

1. Notes on the Milan Glosses: 21^b10

Breatnach (1980: 1-9) has collected examples from early Irish that show that the relative particle in the early language was not limited to expressing nominative, accusative, and genitive relations, as in the later language, but could also function prepositionally (i.e. as an independent dative). He notes (4), however, that by the time of the glosses, the prepositional use of the relative has disappeared, except poetically. The purpose of this note is to argue that there is (at least) one example in the Milan Glosses which still shows such a use.

Ml. 21^b10 appears as part of a heavily glossed section of commentary to Psalm 5:2 (verse 3 in the Vulgate). The text and gloss run as follows:

REX MEUS ET DEUS MEUS..

uult ostendere populum captiuitatis babiloniae castigationibus eruditum.. relictis idolis ad deum esse conuersum.. et quasi qui prius errauerit in gaudium cognitione ueritatis erumpere ac dicere rex meus et deus hoc est^A tu mihi audenti⁵⁻⁶ praebe tu suscipe quae alligare⁷⁻⁸ compellor⁹⁻¹⁰ qui es uerus rex meus et Deus. idola enim dei non erant.

MY GOD AND KING!

He wants to show that, having been taught by the castigations of the Babylonian Captivity and having left the idols, the people turned to God and they, as one who first has erred, erupt in joy with the understanding of truth and say “My God and King!” That is: “provide to me, being daring, and accept those things which I am compelled to mention! You, who are truly my God and King. They are idols, not gods”.

21^b10 .i. *ithéside cotammeicnighthersa* (= *it hé-side cotamm-ēicnighther-sa*)
“it is this to which I am compelled.”

* I would like to thank Jay Jasanoff, David Stifter, and Stefan Schumacher, as well as the editors of *Ériu*, for comments on the following notes. Notes 1 and 2 are the result of research on the Milan Glosses Project, funded by FWF (Austrian Science Fund) grant #P19137-G03, and note 3 was a brief part of my doctoral dissertation.

The important part of the commentary is *suscipe quæ alligare compellor* “accept those things which I am compelled to mention!” Middle Latin *alligare* (Classical *allegare*) means “to relate, recount, mention” and is clearly intended in the commentary. There is another *alligare*, however, meaning “to bind, hinder, hold fast,” and the scribe has glossed this second meaning in gloss 7-8, the first part of which reads: *conda-rias* “that I bind them” (pres. subj. 1sg. of *con-rig* “bind” + infixed pronoun Class C 3pl.).¹ Realizing that the literal meaning is incorrect, the scribe proceeds in the second half of gloss 7-8 to give an interpretation of what *conda-rias* should mean: *noch is nonda ges on con derlaig[e] dam son innahí no guidim dait-siu* “i.e., that I pray for them, that is to say, that Thou forgive me those things that I pray for to Thee” (the translation here is slightly modified from *Thes* to reflect the fact that *innahí* is acc. pl.).² Gloss 21^b9 on *compellor* reads *is ecen dam són nonda ges dait-siu* “it is necessary for me that I pray for them to Thee”, which shows the scribe further reinforcing the interpretation of *alligare* expounded upon in the second part of gloss 7-8.

Finally, we may turn to the main point of this note. As mentioned above, Gloss 21^b10, i. *ithéside cotammeicnighthersa* (= *it hé-side cotamm-ēicnighther-sa*), is translated by Stokes and Strachan “i.e. it is this to which I am compelled”. To indicate the plural *it hé*, we might emend the translation slightly to “i.e. it is these things to which I am compelled”, but I would suggest that a still better translation would be: “i.e. it is these things by which I am compelled”. That is, *hé-side* stands in an agent

¹ Here, as is usual in Milan, a Latin infinitive is glossed by means of a nasalizing relative clause with the subjunctive (*OIPG* 208, note to gloss 63; for an example, compare *ML*. 56^b39).

² The word *alligare* is glossed a number of times in Milan: *alligat* (23^c12 *conrig* i. *asindet*; 101^a3 *sechis asindet ón...*; 118^d10 *...adfét...*), *alligauit* (111^c5 *sechis asrindid són*), *in alligatione repetiuit* (110^c5 *...adcuidsom...*), as well as *alligationibus* (39^b5 *honaib guidib*) and *alligationes sua* (29^b5 *á aisndisnea* i. *a gudi*). It is interesting that in 21^b7-8, given above, the glossator appears unaware of the two different *alligares*, thus mistranslating the word, but at 23^c12 he glosses *alligat* as *conrig* i. *asindet*, showing that he has learned both senses, and from then on he glosses the word appropriately.

relation to the verb *cotamm-eicnighther*. This translation has two advantages. First, the sense suggests that the speaker is not compelled **to** some thing or things but rather is compelled **by** those things to pray to God about them (see glosses 7-8 and 9). Second, the suggested translation, with the relative functioning as the agent of the passive verb, conforms perfectly to the prepositionless examples collected by Breatnach (*ibid*, 3-4), where all but one involve the relative in agential relation to a passive verb. In the end, even if we accept Stokes and Strachan's translation, the fact remains that the prepositionless relative survived into Classical Old Irish, which itself has not yet been recognized. The interpretation argued for here, however, makes more sense contextually, and the fact that it also conforms to the pattern observed by Breatnach for other such relatives makes the case for the new interpretation that much stronger.

