumes* MI106c11 ‘your estimation’ *dulondassasu* MI107c14 ‘your anger’ *duscaith* MI118c12 ‘your shadow’ *dugnimaisiu* MI125d03 ‘your works’ *dutethidensu* MI132b06 ‘your solitude.’

There is one occurrence of *du* preceding a vowel: *du insudighsisu* MI30b05 ‘your decrees’ and a single occurrence of *do* preceding a vowel *doadbchlois* MI40d19.

There are 10 attestations of *du* with a following *f-* , which Thurneysen (GOI §439) had noted, stating that the ‘silent vowel’ was written in MI, referring to the fact that *f-* was silent and thus the prevocalic *-o* would be elided: *dufortacht su* MI38b07 ‘your help’ *dufrecndarcussu* MI87b03 ‘your presence’ *dufirinnisiusu* MI89c05 ‘your righteousness’ *dufortachta* MI93d04 *dufortacht* MI93d05 *dufortachtai* MI101c06 *dufrecur cheill* MI106d03 ‘to worship Thee *du frecur* MI132b03. There are no attestations of *do* before an *f-* and one attestation of *tortachtae* MI108a01 ‘your help’ in which the elision and the silence of the *f-* have been made explicit. Additionally, the only instance of *thu* is used with *fortacht thuforacht* [leg: *thuforacht*] MI4c20, which is the same form with which *to* occurs twice: *tofortacht su* MI45c07 and *tofortachte* MI55a19. There is an additional *tó eredig* MI45d03 ‘your cup,’ that also shows the silent vowel.

Considering that MI appears to have a preference for forms ending in *-u* over *-o*, it was relevant to look as well at the first-person possessive which also ends in an *-o* and see if the preference is exhibited here as well, as can be seen in Figure 21, below.

**Figure 21 Possessive mo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Mo</em></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mu</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mú</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M</em>’</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though not as starkly, MI here again prefers to represent this pronoun with a *-u* instead of an *-o*, but its near absence from both Wb and Sg is striking. As with the second person possessive, the *m-* form on its own is found preceding vowels and combined with the preposition, sometimes both at the same time, such as *armetiuth* Wb10d23 ‘for my raiment’ in Wb and *dungabailse* MI29d04 ‘for my capture’ in MI. In Sg the only
attestation is *moínur* ‘my own’ that is, ‘alone’ Sg202a07 which is again paralleled in *móinur* Wb5a25

Sg only contains two occurrences of *mo* preceding a vowel *mo ainm díles* Sg200b10 ‘my proper name’ and *amoaine* Sg204b02 ‘my delight.’ There are no attestations with a subsequent *f-* and none following a preposition.

Wb has only one instance of *mu* is *muchumacht* Wb33a11 ‘power’ and there is no preceding particle or other reason for the form to be *mu.* Wb does have 15 attestations of *mo* preceding a vowel (cf. *moirnigde* Wb4d18 ‘my prayer’ *moanamchare* Wb10c17 ‘my soul-friend’ *moort* Wb23b18 ‘my rank’ *moanmainse* 32a08 ‘my soul’) and three attestations of *mo* before *f-*: *mofáltse* Wb14d11 ‘my joy’ *mofailte* Wb23c11 *mofochidise* Wb25a10 ‘my sufferings.’ There are no attestations of *m-* preceding *f-* and only three of *m-* preceding a vowel without also being combined with a preposition: *móinur* Wb5a25 *manam* ‘my soul’ (*a prima manu*) Wb17c04a *mort* Wb29d25 ‘my rank.’

Ml on the other hand uses both *mo* and *mu* equivalently within parallel phrases. While there is again an expected preference for *mu* following another element, there are additionally the glosses *oc mofortacht* Ml92a04 ‘helping me’ and *tar mo chenn* Ml88a08 ‘on my behalf’ beside *tarmucenn* Ml80b02 and *tar muchenn* Ml76d09 that demonstrate that it was not required. There are additionally 16 occurrences of the 34 total of *mu* that are not subsequent to any element: *muglanadsa* Ml71c19 ‘my purification’ *muthaithese* [leg: *muthuaithese*] Ml34b06 ‘my people’ *muchoimiusa* Ml36c07 ‘my lord’ *muchumachtæ son* Ml56b02 ‘my power’ *mu pecthu* Ml58c18 ‘my sins’ *muchumachtæ* Ml68a10 *mudrochgnima* Ml68d08 ‘my ill-deeds’ *mú bás* Ml80a09 ‘my death’ *muchland* Ml88a10 ‘my children’ *muchland* Ml88a11 *muginusa* Ml88b10 ‘my mouth’ *munamat* Ml90c18 ‘my enemies’ *munat* [leg: *munamat*] Ml91d04 *muthire* Ml92a03 ‘my land’ *mu rucacai* [leg: *ruccai*] Ml118c04 ‘my shame’ *mudærígise* Ml118b15 ‘my forsaking.’

As with the second singular *do*, Ml has a handful of examples of a non-elided form preceding *f-*, however in this case, all of the examples are of *mo* and not *mu*: *moforcaldecaite* Ml17d02 ‘of my being a teacher;’ *mofrescissiu* Ml38a13 ‘my expectation;’ *mofirinne se* Ml109d06 ‘my truth;’ and the previously mentioned *oc mofortacht* Ml92a04. There is only one attestation of *mo* before a vowel *mo ærchóiltiusa* Ml132c15 ‘my resolves.’
It would appear that, with regards to the possessive, the forms were optionally interchangeable, and that MI preferred the form *du over do, and while there was merely a slight preference, MI uses the form *mu equally to the form *mo, regardless of context.

3.12 Conclusions

In his discussion of the preverb *to-* Stifter (2014, 230) had concluded that given the wide variety of factors that may have contributed to the variation in pretonic vowels such as raising in hiatus, possible lowering before subsequently lost elements and potentially analogous raising, and that when the triggering contexts of these processes were obscured, the allomorphs were entirely confused and became a matter of free variation according to preference.

This seems to be the most likely conclusion from the evidence here. The pretonic forms of *to-, de- eter, fo, no, ro, tre* as well as the 1st and 2nd sg. possessive pronouns all have at least two allomorphs that, at least within the three corpora of glosses discussed here, are used interchangeably. There are particular contexts in which the pretonic forms are liable to show a different allomorph, namely, relative clauses, when containing an infixed pronoun, and following particular conjunctions – especially *má* and *cía*.

These contexts do not only show variation in the forms that alternate between -o and -u as ad- both shows a delenited consonant at- such as atruirmed Wb2c0691 and fluctuation in the representation of the vowel such as amal dunedbarar MI123c04 and conidbarat Wb1b20. Some of the variations in for too contain an infixed pronoun, such as the relative far-dingrat Sg26b13 and farchongrad Wb32d09, though in this particular preverb, the variation is equally widespread outside of these contexts. In the forms that alternate -o and -u these contexts are even more widely attested.

It would appear then, based on the fluctuations discussed here, that the possibility of pretonic raising would need to be considered, despite that not being accounted for in the standard understanding of Primitive Irish raising.

The use of *no- < *nu* as a relative marker, and thus its placement preceding the relative particle which would have had a lowering effect, can be viewed as at least a partial basis for an analogical spread of the form *no-* into positions where historical *nu-* should have been retained, and a subsequent situation in which forms with etymological -o were raised to -u in imitation of the original vowel of the particle now understood as *no-*. The

---

91 This has been renumbered to Wb2c6a in Thes. suppl. 37: 506.
confusion would only be exacerbated by the raising of o in hiatus, providing multiple contexts in which o and u were regularly interchangeable.

Nevertheless, regardless of the possible origins of this fluctuation, it is evident that within the three corpora of glosses MI is functioning under a different tradition. In the pretonic eter and tre MI has a preference for etir and tri that is nearly to the exclusion of all other forms in the former and entirely to the exclusion of all other forms in the latter. This preference is not shared by either Wb or Sg, eliminating the possibility of chronological factors.

In the forms with an etymological -o, including the relevant possessives as well as the particle no-, MI shows a larger variability between the forms in -o and in -u. While the particle do- as preverb and preposition and do as possessive both show a significant and distinct preference for the form du, both in and out of the contexts in which a raised vowel would be expected, this preference is in contrast to both Wb and Sg who still prefer the forms with o-. In all the other forms that end in -o such as fo-ro- and the possessive mo, while there is no distinct preference in MI for the forms in -u there is still a relatively higher frequency of occurrence than found in either Wb or Sg. Likewise with the form nu-, while no- is still more common in MI and the distinctly preferred form, there are more occurrences of nu- and in more widespread contexts than occur in either Wb or Sg, particularly within relative clauses.

Thus, the scribes of MI were very clearly operating from a different variety of Old Irish from those of Wb and Sg, though whether they were inserting features of their own dialect, or had competing ideas about what constituted the ‘correct’ forms is unknown. The absence of forms ending in -u in Sg indicates that this was not a preference that was seeing a gradually increased usage in the Old Irish period. In certain cases, the higher frequency of variants in Wb vs. Sg could perhaps suggest that Sg was conforming to a more conservative orthographic standard that simply eradicated as much variation as possible. This could certainly be the case, but even so, that still indicates at least two competing varieties of Old Irish, one in which the forms in -u were significantly preferred and one in which the forms in -o were given dominance. Either way, MI is clearly distinctly different from both Wb and Sg in ways that cannot be attributed to mere diachrony.
4. Features unique to a particular corpus

Up until this point, chapters have been divided by a general subject: Chapter Two dealt with features that may represent synchronic variation as suggested by previous scholarship, with all of the variants discussed having been identified in previous academic works as potentially being evidence of diatopic variation, or having been otherwise noted as being unique or somehow varying from the anticipated form. Chapter Three then dealt with preverbs and prepositions and their behaviour within the three corpora of glosses, and was separated from the subsequent chapters on the basis of the amount of variation present being substantial, while demonstrating clearly that Ml is distinct from the other two corpora.

Chapters Four, Five and Six are similar to Chapter Three in that they focus on possible variants that have not previously been proposed as evidence of synchronic variation, but that were discovered and investigated during the course of this thesis. Similar to what was found within the preceding chapter, there are certain newly identified features that are treated distinctly different by each corpus, and thus these features have been divided on that basis in the following chapters - distinct within Sg, distinct within Wb and distinct within Ml.

When examining variation within the three corpora of glosses, the types of variation can be roughly subdivided into three categories: 1) all three sets of glosses show a different form of a particular feature 2) a feature is treated equally amongst the three corpora or 3) one set of glosses stands against the other two.

In the first identified category there is internal variation within all three corpora of glosses that is manifested differently in all three, either by utilising different alternatives, or by showing distinctly different preferences for a particular variant feature.

In theory, there could be a situation in which all three corpora deviate entirely from a historically expected or standard form, and from each other, each showing a distinct innovation. Practically, such a situation is unlikely to arise: if the expected or standard form does not appear in any of the three corpora, it cannot be stated to be a ‘standard’ form, especially as many of our ‘standards’ for Old Irish are at least partially based on the three corpora themselves. Thus, while this is a theoretical possibility, it is not a probable one and remains hypothetical.

Instead, the more common occurrence within this category is that all three corpora show a variation of a particular feature, but in differing ways. A prime example is the
paradigm of the lexeme tech, which has two forms in all singular cases, but different stressed vowels in the genitive and dative: tige & taige and tig & taig, respectively. The body of evidence is minor, as each of the sets of glosses only shows a handful of forms. However, there is variation in how this paradigm manifests: Wb shows a genitive tige Wb7c09, but the four dative occurrences are all taig (cf. Wb9b23,) while MI has only two dative singular cases, both of which are tig (cf. MI57c07,) whereas Sg has a genitive taigae Sg66a19. Wagner (1982, 104) has shown that the forms taig, taige have modern counterparts in Ulster Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Manx while the forms with -i- have a continued presence in Munster and Connacht Irish. On the basis of this, he and Ahlqvist (1988, 30) have both argued for a northern origin for Wb and Sg, and a southern origin for MI. However, McCone (1996, 111) has shown that the original paradigm would have resulted in a dative form taig but a genitive singular form tige. Thus, while the forms in MI and Sg can each be tentatively linked to respective southern and northern places of origin respectively, the evidence from Wb is geographically inconclusive as it does not diverge from our expected paradigm. With regards to this feature, Wb conforms to the historically expected linguistic outcome while both MI and Sg show innovatory forms. They do not, however, share a common innovation, and therefore all three corpora are distinct: MI and Sg in their unique innovations, and Wb in its adherence to the ‘standard,’ expected form.

A further example is the variation in the reflexive pronoun meaning ‘self/own.’ There is a variety of forms of fadein/fein/fessin etc. across all three corpora of glosses, but each of the corpora have distinctions from each other. MI is the only one of the three to use the first and second singular form fadein, Wb alone contains a first and second plural form with an unexpected final -e, and Sg uniquely uses the forms beginning with c-, though in this instance it has been shown that this is a semantic distinction; the meaning of the forms beginning with c- is more an emphasiser of both subject and its accompanying verb, potentially translated as ‘too’ (cf. C. O’Rahilly 1976, 255; Byrne 1982, 167; Section 2.1) and there are no analogous contexts in which this form might have been expected to appear in either Wb or MI, while existing in Sg. Sg is additionally distinct in that, outside of the two attestations of c- forms, it contains only one occurrence of a form including *de: dialuc fadesin Sg154b01, in contrast to 16 in MI and 15 in Wb. Although all three corpora do show a preference for fe(is)sin, particularly in the third singular masculine and neuter, which could therefore perhaps be considered the ‘standard’ form (cf. Schrijver
there is a wide variety of various forms that are not used equivalently within
the three corpora of glosses, and they therefore diverge from each other.

In the second category of potential variation, there is a certain level of dissimilarity
present within the three corpora of glosses, however, the variation is roughly equivalent
amongst all three. This category, while expected at the outset of the study, has been more
difficult to use as a classification than anticipated. As an example, the enclitic -so/-sa/-se
as proposed by Stifter (2015, 94,) who argues that the preference for -se in the poems of
Blathmac may be a diatopic variant. While Stifter’s own examples were inherently
flawed, as demonstrated by Uhlich (2018, 64-67,) who pointed out that Stifter’s evidence
relied on stressed occurrences whereas the allomorphy Stifter is referencing only occurs
in the enclitic form, a collection was nevertheless undertaken of the enclitics in case the
basis of his suggestion had merit. The result was that all three corpora showed a marked
preference for the demonstrative -so, regardless of the quality of the preceding auslaut,
and notably -so was used more often than the expected -se following a palatal auslaut.

In this instance, all three corpora of glosses show variation in the enclitic
demonstrative with forms -so/-sa/-se appearing in all three, but with all three corpora in
agreement with -so being the preferred, arguably ‘standard,’ form. At first glance, this
would appear to be a valid example of this second category, as variation exists, there are
alternative forms, but all three are in agreement. Indeed, MI uses -so 57% of the time –
62% if the attestations of -seo are included; -sa 21%, or 22% if -sea is included, and -se
occurs 16% of the time, compared to Wb in which -so makes up 61% of occurrences, -sa
29% and -se only 10%. MI and Wb show no significant difference in their respective rates
of usage. But Sg is just different enough that it makes this feature’s inclusion in this
category somewhat dubious: Sg prefers -so, with it occurring 50% of the time compared
to 29% of -sa and 21% of -se. The fact that Sg’s usage of -se is more than double of Wb’s
(21% vs 10%) would indicate that, while all three corpora of glosses do agree in their
preference for -so, that the usage of -se was on the rise.

In none of the examined variants can the three corpora of glosses be fully viewed as
being entirely in agreement – excepting instances where that agreement is expected, such
as with ní and nícon where the investigation determined the distinction to be a semantic
one, and not an issue of variation at all. Consequently, while owing to the general
perception (cf. McCone 1985, 102) of Old Irish being a ‘standard’ language, this category
was expected to be the most prominent it is instead, practically, non-existent, as the corpora either tend to agree or deviate from each other in some form.

The third category is that in which one corpus stands against the other two in showing a distinct variation. A certain number of these can be attributed to diachrony: the question of -ón and -són, as noted by Thurneysen (GOI §16, §479,) and regarded as showing significant divergence by modern scholarship (cf. Ahlqvist 1988) on the basis of an article by Hessen (1914, 2-3) which states that Sg heavily prefers -són to -ón. Hessen’s collection fails to discuss the evidence from Wb, and the new collection of the forms found in Section 2.7 from all three, demonstrates that while Sg certainly shows the strongest preference for -són (80 occurrences against 5 of -ón), Ml utilises -són in 59% of all occurrences and Wb almost as frequently, with 58%. Although all three corpora of glosses prefer -són, regardless of context, and could therefore be said to agree in the way anticipated in this second category, the heavier preference of Sg, utilising -són 94% of the time, makes Sg distinct. Just as the enclitic demonstrative showed a rise in the usage of -se in Sg, the preference for -són here can be attributed to a diachronic rise of the unlenited form.

Just as anything unique to Sg has to be considered as a younger diachronic feature, anything in Wb has to also be considered as an older diachronic feature, and thus we have to be able to disentangle issues of diachrony from issues of synchronicity. In order to do this, we can broadly break down variations in this third category into two sub-categories: innovation and archaism.

In the first subcategory of innovation, there are a few possibilities. The presence of an innovative feature in Sg that is not shared by Wb and Ml is a clear issue of diachrony, whereas, for example, an innovation that appears uniquely in Ml but a ‘conservative’ form is utilised in Wb and Sg cannot be attributed to diachrony alone. This type of situation would provide only evidence for Ml being a different dialect or register, but potentially inconclusive with regards to the origins of Wb and Sg.

On the other hand, if Ml were to show an innovation and both Wb and Sg both were to show a different innovation, then this would provide strong evidence for Wb and Sg being a part of the same dialect region or school of thought and Ml having originated from elsewhere.

With regards to the subcategory of archaism, if an archaism is not found in Wb, but is found in Ml or Sg, or both, then Wb is distinct by its ‘counter-diachronical’ innovation,
and the other two are made interesting by not participating in the innovation present in Wb. This type of situation would imply that Wb is of a different diatopic region or register than MI or Sg that innovated away from a more conservative form, and that the younger corpora either retained or replaced the older feature.

Essentially, when assessing this subcategory, any instances in which the corpora are operating outside the bounds of diachrony are the ones which are the most interesting for the present purposes: instances in which a conversative feature is not found at the chronological beginning, or an innovation is not found at the chronological end make the unique, or shared, archaism of particular interest.

The purpose of this following sections is to investigate in depth some of these features and discuss whether or not they are indicative of any true variation. The chapters will discuss the features unique to all three corpora of glosses and any notable divergences from the expected standard as well as any variations from the other corpora of glosses, and contextualise them within the wider framework of synchronic or potentially diachronic variation.

Some of the features to be discussed in the following chapters have already been discussed either briefly or at length in other chapters, but owing to the large number of features investigated, some of which had no tangible results, it felt prudent to highlight those that were distinct. Additionally, certain new variations that have been collected and investigated but that did not necessarily fit into prior discussions have been included here.

4.1 Sg

Of the identified and examined variations, Sg showed the least amount of synchronic variation. Accordingly, as the discussion of the unique features of Sg is shorter than the other two, despite being chronologically the final manuscript, it was necessary to discuss it first before the far more substantial discussions of the other two corpora.

Similar to Wb, when examining unique variations in Sg we are faced with the issue of diachrony: as the youngest of the three corpora, any outlying features can always be attributed to innovation, or the result of being a later text. Of course, uniquely shared variation with only one of the other corpora, in particular Wb, cannot be attributed to mere diachrony: a shared archaism between Sg and Wb, or indeed a shared innovation that is not present in MI would certainly indicate something beyond a chronological development.
At the same time, complicating any investigation of Sg is that the glosses of Sg themselves appear to be from different periods (cf. GOI §7; Strachan 1903b; Hofmann 1996, 45; Lambert 1996; Lash 2017, 148-149) with some glosses potentially dating to the seventh century. This mixture of glosses can account for both older and younger features within the glosses, without necessarily indicating a synchronic variation: just as an innovation can be attributed to Sg being a later text, an archaism can be attributed to copying from an older exemplar.

Lambert (1996) undertook a study of Sg to try and determine if the separate hands correlated with particular features, and therefore if certain hands could be identified as belonging to distinct periods. Strachan (1903b, 472-473,) in his discussion, had identified sections of the manuscript in which particular features are more or less prevalent. Unfortunately, as to be discussed further in Section 6.2, these distinctions are seemingly arbitrary, without any logical explanation of their division, and as noted by Lambert (1996, 188-189,) do not align with the palaeographical evidence set out in the Thes. (ii, xix-xx.) Lambert’s (1996) conclusion is that there does not appear to be any particular distinction between the language of the three main glossators, and that the glosses cannot be easily stratified on that basis, or the basis of manuscript composition, as is implied by Strachan (1903b, 472-473.) Indeed, Lambert’s ultimate conclusion (1996, 192) is that the hands can only be characterised in a very general way, and so it does not seem necessary to distinguish hand or section when discussing Sg. Thus, in the following investigation, Sg has been treated as a collective whole, and there are nevertheless a couple features which are distinctive to Sg that merit mention as they are distinct from the other two corpora, the first in showing potential innovation, and the second in perhaps showing an archaism.

4.1.1 Loan Words

During the course of this project, loan words and their occurrences within the three corpora of glosses were collected and examined. With the notable exceptions of *muinter/muntar* to be discussed in Section 5.3 and *spiurt/spirut* already discussed in Section 2.4, which showed limited attestation in Sg, there was not any evidence of loan words having been borrowed differently or having undergone different processes.92

---

92 The exception to this is perhaps *pōc* ‘kiss’ from Latin *pācem* ‘peace,’ which appears initially as *bōc* Sg43a02 and then subsequently as *hpōc*, Sg46a03 with *b* corrected to *p*, and then *pōcnat* ‘little kiss’ in the same gloss. The collection from the dictionary (see Introduction, pg 9) did provide a number of words in...
Though discrepancy between contexts and usages of loan words, as well as the variations that arise from distinct loan practices, are certainly an intriguing avenue of investigation, they are not the only aspect of loan words that deserve attention. Another element of loan words that was examined was whether or not loan words of different linguistic and geographic origins were present in any of the corpora of glosses: loans from a particular language family, or a larger proportion of loan words from a particular region, could indicate that the corpus (or the scribe) originated in an area that had close contact with, and therefore a significant amount of borrowing from, another language in particular. The ability to link any variation within the three corpora of glosses with a particular region or area would be exceptionally useful, as it could potentially confirm or refute the evidence discussed in Section 1.4, and provide a fixed location from which a true diatopic relationship could be posited.

A number of collations of potential loan words were consulted (cf. Güterbock 1882; Meyer 1891; Bugge 1912; Marstrander 1915; de Vries 1961; McManus 1983) in addition to the dictionary itself, and a collection was created of potential loan words, categorised by their various respective origins. These loans were then collected from the three corpora of glosses to determine if any corpora showed any particular preference for loans from a particular language. Unfortunately, the results were mainly inconclusive, as the presence of loans – outside of Latin – was fairly minimal, and there was hardly enough evidence for a proper analysis, much less further discussion. Within Latin loans, no other discrepancies were found outside of the previously discussed spirut/spiurt and upcoming discussion of muinter/montar.

To exemplify, there was one language which provided a minor amount of evidence that could be investigated, and that language was Old Norse, which is a prime candidate which alternation between $b$ and $p$ was present. The only forms of this that appeared in the three corpora of glosses were the aforementioned böc/póc: abgitir Wb33c13 beside aggitri Wb19d12 and aggitrib Wb19d05 ‘alphabet’ from Latin abecedarium consistently with -$b$- in Sg and not present in Ml; apstal (cf. Wb5b17) with abstal Wb10c16 Wb18d14 abstil Wb10c20 Wb23a10 ‘apostle’ from Latin apostolus, consistently with -$p$- in Ml and not present in Sg and derived apstalacht (cf. Wb13b05) with a single abstalacte Wb20d06. Despite all of the collected forms being Latin loan-words, abgitir and abstal are different from böc/póc in that their variation between $b$ and $p$ is not initial but intervocalic, a feature which is already understood: the conservative orthography of British and Irish Latin still represented intervocalic voiceless plosives as -$p$- -$t$- and -$c$- despite the fact they had been voiced, as in British lenition, and were therefore pronounced /b/ /d/ and /g/ (McManus 1983, 24 §12) leading to the orthographic mixture found here. Although fluctuation between initial -$b$- and -$p$- is found in the later language (prísún, brísún IGT II §35) this is the only attestation within the three corpora of glosses, and a proper discussion would necessitate a large-scale investigation into Latin borrowings with initial -$p$-, as current scholarship has chiefly dealt with -$p$- being borrowed as -$c$- pre-lentition (cf. McManus 1983, 21-22 §2-§3,) and it therefore fell outside the scope of this thesis.
for evidence of diatopic variation by the way in which Viking settlers and raiders were known to have established contact, and were settling in Ireland during and after the Old Irish period (Chadwick 1975, 23.) As Viking activity tended to be limited to particular areas and was not part of a larger-scale ‘invasion’ that encompassed the entire island (Jackson 1962, 4) regions of language contact would have been limited to areas with Norse influence, with the result that the presence of Old Norse loan words within any corpora of glosses could perhaps indicate a place of origin that was subject to significant Norse influence, or otherwise had sustained contact with Norsemen. It therefore seemed prudent to investigate potential Old Norse loan words within the three corpora of glosses.

At the outset, identifying the etymological origins of possible ‘loan’ words can be fraught with difficulties: the origins of a word can be difficult to trace, and as such, attributing loan words definitively to cross-cultural contact is by no means definitive. For this reason, although there were a handful of words that are potentially Old Norse borrowings present in Sg, and none in Wb or Ml, and while these might indicate that the scribe of Sg had sustained Viking contact, it does not appear that any of these can be definitively linked to being Old Norse loans.

This is not necessarily surprising as our earliest recorded contact with the Vikings comes from the Annals of Ulster (AU) 795: *loscadh Rechrainne o geinntib & Sci do choscradh & do lomradh*. ‘The burning of Rechru by the heathens, and Scí was overwhelmed and laid waste.’ If this truly was the earliest contact, then the absence of any potential Old Norse loans in either Wb or Ml is to be expected: Wb (c.700-750) is far too early to show any evidence of loans, any evidence in Ml (end of the eighth century) would be surprising, as contact would have been fairly recent, if it had been made at all, though some evidence in Sg would not be entirely implausible. Still, as more recent archaeological work (Heen-Pettersen 2019) has implied earlier contact, potentially before the recorded raids, on the basis of Insular materials found in Norwegian graves combined with evidence of radiocarbon dating that may point towards a potential Viking settlement in Dublin around 780-800 (Simpson 2005,) it seemed as if the potential for Old Norse loans, if even in a minor way, should not be excluded, although even this earlier dating is still too early for Wb.

Various lists of Old Norse loans have been made, notably Meyer (1891,) Craigie (1894,) and Marstrander (1915,) and these collections along with additional lexemes from Bugge (1912,) de Vries (1961, xx) and Ó Muirithe (2010) formed the basis for this
collection. Despite there being a fair number of potential loan words (roughly 200, derivative forms included) the search within the three corpora of glosses yielded only three results.

The most frequently occurring one is rún, which is identified by Ó Muirithe (2010, s.v. rún) as being a borrowing from the Old Norse rún, of equivalent semantic meaning ‘secret, mystery.’ Though it appears numerous times in both Wb and Ml, Ó Muirithe’s proposed etymology appears untenable. None of the sources provided by Ó Muirithe make this claim, and he himself provides no justification for the proposition that it is an Old Norse borrowing. de Vries (1961, 463) in discussing the term refers to it as Celtic-Germanic and states that the etymology is unclear. It could be linked to Old Norse raun ‘to research’ with an original meaning similar to ‘the [magical] exploration of divine destiny or fate.’ de Vries notes that while Pokorny’s association (1959, 867) with the Latin rūmor ‘noise, shout’ is conceivable, the connection to Sanskrit rauti ruváti ‘a roar, a bellow’ is less plausible as it is too far removed from the meaning of ‘a whisper, a murmur’ as it appears in the Middle German rūne ‘whispering,’ Old English rūnian ‘whisper’ and Old High German ‘whisper, murmur.’ Lexique etymologique de l'irlandais ancien (LEIA) states that outside of the known Celtic cognates, and the connections with Germanic, other connections are tenuous at best (LEIA R-53) and suggests that the Germanic was originally a borrowing from the Celtic, or perhaps indicative of a shared religious language at some stage. Without any convincing argument put forward, or any argument at all for that matter, by Ó Muirithe to defend rún as an Old Norse loan word it is most likely that it is not a loan that entered Old Irish through Viking contact, but as put forward by LEIA, an early borrowing.

A second word, put forward by O’Rahilly (1942, 169), is the lexeme brot, appearing only once across all three sets of glosses, in innabrotu Sg94a02 ‘the spikes/goads.’ The opposing view (Matasović 2008, 81) is that brot descends from Proto-Celtic *brozdo-, and is cognate with the Welsh brath ‘stab, wound’ with an unexpected vocalism as *brozdo- should yield *broth. O’Rahilly posited that instead brath be understood as deriving from *braddo- < *brazdo- and therefore be more closely related to Irish brat ‘plunder,’ with an original meaning of ‘stab.’ He submits then, that brot be understood as a borrowing from Old Norse broddr ‘a goad, spike.’ LEIA (B-98) says this theory is to be rejected, though without any reasoning as to why. Greene (1972b, 70) dismisses this proposed borrowing on the basis of its existence within this gloss, ‘many examples
The evidence for the background of brot would appear to be inconclusive: both *brozdo- and broddr are plausible etymological origins. The argument that its appearance in Sg and in the eighth century Críth Gablach eliminates the possibility of it being an Old Norse loan word certainly accords with the traditional dating of Viking incursions into Ireland, yet, the more recent archaeological evidence that points towards late eighth century contact and potential settlement, could call that into question, although Críth Gablach is generally understood to be older than even these late eighth century Viking incursions (Binchy 1941, xiv-xv.)

At the same time, the likelihood of a word being readily and rapidly borrowed has to be taken into consideration, as understanding brot as a loan from broddr necessitates proposing not only earlier Viking contact, but also a fairly quick adoption of the form into Old Irish for it to be present in material written in the same century of contact. For that reason, considering brot as an Old Norse loanword would appear to be questionable.

The final potential loan word to appear is borg ‘fort, town’ in Sg57a06 cuirt l borcc and a derived adjective borggdae in the following gloss: borggdae cuirtaide Sg57a07 ‘belonging to a town, belonging to a court.’ Craigie (1894, 156) regards this word as a loan from Old Norse, though Marstrander (1915, 121,) states that this was not a loan from Old Norse, but rather from the Latin burgus though it was originally a Germanic borrowing into Latin (Walde, Hofmann and Berger 2008, I, 124.)

It is well-established that medial and final voiced stops are regularly spelled with voiceless consonants, regularly after vowels and optionally after other consonants. The use of g, d and b in medial position is rare (GOI, §31,) and these spellings, such as the togad of MI39c16 (beside tocad MI 19d05, MI35d22 and dothoidib Sg138b06) can be attributed to either scribal error, or an attempt at an etymological spelling. Spellings such as bolc MI132c07, MI132c08 for bolg ‘bag, satchel,’ bolca MI99a04 and bolcaib MI99a04 for bolg ‘blister,’ and bolc Sg37a02, bolcsithe Sg67a02 for bolg ‘bellows’ show the typical for spellings with voiced stops after a liquid. The spelling in both MI and Sg is always bolc, and the word does not appear in Wb.

The aforementioned possible loanword borcc (borg) could perhaps also fall into this category, showing an expected fluctuation, but the doubling of the final c gives pause. As it is written doubled, akin to forms like macc or muc, it would be more expected for this
to indicate a /k/ than /g/ (cf. GOI §144) and thus it is unclear what, if anything, this spelling indicates as examples such as biucc (cf. Wb29d15, Sg39a25) of bec ‘small’ with /g/ demonstrate that this doubling can represent either sound.

Therefore, unfortunately, with the exception of rún, Sg is the only set of the three corpora to show any posited ‘loan words’ of any origins that are not present in the other two. It does not appear that these ‘loans’ can conclusively be linked to Old Norse. Even if they were, while emerging archaeological evidence points towards earlier contact with the Vikings than has been traditionally understood, the inclusion of Old Norse loans in the youngest manuscript, and thus the manuscript most likely to contain innovatory borrowings from other languages, cannot be seen as conclusive evidence of a particular geographic location for the provenance of Sg.

4.1.2 d & th

All three corpora of glosses show some level of fluctuation between -d- and -th- albeit all slightly differently, and Sg by far the most. Some amount of fluctuation is expected, as consonantal contact assimilation unvoiced voiced spirants before voiceless consonants preceded by unstressed vowels (GOI §124,) and the same occurs when they came to stand together as the result of syncope, as well as the voicing of voiceless spirants before voiced consonants after unstressed vowels (GOI §124.) In both instances, levelling has restored the original sounds, resulting in both spellings existing side by side (cf. macthi Wb12c09 beside mucde Sg37b09, both with the adjectival suffix -de.)

Following a stressed vowel, the lenited stops have, generally, been preserved (cf. GOI §123,) and in monosyllables there is the ‘complete confusion’ of final spirants discussed previously (see Section 2.9.2,) albeit final dental spirants are more commonly -d than -th (cf. GOI §130.) But, as noted in the Grammar and to be discussed further below, there are exceptions to all of these, especially in the monosyllables, in which hypercorrection was widespread.

It is unclear to what extent these fluctuations are merely orthographic, or represent an underlying difference in pronunciation, such as was present in the lexeme tech/teg (cf. McCone 1996, 134.) Thurneysen (GOI §123) theorises that the spelling fluctuations may be the result of an assimilation of the two spirants, but that it may be confined to writing. Later, at the end of §126 he states:

“In many cases it is impossible to decide whether the fluctuation was confined to writing or whether it represented differences in pronunciation. But it is certain
that, owing to the influence of such examples on the scribes, the representation of spirants in general became less precise."

