Assibilation and Palatalisation in Cornish

5.1. Old Cornish Assibilation

The assibilation of dental stops in Cornish is undoubtedly one of the most characteristic features of the phonology of the language that distinguishes it from Breton and Welsh. Both voiced and unvoiced stops underwent assibilation in certain positions at the end of the Old Cornish period; this process had been completed by the time of the earliest Middle Cornish. The beginnings of the sound change can be seen in the longest manuscript of Old Cornish glosses, Vocabularium Cornicum, which is considered to be a document of the early twelfth century.¹

In absolute final position, words like PrimC. *abrant "eyebrow" (W. amrant B. abrant), *nant "valley" (W. nant "stream" OB. nant ModB. ant "furrow"), *alt "shore, cliff" (W. (g)alt "hillside, high place" OB. alt ModB. aod) and *solt "shilling" < L. solidus (W. swllt OB. solt ModB. saout "cattle") became respectively OC. abrans, nans, als and sols.² The consonant groups –nt, *–lt were written with assibilation –ns, –ls in fifteen words.³ In only two words is the earlier, conservative spelling found: skient "wisdom" < L. scientia (MIC. skyans LC. skeeanz B. skiant) and its derivative diskient "unwise" (B. diskiant); in addition, there are the probably unintegrated loanwords firmament "firmament" (L. firmamentum), sand "dish, meal" (AS. sand) and the unexplained

² abrans Voc. Corn 38, nans 722, als 736, sols 917.
³ Also gols Voc. Corn. 32 (W. gwallt), dans 45 (WB. dant MIC. dans), sceuens 57 (W. ysgyfaint B. skevent), els 142 (cf. MIW. elldrewyn), cans 210, 211 (OWB. cant W. gan B. gant MIC. gans), argans 226 (W. arian B. archant MIC. arghans), guins 447 (W. gwyni MIC. guyns), mols 607 (W. mollt B. maout MIC. mols), pons 728 (WB. pont MIC. pons), oliphans 572 < OFr. ollfant < L. eliphantus (B. olifant). If kefals Voc. Corn. 81 is correctly derived from Brit. *com– + L. artus, irregular /t/ > /tl/ must have preceded /lt/ > /ls/ here; but mans 385 < L. mancus and ors 573 < L. ursus always had /−sl/.
The two reliable examples may have been influenced by the adjective skientoc "wise" (MlC. skyansek B. skiantek) – particularly diskient, which is the next gloss.5

That this began to spread to other positions is shown by five words briansen "throat" < PrimC. *brianten (OB. brehant W. breuant "windpipe"), elses "step-daughter" < PrimC. *eltes (cf. MlW. elldrewn "step-mother"), camhinsic "wrongly-led, erring" < PrimC. *camhintic (WCB. cam "wrong", W. hynt B. hent "way", Brit. suffix *–ig), eunhinsic "rightly-led, righteous" < PrimC. *eunhintic (MlC. ewn, B. eeun W. iawn, otherwise as the previous example) and denshoc dour "pike-fish" < PrimC. *dentoc dour (WCB. dant "tooth", Brit. suffix *–og, MlC. dowr W. dw(f)r B. dour "water").6 The fact that only skientoc given above does not show –nt– > –ns–, although it later had –ns– in MlC. skyansek, implies a strong likelihood that this change was also complete.

Assibilation presumably spread by analogy from words like elses "step-daughter" given above (the next but one gloss) and may have been most common before the plural ending –ou, –eu, although unfortunately the four instances of this ending in Voc. Corn. do not happen to include any examples.7 Perhaps nans "valley" or *hins "way" might already have influenced plurals such as *nantou > *nansou (MlC. nanssow B. antou) and *hintou > *hinsou (B. hentoù).8 This had

---

4 skient Voc. Corn 391 (skyans OM 167; skeeanz CWBF, p. 16, line 10 [NB]), diskient 417. firmament 8, sand 899, tairnant 290. See LHEB, § 110, pp. 507-8. The similarity of OC. *skiens < skient to L. sciens is purely coincidental, since the attested skient must be borrowed from the noun scientia rather than the present participle.


6 briansen Voc. Corn. 50 (see LHEB, § 75 (7), p. 443 n. 3), elses 144, camhinsic 308, eunhinsic 404, denshoc dour 558. The word sinsiat Voc. Corn. 411 probably did not have earlier /nt/, see § 5.8.3.

7 erieu 36 Voc. Corn, pobel tiogou 185, hosaneu 820, exgidieu 821. It is odd that the pl. ending is –eu in erieu, hosaneu, exgidieu since Brit. *–owes gave –ou in CB., not –eu as in W. and HautV., see P. Schrijver, Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology, pp. 331-2. Nance suggested that ennioa Voc. Corn. 828 be emended to en uriou "the seams" WB, gwri, NCED, Appendix i, p. 190. A few Welsh words in Voc. Corn. may show that the scribe was Welsh, perhaps explaining –eu and the failure to write assibilation consistently, see J. Loth, RC 14, pp. 301-4 and LHEB, p. 61.

8 nans Voc. Corn. 722 (nanssow PA 170b). It is likely that –ou > –ow replaced older forms with i-affection, cf. MIW. neint ModW. nentydd. It seems that OC. *hint > *hins was generally replaced by
clearly happened by the Middle Cornish period; the fact that all five words listed above are compounded with a suffix suggests that it was quite possibly the case by the end of the Old Cornish period as well, although there is no conclusive evidence.

Only two examples appear to show that final /–d/ was also assimilated by the time of these glosses: Voc. Corn. *bros "sting, prick" (glossed L. aculeus AS. sticels, cf. B. *broud) and Voc. Corn. *diures "exile" (glossed L. exul AS. * Ultlaga, cf. B. *divroad MLW. * difro).9 These would seem to be beyond dispute, although it is certainly odd that several hundred examples have final –t and final –d occurs in another seven. The latter show, as Jackson pointed out, that the sound in question was [d], even though –t was still the usual OC. spelling for final /–d/.

These words are *ruid "net" (LC. *rûz W. rhwyd B. roued), *snod "ribbon" (AS. loan), *scod "shadow" (MIC. *schus /skœz/ W. ysgawd B. *skeud), *yd "corn" (LC. *is, pl. *ision W. *yd B. ed), *rid "ford" (W. *rhyd OB. *rit, *ret), *lad "liquid, liquor" (W. *llad) and bregaud "bragget" (W. *bragawd).11 The only instance with the plural ending –(i)ou, –(i)eu is esgidieu "shoes" (LC. esgiz, eskas pl. MlC. skyggyow LC. esgizoû W. esgidiau).12

The word *chespar "spouse" is quoted by Jackson as a loose compound of OC. *cet "joint" (W. *cyd) and par "equal, mate" (CB. par); in contrast to *chetua "assembly, meeting" (OC. *cet + *ma "place" < CC. *magos "plain, field") without assimilation, which he calls "an old fixed compound".13 It might be plausible to argue that assimilation occurred in the first of these words in the order /–d + C–/ > /–tC–/ > /–sC–/, that is to

---

10 LHEB, § 52, p. 397. See further at § 5.6 below.
12 *esgiz AB 28a, 45b, 285c, 291a, eskaz 230c; skyggyow OM 1406; TH 8.10; esgizoû AB 250a.
say that /-d/ was first de-voiced to /-t/ before unvoiced /p–/ when the compound *chetpar /ke.tpar/ was formed and then assimilation /t/ > /s/ later gave chespar /ke.spar/. It would then be a unique case of internal /-t–/ > /-s–/, although of course few examples might be expected since original internal /t/ had everywhere become /d/ and therefore new /t/ could only arise by provection in this way. Jackson's analysis, however, proposes assimilation /-d/ > /-z/ in *ced /ke:d/ > *ces /ke:z/, W. cyd "a joining". Upon formation of the compound, /z/ would have been de-voiced to /s/ by sandhi before voiceless /p–/. This explanation is simpler and entirely regular; it would then follow that the compound was formed after the date of assimilation. It might be added that MlC. kes–"co–" (ModW. cyd–) probably remained a productive prefix in any case.

The example of chetua /ke.dva/ is more uncertain. It could be an older compound, as Jackson suggests. However, the scribal practice of using t for /d/ was itself conservative. There is nothing to suggest that the medial sound was de-voiced, since a few hundred words like gulat "country" (MlC. gwlas W. gwlad B. glad), frot "stream" (LC. frôz W. ffrwd B. froud) and diot "drink" (MlC. dewas W. diod B. died) can be compared to the seven words spelt with –d given above.14 Moreover, the following /v/ was also a voiced sound, unlike the following /p/ in chespar, so de-voicing of /d/ > /t/ would be much less probable.15 As the examples of final –t /d/ can also be compared to bros "sting, prick" and diures "exile" with assimilation, it may easily be that all of these words would have shown /d/ > /z/ in spoken Old Cornish at this time. Only the fact that the element *ma was probably obsolete as an independent word in later neo-Brythonic may suggest that the compound was formed before assimilation. Nonetheless it remained a productive suffix –va; in any case

14 gulat Voc. Corn. 718 (gwlas BK 187f), frot 737 (frôz AB 42a), diot 882 (dewas PA 42a).
15 For the question of whether /v/ was still partly nasalised, see LHEB, §94-101, pp. 480-94.
medial /–d–/ could probably still undergo assibilation, if only through analogy with the phoneme in final position. One might compare *denshoc dour and elses with medial /–ns–/ < /–nt–/ and /–ls–/ < /–lt–/. The relative dating of the two compounds may therefore be different, although this is not certain, but the inconsistency of the scribe in his use of graphs may mean that any phonetic difference could equally well be illusory. It would be reasonable to expect a Middle Cornish form *kesva /ke.zva/ in any event, so it seems difficult to give a definitive account of the discrepancy based only upon the evidence of these two words.

It has been assumed in the foregoing discussion that the reflex of assibilated /d/ was /z/ and the reflex of /nt/ was certainly /ns/.

In fact, the precise phonetic realisations of the sibilant phonemes so produced is difficult to prove with absolute certainty. The Breton situation may be informative here, although it is important to note that its new sibilants were reflexes not of /d/ and /t/, but of /ð/ and /θ/ instead. According to Jackson, these first became the infra-dental dorsal spirants /þ/ and /δ/ with supra-dental articulation (at a date unknown), then later the infra-dental dorsal spirants /ζ/ and /ζ/ with dento-alveolar articulation (by the early 11th century).

Although various types of medial voicing and other changes then occurred, varying for dialect, the phonemes (where they remained) became /s/ and /z/ by perhaps the 17th and 18th centuries.

It may be the case that the products of Cornish assibilation of /d/ and /t/ were /ζ/ and /σ/ respectively, as occurred in Breton. It will be seen, however, that occasional instances of historical /s/, albeit rarely, are palatalised when voiced like the reflex of assibilated /d/. I suggest that the main reason that this did not occur more generally is that medial voicing

16 For convenience, /nt/ > /ns/ may be taken to include the rarer /lt/ > /ls/, where not otherwise stated, but for the remainder of this section /t/ > /s/ is clearer for the purposes of comparison with Breton.

17 HPB §§ 955-6, pp. 669-70

18 HPB § 974, pp. 636-7. A summary of all the changes is to be found at § 975, pp. 687-8, but the precise details of the Breton dialects need not detain us further here.
of /s/ did not occur consistently. Moreover, the evidence of s/th confusions suggests that /ç/ could also be confused with these phonemes where such voicing occurred. For the moment, then, it is unsound methodology to propose more phonemes than are strictly defensible.

The new Breton sibilants /ζ/ and /ζ/ were a reflex of the previous inter-dental spirant phonemes /ð/ and /θ/, but with a relatively retracted place of articulation. As already noted, they were not the reflex of the alveolar-dental plosives /d/ and /t/, as in Cornish. Consequently the idea that any infra-dental quality should be ascribed to the Cornish phonemes seems unsound, since their predecessors /d/ and /t/ had no such quality. It seems far more natural to assume /z/ and /s/, which have a place of articulation closer to their unassibilated counterparts. To propose at the outset that Middle Cornish possessed three unvoiced and two voiced sibilants purely on the basis of the Breton parallel is unwarranted. Though the situation in Breton is extremely illuminating, such theoretical considerations suggest it was likely to have been a very different realisation of the same, pre-existing, inherited tendencies.

5.2. Exceptions to Assibilation of /–nt–/, /–lt–/ and /–d–/

The exceptions to the application of assibilation in Middle Cornish were first discussed by Loth and later by Lewis and Pedersen. Both of these discussions were superseded by the analysis given by George, who demonstrated that assibilation in internal positions occurs in all cases except (1) where a vowel and then a liquid follow, i.e. /–dVr/ or /–dVI/ (2) where a vowel and then a nasal follow, i.e. /–dVn/ (there are no examples with /–m/, since original /m/ was lenited and /mm/ does not

---

occur in this position) and (3) where the word has final /-dw/. This formulation is not in itself an explanation for the failure of assimilation, but it accounts much more neatly than previous accounts for the examples found and seems to be a complete summary of the exceptions. This removes the necessity for Loth's numerous categories based on various suffixed endings and explains his categories of isolated words in which the exception was observed. George's categories listed above may be illustrated as follows. In the first group are Voc. Corn lader "thief" (MIC. lader W. lleidr MIB. laez ModB. laer), piscadur "fisherman" (MIC. puscador W. pysgodwr B. pesketour, pesketaer), scudel "dish" (LC. skûdel, skidal, skydel B. skudell). In the second could be cited reden "fern" (LC. redanen W. rhedyn B. raden), corden "string, cord" (MIC. pl. kerdyn W. cordyn B. kordenn), henlidan "plantain" (lit. "broad way ", W. henllydan MIC. leden "wide"). The only example of the third group in Voc. Corn. is the supposed collective *bed(e)w (W. bedw B. bezv) of the attested singulative bedewen "birch tree", which does not occur for certain in later Cornish, since Lhuyd's identical form bedewen may have been taken from Voc. Corn. and Pryce's forms may stem from B. bezv. It is almost certainly the same element found in the place-name Penburthen, with medial /ð/ < /d/.

The objection that /w/ is not final in bedewen and the contrasting example of MIC. peswar "four" < PrimC. *pedwar (W. pedwar OB.

---

20 PHC, § 13.2.4, p. 298. The phonemic transcription /mm/ may be justified despite the loss of contrast with /m/ > /μ/, for the reasons set out at § 2.2 above.

21 The additional exception cited by Williams that no assimilation occurred before a and o is illusory, as all exx. fall within George's three categories, N.J.A. Williams, "A Problem in Cornish Phonology", Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 68 (1990), ed. M. Ball, J. Fife, E. Poppe and J. Rowland, p. 243.

22 lader Voc. Corn. 301 (lader BM 679), piscadur 235 (puscadur TH 45a.12), scudel 847 (skûdel AB 33a, 114b skidal 46c, 241a, skydel 55a). Note also that hudol "magician" Voc. Corn 315 (MIC. huder OM 565; RD 1831) and midil "reaper" 341 (LC. midzhar AB 13c) seem to have /l/ for expected /t/, which might be compared to /t/ > /n/ > /s/ in kefals noted above, § 5.1.


24 bedewen Voc. Corn. 696 (copied AB 241c); see § 1.2.3 above.

25 See CPNE, p. 18; also PHC § 13.3.3, p. 309.
petguar ModB. pevar) may perhaps be explained by the fact that the collective *bed(e)w was the simplex noun and that bedewen could have been analogically re-modelled to resemble it. Presumably assimilation was blocked by the following /w/ and the later CB. change /–dw/ > /–ðw/ was then possible (cf. B. *bedw-en > *beðw-en > bezv-enn). The form bedewen could alternatively represent /beðɔwen/, where d was merely orthographic; this would avoid assimilation and give an identical result. On the other hand, one might then expect **pethwar with /–ðw–/ instead of MIC. peswar. It seems likely that assimilation came first and prevented this, since /w/ is not final in OC. *pedwar > MIC. peswar and would not apparently have hindered the change. The fact that the form bedewen in Voc. Corn shows an epenthetic vowel need not be a problem, as may be seen from the Middle Cornish words quoted by Loth, for example casadow "hateful, hated one" (WCB. cas + MIC. suffix –adow W. –adwy), caradow "beloved" (WCB. car + ditto), plygadow "inclination" (orig. an adj., W. plyn B. pleg + ditto).28

George showed that the same rules hold for medial /–nt–/ in MIC. fenten "fountain" < OC. funten (W. ffynnon B. feunteun), MIC. hanter "half" (W. hanner B. hanter), /–lt–/ in MIC. alter "altar" < OC. altor (W. allor B. aoter) and rarer groups such as in MIC. clamdera "to swoon" (with /–mdVr, see note) and LateC. ardar "plough" < OC. aradar (with epenthesis of earlier /dr/ > /dər/ and unusual syncope, W. aradr MIB. arazr ModB. arar, alar).29 In a few nouns formed from adjectives

---

26 peswar PA 190b etc.
27 See HPB, § 717, pp. 501-2 for the reflex of CB. *pedwar in Breton.
28 casadow OM 892; caradow PA 45d; plygadow BM 14.
29 PHC § 13.2.4, p. 298; fenten OM 771 (cf. funten Voc. Corn. 740), hanter 956, alter 1170 (cf. altor Voc. Corn. 750); clamdra TH 7.3; ardar AB 43b (cf. ardrar Voc. Corn. 344). If MIC clamder (PC 2593) were Brit. *clam > MIC. claf (W. claf B. klañv) + suffix –der (see NCED, p. 23), the failure to lenite /md/ would be unique. Jackson does not consider it separately, LHEB § 94, p. 481, but compare the survival of /mb/ after lenition (with subsequent assimilation /mb/ > /mm/), LHEB § 112 (1), pp. 509-11. Otherwise, compare B. komz V. konz MIC. cows "to speak", in which [õs] usually occurs in V.
with the suffix –der, the groups /–nd–/ and /–ld–/ occur by sandhi and behave in the same way. George cited MlC. gwander "weakness" (gwan "weak" WCB. gwan), ughelder "height" (vghel(l) "high" W. uchel B. uhel) and melder "sweetness" (mel "honey", perhaps also *melys "sweet" W. melys B. milis). The examples OC. prounder "priest" (MlC. pronter Medieval L. provendarius) and OC. bounder "lane" (LC. Vounder Pembrokeshire W. meid(i)r, moydir Ir. bóthar) happen to be similar and would have followed the same pattern.