2. Notes on the Milan Glosses: 28^c17 *báinfeiti*

MI. 28^c17 *báinfeiti*, like most glosses representing simple translations of the Latin, is left untranslated in Thes. Pal., though it must mean something like “it was / was to be intended / fixed on”. The gloss appears above the last word of the phrase *posteaquam enumeravit quibus studiis uita rapacium diuitum esset intenta*, which translates roughly as “after that he enumerated to which inclinations a life of sumptuous greed would be directed”. While the meaning of *infeiti* is fairly clear, the form has not received a good formal explanation. DIL lists the form twice, once under *infeite*, as a participle to *ind-feith* and once under *ind-feith*, as a verbal of necessity. Formally, the ending in *-i* may be either a verbal of necessity or a past passive participle plural. The verbal of necessity very commonly corresponds to a Latin gerundive and follows a form of the copula (GOI, 443). While there is a form of the copula here, the 3sg. pret. *ba*, there is no Latin gerundive, and a verbal of necessity does not fit the context.

Since the Latin commentary is explaining that the psalm mentioned the (bad) things a life of sumptuous greed is directed towards, a gloss meaning “the life of sumptuous greed is to be fixed on” would not fit. We would expect the glossator, if offering an opinion on the text (rather than a simple translation), to express the opposite opinion: “the life of sumptuous greed is not to be fixed on”. It seems safe to disregard the reading as verbal of necessity. The most one could suggest is that perhaps the copyist, knowing the frequent collocation COP + verbal of necessity, mistakenly wrote the verbal of necessity for the form that actually stood in the text before him. The question then would be what the form in the text was.

If this gloss is, as assumed here and by Stokes and Strachan, simply a translation gloss, then the proper analysis of *infeiti* is as a past passive participle, corresponding to the Latin *intenta* (past passive participle of *intendo*). The Latin and the 3sg pret of the copula *ba*, however, require a singular participle, whose ending is *-e*, not *-i*. Since there is already in Milan an incipient tendency to confuse *-i* and *-e* in final position (see Strachan 1903: 52), *infeiti* can be interpreted as a singular showing the beginning of this confusion.

Having established that *infeiti* is a singular past passive participle, we must ask what verb it is the past passive participle of. I would like to suggest that it is the past passive participle of a weak verb **ind-feithi* “intends, fixes on”. In order to uphold this interpretation, a couple problems must be solved. One problem concerns the *infe-* of the the form *infeiti*. Other forms from this verb (vn. *indithem*, cf. MI 28^c14, 31^a12, etc. and derived adj. *indithmech*, cf. MI 35^c28, 51^c6) always have *indi-*. This difference must be explained. Also in need of clarification is the verb class of **ind-feithi*, since it is taken as strong by DIL (I-226.47-50). A strong verb ending in a

dental, however, would have a past passive participle in *-ss-*, not *-t-* (cf. *indrisse* “overrun” *MI. 18^c14*, ppp. of *ind-reith*).

The first problem, the initial *inf-*, can be relatively easily dealt with. First, it must be stated that the form surely contains a lenited *f*, i.e. *infeiti*. The *punctum delens* on *f* is not used in *MI.* (see *Thes* i 718, correction to page 81, l. 29), meaning that *f* is often written where it would not be pronounced. Further, as noted by Thurneysen, two different prefixes, **in / *en* and **ind* have fallen together in Old Irish: “they have become completely synonymous and occur side by side in the same compound: pres. **do-ind-naig** “bestows”, perf. (with **com**, §533) **do-é-com-nacht**” (*GOI*, 521). Thus, while the regular development of **inde-* before an **f-* is clearly *ind-* (as in *as-indet* “declares” < **ess-inde-fed-*), and while other forms from **ind-feithi* show **ind-* (e.g. vn. *indithem*), it would not be unreasonable to find a form showing the monosyllabic **in*. A similar case can be seen in *infolgide* acc. sg. nt. “hidden” (*MI. 51^d8*), a past passive participle of **in-foilgi* < **in-fo-legī-*. While **indilgide* might be expected, we find *infolgide*, exactly parallel to *infeiti*.