The voicing of dentals on a ‘word boundary,’ that is word-final dentals after an unstressed syllable (cf. GOI §130) and dentals on the boundary between a proclitic and the subsequent stressed syllable, can be dated to roughly the late seventh century based on the evidence from both the Cambrai Homily and Wb (Mc Cone 1996, 132-133.) In final position, -d is more commonly written than -th (GOI §130) and -th is generally associated with an earlier or more conservative spelling feature. In the early eighth century (Mc Cone 1996, 133) it would appear that intervocalic voicing between unstressed vowels occurred as well, owing to the higher frequency of conservative -th- spellings in eighth and ninth century sources than later materials.

There is a fair amount of fluctuation in the representation of the spirants across all three corpora of glosses, with instances of consonantal contact being spelled with both the phonologically expected spirant and the restored original sound, as well as forms showing analogical spellings. There are examples such as the nominative plural of peccad ‘sin,’ otherwise attested in Wb as pecthae but occurring once as pecdae Wb33b08, which is likely the result of analogy with the -d that developed in the nominative, accusative and dative (cf. GOI §123n.) as well as adramail Wb6d06 ‘father-like’ for athramail Wb13d11, though there are two additional attestations of adthramli Wb9a14 Wb23c27 which show both the voiced and unvoiced spirant beside each other. Thurneysen (GOI §126) would view this particular form as evidence of the scribe ‘hesitating’ between the two forms, rather than viewing it as evidence of the transition from voiced to voiceless.

Within Ml there are examples of the expected and restored spirant spelled alongside each other: derscaigdetaid Ml64d07 ‘excellence’ beside derscaigthetaid Ml37b07; latharde Ml14c13 ‘actually present’ lathardae Ml140c06 beside latharthe Ml23d01 and latharthæ Ml32c02; aidche Ml21c03 ‘night’ alongside aithche in the same gloss; egeptacthai Ml84c20 ‘Egyptian’ egiptacdae Ml84a08. There is additionally indithmichiu Ml106b01 ‘attentive’ beside indidmichiu Ml79b06, which also shows an unexpected -ch- in place of a more regularly expected -g-. Thurneysen (GOI §128) noted that between unstressed vowels the spirants do not appear to be governed by any particular rules, and it is likely that the -ch- here has been influenced by the -ch in the nominative, just as söinmiche ‘prosperity’ beside söinnige can be viewed as influence from söinmech (GOI §129.) Following a stressed vowel there is idi Ml124c08 ‘eating’ beside ithi Ml127c18
that Thurneysen (GOI §123bn.) describes as a ‘faulty spelling,’ as well as \textit{faidsine} MI81c04 ‘a prophesy’ beside the more commonly occurring \textit{faithsine} – which is unusual in both forms as both \textit{d} and \textit{t} are typically delenited before \textit{s}, but also because devoicing is expected before an \textit{s} (GOI §139.)

\textit{Sg} too shows examples of original and restored spirants side by side: \textit{timdirecht} \textit{Sg}35a02 ‘act of going to and fro’ of \textit{timthirecht}; \textit{indidmech} \textit{Sg}214b05 ‘intent’ of \textit{indithmech}; \textit{fo-timdiris} \textit{Sg}185b07 ‘you should fumigate’ beside \textit{fo-timmthiris} \textit{Sg}54a17; \textit{érredcha} \textit{Sg}30a16 ‘corresponding’ beside \textit{érrethcha} \textit{Sg}27a02; \textit{dithnad} \textit{Sg}90a07 ‘comforting’ of \textit{didnad}. There is additionally the attestation \textit{hodid} \textit{Sg}66b09 ‘alone’ for \textit{úathad}, which Thurneysen (GOI §123n.) would attribute to the complete assimilation of the two spirants, as it is unusual following a stressed vowel.

Overall, there is a fair amount of fluctuation in the representation of these spirants. Indeed, Thurneysen (GOI §126n.) had generally noted that the representation of the spirants had become ‘less precise,’ citing examples such as \textit{irnichthe} \textit{Wb}17a15 ‘praying’ for \textit{irnigde} and \textit{dithnad} \textit{Wb}16b15 ‘comforting’ of \textit{didnad}, the verbal noun of \textit{do-dona}. Following stressed vowels, all three corpora of glosses are relatively consistent, but when it comes to spirants affected by consonantal contact assimilation, there is variation in all three.

These instances are difficult to evaluate: as both spellings are often found in the same words, with the analogically restored original sounds from other forms, such as \textit{athramail} showing the \textit{-th-} from \textit{athir} (cf. GOI §126,) occurring alongside the outcome of the consonantal contact assimilation, it is difficult to determine which form to consider the ‘variant,’ especially in cases such as \textit{adramail/athramail} as \textit{Wb} shows each form only once. It equally does not feel justified to argue that the spellings with the restored sounds are the ‘variant,’ on the basis of them not being phonologically expected, when in certain words, such as \textit{aidchi/aidche}, the spellings showing the restored sound, in this instance \textit{-d-} of the nominative \textit{adaig}, are more common than the expected \textit{aithchi/aithche}: with the former occurring three times in \textit{Wb}, and seven times in \textit{MI}, and the latter occurring only four times in \textit{MI}. Thus, for the purposes of this investigation, instances which are hypercorrect, such as occurrences of final \textit{-d} for an etymological \textit{-th}, or instances that can be clearly attributed to conservatism, such as spelling final \textit{-d} as \textit{-th}, are of far more interest.
In final position following an unstressed vowel, -d is more commonly written than -th owing to the voicing of the spirant in this position, and Wb is relatively consistent in showing this spelling with only 30 examples of the conservative spelling, accounting for only 1.5% of attestations of forms with a final -d. As examples, anasberith Wb12d03 ‘what ye utter’ beside anasberaid Wb7d10; crabait Wb33d13 ‘piety’ dilituth Wb6c02 ‘rejecting’ immith Wb6c27 ‘sorrow’ labrath Wb12b24 ‘speaking’ peccath Wb9c19 ‘sin’ tintúuth Wb12a10 ‘returning’ and uathath Wb5a26 ‘alone.’

In final position following a stressed vowel, Wb has 18 instances where there is -d for etymological -th, which can only be due to hypercorrection: brad Wb93b12 ‘Judgement’ for brath; fúad Wb32b03 ‘likeness’ Wb32c09 for fúath; gnád Wb8b11 ‘customary’ for gnáth; led Wb1d10 Wb2c03 Wb6c18 Wb8b16 Wb14c20 Wb17d07 and leid Wb4b11 ‘half’ which outside of Wb is more consistently spelled leth; rad Wb3d16 Wb5b02 Wb7d03 Wb13b06 Wb14c19 Wb21c20 Wb29d29 ‘grace’ beside the more common rath; and tuad Wb4d01 ‘people’ for túaith.

There is additionally the verbal noun of the substantive verb which shows significant fluctuation in spelling, but especially of the final consonant which 29 times is rendered in Wb as -th but has 15 examples with a final -d: cf. buid Wb2a18.

The presence of this fluctuation in Wb is understandable, as the earliest manuscript examined in this study, the orthographic representation of these relatively recent voicings would undoubtedly still be in flux. Wb contains the most hypercorrect spellings of the three corpora, and this too can be attributed to the orthographic standard changing, and a scribe grappling with the representation of final -th following a stressed vowel.

Despite being a larger corpus, Ml has fewer overall examples, with only four attestations of a final -th, accounting for about .3% of attestations. Considering the later date of Ml, and thus a further distance between the time of writing and the sound changes, the sharp decline in this fluctuation is not unsurprising, as the spelling would have developed to better represent the phonological reality and slips into the more conservative spelling can represent a holdover from the previous norm.

As a final consonant following an unstressed vowel there are four attestations of the conservative orthographic norm of -th: failith Ml21c03 ‘pleasing’ for failid; fomraith Ml28c12 ‘fraud;’ imbith Ml129d11 ‘large quantity’ from imbud; sainreth Ml129c14 ‘a peculiar property’ for sainred.
Following a stressed vowel in a monosyllable there is only one example each of a hypercorrect spelling: *feid* MI108d05 ‘calm, stillness’ for *féth*; *deeth* MI120b03 ‘idleness’ of *deeid*.

As the underlying sound change had undoubtedly already taken place, it is to be expected that there would be fluctuation in spelling as the older orthographic norm lingered and potentially led to hypercorrection. But, as MI is more consistent than Wb in representing the spelling of final spirants, this orthographic variation would appear to be a diachronic development – if it were not for Sg.

But the inclusion of Sg in this investigation makes the evidence significantly more murky, as while it is the smallest of the three corpora, Sg shows by far the most examples of this variation, and especially is the least consistent when it comes to representing the final spirant as a -d.

There are two occurrences of a final spirant following a stressed vowel in a monosyllable written with a hypercorrect -d: *liad* Sg63b13 ‘grey’ of *liath*; *gnád* Sg171b02 ‘usual’ of *gnáth*.

Where Sg stands out, and where the majority of Sg’s attestations of the variation lies, are in examples of final voiced spirants being written as unvoiced. Sg has more attestations of this conservative orthographic norm than the other two corpora both by pure numbers and by percentages, as it has 62 occurrences all together, accounting for nearly 9% of attestations: as examples, *chinniuth* Sg27a06 ‘determining’ of *cinniud*; *dliguth* Sg26b07 ‘law’ of *dligud*; *do-ratath* Sg7b18 the passive perfect third singular of *do-beir*, usually *do-ratad*; *emith* Sg5b02 ‘not only’ of *emid*; *fissith* Sg52a02 Sg90a08 ‘learned man’ of *fisid*; *foilsiguth* Sg28b18 ‘manifesting’ of *foilsigud*; *foluth* Sg39b08 ‘signification’ and *folaith* Sg27b09 ‘substance’ of *folud*; *impúth* Sg4b08 Sg60b15 ‘anastrophe’ of *impuud*; *molath* Sg59b04 ‘praise’ of *molad*; *sainreth* Sg9b18 ‘peculiarity’ of *sainred*; *scribndaith* Sg24a13 ‘writer’ of *scribnid*; *sluindith* Sg25b10 Sg30a02 ‘it expresses;’ *tinfeth* Sg9a13 Sg10a08 ‘aspiration’ of *tinfed*; *togarthaith* Sg76a02 ‘vocative’ of *togarhaid*; *uathath* Sg71b03 and *othuth* Sg198b03 ‘alone’ of *uathad*.

Some level of variation was expected, as it is well-known that the representation of spirants was inconsistent, likely owing to a lingering orthographic norm, and that scribes

---

93 There is the form *sithe* Sg67a02, a form which DIL lists as both *sithe* and *side*, as the original consonant is is unclear. LEIA (S-122) suggests that this may be a mixture of two forms, one with an original -th- and one with an original -d-, accounting for the apparent variation in the form – especially unusual after a stressed vowel.

94 There is additionally *maraith* for *maraid* given in a scribal note (*Thes. ii., xxii.*)
appeared to use both interchangeably (cf. GOI §126.) However, as final -d is more common than -th normally (GOI §130) and dated as being a roughly early seventh century development, in which the pronunciation /θ/ was ended, (McCone 1996, 133) it was intriguing to discover that Sg has the largest amount of any of the three corpora that renders -d as -th, even more so than the earlier Wb.

Although Wb shows the most fluctuation in representation of the spirants in consonantal contact and the most amount of hypercorrection, this can potentially be attributed to less rigid orthographic norms on account of the more recent phonological development, especially in comparison with MI which is far more consistent in its spelling – particularly with regards to writing final -d. It would be tempting to attribute this exclusively to diachronic orthographic development on the basis of these two corpora.

But, with Sg having by far the most examples of a final spelling of -th, it calls the suggestion of pure diachrony into question. Of course, Sg is a heterogenous manuscript (Strachan 1903, 470,) and there is the potential that the scribes of Sg were ‘form-oriented,’ accurately copying from an older manuscript and retaining the original spellings, thus resulting in this higher incidence of spellings with a final unstressed -th. Yet this would be an odd conclusion to reach independently of other evidence because the Sg scribes are not quite as conservative in other regards, such as with regard to the final reduction to -a of -ae (cf. Strachan 1903b, 477-478.)

On the contrary, a ‘content-oriented’ scribe who strictly adheres to an outdated orthographic norm that they felt was ‘correct,’ a prescriptivist to an older scholastic practice, is an equal possibility. These types of scribes and grammarians are known in the historical record – albeit, unfortunately, not for Old Irish specifically and not in an analogous orthographic situation: Augustine mocks grammarians for trying to force an antiquated feature when it was no longer in use; Diomedes introduces earlier forms that contemporary sources are no longer utilising, perhaps indicating he preferred them (Adams 2013, 865-866.) Thus there is always the potential for this to be a false archaism on the part of an overzealous scribe.

It is entirely unclear if this should be understood as a stylistic variation, if it is truly an issue of orthographic norms and the scribe of Sg preferring the -th spelling, or if it should be attributed to a precise scribe faithfully copying his exemplar text.
What is certain, however, is that Sg stands firmly against Wb and MI in this regard. If the representation of the final dental spirants is exclusively a diachronic issue, with their fluctuation in spelling being more common earlier and becoming more rigid, then a wider fluctuation in Wb, a decrease in attestations in MI and the least amount of occurrences in Sg would be expected.

Yet this is not the case. Instead, while Wb indeed does show fluctuation in the representation of final spirants, likely owing to the fact that the sound change was relatively recent, and MI is more consistent than Wb in its representation with a decrease in fluctuating forms, Sg has ‘innovated’ counter-diachronically, showing the most conservative spelling as the youngest manuscript, and setting itself apart from the other two.

4.1.3 Conclusion

The interchangeability of -d(·) and -th(·), especially in word-final position with Sg is undoubtedly the most interesting feature of the corpus, as it stands in opposition to both Wb and MI in that it contains a significantly larger number of attestations, while equally not plausibly being product of chronology: word final -th after unstressed vowels is the older spelling, and as the youngest corpora, the preference for unstressed word-final -th in Sg is unusual. The presence of potential Old Norse loan words in Sg, while an alluring avenue of investigation as it could point to a diatopic variant or, at least, a more precise geographic location, is unfortunately inconclusive.

On the other hand, the evidence of the lexeme tech and the innovatory taig found within Sg, combined with the potential evidence of a more ‘Scottish’ type of nasalisation – an unexpected nasalisation following nasal codas, if it be not scribal error – can potentially point towards a ‘northern’ origin for Sg. This evidence is unquestionably tentative, as the evidence within Sg is scant, owing to it being a fairly short corpus, as well as the fact that it has to be assumed the scribes were working from an established standard, and these ‘northern’ sprinklings are deviations from the norm.

Although there may not be many distinctive features, or conclusive evidence, there is a slight indication that Sg may represent a ‘northern’ diatopic variant. At the very least, Sg contains hints of a scribal practice that deviated from the standard, Old Irish written form, and very likely represents a different tradition – whether it be diatopically motivated, or an issue of competing orthographic standards.
5 Features exclusive to Wb

With Wb being the oldest of the three corpora of glosses, any evidence from it that deviates from both Ml and Sg has to be initially considered as being due to a feature of diachrony, whether the variation in question be the result of an early feature that was present during the time of writing, but subsequently lost by the period of the younger pair of manuscripts or their exemplars, or an older feature that has been preserved by a meticulous scribe that was not necessarily present in contemporary speech. Yet there are features that do not appear to have a chronological basis and thus can be considered evidence for a different variety of Old Irish promulgated by the scribes of Wb.

5.1 fadeine

As previously discussed in Section 2.1 there are a number of variant forms that are understood as meaning ‘self/own,’ found within the three corpora of Old Irish glosses, as well as within in the wider Old Irish extant material. The primary areas on which scholarship has historically focused have been the different forms beginning with f and with c – féin, céin, fadéin, cadéin, fadessin, cadessin etc., – as well as the difference between the forms containing the particle *-de- such as cadéin, fadéin, and the ones that do not, céin, féin. Schrijver (1997, 74) has attributed the origins of the f- forms to *sye-+ (particle *de +) (personal pronoun +) -sin, with a parallel construction in the forms sodain *so-de-sin and suide *so-de-so (cf. Schrijver 1997, 33.) He additionally (1997, 78-83) proposed a potential semantic difference in which he forms with *de had an inherently contrastive meaning, though this is not consistently applied in any three of the corpora and thus, if his assertion were to be historically correct, it does not appear to still be understood, or in widespread application by the Old Irish period.

It has additionally been demonstrated that the variation between the forms beginning c- and f- are semantic, with those with c- functioning as an emphasiser of the subject in addition to the verb, meaning something similar to ‘namely, moreover, to wit,’ etc. (Byrne 1982, 167.) Neither of the most obvious variations, then, are strong evidence of diatopic variation across the three corpora or, indeed, show any evidence of internal variation that is traceable across the three corpora.

There is, however, a form of the reflexive pronoun that appears to be distinct to Wb, that is fesine and fade(i)s(i)ne as appearing in the 1pl and 2pl (cf. dun (fési)ne Wb14c09; airib féisne Wb27c19) whereas in both Ml (cf. átuath fessine MI57d09) and Sg (cf. sí
they occur exclusively in the third person, both singular and plural. Outside of the corpora of glosses, first and second person forms with a final -e are uncommon, with only a handful of other examples outside of Wb.

The origins of this -e are uncertain, with no theory (cf. Schrijver 1997; Greene 1969) being entirely satisfactory. That said, as all of the attestations of third plural in Wb are trisyllabic, it is possible that the -e was original here and spread to the other plural forms, perhaps as it was felt to better suit the plural as it was distinct from the singular, and thus generalised it to the first and second plural. But, even so, the absence of the first and second plural with a final -e outside of Wb and the limited attestations outside of Wb would call this possible theory into question.

It is thus difficult to draw conclusions with regards to the presence of final -e in Wb, as its relative absence in other sources calls a theory of diatopic variation into question, and with no firm conclusions surrounding its origins, categorising it as an early feature that was lost seems untenable. Regardless, this feature, the trisyllabic first and second plural forms, is one that is unique to Wb and whether diatopic or diachronic, it stands against both MI and Sg.

5.2 ar-

One of the possible diatopic variations identified by Thurneysen (GOI §823) was that of the tonic variation within the preposition and preverb ar-. Both MI and Wb show interesting variations with regard to this particular particle, best illustrated by the forms air-diric Sg, irdirc Wb and erdairc MI, as previously discussed in Section 2.8.

Wb is the only corpus to show the particle, in tonic position, as ir- which is never present in either MI or Sg, who prefer er- and air- respectively. Although regularly followed by a neutral r-, as noted in Section 2.8, 35% of the attestations in Wb follow a pattern of irCiC, which can be viewed as either evidence of a palatal r-, or as evidence of missing glide vowels. It is unlikely that this feature is entirely a matter of diachrony, as while the absence of the ir- in the two younger corpora of glosses would certainly appear to indicate a chronological distinction, the form ir- is found in later texts: fir i n-irgalaid in Fled Bricrenn, which is the reading found in LU (Henderson 1899, 36 §29; Windisch 1880, §29; Nîrbo irusa a frithâlim in Tochmarc Ferbe, found in LL (12th century) and Egerton 1782 (16th century) (Shercliff 2019, 50.243) as examples.
The possibility of this being a fossilised feature, or an intentional insertion on the part of the scribe in an attempt to utilise a form they perceived as being older, or perhaps more authentic, can hardly be discounted. It does seem unlikely in the case of Tochmarc Ferbe, as it contains a wide variety of innovatory forms (Shercliff 2019, 10-28) and not much evidence of inherited archaisms.

It is difficult to determine the origins of this alternation: even assuming that *are and *peri fell together at an early stage does not fully account for the forms, as both er- and ir- are generally followed by a neutral and both *are and *peri, if syncopated, would have produced a palatal -r. Perhaps the most logical theory, then, is to posit two competing origins: the collapse of *peri and *are resulted in a palatal *ir, while *are-u̯s on its way to ur- passed through a stage in which various orthographic representations of this intermediate sound was used, including air- er- ir-, creating a neutral variant of ir- which became confused with the palatal ir-. As a regular palatal air- < *are-u̯o- already existed, ir- was not as productive in palatal contexts, but could still be used, while as aur- began to be generalised beyond its original contexts, perhaps so too did its byforms, leading to more contexts in which neutral ir- was felt to be an option.

5.3 muinter

There is little by way of lexical variation within Wb, and as previously mentioned in Section 4.1.1 there is only minimal indication of competing traditions in how words were borrowed into Old Irish in the different corpora. One of these few examples is that of muinter/muntar ‘household/family.’ In the nominative singular Wb has both clearly neutral muntar (e.g. Wb21c22) and palatal muinter (e.g. Wb7b09). Yet, the situation is different in both MI and Sg, neither of which contain a form with a clearly palatal -n.

There are only two attestations within Sg: a nominative singular ammuntarsidi Sg32b06 and a dative di muntir Sgb11. Spellings like the latter, muntir, are ambiguous as to the colour of the internal consonant cluster, as it is equally possible that this is a palatal missing a glide -i- or that it is missing the neutral glide present in other attestations of the form, such as muntair MI48c05. Without further attestation within Sg to properly weigh the possibility, it is difficult to say. The potentially palatal dative is also found within MI in muntir MI74b20 MI142a03, but these are the only possible occurrences of a palatal form in MI.
Wb is the only one of the three glosses to show variation in consonant colour: in the
nominative in which Wb has six instances of a neutral *muntar*, one neutral *montar*, and
seven palatal *muinter*. In the genitive singular there are a variety of forms: *muntaire*
Wb31b12 showing a broad cluster; *muintire* Wb0c28 Wb28d21 with a clear palatal
spelling. There is additionally *muint-e* Wb33a05 which Strachan & Stokes have expanded
as *muintere*, and even without expansion shows a clear palatal form, and then *muintire*
Wb21c04 Wb30b16, which it could be argued has omitted the palatal glide in the first
syllable, or could be viewed as having omitted the neutral glide of the second syllable,
and is thus inconclusive. In the dative, Wb has four instances where the cluster is clearly
palatal: *muintir* Wb11c08 Wb16c11 Wb32a01 and Wb33a02. However, there are five
attestations where, like in the genitive, it could be argued that either a palatal or neutral
glide is omitted as Wb shows no significant preference for either form, cf. *muntir*
Wb21c22.

Figure 22 montar/muinter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>montar/muinter</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The etymological origins of this word are contested, and the expected form is
therefore unclear: the forms in Mi and Sg could be viewed as either deviations from the
norm, or as showing the anticipated variety with the broad cluster. Thurneysen (1909,
§905) suggested that *montar* and *muinter* are derived from *monater-* and *moniter-*, and
later theorised they are potentially derived from *monasterium/monisterium*, with syncope
creating the -nst- group that was subsequently reduced to -nt- (GOI §919.) A Celtic origin
from *moni-terā* has also been suggested (cf. Vendryes 1913, 296; Matasović 2008, 277)
from the same origins as *muin* ‘protection.’ Vendryes later (1958-1959, 310) derives
*montar* from *monu-* and *muinter* from *moni-*, which he later updated to *mono* and
*moni* respectively (LEIA M-76,) presumably to account for the fact that *monu-* would
have undergone raising, resulting in *muntar*, not *montar*, which is then left unexplained.

Vendryes (1958-1959, 309-311) additionally theorised that an etymological blending
might be the reason behind the dual forms. He argued that viewing *muinter/montar* as a
derivative of *monasterium* is illogical, as Old Irish equally contains *monister*, a clear loan
from *monasterium*, as he believes there would be no motivation to repurpose the Latin
word when there was an already existing loan. The word *muinter/montar* has a far broader meaning than *monasterium*, which is relegated to a (religious) community. Indeed, *muinter/montar* tends to refer to any group of people who are united – a local group, inhabitants, or kingdom, an individual within a community, but also used in the compound *cétmuinter* to refer to a spouse: *cétmuinter* (Binchy 1941, 410) as a wife within *Críth Gablach* (c. 700) and *chétmuinter* (LU 10772) indicating a husband (cf. Breathnach 2016b, 6-26.) He therefore proposes the mixture of a native term for ‘community,’ that was then influenced by Latin *monasterium* and the religious affiliation of scribes, and resulted in the favouring of the form *montar* initially (‘au début,’) as well as introducing a religious connotation, while the word equally retained its native meaning.

The argument against a double borrowing is not particularly convincing, especially as other Latin loans were borrowed twice in different periods (cf. *Coithirche* vs *Pátraic*) and it is plausible that *monister* was ‘reborrowed’ later, but this time with the specific religious meaning of ‘monastery.’ That said, owing to the fact that *cétmuinter* is a relatively common form in the sources, shows no variation with -*montar* and is unlikely to have been derived from *monasterium*, the origin of *moni-terā* would appear to be the most plausible as the native form, potentially derived from *muin* (cf. Pokorny 1959, 740-741) meaning something like a community or a household. The neutral form, *montar* can still be attributed to *monasterium*, with the reduction of syncopated -*nst-* to -*nt-* as per GOI (§919,) with the narrower meaning of a religious community or a monastery. This does not, however, account for the more common *muntar*, with the neutral -*nt-* of the Latin loan but the raised -*u-* of the Irish original, but then this is perhaps the byproduct of the confusion of the two forms as argued by Vendryes, with the neutral *nt* of the loan, but the *u* of the native form.

The only attestations in DIL of the distinctly neutral forms are from the glosses themselves, with the exception of a single genitive plural *montar* from The Stowe Missal (c. >792) (*Thes.*, ii 254.10.) The rest of the citations are likely palatal as in *dimuintir* in the Book of Armagh (c. 800) (*Thes.* ii 239.3; Bieler 1979, 172.31); *betit mnāa cana muntera*95 (LL, i 6902); or *munther Benchuir* (*Thes.* ii xxxii) from *Antiphonarium Benchorense*; *ad-condairc noímuinteraib* ‘had seen with the nine heavenly households’

---

95 O’Grady (1892, i. 373.1) has edited this as *beítit mná can muintera*, and while Stokes (1892) had edited much of the surrounding text, he neglected to edit the poetry within which this line is found. The form cited here is from the diplomatic edition, which is the form cited in DIL, though the citation to O’Grady is equally given.
in the Poems of Blathmac (Carney 1964, §73) or ambiguous, as with *caillech dó muntir Brígte ‘a certain nun of Bridget’s family’ (Stokes and Windisch 1880-1909, i 43.13).

There are no clear conclusions to be drawn from the evidence here. It would be counterintuitive to propose that the lack of variation in MI and Sg be exclusively a feature of chronology, as none of the variants can be understood as developments from the other either through phonology or analogy, and as both manuscripts show the neutral form that is not present in the later language: the palatal variant would be undoubtedly be expected to be more common in these two comparatively later manuscripts, as it is the prevailing form from Middle Irish onwards (Modern Irish *muinter, Scottish Gaelic *muinntir and Manx *mooiinjer.)

The explanation of a mixed etymology would appear to be the most plausible theory: considering the high level of linguistic knowledge (cf. Bisagni 2013-2014) that our scribes clearly possessed, that they recognised the similarity to Latin *monasterium, just as subsequent scholarship has done, and exerted influence, whether intentionally or unintentionally, upon the term *muinter/-montar. Vendryes (1958-1959, 311) implies that this was an early imposition, the existence of montar, presumably on the basis of the predominance of the palatal *muinter/-ir in the later language.

But upon examination of the evidence, a purely chronological blending on the form, and positing an earlier montar from Latin influence that either developed in muinter or reverted to the original form, does not quite appear to be tenable: the form montar itself appears only twice, once in the Stowe Missal and once in Wb. The initial vowel, if influenced by monasterium, did not have much foothold in the written language. If then, Latin influence is ascribed to the presence of the neutral variant, it does not seem plausible to posit a purely chronological influence (i.e. the neutral form was prevalent ‘au début’ before succumbing to the palatal form) as The Book of Armagh contains the clearly palatal dative dimuintir whereas MI, a later source, contains the neutral dative muntair.

Equally, the potential for this to be a dialect variant seems small, unless it is to be suggested that Wb, MI, Sg and the scribe of the Stowe Missal represent a dialect that is present nowhere else within the early Irish corpus, an idea which does not appear tenable.

Understanding the palatal muinter as the inherited native form, and therefore an archaism, makes its ubiquity unremarkable, as it is the neutral innovation, montar, that is rooted in Latin influence and is therefore unique. This also could accord with the lack of attestation of *cétmontar, as cétmuinter then can be viewed as having retained the original
form and having not been subject to the same influence of the Latin on account of it being a compound. If the proposition above, that *muntar* is the result of an etymological blending of Latin *montar* and Irish *muinter*, is understood to be correct, then the existence of *montar* exclusively in Wb (and the Stowe Missal) is less exceptional, as the existence of *muntar* would indicate the original existence of *montar*, in which case Wb has just preserved the ‘original’ or uninfluenced form.

Instead, perhaps the variation here should be understood as different schools of thought preferring the Latin-influenced form, as perhaps in the case of Ml, or viewing the forms as interchangeable, as they are not used in different contexts ie. both are used in religious and secular contexts, implying that no semantic distinct was understood between the two forms.

MI contains only the neutral, or ambiguous, forms and appears to use them in both religious contexts, such as *cenditin ámuntaire* Ml83a08 ‘protecting His folk,’ *olsem* [leg: *olessom*] friamuntair MI29d07 ‘he says to his followers;’ and in the context of a household *inmuntair* MI76c09 ‘the household’ *sainfer muntaire* MI61c02 ‘a special man of [my] household.’ The only potentially palatal cases occur (as datives) in the context of a household: *saul conamuntir* MI74b20 ‘Saul with his household’ and *huammuntir feín són* MI142a03 ‘that is, by my own people.’

In the same contexts, Wb shows variation, with both palatal and neutral forms in the context of a household: *muinter priscill et aquille* Wb7b09 ‘Priscilla and Aquila’s household;’ *amontar som inso infectso* Wb7c05 ‘this, now, (is) his household;’ but also in the context of a religious collective *ní fitir cid muntar nime* Wb21c22 ‘not even Heaven’s household knew it;’ *asenud uille tra nibiat inóentu muintire nime* Wb9c28 ‘the whole synod of them, then, will not be in the unity of Heaven’s household.’

The best solution would seem to be understanding the two/three forms present as an etymological blending, with MI showing the Latinised form – and taking into consideration the other Latinism present in MI (see Section 2.5,) this concords with what is already known about the stylistic choices of MI – and Wb, as an earlier stage, perhaps torn between the existing forms at the scribes’ disposal. As the contexts in which both forms are used are not distinct, no difference in meaning or usage can be posited. Nevertheless, this is a feature in which Wb is unique, as MI and Sg appear to share a common innovation in their preference for the ‘blended’ form with -u- while Wb shows a mixture of the native form, the ‘original’ Latin-influenced form, and the blended form.
5.4.1 \textit{alaile araile}

\textit{araile} and \textit{alaile} are a substantivized form of the word \textit{ail} ‘other,’ meaning ‘the other.’ These functionally identical forms have been treated as equivalent and virtually interchangeable by scholars of Old Irish. At the outset of this study, these forms were considered prime candidates for potential evidence of synchronic distinction within the language of the glosses: if one form, particularly the arguably later \textit{araile}, were to be predominant in the later corpora of glosses, this could be used as evidence of a diachronic development during the Old Irish period, whereas if one were to be limited to particular contexts or at a different rate of preference in one of the corpora in particular, then that would be strong evidence for a synchronic variation.

Although this pair was originally examined with a purpose of determining possible variation, it became clear that the representation of these forms was different in Wb than it was in the other two corpora of glosses. Therefore, a full investigation was undertaken, and the following section seeks to discuss the origins, usages and functions of these two forms across all three corpora, making particular note of the ways in which Wb is distinct.

The forms \textit{alaile} and \textit{araile} are described by Thurneysen (1946, §486b) thus:

“Otherwise the substantival form is masc. fem. \textit{alaile}, neut. \textit{alaill} (the latter followed by lenition, §232,7), or, with dissimilation, \textit{araile}, \textit{araill}. This form is always used without the article (acc.pl. masc. \textit{alailiu}). It is stressed on the second syllable and is the result of a fusion of two identical elements, as may be seen from the open gen. sg. fem. \textit{ala-aile} MI51c5 and the gen.pl. \textit{ala n-aile}; Kg. has also nom.pl \textit{ala-aili} (but Wb. and Ml. \textit{alaili}). The archaic spelling nom. \textit{allaill} RC xi 446, 52 (and acc.sg.fem \textit{allaill i bid} 43) with \textit{ll} suggests the fusion originated in the neuter.”

His suggestion here, that the neuter form \textit{allaill}, as found in Meyer’s (1901) edition of Tochmarc Emire (8th century,) was the original, had been discussed by him in an earlier article (Thurneysen 1918, 409-410) in which he argues that \textit{alaile} has been formed from the doubling \textit{ala-aile}, noting, however, that \textit{ala} geminates, consequently the expected form would be \textit{*ala h-aile}, and cites the feminine genitive form from \textit{ala-aile} MI51c05 as above, as a possible example of this. The lack of an \textit{h}- represented in spelling is not troublesome or a mark against this argument, as its function as a ‘silent’ letter in Old Irish resulted in it being inconsistently written, even in situations when it certainly would have been pronounced (cf. GOI §25; McCone 1996, 34.) The form \textit{allaill} from Meyer’s Tochmarc Emire, and the presence of the doubled \textit{l}, are evidence that the fusion of the
doubled form began in imitation of the original neuter: *aill-aill: thus forms like ala-aile became *all-aile, with ala- replaced by all- (Thurneysen 1918, 409-410.)

The form araile is then clearly the product of dissimilation, though when this feature emerged does not appear to have been the subject of scholarly discussion up until this point. Scholarship has noted its presence in later sources (cf. Bergin 1946, 29n.1; Pedersen 1948, 191-192) but without any discussion of dating or development of the form. Although undoubtedly younger than alaile (by virtue of alaile being the original form,) it cannot be claimed to be a Middle Irish development or feature as its presence in the three corpora of glosses long predates what is considered to be the standard emergence of Middle Irish (c. 1200.)