The major problem with George's analysis is that it defined the sound change as palatalisation rather than assibilation, even though there is no evidence of palatalisation in Old Cornish. His argument therefore rested on Middle Cornish examples with palatal spellings. This theory posits parallel changes /d/ > /d´/ and /nt/ > /nt´/, /lt/ > /lt´/, but a further stage /–z/ and /–ns/, /–ls/ in final position only. George subsequently withdrew this explanation in the light of arguments put forward by Williams, but it is argued at § 5.6 below that no satisfactory solution has yet been found that explains the distribution of assibilation and palatalisation in Middle Cornish. Nonetheless, the rules given by George for exceptions to the assibilation of /–d–/ and /–nt–/ are far

but [õms] elsewhere in B., perhaps for SWBr. *kous. See PHC § 1135 (note 5). If /m/ was instead epenthetic in [õ(m)s], homorganic /n/ might be expected before /s/, not /m/.
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The major problem with George's analysis is that it defined the sound change as palatalisation rather than assibilation, even though there is no evidence of palatalisation in Old Cornish. His argument therefore rested on Middle Cornish examples with palatal spellings. This theory posits parallel changes /d/ > /d´/ and /nt/ > /nt´/, /lt/ > /lt´/, but a further stage /–z/ and /–ns/, /–ls/ in final position only. George subsequently withdrew this explanation in the light of arguments put forward by Williams, but it is argued at § 5.6 below that no satisfactory solution has yet been found that explains the distribution of assibilation and palatalisation in Middle Cornish. Nonetheless, the rules given by George for exceptions to the assibilation of /–d–/ and /–nt–/ are far
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simpler and more comprehensible than the categories set out by Loth and should be accepted as the standard summary of its results.

George did not consider the phonetic reasons why assibilation was prevented if a vowel with a liquid, nasal or else /w/ followed the affected dental stop. Toorians pointed out that "… when a number of such alveolar consonants follow one another within a phrase the tongue will move not [sic] or hardly moves from its alveolar position and all the consonants will come out neatly (an intermediate vowel does not affect this…)… If on the other hand no such consonant follows the tongue will tend to leave its alveolar position to move into a more neutral position… this is likely to result in a more lax articulation so that the stream of air is not fully blocked any more and the phonemes become assibilated…"33

Toorians' analysis accounts principally for the fact that the groups /–dVr/, /–dVl/ and /–dVn/ remained unchanged, but this is because /r/, /l/ and /n/ shared the alveolar quality of the preceding /d/.34 Two additional conclusions may be drawn from this. Firstly, even if */–dVm/ had been possible in Cornish after lenition, or indeed in a later loan word, there seems to be no reason why assibilation should have been blocked before the labial /m/ in the same way as before alveolar /r/, /l/ and /n/. One would expect the tongue to fall into a lax position after /d/, since the following /m/ is not alveolar: consequently assibilation could presumably have occurred. Secondly, the phoneme /r/ probably had an alveolar pronunciation at the time of assibilation. It is sometimes suggested that Cornish possessed a retroflex /r/ [ɾ].35 This suggestion appears to be based

34 Whether /d/, /l/ and /n/ were generally alveolar or dental cannot be reconstructed and is of small significance here (but /l/, at least, must have been alveolar). There is a tendency in Northern Welsh towards a dental pronunciation of these sounds, while in most parts of Wales the consonants are alveolar. The difference is not phonemic, however, in any dialect.
35 NCED, introduction [no page], "Pronunciation". Also see N.J.A. Williams, *Cornish Today*, glossary, p. 285; also his *English-Cornish Dictionary Gerlyver Sawsnek-Kernowek*, xxviii. While *Cornish Today* supports a retroflex /ɾ/, Williams' dictionary undermines this opinion.
on the modern pronunciation of English in Cornwall, along with most of south-west Britain.\textsuperscript{36} The precise phonetic realisation of /r/ in Middle Cornish cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but an apical sound is most probable.\textsuperscript{37} Since retroflex [l] involves lowering the blade of the tongue and moving the tip of the tongue backwards, away from the alveolus and towards the hard palate, it is possible that such a sound would not have blocked assimilation. However, this is not precisely the same as the conditions for assimilation described above, since the tip of the tongue nonetheless remains in a tense position to articulate a retroflex sound. It can be concluded only that [r] or [R] is more likely to have blocked assimilation than [l] since these were articulated closer to /n/ [n] or [nn] and /l/ [l] or [ll], but the point cannot be put beyond doubt.

In contrast, it is interesting to note that in the words MIC. trysys "Trinity" (W. trindod B. treindod), densys "humankind" (W. dyndod), MIC. duses "Godhead" (W. duwdod) the group /–(n)dVd/ > /–(n)zVz/ never has assimilation of the first /d/ blocked by the second, even though this is a similar sequence of alveolar sounds.\textsuperscript{38} In the phrase ow fysadow "my prayer" < OC. *pedadou, the second /d/ survives in the group /–dw/ according to George's rules (see § 5.8-8 below) but it does not prevent assimilation of the preceding /d/.\textsuperscript{39} However, this case was almost certainly affected by analogy on the basis of the stem *pes– in the verb pesy "to pray" (B. pediñ) and can be discounted here.\textsuperscript{40} In cases like densys, trysys it seems that the lax articulation and assimilation of the second /d/ to /z/ afforded no protection to the previous /d/. The tongue does not make contact with the alveolus in the sibilant /z/ as it does in /d/,

\begin{flushright}
36 However, retroflex [l] does occur rarely in modern spoken Breton, especially in parts of Treger. On the varieties of /l/ in Breton, see Pêr Denez et al., Geriadur Brezhoneg, xv.

37 See PHC § 18.3.1, p. 428.

38 an drensys BM 994; densys RD 2621, duses 2515.

39 ow fysadow OM 1830.

40 pesy BM 404 (passim).
\end{flushright}
/l/ and /n/. This tends also to support the idea of an apical /ɾ/. Finally, the frequent word *kerense, kerensa < *kerenseth (B. karentez W. carenydd) shows that a final dental affricate was no block to assibilation, suggesting that *bolungeth (B. boluntez) with identical /–ntVð/ could equally have occurred in the unattested form *bolunseth.41

This ignores only the phoneme /w/ in absolute final position, which also prevents assibilation of a preceding dental stop, as seen in OC. *bed(e)w, plygadow, caradow above. The insertion of an epenthetic vowel seems to do nothing to affect this, perhaps because it may have happened after the date of assibilation but moreover because it would not have altered the articulatory position of the tongue. The labial [w] is a semi-vowel whose articulation can resemble that of a vowel in the respect that the position of the tongue may be determined by whatever consonant precedes it. That is to say that [dw] is articulated with the tongue in the alveolar position, while for example [kw] requires a velar closure just as does simple [k] but allows the blade and tip of the tongue to fall into a much more lax position than is true for [dw].

In the words *bed(e)w, plygadow and caradow, the tongue remained in the alveolar position for the sound /w/ after /d/ had already been articulated. Toorians' analysis required exactly this failure to alter the position of the tongue after /d/ in order to avoid assibilation. An epenthetic vowel (and presumably any vowel at all) would behave in the same way in this regard. This accounts for words with /–d(V)w/. It is apparent that the tongue would similarly remain in the alveolar position for the articulation of the labial in groups such as /nt(V)w/ and /lt(V)w/ and would not effect the lax articulation and consequent assibilation of the dental described by Toorians. In fact, there happen to be no examples with intact /–nt(V)w/ and /–lt(V)w/, apparently because this group was

---

41 kerense PC 549; kerensa BM 123; bolungeth OM 873.
rare except in plural forms that were re-modelled by analogy with the singular noun. These plurals are therefore later formations.\textsuperscript{42}

The fact that \textit{peswar} discussed above is not protected from assibilation may appear to contradict Toorians' analysis, but /w/ is not in final position here. The protection that would have been afforded by the alveolar quality of final /t/ is apparently rendered invalid in this sequence because the tongue moves into a more lax position to articulate the group /–wa–/ in the middle of this word. Here /w/ does not behave like a vowel but in fact interrupts the neat articulation of successive alveolar sounds, so that the tongue falls into a lax position for the vowel. In this instance /w/ should be understood as a semi-consonant rather than a semi-vowel. With this should be contrasted the feminine numeral \textit{pedar} "four" (MIW. \textit{pedeir} ModW. \textit{pedair} B. \textit{peder}) which does not contain the labial and consequently avoids assibilation of /d/ before /–Vt/ according to the rule.\textsuperscript{43} It is also worth pointing out that Toorians fails to draw the inevitable conclusion that George's theory linking palatalisation and assibilation implies a more tense articulation of the affected phonemes, rather than a more lax one, and would appear to contradict his own analysis in its basic assumptions.\textsuperscript{44}

5.3. Analogical Changes in Plurals and Suffixed Words

It should be added for the sake of completeness, as has already been briefly remarked, that these exceptions occasionally fail to apply in

\textsuperscript{42} See § 5.3 below.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{pedar} PA 190a. It is interesting that Nance did not compare this word with \textit{rag ov keusel y theder} "for they are talking, it is being said" OM 2794 and \textit{may theder worth the vlamye} "when one is blaming you, when you are being blamed" OM 2797 when he stated that "the archaic \textit{d} for \textit{s} of \textit{eder itself suggests that these forms were rarely used"}, NCED, Appendix VIII, pp. 202-3, since **eser and **pesar would equally have been in violation of the rules governing assibilation.
\textsuperscript{44} This criticism was levelled at George by N.J.A. Williams, "A Problem in Cornish Phonology", \textit{Current Issues in Linguistic Theory} 68 (1990), p. 245. See further at § 5.6 below.
the case of suffixed words that are derived from other common words, notably where plural and singulative endings are added to singular and collective nouns respectively. This analogical re-modelling has precisely the opposite effect to that seen in *bed(e)w based on *bed(e)w above, in which the change seen in *pedwar should otherwise have occurred. The assibilated consonant occurs by analogy in LC. guinzal "winnowing fan", formed from OC. guins "wind" (W. gwynt) and the Brit. suffix –el(l). The form briansen "throat" has been mentioned above (cf. OB. brehant W. breuant), as has OC. nans "valley" MIC. pl. nanssow, which demonstrates by and large why examples of /–ntVw/ without assimilation are missing, since the majority would almost certainly have been plurals of this type. The example of *kensow "recently" B. kentaou seen in agensow, degen[s]ow (of the same meaning) and the derived verb-noun degensywe "to draw near" shows that any remaining words were probably also re-modelled by further analogy with these plurals. It may be observed that the ending –ow is the single most common plural marker and this would account for its potency in analogical levelling.

There seem to be no cases of /–dVr/ > /–zVr/ and /–dVl/ > /–zVl/ by analogy, perhaps partly due to the relative rarity of the suffixes –(y)or, –(y)er and –el(l). Such compounds as OC. piscadur "fisherman" (MIC. puscador OC. pisc "fish", pl. MIC. pucas) and darador "doorman" (OC. darat "door" MIC. daras) may have been common before assimilation and regarded as sufficiently independent words to avoid analogical re-modelling. The suffix –el(l) is rare. The OC. logoden "mouse" > MIC. logosan seems to have been affected by the col. pl. MIC. *logas

45 guinzal AB 60a (guins Voc. Corn. 447).
46 agensow OM 796, degenow RD 2561 [with <s> omitted]; ow tegensywe OM 1079 [with provective mutation after the particle, from prep. (w)orth “against” with loss of /r/ and /θ + d–l > t–l/].
LC. logaz "mice". The analogical change /–dVw/ > /–zVw/ is certainly the most common in the pl. suffix –ow, for which may be cited amongst many examples OC. tat "father" (WCB. tad) > MIC. tas pl. tassow.

5.4. The Dating of Assibilation

By the time of the short, early Middle Cornish text discovered by Henry Jenner on the back of a charter in the British Museum (now known as the Charter Fragment), it is apparent that assibilation was already complete in all positions in which it would be expected in later Cornish. The charter itself is dated 1340, but the date of the endorsement containing this brief drama is almost certainly some years later, probably between around 1350 and 1400. If assibilation was a relatively recent phenomenon in ca. 1100 when Voc. Corn. was composed, it must have been consolidated during the early part of this two and a half century lacuna in the documentary record.

It appears that assibilation had not yet occurred at the time of the Bodmin Manumissions, a collection of the names of manumitted slaves and their manumitters added to the beginning and end of a tenth century manuscript of the gospels belonging to St. Petroc's Priory of Black Canons at Bodmin. These names have been dated from the middle of the tenth century through to the twelfth century, the majority belonging to the second half of the tenth century. However, it would seem that

---

48 logoden Voc. Corn. 583; logosan CW 407; logaz AB 19b.
49 tat Voc. Corn. 127, tas BM 2373; tassow TH 59a.18.
50 L. Toorians, The Middle Cornish Charter Endorsement. It should be noted that Toorians prefers the term "Charter Endorsement" as he discusses, pp. 18-22; however, the term "Charter Fragment" is now generally accepted and the distinction is of little consequence here.
51 op. cit., pp. 8-9 and Appendix A (containing a paleological description by Dr. J.P.M. Jansen).
53 See LHEB, chap. ii, pp. 59-60.
assimilation had occurred, at least in some positions, by the time of Voc. Corn. at the beginning of the twelfth century, so either there must have been at least a short interval between the two documents or else it may be mere chance that the latest of the manumissions do not happen to show assimilation. This is not an insuperable problem, however, since assimilation is not found as standard in Voc. Corn. and orthographic conservatism could account for the discrepancy. In any case, there are only around 150 Celtic names, of which very few would be affected.\textsuperscript{54}

An instance of Old Cornish assimilation $-nt > -ns$ occurs in John of Cornwall's translation into Latin in 1153-4 of an earlier, lost manuscript of the so-called Prophecy of Merlin, surviving in a single copy in the Vatican library.\textsuperscript{55} This includes some partly Old Cornish glosses, which appear to have been based upon or adapted from Brythonic, or perhaps from Old Welsh, although the date and provenance of the earlier manuscript is conjectural. The phrase \textit{pepliden Warnungens hahanter} "twenty-five and a half years" (for \textit{*pe[m]p [b]liiden warn ugens ha hanter}) shows assimilation in \textit{ugens} “twenty”.\textsuperscript{56} If the phrase occurred in the original, it must have had final $-nt$, since this is seen in the gloss \textit{guent dehil} "wind + ?", which may be either unmodified Brythonic (not necessarily South West Brythonic), Old Welsh, or Old Cornish without assimilation.\textsuperscript{57} It is interesting that /l/ is spelt <e> in \textit{guent}, although it appears to be too early, even if it is Old Cornish, to show any sound change.\textsuperscript{58} In addition, toponyms in both Wales and Cornwall occur, along

\textsuperscript{54} It is not clear from the editions if any names that might have been susceptible to assimilation can in fact be dated securely to the twelfth century, but the majority of names are dated much earlier.


\textsuperscript{56} The graph <d> for /ð/ in \textit{bliden} “year” is also a characteristic OC spelling.

\textsuperscript{57} Fleuriot, p. 48, interprets the latter word as “égrainment” (extraction of grain), relating it to B. \textit{dishilh} Cornouailiais \textit{dihilha} and V. \textit{dihillein}. This plausibly translates L. \textit{venti excissio}. Note that Curley mistakes the Cornouailiais form for Cornish, and that no such word is attested. The phrase \textit{awel garu} “harsh wind, breeze” is interesting: \textit{guent} and \textit{awel} presumably meant different types of wind.

\textsuperscript{58} cf. \textit{guins} Voc. Corn. 447.
with three which are difficult to identify, and some corrupt items that are not unequivocally either Old Cornish or Old Welsh.⁵⁹

Although it is open to considerable doubt that much of the material provided by these glosses is originally South West Brythonic, let alone Old Cornish (as it could easily be Old Welsh), it can nonetheless be considered as evidence here. The translator evidently tried to revise what he understood, excepting perhaps the place-names and the material that is now corrupt. The remainder, although it amounts only to a few scraps, can be treated cautiously as Old Cornish, albeit potentially with a residual Brythonic or Old Welsh veneer. It can be said with some certainty, at least, that the entire phrase *pe[m]/p [b]liden warn ugens ha hanter is Old Cornish in its present form. It cannot be Old Welsh because of the /n/ in warn before ugens, and it shows Old Cornish assimilation.

