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F. O. Lindeman, ‘Gaulish ieuru and Old Irish -ír’, SC, 26–27: 7–8, questions Lambert’s explanation of ειωγόου, the Gallo-Greek equivalent of Gallo-Latin ieuru, and OIr. -ír ‘dicavit’ as reflecting Proto-Celtic *eyor-u, derived from a pre-Celtic perfect active 3 sg. *pe-por-u, to the verbal stem *perH₃-. He notes the absence of a securely attested reflex of *pe-por-u/ in all other IE languages and, on the basis of Gk. perf. middle pépôtai vs aorist poreín, posits the perfect active 3 sg. of the stem *perH₃- ‘as (schematically) *pe-próH₃ -e in Proto-Indo-European’. Resultant IE *pe-pró, with loss of the intervocalic laryngeal and contraction of the accented stem vowel with the ending -e, would have developed into *ebrű in Proto-Celtic, with assimilation of the voiced bilabial -β- to the rounded vowel -ū giving *eurū. Lindeman suggests that this is the form which survives in (i-)euru, in which ‘i-’ may be the reflex of a prefix whose preform cannot be precisely decided’. K. H. Schmidt, ‘Celtic movements in the first millennium B.C.’, JIES, 20. 1–2: 145–78, deals with Proto-Celtic (PC) and the Celts in the first millennium B.C. under five headings: i) archaeology, ii) PC and Indo-European, iii) accounts from ancient tradition, iv) the linguistic sources, v) language contacts. Id., ‘Stand und Aufgaben der Deutschsprachigen Keltologie’, Akten des Ersten Symposiums Deutschsprachiger Keltologen, 1–35, furnishes a comprehensive report on achievements in German-language Celtic studies, the present state of research, and desiderata. J. M. Picard, ‘Les Celticismes des hagiographes irlandais du vii° siècle’, EC, 29: 355–73, presents a selection of hibernicisms from Muirchú’s Vita Patricii, Tirechán’s Collectanea, Cogitosus’ Vita Brigitae, and Adomnán’s Vita Columbae. For instance ferenn, as in the fixed expression of feru fer LU (Táin) 4777, which is reflected in ‘induxit nivem . . . pertinguentem ferenn’ = ‘ . . . usque feru uirorum’ = ‘. . . pertinguentem usque ad zonas uirorum’. Other examples from these 7th-c. works include hininglas ‘in a blue wave’, sid ‘fairy-mound’, the prepositions do, hi, for, ferta ‘tumulus’, gronna ‘marsh’. Calques are also listed, e.g. anterior (: Ir. airther), retro (: iarthar), sinistra (: tuaiscirt), dextra (: dess), donum (: dám), nutrire (: ailid), and iurare super alicuem (: for-toing). U. Mac Gearailt, ‘Über den Wechsel des narrativen Stils in den Táin-Varianten’, ScriptOralia, 52:60–99, also dealing with the stylistic
development of the Táin, draws attention to variation in style in Recension I, including the H-Interpolations, and then shows how the author of the Middle Irish Táin developed the sparser prose of Recension I, for instance through repetition. He also points out differences in style, language, and orthography between the first and second halves of the LL-Táin which suggest that it may be a composite text. V. Kalyguine, ‘Quelques aspects mythologiques de la tradition grammaticale vieil-irlandaise’, EC, 29:241–48, distinguishes two layers in Old Irish grammatical tradition, one based on that of Latin and another fundamentally different one reflecting indigenous ideas on poetic composition and a different basis for analysing words. Kalyguine illustrates a number of techniques from the latter which result in deformation. For instance, cennbichrus ‘changement de tête’, which involves replacing a consonant, usually the initial, with another. According to Kalyguine, such techniques show that the language of archaic OIr. poetry had many of the characteristics of secret languages. F. O. Lindeman, ‘Studies in Celtic and Indo-European morphology’, SC, 26–27:1–6, deals with some important points of morphology that concern early Irish. J. T. Koch, ‘Further to Tongu do dia toinges mo thuath, & c’, ib., 249–61, compares the apparently corresponding oath-formulae, Gaul. toncnaman tonsiiontio, Welsh tynghaf tynghet it, Ir. tongu do dia toinges mo thuath. He explains them as cognate inheritances from a Common Celtic tabu deformation of *tongū (do) Lugue lugiom ‘I swear an oath to Lugus’, in which the name of the oath-god and the nearly homophonous common noun ‘had to be avoided’. A. Ahlqvist, Téarmaid Gramadaí na Sean-Ghaeilge; Grammatical Terms of Old Irish, Dublin, An Gum, xi + 32 pp., provides learners of OIr. with a list of basic terms arranged in accordance with principles of traditional grammar. E. Poppe, ‘Vorüberlegungen zu einer Interpretation von Voranstellungen im Alt-/Mittelirischen’, Akten des Ersten Symposiums Deutschsprachiger Keltologen, 229–40, examines the cleft-sentence in early Irish. He presents a more detailed classification of its functions and points out two classes of constituents for which a non-focused (nicht-fokussierte) thematic antecedent is possible. D. Macauley, The Celtic Language, CUP, xvii + 466 pp., contains material on Old and Middle Irish. P. de Bernardo Stempel, ‘Probleme der relatif Chronologie: nochmals zu idg. *ō im Keltischen’, Akten des Ersten Symposiums Deutschsprachiger Keltologen, 37–56, considers again the development of IE *ō in Celtic in the light of the different chronologies proposed by her and Villar. Viewing Villar’s chronology as valid only from Celtiberian, she presents the evidence of other Celtic languages, for instance the gen., acc. pl. of the article in OIr., inna, which reflects IE *ō > ā in the second syllable. She argues in favour of the traditional view that *ō becomes ā initially