Instead, if araile is a ‘later’ feature that is not found to be used in distinct contexts or uniquely applied, it can potentially be added to the list of ‘Middle Irish’ features identified by McCone (1985) as already present within the three corpora of glosses, as further evidence of a divergence between the spoken and written language, potentially pointing to the existence of a register difference. At the same time, as it is present across the three corpora of glosses then a preference, or even an increased percentage of usage in a particular text or corpus, could indicate a diatopic variation, either through the form being dominant in a particular area, or perhaps through a delay in its wider adoption amongst speakers.

This appears to be the only instances in which a word was regularly dissimilated in such a way in Old Irish: while a number of forms were collected from the dictionary that had attested variants that appeared to show this dissimilation, or a comparable one in the opposite direction, such as trílech/trírech, the vast majority of those cases were not present across the corpora of glosses, leaving only alaile/araile as forms where this type of dissimilation was productive.

5.4.2 Usage

If araile is a diatopic variation of alaile then it can be expected to be used identically to that of alaile. Likewise, if there is any diatopic variation here, one form would be expected to be preferred, or potentially used exclusively, in a particular region. If the forms, however, are found to be used in different contexts, or if one of the forms had secondarily been associated with a different meaning, then they cannot be considered
diatopic variants, though evidence of such distinction between the two would still be useful for scholarly interpretation.

Therefore, an examination of the usage and context of the two forms is entirely necessary. As already stated, the form is substantival and is used to express the concept of ‘another, the other,’ primarily. There has been little prior discussion of the meaning of the forms, either comparative or of both concurrently, with the main discussion surrounding the meaning of alaile/araile, treating both as interchangeable, and being with regards to the gloss is līb atā arogū tra mad ferr cotob sehfdér dichosscc alailiu aithirgid bēsu diandaithirsid ŏn isindeseirecc etspirit righthr cucuiub Wb9a23 and is translated in the Thesaurus as ‘It is you, then, that have the choice: if it be better ye will be corrected by another correction. Emend (your) manners: if ye emend them, it is in love and in a spirit (of meekness) that one will go to you.’

Bergin (1943, 29) disagreed with the translation in the Thesaurus and proposed that punctuation is needed after chossc, with the result that a new sentence begins with alailiu, having alailiu instead translated as ‘otherwise.’ This translation of ‘otherwise’ appears for arailiu in Wb21a13, which he claims as supporting evidence for his own translation: i.e. dobeir inso anrab uilib cumactib dichoiissin inim et talam arailiu isarnaib grádib nemdib tantum… Wb21a13 ‘he puts this for all the powers which exist in heaven and earth. Otherwise, it is for (the) heavenly ranks only…’

Further supporting evidence for understanding the alailiu of Wb9a23 as adverbial is the fact that the syntax of the gloss would otherwise be unusual: alailiu is invariably found preceding the noun that it qualifies, whereas here it is found after the noun where ailiu would be expected (Bergin 1946, 29.) Quin (1967, 93-94,) in support of Bergin, provided a few further examples in which alailiu/arailliu may be understood as adverbial: in a few passages from the Táin, alailiu/arailliu appears to have switched from the beginning of a sentence to the end of the preceding one, with Quin arguing that this dative singular had subsequently been misunderstood as genitive. Quin (1967, 94) suggests that the passage from Táin Bó Cúailnge Recension I rodibīa cadān co leith allaile. Dia tonda dino iasc…rodibīa eō i. bratān, co lleth arailiu. Rotbīa… (Strachan and O’Keeffe 1912, 39-40) be emended to rothbīa cadan co leith. Alailiu dia tonda iasc…rothbīa eo co leith. Arailiu rothbīa96…”you shall have a goose and a half. Alternatively, if fish swim…you

96 This reading, with alailiu/arailliu beginning the sentences, is the one included in C. O’Rahilly’s edition of Recension I (TBC, pg. 83:) rodibīa-so cadan co leith; araile dia toichle iasg;rodibīa ὑο co leith; arailie...
shall have a salmon and a half. Alternatively, you shall have…’ as co lleith already has the meaning ‘and a half,’ making alailiu/arailiu redundant. Much like the examples provided by Bergin, a meaning of ‘otherwise’ makes more sense in this context.

There is an occurrence of arole that is used adverbially in the law tracts: araili .i. gne eile (CIH i 64.8.) arole is equally used adverbially in Conall Corc and the Corco Luigde: arole bebthilim97 (Meyer 1910, 59) ‘Otherwise, ye will be killed by me.’

Although somewhat minor, these adverbial occurrences of the two forms provide some justification for Bergin’s emended translation. For the purposes of the present study, however, there does not appear to be a distinction in usage as both forms have two (if Bergin’s amendment is considered to be correct) attestations of an adverbial form in the extant material.

However, Pedersen (1948, 189) has noted that the meaning of ‘the other’ and not simply ‘another’ has often been overlooked, and argued that the posterior placement of arole here should be seen as evidence of adjectival usage, not adverbial. He provides a variety of examples in which arole is following the form it is qualifying, though these are primarily pronouns, and demonstrated that the form can be used adjectively. He concludes that arole with the meaning of ‘the other’ always requires a first term, and that adverbial arailiu can be understood as ‘in the other alternative.’ (Pedersen 1948, 191,) an argument with which Quin (1967, 93-94) agreed. Regardless of whether or not the alailiu of Wb9a23 is understood to be adjectival or adverbial, the ultimate result of the debate is that there is evidence that the form is eligible to be found as substantive, adjective and adverb, giving it quite a wide variety of applications. With the opportunity to serve so many functions, there is therefore the possibility of one form – either arailiu or arole – being preferred in a particular context.

The syntax of Wb9a23 as understood in Thes. is cited as being ‘unusual’ as arole follows the noun that it qualifies, though there are further examples in the material of arole/arailiu appearing after its accompanying noun. Bergin (1946, 29 n.1) would view these as ‘false archaisms’ owing to their lack of expected dative ending:

‘In Mid. Ir. the old neut. acc arail is sometimes found after a noun in the dat. preceded by the article: isind leith arail (=O. Ir. ailiu) LU 8404 (H); even after a fem. isin laim arail (=O.Ir. aili) TTebe 3403. These seem to be false archaisms.”

97 Hull (1947, 896, n. 82, 83) notes that arole ‘stands for’ arole, and also suggests bebthilim be read as bebthe lim.
Pedersen disagrees with the observation that *isind leith araill and *isin laim araill are false archaisms, and instead believes that they are the products of natural, diachronic development, and a genuine Middle Irish innovation, stating that the dative araill might be due to ‘some vague analogy which it is difficult to trace’ (Pedersen 1948, 191.) He reconstructs Old Irish versions of the Middle Irish examples given by Bergin, noting himself that they are not based on any existing attested pattern or evidence:

‘I therefore take Mid. Ir. *isind leith araill, *isin laim araill as representing O.Ir. (not attested) *i-lleith alailiu, *i-lláim alaili and as proof that alaile under certain circumstances could follow its noun.’ (Pedersen 1948, 192)

Understanding these attestations as evidence of a Middle Irish innovation is not tenable: Pedersen provides no justification or explanation for his reconstructions beyond otherwise unidentifiable analogy, and even acknowledges that they are not based on any evidence. Indeed, in order to make the hypothesis work, Pedersen additionally attributed the use of alaile/araile with the article to another Middle Irish innovation to account for the fact that araill does not appear in conjunction with the article in Old Irish (cf. GOI §486b,) and is replaced by aile with the article (cf. Zeuss, 1871, 359.) Additionally, as noted by Quin (1967, 93) Pedersen failed to distinguish between adjectival and substantial uses of the form, furthering casting doubt upon his argument. Without any basis for assuming a dative alaili/araill can be used after the noun it qualifies, or with the article aside from Pedersen’s supposition, it is far better to understand these attestations, as Bergin did, as false archaisms.

Ultimately, both alaile and araile had a wide variety of applications within Old Irish; they are liable to be used as substantives, adjectively and adverbially. As it appears that prior scholarship has understood the forms as interchangeable, there has been no prior comparison of how the two forms are used, and whether or not they are used differently or preferentially in certain contexts or in certain texts.

Considering the large number of contexts in which the form has been attested, there is a significant basis for comparison and an increased possibility of the two forms diverging functionally: perhaps one form was preferred in adverbial contexts while the other was preferred adjectivally, or the dissimilated form rose to prominence in a particular context. Hence, the following section will examine the contexts and any patterns, should they exist, that arise in the usage of both forms.
5.4.3 *alaile* and *araile* within the glosses

A collection of all of the occurrences of both *alaile* and *araile* reveals that the dissimilated form is, by far, less popular than the original. Although Wb contains the most attestations of *araile*, it is relatively uncommon across all three corpora.

**Figure 23 alaile/araile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alaile/araile</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alaile</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>araile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Figure 23 above, MI has 52 occurrences of *alaile*, next to a paltry three occurrences of *araile*. Sg has only three examples of *araile*, in contrast to the 38 examples of *alaile*. Wb has 50 instances of *alaile* and 7 occurrences of *araile*. This is certainly not enough of a discrepancy between Wb and the other two to suggest that Wb stands in opposition to them. With regards to relative frequency, Wb has *araile* 12% of the time, while MI has only 5% of its total attestations as *araile* and Sg has 7% of forms as *araile*. All three distinctly prefer the original form, albeit at different rates.

It is difficult, however, to draw any conclusions from numbers alone. Certainly, the fact that Wb contains both a higher level of frequency as well as the highest number of attestations indicates that the dissimilated *araile* was not a development that was taking hold during the Old Irish period, as its highest frequency occurs in the oldest corpus, and therefore must have already been established by the time of Wb. It could still imply a diachronic difference in which the form *araile* existed but gradually fell out of favour by the time of MI and Sg; on the other hand, its continued usage in later sources would call into question, if not necessarily preclude, that conclusion. Similarly, the evidence in Wb is too scant to conclude that there must have been a diatopic variation with regards to this form, as there is no particular preference, and as it is present in various other extant material is seems unlikely that *araile* be a diatopic marker.

The only plausible conclusion, therefore, is that either stricter orthographic norms dictated that it be less frequently used in MI and Sg, or that the scribes of MI and Sg were more careful and less likely to slip into the alternative pronunciation *araile*. 
There does not appear to be much distinction in terms of syntactic or phonological context that might dictate the usage of either of the two forms. Beginning with MI, there are only 3 examples of araile and all three are preceded by a preposition – twice for and once ó:

| MI96b07 | .i. indumaighfid .i. 
duthormuch cechatrogae foraraili | ‘Cumulatively .i. to exaggerate every misery upon another.’ |
| MI105a08 | ….i. duformastar cech 
fechtnaige foraraili doib 
iar richtin tire tairngiri | ‘each prosperity will be added upon another to them after reaching the land of promise’ |
| MI131d14 | .i. hoarailiu foithniiu .i. 
doandud amenman són 
aroigsitis [leg: 
araroigsitis] atailciud as 
indoiri amal rondgadatar | ‘by a certain kindling, i.e. that is, to kindle their minds that they should pray for their release from the Captivity, as tres pueri had prayed for it.’ |

Although it could potentially be argued that for, and its final -r, exerted some influence that contributed to the dissimilation, the same can certainly not be said for ó, and indeed, as alaili, too, appears following for: .i. intormachtid .i. doformaig cech peccad foralaile ñdo beus intan asmbeir iniquitatem MI55c20 ‘increasingly, i.e. he further adds every sin by him upon another when he says iniquitatem,’ as well as .i. durormacht cech nolc foralaill ón MI90d01 ‘that is, every evil had been added upon another,’ as examples, positing for as the trigger for the dissimilated form does not appear to be tenable. Consequently, there does not appear to be any phonological context to which the dissimilation can be definitively attributed within MI.

Sg only contains three attestations of araile:

| Sg7a04 | trebrigedar cechconsain 
indegaid araile cengutai 
ñetarru | ‘that it continues each consonant (directly) after |

---

98 The Thesaurus has foralaili in this gloss but both Ascoli (1879) and the digital edition of the Milan glosses (Griffith and Stifter 2013) have foraraili. Foraraili is present in the facsimile (Best 1936, 96[r]b) and it is unclear why Thes. (i, 327) has alaili without note.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cachae tarhéisi araili</th>
<th>‘each of them instead of the other’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sg10a10</strong></td>
<td>.i. sed 7 masculinum invenitur ut hieronymus in conflictu contra helvidium ostendit dicens virginali coniugio virgo (.i. christus) filius nasciretur.-7 nībbu machdad tra bed fi gurate nom bed .a. vir go filius as·beir hieronymus .i. conná-sásad nechtar de in n-araill reliqua</td>
<td>‘i.e. but the feminine is also found, as Jerome shows in his conflict with Helvidius, when he says: ‘so that the Chaste Son, i.e. Christ, could be born from a chaste marriage’. And it were no wonder then that the „Virgo Filius“ (Chaste Son) that Jerome speaks of was a combination of two words in apposition, i.e. so that one of the two should not interfere with the other, etc.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as in MI, there are no phonological contexts within Sg that could have caused the dissimilation. Nevertheless, in assessing the usage of the forms, the possibility that *araile* may have secondarily been associated with a particular context, and then used preferentially in said context was considered, but did not yield any plausible results, as there are attestations of *alaile* in nearly identical contexts to those of *araile*, and indeed, the contexts in which *araile* is utilised do not provide any basis for positing that a preferential association may have occurred.

Overall, the situations of MI and Sg are equally inconclusive: there are no distinctions in usage between *alaile* and *araile* and no indication of contexts in which the dissimilated form could have been preferred, or even developed. As the number of attestations are minimal it is impossible to reach any definitive conclusions.

Turning now to Wb, with the highest rate of usage of *araile*:
| Wb8a07 | .i. bid cuingid rochuingid argebaid inscol foraréli | ‘it will be a great question, for one school will attack the other’ |
| Wb9c19 | .i. issí in so intargabáal ishé inpeccath forarele | ‘his is the trespass; this is the sin upon another.’ |
| Wb13a05 | .i. act badchách darési árélí .i. nabad immalle labritir | ‘but let it be each one after the other, that is, let them not speak at the same time.’ |
| Wb21a13 | .i. dobeir inso anrab uilib cumactib dichoissin inim ettalam arailiu isarnaib grádib nemdib tantum et nibo decming rombed imthanad hisuidib combad udíslíu cachgrád alailiu | ‘he puts this for all the powers which exist in heaven and earth. Otherwise, it is for (the) heavenly ranks only; and it were not impossible (to suppose) that there might be alternation in these, so that one rank should be nobler than another’ |
| Wb23b21 | .i. combad imned foraraill domsa .i. mobuith icarcair et moort dogabál | ‘so that it should be trouble upon trouble to me, to wit, that I should be in prison and that my rank should be taken’ |
| Wb25b09 | .i. araill tra cairigedarsom sunda .i. utmuille et déess et foigde nosnguidsom didiu arnarobat leu in pecthisi | ‘(there are) other things now which he blames here, namely, unsteadiness and indolence and mendicancy; he beseeches them, then, that these sins may not be with them’ |
| Wb2909 | .i. berid cách brith forarele | ‘each gives judgment on the other’ |
As before, *alaile* is more common and thus naturally occurs in more contexts, and accordingly, equivalent examples to the syntactical occurrences of *araile* are attested. There are four occurrences after *for* Wb8a07 Wb9c19 Wb23b21 Wb29b09, in which the -r could have been argued to have had some effect, and there are no attestations of *alaile* following *for* in Wb. Thought it might be tempting to try and conclude that *for* was the trigger for the dissimilation, that would necessitate explaining the others contexts in which no triggering -r is present. Thus, Wb too does not provide any insight into any preferential usage for *araile*.

Although Wb and MI have nearly an equivalent number of attestations of both *alaile/araile*, with Wb with 57 occurrences of both forms and MI with nearly as many with 55, Wb has a higher rate of usage of *araile*: 12% compared to MI’s 5%, and even to Sg’s 7%. This demonstrates that *araile* had more restrictive usage in MI and Sg overall, whereas it was more liberal in application in Wb. As no particular context or conditions that might indicate a distinction in usage between the two forms has been found, whether this be an issue of chronology or of diatopic variation remains unclear.

There is another way in which Wb deviates from both MI and Sg, and that is that four of the total seven examples of *araile* (57%) are written with a stressed -e- and not a stressed -a-, which will now be addressed in the following section.

### 5.4.4 Stressed -e- and -a(i)-

A certain level of variation between -e- and -a(i)- is known, as there are certain words within whose paradigms this fluctuation is consistent, such as the nominative, accusative and dative daig alongside genitive singular degol/deg*. The latter concerns an etymological *e* replaced by *a* before a palatal consonant, while the former, and the variation examined here, concerns etymological *a* before a palatal consonant.

Thurneysen (GOI §83) attributes the fluctuation between *e* and *a* as found in *aile/eile* to a presumed fluctuation between *e* and *a* at some stage, as there was a tendency for *el* to be better differentiated from a palatal sound.

It is well-known that *alaile* and *araile* were stressed on the second element, the -ail- and not on either the al- or the ar- making the spelling of -a(i)- as -e- unusual. It is also worthy of note that with the exception of *conaroib diupart neich lelele* Wb16c24 ‘so that there may be no defrauding of one by another’ this variation of -e- for -a(i)- within
_alaile/araile_ occurs exclusively within the dissimilated forms. The initial _le_- is likely derived from _li alèle_ (GOI §114) with raising in hiatus (cf. GOI §845 C,) following a proclitic syncope leading to _e_, and therefore, owing to this particular context, is also the only occurrence of specifically proclitic _le_ and not _la_ across all three corpora of glosses. Wb does, additionally, have two instances of the substantivized _aile_ preceded by _nach_ spelled with an é-: _nachnéile_ Wb6a15 and _nachnéle_ Wb6c18. Though not preceded by _nach_ but by the article, Sg9b02 has a parallel attestation of substantivised _aile_ spelled with an e-: _naheliu_.

In addition to this already known fluctuation, there are a handful of other occurrences of this spelling across all three corpora of glosses, and they primarily occur in MI: _niaipir_ Ml56d16 of _as-beir_ ‘to speak,’ expected _eipir_; _aipred_ MI33c17 beside _epred_ MI36a32; _aiperr_ MI4d13 beside _eperr_ MI21c03; _eiplet_ MI73d07 the third plural imperative of _at-baill_ ‘to die’ beside _aipleat_ MI104b02; the present indicative third singular prototonic _-apail_ MI91d02 beside _-epil_ MI73d07; _epert_ MI31b12 beside _aipert_ MI50b08.

O’Brien (1956, 183) attributes these attestations to confusion between _ad-_ and _ess-_ in deuterotonic forms (cf. GOI §822b) and not a phonological transition. He also (1956, 184) suggests that _tainid_ MI96b11 plural of _tene_ ‘fire’ might be attributed to *_taine_, a by-form of _tene_ that may have had a cognate in Welsh _tan_. In addition to these, there are _eillithri_ MI137b07 from _ailitre_ ‘pilgrimage;’ _elithrigmi_ MI46c22 present indicative first plural of _ailithrigidir_ ‘to go into exile;’ _teilciud_ MI112b12 ‘letting loose’ besides _tailciud_ MI131d14.

There are no occurrences in Sg, and in Wb the only examples, outside those of _araile_, is that of the pronoun _sechi_ ‘whoever’ which appears as _saichi_ Wb23b22, _corro-chraítea_ Wb12c33 from _cretid_ ‘to believe.’

There are additionally instances of _æ_ for _e_ across all three corpora, but this is a well-known orthographic norm inherited from Latin and is unrelated to the spelling found in _araile_ (cf. GOI §24.1.) It was considered that perhaps if _æ_ was equally being written for _a_- that perhaps the spelling of both _a_- and _e_- may have become confused and considered mutually interchangeable as they would have both been interchangeable with _æ_; however,
no instances of an original stressed \(a\)- being written as \(æ\)- were found, outside of two attestations in MI, in which \(æ\) could be standing for \(e\)- (see Section 6.3.)

It is nevertheless difficult to interpret and understand these few isolated forms in Wb and the naheliiu of Sg, especially as this interchange of \(a\)- and \(e\)- does not appear to be a widespread feature in this particular corpus. Although there are the most examples in MI, as the majority can be explained as cross-fertilisation between stressed and proclitic forms of preverbs, it does not seem that this variation had much hold there either, as MI likewise shows no confusion between \(arele\) and \(araile\), or even \(alaile\) and \(alele\).

The contexts of the forms with \(-e\)- do not shed any further light on why they might be written with an \(-e\)- instead of an \(-ai\)-. All of the attestations of \(araile\) in the masculine and feminine in Wb have the stressed vowel written as an \(-e\)-, the only substantivized forms spelled \(e(i)le\) are also accusative masculine, including the instance in Sgb09, as is the outlier \(lelele\) Wb16c24. But there is no reason to propose that the stressed vowel would have become a phonological marker of gender, and no explanation as to why \(-e\)- occurs consistently with \(ar\)-.

Thurneysen (GOI §487) had discussed this variation of \(aréle\), as well as \(é(i)le\) and \(i\)n-\(eilithri\) MI137b07, and attributed it, as well as the fact it occurs only in the masculine and feminine, to analogy with the expression \(a\) chéle\ which can equally be used in the sense of ‘another, the other.’ Whereas this theory is certainly possible as an explanation for the \(a/e\) variation in \(ailelalaile\), it does not seem entirely plausible. First and foremost, the phrase \(a\) chéle\ is a relatively uncommon phrase, it only has one attestation in MI \(dubeir\ câch\ a\ chorp\ hí\ cotarsnae\ friachele\) MI65b10 ‘every one puts his body in opposition to the other,’ none in Sg and four in Wb: \(iroimed\ câch\ achéele\) per caritatem Wb6d04 ‘let every one receive the other per caritatem;’ \(doadbadar\ híc\ ascoir\ dochách\ guide\ dée\ liachéle\) Wb7a13 ‘it is shown here that it is proper for every one to beseech God on behalf of the other;’ \(na\ tiubrad\ câch\ achéle\) Wb9d20 ‘let not each defraud the other;’ \(tairced\ diachéliu\) Wb23c14 ‘let him procure for the other.’ There are additionally the phrases \(fornachnéile\) ‘on any other’ Wb6a15 and \(fornachnéle\) Wb6c18, which undeniably have a visual similarity to \(a\) chéle\, though not so much the nasalised \(naché(i)le\), and it is unclear how much influence a superficial similarity would have exerted, or have been applied to other original, less visually similar forms.

The fact that the phrase \(a\) chéle\ occurs the most in Wb, the only corpus to contain the \(arel\)- forms, would seem to be decent evidence to consider \(arel\)- the product of analogy.
Nevertheless, while undoubtedly possible that the phrase would have exerted influence on *alailealaile* considering their similar function and meaning, it seems unlikely that the less common of the two phrases would have been the influential of the two: *a chéle* as a phrase is far less common than the well-established *alailearaile*.

Similarly, while the fact that it is predominantly masculine and feminine forms that show the -e- in *ailealaile* would appear to be a point in Thurneysen’s theory’s favour, it does not seem coincidental that all of the forms save one that show the e vocalism are forms also that show dissimilation. The fact that the vast majority of the forms in Wb are from *alaile*, without the dissimilated r and with the expected -a- vowel, would perhaps appear to indicate that the scribe of Wb was trying to differentiate the *araile* forms from *alaile*. Outside of Wb, no attestations of *arele*/*alele* with a stressed -e- have been found, and thus this variation is another unique feature of Wb.

### 5.4.4.1 *eile* and *aile*

The substantivized but not doubled *eile* appears twice in Wb *nachnéile* Wb6a15 and *nachnéle* Wb6c18, and once in Sg *naheliu* Sg9b02 and these are the only instances in the three corpora of glosses (outside of the discussed *arele* forms) in which *aile* is written in any other way. The dictionary lists forms like *eile* and *oile* as ‘later,’ and as the Modern Irish incarnation of *aile* is *eile*, then perhaps an argument could be made for Wb being innovatory, showing evidence of ‘later’ or ‘Middle Irish’ features that were represented in natural speech, but not accepted in the written standard. Though there are attestations in Middle Irish material (cf. Breatnach 1994, 232 §3.4,) the vast majority of attestations of *eile* in DIL are found in Early Modern Irish sources eg. *ré n-airdíbhe eile* (Bergin 1916, 24, §98) ‘before other points (of the compass.)’

There are 40 examples of *eile* in DIL to be found that occur in originally Early Irish material, although later transmission can account for scribal innovation from an underlying *aile*: such as *co ndeirgi folat laíg 7 araill eile co solusgili sneachta* (Knott 1936, 38) from *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* which interestingly uses *eile* in conjunction with *araill*; and in ‘The Voyage of the Húi Corra’ *inis eile* (Stokes 1893, 46.1)100 ‘another island.’ There is a single example in *In cath catharda*, a distinctly Middle Irish text: *armu*

---

100 Van Hamel (1941, 10) has *ro ráimset ass co ráncatar inis aile* with a note that MS 23 N 15 has *adconacadar innis eile*, and no other note. This is interesting as the primary manuscript used in the edition, and Stokes’ edition, is the Book of Fermoy (RIA MS 23 E 29) which has a very clear *ele* (pg. 173b,) despite Van Hamel making no note of it.
eile (Stokes 1909, 2129) ‘other weapons.’ Outside of the few literary examples, the vast majority of the Early Irish attestations of eile occur in the law tracts.\textsuperscript{101}

It would appear that while eile was not the predominant form until the Early Modern Irish period that it was indeed present, albeit marginally, in the Early Irish corpus, particularly in the Middle Irish period. It is difficult, therefore, to evaluate the presence of eile in Wb, as attestations in material with later dates of transmission can be attributed to scribal innovation, thereby making Wb an early innovator, or it can be viewed as an optional spelling able to be exploited during the Old Irish period.

5.4.5 The quantity of the vowels

The length mark on the -e- in aréli Wb8a07 and áréli Wb13a05 could theoretically be attributed to the analogy with céle, which is the conclusion on which Thurneysen landed (GOI §487.) This could potentially be the case; however, the stressed vowel is not only marked long in the forms written with -e-, but in Wb, there are two instances of the -a- marked as long innaláil Wb12a10 and aláili Wb12a34, and there is additionally an occurrence where the initial vowel is marked long: cách darhési álaili Wb13a09. If the two length marks on the é of aréli and áréli were exclusively the product of analogy to céle a length mark on the form alaile would not be expected.

Outside of Wb, both Sg and MI have forms that arguably could be understood as being long, with doubling indicating length; Sg has six examples in which the stressed vowel is doubled: ataat alaaili Sg10a01; alaaili Sg27a18; 7 alaaili Sg71b17; 7 alaaili réta Sg111b05;) i. alaaili prepositiones... alaaili dano Sg215a01 and MI has the single ala aile MI51c05.

To counter, this doubling of vowels to indicate a long vowel is only consistently found in Wb (cf. GOI §27,) not MI or Sg, and as alaile is likely derived from ala-aile it is more plausible that these are not long vowels but a retained older spelling.

In order to account for the later length marks, a few potential scenarios regarding pronunciation must be explored. The first is the possibility that the forms were originally pronounced with a hiatus that was subsequently reduced, as the reduction of hiatus often resulted in vowels being long, especially in cases in which a stressed vowel was followed

\textsuperscript{101} There are two additional attestations given within DIL for eile within the law tracts. These are cited from Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland, but in CIH are given merely as .ii., which would indicate that the eile here is the extrapolation of the editors and not necessarily a genuine eile: cf. CIH ii 346.6; CIH ii 404.14.
by a posttonic vowel (cf. GOI §113-§114; McCone 1996, 141-142.) While this is not analogous with the sequence of proclitic vowel followed by a stressed vowel found here, this contraction may have happened earlier: the conjunction *duus/díus* < *do fíus* ‘for knowledge’ is directly comparable to *ala-aíle* and appears in Wb as *duíus* (cf. Wb5b20) *díus* (cf. Wb30b30) as well as *díus* (cf Wb10a04;) it exclusively appears in contracted form in MI as *díus* (MI16c05 MI35b24 MI87c04 MI91c01) and it has a contracted attestation in the Book of Armagh as well (*Thes.*, ii, 239.2.) These contracted forms, particularly those in Wb and the Book of Armagh, can potentially be indicative that this type of hiatus had indeed been reduced by the Old Irish period and was now pronounced as a long vowel. This could then indicate that Sg and Ml both retained an older spelling of *alaile*, which was potentially understood by their respective scribes as indicating length.

The difficulty with this supposition – trying to attribute the length marks as legitimate and indicative of a reduction in hiatus resulting in a long vowel – is that there is no other evidence that the vowel was understood as long: with the exception of these handful of forms, there is no reason to suspect that *alaíle* was understood or pronounced as *aláíle*. On the other hand, this is not necessarily an insurmountable obstacle, as the presumed *aláíle* would have been in paradigmatic competition with forms like *alaile*, transformed by analogy with the neuter *alaill*. There is equally no evidence nor any reason to believe that one of the *a*’s was not simply elided, perhaps via analogy to the neuter (cf. Thurneysen 1918, 409-410,) eliminating an original hiatus by other means, and without the creation of a long vowel. In contrast, the apparent contraction of the vowels of analogous *do fíus > duus/díus* may suggest that a contracted hiatus is the most plausible explanation.

Prose text does not provide us with a definitive insight into how words were pronounced, especially as there is evidence that the scribes of the glosses were working with an orthographic standard, and there is always the possibility of pronunciation not being reflected in the written form. As poetry is metrically bound it can be a useful tool for determining pronunciation, and while there is no poetry within the three corpora of glosses themselves, there are the *Poems of Blathmac* which slightly predate Wb and contain three occurrences of *alaile* (Barrett 2017, §19, §51, §216,) unfortunately none of which is in rhyming position, and none are marked as long, nor are they written with the doubling. The Poems also may contain evidence of a similar contraction: Stifter (2018,
notes that the metre of stanza §218 (cf. Barrett 2017, §218) necessitates that *beos* be read with a hiatus, and that spellings such as *beous* MI77b02 and *beius* (LU 9035) may be further evidence of an original hiatus. He derives the word from the phrase *bi fus* ‘be in rest, stay still, still,’ which would create the same sort of hiatus, albeit here fully realised, as seen in *alaile*.

On the one hand, it is tempting to consider these outlier forms as evidence of slips that represent a more natural spoken language that deviated from the written standard, but on the other, the higher proportion of evidence cannot be ignored. It seems counterintuitive to dismiss the fact that *alaile* and *araile* are more consistently written with no indication of length simply on the basis of a handful of forms that may or may not be indicators of pronunciation, especially considering that there is no indication elsewhere to suggest that the vowel was indeed long, especially when the length in *aréliaréli* may simply be analogy on the basis of *a céle*.

At the same time, presumably the scribes of Wb would not have marked *aréliaréli* long on the basis of analogy with *a chéle* unless the vowels were pronounced the same or similarly: they were well-educated and intelligent (cf. Bisagni 2013-2014) and undoubtedly would have recognised the difference between a long vowel and a short one; it seems unlikely they would have represented two different sounds identically. Correspondingly, the form *aláile* requires an explanation. It can either be viewed as a simple mistake, an erroneous marking of length, which is a poor ‘explanation’ indeed; an indication of pronunciation; an intentional marking done by analogy to the form *aréli*, which itself was the product of analogy to *céle*, or an indication that the form did originally contain a hiatus which was subsequently lost in spelling but retained in pronunciation as a long vowel.

Another possible explanation has been put forward by Greene (1952-1954, 339-340) who posited that the length mark was not marking length, but stress: when words were written as a single unit, such as *ammág* Wb12a25, the length mark was used to denote that these were two separate lexical units written as one. While this could potentially explain *aláile/aráile* in which the stressed syllable is marked, forms with two markers of length, such as *áréli*, would still not be satisfactorily explained, as this orthographic tendency would not account for the length mark on the initial á. The possibility of the initial á- being genuinely long cannot be discounted, but nor can the possibility that this be a mistake, or a misapplication of the above-mentioned spelling convention.
There is, perhaps, a further option. Whilst in Old Irish, the only quantity of vowels

distinguished are either long or short, in Early Modern/Classical Irish, there is discussion

of a middle quantity (cf. IGT Introduction §1, §41, §92, §151, §156.) Greene (1952) has
demonstrated that this middle quantity was likely indeed present in Old Irish, and
accounts for the optional marking of certain short vowels as long (cf. GOI §45-§47.)

Middle quantity can be found in monosyllables that contain a short vowel followed
by a long liquid or nasal or when a short vowel is followed by a ‘heavy’ consonant group,
such as in fergg, garb, Medb (Greene 1952, 218.) The latter category is likely the
progenitor of modern svarabhakti vowels, which can equally occur in disyllabic words.

The collection of forms containing short vowels marked as long presented in GOI
(§45) includes disyllabic words in which the unstressed syllable is marked as long,
despite containing an original short vowel when preceding an unlenited nasal or liquid:
du-sesáinn Mi41c05; ubúll MI100c21 adíll of adall Wb14a08. According to the
discussions of middle quantity in Classical Irish, half-long vowels preceding a liquid or
nasal only held middle quantity in monosyllables (IGT §92) and this is presumably why
the potential of middle quantity in disyllabic words in this context was not discussed by
Greene.

Returning to alaile, the original neuter aill would have been a suitable candidate for
possessing middle quantity as a monosyllable with a short vowel preceding an unlenited
-l-. As the proposed origin for alaile is the doubling of the neuter *ail-l-ail, it could be
theorised, perhaps owing to the fact it was a type of compound, the middle quantity or
half-length of both syllables was retained. The main limiting factor in this supposition is
the fact that this is not a regularly formed compound, but a univerbation that incorporates
a preposed proclitic adjective and does not contain stress on the first syllable. As
evidenced in forms such as the genitive plural ala n-aile, the initial element was still able
to cause mutation and therefore retained case inflection, which is not possible in regular
compounds. Indeed, while this would be an attractive option to account for the length
marks in Wb in both the unstressed (álaíli Wb13a09) and stressed syllable (aláíli
Wb12a34,) it is unlikely to be correct, as once followed by another vowel, middle
quantity would be lost. Middle quantity is additionally not a viable explanation for árélí
Wb13a05, as there is no indication that the -r- would be unlenited: it is never spelled
doubled, -rr- a standard indication of an unlenited consonant. Furthermore, it was more
than likely dissimilated from a lenited -l-, although Thurneysen would suggest this was originally unlenited -ll- from the neuter.