In any case, only the forms ugens and guent have any relevance to the matter of assimilation. The latter is also found in Voc. Corn. guins, with assimilation written. Since both words are attested in Cornish, the exact provenance of the original from which John of Cornwall was translating (if these were not his own additions anyway) does not especially matter here. He would have understood both words perfectly well as Cornish. Considering that he was writing in the mid twelfth century, around fifty years after the date of Voc. Corn., the assimilation in ugens seems highly likely to be his own emendation or addition. Since the pan-Brythonic nature of the list of names points to an earlier period, it seems reasonable to assume he neglected to amend guent in the same way. Even if guent is due to Old Cornish scribal conservatism, the slight evidence of these two words is wholly in keeping with the date of that

⁵⁹ The toponyms are Treruf, Dindaliol "Tintagel" (see § 5.2 below), Periron “Peryddon” (?), Armon “Arfon”, Mon “Anglesey”, goen bren "Fowey-moor, Bodmin Moor", Kair Belli [= Caer Beli ? i.e. Beli ap Mynogan ? Beli Mawr ? Beli ab Elfín ?] and Castel uchel coed. The item cusfic or culfic may be a copying error from Latin, according to Curley, p. 247, n. 197, while culemo (Fleuriot, p. 46) is obscure and michien luchd mal igaset (Fleuriot, p. 59; Curley, pp. 230-1) is apparently partly corrupt.
seen in Voc. Corn. above. It might be added in passing that /nt/ in hanter avoids assimilation before /t/ according to the expected rules.\textsuperscript{60}

The only method for more accurately dating the sound change that has been attempted is the analysis of place-name evidence by Dr. O. J. Padel.\textsuperscript{61} There are few names whose history can be traced consistently from an early date, although Padel shows that some, for example Seynt Gerent 1376 (but Seynt Gerens 1386), retained orthographic -nt even in the late fourteenth century. A casual glance at a map of Cornwall reveals that some modern names also show forms without assimilation, but many of these have reverted to earlier spellings or else may be in eastern areas where Cornish died out early. In some areas this may have been before the date of assimilation. Orthographic conservatism may sometimes have been a factor in the official spellings of place-names, as the example Seynt Gerent may show.

Without fuller access to Dr. Padel's findings and an analysis of the distribution and dating of a significant number of place-names, the most useful examples remain the earliest ones that show assimilation. This dating evidence has been examined at some length and is included here for the sake of completeness. Padel gives Penpons in 1232-33 (Penpont ca. 1214, now Penponts in Camborne parish).\textsuperscript{62} George cites Risleton from the Domesday Book 1086 (now Rillaton in Linkinhorne parish, apparently C. \textit{rid} > \textit{ris} "ford" + *\textit{legh} "flat rock, slab" + Eng. -\textit{ton}).\textsuperscript{63} He also gives the example Cofer-fros, perhaps "copper-stream", which was originally noted by Förster in an AS. document dated 960.\textsuperscript{64} It is even possible that this might be a later copy of an earlier document, although

\textsuperscript{60} See § 5.2 above. That /nt/ remains in hanter is a SWBr. feature, LHEB § 108, pp. 505-6.
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{ibid.}, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{64} PHC, § 13.2.6 (3), p. 303. See note in LHEB § 52, p. 398 n. 1; also CPNE, p. 101.
there is no evidence either way. In any case, Jackson considered that this was almost certainly too early and therefore agreed that it contained some element other than OC. *frot* "stream".\(^{65}\) The earliest example given by him is Förster's *Bos Carn* 1291.

It appears from the rather meagre early evidence that Jackson's dating of asibilation was broadly correct and that George's use of Förster's rejected example *Cofer-fros* from 960 must be mistaken as an indicator of the beginning of the sound change.\(^{66}\) If the date of ca. 1100 given by Förster and Jackson for Voc. Corn. is also correct, some 140 years later, the level of scribal conservatism in the orthography of these glosses would have to be staggering.\(^{67}\) Since the changes /–nt/ > /–ns/ and /–lt/ > /–ls/ appear almost as standard, yet there is only a trace of /–d/ > /–zl/, it seems unlikely that at least the latter change was old when they were written, even considering a certain level of archaism in their composition. The exceptions *skient*, *diskient* and *skientoc* tend to suggest that even the former sound change was also sufficiently young for the scribe to occasionally hypercorrect to the older spelling. At the earliest, the Cornish glosses cannot have come into existence before the monk Ælfric produced the original Anglo-Saxon glosses upon which they were based, normally dated to ca. 1000. If the date 960 were correct for the beginning of the change /d/ > /z/, it would already be difficult to explain why it is so infrequently written in the Cornish versions, since the AS. exemplar would need to be at least forty or fifty years old at the bare minimum. Moreover, the complete lack of asibilation in the Bodmin Manumissions strongly suggests that it could not have occurred until the latter half of the eleventh century at the earliest. In short, there is no reason to doubt that Jackson's date of ca. 1100 for Voc. Corn. is correct.

\(^{65}\) *frot* Voc. Corn. 737.

\(^{66}\) LHEB § 52, p. 398. The dating of internal *d > s* (and/or *d > g*) is addressed separately below, § 5.6.
Nonetheless it is certainly odd that the associated /–lt/ > /–ls/ and /–nt/ > /–ns/ are written almost without exception while /–d/ > /–z/ occurs only in two glosses. Jackson's solution was to date the former to the second half of the eleventh century and the latter slightly later to ca. 1100, but evidently neither he nor Förster were aware of Risleston 1086 with apparent /d/ > /z/.\(^{68}\) This may mean that both changes should be assigned tentatively to the same period in the latter half of the eleventh century. It is a far more natural assumption that assibilation of the voiced phoneme and unvoiced phonemes happened at the same time. The latter were confined to groups such as /lt/ and /nt/ because in all other environments medial and final /t/ had been voiced to /d/ at the time of lenition. George gives the most exhaustive discussion, although the place-name Kiniavots ca. 1190 and 1212 is unlikely to represent palatalisation as he suggested.\(^{69}\) The name Lanzian 1284 probably contains the French graph <z> for /ts/ as he pointed out, but this is only because /nant+sixan/ "valley of a dry place" inevitably gives /ts/ by sandhi, not because the name necessarily contains a palatalised phoneme /t´/.\(^{70}\) The available evidence tends to support a date for assibilation at around the end of the eleventh century but nowhere implies palatalisation as the motivation for it.

5.5. The Problem of Assibilation and Palatalisation

The immediate cause of assibilation in Cornish has therefore remained the subject of debate: the whole issue was summarised by Padel as "… the vexed problem of the assibilation of dental stops – the

---

\(^{67}\) LHEB, ii, pp. 60-1.

\(^{68}\) LHEB, § 54, p. 401; § 110, pp. 507-8; § 53, pp. 399-400.

\(^{69}\) PHC, §13.2.6-7, pp. 300-5. It is likely that Kiniavots indicates a middle stage /–d/ > /–dz/ > /–z/. This agrees in part with N.J.A. Williams' model for assibilation, on which see § 5.6 below.

\(^{70}\) PHC § 13.2.7, p. 305.
continuing great problem in Cornish phonology." In subsequent Middle and Late Cornish these phonemes sometimes show assibilation but at other times have apparent palatalisation, so that a limited range of words may appear with either spelling in the same document and within the space of a few lines. For example in OM, *moyses del oge den mas* "Moses, as thou art a good man" is followed within thirty lines by *del ose dev hep pehes* "as Thou art God without sin". In RD, *woge bos yn lowene* "after being in happiness" is followed by *wose try deyth ha hanter* "after three and a half days" twenty lines later. The word *dewgys, dewsys* "godhead" occurs in both forms within six lines in BM. This variation of *s* and *g* for earlier /d/ is mirrored by the variation of *ns* and *ng* for earlier /nt/ in words such as *kerense, kerenga* "love", so frequent that *s* and *g* occur in apparent free variation in this word.

The overlap between these two phenomena is considerable, since they affect the same phonemes. However, the fact that spellings indicating assibilation alone are everywhere more frequent than spellings showing palatalisation strongly suggests that the latter represents a subsequent sound change, especially given that the representation of palatalisation in the orthography is far more restricted in early Middle Cornish than in later texts. It is therefore necessary to re-examine the theory behind previous descriptions of palatalisation in Cornish, as well as the extant evidence as it is represented in the orthography of the Middle and Late periods of the language.

As a matter of methodology, it is difficult to assess from spellings the exact extent of palatalisation that a phoneme might have achieved at

---


72 *moyses del oge den mas* OM 1767, *del ose dev hep pehes* 1796.

73 *woge bos yn lowene* RD 206, *wose try deyth ha hanter* 226.

74 *dewgys* BM 884, *dewsys* 889.

75 *kerenge* PC 483, *kerense* 549; also *carenga* TH 20a.2, 20a.3, *kerensa* 20a.19 [passim].
any given date. For instance, palatalised /z/ might be the fricative /ʒ/ or the more fully palatalised affricate /dʒ/, depending on the progression of the sound change, yet the same spelling might occur in both cases. The opposing model requires direct palatalisation /d'/? /dʒ/. On the basis that the place of articulation of /d/ or /d'/ is closer to /dʒ/ than to /ʒ/, being an affricate, it seems theoretically unlikely to propose that /d'/ could be palatalised to the fricative /ʒ/ rather than the affricate /dʒ/, although that may be a matter of opinion. It would seem that the tongue would have to pass through /dʒ/ on the way from /d/ or /d'/ to /ʒ/, which is unlikely. In the case of the unvoiced counterpart, the change seems to be /t'/? /tʃ/ in all instances, since it is theorised that no instances of the assibilated phonemes /ns/ and /ls/ were palatalised without first being voiced. This does not apparently conflict with the representation required by a theory of direct palatalisation /nt'/ > /lʃ/ and /lt'/ > /lʃ/.

As a result, where it is not possible to deduce the level of palatalisation, only one phonemic transcription will be used, assuming the final stage /dʒ/ (and /ʃ/). This seems to be the most reasonable approach if the opposing theory of direct palatalisation, without an intermediate assibilated stage /ʒ/ (and /ns/, /ls/), is to be discussed fairly. On the other hand, this should not be taken to prejudice the discussions below in any way. The choice is necessary to minimise confusion, except in a case where it may be shown definitely that /ʒ/ or /dʒ/ is meant.

Another factor that has the potential to be a source of disagreement over the dating of palatalisation is the dating of individual texts, of which perhaps CW is the most obvious. More crucial is the relative dating of the two earliest Middle Cornish texts, PA and the Ordinalia. On these matters, I have followed Murdoch, whose gives the fullest and most up to
date discussion. Since he considers that elements of the Ordinalia are based upon PA and draw from it, and that the latter is “certainly older than the Ordinalia”, they have been treated accordingly here.

5.6. Theories on Palatalisation of /–nt–/, /–lt–/ and /–d–/

The argument about the relationship between assimilation and palatalisation was apparently initiated by Pedersen, who believed that final –t, –nt and –lt were treated differently in final position than in internal position. He considered that the oldest changes were /–nt/ > /–ns/ and /–lt/ > /–ls/ in final position and that final /–t/ > /–s/ > /–z/ occurred later, having already become /–s/ by 1300. Jackson noted that no evidence was offered for this date (presumably based on the fact that only three items out of several hundred show the change in Voc. Corn). As has been mentioned at § 5.1 above, he also pointed out that the orthography of Old Cornish used –t for voiced final /–d/, rather than for a supposed /–t/. Consequently, Pedersen’s sequence of sound changes must be amended to /–d/ > /–z/.

However, Pedersen was also responsible for the idea that the same phonemes developed palatalisation rather than assimilation in internal position "… before every unaccented front vowel…", giving pysy, pygy "to pray" (B. pediñ), cresy, crygy "to believe" (W. credu B. krediñ), wose, woge "after" (MIW. gwedi ModW. wedi B. goude), resek "to run" (W. rhedeg B. redek); he considered that it also occurred before /ǭ/ > /ö/ in

---

76 See the references given above in § 1.2.2.
77 B. Murdoch, Cornish Literature, p. 20. He dates PA from the earlier part of the 14th century. The medieval narrative style and more frequent use of the graph <ʒ> for /θ/ and /ð/ than in the Ordinalia support this, as does the infrequency of palatal spellings even compared to OM, as noted below.
78 CCCG, § 263, pp. 154-156.
79 LHEB, § 52, p. 398.
80 LHEB, § 52, p. 397. This correction is acknowledged in Supplement to a Concise Celtic Grammar, H. Lewis & H. Pedersen, Göttingen, 1961, p. 8.
dewsys "Godhead" (W. duwdod) and trenses, trengys "Trinity" (W. trindod B. treinded).\textsuperscript{81} These changes were given as /t/ > /t´/ > /č/ and /d/ > /d´/ > /ǯ/, apparently represented by both s and g.\textsuperscript{82} Jackson added that the change /ö/ > /ö/ meant that this must have been later than the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{83} However, the final sibilant /z/ (and by implication /ns/, /ls/) was "... extended to medial positions... and also the /č/, /ǯ/... was extended analogically to finals and the position before back vowels."\textsuperscript{84} In essence, this would lead to a very confused situation in which any s could be interpreted as being either a palatal or a sibilant. Not only did /z/ and /ǯ/ (here /dʒ/), /s/ and /č/ (here /tʃ/) presumably replace each other, but he claims that d /d/ (and by implication t /t/ likewise) was directly replaced by s by analogy in pysaf "I pray", pysough "ye pray", nyn cresons "they will not believe it", which should otherwise have remained /d/.\textsuperscript{85}

By this measure, it would be difficult to see how the distribution of s and g could be used to draw any conclusions about the order of the sound changes that occurred. Although such analogical changes might perhaps be an intelligible process in verbal paradigms, since for example the verbal stems pys and crys could have infected other inflected parts with /z/, or alternatively pygy and crygy (or other forms with a following

\textsuperscript{81} CCCG, § 263 (2), pp. 155-6; e.g. pesy BM 707 (*pysy does not in fact occur in MlC.); pygy RD 1932; crys PC 2883, crygy 2963; wose BM 999; woge PC 834; resek OM 773; dewsys BM 889; drenses PC 68 (for *trenses); drengys BK 268b (for *trengys).

\textsuperscript{82} It should be noted in passing that he did not cite any exx. of the change in the voiceless phoneme, since MlC. *trenses, *trengys W. trindod B. treinded < L. trinitātem has earlier /nd/ by syncope, not /nt/. The ending –sys was abstracted from words with L. –tātem to form words such as densys. For the identical process in Welsh, see S. Zimmer, "Latin Suffixes in Welsh", Britain 400-600: Language and History, ed. A. Bammesberger & A. Wollmann, Heidelburg, 1990, § 4.2, pp. 266-7.

\textsuperscript{83} LHEB, § 52, p. 398. But George and Toorians' explanation of the survival of internal /d/ in certain environments undermines much of the basis of Jackson's support for Pedersen's belief that assimilation occurred later in internal than in final position. The fact that s and g vary in medial position while s alone occurs in final position can be explained also as later palatalisation of medial sibilants, which is the core of the arguments set out in this chapter. The vowel change /ö:/ > /e:/ in trenses, trengys does not therefore date internal assimilation if palatalisation can be shown to be a subsequent change.

\textsuperscript{84} CCCG, § 263, pp. 154-5. In fact no example shows g for s before a back vowel unless subsequent lowering has occurred or else a common word seems to have been compounded with a suffix.

\textsuperscript{85} CCCG § 263 (2), p. 155; pysaf OM 1390, pysough 828, nyn cresons 1440.
front vowel) could have infected them with /dʒ/, there would seem to be no natural motivation for analogical re-modelling of a word that was not compounded with an ending, e.g. *wode > woge > wose.

This theory was in effect adopted by George, although he omitted the important modification that palatalisation should only have occurred before unaccented front vowels, thereby requiring every instance of medial s in Middle Cornish to be understood as /d/ and every instance of medial ns, ls as /nt/, /lt/, or else as analogical /z/, /ns/ and /ls/ based on the sound change in final position.\(^86\) He believed, however, that analogical re-formation was infrequent and "... in general the two reflexes remained distinct."\(^87\) He also dispensed with Pedersen's idea that assimilation occurred in two distinct periods, considering that palatalisation /d/ > /d/ and /nt/ > /nt/ occurred in all positions as a single sound change but that in final position alone this subsequently produced /z/ and /ns/, /ls/. These departures from Pedersen's model avoided the difficulty that assimilation somehow failed to spread from final position to internal position by analogy until after palatalisation had blocked it before front vowels. In spite of these superficial disagreements, both theories work essentially by assuming that palatalisation was the earlier and principal change in internal position where both s and g occur.

George therefore believed that internal s and ns, ls were either graphs for /d/ and /nt/, /lt/ or else that they occasionally stood for analogical /z/ and /ns/, ls/. He added that the opposite analogical change is seen in final position in LC. ny a peige "we pray thee" for MlC. ny a’th pys.\(^88\) In this sentence the infixed pronoun th "thee" has evidently been

\(^86\) The fact that Pedersen, unlike George, allowed /z/ before back vowels is an important distinction that was ignored by Williams, "A Problem in Middle Cornish Phonology", *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 68 (1990), p. 243. Although George has retracted this theory, it cannot be ignored here.

\(^87\) PHC, p. 306. Unlike Pedersen, George did not believe that internal /d/ > /d/ and /nt/ > /nt/ became respectively /d/ and /nt/, but this is a relatively minor disagreement and is largely ignored hereafter.

\(^88\) ny a peige CWBF, p. 42 [TB: "Deag Laver deu"]; ny ath pys OM 2584 [my apostrophe above].
lost, leaving only non-mutation of the verb by provection to show the omission. It seems, however, that the verb was compounded with suffixed *ge "thee", as is often seen in Middle Cornish for emphasis or reinforcement. It is likely that the sentence in fact stands for *ny a(th) pys-ge in earlier Middle Cornish spelling and that the suffixed pronoun became obligatory when the infix was lost, in order to make sufficient distinction from what could otherwise be a mere mutation error. At the very least, as an example of final palatalisation, it is uncertain.