The vowel *e* in the middle syllable is also somewhat unexpected, but it, too, has parallels. Unetymological vowels are occasionally restored in internal syllables, as seen in various forms of *con-airleici* (e.g. *cot-rairléic-som* “He has permitted him” *MI. 44^d16*, with the long vowel of the simplex *léicid*) or in 2sg. pres. *condid forcane* “so that you (sg.) may teach it” *Wb. 28^d13* (with the vowel of the deuterotonic form for expected **forcnae*). The bottom line is that, while the *infe-* in *infeiti* (= *infeiti*) is not the historically regular form, it is not particularly anomalous within Old Irish.

Now we may turn to the *-t-* of the form. If **ind-feithi* is a weak *i*-verb, the ppp. would regularly end in *-te*, pl. *-ti*. As mentioned above, however, *DIL* assumes that

**ind-feithi* is strong. Though the verb has no attested finite forms,³ etymological considerations seem to point to a strong verb. Schumacher (2004: 675ff.) has argued that *fethid* is strong and that *1 fethid* and *2 fethid* do not need to be separated either within Old Irish or in Indo-European. The attestations of *fethid* and its compounds *ar-feith* and *do-feith* do point to a strong verb (cf. forms like 3sg. pres. *ar-feith* CIH V 1580.26 or 3sg. perf. *ro fáith* LU 853). The few *s*-preterite forms and the verbal of necessity *feiti* may simply be later, regularized forms. The verbal noun *fethem*, built with a suffix *-mā-* typical for weak *i*-verbs (*GOI*, 453), is also not probative for determining whether the verb was weak or strong.

Since it seems relatively certain that *fethid* was a strong verb in Old Irish, the ending of *infeiti* appears to be an isolated error. Liam Breatnach has noted (p.c.) that the expected past passive participle of a strong verb **ind-feith* would have been **indisse*, identical with the unattested but expected participle of *in-fét* (cf. *aisndisse* to *as-indet*). It is possible that simple homonymy-avoidance led to the rejection of the “correct” **indisse* and the adoption of a less ambiguous, more recognizable choice: *infeiti*.

There is one other possible solution, however. Since there are isolated cases of a particular compound of a strong verb showing weak inflection (e.g. *imm-foilngi* vs. *fo-loing*, *con-secha* and **con-sechi* vs. *in-cossaig*, and possibly *do-áirci* vs. *ar-icc*), one could argue that *fethid* was strong, but its compound **ind-feithi* was weak. We would then have another case of a root building both weak verbs, as in **ind-feithi*, and strong verbs, as in *ar-feith* and *do-feith*. At the very least, however, we must admit

³ The 2pl. impv. cited in DIL, *indfethid*, from *Féilire húi Gormáin*, Feb. 2, is actually from the simplex verb *fethid* “pays attention to”, as seen by Bergin (1938: 203). My thanks go to Liam Breatnach for bringing this citation to my attention.

that the form *infeiti* is derived as if from a weak verb *ind-feithi* in this gloss.

Otherwise, the past participle *infeiti* remains inexplicable.

3. Old Irish *cré*, gen *criad* and MW *pridd* “clay”

In his discussion of the development of intervocalic yod in Proto-British, Jackson (1953: 351) argued for a sound change Proto-British $*-\tilde{i}V-$ > W *-idd*, NC and NB *-i*. Schrijver (2003: 76) has recently questioned the claim, noting that it is based on a single example, that of W *pridd*, NC and NB *pri*. He is interested in *pridd* and *cré* because of the phonological similarity they have with hiatus verbs. He believes that the preform of OIr. *gnüid* “makes” and W (*gwei*)*nydd* “serves” is $*gn\tilde{i}eti$ with a long vowel (though see Schumacher 2004: 246 for arguments that the root vowel must be short). This view requires him to argue that $*k^{\#}r\tilde{i}Vt-$ was not the preform of *pridd*, since $*k^{\#}r\tilde{i}Vt-$ would for him have given W **prydd*. Schrijver does not specify the preform of the British etyma, saying simply that the preform is “obscure”, given that the corresponding Old Irish *cré*, gen sg *criad* requires an Insular Celtic $*k^{\#}r\tilde{e}iVt-$ with which the British data cannot be reconciled.⁴

Schrijver’s argument, however, appears to be incorrect. The paradigm of Old Irish *cré* actually supports a pre-form $*k^{\#}r\tilde{i}Vt-$. The critical form is dat. sg. *crí*, which appears twice in the Poems of Blathmac (ll. 817, 933) and twice in the Irish Gospel of Thomas (§§1, 4). See Carney (1964: 147, note to 817) on these forms. That the *crí* belongs to *cré* “clay” and not the indeclinable *crí* “body” can be seen clearly in the Gospel of Thomas §4: ...*dos-rigni / delba én de chrí* “he made them, images of birds out of clay” (my translation). The dative form *crí* would be totally inexplicable if the Insular Celtic preform were $*k^{\#}r\tilde{e}iVt-$. Because the expected short dative from $*k^{\#}r\tilde{e}iVt-$ would have been **cré*, identical to the nominative, and because the synchronic pattern for Old Irish short datives (outside the *n*-stems) is for the dative to