Presuming to explain the spellings of *alaïli/ala aile* in MI and Sg this way is even less convincing, as it requires a few levels of assumption: firstly, it has to be assumed that the vowels held middle quantity that was occasionally marked by a long vowel; then it has to be assumed that the scribes opted to indicate this middle quantity, this long syllable and not long vowel, by writing the vowels doubled, which can be used as another marker of length. This would also have to assume that this doubling was genuinely to indicate that the syllable was not short, in this case half-long, instead of the supposition that this is indicative of the original spelling (cf. GOI §486b.) Considering that there is only one other example of doubling that may indicate length in Sg *impúud* Sg106b10, and indeed this may simply be a retained spelling of the original hiatus form, and no examples of doubling to demonstrate length in MI, the supposition that the doubling in *alaïle* should be understand as an indication of length is tenuous at best. At this stage, no firm conclusions can be drawn about the quantity of the vowels in *alaïle*, and why they are sporadically marked as long in Wb. Middle quantity, albeit a tempting explanation, is simply not possible, and far less plausible an explanation than analogy to the form *céle*, or indeed an orthographic convention to identify stressed elements, both of which are still somewhat unsatisfying explanations. Indeed, explaining the length marks in *alaïle* as evidence of middle quantity would be equally proposing that middle quantity was possible in syllables containing short vowels before an intervocalic strong liquid or nasal during the Old Irish period and that this phenomenon was reduced by the Classical Irish period, which does not seem tenable. Therefore, it does not seem that there are any clear conclusions to be reached about the quantity of the vowels.

5.4.6 Conclusions

Issues of length aside, it does not appear that neither the dissimilated *araïle* nor the forms showing -e- are indicative of any kind of wider-spread trend, as *araïle* is found in all three corpora of glosses, as well as outside of the three corpora discussed here in the wider context of Early Irish extant material, while none of the three corpora show any other evidence of this dissimilation outside of these forms. Additionally, with regards to the forms *elele, árélí, arélí, arele* etc. no other attestations of such spellings have been found outside of Wb, thus this variant stands as an outlier.
Wb, then, stands in opposition to both MI and Sg with its odd forms of *araile*, although the exact nature of this opposition is unclear. There is the option of an orthographic variation, in which Wb has spelled the forms with an -e- instead of an -ai-, based on analogy to *a chéle*, although this does not explain why the forms with -e- also contain the dissimilated *ar*-. There is always the possibility of diatopic variation, though the inability to pinpoint to what extent this variation was realised in pronunciation makes this a tenuous suggestion at best. There may also be a diachronic element, in that the analogical spelling with -e- fell out of favour by the time of MI and Sg.

Overall, the situation with *araile/alaile* is opaque. There are no definite conclusions nor answers with regards to variation within the glosses to be found here, primarily because the evidence from all three corpora of glosses is fairly minimal. On the surface, MI and Sg do not have any distinct or preferential usage of *araile*, and consequently any attempt to draw a definitive conclusion would be overzealous.

Considering the fact that MI is a larger corpus, the higher number of attestations of *araile* in Wb is interesting as proportionally, fewer attestations would be expected. This implies that the scribe of Wb was either less careful about not slipping into a vernacular pronunciation that was not reflected by the orthographic standard to which MI and Sg more rigidly adhered, or that perhaps the more limited usage in MI and Sg indicate that the form was falling out of favour.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the dissimilation had already taken place by the time of Wb and thus *araile* cannot be considered either a later or specifically ‘Middle Irish’ form as it is already present in our earliest sources. It is obviously still the younger of the two forms; however, its existence in Old Irish, and the fact it is more regularly present in our earliest corpus of glosses, clearly demonstrates that it is a true Old Irish form. As it stands, *araile* cannot be considered a marker of dialect nor register simply on its own as it appears to be interchangeable with *alaile* and regularly, albeit minimally present within Old Irish.

Equally, Wb does not seem to distinguish between the forms *araile* and *alaile* in terms of context, indicating that at the time of writing they were entirely interchangeable. The only true variation found within Wb is that of the stressed vowel, which is possibly based on analogy with the similar phrase *a chéle*, but is preferentially used with the dissimilated form. The stressed vowel is also occasionally marked as long which, as discussed, has to be considered entirely ambiguous with regards to pronunciation as there is no single explanation that is entirely satisfactory. There is the possibility that a mixture of the two
explanations be at the root of the seemingly optional marking of length: the contraction of the hiatus in *alaile* could potentially have led to a pronounced long vowel, *aláile*, while the analogy with *a chêle* can account for the marking of *-e* as long.

It is undoubted that Wb was treating these forms differently, both with regards to more attestations of the dissimilated *araile*, as well as the fact that the masculine and feminine forms of *araile* are spelled *arele*. It is unclear what these variations indicate, as they could be either an issue of dialect, or orthography, but nevertheless they are an innovation in which Wb is distinct from both the other two corpora of glosses, as well as from later sources.

5.5 Conclusion

The preceding chapter has demonstrated that while there is certainly variation in Wb that is not present in either Sg, or MI, it is difficult to attribute it to a particular cause: the early age of Wb, and the dearth of extant contemporary material results in a difficulty to positively attribute fluctuations and variations to archaism alone.

Especially given the fact that many of the deviations in Wb are found in other material, plotting them on a chronological map is tricky: as scribes can always be liable to include pseudo-linguistic archaisations, no matter the motivation. The presence of *fadéine* and *fodeisne* in *Regula Choluimb Chille* and *Immram curaig Máil Dúin* can be viewed both as evidence that the form was still in use during the time of writing, a preserved form from an older existing original or an archaisation on the part of the scribe.

That said, the innovations in the potentially analogical *arele* in Wb are interesting for the purposes of this study, as any innovation found only in Wb is ‘counter-diachronic,’ and should be considered evidence of language variation accordingly, whether it be evidence of a diatopic variant, or inclusion of a form generally only contained in a lower register – as it is unlikely that variation in a stressed vowel is exclusively an orthographic innovation. Hence, there is at least one good example of innovation in Wb that is not shared by later sources, and owing to the fact that *-e* cannot derive from the *-a*- of *aile-* , cannot be attributed to pure diachrony alone.
6. Features exclusive to MI

As the corpus which stands in the middle between the other two, any distinct variations in MI will always be the most convincing as evidence of synchronic, and potentially diatopic, variation as they cannot be attributed to simply being the result of diachronic development: an archaism present in MI but not shared by Wb, or an innovation in MI that is not shared by Sg cannot solely be the product of language change.

Any particular variation in which MI stands in isolation will always be of increased interest, but the most considerable evidence for synchronic variation will come from those variants in which Wb and Sg are united in opposition to MI: a common ‘archaism’ present in both Wb and Sg with an innovation present in MI, or an innovation in Wb and Sg that is not present in MI, demonstrate that MI was not operating within the same diatopic or diastratic variety of the language as Wb and Sg. Of course, the possibility of Sg adhering to a more rigid, earlier standard of Old Irish (as perhaps seen in Section 4.1.2) and editorialising away any innovative features cannot be entirely discounted, but still, variants in which MI is unique are features of keen interest.

Indeed, there are a fair number of variants in which MI is unlike the other two corpora and which would strongly indicate that MI is operating from a separate system – whether it be entirely orthographic, or reflective of a different register or dialect. A number of the variants to be discussed below are potentially merely orthographic, but regardless of whether or not the forms do not represent a variant in the spoken language and only represent a written variation, they are still candidates for discussion here as they can still be indicative of competing scholastic ideas about the ‘correct’ standard forms or indicate local stylistic variations in the language. It will become apparent in the forthcoming discussion, if it has not already been made apparent, that MI was undoubtedly operating from a different standard or system of Old Irish than Wb and Sg.

6.1 Prepositions & preverbs

During the compilation of the collections, it became increasingly obvious that representation in MI of some of the prepositions and preverbs was divergent from that of Wb and Sg, without any particular variation with regards to the usage of the differing forms, specifically with regards to the writing of vowels in prepositions such as eter, tre, do, de and fo, and this fluctuation was dealt with in Chapter 3. MI appears to be working from an opposing standard, or at the very least utilising a different orthographic norm,
with regards to o or u in proclitics, and in these instances it is entirely unclear if this was an intentional act to better reflect the pronunciation, or if it was a completely orthographic choice.

There are various historical contexts in which o can be raised to u in stressed position, that would have occurred before the Old Irish period and may have accounted for the variation in MI; however, the majority of the fluctuations found in MI occur in unstressed or pretonic position and are therefore ineligible as candidates for raising in the traditionally understanding of Primitive Irish raising.

The lack of evidence of this ‘raising’ in stressed or tonic position would appear to indicate either that this was not pronounced, or that the pronunciation of proclitics when in pretonic position had shifted: there is the possibility that o was raised to u before a subsequent high vowel in Early Old Irish, following the typically understood system of raising in Primitive Irish (cf. Stifter 2014, 229-230; Chapter 3.)

The variation between the particle ar and its byforms air- er- aur- and ir-, in which both the representation of the vowel and the colour of the r are in variation, as previously discussed in the third chapter as well as in Section 2, is another feature in which MI is distinct. As one of Thurneysen’s (GOI §823) original propositions of diatopic variation and the only one with a clear distinction between the three corpora, this particular feature is interesting both because of the limited presence of ir- only in Wb but also because of MI’s significant variation from the other two corpora. Here, while Wb and Sg strongly prefer the tonic form air- MI shows a significant preference for er-, which is only marginally present in the other two corpora. While it is unclear whether or not this variation was realised in pronunciation, or whether it is exclusively orthographic, MI is very clearly utilising a different version of the language than either Wb or Sg.

As stated above, this variation and its treatment in the glosses is unlikely to have represented a spoken diatopic variant, or at the very least is inconclusive evidence. They can, however, potentially be regarded as a variant standard – whether it be an issue of register, or a competing standard propagated by competing schools of thought: either one that was entirely orthographic, or diatopic if they standard originated in a particular region. In addition to these, there are further indications in MI that the scribes or school had a particular orthographic preference that was not shared by the other two corpora.
6.2 Genitive singular -o and -a

One of these such features, in which MI appears different from that of both Wb and Sg, is that of the genitive singular endings -o and -a in both the i-stems and in the u-stems. These endings are the product of original long final vowels that preceded pre-apocope final consonants, and once those consonants were lost, the original long vowels were subsequently shortened (cf. GOI §93) such as fedo the genitive singular of u-stem masculine fid, from *widōs.

The i-stems have traditionally been understood as originating from the Indo-European -ois, with seeming supporting evidence of Ogham inscriptions with i-stem names ending in -ōs (Deagos, Allato) which can suggest that this diphthong must have been treated differently than in -oi, which became -ī, -i (GOI §303.) The u-stems would have originated as the ending *-ous (GOI §311) and thus their similarity with the i-stems is coincidental and cannot have been expected to have developed identically. McCone (1994, 117, §18.3) has instead suggested that the i-stem -ois naturally became -īs, and then adopted the u-stem -ōs to distinguish the genitives from the nominative and accusative plural.

Both of these original endings would result in a genitive singular of -o, and the -a byform is observed by Thurneysen (GOI §95) as being interchangeable with its -o predecessor from about the beginning of the eighth century onwards. McCone (1996, 139) believes that instead of merely being interchangeable, that -o and -a merge to -a rather early, reducing the final unstressed phonemes to four instead of five (-a, -e, -ī, and -u,) noting that Wb contains attestations of both endings while the -a is the ‘normal’ ending ‘from MI onwards.’ Based on the contrast of Early Old Irish nom. sg. fēda (Thes. ii, 244.22) and gen. sg. fēdot (Thes. ii, 244.32,) both forms of fiada in the Cambrai Homily, McCone (1996, 139) states he is ‘tempted’ to suggest that during the middle of the seventh century -o was lowered to /ɔ/ and that it was this sound that could be either represented graphically as -o or -a in Wb before being unrounded to -a and spelt accordingly in MI.102

In his article on the language of Sg, Strachan undertook a collection of the forms both in Sg and Wb, though not in MI, and not in his article (Strachan 1903a) on MI exclusively.

---

102 Griffith (2005, 48) does not agree with McCone that fēda should be understood as representing an original fēdo owing to the fact that u-stem final -o is consistently written as -o, and confusion between -o and -a does not appear consistently until Wb. He would instead view fēda as representing a phonemic -a, with the -a appearing in the pre-Ogham change of -o to -a in unaccented final syllables (Griffith 2005, 57.)
either. In his collection, Strachan (1903b, 472-473) notes a different distribution in different sections of the Sg codex: pp. 1-40 show an equal balance of the two forms of the ending; pp. 50-150 shows more occurrences of -a and that -o is rare; pp. 150-202 finds -o common and -a rare; pp. 202-210 -a is more common; pp. 215-216 show -o only.103

Unfortunately, Strachan neglects to explain the logic behind the compartmentalisation of these sections, as surely changing the boundaries of these divisions would change the apparent results. The division is not immediately apparent either: pp. 1-40 covers Priscian’s books 1-3, pp. 50-150 spans books 4-8, pp. 150-202 is comprised of books 8-12 and pp. 202-210 is only books 12-13. Even so, Strachan’s divisions do not correlate with the books themselves: for example, book 8 is pp. 138-163 of the manuscript, and is inexplicably broken up by Strachan’s sections. The divisions also have little to do with hand, as there is evidence of the main glossator writing throughout the manuscript (Hofman 1996, 14,) thus the motivation behind these divisions is unclear, and while the implication of these divisions could be that glosses were copied from a separate source or inserted by a different scribe perhaps, that is never explicitly stated, leaving Strachan’s intentions behind these divisions entirely opaque (cf. Lambert 1996, 189.)

Overall, both types of ending exist across all three corpora, albeit in different distribution. It is worth mentioning as well that there are irregular forms found within the glosses in addition to the expected -o and -a endings. Wb has three attestations of words with both i-stem and ā-stem flexion showing ā-stem genitive endings: buithe Wb14d07 ‘being, existence’ taidchrecce Wb21a06 ‘buying back’ brithe Wb25d03 ‘carrying, bearing.’ Both buithe and brithe are verbal nouns that have replaced the nominative with the dative and which occasionally show ā-stem flexion (cf. GOI §294b,) though as an original ā-stem, buithe can be viewed as an ā-stem inflection, as can taidchrecce. Although brithe is not an original ā-stem, there is evidence that the ā-stems and i-stems inflections were occasionally confused (cf. Schmidt, 1972,) and thus this too can be regarded as an ā-stem inflection.

103There are no relevant cases on pgs. 41-49, and there is a single genitive singular of the adjective remšuidigtho on pg. 212 (Sg212a10) which is inconclusive as the ending is unexpanded. It is not stated explicitly by Strachan, merely implied, that there are no relevant attestations on these pages and thus it was necessary to check.
Wb also contains búade Wb24a17 ‘victory,’ a neuter i-stem, and Thurneysen (GOI §301n) suggests that all instances of búad(a)e should perhaps be understood as genitive plural, and not singular. MI contains only three apparently irregular forms: fuile MI22b01 ‘blood’ and fule MI37c04 as well as tomais MI20a21 ‘measuring’ but these are also easily explained. There is already some confusion between o-stems and u-stems in the Old Irish period (cf. GOI §309) and thus the palatalised genitive singular ending of tomais in not altogether surprising. Though the Milan Glosses Project (Griffith and Stifter 2013) gives both fuile MI22b01 and fule MI37c04 as genitive singular, and thus would make them irregular, C. O’Rahilly (1973, 141) has discussed their plural meaning and it seems more likely that in both cases we are here dealing with a genitive plural form with singular meaning, in which case they show regular i-stem inflection, especially as MI also has fola MI37d06.104

Sg has 20 examples of ‘irregular’ endings. Some, such as choibnis Sg9b09, Sg28a19 ‘relationship’ are similarly explained as above, while the majority end in -e. Final vowels -o -a, spelled -eo -ea with glide vowels after a palatal consonant, after the reduction to /æ/, were often spelled as simply -e after a palatal consonant (GOI §99,) with examples from the glosses such as genitive singular suidigthe Sg193b04 ‘established.’ The increased presence of these endings in Sg is likely due to the Middle Irish development of reduction of final unstressed vowels to schwa, which was certainly underway in some capacity during the period of the glosses (cf. McCone 1985; GOI §99) and is indeed present, though to a lesser extent, in both MI and Wb (cf. Strachan 1903a, 51-52.) Having now dealt with the apparently deviating, but explicable, forms present in the glosses, the variation between the expected -o and -a genitive singular endings can now be properly discussed. Wb favours the -o ending with it occurring 62% of the time, MI prefers the -a ending, utilising it 65% of the time and while with a less distinct preference, Sg prefers the -o ending as well, 53% of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>Wb</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 Joseph (1988, 171-172 n.4) has discussed this word as well, and the potential merger of an originally neuter fuil and a feminine fuil, both with the same meaning of ‘wound,’ or ‘blood.’
This appears to run contrary to McCone’s (1996, 139) suggestion that -a was ‘the normal form from Ml. onwards,’ as it would be expected to be predominant in the later Sg. Any level of fluctuation between the endings, which exists across all three corpora of glosses, indicates that the two sounds had already fallen together, as they would not have been considered appropriate alternatives for each other if their sounds had not been considered to be equivalent by the scribes. Thus, this particular fluctuation is clearly a variation that is distinctly orthographic, though it does reflect a phonological change.

Furthermore, as the sound change had clearly already taken place, then the preference for -o in Sg can potentially be regarded as a conservative writing feature that retained an older spelling – as presumably at some stage there was an initial stage in which -o was always written – that then progressed towards a stage in which -a was predominant, with the intermediate stage represented by the three corpora in which -o and -a were in free variation. As the reduction of unstressed final vowels was undoubtedly already present in Ml (cf. Strachan 1903a, 51-52; McCone 1985) and therefore Sg as well, it is additionally possible that spellings with final -a may represent not only the change of -o to -a, but also the ultimate shift to /ə/.

If this is presumed to be the case, then it would logically follow that as the oldest, Wb would conform most closely to the original spelling of final -o, Sg to the younger and encroaching -a, and MI would be somewhat in the middle. But this is not what is represented by the three corpora, and while the impetus behind the norms of Sg is possibly orthographic conservatism as already evidenced by the preference for final -th (Section 4.1.2,) the tendency of MI to prefer the -a ending indicates that the scribes were using either an alternative, or innovatory orthographic standard to that preferred by the scribes of both Wb and Sg.

### 6.3 Stressed e as æ

A further orthographic variant that was prevalent in MI was the usage of the Æ/æ ligature in place of Æ/æ. This usage is well-known (cf. GOI §24) and so its presence in the glosses was expected; however, it became abundantly clear while collecting that MI utilised this ligature far more than either Wb or Sg. It is hardly predominant, and MI certainly uses Æ/æ more consistently than it utilises than æ, but the fact that it has such a large number of occurrences, even accounting for the larger size of the corpus, merited some investigation.
In both Wb and Ml, a significant number of æ are attested in forms of *día* ‘god,’ namely 44 in Wb (56%) and 491 in Ml (92%). Sg only has one occurrence of the ligature with *día* and it’s within a compound and therefore does not bear the primary stress: * bande* Wb28d31 for *eclais*; *ætach* Wb32c11 for *étach* as examples; *bês* Ml127d15 for *bés*, *du-ærget* Ml56b13 for *do-érget*, *ær[a?]*sighi Ml127a04 for *ér[a?]ssaigthe* as examples.

Only 18 examples from Wb are short, 10 of which are of the word *ecne* such as *æcne* Wb8a10; two are of *etergne*, *ætarcne* Wb12c32; and the rest are single instances of a particular word, such as *æitiud* Wb29a13 for *etiuad*.

Sg is different, in that the majority of examples are short vowels – *æscae* Sg61a26 for *éscae*, *ǽtrud* Sg68b09 for *étrad*, *hællned* Sg55b11 for *éilned* and *ǽsi* Sg207a01 for *éisi* being the only long vowels.

Ml also has 18 instances of æ for a short e, such as *ælscud* Ml56b26 for *elscud*, *æsnadud* Ml24c10 for *esnadud* and *nī ærbarad* Ml31b20 for an augmented past subjunctive 3rd singular of *as-beir*, *-érbarad*.

Part of what makes this particular orthographic feature interesting is that while Ml prefers the form er- to represent the preverb ar-, there are only two instances of that er-written with the ligature despite it occurring rather frequently in other instances: *isærutsu* Ml2d08 a second singular prepositional pronoun, and *ærgarthae* Ml69a21 of *airgarthae*, which has one other attested form in Ml of *ergarthaí* Ml121d06.

Regardless of the reason, this use of æ in place of a stressed e or é is another instance in which the orthography of Ml does not conform to that of Wb or Sg. The variation in the representation of the prepositions, as well as the possessive pronouns of the first and second singular, in addition to the preference for air over ar as a conjunction, as well as this significant use of æ, all certainly indicate that Ml was utilising a different orthographic standard than that of Wb or Sg, and that its spelling norms thus cannot be considered to be part of a stage in a diachronic orthographic development.
6.4 *cach* & *cech*

The pronoun *cách* is consistent across all three corpora of glosses (*as cāch*) but its unstressed pronominal form shows wider variation. MI heavily prefers the innovatory *cech* with only 26 occurrences of *cach*, contrasted with 126 *cech*. The more popular *cech* is undoubtedly a secondary form as, not only did the form never contain an original *e*, but proclitic short *e* regularly became *a*.

*Cach* occurs across all cases and genders in MI and no case nor gender shows any particular preference for *cach*: it occurs three times as a masculine nominative singular (cf. *ol cach diib fri alaile* MI114c15 ‘says each of them to the other,’) three times as neuter nominative singular (cf. *airthuccai cach chenel hí coitchet chenas* [leg: *coitchenas] aninsci sidi MI42c08 ‘for each nation together understands its speech’) three times as masculine accusative singular (cf. *ruucthar fricachrét* MI35b10 ‘it can be applied to everything’) and once as accusative neuter singular (cf. *la cachmaith* MI105d04 ‘with every good thing.’) It occurs nine times in the feminine accusative singular, eight of which are in the phrase *cach lecáin / cach lacéin* (cf. MI40b08 ‘at the one time’) and only once in a different phrase: *fri cach crieid* MI85c14 ‘as any clay.’ It also occurs once as a feminine genitive singular *cach afrithare* MI111a05 ‘every watch’ (for *cacha frithare*) following *cechlathi*; once as a masculine dative singular (cf. *coitchen do cach peccad són* MI56b41 ‘common to every sin’) once as a masculine genitive plural *fri tige cach n aithech* MI92d15 ‘to the houses of any subjects’ and once as either accusative/dative neuter singular *forcachleth* MI22b01 ‘on every side.’ From the preceding examples alone, it is evident that there is no predominant semantic or grammatical context in which *cach* was preferred in MI, indicating it was not an issue of distinctive or preferential usage of the form in opposition to *cech*. Equally, it does not appear that the subsequent consonant colour had any effect, meaning that the scribes were not attempting to concord the neutral vowel of *cach* with a subsequent neutral vowel, as example.

Sg on the other hand almost exclusively uses *cach*, with 64 occurrences and only two of *cech*, one accusative singular feminine *cech consain* Sg7a04 ‘every consonant’ and once in a genitive masculine or neuter *cech muid* Sg190a03. Wb equally prefers *cach*, with 83 instances against 13 of *cech*: thrice in nominative singular masculine (cf. *rabad cech brathair* Wb34a04 ‘so that each brother should be’) once as nominative singular feminine (*cechirnigde dongneid ituil dée beddlitchhech* Wb5c20 ‘let every prayer that you make in God’s will be lawful;’) once as accusative feminine singular (*cedumelmis...*
cechtuarí Wb10c21 ‘if we consumed every food;’) thrice in the genitive singular, once masculine and twice neuter (cf. *foditiu cech inmid Wb1c18 ‘endurance of every tribulation;’ *fobésad cech dachpreceptoro Wb4a02 ‘according to the practice of every good preceptor;’ *cit atobaich cendílgud cech ancrídi dognethe frib Wb9c20 ‘what impels you not to forgive every injury that may have been done to you’) and both masculine and neuter in the dative singular (cf. *ocech cenélu serbe Wb2a22 ‘of every kind of bitterness;’ *oscech anmimm ainmigther Wb21a14 ‘over every name that is named;’ *hicehcaingním Wb33c08 ‘in every fair deed’) and once as a nominative plural feminine issí didiu trebaire chollno cecha dethidnea domundi doimradud cen imradud nanemde Wb3d30 ‘this then is ‘prudence of the flesh,’ to consider all mundane cares without considering the heavenly.’

The shortened form cach of cách < *kʷākʷo- is entirely regular, but cech does not have any etymological basis (GOI §491.) Further, the remodelling of cechtar on the basis of nechtar is not a sufficient explanation for cech, as there is concurrently nach, the unstressed form of *ne-kʷos. It potentially may have been influenced by the conjunct particle cacha/cecha (cf. GOI §491,) albeit this form is not present across the three corpora of glosses with the exception of cacha orr Sg12b07 ‘whichever he may slay,’ so while possible, is inconclusive. Indeed, an etymological origin for cecha is equally mysterious: aside from attributing it as the potential original for cech (cf. GOI §491; LEIA C-3) no suggestions as to its origins have been put forward. As it stands, there is no clear origin for the innovatory cech.

Obviously, the innovation, whatever its origins, had already occurred by the time of Wb as it is optionally present and without any particular context or reason for necessity. Sg accords with Wb in its preference for the expected cach, albeit with minimal attestations of cech, and therefore cech cannot be considered a feature of diachrony alone, as it was not a feature that saw increased usage over time. Ml’s significant preference is innovatory, especially as it stands against both Wb and Sg, and unusual, as there is little else by way of fluctuation between a and e in unstressed positions within Ml. Nevertheless, this particular feature is yet another in which Ml is in opposition to the other two, demonstrating that it was, at the very least, the product of a divergent school of thought.
6.5 oldaas & indaas

Similar to araile/alaile, the forms oldaas and indaas are two functionally identical forms that are treated as being interchangeable by scholars of Old Irish. The forms are attested following comparative adjectives and are often found glossing Latin quam ‘than.’ Unlike araile and alaile which both appear in all three corpora of glosses, the forms oldaas and indaas show different representation across the three corpora of Old Irish glosses, in that while oldaas occurs in all three sets of glosses, indaas appears only in Ml.

When presented with a situation in which a form is present in only one corpus there are a few options: the first being that of dialect, with the understanding that the form is present in one corpus in opposition to the others because it was not present in their dialect regions; an issue of diachrony in which a form develops later and is only present in sources that were written after the form had come into existence; or an issue of function, in that the form is not entirely identical to its counterpart and was originally used in particular contexts and thus the absence of a form in other texts is dictated by there being a lack of appropriate contexts and thus the form is not a diatopic variant.

The second option of diachrony, does not appear to be the case when it comes to oldaas and indaas as the form indaas is not at all present in Sg. Considering that indaas has been noted to have been attested in later sources (cf. GOI §779.1,) and that its derivative ná survives into Modern Irish (Lambert 1995, 172) it is surprising that it sees no representation whatsoever in Sg, but does indicate that the presence of indaas is not strictly an issue of chronological change. It would appear that oldaas and indaas have strong potential to be true diatopic evidence.

In order to determine whether or not the variation of oldaas and indaas can be attributed to diatopic variation, or whether they are simply two forms that have similar but distinct functions, their contexts will be examined in depth and discussed. In order to effectively do so, a full discussion of the forms, origins, and the various theories, as well

\[\text{\textsuperscript{105}}\text{There is a further variant in which both ol- and in- have been replaced with a- the neuter accusative article. Thurneysen, who believes ind- to be the neuter dative article therefore attributes the presence of a- to contexts which dictated the accusative, such as following amal or in the equative. There are exceptionally limited attestations of this form, however. There is amal addaas from a text edited by Stokes (1905b, §59) which he dates to the 10th or 11th century (Stokes 1905b, 97;) there is adosa gl. prior me in Turabian 25a (Thes. i, 485;) and finally the single adaas (Sg190a04) found in Sg, which the digital edition (Bauer, Hofman and Moran 2017) would read as adas ‘according to,’ and not a variant of oldaas/indaas. As the context is so limited and it would appear to be a natural development from indaas, it has not been included in the above discussion. The primary focus has remained on oldaas and indaas both because they are wider spread, but also because they cannot be developments from each other.}\]
as ideas about the forms’ use will be undertaken, in order to establish a basis from which deviations or discrepancies can be examined.

6.5.1 Origins of the forms olдаas and иndaas

Thurneysen (GOI §779.1) explains olдаas and иndaas respectively as a combination of the substantive verb with ol- ‘beyond’ and in(d)-, the dative of the neuter article, following comparatives in nasalising subordinate clauses. In the third persons, olдаas and иndaas use the relative form, and therefore an absolute ending, of the substantive verb, while in other persons they do not: oldáu-sa 1sg, oldái 2sg are among the examples given by Thurneysen, though they are inconclusive (Uhlich 2004, 241.) It has been suggested by Thurneysen, and subsequently agreed with by scholars such as Lambert (1995, 172,) that the meaning of ‘to be’ has entirely disappeared and both olдаas and иndaas are used similar to a particle, albeit with inflection, with the meaning of ‘than.’

The fact that they are frequently followed by a conjugated verb is cited as evidence that both olдаas and иndaas have therefore become a conjunction, though there are no known examples in which this can be argued definitively: Lambert provides only MI59a07 .i. olдаas bid iniquus as berad … translated as ‘than if it were iniquus [unjust] that he had said’ though it could equally be ‘than it is if it were…’ Even so, the form bid was likely originally an unstressed form of the verbal noun buith (GOI §806), in which case there is the potential that it was understood as being the verbal noun, and thus is not a convincing example of a finite verbal form.

Thurneysen (GOI §779) provides a snippet of MI92d06, mou ... indáite bitis cranna ‘more than if they had been trees,’ though again, ‘more…than they are had they been trees’ seems equally possible. Although undoubtedly used to gloss quam, and clearly understood as meaning ‘than,’ at the outset, understanding the forms as no longer containing any element of the substantive verb seems untenable.

The spelling of -daas in both, as opposed to -taas – the expected form of the substantive verb – is attributed by Thurneysen (GOI §779.1) to being ‘in accordance with the pronunciation,’ the presumed implication here being that the t- has been nasalised to d- as part of the nasalising relative clause, and that, as -t- can be either voiced or unvoiced following a liquid in the interior of words, it was intentionally marked orthographically as being d-, with the exception of the single oltaí (MI112c02) noted by Thurneysen (GOI §779.1 n.)
Ahlqvist (1985) has suggested an alternative, however, in which the nasalisation is the result of the element $a^N$, that existed in a form $*ol-a^N$-taas. Ahlqvist (1985, 344 n. 45) posits that the $a^N$ had been elided after the preposition, but he considers the form $a$-ddaas – understood by Thurneysen (GOI §779.1) to contain the neuter accusative of the article, – as this pronominal antecedent as it follows the preposition $amal$, as well as following Thurneysen in considering the ind- of indaas to be the dative singular form.

Ahlqvist (1985, 336-338) argues that the relative marker $*jo$ (GOI §509a) must have been included in enclitics governed by Wackernagel’s Law and accordingly placed immediately after the sufficiently accented part of the phrase, resulting in the special relative forms of simple verbs (in which the relative marker was on the end of the verb itself) and the lenition within the verbal complex (for which he provides the example $ad$-chiam from $*ad$ ($j)o$ kiomos.) From there, he theorises that univerbation fixed the elements inside the verbal complex. He takes the simple verb relative forms with the preverb $no$- to be an innovation, and posits that a system with a suffixed relative marker was in existence before the Old Irish period. He compares it to the systems of simple verbs expressing pronominal objects through either an infixed pronoun with $no$- or a suffixed pronoun. Breatnach (1978) has shown the former is overtaking the latter in the Old Irish period. Ahlqvist (1985, 341-342) additionally states that the earliest stages of Old Irish contained fully inflected relative markers, but that they had been lost by the Old Irish period.

While this relative marker has disappeared, the usage of $(s)a^N$ must be taken into account. The element $(s)a^N$, regarded by Thurneysen (GOI §473) as being the nominative and accusative singular of the neuter, is used before leniting relative clauses in the meaning ‘that which,’ before a nasalising relative clause meaning ‘while, when,’ and in some rare cases after a preposition before a relative verb. Ahlqvist (1985, 342-343) proposes that this usage is evidence of an older system in which $a^N$ functioned as a pronominal antecedent before a verb that contained a relative marker. He continues to suggest that the system of a preposition followed by the verb and then the relative marker (or, in deuterotonic forms, the preverb + relative marker + verb,) was combined with a system in which a preposition was followed by the pronominal antecedent $a^N$ and a verb containing a relative marker, to produce a situation in which a preposition was followed by $a^N$ and a relative verb. The relative marker $*jo$ was subsequently lost, with the ultimate result the $a^N$ was reinterpreted as being said relative marker. Ahlqvist would see this
reinterpretation as having occurred around the time deuterotonic and prototonic verbs were being established.

This theory serves to satisfactorily explain the second element of the forms in question, *oldaas* and *indaas*, but it is the first element, the element that shows variation, that is of interest for the present study.

**6.5.2 ind vs ol**

There have been various explanations as to the background of the first elements *ol*- and *ind*- in addition to some minor discussion of *a*- and the general existence of these two forms that appear to function in much the same way. Pokorny (1911, 36) notes that *indaas* first appears in MI before becoming predominant over *oldaas* in Middle Irish. Recognising that the form does not appear until the time of MI could potentially imply that *indaas* is the younger form that eventually replaced the older.