In fact, this would be one of a very few rare examples of final /dʒ/ (Pedersen's /ʒ/) in native words, unless a brilliant reconstruction of a sentence of spoken Late Cornish from Ludgvan that was orally recorded for over a hundred years is to be considered reliable evidence.89 This runs curiously Jee an jee wopen ha gessa boo catter, corrected by Nance to Ajy hens yu open ha geses ow bugh ater "the road gap (i.e. gate in a Cornish stone hedge) is open and my cow let out". Not only would the word *aswy "gap" have palatalisation as *(ajy /a)dʒi/, but for this to be correct the word *hens "way" (cf. OC. camhinsic) would have to show palatalised /dʒ/ or /ʒ/ in final position. In which case, perhaps *Ajy henj yw open... would be a better rendering of the sentence.90 It ought to be noted here that a front vowel follows the affected phoneme across word boundary, which seems to be appropriate conditions for the seeming palatalisation /z/ > /ʒ/ or /dʒ/. It is possible that this is an isolated effect, although it would still suggest /d/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ rather than /d/ > /dʒ/ > /dʒ/.

---

89 R.M. Nance, "A New-Found Traditional Sentence of Cornish", JRIC 22/2 (1927), pp. 281-87. This sentence is thus described by Williams, Cornish Today, § 19.10, p. 196.
90 For *aswy see CPNE, p. 12 and for *hins see p. 131-2. These renderings are based on Nance's revivalist "Unified Cornish" spelling system, in which <j> means /dʒ/. 
As has been noted briefly above, Williams challenged George's model on a number of grounds.\textsuperscript{91} He doubted that the series of oppositions /t/-/tʃ/-/tʃ/ and /d/-/dʒ/-/dʒ/ was sustainable (the last of these series occurred in loanwords from English such as \textit{chambour} [sic] "chambour", \textit{tuchya} [sic] "to touch", \textit{gentyl} "gentle" and \textit{page} "page"), since the middle member of each series would be liable to reduction to /tʃ/ and /dʒ/.\textsuperscript{92} In the case of the first series, the lack of forms such as *\textit{kerenche} for \textit{kerense}, \textit{kerenge} and *\textit{gancho} for \textit{ganso} suggest that this did not happen in Middle Cornish. George stated that /dʃ/ became /dʒ/ ca. 1625 and /ntʃ/ became /ndʒ/ ca. 1575.\textsuperscript{93} He speculated that voicing of the latter may have been "... analogous to that of /f, s/...", which implies an intermediate stage /ndʃ/ or /ntʃ/.\textsuperscript{94} Williams argued that the threefold series of very similar consonants would then have remained stable for around five centuries after they arose, an impossibly long period of time for no confusions to arise.\textsuperscript{95}

Williams also raised orthographical objections.\textsuperscript{96} Since George maintained that /tʃ/ was written both as s and g, the word \textit{chy} "house" ought to occur as *sy and *gy. A possible line of defence might be that \textit{ch} occurred for /tʃ/ initially while s and g were written medially, but unfortunately \textit{ch} means /tʃ/ and g means /dʒ/ in both initial and medial positions in the loanwords cited by Williams above. George also believed that /tʃ/ could be written s and g in \textit{kerense}, \textit{kerenge} while the same graphs meant /dʃ/ in \textit{nyns yw}, \textit{nyn gyw} "is not", an inherently implausible

\textsuperscript{91} See § 5.2 above; N.J.A. Williams, "A Problem in Cornish Phonology", \textit{Current Issues in Linguistic Theory} 68 (1990), pp. 241-74. For the sake of brevity, only the principal objections are addressed here.

\textsuperscript{92} \textit{ibid.}, p. 244, e.g. \textit{chambbour} OM 2110 (*\textit{chambour} does not occur); \textit{tuchia} TH 1.14 (*\textit{tuchya} does not occur); \textit{gentyl} OM 1566; \textit{page} PC 1866. Unaffected /t/ remained in initial position.

\textsuperscript{93} Although both were dated ca. 1675 in PHC, § 13.2.5, p. 299, the latter was dated ca. 1575 in \textit{The Pronunciation and Spelling of Revived Cornish}, 1986, p. 165.

\textsuperscript{94} PHC, § 13.2.3, p. 296. The reference is to "New Lenition", see also PHC § 19.4.1, pp. 443-5.

\textsuperscript{95} Williams, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 244.

\textsuperscript{96} \textit{ibid.}, p. 246.
orthographical convention. Williams objected to the idea that medial /d´/ could occur as s and ss in place-names such as *Trelissick < tref "town"+*guledic "leader", since the nearest equivalent in English would be /dl/. Presumably place-names were largely recorded according to the orthographical conventions of English, as the dominant language.

The most serious theoretical objection given by Williams was that assibilation /d/ > /z/ represents a change from plosive articulation to greater continuance while palatalisation /d/ > /d´/ represents only a change in the place of articulation. Since George accepted that assibilation occurred in final position, the dissimilarity of the two changes made it difficult to explain the phonetic motivation for two simultaneous changes. If assibilation occurred in final position, there is no phonological reason why it should not have occurred medially. It might be added that this would hold true whether /d/ > /z/ developed directly or through a stage /d´/, although Williams did not believe that the latter was phonetically plausible. He added that rhotacism in LC. *thera "was" < MLC. *ythesa would be unparalleled among European languages if s meant /d´/ rather than /z/.

The doubts expressed above about the theories of Pedersen and George on the origins of assibilation and palatalisation may be formulated as the following alternative theory: (1) that assibilation /d/ > /z/ was an earlier change than palatalisation of /z/ > /dz/ (with perhaps an intermediate stage /ʒ/), so that the complete sequence of changes /d/ > /z/ (> /ʒ/) > /dz/ could sometimes occur when the phoneme was in contact with a front vowel (2) that /nt/ > /ns/ and /lt/ > /ls/ likewise occurred during the Old Cornish period, but the changes /ns/ > /nz/ > /ndʒ/ and /ls/...
> /lz/ > /ldʒ/ tended to happen much later. The reason for this is that the change could not happen until the phoneme had been voiced in “New Lenition”. According to this theory, the Middle Cornish distribution of s /z/ and g /dʒ/ is not the result of analogy but of later, sporadic, and ongoing palatalisation. The graph s would not need to be pressed into service to represent /dˈ/ or /dʒ/ from earlier /d/, which would seem to be at variance with the inherent probability that Cornish s for /z/ was borrowed from contemporary French and English orthography.

The strongest evidence for this is that early Middle Cornish shows a far more narrowly limited distribution of palatal spellings than later texts. In fact, only a small number of words were apparently affected in PA and even in OM, while the rest of the Ordinalia and subsequent texts have rather a greater incidence. It is curious to note also that the twelve homilies of JT (TH) contain a surprisingly large number of forms that seem to show only assibilation in the orthography, often within the more limited range of words written commonly with palatalisation even in the earliest Middle Cornish. For a document of 1555-8, a transitional period between Middle and Late Cornish, this is particularly significant. These points are illustrated more fully in the individual sections below.

5.7. The Comparison of Palatalisation in Breton

It appears from the distribution of spellings that palatalisation of the dental plosive and sibilant phonemes in Middle Cornish was probably not a consistent or homogenous affair. By way of comparison, even today the occurrence of palatalisation in Breton, for example, continues to be irregular and sporadic, in both dialect and, to some extent, even in the

---

100 The voicing /s/ > /z/ in MIC, required by these changes is discussed in the following sections.
Palatalisation in Breton in initial and medial positions can affect much of the consonantal system and can affect the mutation system on a regional basis, but its realisation in the dialects is an extremely complicated and inconsistent matter. A few illustrative examples will suffice here: *alfe* < *alc’houez* “key” with /l/ < /xw/ (and generally with subsequent voicing) in parts of SW. and E. Cornouailles, *chetu* < *setu* “there is” (< *sellit-hu*) with /ʃ/ < /s/ in Vannetais and the border area with Cornouailles, *chelaou* < *selaou* with /ʃ/ < /s/ everywhere except Leon, and even *kig* [ketʃ] at Sarzeau. It is well known amongst speakers, for example, that the superficial phonetic changes that occur in Vannetais and parts of neighbouring Cornouailles can make their dialects almost unintelligible to speakers from other regions. That is not to suggest, however, that palatalisation is by any means a purely southern phenomenon in Breton, as it is a quite piecemeal phenomenon.

A few important differences must be noted between the situation of palatalisation in Breton and that in Cornish. For one thing, no substantial evidence for widespread palatalisation beyond the dental plosives and their assibilated reflexes has yet been produced in the case of Cornish, a situation that is hardly likely to change. There is no such equivalent dialect map as the *Atlas Linguistique de Bretagne*, however out of date it has become for modern Breton. Furthermore, it is self-evident that no recordings can exist for an extinct medieval and early modern language such as Cornish. Nonetheless, some level of orthographical evidence might be expected if it had been widespread. Since it apparently does not, it may cautiously be supposed as a working hypothesis, until evidence to

---

101 HPB, § 521-65, pp. 375-403.
103 HPB § 521, pp. 375-6.
104 HPB §§ 9-10, p. 5-7. There is a useful map at HPB, p. xxx. The six parts date from 1924, 1927, 1937, 1943, 1953 and 1963. Given the terminal decline of Breton today, they are already out of date, but Jackson in any case notes the extreme caution with which one should use their limited data.
the contrary may be forthcoming, that no such palatalisation occurred outside the dental phonemes and their reflexes so described. At any rate, there is little choice but to admit this approach.

Jackson states that “There are no palatalised dental [plosive] phonemes in B., and ALBB does not even recognise them phonetically. They and their reflexes scarcely occur outside V.” ¹⁰⁵ This is not necessarily true in Cornish, however, as the equivalents of many palatalised phonemes in Breton do not show any such evidence in MIC. orthography, and the reverse could equally be true, i.e. that phonemes showing little or no palatalisation in Breton might have been affected in Cornish. It is to be noted, for instance, that chy is exclusively palatalised in MIC., though no other initial /t-/ is so affected. If Jackson’s remark is correct, there is no parallel in Breton. Hence, in this case at the very least, palatalisation of a dental plosive was demonstrably possible in Cornish.

However, palatalisation of /s/, /ζ/ < /ð/ and /ζ/ > /θ/ does occur, modified by New Lenition (as are other consonants) where it arises in the dialect in question.¹⁰⁶ Although the latter two phonemes do not arise from the same sources as those participating in assimilation in Cornish, the broad comparison is nonetheless highly instructive. Importantly, Jackson points out that “The palatalisation of the sibilants referred to above has been described as ‘in contact with front vowels’. In fact, however, the examples are almost all cases of it taking place before front vowels or at least between them; I know scarcely any instances before back vowels after front vowels..., and in final position after front vowels it seems very rare also. ... It would probably be adequate to describe palatalisation of the sibilants as taking place essentially before front vowels only, allowing

¹⁰⁵ HPB § 522, p. 376. Note that the addition in square brackets is mine: the reference is to stops, not continuants, as is made clear by the paragraph title “Palatalisation of /t/ and /d/”.
¹⁰⁶ HPB §§ 542-51, pp. 393-395.
for a few exceptions.” Finally, on dating, he considers that the various types of palatalisations of all letters occurred no later than the 17th century and mostly by the 15th, with little evidence to date them before the 12th-13th centuries. It would be a mistake to apply these observations wholesale to Middle Cornish, since the phonemes affected are different and there is no rational reason for substantially related changes to occur at identical times in separate languages, irrespective of hypothesised language contact (although that is not to deny such contact a possible small role). However, it does appear that the same pre-existing tendencies in both languages led to similar results, at least in limited phonemes in Cornish, in more or less exactly the same historical period. Furthermore, Breton provides the excellent, if circumstantial, evidence that sibilant phonemes are indeed likely to be palatalised in circumstances such as those arising in Cornish. In this much, the parallel is a striking one.

5.8. Palatalisation in Early Middle Cornish

5.8.1. The Charter Fragment (CF)

It is worth pointing out first of all that the Charter Fragment shows no palatalisation at all except the word *chy "house", which appears in Voc. Corn. twice as OC. *ti and also in the compounds *clechti "bell-house" and *cuscti "dormitory". It is the standard form found frequently in Middle Cornish except in compounds like MlC. *gwreghthy "house-wife" and in occasional place-names such as *Laitey < *lety "dairy" (formed from *leth+ty, lit. "milk-house"). In these cases the final consonant of

---

107 HPB § 551, p. 395.
109 *gwreghthy CW 448; CPNE, pp. 148, 275.
the preceding element seems to have caused protection and prevented the expected palatalisation. There are also some place-names containing *mon-dy "mineral-house" and *meyn-dy "stone-house" in which /d/ was apparently protected by the homorganic nasal preceding it.\textsuperscript{110}

George assumes that the OC. phrase *in ti [\textit{in ti}] became [\textit{in t\textasciiacute {i}}], for which he gives the meaning "in the house".\textsuperscript{111} It might be noted that the definite article always appears as \textit{en} (< CC. *sind-) rather then \textit{an} in Voc. Corn. and also occasionally in PA.\textsuperscript{112} This might then just as easily mean simply "the house", if the vowel of the article were still occasionally sufficiently close at this time.\textsuperscript{113} In any case the archaic form occurs only once after the Old Cornish period and the change /t\textasciitilde {\textasciitilde {i}} > /t\textasciitilde {\textasciitilde {i}}/ in this word otherwise appears to by-pass normal mutations.\textsuperscript{114} The only exception is in the compound word \textit{agy} "in, inside" (from a "of"+chy).\textsuperscript{115} This is not necessarily mutated by analogy in this compound (Jackson's "New Lenition"), because OC. *a di could easily have existed. If this is so, it is possible that the front vowel of OC. \textit{ti} was sufficient to allow initial unvoiced /t\textasciitilde {\textasciitilde {i}}/ to be palatalised in this word alongside voiced /d\textasciitilde {\textasciitilde {i}}/ in the mutated form. Assibilation would not be expected in this position in any case, although this is not true in compounds such as MIC. \textit{hensy} "ruin, ancient house".\textsuperscript{116} Most of Padel's examples have forms suggesting /dʒ/ or else unaffected /d/, but at least the example \textit{Rinsey} (< *rynn "promontory"+ty) seems to have /z/.\textsuperscript{117} Although the place-name \textit{Clodgy} (\textit{claf} "ill"+ty, "sick-house") is frequent with palatalisation, it is significant

\textsuperscript{110} CPNE, pp. 159, 168.
\textsuperscript{111} PHC, § 13.2.3, p. 296.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{en uogh} Voc. Corn. 37, \textit{en lagat} 39; \textit{en toll} PA 182a.
\textsuperscript{113} Since *\textit{in} "in" is from IE. *\textit{en} (see A. Fallileyev, Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh, p. 91) and \textit{en} "the" is from CC. *\textit{sind-}, they are clearly both unstressed words containing the phoneme /\textasciitilde {\textasciitilde {i}}/. The elision of the preposition and article is normal from MIC. & MIB. onwards, so OC. may well also have had it.
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{yn ow thy a piyadow} PC 334, discussed by N.J.A. Williams, "Four Textual Notes on the Middle Cornish Drama", BBCS 22 (1966-8), p. 237. See § 5.9.5 (ii) below.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{agy} OM 953.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{hensy} BM 1307. Stokes' reading in confirmed by Hawke 1975-98 [unpublished].
\textsuperscript{117} See the references in CPNE, p. 79.
that the plural *Clausiow* (Truro) also appears in 1607.\(^\text{118}\) Padel gave the change seen in these compounds as \(\text{-dy} > \text{-sy} (= /\text{zi}/ ?) > /\text{dzi}/.\(^\text{119}\) Since the word *chy* itself is irregular, it does not provide evidence that assibilation and palatalisation are linked: its compounds appear to suggest \(/d/ > /zl > /\text{dzi}/\) rather than \(/d/ > /d\acute{l} > /\text{dzi}/\), as Padel suggested, probably unrelated to the change \(/t/ > /\text{t}l/\) in initial position.

Apart from this word, the Charter Fragment shows no palatalisation in any position, but it does show assibilation in all positions. The words *\(\text{zy}s\) "to thee" (W. *it, iti B. *dit*), *genes" with thee" (W. *gennyt B. *ganit*), *pes" pray" (B. *ped 3s. pres-fut.*), *vos" to be" (W. *bod V. *boud*) and *Ras [sic]" grace, blessing" (W. *rhad*) occur with apparent assibilation \(/d/ > /zl/\) in final position and *bons" bridge" (WCB. *pont*) seems to have corresponding final \(/nt/ > /ns/\).\(^\text{120}\) The example *gensy" with her" (MIW. *genti B. *ganti*) shows internal assibilation \(/nt/ > /ns/\) while *wor\(\text{z}esy" against thee" (W. *wrthyt ti B. *ouzhit-te*) and *lauar \(\text{ze sy}" say thou" (W. *llafar dydi*) show internal \(/d/ > /zl/\).\(^\text{121}\) The example *gaffy* given in Toorians' edition should be correctly read *gassy "leave her, let her" according to Padel and is therefore *gas+hy /ga:z hi/ > /ga:ssil/ (W. *gad hi" leave her"). It would not therefore be the subject of dispute here.\(^\text{122}\)

The form *gensy" with her", with apparent internal \(/ns/\) (and possibly subsequent voicing to \(/nz/\), might in particular be compared with later Middle Cornish. It is interesting that the inflected parts of the preposition *gans" with" never show internal palatalisation in extant Middle Cornish examples, i.e. *ganso" with him" (MIW. *gantaw B. *gantañ*), *gensy" with her" (as cited above), *gansa, gansa" with them"

\(^{118}\) CPNE, pp. 60, 256.
\(^{119}\) CPNE, p. 77.
\(^{120}\) *\(\text{zy}s* CF 6, 13, 34, *genes* 8, *pes* 19, *vos* 31, *Ras* 33 [cap. sic], *bons* 18.
\(^{121}\) *gensy* 21, *wor\(\text{g}esy* 26, *lauar \(\text{ze sy* 28 [for the latter, see Padel's comments in CMCS 30, p. 126].}
\(^{122}\) *gassy* CF 22; Padel, *ibid.*, p. 125.
(MIW. *gantu(nt), B. *ganto, *gante). These words are extremely common, especially because they are used to express possession. The only known exceptions to the usual spellings are in CW, where *ganza "with it (him), them" appears twice and a variant *gonza once. This graph is never used to show the palatal sound in CW, for which *g, *i, *j or *J is used. Since these words are so frequent, it must be assumed that such graphs would have been used at least occasionally if George's proposed sequence of sound changes /nt/ > /nt´/ were correct. Pedersen's theory only posits palatalisation instead of assibilation before an unaccented front vowel, but the lack of forms such as ***geny for gensy would then have to be explained by analogical levelling. This argument, however, has the potential to explain away every inconvenient example that does not fit theoretical predictions. It may be best therefore to use it sparingly.