⁴ For Schrijver, the phonology of the nom. sg. is straightforward. The gen. sg. arose via shortening of the long vowel in hiatus (*GOI*, 33) followed by raising of **e* to **i* before a back vowel (*GOI*, 50; Greene 1972: 232). For the raising, compare 3sg subj *-cria* “may buy” < **-crēa* < $*k^{\#}r\tilde{e}iāt$.

be identical to the nominative, the form *crí* could never have arisen via analogy within the paradigm of *cré*.

Arguing that the word was originally an $\check{i}\bar{a}$ -stem, as Thurneysen suggests for the phonologically similar dat. sg. *scí* “whitethorn” (*GOI*, 204), is unattractive. A $\check{i}\bar{a}$ -stem could probably account for the Irish forms of *cré* and the *-dd* of the Welsh *pridd* (< $*\check{i}\bar{i}$, see Jackson 1953: 348ff), but it would leave the long vowel of the British forms without explanation. In addition, there is no clear evidence of an $\check{i}\bar{a}$ -stem for *cré* (or *scé*) outside of the datives *crí* (and *scí*) and transfers to dental stems do not seem to be common in Pre-Old Irish. Clearly, it would be preferable to explain *crí* and *scí* within a single paradigm. That both *scé* “whitethorn” (W *ysbyddad*) and *cré* (W *pridd*) are dental stems (see Binchy 1971: 163-4, note 65 on *scé* as an original dental-stem, not a guttural-stem) and that both have an unexpected short dative form is unlikely to be accidental. If we assume an Insular Celtic *t*-stem $*k^u r\check{i}\bar{i}Vt-$, we can explain all the forms. The dat. sg. $*k^u r\check{i}\bar{i}Vt$ yielded *crí* regularly. The attested *cré*, gen *criad* can be explained as a modification of expected nom. sg. $*cr\check{i}$, gen. *criad* under the influence of *scé*, gen. *sciad* and *dé* “smoke” gen. *diad*, both regular from $*sk\check{u}i\bar{i}ats$, gen. $*sk\check{u}i\bar{i}atos$ and $*d\check{u}i\bar{i}ots$, gen. $*d\check{u}i\bar{i}otos$, as has been seen by O’Rahilly (1942: 119). Despite the remodelling of the nominative, the subsequently anomalous dat. *crí* survived and even engendered an analogical dat. sg. *scí*, thus creating a unitary paradigm for this small class of monosyllabic *t*-stems in a front vowel (the short dat. sg. of *dé* is not attested).

Considerations internal to Irish thus make it likely that the preform of *cré* was $*k^u r\check{i}\bar{i}Vt-$. Since this preform will also yield W *pridd*,⁵ we should assume that the phonological reflex of $*-\check{i}\bar{i}V-$ is W *-idd*, even if this word is the only good etymology supporting the sound change. This sound change in turn suggests that Schrijver’s derivation of MW *gweinydd* from $*gn\check{i}\bar{i}eti$ (2003: 76) is not phonologically regular.

⁵ I do not address why W *pridd* “clay” generalized the nom. sg. while W *ysbyddad* “hawthorn, thorns” generalized the oblique. A possible explanation may be that *ysbyddad* represents a collective taken from the plural while *pridd*, which semantically did not need a plural, simply adopted the singular.

Bibliography

- Bergin, O., 1938: "Syntax of the verb in Old Irish", *Ériu* 12, 197-214.
- Binchy, D.A., 1971: "An archaic legal poem", *Celtica* 9, 152-68.
- Breatnach, L., 1980: "Some remarks on the relative in Old Irish", *Ériu* 31, 1-9.
- Carney, J., 1964: *The poems of Blathmac*. ITS 47. Dublin.
- Greene, D., 1972: "A detail of syncope", *Ériu* 23, 232-4.
- Jackson, K., 1953: *Language and History in Early Britain*. Edinburgh.
- O'Rahilly, T.F., 1942: "iarann, lárach, etc.", *Ériu* 13, 119-27.
- OIPG = Strachan, J., 1949: *Old Irish paradigm and selections from the Old-Irish Glosses*. 4th ed. Revised by Osborn Bergin. Dublin.
- Schrijver, P., 2003: "Athematic *i*-presents: the Italic and Celtic evidence", *Incontri Linguistici* 26, 59-86.
- Schumacher, S., 2004: *Die keltischen Primärverben*. Innsbruck.
- Strachan, J., 1903: "On the language of the Milan Glosses", *ZCP* 4, 48-71.