This idea is logically unsatisfactory, however. The predominance of *indaas* and its reflexes from Middle Irish onwards does not necessarily indicate that it is the younger form, as this assumption would necessitate that the form developed, became both common parlance and the preferred term, and rapidly overtook the older *oldaas* in an exceptionally short period of time, which seems simply improbable.

If anything, it would appear to be more logical to conclude that a newer form would be less widespread than the original, having only recently just developed and come into use – much in the way that initial evidence of ‘Middle Irish’ developments are often minor slips into newer forms.

Even so, if one were a later formation, the diverging initial elements would still necessitate explanation, as unlike the previously discussed *alaile* and *araile*, there is no simple phonological process like dissimilation that can explain the development of *ol-* > *ind-.* The most logical conclusion is that the two developed from different origins, though whether or not they were parallel developments or were established consecutively is a question that the following discussion seeks to answer.

Historically, the first element of *in-* has been regarded as the nasalising preposition *i*, ‘in which’ (cf. Zeuss 1871, 717; Pedersen 1913, 78-79) but this would be impossible with a subsequent special relative form such as in *oldaas* and *indaas*, as well as the absolute endings in *oldáthe* and *oldammit* (GOI, §779) and *indáthe-si, indátháï* and *iondáthísi* (Uhlich 2004, 241.)
This understanding contains a further flaw, in that a nasalising $i$ would not both voice the $t$- to $d$- and cause a nasalising $n$; indeed, the expected nasalisation of a $t$- is the voicing, not the insertion of a preceding $n$ which would then need to be otherwise explained (see Sections 2.11.4, 2.11.5 for discussion of how this may have occurred.) Pedersen (1909-1913, ii, 78-79) attempts to resolve this issue by alleging that the $n$- was restored but it is not clear on what basis: he cites two of his prior discussions (i, 391 §263; i. 400 §268) by way of explanation, the former of which refers to the interrogative particle and the latter of which refers to nasalising relative clauses. It is not clear, therefore, if his argument is that the $n$- was restored based on visual similarity to the interrogative pronoun, which commonly appears as $in$, or if he is regarding the $n$- as nasalisation, though it is unclear why he believes this would have happened, as regular nasalisation had already taken place.

There are only two forms of *indaas* and *oldaas* with an inconclusive following form: *imbói* MI53d06, in which it functions exactly as *indaas*, following a comparative and translated as ‘than…was’ and that Thurneysen (GOI §779.1) recommends be emended to *inmbói* or *inbói*. This form *bói* is not a clear conjunct, however, as it is ambiguous and could equally be an absolute. There is isolated *olambieid* Wb26d26 which Uhlich (2004, 241) has explained to be an innovatory form borne out of confusion with the prepositional relative (cf. GOI §492.)

In his Handbuch ii, during a discussion of the functions of the preposition *i*, Thurneysen (1909, ii, 80) mentions the form *i-tá* ‘in which he is’ and suggests that perhaps it is from this *i* that *indaas* is formed; however, he provides no further explanation or justification for this theory. Pokorny (1911, 37) deems this ‘explanation’ unsatisfactory, despite not providing any justification, although the fact that *i tá* does not contain an $n$ would have been a valid criticism, and instead proposes what he considers a simpler solution in that *oldaas* was remodelled under the influence of the noun *indas* ‘type, manner, quality,’ that occurs in adverbial use and often in modal use with a following relative clause translated as ‘how.’ This usage is present in Old Irish, and he cites *rofessursa indas nombiedsi* Wb9a21 ‘I shall know how ye are’ and part of *tuucthar hicech belru indas fograigte inna duli* MI42c02 ‘It is understood in every nation the way in which the elements sound’ and argues it is used here as a modal particle. Essentially, he suggests *oldaas* was contaminated by the noun *indas* with the resulting *indaas* and he points to the German *als* (oft confused with *wie*) and Latin *quam*, originally meaning ‘as’
in *tam-quam* as evidence of modal particles that have served as comparative particles (Pokorny 1911, 38).

By way of explaining how this new form *indaas* prevailed in the later language, Pokorny further argues (1911, 36) that the element *ol-* which he identifies as a conjunction, was no longer understood by speakers. He purports that the similarity between the initial element of *indaas* as well as the interrogative particle and the article is what caused its favoured usage. If this is correct, then it implies that both *oldaas* and *indaas* were understood as consisting of separate constituent parts by speakers, *ol-*/*lin-* as well as *-daas*, and while this is plausible, as the form is still inflected, it seems unlikely that an entire word would be discarded because a single constituent element was no longer understood as an independent morpheme.

One of the most substantial discussions of the two forms, their origins and their individual usages, was undertaken by Lambert, who had a few creative solutions for explaining the initial elements. Lambert (1995, 173) disagrees with the idea of *oldaas* being remodelled by *indaas*, though he has misunderstood Porkony’s argument as being the inverse, stating that he finds it unlikely that *indaas* the conjunction was remodelled on the basis of *oldaas* and reinterpreted to contain the verb. This is the opposite of what Pokorny has proposed, and indeed, the original argument seemed to be that both forms were conjunctions, and not at all understood as containing the verb ‘to be,’ despite the fact that they both consistently inflect.

Lambert additionally objects to Pokorney’s theory on the basis that the remodelling does not sufficiently explain the element *ol vs ind*: although if Pokorny was correct, the contamination of *oldaas* by *indaas* and the existing conjunction, then the initial element *ind-* would be adequately accounted for. Lambert equally finds this explanation of the initial elements of *indaas* and *adaas* – a form which Thurneysen (GOI §779.1) theorises was originally used exclusively after the equative and *amal*, both of which necessitate accusative forms, before spreading to the comparative – as the article insufficient.

His primary objection to this theory lies with the issue of mutation: as we understand the second element of these forms *-daas* to be a form of the substantive verb *-taas*, with the *-t-* being rendered *-d-* by way of nasalisation, Lambert queries why the form *adaas* shows the expected nasalisation from a neuter accusative article, but *indaas* does not show the expected lenition of a dative article: he wonders, ‘y a-t-il là aussi combinaison avec *adaas*?’ ‘Is this also a combination with *adaas*?’ It is clear he has neglected to
consider homorganic delenition (Uhlich 2004, 242.) As both $n$ and $d$ are homorganic consonants, they are regularly delenited when they come in contact, which accounts for the lack of lenition of *indaas*, were this explanation to be considered correct. The nasalisation of *indaas* could then be explained by analogy with *oldaas* (Uhlich 2004, 242.)

Lambert perceives the best explanation to be the alternation between the initial elements *a*- and *ind*- being similar to the alternation between the preverbs *ad*- and *ind*-, just as in verbs such as *ad-gnin* or *in-gnin*. This would give forms such as *adaas* and *indaas* a similar origin as our understanding of *oldaas*, and, according to Lambert, sufficiently explains the initial element as a preposition in conjunctive use. This proposal, as explained by Uhlich (2004, 242), does not work, as neither *ad*- nor *ind*- could be used as a preverb before a special relative form, and even so, *ol*- was never a preverb (GOI §825.) Thus, Thurneysen’s explanation of these elements as forms of the article are the most convincing.

As implied by the observation that *indaas* is present in MI (cf. Pokorny 1911,) *indaas* is entirely absent in Wb, which uses *oldaas* exclusively. This is not the case in MI, which heavily prefers *indaas* to *oldaas*, but, there is a conspicuous absence of *indaas* in Sg, which contains no attestations and, like Wb, solely utilises *oldaas*.

While this is a point in favour of a diatopic variation, it does complicate the question of diachrony as it cannot be determined if *indaas* was present prior to or during the time of Wb, or if it developed between Wb and MI: whether the forms were concurrent developments, with *indaas* never forming in certain regions, or if *indaas* was formed subsequent to *oldaas* and only in particular areas, as was suggested by Pokorny, cannot be determined at this stage.

**6.5.3 Usage**

With regards to usage, there has been no true comparison of the function of the two forms. Scholarship up until this point has primarily treated the forms as functionally identical, and while that might be the case, in order to definitively conclude that this is a true diatopic variation, then it needs to be determined if *indaas* was more limited in function; if *indaas* is only applicable in particular contexts then its absence in Wb and Sg could be explained as lacking those contexts, and thus then, the forms cannot be viewed as evidence of diatopic variation.
Looking exclusively at the forms in MI, Lambert (1995, 174) states that the two variants are used in divergent ways, noting three particular categories in which he says MI uses *oldaas* preferentially over *indaas*, suggesting that, in MI at least, it is *oldaas* that is more limited in function than the more prevalent *indaas*. He notes that these environments are not limited to *oldaas*, as they are equally found with *indaas*, which could perhaps indicate some original variation in meaning that had become obscured. Indeed, Lambert briefly suggests that *oldaas* might be closer in meaning to *plutôt que* ‘rather than,’ as opposed to simply *que* ‘than’ which will be discussed further in Section 6.5.3.6 below.

Lambert does not make mention of the fact that *indaas* is absent in both Wb and Sg, as this would have affected his conclusions somewhat, though this is undoubtedly part of the reason why he limited his survey to MI exclusively. Though discussions of the two forms (cf. GOI §779.1) states that *indaas* is present in MI and later sources, it is never explicitly noted that the form does not appear in the earlier Wb or the later Sg; it is not only Lambert who has failed to mention it. It is unclear if this is because of the supposed later formation of *indaas*, and thus its absence in Wb can be attributed to chronological divergence, but its absence from Sg has never been addressed.

As there have been no other suggestions as to the different categories in which *oldaas* or *indaas* might be used, it seems pertinent to examine the proposed categories put forward by Lambert to see both if they hold up when examined in further depth (as he provides only minimal in-depth examples for each particular category,) and equally to see if they can be applied to the forms of *oldaas* found in Wb and Sg: if *oldaas* within Wb and Sg is not as restrictive as those instances of it used in MI, then there is a decent argument for a diatopic variation.

### 6.5.3.1 *oldaas* in MI: Lambert’s Category A

Lambert’s (1995, 174) first category is glossing a Latin adverbial comparative, of which he says there are 10 examples in MI. He provides the references to the ten examples in a footnote, and it is worth examining them all here.

Not all of the examples use *oldaas* in quite the same way. Indeed, while they do follow a Latin adverbial comparative – in most cases – the glosses themselves perform different functions. The most common by far is that of an expansion on the Latin text, adding further context or explanation, of which there are five examples. These first five examples
are rather straightforward, as the Latin does contain an adverbial comparative that is expanded on by the Old Irish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI56b44</th>
<th>....quem uerius miserabilem pro peccato conueniat dici prouidendo</th>
<th>oldaas bes findfadach than that he may be blessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who should more truly be called miserable in order to account for the sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI45c06</td>
<td>et conuertiret magis quam perimeret delinquentes</td>
<td>oldaas itir n dadibed than that he should destroy them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… and more to convert than to destroy offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI59a07</td>
<td>inuidiosius quam inimicus dixisset [i. peccator] et grauius, quia inique ei Saul aduersabatur</td>
<td>.i. is miscsigiu 7 is trumnu aní inchoissig aní asrubbart som .i. peccator .i. oldaas bid iniquus asberad airis indéric uilc taræsi nuilc dognì side non sic peccator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more hatefully than an enemy might have said and more gravely, because Saul was unfairly standing against him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. what is indicated by what he has said, namely, peccator, is more odious and heavier, to wit, than if it were iniquus that he had said, for it is the repayment of evil for evil that he does, non sic peccator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Source</td>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Old Irish Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **MI59c07**  | *quia petendi scius et votorum parcus utilia magis quam speciosa deposcit.*  
   because one who [is] knowledgeable of asking and is sparing of prayers seeks useful things more than beautiful things. | *oldate inna suaccubri i.e. digal fora naimtea*  
   than the desirable things, namely, vengeance on his enemies. |
| **MI137d01** | *quod non minus flagrantia iucundum est quam consecratione reuerendum*  
   Because it is no less than pleasant by [its] heat than to be revered by consecration | *oldaas nermitnigthi feid*  
   than to be honoured. |

There are two further examples that function as straight translations of the Latin into Old Irish, again both following an adverbial comparison. One of the examples appears to translate *quam*, and only *quam*, but is correctly inflected in the plural to concord with the plural subject found in the Latin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Source</th>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>Old Irish Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MI53c07**  | *citius diuites egebunt quam timentes Deum*  
   the rich will be in need (of the psalms) sooner than those who fear God | *oldatae*  
   than (are) |
| **MI111c08** | *ipsa suplicia mansuetudinis nomine eruditoria putius quam ultoria fuisse*  
   than that they are vengeful | *oldaas atan diglaidi*  
   than that they are vengeful |
that these punishments in
the name of gentleness
have been educational
more than for vengeance

The three final examples identified by Lambert (1995, 174 n.15) as following an adverbial comparison actually do not contain an adverb. The first, and the only example he examines in full in his article, contains the form celsius, the nominative singular neuter agreeing with nihil and not the adverb. However, as indicated by the Old Irish indhuaisliu, it was clearly understood by the scribe as having been the adverb despite the inclusion of an adverb being uncommon in Old Irish comparative constructions (cf. Uhlich 2020.) This particular gloss is a fairly straightforward translation of the Latin, as in the examples above, whereas MI92a09 is an expansion of the Latin, but amplius is not adverbal, rather the object of the sentence. Lambert had included MI92a09 in two of his categories, and as it does not fit into this first category, it will be included further below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI48c21</th>
<th>nihil uechimentius multis aquis, nihil celsius cedris Liuani</th>
<th>indhuaisliu oldate cedair leuain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing is more violent than the many waters, nothing is loftier than the cedars of Lebanon</td>
<td>more loftily than the cedars of Lebanon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final example of MI89d06 is presumably an accidental misassignment on his part as it does not contain any comparison in the Latin and nothing that could be interpreted as an adverb. For that reason, this gloss will be discussed further below.

As noted by Lambert, there are examples of indaas following an adverbial comparison as well, this context is not exclusive to oldaas, indicating that within MI there was some level of interchangeability. As some examples of indaas following an adverbial comparison:
| MI67c02   | consanginitatis memor grauius humiliatos gratulatur gentiles [Being] mindful of consanguinity, he rejoices more gravely that the Gentiles have been humiliated | is huilliu anasbersom donaib geintlidib i. atabairt fuchossa i. quando dicit sub pedibus indaas infoammamugud [leg. infoammamugud] asbeirsom dia chomfulidil [leg. chomfulidil] fessin-i. subiecit populus i. cuit foammamigtho tantum ón\(^{106}\) i.e. what he says of the Gentiles, to wit, putting them under foot (i.e. when he says *sub pedibus*), is more than the subjugation that he speaks of concerning his own kinsmen, i.e. *subiecit populos* i.e. that is, as to subjugation only |
| MI83a10  | citius quam sooner than | indaas than |
| MI84a03a | *in terra non minus lata quam leta,* in a land that is not less broad than joyful | *indaas toirthech són* than it is fruitful |

\(^{106}\) Referencing *subiecit populos nobis et gentes sub pedibus nostris* Ps. 46(47): 4 ‘He hath subdued the people under us; and the nations under our feet.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI105b06</th>
<th><em>multo nobís melius est quam pulsos separatosque a te in senium peruenire</em></th>
<th><em>dundórbiarnmi .i. indaas bemmi in doiri coricci sentaid</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is much better for us than to reach old age having been expelled and separated from you</td>
<td>that we should reach it, i.e. than that we should be in captivity till old age.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It certainly seems as though *oldaas* was preferred after an adverbial comparison within MI, especially seeing as *oldaas* has such limited usage in comparison to *indaas*. Lambert (1995, 175) attempts to account for this by stating that the preference for *oldaas* following an Old Irish adverb, particularly an adverb beginning with *ind-*, indicates to him that *indaas* introduced an ambiguity, and that the *ind- of indaas* and said adverb were felt to be the same.

This conclusion is difficult to accept. At the outset, Old Irish adverbial constructions beginning with *in(d)* and followed by the uninflected forms of the comparative or superlative are likely artificial (GOI §382,) occurring only in the three corpora of glosses, only as renderings of Latin adverbs, and never in a clause, but only in isolated glosses. A more natural construction is that of the comparative or superlative adjective followed by a nasalising relative clause, and this is the better attested construction (cf. GOI §383) with all attested examples of these adjectival cleft constructions either showing nasalisation or being able to be understood as containing nasalisation (Uhlich 2020, 207-216.)

Even if it is assumed that Lambert is speaking exclusively of the glosses here (and even, exclusively MI), this argument is still untenable, as there is only one example of *oldaas* following an adverb beginning with *ind-* in MI, the previously mentioned MI48c21, and as illustrated by the examples above, it is the only instance of *oldaas* directly following an adverb in MI, and it is equally the only example of *oldaas* following an adverb across the three corpora of glosses. Lambert provides no further example for this statement beyond MI48c21 and thus this assertion that there is a preference for *oldaas* following an adverb is, at least within the context of the three corpora of glosses, entirely unfounded.

Overall, Lambert is correct in his assessment that *oldaas* is used in more restrictive contexts than *indaas* in MI, though as he does note (1995, 174), *indaas* is not entirely
unknown in the contexts in which *oldaas* is used, and so it would appear that *indaas* was understood as being more widely applicable.

### 6.5.3.2 Category B

Although this category is listed third by Lambert, as the category he lists second contains some inherent difficulties, it was necessary to first address the more straightforward third category, which will be the topic of discussion in this section. This category is one in which the first element of the comparison in Old Irish is not in the nominative in the Latin, thus the glossator had the ability to transpose the first compared element in question into the subject. He provides the example of: *ardu oldate anamit* gl. *in tuto loco atque edito statuit, superiorem fecit hostibus* MI47c20 in which ‘the enemy’ *hostibus* is in the ablative in Latin following the comparative *superiorem*. Of the examples he cites, two are relatively straightforward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI47c20</th>
<th>superiorem fecit hostibus</th>
<th>ardu oldate anamit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he made (me) higher than</td>
<td>higher than his enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the enemies</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI126c09</td>
<td>sublimitas operum tuorum</td>
<td>i. at huaisliu oldate nime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>té cælis adprobat</td>
<td>i.e. You (sg) are higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caelsiorem</td>
<td>than the heavens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the grandeur of your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>works proves that you are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher than the heavens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In MI112b13 the subject has been converted into a relative pronoun. This certainly fits with the spirit of Lambert’s categorisation without being initially quite as obvious as the prior examples above.

| MI112b13  | plus fidei merentur uisa   | 1. is demniu liunn               |
|           | quam audita, unde citius   | anadchiam huasulib              |
|           | oculís quam auribus in      | oldaas anrochluinemmar           |
|           | adsensum ducimus           | huachlusaiib.                    |
They deserve more credibility when seen than when heard whence we are sooner led to approval by the eyes than by the ears or that which we see with the eyes, we deem it more certain than that which we hear with the ears

The other examples cited by Lambert as fitting into Category B are not quite as obvious as the ones above, making the parameters of this category a bit looser. In Mi63c06, Mi92a09 and Mi94d03, there is indeed a Latin comparative, but the Old Irish gloss is expanding on the Latin without including the same comparison. Thus, the first element of the Old Irish comparison is not present in the Latin comparative. It has been supplied by the glossator based on context, but has not been directly transposed from Latin into Old Irish from the section it is glossing, and they therefore do not seem to be entirely applicable to this category. In Mi105b07, there is no comparative in the Latin, and the Old Irish is an expansion with the comparison supplied by the glossator. Although Mi92a09 was given in both this category and the latter by Lambert, as it does not contain an adverbial comparative, it has been included here.

Arguably, these would perhaps fit better into Lambert’s Category C, to be discussed further below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mi63c06</th>
<th>quia magna a patribus de tuis factis audiuius et maiora aut similia praestulamur</th>
<th>because we have heard great things about your deeds from the fathers and we expect greater or similar things</th>
<th>oldate inna foris diarnathraib than the foundations of our fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi92a09</td>
<td>neque habeo amplius neque peto non solum</td>
<td>.i. ní fail ní bed huiliu oldaas attrab ladia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### super terram uerum neque in caelo, excepto hoc nisi ut tecum semper sim

I neither have more nor do I seek (more), not only on earth but in heaven, I do without this unless in order that I am always with you.

---

### rerum gestarum testimonio ut potentam me ac superiorem omnes aspiciant

by/with testimony of the things that were done so that all might regard me [as being] strong and superior.

---

### uilitati habitationum [leg. habitationum] terræ meæ postponenda sunt bababiloniorum [leg: Babiloniorum] ambitiosa et culta domicilia

The showy and elegant homes of the Babylonians are to be rated as inferior to the lowliness of the habitations of my land.

---

### i.e. not anything which would be greater than dwelling with God

---

### i. oldate assair

Than the Assyrians

---

### i. isferr liumsa buith inneuch asdoiscairem hi tir israhel oldaas buith inneuch ditechdaisib sainemlaib 7 sommaib innabellondae [leg. Babellondae]

i.e. I would rather be in the meanest place in the land of Israel than in any of the splendid and wealthy houses of the Babylonians.

---
As with the prior category there are examples of *indaas* used in a similar way, as example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI17c07</th>
<th>atque audent cui datum sit imperium et per hoc minorem unigenitum filium a parte deitatis [MS dietatis] accipere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And dare to regard the only-begotten Son as inferior in respect of divinity because authority was given to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. huare is athir [leg. hoathir] arroét macc cumachtæ i. ised berat [leg. asberat] ind heritic aslaigu deacht maicc <em>indaas</em> deacht athar airis ho athir arroét macc cumachtæ is laigu di diu intf arafoim- <em>indaas</em> intf honoroimer- 7 is [leg. is laigu] intf danaigther <em>indaas</em> intf naddanaigedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. because it is from the Father that the Son has received power, i.e. it is this that the heretics say, that the divinity of the Son is less than the divinity of the Father, for it is from the Father that the Son has received power: therefore he who receives is less than he from whom it is received, and he who is endowed (is less) than he who endows it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI119d08</th>
<th><em>intra meritum nostrum stetit ipsa quoque punitio</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. lugu inpianad <em>indaas asindroillissemni</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also our punishment itself stood below our merit i.e. the punishment is less than we have deserved.

**MI123c10**

*ad maioris redemptionis laudem non solum liberatos eos adserit sed ditatos*

For the praise of greater redemption, he declares them not only freed but also enriched

*i. ataidchrec co sommataid 7 setaib leu is huilliu són didiu indaas bid censomataid leu doaithchretis*

i.e. their redemption with wealth and treasures with them, that then is more than if it were without wealth with them that they had been redeemed.

**MI135a13**

*non minus quippe somno quam modica sesione laborantium recreatur uirtus*

No less, indeed, by sleep than by working people being seated, is strength restored.

*ní lugu immefolngi sonartai do neuch incotlud indaas bid suide garait nosessed etarlam-*

Not less does sleep produce strength to a man than though he were to sit for a short time (lit: though it were a short sitting he should sit, on occasion (??))

### 6.5.3.3 Category C

Lambert’s final proposed category is rather opaque: he states that, in this category, the two terms compared are ‘dissymétriques,’ but does not explain what this practically

---

107 The digital edition (Griffith and Stifter 2013) ignores *etarlam* in their translation: ‘it is not less that sleep produces strength to anyone than if it were (lit. though it were) a short sitting that he would sit.’
means, and he provides only two examples, leaving the understanding of this ‘category’ up for interpretation as the two examples are not noticeably similar.

He cites Ml111c08, which he had previously included in his first category: *oldaas atan diglaidi* Ml111c08 ‘than that they are vengeful’ gl. *postremo ipsa suplicia mansuetudinis nomine eruditoria putius quam ultoria* ‘that these punishments in the name of gentleness have been educational more than for vengeance.’ The Old Irish gloss is a fairly straightforward translation of the Latin and thus the asymmetry here is not entirely clear. It is possible that the fact that the ‘punishments’ are not directly involved in the comparison in the Latin while clearly being understood as the subject to be compared in the Old Irish, as evidenced by the plural copula and plural *diglaidi* (although this is the same as the plural *ultoria* in the Latin) following the singular *oldaas*, is what Lambert regarded as dissymétriques. If this is indeed the asymmetry to which Lambert was referring, then it does not have a direct comparison with the second example provided.

His second example does not elucidate further as he cites Ml ‘112c20’ which is presumably a mistake as the glosses marked 112c- conclude at Ml112c12. There are two potential candidates for the intended gloss. The first is Ml112c02, if the mistake here is an accidental insertion of the ‘0,’ as this does indeed contain an *oldaas*, albeit, without a Latin comparative: *oltai són* ‘that is, than you are’ Ml112c02 gl. *talibus praesidiis periculosa quaeque et fortia dispicies* ‘by such protection measures, you will recognise certain dangerous and strong things.’

In this case, the asymmetry is not the same as in the above example. Potentially, the asymmetry here refers to the fact that the ‘you’ of the Old Irish is supplied by the glossator and is not present in the Latin itself. In the same general sense, in that one of the elements compared in the Old Irish is not being directly compared in the Latin, but implied, these two glosses are similar, but if that is indeed the intended asymmetry, then the distinction between categories is significantly blurred as other examples from his former categories also might fit, such as the previously discussed Ml94d03, when a comparison to the Assyrians is supplied by the glossator but is not present in the Latin itself.

Perhaps the more likely candidate is that of Ml112b20, assuming ‘c’ has been written in place of ‘b,’ as the asymmetry could stem from the fact that it contains a
comparatio compendiaria, ‘their substance is nobler…than men’ as opposed to ‘their substance is nobler than [the substance] of men.’

| MI112b20 | superioris naturae adhibetur custodia, que facile possit aduersa a té omnia submouere |
| Protection of a higher nature is employed, so that it may be able easily to ward off all adversities from you |
| .i. aingil dae bete occomet indfir firioin 7 is huaisliu a folud saidi 7 is toisigiu atuistiui oldatae indoini 7 is ari cotnoat som arnach risat fochaidi demuin oidcloitis as ind noibi imbí |
| i.e. [it is] the angels of God who will be engaged in guarding the righteous man, and their substance is nobler, and their creation is prior to men, and therefore they (the angels) guard him: so that the trials of the Devil may not reach him, so that they (the trials) might drive him from the sanctity in which he is |

This is the clearest ‘asymmetry’ of the three options, but is not quite the same as the ‘asymmetry’ present in MI111c08, which is the only of the two examples that is not in question. As consequence, it is not entirely clear what the distinction of Category C is, especially as Lambert provided only two examples – one of which has to be inferred on account of the misprint – and they are not obviously similar. Indeed, the overlap with the second discussed category of transposed nominative and the fact that one of his only two examples (MI111c08) also contains an adverbial comparison calls into question the necessity of this third possible category.

Due to the ambiguity, it is somewhat difficult to find examples of indaas which are obviously applicable. There are no good examples of indaas in the particular context
of the first example (in which the subject being compared is not present in the actual comparison but nevertheless present in the Latin) but there are however numerous examples of *indaas* in which the comparison has been supplied by the glossator in the style of M111c08, far more than those provided of *oldaas*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ml26b06</th>
<th>ostendit quod sermo illi sit de praestantiore persona quam est nostra mensura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He brings out that his remarks refer to a person more illustrious than we can estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. indaas artomusnai .i. intomus inchumachtaí fil linni· is laigiuson indaas chumachtaí doinachtæ crist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. than our measure, i.e. the measure of the power that we have; it is less than (the measure) of the power of the humanity of Christ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ml34a05</th>
<th>et accipiam uos in terram meam, terram quæ est sicut uestra terra [in terram] frumenti et uini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and take you to my country, a country like your own, a country of fruit and wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. ni mesa indas talam fortiresi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. it is not worse than the ground of your land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ml64c22</th>
<th>pro obtima adnuntiatione cæterís profetalibus uerbum posuit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the best announcement he has put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. erechdu indaas cechterchital dunairc[h]echainnsom fesin 7 indaas dunarchechainn nach fáith aile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the word for (the) other prophetic statements

i.e. superior to every prophecy that he had prophesied himself, and to what any other prophet had prophesied.

**Ml83a06**

*qua uí sermonis fortior impetus post requiem indicator*

By which force, the stronger thrust of the speech after a respite is indicated

*indaas cech teduar*

than any force

Overall, Lambert’s categories are excessive. Especially with regards to Category C, described as asymmetrical comparisons, and the one in which the nominative has been transposed, there appears to be significant overlap, with some of his examples of the latter appearing to fit better with the former.

The only truly tenable category is that of Category A, the first discussed, in which *oldaas* is supplied after a Latin adverbial comparative. In those instances, Ml does appear to have particular contexts to which *oldaas* is limited, but which are not exclusive to *oldaas*. This can potentially be attributed to the possibility of *oldaas* having the meaning ‘rather than’ as opposed to simply ‘than,’ which will be discussed further in Section 6.5.3.6.

### 6.5.3.4 Uncategorised *oldaas*

There are three occurrences of *oldaas* that are not acknowledged by Lambert or included in any of his three categories. Two of these are Ml112c02 and Ml112b20, which were discussed above as potential candidates for the intended second example of the Category C. Although the latter is the better potential candidate, it is still technically neglected by Lambert.

The only undiscussed *oldaas* in Ml is found in Ml131a06, and, unfortunately, it does not neatly fit into any of the three categories without an adverbial comparison or a
transposed nominative, and the unclear definition of ‘asymmetry;’ although the comparison of the Old Irish is not explicitly present in the Latin, it is certainly implied, as there is little functional difference between ‘exceeding’ and ‘greater than,’ thus it is unlike M111c08; all of the elements of the Old Irish are present in the Latin and therefore have not been supplied by the glossator as in M111c02; and there is no sense of a *comparatio compendiaria* as in M112b20:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M1131a06</strong></th>
<th><em>in diffensionem nostri indulgentissima mirabilium adtestatio signorum, quae merita exceedens nostra misericordiam respicit vindicantis</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A most gracious testimony to our defence of wondrous signs, which, in exceeding our virtues, refers to the compassion of the avenging one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>asingaib .i. is huilliu introcaire oldatae ar nairilltinni-</em> which exceeds, i.e. the mercy is greater than our deserts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for their exclusion from Lambert’s discussion is unclear, particularly considering the limited number of occurrences of *oldaas* to begin with. Perhaps he did not feel they fit into his categories, and this is why they were not thus sorted.

There is also the gloss M189d06, which was mentioned briefly above. Lambert had included this gloss in Category A, which he identifies as containing adverbial comparisons, despite the Latin not containing a comparison or anything that could have been misunderstood by the glossator as being an adverbial comparison. This gloss is, instead of a commentary on the Latin text, a comment on the Latin language, and does not quite fit into any of Lambert’s three categories (with the caveat that perhaps there is intended asymmetry here that is not currently understood.)
| **Ml89d06** | *consuetudo profetę est emfasses addictorum suorum pondus commendationemque commouere*  
the custom of the prophet is to move the emphases, the importance and praise of his devotees | *i. is ed as doig liun is indisiu bid exaggeranter duintad anemfases asbeir som i. dubeir som dudumugud aaisndísen as nuilliu oldaas ani adfet som amal dundadbat som sis on*  
i.e. it is this that we deem probable here: that it would be *exaggerenter* that would render the emphasis that he uses, i.e. to exaggerate his declaration he puts what is more than the thing that he speaks of, as he shows it below. |

This particular type of gloss, in which the Old Irish comments directly on the language of the Latin glosses, is far more common in Wb, which exclusively uses *oldaas*. There are only three examples of this type of gloss that utilise *oldaas* or *indaas* in Ml, one of which is Ml89d06 and then two examples using *indaas*:  

| **Ml47a14** | **ODIO HABUI CONGREGATIONEM MALIGNORUM**  
I have hated the congregation of the wicked | **debe tintuda les inso-frisaní as odiui eclesiam malignantium 7 atá imthuus an [leg. and] dano airis toisechu- anisiu indaas andabeirsom [leg. andu-] arthuus i. cum impiis rl.** |
he has here a difference of
rendering from *odiui ecclesiam malignantium*,
and there is moreover an
inversion in it, for this is
prior to that which he puts
first, to wit, *cum impiis*
etc.

| ML54a11 | **respexit euentum rerum, quo iusti plerumque, immo frequenter arguntur**  
He considered the outcome of things by which the just are mostly, or rather frequently, confirmed. | **.i. an as nessa lium do inni frequenter indas plerumque**  
i.e. what I deem nearer to the sense, *frequenter* than *plerumque* |

### 6.5.3.5 Usage in both Wb & Sg

Discussions of *oldaas* and *indaas* tend to focus on Wb and Ml, as well as later texts, while neglecting to mention Sg. As with Wb, *indaas* does not occur within Sg; both exclusively use *oldaas* and its conjugated forms. Although Ml shows significantly more usage of the two forms combined, the 12 occurrences in Sg and the 24 in Wb are not insignificant, especially considering both sets of glosses are less extensive overall than Ml.

If *indaas* is indeed a younger form (cf. Pokorny 1911, 36) then it would be expected to be found within Sg, especially considering the marked preference for *indaas* within Ml. The occurrences of *oldaas* are to be expected, as Strachan (1903, 470) has noted that Sg is ‘heterogeneous’ and thus contains older elements that may have seemed outdated to the scribe, but the exclusive usage of *oldaas* is interesting as the complete lack of *indaas* indicates that this was not a straightforward shift in preference from *oldaas* to a preferred *indaas*.

Of course, there may still be an element of diachrony between Wb and Ml, if *indaas* had developed between the creation of the two, but its absence in Sg strongly implies that
there was either a distinct usage for *oldaas* and *indaas* respectively, and there was no need for the latter in either Wb or Sg, or that this was a diatopic variation. The emergence of *indaas*, however, is difficult to trace as this is not a straightforward phonological change: *indaas* clearly did not develop from *oldaas* and thus whether it was in existence at the time of Wb but restricted to a particular geographic region is unknown.

There is, of course, the possibility that if *oldaas* is used exclusively in the same ways within Wb and Sg as in MI then it could be suggested that *oldaas* had a different meaning, or was understood as functioning in specific semantic contexts, and therefore the lack of *indaas* within Wb and Sg would be due to a lack of appropriate context, and not a lack of usage.