5.8.2. Pascon Agan Arluth (PA)

It should be pointed out first of all that, although PA is a document of the early to mid fourteenth century, the manuscript may date from the mid fifteenth century. The effects of transmission upon the written representation of the sound changes being examined here is difficult to establish, but as a whole the language and orthography do not seem to vary greatly. There seems little choice but to take the spellings as found at face value, whilst admitting a level of possible uncertainty.

In PA, palatalisation is restricted to a narrow range of words. The phrase *yn chy "in the house" < OC. *in ti occurs once, as predicted above. The example *blegyow "flowers" appears as a plural of OC.

124 *ganza CW 734, 1566, *gansa 1583.
125 See § 1.2.2 above. As noted, Murdoch points out that PA must be older than the Ordinalia.
126 *yn chy PA 159a. See George's reconstruction OC. *in ti, § 7.1.
**blodon** (glossed L. *flos* AS. *blôstm*), in which the following vowel plus nasal would be expected to block assibilation according to the rules set out by George and Toorians.\(^{127}\) The lack of yod in the singular is curious, since it seems to appear in LC. *bledzhan, bledzhiân* and might be compared to OC. *odion "ox"* (LC. *udzheon, odgan B. *ejen*) with yod written.\(^{128}\) Forms without yod occur in W. *blodyn* pl. *blodau* and B. *bleuñvemn*, which seem to be extended forms of WCB. *blôd* (MIW. *blawd "bloom" B. *bleuñv "flowers"*); but it occurs in the alternative B. *bleunienn* pl. *bleunioù*, likewise from CB. *blôd(i)enn, *blôd(i)ou*.\(^{129}\) It is noteworthy that yod is not written in *blodon*, but in any case LC. *bledzhan, bledzhiân* and the plural MlC. *blegyow* suggest that a form with yod was ultimately selected in both singular and plural.

Assibilation might well have occurred in PrimC. *blûdiou > OC. *blesiou* by analogy with a simplex OC. *ble(u)s*, so that –yow would behave like –ow in *tas "father"* pl. *tassow* at § 5.4 above.\(^{130}\) Analogy could also have created *blesen* or on the contrary allowed *blediou* to retain regular /–dVw/ on the basis of *blodon* in spite of the potency of suffixed –(y)ow in analogical levelling. In the first case the sequence of changes would be /dj/ > /zj/ > /dʒ/ in both *bledzhan* and *blegyow* but in the latter assibilation would be avoided and the change would be /dj/ > /dʒ/. However, analogy can be avoided entirely by assuming that palatalisation happened in both words before assibilation, thus preventing

---

\(^{127}\) *blegyow PA 27a, blodon Voc. Corn 673. Nance notes “blosan Aelfric”, NCED, p. 12, but this reading of Voc. Corn. is not borne out by Campanile and Graves. It is possible that this is Nance’s misreading, or a copying error if he saw another MS. of *Ælfric*, from OE. *blôst(ima), see J.R.R. Tolkien, Middle English Vocabulary*, p. 2, and H. Sweet, Anglo-Saxon Reader, p. 238. It may be ignored here.

\(^{128}\) *bledzhan AB 240c, 60b, bledzhiân 10b; odion Voc. Corn. 601; udzheon, odgan Pryce, ACB sigs. K1r-Bb4v. The vowel <e> of Lhuyd’s *bledzhan* shows that these are not modernised OC. forms.

\(^{129}\) Since /iː/ > /œː/ was unrounded to /æː/, it would be difficult to determine whether i-affection was caused by the yod here, cf. C. les “plant” pl. *losow, *lexyow with long /iː/ (see CPNE, p. 147).

\(^{130}\) It does not seem possible that /–djVw/ in *blegyow* could behave like /–dwVr/ in *peswar* above in avoiding the normal exception to assimilation in groups showing /–dVw/ etc. because /j/ is articulated close to alveolar /l/, unlike /w/; moreover, simple analogy would accomplish this far more regularly.
it. If OC. *odion contained a palatal /d´/ < /dj/, it seems that Old Cornish orthography would have possessed no unambiguous means to represent it, so *blodon may show only a variant spelling based on earlier vacillation between singular and plural forms with yod and those without. There is no need to invoke further analogy by arguing that perhaps OC. *blediou infected OC. blodon with /jl/, giving MIC. *bleden > LC. bledzhan with /dl/ > /d´l/. In any event, this would be the expected result.

The word dyth "day" (W. dydd B. deiz) is regularly found as an g(e)yth "the day" after the article (or the article compounded with other words, such as yn "in the", han "and the") with the same change.¹³¹ This does not happen if a word other than the article intervenes, for example war dyth pasch "on Easter day" and yn tressa dyth "on the third day", except in the case of In keth gythna "that same day".¹³² This seems to be by analogy, where the normal effect of the article on the noun is applied even though a word is inserted. The plural does not show the effect of the article in the example en deʒyow "the days", perhaps because this was a less common phrase.¹³³ An identical change is seen in an ioul(l) "the devil" (W. diawl, diafol B. diaoul), which appears in the Ordinalia as deawl without the article.¹³⁴ These examples are interesting because they are apparently unconnected with assimilation and represent direct palatalisation of /dl/ (> /d´l/) > /dzl/. The plural dywolow, dewolow occurs in PA without the article, consequently unaffected.¹³⁵

Two similar groups of words occur with comparable palatalisation across word boundary. The first of these are the various forms of the verb "to have, get". The third person singular of the verb "to be" and an infixed

¹³¹ dyth PA 91c, yn geyth 20c, en gyth 41c, han gyth 243a, an gyth 244a, yn gythna "that day" 259d.
¹³² war dyth pasch PA 124c, yn tressa dyth 238d, 259a, In keth gythna [sic] 252a.
¹³³ en deʒyow PA 169b.
¹³⁴ Han ioull [sic] PA 11a, An ioull [sic] 14a, 18a, An Ioull 15c [sic], an ioull 16c (4 exx.), en ioull 62b, deawl PC 137. It may be noted in passing that W. diawl has /dzl/ colloquially almost everywhere.
¹³⁵ dywolow PA 106c, dewolow 212b.
A pronoun with dative meaning were used to convey this sense, corresponding to Breton *en deus* "he has" and Middle Welsh *nis dioes dayar* "they have no land". When the masculine pronoun *n* preceded a form beginning with the verbal prefix *de-* < *di-*, palatalisation occurred in all cases in PA. This occurs in various tenses as *yn geuas* "he has not" (pres.), *an geue*, *an geve*, *yn geve* "he had", *man geve* "that he had", *manna geve* "that he had not" (pret.), *an gevo* "he had" (imperf.), *an geuyth* "he will have", *an geffo*, *manan geffo* "that he may not have", *man geffo* "that he may have" (pres. subj.), *an gyffe* "he had" (imperf. subj.). In *manna geve* the first *n* contains a misplaced *n*-contraction and should read *manan geve*. Every one of these 15 examples shows *g* for initial /d/ > /dʒ/. Palatalisation in this position appears to be unconnected with assimilation; possible evidence to the contrary in BM and TH is discussed at § 5.2.3 below.

The second group of words in which a similar feature seems to occur are forms of the verb "to be" that begin with a vowel following the negative particle *ny*(ns) (W *ni*(d) MIW. also *nit* B. *ne*(d) V. *ne*(nd)) and the "definite particle" *na*(ns), *nev*(ns) (MIW. neu(t) Ir. *no, nu*), conveying the sense "now" or "ago, since". The first of these appears in the present tense *yn gyw*, *ny(n) gew* "it is not", *yn iough* "ye are not", *yn gens* "they are not", in the locative present *yn gvgy* "there are not", in the imperfect *yn io*, *nyngo*, *ny(n) go* "it was not", in the existential present *yn ges* "there are not" and in the locative imperfect *yn gese*, *yn

---

137 The 3s. verb probably represents the otherwise unused verb CB. *do-but*, while the verb "to be" CB. *but* appears in all other persons. See R. Hémon, *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton*, § 140, n.2, p. 218.
139 Pointed out to me by O.J. Padel.
140 This term was used by Nance, NCED, Appendix vii, p. 196.
gesa "there were not". In total there are 26 examples. The graphs $g$ and $i$ are both used for the palatal, although the incorrect word division *nyn gyw < *nyng yw shows that it could be taken to be in initial rather than final position. These locutions may have been so common that word division was not crucial and the phoneme was effectively in internal position. This is seen in five examples after the particle $na(ns)$, *$nev(ns)$, all in the imperfect tense. These are navnio, navngo, Nevngo, Nango and Nanso. The last is the only one to show assimilated /z/ in PA. It should be pointed out that one example of $ny go$ has the graph $n$ missing, but one may compare $ny[n]$ gyw, which has an n-contraction written in the MS., which suggests strongly that the contraction has simply been omitted.

By contrast, the element /n/ does not seem to have developed in the perfective and optative particle $re(s)$ (CC. *ro OW. rit MIW. ry B ra), the only example of which in PA is regeth "has gone" with palatalisation written. In all of these particles, the change seen is /d/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ according to the argument presented here. By the theories of both Pedersen and George it would be /d/ > /z/ if the word division were *nyns yw, *nans yw but /d/ > /d´/ (and then /dʒ/ in Pedersen's case) if it were understood as *nyngyw, *nangyw. Considering that all of these forms occur throughout Middle and Late Cornish (see further below), the evidence of these verbal forms alone does not in itself support or undermine either explanation.

---

141 nyn gyw PA 82d, ny[n] gew 255d [with n-contraction], nyn iough 47b, nyn gens y 41b, nyn gens 68d, 252d, nyn gvgy 102a, nyn io 6d (7 exx.), nyn go 206d, ny go 225a, nyn ges 32d (5 exx.), nyn ges 75b, nyn gesa 140b, 157b.
143 Pointed out to me by O.J. Padel.
144 regeth PA 115c. Compare MIC. re seth etc. below, with apparent /zl/. In MIW. ry B. ra, the particle does not end in a consonantal element, but OW. rit appears to be a cognate of MIC. res. This seems to be a compound of OW. ri+it, see D.S. Evans, A Grammar of Middle Welsh, § 185 (note 1), p. 166.
145 It is clear at least that nyns and nans did not contain the reflex of /nt/, since /n/ cannot be original.
146 As noted at § 5.6, George's /d/ > /d´/ occurred in internal and final positions, but /zl/ was the result in final position only. Pedersen's more limited palatalisation prevented assimilation before front vowels.
The remaining examples of palatalisation in PA are surprisingly few, given that the sound change is nearly universal in the examples given above. The form *nyngvgy "there is not" that has been mentioned above should also be compared to vgy, found once.\textsuperscript{147} This also appears in other texts as MIC. \textit{vsy}, \textit{usy} without apparent palatalisation of the medial consonant.\textsuperscript{148} The phrase \textit{hy a begyas} "it lasted" may be compared to \textit{rag trega in ioy a beys} "to live in lasting joy" in BM and to three occurrences of \textit{ny bydgal} "I will not endure" in CW.\textsuperscript{149} The stem of this word seems to be \textit{*pesy}– \textit{/pe:zj}–/ (B. \textit{padout} with no yod), but the final /\textit{j}/ was apparently lost when it stood in final as a non-syllabic semi-vowel. (This verb should not be confused with \textit{pesy} "to pray", with stem \textit{pes}, of which there are no palatal spellings in PA.\textsuperscript{150}) The presence of the yod is significant, although the example could also be made to serve the theory that internal /\textit{d}/ was always palatalised rather than assibilated and that there was no analogical re-modelling in the forms of this verb. The same could be said of \textit{cregyans} "belief" (W. \textit{credu} B. \textit{krediñ}, suffix MIC. –\textit{yans} W. –\textit{iad}), which might be compared to the example \textit{mara cresyn ha bos vas} "if we believe and be good", which shows no internal palatalisation.\textsuperscript{151} Lastly there are the forms \textit{otese}, \textit{ota gy} "thou art", \textit{mars oge} "if thou art" and the phrase \textit{pan dra a wovente se} "what dost thou know?"\textsuperscript{152} These suffixed forms of \textit{*di} "thou" variously show assibilation and palatalisation, suggesting that the assibilated phoneme /\textit{d}/ > /\textit{z}/ could be later palatalised by the front vowel.

The rather self-evident point that was tacitly assumed by Nance, but later rejected by George, is that examples showing internal \textit{s} and \textit{ss}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{vgy} PA 53d.
\item \textit{vsy} OM 2692; \textit{usy} RD 1217.
\item \textit{hy a begyas} PA 201; \textit{rag trega in ioy a beys} BM 4348; \textit{ny bydgal} CW 1364 (3 exx.).
\item \textit{pesy} PA 53c.
\item \textit{cregyans} PA 44d, \textit{mara cresyn ha bos vas} 258d.
\item \textit{otese} PA 107b, \textit{ota gy} 144a, \textit{mars oge} 197b, \textit{pan dra a wovente se} 80a.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
are so frequent in PA for earlier /d/ that they must be taken to show /zd/ by assibilation.\(^{153}\) These could be quoted at length, but a few examples will suffice. The verb urusy "to judge" (W. brawd) and its past participle bresys, the words ankensy "grievous" (W. angen B. anken), gerensa "love" (W. carennydd B. karentez), densys, žensys "mankind" (W. dyndod), žewsys "godhead" (W. duwdod), besadow "prayer" (B. pediñ), pesy "to pray", sensy, synsy "to hold" (see § 5.8.3) and tressa "third" (W. trydydd, trydedd B. trede) all appear in later Cornish with palatal-type spellings (see § 5.1-4 below).\(^{154}\)

Unlike the final /zd/ in nyns, nans seen above, in the word mar(s), mara(s) "if" (B. mar(d)), no example of palatalisation is found. This includes mars o "if it was", mar sos, mar sota "if thou art", Mara sew "if it is", mar sew "if it is" and mar syns "if they are", a total of eight examples.\(^{155}\) If internal /d/ became /dʒ/, then speakers would have to consider nyn gyw "it is not" as though it were a single word *nyngyw even though it would be contrasted with the positive y thew < *yth yw. At the same time, it would be necessary to divide mar sew as *mars yw correctly so that /zd/ would be in final position. It is apparent that this is not the usual division in the texts and it seems clear that the scribe’s normal habit was the same in both nyn gew and mar sew. One significant difference is that nyns contains a front vowel while mars does not, probably going some way to explain the frequency of palatalisation in the former and its absence in the latter.

---

\(^{153}\) NCED, "Pronunciation" [no page, in foreword]. See the remarks at § 5.2 on George’s attempts, since withdrawn, to present a unified theory of assibilation and palatalisation. The graph <ss> is an occasional variant of <s> /zd/ for earlier /d/ but can also appear for medial /d/.

\(^{154}\) urusy PA 114d, bresys 88c, ankensy 184, gerensa 58d, 70d, densys 10d, 258b, žensys 54c, žewsys 60c, besadow 61a, pesy 62a, sensy 75b, synsy 82c, tressa 57c (4 exx.).

\(^{155}\) mars o PA 215d, Mar sos [sic] 11c, mar sos 14d, mar sota 129d, 191b, Mara sew [sic] 55a, mar sew 61b, mar syns 78c.
The fact that graphs indicating palatalisation are so uncommon in one of the earliest long texts of Cornish is a problem for the hypothesis that internal /d/ and /nt/, /lt/ were normally palatalised instead of assibilated. According to George's theory, the graphs s and ss for earlier /d/ in this huge number of examples actually stood for /d´/ and /nt´/, /lt´/.\(^{156}\) This would seem to be absurd, given that the French graph s would have been the usual graph for /z/ at this time in both English and French as they were spoken in Cornwall. Loanwords and whole sentences from both languages appear in PA, the three plays of the Ordinalia and even in the sixteenth-century BM, so French conventions would certainly have been familiar to the Middle Cornish scribes.

Pedersen's theory would require s /z/ and ns, ls /ns/, /ls/ before back vowels but s, g /dʒ/ and ns, ls /ntʃ/, /ltʃ/ before front vowels in PA, since ng and lg do not occur. Even ignoring his allowance for the analogical spread of these palatals to other positions, this model explains the use of s for palatal phonemes no better than George's model. Moreover, there is no way to show whether any given s stood for a palatal or a sibilant. Both models ignore the fact that g and ng, lg are uncommon in PA but become frequent in later texts. The only way to reconcile these theories with the evidence of PA would be to argue that analogical extension generalised /z/ where the predicted sound change should have given /d´/ or /dʒ/. If this were true, it seems hard to understand why later texts have more extensive palatal spellings. In short, it seems that s probably indicated a sibilant in these phonemes, according to contemporary conventions.