At least with regards to the categories put forward by Lambert, this does not appear to be the case. To begin with, there are no perfect examples in either Wb or Sg of *oldaas* in glossing a Latin adverbial comparative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb9c21</th>
<th><em>quare non magis iniuriam accipistis? quare non magis frudem patiemini?</em></th>
<th><em>baferrr oldaas adígal</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?</td>
<td>it were better than to avenge it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb21d09</th>
<th><em>Ei autem qui potens est omnia facere superabundanter quam petimus aut intellegimus</em></th>
<th><em>ismóa dongnísom oldaas dontlucham</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now unto him who is able to do exceedingly more than all that we ask or think</td>
<td>He does it more than we ask it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is Wb9c21 in which, while it does contain a comparative adverb, there is no explicit comparison in Latin, and the Old Irish gloss is glossing the entire phrase but can
nevertheless be understood as fitting into this category. The second example of Wb21d09 is again, not an ideal example as *superabundanter*, while indeed an adverb, is not a morphological comparative although functioning as one, and the sentence is not strictly a formal comparison in the Latin here either. Outside of these two examples, there are only three further Old Irish glosses in Wb which gloss a Latin comparative at all, placing it firmly in a context in which *indaas* is used in MI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb13b02</th>
<th><em>Deinde uisus est plus quam quincentis fratribus [simul], ex quibus multimanent usque adhuc.</em></th>
<th><em>Oillu oldate cóiccet fer dodennigud tra resurrectionis</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thereafter He appeared to more than five hundred brothers at once, the greater part of whom remain until now.</td>
<td>more than five hundred men; for certifying <em>resurrectionis</em> then</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb23c15</th>
<th><em>sed in humilitate superiores sibi inuicem arbitrantes</em></th>
<th><em>bad uaísliu cách tialaile oldaas fessin</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but in lowliness of mind let each esteem the other better than themselves.</td>
<td>let each esteem another better than himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb32b05</th>
<th><em>Tanto melior angelis effectus</em></th>
<th><em>oldate ind angil dorimthirthetar</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being made so much better than the angels</td>
<td>than are the angels who have ministered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sg has only one example that neatly fits into one of the categories laid out by Lambert, Category B in which the first compared subject is not nominative in the Latin: *móa oldaas óensil/lab ‘more than one syllable’ Sg68b08 gl. in ex supra sillabam i antecedente in paenultima syllaba feminina sunt ‘[words ending] in -ex beyond [one] syllable with i preceding in the penultimate syllable are feminine.’
Wb has two examples that also fit into this category, and in which the Old Irish gloss introduces the comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb12b35</th>
<th>et si tradidero corpus meum ut ardeam, caritatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest</th>
<th>isferr deseercc oldate uili better is charity than all things are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb18d14</th>
<th>Deus personam hominis non accipit</th>
<th>niairegdu apersansom oldaas persan nanabstal olchene cetothóisegu iniriss quia deus personam rl. .i. quis deus personam non prauidet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God accepteth no man’s person</td>
<td>not more eminent are their persons than the persons of the rest of the apostles though they are prior in faith, quia etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one other example that perhaps can be understood as fitting Category B: *ba uissiu fálte domsa úaibsi oldaas brón* ‘joy from you to me were more fitting than grief’ Wb14d10 gl. *ut non ... tristitiam super tristitiam habeam, de quibus oportuerat me gaudere; confidens in omnibus uobís, quia gaudium meum omnium uestrum est*, ‘I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all.’
In this gloss, the first item being compared in the Old Irish is *fáilte* ‘joy,’ which has no noun counterpart in the Latin. Instead, it renders the Latin *gaudere*. Technically, this would fit into this category in that the first item compared in the Old Irish is not nominative, but it is also not a noun, though the noun *gaudium* does appear later. Here again, the comparison is only extrapolated by the Old Irish glossator.

As discussed above, the third of Lambert’s suggested categories, Category C, is rather broad, and thus it is difficult to identify with certainty which glosses in Wb and Sg should be considered apart of said category, as the exact understanding of asymmetry is unknown.

With regards to Sg, 5 of the 23 total occurrences of *oldaas* are the entirety of the gloss and translating *quam* without there appearing to be any other context or function. This usage, of simply glossing *quam*, could be seen as evidence of Thurneysen’s argument that *indaas* eventually became simply a particle meaning ‘than,’ which also occurred to *oldaas* as well, though as discussed above the potential for the meaning of ‘than it is’ still seems plausible in most cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg9b07</th>
<th><em>non aliter quam si antecedens uocalibus auferatur</em></th>
<th><em>oldaas</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No different than if when preceding vowels it is removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg16a10</td>
<td><em>quantum expeditior est ψ quam ps</em></td>
<td><em>oldaas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as much as ψ is easier/handier than ps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg21a02</td>
<td><em>non plus quam ad sex literas procedere syllaba potest in Latino sermone, ut: a, ab, arx, mars, stans, stirps.</em></td>
<td><em>oldaas</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No more than six letters can appear in a syllable in Latin speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg40a05</th>
<th>Quamuis Graeci honoris causa suae gentis quam ratione veritatis dicunt non posse ad multos sui generis fieri comparationem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even though the Greeks speak for the pride of their people, rather than for discernment of truth, they could not compare themselves to many of their kind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Sg16a10 above and Sg16a05 actually gloss the same phrase in the Latin *quam ps*, but Sg16a05 contains the Greek characters πς, rather than ψ at 16a10, a straight transliteration of the Latin: *oldaas πς*: ‘than ps’ Sg16a05.

This use of glossing *quam* without any further exposition in the Old Irish gloss is done in Ml as well as in Sg, albeit more commonly with *indaas* and not as frequently. There is a single instance of *oldatae* Ml53c07, which also shows the correct agreement. There are no examples of *oldaas* in isolation in Wb, this practice of *oldaas or indaas* exclusively glossing *quam* would then appear to be a later practice than the time of Wb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ml23c22</th>
<th>amplioris enim uirtutis testimonium est iniuste in sé agentem alterum sustinere patienter quam ipsum non agere alicud inique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Indaas</em> -------- Than --------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

252
For it is a testimony to greater virtue to tolerate someone else who acts unjustly against oneself than not to do something unfairly oneself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML60b03</th>
<th>Nihil tam insanum est quam ut animati uenerentur inanimata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing is as insane as that animate people should venerate inanimate things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML60b09</th>
<th>Plura sunt quae contulisti quam ut narrari queant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are more things that you have brought together than could be recounted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML83a10</th>
<th>citius quam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sooner than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining attestations from Sg are either direct translations or further expansions of the Latin text. Although the comparison is not always in the Latin, and thus is supplied by the glossator, the usage in Sg is analogous with the usage of oldaas in Wb, and therefore more similar to the usage of indaas in Ml.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg6b07</th>
<th>quod si ideo alia litera est existimanda quam c, debet g quoque, cum similiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>than c: different to c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108 This particular example is not only an isolated, seeming direct translation of quam, but also a misunderstanding: this is not glossing quam ‘than’ but rather tam…quam ‘so…as.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>praeponitur ( u ) ( \ldots ), alia putari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because if therefore ( q ) is to be considered a different letter than ( c, g ) also has to be believed to be different, since it is similarly put before ( u ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg19a03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aufertur ei, id est oe diphtongo, altera uocalis sequente e longa... necnon pro ( \omega i ) diphtongo Graeca nos hanc, id est oe, ponimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From it, ie. the diphthong ( oe ), the second vowel is removed if a long ( e ) follows...as well as that we put this ie. ( oe ), for the Greek diphthong ( \omega i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg30b12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omnes enim ab illo, qui primus Cornelius et qui Marcellus nominatus est, hoc nomen habuerunt, quicumque eiusdem familiae sunt sicut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For all who are of the same family have had their name from him who was first named Cornelius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| .i. oldaas aindlach 7 int v amal greic 7 ahairitiu ar dib consonaib |
| i.e. than its diaeresis, and the \( u \) as Greek and its assumption for two consonants |

| .i. maicc 7 háui reliqua .i. is follus issin maginsin tète aitherrechtaigthe Ní as hire oldáta maicc 7 aui reliqua |
| i.e. sons and grandsons etc.: it is clear in this place that a patronymic goes further than sons and grandsons etc. |
and who was first named Marcellus

| **Sg42a09** | *tristior atque oculos lacrimis suffusa nitentes*, ‘tristior’ enim hic ‘ex parte’ significat ‘tristis.’

‘Rather sad as well as the shining eyes full of tears’, for ‘tristior’ [sadder] here means ‘ex parte’ [to a degree] ‘tristis’ [sad] | *is and is follus as laigiu oldaas posit quando dicit oculos nitentes*,

in this it is clear that (the comparative *tristior*) is less than the positive, *quando* etc.

| **Sg45a15** | ‘Thais quam ego sum maiuscula est’, id est ‘paruo maior quam ego’

Thais is larger than I am, that is a little bigger than I | *inbec máo .i. isbec asmao oldáusa .i. is bec inderscugud*

a little greater i.e. she is a little greater than I, i.e. the distinction is small

In terms of Category C, there are three examples in Wb that could potentially fit, as the comparison is supplied by the glossator and not included in the Latin, as in MI111c08. In all of them, the glossator is directly using the comparison to expand on the idea presented in the Latin gloss, as has been seen already above.

| **Wb11b17a** | *Án aemulamur Dominum? Numquid foriores illo sumus? Omnia [mihi] licent, sed non omnia expediunt.*

Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we | *nitattorbi fritoil dée is diliu lemm didiu aní astorbae oldaas aní as dílmain*

they are not profitable against God's will: dearer to me, then, is that which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>really stronger than he? All things are lawful [for me], but all are not profitable</th>
<th>is profitable than that which is lawful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wb16c09</strong></td>
<td><em>Sed sicut in omnibus abundatis fide, et sermone, et scientia, et omni sollicitudine, insuper et caritate vestra in nos, ut et in hac gratia abundetis.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore, as ye abound in every thing, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wb33d09</strong></td>
<td><em>Abrachae namque promittens Deus, quoniam neminem habuit, per quem iuraret, maiorem, iuravit per semet ipsum.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>condibferr donberaidsi oldaas cách</strong></td>
<td>that you may give it better than anyone (else)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These certainly appear to fit the constraints of Lambert’s category, as best as it can be understood. However, thus far only roughly half of the total examples in Wb have been examined, and even then, not all of them fit neatly into the categories into which *oldaas* tends to fall in Ml. Indeed, within Sg and Wb, but Wb especially, the function of
oldaas is far more similar to the function of indaas within MI: MI has a particular usage for oldaas while using indaas more generally, for all functions, which is how oldaas is utilised within both Wb & Sg.

The remaining glosses containing oldaas in Wb can be categorised into three different functions. The first is an expansion on the Latin idea, but in a way that is not always directly related to the content of the gloss: eg. in Wb12a21 the Latin states that the foot does not believe itself to be a part of the body as it is not a hand, and in Wb12a25 the ear expresses the same concern but by comparing itself to the eye. In both, the Old Irish gloss expresses jealousy on behalf of the respective body parts for not being as beautiful, nor as functional as the ones with which they are comparing themselves, a sentiment that is not present in the Latin. These glosses, and the ones thus categorised with them, are different from those above in that they do not directly add to or explain the Latin that they are glossing. They instead introduce a new idea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb1d21</th>
<th>Et iudicabit té, quod ex natura est praeputium legem consummans te qui per litteram et circumcisionem praevicator legis es</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb9c10</td>
<td>Nescitis quoniam angelos iudicabimus?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb1d21</th>
<th>And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wb1d21</td>
<td>ditéscíbea a iudidi .i. bid ferr oldái</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb9c10</td>
<td>.i. fóibhth ba deibiriu dúní immormus assínfolud apprísecc inna colno araróitmar ceitimroimsimmis ol nóboí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because it were more reasonable for us to sin out of the brittle substance of the flesh which we have received, if we should sin, than it was for him (to sin) out of the subtle substance which he has received…

| Wb12a21 | Et si dixerit pes: quoniam non sum manus, non sum de corpore, num ideo non est de corpore | *issochrudiu láam oldósa olcoss nidichorp atóosa hóre nimthalaám*  
If the foot shall say,  
Because I am not the hand,  
I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?  
i.e. ‘Hand is comelier than I,’ says Foot. ‘I am not of the body because I am not Hand.’ |
| Wb12a25 | Et si dixerit auris: quia non sum oculus, non sum de corpore, num ideo non est de corpore?  
And if the ear shall say,  
Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?  
i.e. the field which the eye has taken in is more delightful than mine [lit. ‘I am’] |
| Wb12b02 | *Et quae putamus ignobiliara membra [esse] corporis, hiis honorem habundantiorem*  
andíten issairiu doib fognam donaballaib ailib doib oldaas cidafo gnam féisne cianubed leu |
| | circumdamus, et quae inhonesta sunt | of protecting them: it is nobler for them to serve the other members than even to serve themselves, though it should be in their power |
| | habundantiorem honestatem habent. |  |
| And those members of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. |  |

| Wb12d07 | Síc et uos [quoniam aemulatores estis spiritu ad aedificationem ecclesiae quae rite ut abundetis]¹⁰⁹ | hóre isamne atáa tra .i. is ferr precept oldaas labrad ilbéelre bad hed dogneithsi |
| | Even so ye, [forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church.] | since then it is thus, i.e. better is preaching than speaking many languages, be it this that you do |

| Wb20b09 | Utinam abscidantur qui uos conturbant | doduthris .i. baassu limm oldaas fornimdibesi |
| | I would they were even cut off which trouble you. | I should wish, that is, I should think it a lighter thing than that you should be circumcised |

¹⁰⁹ The section in brackets is not present in the Thes. edition but has been supplied from the Vulgate (1 Corinthians 14:12) for additional context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb22a16</th>
<th>[ut iam non] simus paruuli fluctuantes, et circumferam omni uento doctrinae...in astutia ad circumuentionem erroris.</th>
<th>is amre leu cách icomrorcuin ut dicant niansu dúnni oldaas dochách.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine… and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.</td>
<td>they marvel that everyone (should be) in error ut dicant ‘not harder to us than to others’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb26d26 (^{110})</th>
<th>Hoc autem dico ut nemo uos decipiat in subtilitatesermonum.</th>
<th>.i. filosphi .i. arnipacigcucu felsub olambiedsi sí in christo estis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.</td>
<td>for no philosopher will be more subtle than ye will be si etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, depending on the limitations of Lambert’s categories, the above examples could equally be understood as having been in Category C. That said, this usage of oldaas is more akin to the way that indaas is used: within Ml indaas regularly expands on the Latin by introducing a new concept (see below but also cf. Ml23c20, Ml42b18, Ml67c02, Ml85b11, Ml85c14.)

---

\(^{110}\) Wb26d26 is one of only two examples found in the glosses where the second element of the form is not -daas or -date, it is instead a future second plural, and the other example from Wb9c10 above, ol ìmbóí, is a preterite third singular. In Wb26d26 the nasalisation of the b is clearly marked by the m, while in Wb9c10 the m is marked by a punctum delens, and it is unclear why one would be apparently acceptable while the other is not, and thus the conclusion by Feuth (1982) that the punctum delens served as a marker of nasalisation might find support here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML22c14</th>
<th>in tantum graviora uerbera ferre non posum ut sim miserationi magis pro ipsa mei adtenuatione ucinior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Such is my inability to bear more severe scourging that I am closer to suffering by my very infirmity.</td>
<td>.i. airimmou [leg. airismou] ruicim les mairchissechtae indaas digal dothabair [leg. dothabairt] form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e. for it is more that I need compassion than to have punishment inflicted on me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML24d23</th>
<th>notandum est sane illud contra hereticos qui quidem ita ut nos [.i. recipimus] tam uetus quam nouum testamentum recipiunt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That should certainly be noted in opposition to the heretics – who, like us, in fact accept both Old and New Testament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.i. asberatsom aslaigu deacht maicc indaas deacht athar· olsodin as eres doib·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e. they say that the divinity of the Son is less than the divinity of the Father, which, however, is a heresy of theirs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML39a06</th>
<th>elegens cum metu periculis uiuire quam mercari peccato securitatem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preferring to live in fear [and] dangers than to purchase safety with sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indas nocundraiged [leg: nocundradaiged].i. ɔdenad figail [leg. fingail] archuinged soinmige do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than that he should traffic, i.e. that he should slay a relative through his seeking prosperity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the glosses that expand on the Latin, there are also glosses that are used to explain the Latin commentary, to add further context, or indeed to comment, on the choice of language, and these can be considered as comprising the second category of function within Wb. Wb4b17 and Wb4b25 comment on the meaning on the Latin while Wb9d13 and Wb32b05 add context to the Latin to explain the intention of the gloss.
Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb4b25</th>
<th>neque Angelus, neque Principatus</th>
<th>angrád asisliu oldate angil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neither Angel, neither nor sovereignty</td>
<td>the rank that is lower than angels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb9d13</th>
<th>portate Dominum in corpore uestro</th>
<th>ba uissiu dúib oldáte pecthe dobuid and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry God in your body</td>
<td>it were more proper for you than for sins to be therein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb32a25</th>
<th>Confidens de obédientia tua scripsi tibi, sciens quoniam et super id quod dico facies.</th>
<th>bid mó dongenaesiu oldaas rofoided cucut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having confidence in thy obedience I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say.</td>
<td>thou wilt do it more than has been sent to thee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As above, perhaps Category C could suit here, but the examples above are far more analogous with *indaas* than with the examples of *oldaas* in MI. The previously discussed MI17c07 provided additional context to the Latin it is glossing. MI43d18 does the same
but also comments on the use of the verb *proficisti* in the Latin, just as MI47a14 and MI54a11, already discussed above, comment on the language used in their accompanying Latin, whether it be main text or commentary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MI43d18</th>
<th><em>proficisti dona muneribus quia non solum difensus est sed etiam uindicatus est</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You have advanced gifts with favours, because he was not only defended but also rescued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>l. pro .i. taræsi· uicisti .i. rocloissiu .i. it uilliu innammaini [leg. innammaini] dorataissiu damsas· in datae indánai innanguide rongadsa daitsu adê</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or <em>pro</em>, i.e. <em>for, uicisti, i.e.</em> You (sg) have overcome, i.e. greater are the treasures You (sg) have given to me than are the gifts of the prayers which I have prayed to You (sg), O God.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to asymmetrical comparisons there is potential for them here, but Lambert’s intention remains unclear, especially in the face of so few examples.

As set out by Lambert, his suggestions of types of usage for *oldaas* in MI are not unknown with *indaas*, which is not necessarily a problem, as we can assume that, within MI, *oldaas* may have had a distinct semantic meaning, denoting something specific.

It would appear, however, that this distinction was not present in Wb and Sg. While there was always the possibility that the contexts in which *indaas* was used were not present in either Wb or Sg, thus resulting in the absence of the form in the respective manuscripts, that does not appear to be the case. Though there are only a few attestations collected from Sg, there, as well as in Wb, *oldaas* is used in contexts not open to *oldaas* in MI, in addition to the contexts in which *oldaas* is found there.
The conclusion, then, must be that while in the variety of Old Irish present in MI, there existed certain contexts in which *oldaas* was the preferred form, and that *indaas* had developed to take over general usage, or perhaps that *indaas* had gradually begun to spread and *oldaas* was relegated or fossilised into particular usage.

### 6.5.3.6 *Plutôt que ‘rather than’*

With regards to particular usage, it is only briefly that Lambert (1995, 174) suggests that *oldaas* might be closer to the sense of ‘plutôt que’ which would correspond to English ‘rather than,’ with a meaning similar to that of ‘as opposed to’ or perhaps ‘instead of.’ This is an interesting proposition and one that certainly merits further exploration: if ‘rather than’ really does appear to be a more correct rendering of *oldaas* then that could perhaps explain the existence of *indaas* in MI, used more preferentially in a wider context. Likewise, if ‘rather than’ better suits the context of all of the examples in Wb and Sg, then that could potentially explain the absence of *indaas*. Of course, at the outset, the latter statement seems implausible: what are the chances that a comparative better translated as ‘rather than’ be exclusively used in an entire corpus? Surely, as a more specific variety of comparative, it would be less common, not the only type used.

Indeed, ‘plutôt que’ does not appear to be the primary way in which Sg uses *oldaas*. There are only two examples that lends themselves to being translated as ‘rather than:’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg6b07</th>
<th><em>oldaas .c. sain fri .c.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>rather than</strong> <em>c</em>, different to <em>c</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg19a03</th>
<th><em>i. oldaas aindlach 7 int v amal greic 7 ahairitiu ar dib consonaib</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>i.e. rather than</strong> its diaeresis, and the <em>u</em> as Greek and its assumption for two consonants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other glosses, such as *móa oldaas òensìllab* Sg68b08 ‘more than one syllable’ very clearly could not be understood as ‘rather than.’ For the most part, Sg appears to more commonly gloss *quam* meaning simply ‘than,’ in the way stated by Thurneysen (GOI §779n) that *indaas* eventually came to be used.
Wb has four examples that lend themselves to a translation of ‘rather than/instead of/as opposed to’ with the remaining attestations appearing to be better understood as simply ‘than’ eg. *isáildu ammág rogab súil oldósá* Wb12a25 ‘the field which the eye has taken in is more delightful than mine’ would not make sense to have ‘rather than’ in this context. Hence, within Sg as well as Wb, the suggestion that *oldaas* be perhaps closer to the sense of ‘rather than’ is not entirely agreeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb9c21</th>
<th><em>baferr oldaas adígal</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it were better <strong>rather</strong> than to avenge it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb9d13</th>
<th><em>ba uissiu dúib oldáte pecthe dobuid and</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it were more proper for you <strong>rather</strong> than for sins to be there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb11b17a</th>
<th><em>nitattorbi frtoil déé is diliu lemm didiu aní astorbae oldaas aní as dílmain</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they are not profitable against God's will: dearer to me, then, is that which is profitable <strong>rather</strong> than that which is lawful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb12b02</th>
<th><em>andíten issairiu doib fognam donaballaib ailib doib oldaas cidafoígnam féísne cianubed leu</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of protecting them: it is nobler for them to serve the other members <strong>rather</strong> than to serve themselves though it should be in their power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

111 Although in some cases the translations of ‘instead of’ or ‘as opposed to’ are preferable in the English (cf. Ml105b07 ‘I would rather be in the meanest place in the land of Israel as opposed to in any of the splendid and wealthy houses of the Babylonians’) for the purposes of the above and forgoing tables, I have opted to stick with ‘rather than’ as it causes the least interference with the original translation of the glosses as found in *Thes*, and is arguably therefore more illustrative.
ML has the most examples of *oldaas* used in a context that can be better understood as ‘rather than.’ While only 4 of Wb’s total 24 examples suit the more specific translation, 8 of ML’s 19 total examples certainly suit, meaning while roughly 16% of *oldaas* in Wb could be understood as ‘rather than,’ 42% of *oldaas* in ML is closer to *plutôt que*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML45c06</td>
<td><em>oldaas itir ndadibed</em></td>
<td><em>rather</em> than that he should destroy them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML56b44</td>
<td><em>oldaas bes find fa dach</em></td>
<td><em>rather</em> than that he may be blessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML59a07</td>
<td><em>i. is miscsigiu 7 is trummu aní inchoissig aní asrubbart som  i. peccator  i. oldaas bid iniquus asberad airis indèric uile taresi nuile 〈taraesi nuile〉 dogni side non sic peccator</em></td>
<td>i.e. what is indicated by what he has said [lit. that which what he says indicates], namely, <em>peccator</em>, is more odious and heavier, to wit, <em>rather</em> than if it were <em>iniquus</em> that he had said, for it is the repayment of evil for evil that he does, <em>non sic peccator</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML59c07</td>
<td><em>oldate inna suaccubri  i. digal for a naimtea</em></td>
<td><em>rather</em> than the desirable things, namely, revenge on his enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML89d06</td>
<td><em>i. is ed as doig liun is indisiiu bid exaggeranter duintad anemfases asbeir som  i. dubeir som dudumugud aaisndisen as nuilliu oldaas ani adfet som amal dundadbat som sís on</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ie. it is this that we deem probable here: that it would be *exaggerenter* that would render the emphasis that he uses, i.e. to exaggerate his declaration he puts what is more *rather* than the thing that he speaks of, as he shows it below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MI105b07</strong></th>
<th><em>i. isferr liumsa buith inneuch asdoiscairem hi tır israhel oldaas buith inneuch ditechdaisib sainemlaib 7 sommaib innabellondae [leg. Babellondae]</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. I would rather be in the meanest place in the land of Israel <em>rather</em> than in any of the splendid and wealthy houses of the Babylonians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MI112b13</strong></th>
<th><em>l. is demniu liunn anadchiam huasulib oldaas anrochluinemmar huachluasaib...,</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or that which he we see with the eyes, we deem it more certain <em>rather</em> than that which we hear with the ears</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MI137d01</strong></th>
<th><em>oldaas nermitnigthi feid</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>rather</em> than to be honoured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is in contrast to the only five examples of *indaas*, of a total 49 and therefore 10%, that could be similarly translated as ‘rather than,’ indicating that *oldaas* was preferred, but not obligatory:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI22c14</td>
<td><em>i. airimmou [leg. airismou] ruicim les mairchissechtae indaas digal dothabair [leg. dothabairt] form</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. for it is more that I need compassion <strong>rather</strong> than to have punishment inflicted on me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI39a06</td>
<td><em>indas nocundradaiged .i. ɔdenad figail [leg. fingail] archuinged soinmige do</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>rather</strong> than that he should traffic, i.e. that he should slay a relative through his seeking prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI54a11</td>
<td><em>i. an as nessa lium do inni frequenter indas plerumque</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. what I deem nearer to the sense, <strong>frequenter rather</strong> than <strong>plerumque</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI67d13</td>
<td><em>indaas hicechluc oche [leg. olchene]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.i. <strong>rather</strong> than in any place besides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI72b18</td>
<td><em>i. is l. rubu ferr lat comaidech [leg. comaitecht] du assaraib indaas dunni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. it is, or was, better in your mind to favor the Assyrians <strong>rather</strong> than us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusion here can only be that *oldaas* was not, in the variety (or, indeed, varieties) of Old Irish utilised by the glossators of Wb and Sg, more similar to a meaning of *plutôt que* and used exclusively in that context. Instead, it appears to have been used in wider application, more akin to the French *que* and more like how Ml utilises the counterpart *indaas*.

In Ml, *oldaas* does not appear to have exclusively been used in contexts which would dictate a translation of ‘rather than,’ glosses such as *lugu inpianad indaas*.
asindroillissemini Ml119d08 ‘the punishment is less than we have deserved;’ at huaisliu oldate nime Ml26c09 ‘You (sg) are higher than the heavens;’ …is toisigi atuistiu oldatae indoini… Ml112b20 ‘their creation is prior to men’ obviously cannot be understood as meaning ‘rather than.’

Therefore, oldaas does appear to be preferentially used by MI in contexts that better suit the sense ‘rather than,’ but not exclusively and not obligatorily, indicating there was at least a partial distinction between oldaas and indaas. The same cannot be said about Wb & Sg, in which oldaas functions in more general contexts, and similarly to the way indaas is utilised within MI.

6.5.4 Conclusion

At least within the context of MI, oldaas appears to have had particular contexts in which it was preferred. It is not quite so clear-cut to say that oldaas was exclusive to these contexts, but oldaas does appear to be more regularly used in the circumstances noticed by Lambert, and it does appear to have a more restrictive meaning when compared to the more liberally applied indaas.

Though Wb and Sg do have some examples of oldaas being used in much the same way as MI, it does not seem as though they strictly adhere to these categories, and instead are much more broadly applied, in the way that MI prefers indaas. It would appear that Old Irish originally had oldaas for all comparative contexts (based on the absence of indaas from Wb) and that the form indaas began to take over more general use while oldaas was either optionally limited to specific contexts, or simply preserved in MI, although it is difficult to understand why, when oldaas existed with general usage, an alternative would have developed.

The predominance of oldaas in Sg makes it impossible to assert that indaas is a younger form, or at least, not an innovation that occurred widely during the Old Irish period – in which case it was not yet present during the time of Wb, as with 24 examples of oldaas, if indaas did exist during the writing of Wb, at least some trace would be expected.

Although there are not many attestations of oldaas in Sg, 12 examples are not so limited as to argue that there was no opportunity for indaas to appear. It therefore does not seem reasonable to assert that indaas is entirely a diachronic development, as it does not make sense to posit that the form developed, was the predominant form at the time of
MI, only to disappear by the time of Sg, and then rise to popularity and be the standard form at the time of Middle Irish.

The most reasonable explanation is that of diatopic variation, perhaps by way of a regional delay, or outright failure, in adopting the younger form, or one form being the preference of a particular register that is represented in either MI or Wb and Sg. It seems logical to suggest that as the diatopic variant to which MI adheres began to generalise the alternative indaas, that the original oldaas began to be relegated into particular contexts and that indaas saw more widespread use as the innovatory form. Wb and Sg, on the other hand, seem to have not retained or developed indaas which allowed them to continue to broadly use oldaas in the contexts in which MI prefers to utilise indaas.

6.6 Conclusion

It is abundantly clear that while a standard of Old Irish certainly existed, and the three major corpora of glosses of Wb, MI and Sg all adhered to this standard to a certain extent, certain preferences exist within all three that indicate that there was some level of variation present during the Old Irish period.

This chapter has served to highlight the main variants that are exclusive to MI that mark it unique in comparison to the others. It is, however, difficult to pin these features to a particular origin: it is not always possible to determine if a feature is the function of diachrony, whether a feature is exclusively diatopic, or whether it is only orthographic and not representative of the spoken language.

It is pretty clear that all three corpora have their own particular preferences, but it is unclear to what extent all unique features of Wb and Sg are the function of diachrony, or if they can be traced to particular registers, scribal practice or dialects: the preference for -a in the genitive singular of i-stems and u-stems in MI is pretty clearly orthographic in application, while representing a genuine linguistic change, while the significance of its preference for -u over -o in proclitics in pretonic position is not so clear.

The predominance of indaas in MI and its absence from both Wb and Sg is the strongest indication of a true diatopic variation, as it is clearly not an issue of orthography, but rather an innovative form that does not exist in either of the other two corpora, is used in equivalent ways and is clearly not simply a linguistic development of the same form. The lack of indaas in either Wb or Sg would indicate that is not a diachronic variant as it is entirely implausible to suggest that indaas came into existence, became predominant.
in a prolific corpus such as MI, dropped out of favour by the time of Sg only to return during the Middle Irish period, especially as *indaas* has a wider application in MI as the favoured form. The fact that *indaas* does not appear at all in Wb and Sg would strongly indicate that this was a form that was exclusive to either the region or the school from which the scribe of MI originated.

It also appears to be fairly conclusive that MI was – at the very least – operating from a distinct standard with regards to orthography, accounting for the different renderings of the proclitics as well as the difference in the *i*-stem/*u*-stem endings, the variation in its representation of proclitics, and the preference for *ae*. The presence of *indaas* is by far the most important piece of evidence examined in this chapter as it provides a strong basis for asserting a true, identifiable diatopic variation within the Old Irish period. The other features exclusive to or preferred by MI are not as clear evidence of diatopic variance, and their inclusion as markers of dialect can only be considered tenuous, as the extent to which they were realised phonetically and not just orthographically is unknown. It seems pretty definitive that MI was writing with its own particular variety of Old Irish.
Conclusions

The primary aim of this study was to seek out and examine synchronic variation within the Old Irish record, with a secondary aim of identifying the existence of dialects within the material. It is clear that both of these aims have been achieved, with a significant amount of variation having been identified and at least one feature having been determined to be a diatopic variant.

The first chapter dismantled the long-held academic belief that the Old Irish period was free from linguistic variation. The sheer geographic spread of the language (cf. Russell 2005, 439) as well as the ultimate emergence of the three modern Gaelic languages were already evidence that opposed this theory, but the improbability of a homogeneous language existing for such a significant period of time was discussed (cf. Hymes 1964; Macaulay 1975; Thomson 1977) and determined to be implausible.

Indeed, the theory of Common Gaelic (Jackson 1951) which has pervaded scholastic thought has been found to be unsatisfactory, owing to the unlikelihood of an entirely invariant language being able to exist for such a significant period of time. Alongside the long-standing belief in Common Gaelic and the apparent lack of diatopic evidence, the primary objection to the possibility of Old Irish dialects has been the impossibility of mapping any identified Old Irish variant to the Modern Irish dialects (cf. Ahlqvist 1988; Russell 2005, 441.) The case was made, by examining parallels to the Ancient Greek Koine, that the requirement for mapping any diatopic distinction in Old Irish to a corresponding feature of Modern Irish dialectology needs to be disregarded.

The argument was put forward for understanding Old Irish as a scholastic standard that was utilised by an educated elite (cf. Binchy 1943 209-210,) deviations from which can be understood to be slips into more natural registers, as the written evidence alone cannot be considered to constitute the sum total of the language (cf. Ó Buachalla 1985, 32.) The suggestion of a literary standard accounts for diachronic variation found within the material, as well as explaining the relative uniformity of the written language itself. A proposed origin for this literary standard was put forward as the north of the country (cf. Kelly 1982; Wagner 1982; McCone 1985; Ahlqvist 1988; Ó Buachalla 1988) owing to the high-level of productivity in monasteries such as Bangor, Nendrum, Downpatrick and particularly Armagh (cf. Charles-Edwards 2000, 426-427; Ní Dhomhnaill 2010, 547; Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 220-221.)
In the second chapter, prior scholarship relating to diatopic variation within the Old Irish extant material was examined, and while a number of features were identified and investigated, the majority were found to not be conclusive evidence of diatopic variation – or at least, not conclusive with regards to the three corpora studied here.

Features such as the variation between *ní* and *nícon* as well as the difference between words meaning ‘self/own’ that begin with *f*- and *c*- or contain the feature -*d*- or not, were determined to represent semantic distinctions (cf. Byrne 1982.) Other features such as the anaphoric pronoun -són/-ón (Hessen 1913) and the enclitic demonstrative -sa/-sa/-se (Stifter 2009) displayed variation, without any apparent phonological or semantic context distinctions across all three corpora of glosses that therefore cannot be mapped to any particular dialect or school, though may potentially be an indication of a rising preference for particular forms.