\(^{156}\) PHC, p. 294. Although he allowed for rare analogical s /z/, it would seem impossible if it was strictly a development of /d´/ in final position. Presumably s meant /d´/ by his theory anyway.
5.8.3. The Ordinalia (OM, PC & RD)

The three plays of the Ordinalia are considered to have been produced in the late fourteenth century, perhaps around half a century later than PA. The earliest manuscript, however, dates perhaps from the mid fifteenth century and it is therefore possible that a certain amount of subsequent revision could have occurred in transmission. However, as in the case of PA, the extent of this does not seem to be considerable, since the language and orthography does not vary greatly. It remains nonetheless difficult to establish for certain how much of the material dates from the fifteenth century. This should be borne in mind, although it seems impossible to analyse properly the effects upon the sound changes examined here. The best approach, as noted in the previous section, seems to be to take the material as found.

The Ordinalia, like PA, is also discussed here under the general term "Early Middle Cornish", but since the period covered by the extant Middle Cornish texts is between around 1400 (the Charter Fragment) and ca. 1570-1600 (SA), they in fact fall roughly between these dates and the distinction is comparatively trivial. The relative frequency of spellings indicating palatalisation instead of assimilation might perhaps be considered the only particularly striking indicator of any phonological change between the earlier and later halves of the Middle Cornish period. In this regard, it is apparent even from a cursory examination that spellings showing the palatal /dz/ are considerably less frequent in the first play Origo Mundi than in the longer second Passio Christi and the much shorter final play Resurrectio Domini. It is at least possible that this may show that the author (or else perhaps his scribe) was a different

---

157 See Murdoch’s dating, § 1.2.2 above. George’s dating seems to be too late, PHC, § 2.4.3, p. 22-3, followed by Williams, Cornish Today, § 14.2, p. 125.
individual. The orthographic failure to show palatalisation may be simply a matter of scribal conservatism; but if so, it would be a further indicator that assonibilation was an older sound change than palatalisation, even though the same phonemes were affected.

In environments where assonibilation could not be expected as an alternative, spellings indicating palatalisation in the three plays occur in the same words in which they are seen in PA. The word *chy "house" occurs as normal, whether or not it is preceded by the words *an "the" or *yn "in (the)".\(^{159}\) It does not show mutation in *ov chy "my house", *yth chy "in thy house" and *y chy "his house", although analogical mutation ("New Lenition") may have been present in speech after *yth "in thy" and *y "his".\(^{160}\) There seems to have been occasional reluctance to write the graphs *g, *i, *j and *J initially as lenition products (no other native words begin with /ʃ/), although a few instances occur in loans. Henry Lewis cited, for example, *cheryta “charity” but *dre geryte “through (=out of) charity” and *a gangyes “changed” (from *changya), all from PA.\(^{161}\) To this may be compared *me re jangyas “I have changed” in BK.\(^{162}\)

The word also appears in the compound *agy, *agey "inside".\(^{163}\) The fact that mutation is seen in here but is missing in *y gy < y chy could be because the compound was formed prior to palatalisation of lenited initial /d/ > /dʒ/ in OC. *a di > MlC. agy. Thus OC. *a di would have undergone palatalisation purely because of the high front vowel. There is nothing in principle to disallow *y gy “his house”. However, the fact that the initial

\(^{158}\) J. Bakere, The Cornish Ordinalia, p. 1.

\(^{159}\) chy OM 356 (6 exx.); *ov chy PC 634 (17 exx.); *y chy RD 1397 (5 exx.). The ex. *yn ow thy a piyadow PC 344 is considered below, but did not in any case participate in palatalisation.

\(^{160}\) *ov chy OM 1961; *yth chy PC 1802; *y chy PC 649; RD 1631. Probably lenition (in this case voicing) would in any case have been negated by subsequent provection in the example *yth chy. See the two similar examples in BK at § 5.9.1 below.

\(^{161}\) H. Lewis, Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol, § 8, p. 9, n., exx. *cheryta PA 45b, *dre geryta PA 38a, *a gangyes PA 68a [cited incorrectly]. Compare *changya BM 1906. These are instances of New Lenition.

\(^{162}\) *me re jangyas BK 412f.

\(^{163}\) agy OM 764 (9 exx.); RD 115 (4 exx.); *agey PC 627.
phoneme occurred in no other native word may have led it to be treated like the more frequent loanwords with initial /tʃ/. If New Lenition was not yet a consistent sound change at this date (and it may be noted that it is not complete even today in all dialects of Breton), this fact may account for the sporadic recognition of the initial mutation. The word would then no longer be recognised as a reflex of earlier initial /t/. The isolated instance of *yn ow thy a piyadow must represent a fossilised, archaic phrase *ty a bysadow “house of prayer”. Whether it was in common or literary use is uncertain, but the spirant mutation shows that it did not participate in palatalisation, so it may be ignored here.

The word *deth, deyth, dyth "day" occurs frequently without palatalisation, never preceded by the article or *yn "in (the)". There are also apparent compounds *tryd(d)yth "three days" and *whed dyth "six days", although this may simply be incorrect word division. The phrase *pup deyth "every day" also occurs with provection as *pup tyth. More significantly there are three cases of *vn deyth "one day" in which palatalisation fails to occur, compared to one of *un geyth. After the definite article *an and the word *yn "in (the)" , forms such as *yn geyth, *an geyth "(in) the day", *yn geth hethev "today" occur as normal. A minor variation on this is the oath *ren geyth hythev "by this day!" occurring in PC in three spellings. This usage is identical to that seen in PA and had apparently become regular. The example in PC *hanter dogha geyth "mid afternoon" appears to contain a contraction of *dyworth ewha an geyth

---

164 *yn ow thy a piyadow PC 344, see N.J.A. Williams, "Four Textual Notes on the Middle Cornish Drama", BBCS 22 (1966-8), p. 237. See also the note in the conclusions in § 5.9.5 (ii) below.
165 OM 17 (11 exx.); PC (8 exx.); RD (14).
166 trydlyth OM 829; trydlyth PC 347; triddyth PC 347; try-dyth PC 1311, 1315; whed dyth OM 142.
167 PC 2549; OM 831.
168 *vn deyth OM 1952; PC 268; RD 1187; *un geyth OM 385. This is not an indefinite article, see § 2.3.
169 *an geyth OM 1013; *yn geth PC 2269; *yn geyth OM 1516; PC 1881; RD 1503, 2496; *yn geth hythyw PC 831; *yn geth hythev RD 729; *yn geyth hythev RD 1233.
170 *ren geth hethev PC 1588; *ren geyth hythev PC 2684; *ren geyth hythev PC 3089.
"from the afternoon, late afternoon", to which may be compared *ewhe an geyth* in RD (W. *echwydd B. ec’hoaz*).\(^{171}\)

Similarly, the word *dyowl, deawl* "devil" occurs in a variety of spellings without apparent palatalisation.\(^{172}\) None of these are preceded by the article. However, forms such as *an jawl, en ioul, an iaul* "the devil" show palatalisation of the initial /d/ > /dˈ/ > /dʒ/ in every example after the article.\(^{173}\) Like the example *en deʒyow* "the days" seen above in PA, the plural *an dewolow, an dywolow* "the devils" does not have palatalisation, perhaps because these were rarer collocations.\(^{174}\)

The additional syllable in these plurals would also have shifted the stress on to the following syllable. This meant that the syllable containing the affected phoneme was now unstressed. It is possible that the unstressed vowel tended to be lowered and that the conditions for palatalisation of the preceding consonant were not as favourable. Initial mutation in the instance *an thewolow* was apparently a block to palatalisation in any event.\(^{175}\) Another word *an ievan, an gevan* "the devil, demon, fiend", *an fals ievan* "the false devil, fiend" appears with similar meaning, but *d(y)evan* (presumably from the Latin *daemon*) does not occur without the article.\(^{176}\) Just as in PA, this sound change seems to have been regular in these few words where the nasal /n/ preceded and a front vowel followed, apparently always in a stressed syllable.

This is precisely the same phonetic environment described above in verb forms such as *an geves* "he has" formed from the masculine singular

---

\(^{171}\) *hanter dogha geyth* PC 2912 (see NCED, p. 41); *ewhe an geyth* RD 275.

\(^{172}\) *dyowl* OM 300; *deawl* PC 137; *daulf* PC 1618, 3062; RD 132; *deaulf* RD 2089 (5 exx.).

\(^{173}\) *an jawl* OM 2526; *an ioul* OM 2700; RD 1564 (3 exx.); *en ioul* RD 2130; *an iaul* PC 1461, 2045; RD 80, 2641.

\(^{174}\) *an dewolow* RD 97, 2345, 2277; *an dywolow* PC 77. In addition to the examples without the article in PA, note *dewolow* OM 569; RD 2299; 2302, *ow dewolow* 2307, *dywolow* RD 301.

\(^{175}\) *an thewolow* PC 3057. Initial mutation in this plural is also found in CW (see below). Certain masculine plurals, as in Breton, have initial mutation, mostly human plurals. See H. Lewis, *Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol*, § 9, p. 11. Presumably the devils are not felt to be people in the other instances.
infixed pronoun, the prefix *de- and forms of the verb *bos, bones "to be" in order to indicate possession. As seen above in PA, this occurs in a variety of tenses; in the Ordinalia, however, the initial /dʒ/ is represented by i or j as well as g. Examples include an gefes, an ieves "he has", nyn ieves, nyn jeves, nyn gefes "he has not", nan geves, nan gefes "that he has not", mara ieves "if he has" (present), an geffo, yn geffo "that he have", nan gefso, nan gefo "that he have not", man geffo, man ieffo, "that he have", ren geffo "may he have" (pres. subj.), an geve, an gefe "he had", nyn gefe "he had not" (pret.), an geffo "he had" (imperf. subj.), nyn gyfye "he had not" (pluperf.), an gefyth, yn gevyth, an geuyth "he will have", nyn gevyth "he will not have" (future), a total of 41 cases.177

The only other word in the Ordinalis in which it is to be expected that palatalisation occurred first, and thus blocked any subsequent assimilation, is nyge "to fly, float, swim" (W. neidio "to jump" B. nijal "to fly") and a few other related forms.178 Since Jackson traced the equivalent sound changes in Breton back to the 11th century at least, it is probable that palatalisation in this word pre-dated assimilation.179 There is no need to speculate that the Cornish word was affected by Breton, since the word apparently had etymological /dj/ in both languages.180 The changes in both languages may be seen as natural, parallel developments. In the phrases y a nyg quyc hag vskys "they fly quickly" and ke nyg a vgh lues pow "go fly thou over many countries" in OM, respectively the third

176 an ievan RD 2282; an gevan PC 1338, an fals ievan PC 154. The third example is again by analogy, despite the insertion of a word.
177 an gefes OM 1484; an ieves PC 1776, nyn ieves 66, nyn jeves 862, nyn gefes 1855, nan geves 1578; nan gefes RD 788, 912; mara ieves PC 47; an geffo OM 422; PC 919, ym geffo 986; an geffo OM 551; RD 384, 2020, nan gefso 269; man geffo PC 2092; RD 1621, 2012, 2049, man ieffo 1973, ren geffo 2085; an geve OM 2219; PC 2975; an geffo RD 694, nyn gefe 1783; an geffo OM 2230; nyn gyfye RD 966; an gefyth OM 516; RD 1985; an gevyth OM 599; PC 963; 1882; RD 2345; an geuyth PC 1181; RD 2080; ym gefyth OM 2094; ym gevyth PC 670, nyn geuyth 1118; nyn gevyth RD 1561.
178 nyge OM 1023; RD 552.
person singular of the present-future and the second person singular of the imperative, this verb has the rare feature of final /dʒ/.\(^{181}\) It seems clear that ***nys was not a possible form. The related verb *trenyge* "to overfly" occurs in *nys guelaf ov trenyge* "I see her not overflying" and the third person singular preterite of *nyge* occurs once in *agan gorhel re nygyas* "our ark hath floated" with a related meaning.\(^{182}\)

In verbs such as *pesy*, *pygy* "to pray" and *crys*, *crygy* "to believe" given above, forms suggesting both /z/ and /dʒ/ appear in both medial and final positions but the bare stems *pys*, *crys* are written exclusively with s as though only /z/ were possible in final position. This might be compared with *rag trega in ioy a beys* "to live in lasting joy" in the earlier example cited from PA. A non-syllabic semi-vowel was apparently lost in final position from the stem *pesy– /pezj–/, yet the form indicates assimilation rather than the palatalisation seen in *ny bydgaf* in CW. It seems that the sound change /z/ > /dʒ/ from earlier /d/ was avoided in final position after a vowel.\(^{183}\)

By contrast, there are no examples in which parts of the verb *nyge* occur with orthographic assimilation and the Breton form *nijal* suggests that /d/ > /dʒ/ was an earlier sound change. Since the form *nyg* is so highly unusual in showing apparent final /dʒ/, it seems that palatalisation /d/ > /d’/ > /dʒ/ was probably caused by the following yod and therefore prevented subsequent assimilation of the phoneme. It is not clear why this did not happen at this time equally in *pesy– < *pedy– unless it was perhaps because the preceding vowel was not as close. If these two examples show that palatalisation occurred in more than one period of

---

\(^{181}\) *y a nyg quyc hag vskys OM 1068, ke nyg a vgh luas pow, 1136.*

\(^{182}\) *nys guelaf ov trenyge OM 1142, agan gorhel re nygyas 1087.*

\(^{183}\) As George notes in PHC § 12.1.3 (4), although no explanation is given. Although final /–Vdg/ does not occur in Middle Cornish, final /–ldʒ/ occurs in a few rare examples in BM (see below).
Cornish, this is further evidence that OC. /d/ was affected by several distinct sound changes and that the sequence and results of these depended on the precise phonetic environment in any given word.

In environments where either assibilation or palatalisation could be expected, the Ordinalia shows a slightly greater incidence of spellings indicating the latter than does PA. This is particularly true of the second and third plays. Even so, orthographic s is still far more common than g in all positions. It is broadly true to say, nonetheless, that palatalisation occurs sporadically in most cases where it is also found in PA.

A surprising exception to this is in parts of the verb *bos* "to be" with the negative particle *ny(ns)* or the temporal particle *nans* meaning "now, since", where it is oddly infrequent. The present tense occurs in the third person singular in various spellings of *nyn syv, nyns yw* "is not" on 28 occasions, none of which show palatalisation.\(^{184}\) Seven variations on *nans yw, nannya* "now it is, since" occur with assibilation and no apparent palatalisation.\(^{185}\) The same pattern occurs in other persons and tenses. In the present tense, the forms *nyns os, nyn sos, nynsos(e)* "thou art not", *nans on* "now we are", *nynson* "we are not, nynsough, nyn so(u)gh" "ye are not" occur.\(^{186}\) The short imperfect tense is found once in *nans o* and twice in *nynso* "it was not".\(^{187}\) In the longer form of the present and imperfect tenses (either locative or used in a present participle construction) there are the forms *nynsugy* "it is not" and *nyngese* "it was not, there was not" that show palatalisation and two further spellings *nynsese* of the latter that do not.\(^{188}\) The former shows palatalisation only

\(^{184}\) Nynsew OM 93 [sic]; nynsyw OM 1546 (3 exx.); PC 86, 216; RD 613 (9 exx.); nyn syv PC 1894; RD 264; nyns yw RD 2105, 2234; nyn syv PC 800 (5 exx.); nynsyyv PC 1678 (3 exx.); RD 406.

\(^{185}\) Nans yw OM 656 [sic]; Nansywy OM 2321 [sic]; nans yw OM 1127; nannya OM 2454; nans yv OM 2758; PC 701, 2240; nannya PC 2617.

\(^{186}\) nyn sos PC 2220; nyn osse RD 1261; nyns os RD 1092; nynsos RD 1364, 1410; nans on OM 283; nynson RD 2155; nynsough OM 1504; RD 1136; nyn sough PC 866; nyn sogh PC 791.

\(^{187}\) nans o PC 3119; nynso PC 1298; RD 1252.

\(^{188}\) Nynsugy OM 1398; RD 782; nyngese RD 650; nynsese OM 789; RD 1321.
of vgy "is", not the particle nyns. By far the most common example is the present existential nynsus, nyn sus, nynses "there is not".\textsuperscript{189} There are a total of 32 occurrences, none of which have orthographic palatalisation.

To these cases might be added also the first word of the English phrase \textit{Nans ye abel doway that} "Now ye, Abel, do that", the Cornish word replacing English "now".\textsuperscript{190} Finally there are a few inflected parts of mos, mones "to go". The forms nynsaf "I go not", nynsa, nyns a "goes not" follow the same pattern as parts of bos following the particle.\textsuperscript{191} (This is the only other verb apart form bos before which the longer form of ny(ns) and the temporal particle nans are found in Cornish.) The particle res occurs with perfective meaning in three instances of re seth "has gone" and once with the optative subjunctive in the unique instance re gymmy "may thou kiss".\textsuperscript{192} This is the only example in Middle Cornish in which res occurs before a vowel in a verb other than bos and mos. In short, in some ninety examples only one of nyngese and one of re gymmy in RD show palatalisation in the entire Ordinalia. Considering that the sound change is written in twenty-nine out of thirty cases in PA, this is a strange reversal of the earlier situation and suggests that the feature had probably not become standard in these words.

A few inflected parts of the verb bos "to be" also occur showing palatalisation which is not connected with the negative or temporal particles. The form nynsugy has already been given above, to which may be added mar asugy "if it is".\textsuperscript{193} Four other examples of vgy "is" have the

\textsuperscript{189} nynsus OM 435 (16 exx.); PC 1336 (5 exx.); RD 420 (6 exx.); nynses OM 1236, 2468; nyn sus PC 1833 (3 exx.). The example nynsa ioy RD 760 is probably not a mistake for *nynses ioy (which would require assimilation /zd/+/dz/ > /dz/). It is probably nyns a "goes not", see Loth, RC 26 (1905), p. 257.

\textsuperscript{190} Nans ye abel doway that OM 485

\textsuperscript{191} nynsaf RD 811, nynsa 1480, nyns a 760, 2214.

\textsuperscript{192} re seth PC 1027, 1246; RD 789, re gymmy 2355. Nance was not entirely convinced that re gymmy indicated that res rather than re was regular before vowels in verbs other than bos and mos, see NCED, Appendix vii, p. 197. The new examples discovered in 2002 (see § 5.9.1 below) all occur before forms of mos and do not prove the point, but there seems to be no reason to doubt re gymmy in any case.

\textsuperscript{193} mar asugy RD 1636, 1758.
sound change and one of vsy does not.\textsuperscript{194} Two further forms of nagusy, nagvsy "that it is not" also show only assimilation.\textsuperscript{195} The longer form of the imperfect tense is found with the palatal written as \((yth)\) ege "it was not, there was not", which may be compared to nynsese, nyngese seen above.\textsuperscript{196} (The latter shows palatalisation of only the particle and not the verb.) Also without the change, there are four cases of ese and two of ythese.\textsuperscript{197} In the second person singular there occur ytheses and eses "thou wast not".\textsuperscript{198} In the long form of the present tense one case of \(y\) thegen "we are" shows a palatal compared to one of ythesen and one of esen without.\textsuperscript{199} The number of examples with orthographic palatalisation is therefore roughly equal to those that have assimilation.

Two further groups of words preceding parts of the verbs bos "to be" and mos, mones "to go" are also worth considering here. Firstly it should be noted that, exactly as in PA, the conjunction \(mar(s)\), \(mara(s)\) "if" < SWBr. \(*mard\). \(mar(d)\) "if" is never written with palatalisation of the final sound, which always appears with assimilation. It should be noted that the full form \(mar(a)s\) only occurs before inflected parts of bos and mos that begin with a vowel, the final phoneme being elsewhere lost in any case.\textsuperscript{200} Of the 47 examples with parts of bos and the four examples with parts of mos, a few will suffice here. These include \(mar(a)\) syw, \(mar syv\) "if it is, if he/she is", \(marsof\) vy "if I am", \(marsos\) "if thou art", \(mar syns\) "if they are", \(marsu(e)s\) "if there are", \(mar asugy\) "if it is",

\begin{itemize}
\item \(vy\) PC 962 (4 exx.); vsy OM 1616.
\item \textit{nagusy} OM 573; \textit{nagvsy} RD 1217. This is for \(*nag usy /nag az{i}/, in which \(<g>\ means /g/. The use of this graph for both /g/ and \(dg/\ is a potentially confusing feature of Middle Cornish orthography.
\item \textit{ege} OM 796; PC 502; RD 1095.
\item ese OM 1089; RD 514 (3 exx.); ytheses PC 1405; RD 140.
\item ytheses PC 2259; eses OM 900.
\item \(y\) thegen RD 2148; yth esen RD 1169, esen 2395.
\item There seems to be no limitation upon the form \(<mar(a)\> according to tense as there was in MIB. and as is still the formal usage among some writers of ModB. The word is always compounded with the old particle \(<re>\ or <ro>\ (which was still used in MIC.), except before the negative \(<ny(n)s>\, where the older simplex form \(<ma>\ is always found instead, perhaps since both particles could not be used.
\end{itemize}
The word mar(a)s "if" is especially interesting in comparison to kyns "ere, before". This appears both before parts of the verbs "to be" and "to go" and also before es, ys "than" with the meaning "rather than". The former may be illustrated by the examples kyns en "before I was" and kynseth "before thou goest" with assimilation. The other use may be seen in two cases of kyns ys, but also in five examples of kyngys and two of kyn gys that show palatalisation. Although it is not inflected parts of a verb that follow but a conjunction, it is nonetheless instructive to note that palatalisation is common in kyns, which has a high front vowel, but it never occurs at all in mar(a)s, which does not.

The suffixed pronoun -sy, -gy occurs far more frequently in the Ordinalia than in the few cases in PA given above. It is used after verbs and prepositional pronouns as well as to reinforce a prefixed possessive pronoun with either a noun or verb-noun. In the first of these four categories, the vast majority of examples follow parts of the verb bos "to be", particularly compounded with the second person singular os "thou art", with the same meaning or slightly emphasising the pronoun. The forms oge, os gy, oge gy (with an emphatic doubled pronoun), ota gy (with two pronouns -ta and -gy, both meaning "thou"), asoge, a soge "how thou art!", hessoge < *ha essoge "and how thou art!" are written with palatalisation, a total of eight examples. The forms ose, osa, osy, ythose "thou art", a nynsose "art thou not?" and assosa "how thou art!"

---

201 marsevgh "if ye go", mar a seth, mar seth, marseth "if thou goest".
202 The forms oge, os gy, oge gy (with an emphatic doubled pronoun), ota gy (with two pronouns -ta and -gy, both meaning "thou"), asoge, a soge "how thou art!", hessoge < *ha essoge "and how thou art!" are written with palatalisation, a total of eight examples.
203 Although it is not inflected parts of a verb that follow but a conjunction, it is nonetheless instructive to note that palatalisation is common in kyns, which has a high front vowel, but it never occurs at all in mar(a)s, which does not.

---

201 mar syw PC 222; mara syw RD 828; mar syv PC 742; marsof vy RD 1831, marsos 1699, mar syns 1699; marsues PC 3142; mar sus OM 1116; mar asugy RD 1758; marsevgh OM 2185; mar a seth RD 538, mar seth 701, marseth 2362. In <mar asugy>, the palatal is in the verb, not in mar(a)s "if".
202 kyns en RD 2580, kynseth 1013.
203 kyns ys RD 202, 925; kyngys PC 324 (4 exx.); kyngys RD 1728; kyn gys PC 1713, 1779.
204 os PC 420; RD 262 (passim).
205 oge OM 1767; os gy RD 1931; oge gy PC 1234; ota gy RD 463, asoge 971, a soge PC 2891; hessoge RD 983.
are found with assimilation only, numbering ten examples.\textsuperscript{206} There are too few forms to show any difference between the texts, although OM has only one apiece, but it seems that all three texts sometimes show palatalisation and sometimes do not.

The phrases \textit{Eua prag y whruste sy} "Eve, why didst thou...?" and \textit{prag y tolste sy} "Why didst thou deceive...?" occur with assimilation in OM.\textsuperscript{207} One example \textit{may fy the gy offrynnys} "that thou be sacrificed" has palatalisation in the doubled pronoun.\textsuperscript{208} The remainder are found in RD, including \textit{fateł thuthte gy} "How didst thou come...?", \textit{rak na vy gy} "that thou be not" and \textit{pan ylly gy} "when thou canst".\textsuperscript{209} The imperatives \textit{na whyla gy} "seek thou not", \textit{tau sy} "be thou quiet", \textit{ha fasta sy} "and make fast" also occur in RD, only the first having palatalisation.\textsuperscript{210} Beside these are the variants with doubled pronouns \textit{tav the gy} "be thou quiet" and \textit{faste the gy} "make fast", both with palatalisation.\textsuperscript{211} A double pronoun occurs in PC with palatalisation in \textit{kerghy the gy} "fetch them thyself" as an independent emphatic pronoun rather than a true suffixed pronoun, since the object of the sentence separates it from the verb.\textsuperscript{212}

The suffixed pronoun -\textit{sy}, -\textit{gy} also occurs after prepositional pronouns in a few cases. These are \textit{dyso gy}, \textit{thysy gy} "to thee", \textit{drethos the gy} "through thee" (emphatic), \textit{genes gy} "with thee", \textit{ahanas gy} "of thee" and \textit{worthys gy} "to thee", all written with palatalisation.\textsuperscript{213} In some cases it occurs after a noun or noun and adjective to reinforce a preceding possessive pronoun. This occurs in \textit{the lynneth the sy} "thy lineage", the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ose OM 1796 \& PC 1018 (3 exx. in PC); osa PC 332, osy 2179; ythose RD 2626; a nynsose PC 1290; assiona RD 1261; RD 953.}
\item \textit{Eua prag y whruste sy OM 277, prag y tolste sy 301.}
\item \textit{may fy the gy offrynnys OM 1327.}
\item \textit{fateł thuthte gy RD 260, rak na vy gy 474, pan ylly gy 2452.}
\item \textit{na whyla gy RD 222, tau sy 405, ha fasta sy 1163.}
\item \textit{tav the gy} "be thou quiet" and \textit{faste the gy} RD 1091, 2368.
\item \textit{kerghy the gy} PC 2282. Better re-divided as \textit{kergh y thegy} /kergi dargi/.
\item \textit{dyso gy OM 842, thyso gy 1282 (4 exx.); PC 59 (3 exx.); RD 1740, 1830; drethos the gy PC 295; genes gy OM 1563; ahanas gy PC 2263; worthys gy RD 1728.}
\end{itemize}
voth the gy "thy will", the thythyow the gy "thy days" and the thev ploste gey "thy dirty god", all of which have an emphatic doubled pronoun.\textsuperscript{214} The first of these is the only example of such a doubled pronoun the gy /ðɛdʒi/ < the sy /ðɛzi/ < OC. *dedi /didi/ < PrimC. *didi that show assibilation only. Only once in the naghe gy "to deny thee" is the second person singular suffixed pronoun used with a verb-noun.\textsuperscript{215} It seems from these examples that the pronoun was written with only assibilation as often as it was written with palatalisation in all three plays, but that the doubled pronoun was usually spelt with a palatalised element. This may be because the affected segment in MIC.*ðe sy /ðɛzi/ PrimC. *didi did not only precede a front vowel as usual but also followed one, albeit not as high, which perhaps reinforced any tendency towards palatalisation of the phoneme. If unstressed /ɛ/ tended to become /ə/ in this word, since it had unusual stress (cf. W. tydi), the preceding vowel is irrelevant.

Other than these various categories, the Ordinalia contains a much wider assortment of words with spellings indicating palatalisation of PrimC. /d/ than does PA, in which the phonemes in question are nearly always found with assibilation instead. Even so, spellings indicating assibilation are still so common even in the Ordinalia (especially in OM) that it is not possible to list them all here. It is however easy enough to demonstrate that a great many words showing palatalisation would have been equally likely to appear with assibilation only.

Amongst the most common, due to the religious nature of the Middle Cornish texts, are words related to the verb crysy "to believe", which itself appears also as crygy and with initial lenition as grysy,

\textsuperscript{214} the lynneth the sy OM 315; the voth the gy PC 1039; the thythyow the gy RD 2037; the thev ploste gey OM 1809.
\textsuperscript{215} the naghe gy RD 1156.
The word *cregyans* "belief" seen above in PA appears once in OM, along with the more frequent variants *crygyans* (6 examples), *grygyans* (4 examples) and the related *dyscrygyans* "unbelief". The word *dyscrygyk* "unbeliever" appears twice in RD, rhyming once with *dywysyk* "devout" and once with both *anfusyk* "unfortunate, disastrous" and *cuthygyk* "contrite, repentant". In either case it is obvious enough that final */–zɪk/* and */–dʒɪk/* constitute a full rhyme and were equivalent in the mind of the scribe. The word also appears as *descrygyk* once in RD and twice in OM in the plural *dyscrygyyon* "unbelievers". The word *cuthygyk* is also made to rhyme with *anfugyk* once in PC, which on this occasion is written with palatalisation. The plural *anfesugyon* appears once without palatalisation in RD and the related noun *anfugy* "disaster, calamity" occurs with the sound change written in both OM and PC. In all of these cases, either a yod or high front vowel follows the affected phoneme. These examples might be compared with the word *galogek* "powerful, mighty" with the palatal written for OC. *galluidoc*. The vowel of the ending MIC. */–ek/* < OC. */–oc/* perhaps had a tendency to be raised, since there seems to be no other motivation for palatalisation.

Palatalisation is strangely uncommon in the inflected parts of this verb, seen only in *nan crygyth ef* "that thou believest it not" and *nyn cregyth* "thou believest not". The forms *ny grysaf*, *ny gressaf* "I believe not" (which rhymes with *pesaf* "I pray"), *ny gresough* "ye believe not" occur in the present tense and *y kresen* "we would believe" and *ny gresyn*...

---

216 crysy PC 2883; crysy RD 1130, 2461; crygy PC 1482 (4 exx.); RD 8 (23 exx.); grygy RD 1047, 1219, 2381.
217 cregyans OM 1882; crygyans PC 1813 (3 exx.); RD 1174 (3 exx.); grygyans PC 1572; RD 1164 (3 exx.); dyscrygyans RD 1516.
218 dyscrygyk RD 1369, 1519, dywysyk 1370, anfusyk 1520, cuthygyk 1521.
219 descrygyk RD 1431; dyscrygyyon OM 1855, 1869.
220 cuthygyk PC 1423, anfugyk 1424.
221 anfesugyon RD 85: note that the graph <g> here means */g/*, replacing de-voiced final */k/* in the singular; anfugy OM 2328; PC 1473, 2044.
222 galogek RD 2376; galluidoc Voc. Corn. 247.
223 nan crygyth ef RD 1087; nyn cregyth 1385.
"I would not believe" appear in the imperfect. The related past participle *thyscryssys* "disbelieved" and the plural imperatives *creseugh* and *cresough why* "believe" also appear.

More interesting are the forms of the present subjunctive *nan cresso* "that believe it not", *na gresso* "that believe not", *an cresso* "that believe it" and *a (len) grysso* "that (truly) believe" in RD. Although the double graph <ss> is used as a rare alternative for <s> /z/, it is habitually used in the subjunctive forms. Since a form such as *cresso* would have developed from PrimC. *kred+ho*, it seems that this developed to MiC. */krez+ho/ > /kresso/ by asibilation and profection. Either this rendered it immune from palatalisation or, in addition, it was always followed by a back vowel in this part of the verb and was not therefore likely to be palatalised. It may be noted that the present subjunctive is never written with palatalisation in Cornish. To fit with the George's theory that /d/ became /d/’/ in internal position, it would be necessary to fall back on the idea that analogy re-shaped such paradigms, presumable based upon the stem and third person singular *cres, crys*. Otherwise the present subjunctive would have been ***/kred´+ho/ > ***/kret´o/ and <ss> would have fallen together with <ch> /t/’/ in *chy* if it were perversely used for this sound. It seems far simpler and in keeping with the evidence that these phonemes were /ss/ as they were written.

Another common verb is *pygy, pigy* "to pray". The third person present-future appears in *my agis peys* "I pray ye" with the expected assibilation rather than palatalisation in final position. In the third person preterite the form *pygys* "prayed" is found twice and *pysys* once, this

---

224 ny grysaf RD 1056, ny gressaf 1353, pesaf 1356; ny gresough PC 2688, y kresen 2871; ny gresyn RD 1549. The forms of *y kresen* and *ny gresyn* do not show whether they are imperfect or pluperfect, but in the latter the graph <ss> would stand for /s/ < /z+h/ rather than /zl/. The context shows that the first is conditional and is probably imperfect, while the latter is certainly imperfect with medial /zl/.

225 thyscryssys PC 1040; creseugh RD 1141, cresough why 1300.

226 nan cresso RD 1348, na gresso 2478, an cresso 1555, a grysso 1707, a len grysso 2466.

227 pygy PC 1013 (4 exx.); RD 285 (6 exx.); pigy PC 109, 357.
latter also appearing once as the form of the past participle. The related noun *pyidow, piyadow* "prayer" is also left without palatalisation in *ow fysadow*. The present tense forms *pesaf* "I pray", *pygyth* "thou prayest", *pigyn, pygyn* "we pray" show palatalisation before a front vowel but not a back vowel. Two plural imperatives *pyseygh* and *pesough* "pray" show no palatalisation. The form *pyss* occurs once as the conditional, probably the pluperfect conditional with /s/ < /z+h/ instead of /z/ and once as the past subjunctive, which almost certainly contained /ss/. The verb *bryge, brugy* "to judge" appears also in the past participle *brugys* with apparently the same meaning but no palatal written. The verb *gase, gasse, ase* "to leave" is also found as *gage, age* and in the plural imperative *gesough, geseugh, gysseugh* "leave!". Other verbal forms with apparent palatalisation found in the Ordinalia include the past participle *vygythys* "baptised" (cf. *besythia* in TH), and *sallug* "to salute". No example of *sallusy* occurs without palatalisation. The common verb *sensy, synge* "to seize, hold" shows a variation between forms with palatalisation and those without in the third person singular preterite *sengys, senges, byngys, synsys*, but has none in *pyv a synsow why mogha* "who do you take (as the) greatest?" The present tense *sensaf* "I seize, hold" has no palatalisation before the back vowel. The imperative occurs in the singular *syns y* "take her" and *syns yth dorn* "take in thy hand", in the plural *sensew e, senseugh ef* "seize him" and in

---

228 *pygys* OM 739; PC 2195; *pysys* PC 1095; *pysys* OM 860 [p.pt.].
229 *pyiadow* PC 24, 2651, *piyadow* 334; *ow fysadow* OM 1830.
229 *pesaf* RD 1356, *pygyth* 852; *pigyn* PC 199; *pygyn* RD 2394.
230 *pyseygh* PC 2, *pesough* RD 1076.
231 *pysse* PC 2906; RD 2378.
232 *bryge* PC 444, *brugy* 1668; RD 2199; *brugys* PC 2234.
234 *vygythys* RD 1143, *besythia* TH 36a.4 [JT], *sallug* 1009; RD 598; PC 972 & 2126.
the rare third person singular *syngyns* "let him take". These all follow the expected pattern, in that palatalisation would not normally be expected in final or before a lax vowel but it could occur before a close vowel as in the final example given here.