Other features, such as the alternation between *ar*- *ir*- *er*- (GOI §823) as well as the dual singular paradigms of the lexeme *tech* (Wagner 1982) were found to display variation between all three corpora of glosses, indicating some level of variation that cannot be attributed to diachrony alone, and must indicate some level of diatopic distinction within the language. A caveat is needed here, that it is not entirely clear what are the origins of the variation in *ar*-: it seems implausible to understand this as an exclusively orthographic feature, as stressed vowels are consistently written and such a view would necessitate arguing that all spellings were pronounced the same, but the fact that all three corpora of glosses tend to use the forms interchangeably would seemingly indicate that they had the same phonetic realisation – otherwise they would have been made distinct. Of course, understanding Old Irish as a written standard could conceivably account for this, as the fluctuation could be indicative of a scribe best attempting to graphically represent his own pronunciation.

Although all three corpora of glosses represent nasalisation in different ways, potentially indicating different competing or developing orthographic practices, the more consistent representation of nasalisation after nasals in Sg, as well as the isolated *nícon* *dét*, which may show contact nasalisation of the Scottish Gaelic variety, may be evidence of an early deviation between the branches of Irish and Scottish Gaelic.

The different representation of nasalisation, and the unusual borrowing of *spiurt/spirut* (McManus 1983) within MI in conjunction with its significant preference for the form *er*- against the more popular *air*- in the other two corpora, identified it at the
outset of this thesis as potentially operating from a different diatopic or scholastic background.

This hypothesis received further validation in the third chapter, in which the variation within prepositions and preverbs was examined, and while all three corpora of glosses do contain some level of variation within their prepositions and preverbs, MI stands in contrast to both Wb and Sg. Regardless of whether or not Sg is considered to be significantly more conservative than MI, the fact that MI and Sg do differ in such significant ways indicate that there were opposing operational practices.

The primary findings from this chapter that revealed that MI stands apart were the fact that MI contains no attestations of the proclitic *tre* spelt as such, but exclusively uses *tri* against both Wb and Sg who prefer *tre* (the latter more significantly so than the former) in addition to the higher rate of *-u* in place of an expected pretonic *-o* in all of the prepositions and preverbs that end in *-o*.

This chapter additionally suggested that the variability between *-o* and *-u* may be attributed to the particle *no-* which contained an original *-u* that may have been lowered, in certain contexts, by vowels that are now lost and that could have exerted lowering influence (cf. Stifter 2014, 222.) This alternation of *no-/nu-* in such positions, caused by unstressed lowering of lost particles, could have led to the analogical lowering of *-o* to *-u* in other preverbs and prepositions, especially in certain contexts such as when an infixed pronoun or relative clause were utilised. This would account for the fact that the majority of contexts in which *-o* alternates with *-u*, as observed within the three corpora, there was a lost particle.

The extent to which the higher rate of *-u* in MI was realised phonetically, as with the variability between *air-* *er-* *ir-* is impossible to determine. If it is indeed believed to be a variation in pronunciation, then MI can be said to be adhering less rigidly to the orthographic standard, while Wb and Sg show only slips into a more contemporary pronunciation. But, as above, it is impossible to determine the extent to which this practice was phonetic.

Chapters Four through Six examined features that are exclusive to each of the three corpora. Sg, as the smallest corpus, showed the least number of unique variations with really only an orthographic difference in the representation of final *-d*, for which it prefers *-th*. This could again be viewed as evidence of Sg adhering to a more conservative standard of writing, as *-th* represented the Early Old Irish pronunciation.
Within Wb, the primary feature that set it apart was the higher number of attestations of the dissimilated *araile*, as opposed to the standard *alaile*. A thorough examination revealed that these two forms were treated slightly differently within Wb, compared to MI and Sg, albeit with evidence so marginal in the latter two that it is difficult to draw clear conclusions. The origins of both the dissimilated consonant as well as the fluctuation in the stressed vowel – sometimes -e- in Wb – are unclear, and potentially the product of analogy. Although the evidence is far too minimal to definitively posit a diatopic variant here, there is the potential for a diachronic variation within the synchronic record: the presence of *araile* may have been reduced by the time of MI and Sg through natural language progression. As it is not the original form, it is unlikely to posit it as a standard to which MI and Sg were adhering, and thus a situation in which we have a fading feature would appear to be the most likely.

This is not the case with the variations collected from MI. As the chronological middle of the three corpora, any variations in which MI is distinct are interesting as they cannot be attributed to diachrony alone. As already established, MI contains multiple features that would indicate it was operating from a different scholastic standard, in that its orthography differs from that of Wb and Sg. This chapter further explored the variation between *cach* and *cech* and the spelling of final -o and -a, which indicate further orthographic divergence within MI.

There is the case of *oldaas* and *indaas*. Although generally considered to be interchangeable, *oldaas* and *indaas* undoubtedly did not share the same origin and therefore cannot be understood as different stages of a natural phonological development.

The absence of *indaas* in both Wb and Sg indicates that this is not an issue of diachrony: if *indaas* were indeed younger it would presumably have appeared in Sg, and if it were older, it would have appeared in Wb. The fact that MI significantly prefers *indaas* is equally a point in favour of arguing against a diachronic distinction, as it would be heavily unlikely that a form would develop, become dominant, disappear and then re-emerge again in such a short time span as that between the creation of the two corpora. A full examination of semantic contexts was undertaken, and it was demonstrated that while the usage of *oldaas* was indeed restricted in MI, this was not the case within Wb or Sg, and both use *oldaas* in contexts in which *indaas* is preferred within MI. Without being able to attribute their development to diachrony and with *oldaas* being used equivalently
to *indaas* in MI, this would appear to be the first demonstrable evidence of diatopic variation within the extant Old Irish material.

It has previously been established that the provenance of MI was likely Bangor (cf. Ó Muircheartaigh 2018, 138; Lash 2017, 148; Dumville 1997, 28-29; McNamara and Sheehy 1973, 209), a prominent and influential monastery, which can account for the spread of *indaas* into later Old Irish sources: this preferred dialectic variant established itself in later works and was eventually adopted into more widespread scribal practice, and indeed, the spoken language, owing to the heavy influence of Bangor.

This thesis has demonstrated that a certain level of variation was undoubtedly present in the synchronic record, with different categories of the type of variation identified. The first category would be that of *oldaas/indaas*, which is fairly concrete evidence for variation between the three corpora of glosses. Although it cannot be mapped to a particular dialect region, or connected to the Modern Irish dialects, it is the strongest piece of evidence that points towards dialects of Old Irish.

Following that, there are variations such as the doubled superlative *-imem*, the variation in *ar*-, the distinctive handling of the *-ol-u* vocalism in particles and preverbs as well as the fluctuation in the singular paradigm of the word *tech*. These features are evidence of variation within the synchronic record that cannot be attributed to definitively to diachrony. While the paradigm of *tech* is potentially a diatopic feature and *-imem* is likely an issue of register, they still demonstrate that the scribes of the three corpora of glosses were not utilising an identical standard of the language. This is exemplified by the different treatments of particles and preverbs, such as the fluctuation in the *-ol-u* vocalism, as the distinct preference by MI for forms with *-u*, as well as its preference for *tri* over *tre*, further demonstrates that MI is unique – though whether or not MI’s exceptional features are the product of dialect, sociolect, register or a competing orthographic norm is unknown.

In a third category there are those variants that exist within the three corpora of glosses but are likely the product of diachronic linguistic development: features such as *-són/-ón* and the alternation between *-sol/-sal/-se*, *montar/muinter* and the trisyllabic reflexives in *-e* of Wb. All of these are variations present in the synchronic record but would appear to have a diachronic element: the popularity of the unlenited *-són* appears to have increased through the Old Irish period, as did the use of that of *-se* following a
palatal auslaut. While *montar/muiinter* and the trisyllabic reflexes are not exclusive to Wb, the fact that it stands against Ml and Sg makes it unique.

There are, of course, variants that were identified that cannot be mapped to diachronic or synchronic developments: the system of nasalisation can be viewed either as an early divergence between the Irish and Scottish Gaelic systems, or as evidence of the rise of nasalisation – presumably, more specifically, the orthographic representation of nasalisation.

Nevertheless, the ultimate result is that evidence of synchronous variation within the Old Irish record has been found, catalogued and discussed here. This thesis has dismantled the prior assessment of Old Irish as a homogenous language free from variation by collecting and examining a wide range of features present within the three corpora of Old Irish glosses that demonstrate that a significant level of variation was indeed present, if not immediately apparent.

It established that the scribes of Ml, and potentially all of those working out of the monastery of Bangor, subscribed to a different orthographic practice, or competing orthographic standard, that was not shared by Wb and Sg. It has additionally shown that, while minimal, there is indeed evidence of diatopic variation within Old Irish, which can hopefully be useful for future study of the language with regards to locating the origins of texts.
Appendix I: Words meaning ‘self’

As the forms of this collection are disparate, I have organised them first by corpora, then by form and then by person & number.

Wb

Féin

(1sg) féin mosaithar féin 7a01 isform féin 7d15 naform féin 8d26 aughtortás féin 9b05 uaimm fein 11c01 mo(esséir)ge féinn 13c10 mumuinter féin 14a05 isme féin 14c30 ronicub féin 18b14 limm féin 23b34 imgnais féin 32a09 bidme féin 32a17

(2sg) tú féin 8d27 dei féin 28d15

(3sgm) in domino féin 7b01.

Feisin

(3sgm) friu fessin 3c13 do féisin 5d16 daráchen fessin 6b28 athoil fessin 11b18 didtanice fessin 12b34a issathorbe feisin 12c25 tuicci feissin 12c26 daucci feissin 13a8 fricrist fessin 13d13 aaimm fessin 14b02 arathíchtin fessin 14d02, nodmoladar fesin 17b21 aimumed fessin 20c06 friachubus fessin 20c08 oldaas fessin 23c15 dó fessin 23c16 do fessin 23c17 isaindocbál fessin 23d05 de fessin 25b19 achoirp fessin 27a23 insenduine fessin 27b08 etir fessin 28b03, darrat fessin 28b04 nihe fessin 33c03

Fesin

(3sgm) nodmoladar fesin 17b21 do fesin 23c13, ronsóir fesin 32d13 nihe fessin 33c03

(3sgn) isachorp fessin 13c24

(3sgf) ammuintire fesine 28d21 ni adoenact fessine 33c05.

(1pl) dun (féisi)ne 14c09 cene fanisin 15a04 niuaím fesine 15a13 arnindocháil fanisin 15b17 frinn fanisin 17b10 frinn fesine 17b12

(2pl) fornairchínnech féísine 5a11 diib féisne 13a26a airib féísne 27c19 daberidsi féísne 24c16, lib fésin 9d11, isuaíb fesin 27d06

(3pl) dianimortun féísine 6a05 afíli fésine 31b19, cidafogam féísine 12b2 atola féísne 30d08 uile féssine 30c26 ciid fessine 20c22

Fadesin

(3sgm) friss fadesin 6c18 arafoirbthetu fadesin 6c19 induine fadesin 8b08 achorp fadesin 13d20, uile féssine 30c17 oldaas fadeissin 33d09 docuitig tarais fadeissin 33d10

(3sgn) asenchassom fadesin 30c17

(2pl) triib fadeísne 3b22 farmbráthir [leg: farmbratir] fadesin 4c40

(3pl) foairf féísne 5b03 naforcitaide fadesine 31d17, fadeisine 31c02.

Ml

Féin
(1sg) erum féin ón 86b01 méféin 109d03 atchondarc féin són 142a03
(2sg) techtai féin 56b33 notechtai fein 56b33 imbi féin 135d01
(3sgnt) and fein 84a02

Fadéin
(1sg) fadéin 23c01
(2sg) fadein 24a02

Fessin
(3sgm) triairfrinni fessin 33b05 huaid fessin 35c23 intalam fessin 45d13 indfessin
51b12 soirad ezechiae fessin 53d01 dosom fessin 55d05 átuath fessine 57d09 assa
aicluid fessin 61a08 de fessin 65a01 adidnopair fessin 66b04 achenel fessin 67b03
chomfulid [leg: chomfulidib] fessing 67c02 salm fessin 74b01 apersain fessin
90b15 áairirtiin fessin 108b08 ní huaid fessin 108b17 fris fessin 127d10-11 ind
fessin 129d18 hae fessin (3pl) 130a08
(3sgf) flaith fessin 90b11 friæ fessine 130c09
(3pl) trisnadeu fessine 35c19 dianeurt fessin 46d10 nachfuar fessin 57d03 leu fessin
91a10

Fissin
(3sgf) duchathraig [leg: dunchathraig] fissin 131c03

Fadisin
(3sgf) huai fadisin 133c10
(2pl) duib fasdin 68b03 crichaib fadisin 115b10

Fesin
(3sgm) fuareir fesin 14b13 fair fesin 30d25 abelrai fesin 42c10 huanduni fesin
49b08 hesom fesin 53a05 doib fesin 53b11 ucht fesin 54d03 dunaircechainnsom
[leg: dunaircechainnsom] fesin 64c22 dun pul [leg: popul] fesin 126b02
(3sgn) neirt fesin 128d18
(1pl) arapecticaig [leg: arar-] dano fesin 105a04
(3pl) madaigset fesin 48a01 intiu fesin 53d17 friusom fesin 54c18 innasoinmecha
fesin 57a03 samlaibson fesin 57c05 doib fesin 61b17 nachanert fesin 63b12 forru
fesin 73b17 dib fesin 129c18 innime [leg: innanime] fesin 145d04

Fadesin
(3sgm) hodegnimson fadesin 20b03 imma bragait fadesin 23b10 afirinni fadesin
24a17 gnithisium fadesin 30b20 hofaithsini fadesin 33c17 inpopul fadesin 34d07
doromlad fadesin 36a29 anoibi fadessin 46d15 nachatuarraad fadesin (3sgf) 121d18
(3sgn) indnime fadessin 51c27
(3sgf) nachatuarraad fadesin 121d18
(2pl) crichaib fadisin 115b10
(3pl) dib fadessin 31b10 áttire fadessin 34d12 ind idail fadessin 36d16 inna nime
fadesin 45b15 fadesin 51b16 intiu fadesin 53b11 fadesin 66d13 doib fadesin 72c14 amenma fadesin 74c03 banert fadesin 95a05

Sg
Fein
(1sg) féin 209b30
(2sg) fein 209b30

Feissin
(3sgm) olprescien feissin 40a12 ašo tho feissin 65a06 triit feissin 73b07
(3sgn) acheneuil feissin 40a06 achenëuilfeissin 40a07 achenëuilfeissin 40a11
ache/niuil feissin 40a17 and feissin 50a02
(3sgf) naimsir feissin (3sgf) 188a26
(3pl) isleo feissin 71b03 huadib féiss- 144a01

Fessin
(3sgn) acheneuilfessin 40a08 dochru n fessing 61b08

Cadesin
(3pl) indib cadesin 150b02 indib cadésin 188a02

Feisine
(3sgf) sì feisine 165b03

Feisne
(3sgm/n) aggním féisne 199a02
(3sgf) inte feisne 159a04 difféisne 199b06
(3pl) forciunn feisne 213a08

Fesin
(3sgn) chrunn fésin 61b13
(3pl) treo fesin 4b04 uadib fesin 188a20

Fadesin
(3sgm) dialuc fadesin 154b01

Feisin
(3sgm) triít feisin 43a03 lais feisin 153b07 arddu feisin 161b09 foir feisin 209b12
foilsigthi feisin 211a08
(3sgn) aimm [leg: aîmimm] féisin 6a07 acheneuil feis ın 40a18 anchride feis ın 209b18
innaci niud feis ın 209b35 afoil d feisin (3sgm) 211b03 folud feisin 211b05
(3sgf) trée feisin 25b14 ind aimsir feisin 188a26 di féisin 199b10 fui ri feisin 209b28
fuirí féisin 209b34
(3pl) ní s tuaraschat feisin 7a11 inna naci niud feisin 188a18
Appendix II: Negative particle

**Wb**

*nicon*

*niconchoscream* 2b21 nicon digénte 9d09 níonfítrir 12c22 nicon fíl 12d05 nicon airigusa 16a28 niconlainemmem ní 17b08 nicon fíl 18a02 arniconchoinnucuir 19c10 niconchloor 23b41 niconchechrat 30c04

*ní* with substantive verb – without infixed pronoun

*nífíl* 1a04 *nibia* 1d02 *nibíad* 2c17 nífíl 3a14 nífíl 5a25 níbí 6b17 ní *bíedsi* 9b17 níbethe 9c20 níbíat 9c28 níbíad 9d01 níbí 10b09 act ní *bed* 10b27 *niribi* 11c17 nífíl 11c21 act *ní*robar 11d09 *nibia* 13d18 *nibí* 13d19 *nírrobe* 14c31 *nífíl* 15a32 ní bói 17d17 nífíl 18c08 ní ro *be* 18d07 ní rabarar 19d11 ní *robabar* 20a06 níbíso 22b04 nífíl 22b26 *nírobe* 24b21 níbí 28a21 nífíl 28b01, ní *bíi* 28b25, nípí 29b11 actníroib 30a16 nipiam 30b17 nipía 32c12 *nírobe* 33d10

Other verbs without infixed pronoun

*ní* ágathar 1a03 ní tartisit 1b17 ní scrátí 1d22 ní derscigem 2a14 nífarnic 2a21 nífedligedar 2c03 nírórois 2c28 nítdíbarid 3b11 nígaib 3d08 nígebar 4c08, ní dlig 4c23 nítaidíred 4d09 níaríset 4d10 níceilsom 4d16 ní roitea 5a03 ní remdechutar 5a30 níirmadatar 5b02 coníecmi 5b35 nitella 5c13 ní dene 5d38 niármsom 6a01 nimathi 6a05 nídelegar 6a24 ciníestar 6b23 nítaibríd 6c01 níráncatur 6c31 níttuccfíther 8a05 nífuírmi 8c01 nífuhlúidí 8c03 níepur 8d26 nírisísn 9a19 ní epur 9b19 ní airicc 9b24 nígte 9c08 ní dolgaid 9c22 ní cumúíng 9d16 nicumuíngide 9d18 nítíét [leg., nátét? nítéti?] 9d31 ní liim 10a01 nígátada [leg., nígata] 10b1 nícetsí 10b06 ní airbertis bith 10b08 ní arbarat biuth 10c01 ní rígd 11a22 níggessamn 11a24 nícuimáing 11b09 níttucísí 12a03 nírirccim 12a33 ní dènar 12b20 nitectat 12b21 nílabrátar 12b22 nitorban 12b32 nitorban 12b33 nírecar 12c03 nilabrafammn 12c04 ní dením 12c09, níttucatar 12c43 nituchar 12c46 nitucfa 12d03 níttucchu 12d06 nífiastar som 12d18 níricfíder 13b28 níérbarid 13c13 ní áirmisom 13d17, nitabír 14b15 nídechudsa 14c40 contharimse 14d17 níruanus 14d29 niboltígetarside 14d34, nícuíngem 14d38, ní adilgnígmar 15a02 ní reccar 15a05, nífollítsís (MS nífoiltsís) 15a20 nitucscar 15a32, níprídchum 15b17 ní dergemarmn (a prima manu) 15b23 nitáibrem 15c09 ní imdindhíber [leg.: ní imdindhibher] 15c25, ní recam 15d01, niedignemn 15d06, nitabír 16a01 níruithógaitsasam 16a22 níepur 16d07 ní cuimisin 17b01 ní irbágam 17b06, ní digream 17b09, níforuasáilígtm 17b17 nícoitsí [leg.: nícoitsí] 17b32 nítarga 17c04 nícuímsímsí 17c18 níepeírom 17d11, ní torbanad [leg.: ní torban] 17d18 níetar 17d27 nitormult 18a10 níthíbértar 18b11 ní creid 18c11níroimíbeithe 18d09 ní aíric 19b02 nirransam 19d06 nícreit 20a13 nídérsid 20b10 ní fdomat 20c21, ní comahtaim 20c22 níarísléimsí 20d14 ní imthessid 22c04 níderneat sidi 22d03 ní tuícsom 23a10 nítarlicid 23c04 níroimíbeithe 23d25 ní dèccu 24a13 ní áirmi 24a17 nitéanat 24a25 níepur 24a38 ní comachtamn 24b20 níartsar 24b20 nírogabsamnn 24b20, nírogabsam 24d02, nírothuíllíse 24d06 nítefíe 25b18, níepir som 25d04, níain 25d14, níteffíe 26a23 nígeisí 26a34 nítaírci 27a28 nituchur 27d22, nífóíret 27d24, ní ib 28b24 níriat 28c02 nífetar sa 28c10 níotoíbre 29a20, nítaibre 29a22 nítaibre 29a28, nitucscar 29b14, ní imbresnáid 29d02 nícarthá 29d08 ní rohela 30a10 nitáírcet 30b12, nírochumscigther 30b15, nímmear 30c20, ní epíl 30d14 nitáirle 30d20 nífrítát 31a06, niargart 31c25 nítarcat 31d10 níainfíd 32a11, ní épíer 32a20 coníepsírsa 32a20 nierbrad 32c08, níinotsat 33a14, ní derláchtha 33b8 nídlglíbíther 33b8 nípríde 33d01


ni with infixed pronoun
níntáicce 1d01, nísnaín 1d1, níterpi 1d10 nítha 2b12 nínnfóirítíní 4a27 níchnumcamnaí 4a27, nímarcercede 4b13 níntmíothaí 4b27, nícheil 5b05 ní tha 5b10 níntmharatsa 5c06, nísfítir 5c15, nísnagathar 6a07 nísn deaitheai. 6b29 nímirchóí 7a11 níthuacatsaom 8a10a nimtherbarar 9c31 nísn-derigí 9d05 nísncoirther 10a21 nístectíitis 10b05 nímbia 10d23 nísfítemmhar 12c06 níthuccar 12c20 níthuccí 12c46 níthucce 12d11 nístueccín 12d25 níthueafa 13a07 nínbóifea 13b19 níbscaara 13b19 conintorgáitair 14d27 níthuccat 15a34, ninincétheair 15d27 nínsfíson 16a02 nísthabar 16a30 cinínífil 16b09 nígaíb 16d04 nínmoídem 17b10, nínmoímacnor 18d03 níabá 19b10 níb ífíchifíthe 20a11 nínthumoíildí 20d04 níarlisid 21a17 nínruc 21b03 ní fí                                                               

Mí
nícon with the substantive verb
nícon fil 18c11 níon bía 26d12 ní confi 31d10 ní conrobæ 51a02 níconfel 55c13 níconbia 56c08 níconfil 7818 ní confil son 92a08 ní conrabar 100c11 níconrobæ 100c23 ní conrobæ 104d02 ní confil 107b08 ní conrobæ 125b07

nícon with substantive & infixed pronouns
ní confil 46c19 Ní cosfuarsa 57d03 ní condabia 69a08

nícon with other verbs
nícointuislifea 27b18 níconairsolset [leg: níconairsoilset 3109 Ní consecmalad 33c21 nícontarat 36a01 ní condergiení 36a01 ní conrogbal 36a32 ní conrogbal 36a32 nícontorparenasa 42a10 nícon dèth 53a17 níconairsbha 53b08 ní conallair 56d02 níconderenachda 57d12 ní congoíobat 69a08 ní condúritar 72b17 ní conromúch 76a12 ní conrifíra 95a12 nícosfionn 117d04 níconagathar 129a12 níconetada 129b05 ní con ruaccaobh 136b07

ní with the substantive verb
ní feil 2b04 nífeil 17a15 nífél 19d02 nírbu 20d04 ní rabae 28d03 nífél 30b02 níbhíat som 31a17 ní bhí a 33a05 ní robæ 33c17 níboí 34a16 nífil 35a08 sech ní robadh 44b08 níbí 45d15 níbeithshí 46a10 nífél 48c29 nífél 55c10 nífél 55d25 ní bhí 57d06 ní feil 60b02 ní bith 62b06 ní bia 67c14 ní bí 69b03 ní fail 69c07 ní robæ 74a02 ní fil 82d07 ní fail 92a09 níruathar 94b23 ní bhi 97a04 ní bí 100b21 nírobæ 106b06 ní bhein 131d19 nírib 134d02 níbí 140c03

ní with other verbs
nígréat 3a14 ní digned 14b04 nísonartnaígedar 14c04 nísechmalmáid 14d03 níthubertais 15c07 ní rothaoinnigigestar 16b12 níroíslat som 16d02 nítarcredthar 17d05 nírothochurestar 18d06 ní secheta 19b11 ní dixngedar 20c07 nídephthigim 21a02 níthubair 21b02 ní erchértar 21c12 ní trelfeidlig 21d04 ní trelfeidlig 21d05 ní cumatt 23a05 nírailc 23b04 níruforaimhnearsom 24a17 nífíthar 24a19 níshdúg 24b17 ní fíeraígedar 24b18 níruforaimhnearsom 24c08 níreígedar 24d22 nísechmalmáinní 25a03 ní rufrecsachtarántic 26b25 níretaral 27d07 ní de intamladarson 27d12 ní aircíbeasom 28b14 nítabarr 30a09 nídigenamni 30c09 ní duaird 31a06 ní radat som 31a18 níscríom 31a19 níaisnedetad 31a19 ní aeresa[d] 31b24 níacumnaí 31c19 nínperr 32c15 ní taibred 32d05 nícumgaíthair 32d14 níer ní gait 32d19 nígaib som 34b06 ní
ní oc 14d04 aírchnoimnaictar 19c05 níscloinethar 21b02 sechnisaerbatar [leg: aerbartatar] 29a04 ní chaíriged ar 36a20 níntanic ade 37a15 níndichimse 38c21 nídernus 39a11 nírsioise 39c34 níosrochret [leg: nírochret] 39d05 nírstuar 44a15 nírothechtusád 44b10 níbsfaí 44b10 ní fol aí [leg: nísh faisal] 44b10 níchantrummaichthersa [leg: níchantrummaichthersa] 44c03 nírasoir 44e19 nítarilib 49b03 ní arrain 49c09 ní naithgeuin 52x00 nísc congheaitis 55a18 ní charae 56b31 níascnae 56b31 nó chumgat 56c07 níscéad 57a07 nóchribhte 128a02 ní cinn 128a04 nimolat 130b06 ní saig 131b04 nó coinnmacmarni 135d04 sechnicoinnactar 13d04 ní fith 140c10 ní miclothachtia 143c03 ní espaitber 145c01 ní epp 145c03

ní with infixed pronoun

níntanic ón 14d04 aírchimnaictar 19c05 níscloinethar 21b02 sechnisaerbatar [leg: aerbartatar] 29a04 ní chaíriged ar 36a20 níntanic ade 37a15 níndichimse 38c21 nídernus 39a11 nírsioise 39c34 nírosrochret [leg: nírosrochret] 39d05 nírsucat 44a15 nírosrothechtusád 44b10 níshfail 44b10 ní fol aí [leg: nísh fail aí] 44b10 níchantrummaichthersa [leg: níchantrummaichthersa] 44c03 nírasoir 44e19 nítarilib 49b03 ní arrain 49c09 ní naithgeuin 52x00 nísc congheaitis 55a18 ní charae 56b31 níascnae 56b31 nó chumgat 56c07 níscéad 57a07 nóchribhte 128a02 ní cinn 128a04 nimolat 130b06 ní saig 131b04 ní coinnmacmarni 135d04 sechnicoinnactar 13d04 ní fith 140c10 ní miclothachtia 143c03 ní espaitber 145c01 ní epp 145c03

Sg

nicon

nicon biasom 29b10 niconfí 188a04 Nicon talla 90a02 ní conétada 188a04
ní ruban 3b28 ní fail 4a12 ní fail 6b02 ní biat 6b17 ní fail 6b25 ní bía 7a01 ní bi 22a09 ní fail 26b07 ní bí 27a09 ní fil 31b12 ní fail 32a01 ní fil 32a09 ní bí 45b07 ní fil 52b01 ní fil 61a24 ní fí 68b03 ní bòi 72b06 ní fil 114b02 ní bia 147a10 ní biat 148a04 ní rubatar 148a09 ní bí 150b06 ní fil 154b02 ní bí 165b03 ní fil 178b02 ní fil 181a01 níbí 182a01 ní bí 203a27 ní fil 207b03 ní fil 208b03 ní rubai 209a03 níbí 209b33 ní fail 215a02 ní biat 215a05

ní with other verbs

ní astaider 3a04 ní timmorcar 3a04 ní aescomlai 3a06 ní rograigther [leg: ní rofograigther] 4b14 ní turgabar 4b14 ní roscribad 6b03 ní erchuiretar 6b17 ní rela 6b27 ní diuschi 6b27 ní foičnithaer 6b28 ní rubai 7b03 ní inchoisig 9a16 ní taimhinedar 13b04 ní forbur 16a13 ní tabur 19b02 ní airecar 20a09 ní ordnimm 22b02 ní sluindi 25b14 ní epil 28b20 ní epil 30a03 ní airdben 30a04 ní fitemmar 32b05 ní cumcat 33a16 ní derscaigi 40a06 ní derscaigi 40a17 ní aribartatar 41b03 ní aisñdiosa 47a13 ní techtá 50a02 ní dentar 51b13 ní coméicnigedar 61a09 ní midedar 63a14 ní deni 63a17 ní cumscig 65b08 ní rochinnset 71b03 ní fiodlatair 72b01 ní eperr 73a11 ní epr 73b06 ní tuc 100a07 ní ágor 112 ní deni 125a06 ní techtat 138a04 ní eoríim 139a05 ní comshuidigher 140a04 ní airecar 145b03 ní cinnet 147a09 ní roilgius 148a10 ní forbanar 148a11 ní dechuid 148b03 ní(d)techrīgetar 155b05 ní foromat 157b09 ní taet 159a03 ní techtat 161a02 ní airecar 162a01 ní cumscíchtar 162a07 ní hilaigedar 166a02 ní airecar 173b06 ní forcmi 188a30 ní airberar 192a01 ní taet 197a04 ní fiodlatair 197a21 ní ern 197b10 ní etargeiuin 197b10 ní cumcat 198a02 ní labrathar 199b06 ní aidlīciog 200a02 ní fintar 200b13 ní dìltai 201b10 ní tórmarag 202a02 ní techtat 202b02 ní incoisig 202b03 ní fognat 203a17 ní comarscaiged 205b02 ní recar 208a06 ní taírfhír 208b03 ní sluindi so 208b05 ní erchondla 208b05 ní recar 209b28 ní taic 209b29 ní adchumtig 211a08 ní tabair 214a05 ní epur 217a ní cumcat 220a07 ní dìnit 220a09 ní róis 229a

ní with infixed pronouns

nís tabur 4b13 nís tuarascbe 7a11 nís narróetm 16a08 nín tánaic 26a14 nísluindi 66b18 ní thabur 173b02 ní thabur son 179a02 ní thabur son 179a02 ní thabur 179a04 ní thechta 195b04 nístabor 204b05 nístabor 204b08 níslairmim 205a02 ní t(h)abur 207a02 ní thabur són 215a08 ní thabur 218a08
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Appendix III: -ón and -són

Wb

-ón
bid hinoibad duibsi ón 3b31 acht níchumcamnì ón 4a27 duíb si ón 5d37 ished on 7d10 lesom ón 8a13 arnafleg lìdís ón 8c03 diandaithirísìd ón 9a23 ni hédon 9b19 ishedón 9c15 ba hédon 10b09 andson ón 12b05 doibson ón 13a31 ished ón 13b23 ni áirmisom ón 13d17 iarforcìtul ón 16a14 niconlaimmemmar ni ón 17b08 dognúsa ón 18a19 is hédon 18d09 duibsi ón 21d3 ished ón 22a03 duibsi ón 22d19 ishedón 23b38 cid ed ón 23b31 ishedón 23c02 limsa ón 23c22 libsi ón 23d11 spés ón 25c07 isinprecept ón 25c25 isfíron [leg: is fír ón] 25d10 at-beirsom ón 27c18 ished ón 30d5 de iudeib ón 31b15

-són
nocha...son 1b20 ni cumme són 3c01 diárfrianugudní són 4b17 amne són 4d03 signum són 5a05 lem són 5b31 fhrtheibaire són 5d29 ferr són 6b10 ól són 6c30 isinonsón 8d16 isin són 8d17 baiussiú són 9b01 lim són 9b17 ferr són 10a16 uirgosón 10b12 bamaithson són 10b27 immúdrforligsón 10c20 ba dochu són 10d7 ithé són 10d17 arboí són 10d31 bidcorp són 12a27 bid ex toto són 12c14 istorbe són 12c24 issathorfe feisín són 12c25 baferr són 12c30 istorbe són 12c32 bás són 13c01 imbéith són 13d17 cotaneccarsa són 14c40 isfírson 17c22 doprecept són 18d02 etir són 19b18 daaslú són danno 19d21 baferrson 23b35 cenelachsón 23d32 duinní són 24a31 dé són 25c11 leírson 27d19 cachréit són 27d25 grád són 28c06 nirochumseictorsón 30b15 isfír són 30b22 épéer són 32a0 etdalgub són 32a21 úisce són 32d03

Mi

-ón
conacertussa ón 2a01 níntài són 14d04 condamchloithersa ón 21b06 nochis nondages on 21b07-08 hognimaib ón 25a20 nongnetís ón 30a04 innadausa ón 31b05 trimiailluid ón 31c05 ni fretsai à mes ón 31d06 nídigensa ón 37c02 nídeí són 38b05 dughnissiú ón 38b07 ammaic ón 40a11 intoraín ón 40d11 noticed scís mochnamai ón 41d09 geillfit ón 41d13 huad ón 42a05 fithis ón 42c30 disluindi ón 44b12 frisorcaissiú ón 44b31 remninfu òran ón 44c24 ochlas ón 44c26 cot rairléics ón 44d16 mosorthasa [leg: mosoirthasa] ón 45b02 mochlanda sa ón 45b13 nobsoirfe ón 45d10 maní erchissea ón 46c15 hílaith ón 47b16 arnachammatarcaschar ón 47c10 ásenathrae ón 47d09 ideal ón 47d10 reommörummaidg ón 48b05 huil [leg: huiliu] lesom ón 53a02 codobenthar si ón 53b15 ni ón 53b18 in ointimthreach [leg: ointimthreach] ón 53b20 inforcometas ón 55d07 sechis mochois ón 56b01 atathimartu ón 57a06 dunpeachtach ón 57a13 asbeirson ón 58b05...i. mét inchumachta ón 64d07 achdobrái ón 65b02 críst ón 65b04 nundnerbái ón 65b06 innerdarcs ón 65c05 eburneís ón 65c11 etirscarid ón 67b04 foamamigtho tantum ón 67c02 lintae ón 68a14 forsonartaesi on 68a15 lesom ón 69d02 sacrificia ón 70b06 ar peccad ni ón 71b17 tris dec di...i. díxit insipiens ón 72c08 imorcan ón 73d06 huanbás ón 73d14 innpacech ón 76a03 a chomallad ón 76a15 coadcota ón 77b12 dauisir [leg: duaírissiú] ón 79a09 indídmichsiú ón 79b06 friú ón 79b08 lám ón 79d05 annadremercachmarni ón 80b14 inna gnimu ón 80c05 innasoinmch ón 81b10 mescaigfür ón 81c04 dianimcásin ón 81d03 biuth ón 83b06 dulinat ón 83c07 istoiríoch [leg: toirthech] ón 84b02 israheldu ón 84d01 israheldae ón 85b04 ind hires ón 85d08 hotoissigecht aidi ón 85d11 erum féin ón 86b01 degedbair ón 87b08 acarbaig ón 87b14 buidechta ón 87b16 lium ón 87b17 leu ón 87c03 nonindaig ón 88b06 manúndimdea ón 88c02 daír siú ón 89a06 inna preceptae
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duinind naig són 59c11 indomuin són 59d03 indrelta són 60a01 innanedbart són 60b17 induuloscud [leg: induleuloscud] són 60b18 in salm són 61a38 doib són 61b23 immalle són 61b23 animed són 62b20 innatonna són 62b23 honchrothad són 63d08 inmetair són 65b11 hontrup són 65c15 and són 65d06 trup són 66a04 cristide són 66b08 buide són 66c05 duema són 67c05 duimchella son 67d08 indimbid són 68c02 infoglnai són 69a23 degtallanda són 69c02 gentar són 69d06 nime són 70a11 béstataid són 70b09 béstataid són 70b10 duthaíchur són 70c15 cenachomallad són 70c15 aforcital són 70d07 animed són 71c03 imeairec són 72d09 imeairec són 75a02 mór són 75b02 gnima són 75d06 otgim són 77c08 dia són 79d01 foru són 80b01 morson 80b04 rogenset són 80c06 huagnáimaib són 80c08 ilaigfe són 81c05 cáich són 81d04 adnorfa són 81d06 innaichthen són 82d08 taírgeri són 83d04 toirtech són 84a03 drochgnimu són 84c14 trop són 85c01 drochscél són 86c03 trithrop són 86b09 infet són 86b10 maith són 86d11 indfrithorcuslon 87a11 indigail són 87b01 móith són 87b13 forgellat són 87b15 airechdae són 87b21 clithon són 87d08 indurca són 87d09 indi són 88d05 innafochaide són 89a05 fira són 89b14 ēpert són 89d07 fir són 89d13 anícg són 90b16 dorusluidset són 90b17 assindethar són 90b18 derchoinni són 90b19 dilged són 90c16 samraid són 90c27 nech són 90d03 cloine són 90d20 dia són 91c09 cendigail són 91c15 confitetsarsón 91c18 imthir són 92a04 n' eil són 92a08 folaid són 92a13 cenfáti [leg: fathf] són 93a07 chuintechi són 93a08 forru són 93a08 aradéni són 93b10 imfoglnai són 94b03 ìsligud són 94c02 fájausna són 94c08 arabarach són 95a08 ácial són 95a09 innaimmeda són 95c05 mór són 96c06 fujog mór són 96c06 díb són 96c13 indisón 97a01 rechto són 97a14 innaclansdón 97a16 adamri són 97c02 ingréne [leg: innigrné] són 97c04 aittech són 98b06 díthrab són 98d04 finda són 99a04 ñ dîmter són 100a05 solman són 100b06 ainm són 100b12 innammómredd són 100c20 ata són 102a07 gudi són 102d03 inraiccaithger són 103a08 popul són 103b09 almsan són 103b13 fírían són 103c08 indigial són 103c12 achenela són 103d03 de són 104c05 ëthaid són 105a01 innacairde ón són 105a02 leu són 105a03 tridegnimu són 105b17 gnímae són 105c08 dín són 105d07 glanaib són 106d13 forcital són 107a14 atuisten són 108d07 teit són 109a02 tét són 109a02 innacland són 109d02 méfein són 109d03 marb són 110c02 cath són 110d10 fóssoichet són 111a04 fuodadail són 111a07 ar soirad ni són 111a12 acossa són 111b14 nách a side són 111b19 slántad són 111b21 bliadnae són 111b22 arsinndid són 111c05 diafortachtini són 111c21 doneamthar són 112a02 etarru són 112a08 aimser són 112b01 áingeil són 112b19 oltai són 112c02 oldia són 112c05 gnímaí de són 112d07 imbait són 113a04 flaith són 113c07 in babillondai són 113c08 arapechtaighi són 113d06 forru són 113d07 frinnai són 114a08 nóib són 114b13 indoiri són 114d16 forcaldeu són 115d10 trop són 116a08 ciuál són 116c07 ingnim són 117c03 acloiní són 117d02 innangude són 119a05 cenainththini foraib són 121a05 náimtea són 122c08 iacob són 123b06 innaiccc són 123c09 huilliu són 123c10 trachaid [leg: trachtaid] són 123c16 asfiat són 125b01 lugae són 126c05 aracrete són 126c10 canoin són 126c20 ñ dal són 126d08 ni són 127a15 innacland són 127b04 drochgnimae són 127b07 imthimcheltar són 127b17 de són 127b19 cinn són 127c22 indfritchtbaid són 127d07 dese desón 128a03 maic són 128a16 arainn doinachtae són 128b03 ríg són 128b09 iðlu són 129c10 olchenae són 129c16 trop són 129d02 dluith són 129d08 dae són 129d16 indib són 130b07 daraírrgert són 130c16 ocmunuch són 131c08 togu són 131c13 am brith són 131c17 indore són 131d01 n indib són 131d07 indi són 131d11 amenman són 131d14 apecthui són 131d16 arthraciuimn són 132a03 meirc són 132c08 achém [leg: aecmí] són 133b05 trúip són 133c01 doronta són 133c05 bibdáid són 134b01 dé són 134b03 athchumach són 135a08 arnamait són 135d04 inpopuil són 137c11 molad de són 137d08 molad de són 137d10 lam són 138a01 in corp són 138c03 inanim són 138c03 deu són 138c05 an deu són 138c08 innamedón són 138d06 dunaidbdet són 138d12 nafuldmnai són 139d09
tinda [leg: tintuda] són 139a01 innúnn són 139a05 diannadnaid són 140b11 huamunur fir féin són 142a03 doindnastar són 142d01 ógae són 144c07 leir són 145c12 huathud [leg: arhuathud] són 145d05 comallaid són 146a01 fid són 146a05
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Appendix IV: ar-

Wb

airis 1a01 isairdirce 1a03 aír 1a04 airmitin 1b17 airechas 1b12 dorairngred 2c12 dauairngerthe 2c17 Maní airgara 2c18 isairi 3b01 táircet 3b08 conaoiladigthe 3b09 isairi 3c21 nán raíngsiur 3c26 nádraíngsiur 3c27 iscuit airicc 3d08 airechas 3d08 do airiuc 3d10 gaíbes airechas 3d15 doairic 3d19 ináirritiú 4b09 indaim 4b26 asairchinnch 4c03 asíl nairegde 4c07 Intairdégud 4c13 dianairchissi 4c20 dia arischiscecht 4c21 aíritiú 4c40 tairchechun 4c40 isindaimmm 4d02 tairchechun 4c40 isairi 4d31 nadtairchechnatar 5a01 forairchinnch 5a11 ináirritiú 5a12 isairi 5b29 caní aíri 5b31 nádnairchiussa 5b35 andurairngert 5c09 airmitin 5d16 isairi 6b20 doairchet 6b26 aíri 6c08 indairitiú 6d05 tairrchet 6d06 tairrchet 7a02 árium 7a12 aíriitiú neich 7b01 airde 7b04 diairchinchib 7b11 hóairegas 7b11 immaircide 7c04 aíriitiú 7c13 aíriitiú 7d14 isairi 8a09 ni aírmithe 8c13 isairi 8c06 airrofetar 9b17 isairi 9b18 nóairitiú 9b23 ni airicc 9b24 isairi 9c10 aratairche 9d01 is aíri 10a04 ni airbertis bith 10b08 airbert 10c03 airbeir biuth 10c06 aírisom 10c10 airbert 10d14 airbert 10d18 aíriitiú 10d31 airbert 11b14 airbert 11b15 airbert 11b18 áiri 11b21 arnách airbirid 11b25 aírmitin féith 11c14 ciaus airgead 11c17 isaire 11c11 isairchen 11d03 aíriu 11d11 aírisom 12b05 tairchealla 12b33 doairici 12c26 an taircri 12c31 farnaire 12c35 cia aírm 12d18 immaircide 12d18 immaircide 12d26 donairchet 13a36 isairi 13b18 a(i)ritiu 13b04 inúrt aírinaí 13b27 ni aírisom 13d17 aíri 14a20 airíbsi 14a33 óndaircur 14b12 doraíirngert 14c32 is ar aríscribers 14c40 intairissem 14c43 donairíssed 14c43 airíbsi 14d25 isairi 15a16 aírmitu féid 15a19 aíriu 15a23 atairchet 15a34 isairi 15b17 isairi 15b18 doairíci 15b28 aíriubi 15c01 ni aírmithe 15d12 aírrien 15d23 aíríd 16a1 oceanaíritin 16a12 ocaírin 16a15 airíbsi 16a26 ni airgursa 16a28 na airilicud 16c17 aíriubi 16c23 aírocre 16d07 aíriubi 17a05 aírlíthear 17b22 aíri 17d16 rópsa airchinnech 18c15 isairi 18d01 niairegdú 18d14 isairi 19a19 ní aíric 19b02 andurairnrgred 19b22 aírib 20a03 airíusi 21d11 isairi 22a06 aír 22b06 immaircide 22c17 aírib 22d25 isairi 23b17 aírcur 23b19 aíri 23c07 nátáirg 23c13 taircéd 23c14 isairi 23d25 isairi 23d26 ní aírm 24a17 aírde 24b28 airde 24c02 oca aírítin 24c13 aírirg 25b20 bid aíreghdu 25b21 rann aíregh 25c26 cenn aírirch 25c27 andurairnrgert 25c28 ci aíret 25d01 aíraí 26a14 immaircide 26a23 náiraígdu 27b14 aírib féisne 27c19 isairi 27c22 tairtht 27d23 biaisairchinnch 28b14 diairlabri 28b15 renairite 28b21 nairlethar 28b32 renairite 28c06 aíria 28d32 aáirrit 29a06 aírib biuth 29a25 doraíirngert 30b02 andurairngert 30b03 nídaircet 30b12 isairi 30b25 doaire [leg: doaireur] 30c01 doraíirngert 31a09 aírilicud 31c05 aírl 31c07 aíriitiú 31d02 aíriitiú 31d03 niarbéér fritt 32a20 airíritiúson 32a23 aíritten 32a26 andurairnrgred [leg: andurairnrgred] 33b03 durairngert 33d10

ir-with neutral consonance

hirchri 3a14 irgail 3b11 a nirgair 3c23 járnairgairiú 3c30 conirchloiter 4a14 hirnaigde 4d20 níirmadatar 5b02 irgal 5d18 iroimed 6d04 nímirchói 7a11 irlatu 7c02 roirladigsetar 7c16 irdírce 7c02 irdírce 7c03 irdága 7d10 irdurcu 9b17 doircgairiú 9d01 irlamu 11a07 doircgairiú 12d32 irócre 16d07 isirlam 16d07 oicrbáig 16d08
irfócire 16d10 moirbag 16d11 ni irbágam 17b06 iniráil 18a17 diarnráil 18a18 ocirbáig 20a03ndon risolcot 22d07 biddaigairiu 25c12 icrhe 26a05 irchomted 26a23 niráil Wb26a30 ilraithi 27c11 arni irmadadar 28a21 irdorcú 28b32 irdúrc 31b4 irtach 32a23

ir- with palatal consonance
irnigde 4a27 rinnigde 4d18 irnigde 5c20 irnigdí 5d22 irnigidb 7a12 irlithi 7c14 irnigdi 10d15 isirchride 11a29 immircidi 12b26 anasirchride 13d08 irnichthe 17a05 irnigidid 22c08 irlíthi 22d02 irchlige 22d18 irnigde 23a13 arisirchride 24b05 irtírdirc 24c15 indirníg(d)e 25c23 irlithi 27c08 irnigde 27c12 irlithi 27c19 irlithi 29b02

er- with neutral consonance
erru 4d20 errusom 11a29 rochoncherloatar 14c06 erunn 15d13 dianderóimtis 26a22 erruíbsi 27d07 erutsu 27d19 erutsu 29d7

with palatal consonance
erru 9c08 erru 11a20

MI
air-
immidaircet 2b05 airc 2b06 immidaircet 2d04 airc 14a04 airc 14a04 airc 14b12 immannairi 14d16 immaircet 17b20 hónephairirim 17d06 airc 20b02 Mairchisseacht 22c14 isindairítre 24a14 duaircet 24d05 immindaircet 25c15 airc 27a06 nad comairlece 27a07 airceltai 27b10 immenaíri 27b12 Airnaíb 27c16 intain saírleci 27d10 ní aircíbe 29b14 dunáirngabail 29c14 nadairíghther 30a03 airc 30c05 airmidet 30c17 mán nairí 30d24 niconairsoilset [leg: niconairsoilet] 31b09 airc 31b17 airc 31b17 airdiri 31b17 airbirt 31b24 annad comairlecbí 31b15 conraírleic 32c04 nairí 31d05 aircmarleicthe 32d05 nach[am] chommaírlíc [leg: nach comairleca] 32d05 saírleither 32d17 frisairrisseid 33b28 nanairtbide 33d06 intairissitis 34d19 saírleitheca 34d21 immearíic 35a07 doairchét 35b09 acomairbhte 35c15 acomairbhte 35c17 saírleced 36a29 hoairchellad 36b02 aircdu 37d14 condammairlece 38a11 taircheta 38c09 intaircur 38d12 frisairrissetar 39b13 airc 40c20 intan saírleci 40d06 airmert 40d12 aircbhe 41d02 airdbe 41d05 aircís 44b07 innairguir 44b20 airc sechís cot rairléicsom 44d16 saírleci 44d21 45a08 hoaircuir 45c05 airc 46a21 airindéaes 46b02 aircchas 46b06 dorairngert 46c20 airc 46d03 airc 47a08 fris tairrissetar 47c03 trissinnaimir 48c19 airnaiab 48c22 airdbidí 49a25 innNeillmid 50d02 airc 50d07 tairngrí 50d10 airc 51a19 airccech 51c02 air 53a15 airc 53c13 rochomairleic 53d09 airc 54a01 saírleici 54a10 saírleici 54a10 connammanairí 54b10 airmí 54b30 airmí 54c04 airdbiú 55b17 airdbidí 55c15 aircendám (airchenann) 56b22 maniscomairlece 57c05 aírleic 58c06 aircbte 59a10 aíre 59a22 cda aíreleci 59c10 airc 60a06 aircfrithorcuin 61a10 airc 61a15 aírlíte 61a20 connairleicter 62b19 innarnairbrib 63c12 dunaircechainnsom [leg: dunaircechainnsom] 64c22 innairechas 64d11 huanairmbiurt 65a08 airnaiab 66c06 airc 66d15 aíris 67b25 airc 68a15 airc 68b01 airc 69d14 aircinnech 71b10 imme airc 72d09 immeaire 72d09

292
immeairc 72d09 immeairc 73a11 airchennech 73b11 air 73c02 immeairc 74b01 conairlecius 74c15 duairrnirtsi 74e20 immeairc 74d13 immeairc 74d13 duairnragaird 75d06 indancomairlené 77d07 sechis duairsi [leg: duairstiur] 79a09 donairisíu 79a10 airdhiu 80c13 duairnredret 81b02 airmi 82a08 sidairleciussi 87a08 duairnngerat 87b15 nairechdae 87b21 airdreich 88b05 air 88b15 airchelltaide 89c07 airmintig 90a04 airbirthi 90a11 airnaib 90a11 air 90a14 airmite 94b23 air 94c09 innairidig 94c11 airbirthi biuth 94d01 airmbrith 95a11 roairis 95d09 airc 95d10 airc 96b18 anairmert 98a07 arinuindnedchi 98b11 airdhiu 100a06 immeairc 103b07 ndair tairissadair 104b04 conairtissar som 104b04 isairi 105a04 duraiungert 105b11 conairleci 105c09 duraungert 108b08 duraungert 108c02 nadairnertar 108c08 dundarairgirtse 109c09 immeairc 110d08 airnaib 110d09 airi 112b20 huanaircheon 113b10 dorairengert 113d05 airechdu 115d08 airdibid 116d04 isairi 118b01 airm 119a08 immairc 119d05 conairleceit 121b12 airigid 123a13 duraiungert 123c01 airci 123c08 cairnairlic 125a09 noairiget 125d04 isairi 126c10 dianairlicther 127a15 airlicthid 127a16 airechas 128a15 sechis duraiungert 130c16 maní airisededar 131b04 indairechsa 131c05 airechas 131c09 airci 132a01 commairic 133c04 imminndairec 135a07 airdibide 135d06 dorairengert 136c12 air 138d02 airdrisse 138d05 aircis 142b03 airnaib 144d07

er-with neutral consonance

eruibsí 2a11 hoermaissiu 2d05 isærutsu 2d08 bed erseitlichi 14d02 erbaid 14d15 andunairchain 15d10 erngabthi 16a05 noerladaigits 16b14 honeroiimer 17c07 erlama 18c06 serheltoither 18d19 inerchelltae 19a02 donerhanatsom 19b11 nerru 20b11 errenraid 20c02 doerbeirt 20d01 doerchain 21a07 erumna 22a01 nersoiiletce 22a11 érchlos 22b01 ersoiiletce 22b01 iarnaerbertad 23b05 ertexti 25a13 erlabrai 26c06 érdaircigdir 28b15 ergabale 29c18 iserlam 29d11 maní eromnet 30d13 isintercher 30d27 aethi 31a04 erchoitechaib 31d14 níer n ngá 32d19 erat erlam 33d09 con-
erchloí 33d16 oergail 34c12 erchuraib 34c13 ergeg 35a20 baerchoitech 35b25 ergairi 35c11 ergairi 35d18 erdarcai 36a10 érlamae 36c20 erlamaidir 36c21 er naïgd 38c11 conmerchloither 38c29 erchót 39c20 erchrai 39c34 cenerchót 42c19 eredig 45d03 ersoiilciti 46a07 arnda ersoilcet 46a12 nachaibersoilcfithe 46a14 nadersoilcfitis 46a19 cenersolcuad 46a22 cena nersolcuad 46a23 erdarcu 47a18 ergaí 47c02 erhoat 47c04 doergairi 48c05 erthritae 49b08 eréigim 50c09 mernairgdese 50d07 erru 54a34 donerchanad 54c24 aernaidge 54c37 ernaig 54d03 not-erdarcugub 55a05 diersolcuad 55a18 eredig 55c01 aerédig 55c01 ehook 56a13 nerumsha 58a11 erhook 58b10 erchredetu 59b06 nercheradach 59d03 ara erchredetu 59b06 n-erluat 60b16 cia
erchomraiictis 61b16 erchoit 61c06 huandereni 63d13 erbrúnúinn 64c17 inerdarcus 64d01 neraldaigedur 64d03 erladaigdir 64d05 innerdaic 64d06 erdaric 64d10 innerdarcus 65c05 erlataid 65d09 erdaic 66a01 iarnerglannadae [leg: iarnerglannadzachannae] 68b04 erchoiitig 68c21 n-erchoisí 73c09 innerfoichill 73d02 erégim 74b01 nephernoitchechta 74c06 indernaigdae 75a06 huerchoraib 75b08 conretortatatar 75d10 ergalaiichthib 78c05 erum 86b01 dindergabail 88a02 dergomharrac [leg: dergomharracai] 88c05 erdarcaighse 89b04 ereg 90b19 eregem 90c08 innerégime 90c12 coneregim 92b10 erthroid 92c11 éral M19b06 aerscailuid 96a08 erru [leg: erriu] 96d03 erberdu 97d02 erlama 100c24 ersoiilchit 100c24 erlam 102a10-
11 erlam 103c06 erlam 106b11 coerlundicear 106c06 eronn 106c13 eret 107d08 ní 1128c07 lase conterchomraic 119b12 anerchrae 119b09 anersolcud 120d05 erlatad 120d18 anertach 121b07 erchot 121d04 ergarthai 121d06 er 122a16 anerchrae 122a17 erdarco 122d07 anergairiu 125a07 ní erthaissiu 126d11 ersoilead 127a20 inderbarten 128d03 erdachaith 130b10 erlaman 130c05 ercradhach 130d03 duerchradaitid 130d08 erru 130d15 eroímsiu 132c15 erdaicr 133b06 erthoitar 134d03 ercradchach 135d07 erut 140b01 sterisisedar 145c04

er- with palatal consonance

ní ercheltar 21c12 ermitiu 22a04 ermitiu 22c06 ermitiu 24d31 erigmea 26b22 erchride 26d12 nanaeigme [leg: naerigme] 27d05 ermitiu 28a21 eriti 29a15 erchelu 32a18 ermitech 32b03 honderchisseacht 32d23 32d27 ciaeret 33a09 erbigithir 35b06 inermitech 35b08 ermiten 35c23 hoerchellad 38a13 an dunerissidersu 38c25 erbertaidh 38d17 ergim [leg: eregim] 44b04 ríissem 45c09 ní erchissea 46c15 anermien 47b02 ermiten 47b04 nn-erbert 46b28 ciarneiu 47b01 erbert biadh 47c04 hónerberadh 48a05 hónerbera 48b12 ndercheltei 49a08 cia nderberthar 49c03 erchdu són 53a15 ercheltai 53b14 erbigirther 54b10 mernigde 54d07 inderidech 55c02 innergim 55d11 n-erbert 56a13 n-eribirt 56a19 tríerchellad 57a02 eritii 59a15 erchised 61a05 nembert 61c09 ní erlissai 62a09 erchelte 63c16 duerchisseocht 63d10 erchdu 64c22 erderc 65c10 sencheromhertae 65d04 ermitin 66c18b erib 67b17b ermiten 67c06 ermiten 67c07 erríg 67d17 inerbert 68b14 duerbert 68c14 erbert 69a23 eibert [leg: erbert] 83a05 erbigirgidh leg: erbigirgidh 90a07 inerigemsa 90c11 ermitin 91a06 ermitin 92a07 inderidech 94c12 erbirthi 98c10 amal dunerberar 99d01 eneo leg: eneo 101a04 innergim 101a09 erbertae 101d02 inana eiritcha 101d03 erchellad 102a10 ermitiu 108b12 erriu 116d05 araneirmest 118d10 innaerchisecth 120a05 innergim 121a06 comermgim 127d10 erbirt 128c02 ermitiu 128d07 ermitiu 128d09 erchinn 131c12 óeritnichí 132c15 nermiunghi 137d01 huand eregim 139a13
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air-

airdircus 2a03 airberthach 3b24 airriusom 4a08 airic 4b09 Airí 4b13 nairec 5a11 airdixí 5a15 nairí 6a05 airdíxá 7b14 aíri 9a08 is aíri 9b10 is aíri 10a08 airsailche 14a16 isairí 18a01 airdíxi 18a06 hairíriu 19a03 isairí 19b02 ní aíirecar 20a09 airdrixu 23b03 airléích 24a14 airíndí 27a02 aíri 29b15 ni-áirdben 30a04 diairísin 31a06 aíríndí 33a03 airíndí 33a04 airíndí 33a07 airíndí 33a08 airíndí 33a14 airíndí 33a18 airíndí 33a21 airíndí 33a28 airíndí 33a30 airíndí 33a31 airíndí 33b04 aírther 34a02 airíndí 35b05 airí 35b13 asa-nairbercar 39a26 aíri 41b03 airdíxá 44b01 airíne 49b17 aíri 50a04 airíech 50a26 aire 50a27 airégem 51a07 aírcherellad 52b03 airdíxá 56b04 aírchelad 62b09 aliredech 65b10 aírchinnéch 66a17 aírid 66a25 aíri 66b10 airírtuad 67b01 banaírchinnech 69b05 aírmm 70b13 aíri 71b08 do-airbirt 76b01 innaairde 77a06 airídhga 77a08 airiddhen 92a02 airdíxá 92a03 airdérdug 93b08 aírddá 103a02 airdícse 104a01 aírressen 106b15 airiuca 106b20 nairdíxa 109a05 ní air-icc 137b04 aíri 138a04 aírítin 139a07 forsainirisedar 139b01 aíri 143a01 ní aíreacar 145b03 do-airbirt 149b07 aíri 153b06 aíri
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er- with neutral consonance

ni-erchuiretar 6b17 erochair 12b04 cotom-erchloither 17a07 erchoitech 34a07 ersolgud 107a03 erchomul 126b01 anerthuasach 138b08 ní-eróim 139a05 erchrae 143a03 do-erdechtim 155b04 erchra 169b02 erchrae 192b03 ní-erchondla 208b05 con-rerotatar 210b04

er- with palatal consonance

innheret sin 148a06 érchintiu 152a04 an-erchre 193b07 treerchre 197b09
Appendix V: The enclitic demonstrative

For the purposes of this collection, I have marked in bold all instances where the enclitic does not match with the expected final consonant quality. The instance of -seal-seo are underlined, as while they consistently occur with a palatal auslaut, they are further deviations from the expected -sal-sol-se forms.

Wb
Attestations that occur with expected consonant quality
indectsa 3a07 infectso 3c13 indectsa 3c22 indechtso 4a08 innitirchorsa 4b01 indectso 4d03 indrásns 5c14 infectso 7c05 inmnesso 8d18 forscininsa 9b10 infectsa 9b20 indomunso 9c09 intórdsa 9c17 infectso 9d18 inchrudso 10a05 in fectsa 10a06 inchrudso 10c21 inbéisso 11c21 indorsa 12c35 insindiuthso 12d04 trisanimthanadsa 13a10 infectso 13d07 inna epistlese 14a15 infectto 14a23 amaiths 14b06 infecthsa 14d01 inchúrsagthaso (MS incúrsagthaso) 14d06 in dor sa (MS indor .i. sa = Facs.) 14d28 donbiuthso 15b25 infectsa 16b07 anuilese 16c08 isintestiminse 16d07 infect so 17a12 inna fochathosa 17d28 insechasso 20a5 in fechtso 21b14 infectso 21c04 infectso 21c08 acethardese 21d08 infectso 22b08 narétusa 22b23 cossalaasa 23a17 infecth so 23b10 nahulilse 23c11 infecthso 24b24 ineptihisi 25b09 infoditinigese 25c20 inneres 27b11 anetach macc cóimsa 27b16 ind epistilse 27d13 nabriathrasa 28c11 inmaicsi 28d22 insimbithsa (MS isimbithsa) 29b14 inchrudso 31c11 angaimredsa 31d14 asainredsa 32a05 infectto 32a15 inchruthso 33b01 iarsinchumsanathso 33b14

Attestations that occur without expected consonant quality
indepistil so 3b20 indfirso 5a05 átredeso 5c22 isind insci so 6a26 inna huilisa 8d26 trisintestiminso 10b19 andedeso 10d08 andedeso 12d01 infogur st 12d05 inninsci so 13c12 andruainitheso 13d20 indlibuirso (MS indliburso) 15a30 anuilese 15d13 indforcitil sa 16a15 indfirso 19d1 inda nainmso 21d01 forsintestiminso 23c11 acethardese 31b24

MI
Attestations that occur with expected consonant quality
in nuathintudsa 2a06 insalmso 2b06 dincethrurso 2b13 andubso 13d01 insalmsa 14a04 isintsalmsa 14b04 isint salmsa 14b06 insalmsa 14b12 insalmsa 16a07 insalmsa 16a10 ingnímso 16c05 áscelso 17b18 andedeseo 17b26 innaiclichthiusa 19b15 innabriathrasa 22c05 ascelsa 23b08 isintsalmsa 24c08 insalmsa 24d12 insalmsa 24d26 insalm 24d29 innafoithsinse 25b08 insalmsa 26b10 isindlinursa 26c06 asinstitorsea 26c06 inbriatharsa 27c10 dunt salmsa 27d02 inferso 30d24 innadausa ón 31b05 mailliuso 32d06 insalmsa 35a07 insalmsa 35a08 insalmsa 35a10 insalmsa 35c11 indinnisseo 35c33 indfirseo 36a19 incethardai seo 36c23 innisseo 37c20 inna desese 42a07 insalmsa 42b07 insalmsa 44b01 insalmsa 44b04 noisinchruthsa 44b16 alatharsa 44b17 inninsesea 44b29 insalmsa 45d07 briathar sa 46a19 in quoniam so 47a08 dingalarsa 48a21 insalmso 48b11 insalmsa 48d27 focull sa 51a14 isintitul sa 52x00 insalmsa 52x10 anuilese 53c14 incaraighe [leg: incathraigse] 54c26 insalmsa 55c01 anuile se 55d21 fonidasa 56a24 insalmsa 56b16 insalmsa 57d13 indaferso 58a11 indosa 58c15 intrediuse 60a07 indassa 61b02 dundlobraise 61b03 forcitulsa 61d03 atredese 63b01 argumint seo 64c11 maraisndisenso 64d02 remepethise 65a11 dund
etarcnus 67b05 insalmo 67c18 isinchanóin se 67d08 inbethe so 68b09 in [leg: inna] canonese 68d11 inna óina oinasa 70a04 indi seo [leg: indímise] 71d05 ind inni seo 72a08 insalmo 74a12 insalmo 74b01 insalmo 74b12 insalmo 74d13 insalmo [leg: insalmo] 74d13 indliged sa 76a13 indliged so 77b01 andliged sa 77b11 inañnulise 78b18 int salmo 82c08 imnolad so 82d11 innanninnise [leg: inna innise] 83c03 in chomaíre se 88b15 indermitiu feid mórsa 90a07 insalmo 90b15 insalmo 90b15 indinni se 90c08 inerigemsa 90c11 innerégimse 90c12 indassa 92c07 in meitse 93b02 intuilsa 94a01 intlucht so [leg: int intlucht so] 94d04 andese 100c03 fudulso [leg: fundulso] 101c06 insalmo 107b01 indassad108d11 indsalm so 109b02 dund salm so 110d06 in salm so 110d07 indesamnae so 110d12 andligedso 111b15 insalmo 112c11 indafersaso 112d01 insalmo 113d03 in salmo 115d09 insalmo 116c02 fersin canoin se 121a08 trissandese 123c05 isdun focull sa 125a11 huandabrussa 127c22 incheil se [leg: inceil se] 129c15 fonsulso 133b01 in ferso 137b07 insalmo 138d01

Attestations that occur without expected consonant quality

Brither [leg: briathar] intestiminso 14d01 indinaimso 16c05 ind firso 23s17 innisciso 28b11 inda nainm so 34d06 anaimn so 37b28 intestiminso 38c02 intestiminso [leg: intestiminso] 38c03 forsin intestiminso [leg: forsin intestiminso] 44b10 intestiminso 61b15 intestiminso 62c07 andeso [leg: andedeso] 63b04 andeso [leg: andedeso] 65a02 int sailmo 65b14 immseitso 65d05 ind ord preceptae se 68c09 annoisba 69a21 aergarthase se [leg: aergarthase se] 69a21 lasna doini so 69b03 andeso [leg: andedeso] 74b01 in testimin so 101c06 donai trebaib so 101c06 donai trebaib so 101c06 int sailm so 102c05 int sailm so 103b06 innandegninae sése [leg: sé] 104d09 indib desmrechtai se 114b01 ind aliterso 115a02 in lésbaire cechtar dae se 121c23 isnaib desmrechtai se 128a08 insalmaib so 138c15 int sailm so 139a07
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Attestations that occur with expected consonant quality

in méisí 7a09 indiassa 1a04 in fechtsa 11a04 digammsa 14a06 indosa 14b02 infetchtso 20b04 innateoir rannasa 26b13 a ndédeses 28b08 ind flescse 40b16 in meitse 42b06 oendesimrechtso 49a12 aandligudsa 71a06 coitche na 72a02 inna briathra gredci se 72a02 huanaisa oct so 90b08 anmanaisa 108a03 inchrutso 111a05 an diligd cruathaige genitensa 113b03 innalitersa 114b02 in fecht so 153b03 andedeses 158b03 indosa 159b05 donadhguiso 163b10 an inignad so 167a04 fechtsso 185b04 fechtsso 188a17 infetchtso 190b05 intesteminse 193b06 fortírmach so 202a05 indulso 203a frisnacomacomla 203a10 ind óin ainmnede so 209b11 immuntorisinse 209b23 indicheilse 209b29 inniscise 210a01 inchrutso 211b04 inna olcsa 217a08

Attestations that occur without expected consonant quality

innméisó 1a03 in testiminso 4a12 na teora litreso 10a12 andédese 28b13 andedeses 28b14 innainnese 30a14 innachurrummaichthiso 39a10 anmanibso 188a27 in leitráim so 195b dobriathraib so 201b14 brethirso 203a16
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