This verb is at least in part derived from L. *sentiō*, as are its cognates MIB. *sentīf* B. *sentīn* W. *synnwyr*, *synio*. The Welsh meaning is “to imagine, think, sense” according to the Latin, whereas the Breton (with the preposition *ouzh* “at, to, against”) has come somehow to mean “to obey”, either from the secondary Latin meaning “to judge, decide” or else perhaps through an intermediate sense such as “to esteem.” This would account for the use of the verb with similar meanings in Middle Cornish, but not for the additional sense "to hold, seize". That this sense was already current in Old Cornish is shown by the word *sinsiat* "miser" (lit. "one who holds") with the suffix –iat (MlC. –yas WB. –iad). Presumably the process of semantic change went through a series of meanings such as “to think” > “to esteem” > “to hold to” (a decision, authority or view) before it came to replace the root *dalgh-* “to hold” (physically). The alternative idea seems difficult, that the additional range of meaning might have been due to the influence Eng. *seize* < OFr. *seisir* < LL. *sacīre* < Gmc. *sakyan* (not directly from Anglo-Saxon, cf. OHG. *sazzan*). This verb was borrowed separately as C. *sesya*, though it is not

---


239 It is just possible that a further verb related to the adj. B. *sañset* "esteemed, considered, held (to be)" could have been merged with this in C. (not B.), derived from Fr. *censé* < L. *censēre*. The verb may be obsolete in B., but probably only the adj. ever existed. Even if this is true, the verb is still cognate with the WB. forms. Any such merger would in any case be impossible without prior assimilation /nt/ > /ns/.

240 The native stem *dalgh-* (MlW. *daly* ModW. *dal(a)* B. *delcher*, *derc'hel*, stem *dalgh*) occurs only in the derived *dalhen* "grip" (PC 1131), *dalhenne* "to grip, seize" (PC 1141).


impossible that such influence pre-dated the later loan. Whatever the reasons for the semantic change, the verb must contain /ns/ < /nt/.

Palatalisation in other words appears to be of limited scope in the Ordinalia. Various spellings of bolungeth "will" (B. bolontez L. voluntatem) appear, always with palatalisation. In vryongen and bryangen "throat" the palatalisation may be compared with the assimilation in bryonsen in BM. The reverse is seen in martesen "perhaps" with /z/, which appears once as martegen and once as martesen in BM. However, this word must contain /z/ < /s/, since the cognate B. marteze is evidently from mar+teu+se "if that comes". This is a telling orthographical possibility, albeit rare, that demonstrates clearly that /(d)ʒ/ could result from /z/ of whatever origin, including from voicing /s/.

The loan hobersen "habergeon" < MlFr. haubergeon is paralleled by B. hobregon with /ʒ/ from the same source. It is likely therefore that s means the fricative /ʒ/ < /z/, or perhaps even the fully palatalised affricate /dʒ/. The fact that s is not a natural choice of graph for /dʒ/ may mitigate slightly against it. It may be a scribal hypercorrection, drawn from the awareness that s and g could vary in some words. In any case, this seems to be the same as saying that the difference between s and g was not important to him in some phonetic environments. That either the fricative or affricate should be written with s is remarkable. The most obvious and natural conclusion is that the change /z'/ > /dʒ/ was well advanced in relevant phonetic environments.

---

243 If allowed as a possibility, such similarity would depend upon OC. assimilation in the L. loanword.
244 bolungeth OM 873 (3 exx.); bolenegoth PC 1139; volungeth OM 1165, 1271; PC 2053; volnogeth OM 2352; volnegeth PC 957, 1072. The phoneme has been omitted voluneth OM 1292, no doubt by scribal error, so it is impossible to decide whether the example showed palatalisation or not.
245 vryongen PC 1007, bryangen. 1527; bryonsen BM 1620.
246 martesen PC 2870; martegen BM 61, martesen 3291.
247 See HPB, § 994, p. 703. Jackson's belief that the word contains aze "there" makes this clear. Also CCCG, § 263, n. 3, which states that the word contains old /sl/.
248 hobersen RD 2536. See Piette, French Loanwords in Middle Breton, p. 130.
The word *treys* "feet" similarly rhymes with the re-spelt English loan *scryg* "screech" with final */tʃ/.*249* This must mean that *treys* contained the affricate phoneme */dʒ/ (or could do for the sake of rhyme), realised as its de-voiced counterpart in final position. Together with the rhymes *dyscrygyk, dywysyk, anfusyk* and *cuthygyk* seen above, these spellings seem to show considerable sporadic confusion between */z/ and */dʒ/.

Palatalisation seems to have been common in abstract nouns ending in the group */–nz–/ plus a front vowel. Further examples are *fleyryngy* "odour, stink" (B. *flaer*) and *drenges, drynsys, drenses* "Trinity", although *denses, densys* "mankind" is unaffected.*250* The most common is *kerenge* "love" (B. *karantez*), appearing ten times as such but only once as *kerense.*251* Several plurals or compounds that ended in either */–ys* or */–us* in the singular show the sound change, including *aflythygyon* "ruffians" (cf. *avlethis* in CW), *deulugy, devlugy* "devilry" (perhaps from */deulus* "diabolical"), *govegyon, govygyon* "sorrow, care, regret" (W. *gofid, –ion*), *varthogyon, varthegyon* "marvels" < */marthus* "wonderful", *profugy* "prophets" < *profus* "prophet" and *terrygy, teroge* "ruin, downfall, destruction" < *terros* "ruin, disaster".*252* The alternative plural *marthusow* "wonders" has only assibilation, perhaps because */z/ is here followed by a lax vowel that would have been likely not to cause any palatal effect.*253* A similar phonetic environment apparently caused the same effect in *meystrygy, mestrigi, mestrsy* "masters", *servgy, serusys, seruygy* "servants" and *trewesy* "sad, serious, grave".*254*

---

*scryg* RD 853, *treys* 854.
*fleyryngy* RD 2133, *drenges* 309; *drynsys OM* 1734, 2660; *drenses PC* 68; *denses RD* 2514 (3 exx.), *densys 2621.*
*kerenge* OM 1207 (2 exx.); PC 483 (4 exx.); RD 453 (4 exx.); *kerense* PC 549.*
*aflythygyon* OM 2745; *avlethis CW* 1152; *deulugy RD* 2124, *devlugy 2174; govegyon PC* 1062; *goygyon RD* 1154, *varthogyon OM* 2546, *varthegyon PC* 770, *profugy 1480, profus OM* 1799, *terrygy PC* 102, *teroge 2303 terros OM* 360.*
*marthusow* PC 86.*
*meystrygy PC* 1711, 1850, *mestrigi 1647, mestrsy* "masters"; *servgy OM* 2468; *PC 279, serusys* 713; *RD 2470; seruygy PC* 2708; *RD 2460, trewesy PC* 1269.
The curious place-name Carnsew appears in *carn suyow ha trehembs* “rock” + “gods”, where the latter element should perhaps better be understood to mean “fairies”.\(^{255}\) It does not contain C. *du* as it may superficially appear, although another Carnsew does contain that element.\(^{256}\) Assibilation would not be expected (in either) unless the noun and adjective had been taken as a single word.

There are three place-names that show palatalisation of *du* "black", *Lanjew* < *lyn du* "black pond", *Lanyew* < *nans du* “black valley” or *lan du* “black enclosure” and *Opetjew* < *op(et) du* “black ope, alley”, although assibilation is also found in the two examples *Crubzu* < *cryb du* "black ridge" and *Polsue* < *Pol Du* "black pool".\(^{257}\) The lax articulation of earlier /d/ might be expected to cause occasional assibilation in these environments according to Toorians' analysis described above, however irregular it may seem that they were apparently treated as single words rather than as nouns with adjectives. The rounded front vowel in *du* may have been enough to cause palatalisation, helped perhaps in *Lanjew* < *lyn du* by the preceding high front vowel and /n/ preceding the affected phoneme. If *Lanyew* is from *nans+du* then it seems to have required assimilation /z/+/d/ as well as palatalisation, but the presence of /n/ could still be a factor. Presumably /y:/ was high enough to cause palatalisation, but if the front vowel were by this time diphthongised /dy:/ > /drw/, this could help motivate the change. It is worth noting that while *du* is an extremely common place-name element, there are only a handful of examples that show either sound change.

\(^{255}\) *carn suyow ha trehembs* OM 2311; see also CPNE, pp. 82, 252 (Mabe).

\(^{256}\) CPNE, pp. 89-90, 252 (St. Erth).

\(^{257}\) CPNE, pp. 89-90. See pp. 143, 170 for the frequent confusion of *nans* and *lan* in place-names. In spite of the uncertain first elements, both *Lanyew* and *Opetjew* contain *du* “black”. If the former is *lan du* then it has missing lenition of the adj. after a fem. noun (as would *Crubzu*, since CB. *krib* is fem., although W. *crib* may be masc.). It is also considered uncertain, p. 174, that the latter contains *op*, since such a loan seems to require *opet*, perhaps an Eng. diminutive.
A further unusual example is prygwyth "a while" < prys "time"+gwyth "occasion", in which following /w/ perhaps does not seem to give any protection from the palatal effect of the following high front vowel.\(^{258}\) It is more likely, however, that the major cause of palatalisation was the preceding front vowel. The word skyggyow "shoes" (W. esgidiau) is apparently regular, showing palatalisation presumably as an effect of the following yod.\(^{259}\) A strange graphemic variation of <ss> and <g> is seen in trysse, tressa and trege, tryge "third" W. trydydd, trydedd B. trede.\(^{260}\) The word is spelt with single <s> nowhere in Middle Cornish. It may indicate that a form with de-voiced /–ss–/ co-existed with one with /–z–/; possibly only the latter was liable to become a palatal if the original close vowel was retained in this word. Finally, the common word wose "after" (W. wedi MlW. gwedi, wedi B. goude) appears more frequently with a spelling woge indicating palatalisation than it does with assibilation.\(^{261}\) The original close quality of the final vowel must have remained long enough to cause palatalisation as a common variant. The unique variant wege, apparently closer to the Welsh form but perhaps coincidental, is found once in OM.\(^{262}\)

### 5.8.4 Summary of the Early Middle Cornish Evidence

In summary, it appears that palatalisation in the early part of the Middle Cornish period should be divided into two separate sound changes. The first of these affected dental stops in a limited range of environments where the phoneme in question did not undergo assibilation. It probably preceded that phenomenon and therefore does not

---

258 prygwyth PC 1055. Here it seems certain that <g> means /dʒ/, not /ɡ/, with lenition /gw/ > /w/.
259 skyggyow OM 1406.
260 trysse OM 1130, tressa 25 (2 exx.); RD 5, trege 329 (3 exx.), tryge 452 (3 exx.).
261 wose OM 1899; RD 226, 940; woge OM 1427; PC 1327 (6 exx.); RD 206 (7 exx.).
overlap with it. Palatalisation in these words was restricted to the voiced phoneme /d/ in all cases except the ubiquitous MIC. chy "house" < WCB. ti, which is the only known example where unvoiced /t/ was involved. As this may be a special case, this is discussed separately below. The second sound change accounts for a much larger number of words showing palatalisation and conversely does overlap with assibilation, so that both s and g may commonly be written for earlier /d/. It is important to distinguish between these two changes in order to properly account for palatalisation in the history of Cornish. The term "First Palatalisation" will be used hereafter to refer to the sequence /d/ > /d' / > /dʒ/ and likewise the term "Second Palatalisation" will be used for /d/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ and for the sequence /ns/ > /nz/ > /nz'/ > /ndʒ/.

i. First Palatalisation /d/ > /d'/ > /dʒ/  

The consistency of this sound change was so great that there are no attested words in PA or the Ordinalia in which it failed to occur when OC. /d/ occurred after /n/ with a following front vowel in the limited range of words described. This occurred across word boundary and affected the initial /d/ of the following word. Assibilation did not in any case occur in initial position because the initial sound of a word would be presumably unable to suffer the kind of lax articulation prescribed by Toorians. No overlap between the two sound changes would therefore be expected to arise in these circumstances, making it difficult to assess which might be the older of the two. Both assibilation and "First Palatalisation" have such a uniform application in Middle Cornish that they seem to have been well-established sound changes, unlike the

262 wege OM 2828.
sporadic and unpredictable "Second Palatalisation". This fact alone should perhaps be enough to suggest strongly that the latter was a younger phenomenon than either assimilation or "First Palatalisation".

The change /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/ is seen regularly when the word dyth, deth, deyth "day" (B. deiz W. dydd) occurs after the article as an g(e)yth "the day" and when deawl "devil" (B. diaoul W. diawl, diafol) occurs similarly with the article as an ioul(l) "the Devil". This does not happen with the less frequent plural nouns. The main reason for this is that the syllable containing the affected phoneme was long in a monosyllable but was reduced to half-long in a polysyllable. The reduced tonic accent and shorter realisation apparently resulted in a relative tendency to lower the vowel.\(^{263}\) In the case of an dewolow, the stress accent was entirely removed from the affected syllable with the addition of a plural suffix, resulting in the lowering of the vowel, although word stress remains on the penult in en deʒyow "the days". Nonetheless, the realisation of /ɪː/ as half-long [ɪ.] in polysyllables is why it tended to be lowered to [e:], as these sounds are extremely close from an articulatory point of view.\(^{264}\)

It might be argued that spellings such as deth indicate such a lowering of the vowel even in the singular, which has keeps the long, stressed monosyllable. This is probably true, since the vacillation in spelling seems to keep the former diphthong /ei/ in deyth occasionally, but more often reduced it to either dyth with [ɪː] or deth with [eː]. It is probably best to assume that the spelling indicating the diphthong is a result of scribal conservatism, so the representation of the phoneme is probably best written /ɪː/ with allophones [ɪː] and [eː].

\(^{263}\) Williams gives a rather different explanation of his “Vocalic Alternation”, *Cornish Today*, § 5.1-9, pp. 36-41, but the observed phenomenon is sound, despite the unclear account of the quantity system.  
\(^{264}\) It must be admitted that it is not certain whether half-length was distinguished properly at all, or at what dates that may have been so, so reduction to a fully short realisation is entirely possible.
All the same, such lowering of this phoneme in MIC. is likely to have occurred later and less consistently than in the plural *deʒyow, where it was shortened from long to half-long on a realisational level. If the palatalisation of /d/ > /d'/? happened early in *dyth [dI:θ] > [d'I:θ] but not in *deʒyow [dI.ðjow] > [de.ðjow], whatever lowering subsequently occurred would have made little difference to the outcome. If the tendency to palatalise is linked to high front vowels, according to the observations made so far, it is easy to see why it was frequent in the singular, whose front vowel was realised relatively higher than in the corresponding plural. Except in the earliest MIC., it does not seem likely that the vowel of MIC. *an "the" < OC, MIC. *en < PrimC. *in < CC. *sind- was still sufficiently high to be an additional factor, although this is uncertain. In any case, this would not be a factor distinguishing singular from plural, as it would be the same unstressed vowel in either case.

A further factor alluded to above is the fact that the singular of these words occurs substantially more frequently than the plurals, nearly always following the definite article *an or elided preposition plus article *yn “in the” (< *yn “in” + *an “the” B. *en < *e(n)+*an). It has been noticed already that a preceding /n/ appears to contribute to palatalisation, no doubt because it is a nasal alveolar-dental that is articulated just in front of the hard palate. It is likely that the plural would occur less frequently with the article for two reasons: (1) quite possibly, from a natural semantic point of view, one would tend to refer to “the Devil” more often than “a devil” but conversely to “devils” more often than specifically to “the devils”; (2) moreover, less frequent words are inherently more likely to preserve conservative speech than more frequent ones.

In the Ordinalia a further noun *d(y)evan (< L. daemon) is added to these examples in the form an ievan "the fiend, demon". This is more
difficult to account for, since L. /æl/ became short /ɛ/ in Brittonic. The spellings of this word are fairly consistent, and nowhere is there e > y that might indicate raising. It must be admitted that this would be a difficult representation, since all of the spellings show palatalisation and it would not be natural to write y after consonantal i/j in **an iyvan (where **an jyvan would be a mere orthographic variation, because the letters i and j were merely different forms of the same letter that showed different distributions according to position). However, *an gyvan does not seem less likely than an gevan, yet the former does not occur. It is clear that the conditions for palatalisation existed in this word, but it is not at all clear why the words *d(y)evan and d(e)yth were both apparently equally likely to show palatalisation, considering the relative height of the vowels.

The same change is seen across word boundary in all tenses of the third person singular verb an ieves "(he) has got", an geffo "that he may have" and so forth. Here again the phoneme /d/ was followed by the high front vowel of the prefix *di– compounded with parts of the verb bos "to be". A further similarity with the examples above is that the nasal /n/ immediately precedes the palatalised /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/ across word boundary. It appears that the resulting group /nd/ plus front vowel or yod was particularly likely to undergo the sequence of changes /nd/ > /nd´/ > /ndʒ/ because [d] is likely to be articulated closer to the hard palate between unexploded [n] and a following front vowel. The articulation of /d/ in these circumstances apparently became so tense that it first became palatalised /d´/ and then a full affricate /dʒ/.

---

265 LHEB § 29, pp. 335-6.
ii. Apparent Irregular "First Palatalisation"

Two words occur in which it appears that early palatalisation in internal position may have prevented later assibilation. These are various parts of the verb nyge "to fly" and the plural noun blegyow "flowers". It should be remarked first of all that because these are isolated examples, it cannot be certain whether or not they are in fact linked with the "First Palatalisation" seen above. Moreover, there seem to be significant differences between the phonetic environments in question. The least significant of these is the fact that /d/ > /dʒ/ is in initial position in the examples given above, whereas the palatal in nyge and blegyow is internal. As has been noted, the sound change could occur across word boundary. A more important difference is that the nasal /n/ is no part of the process of palatalisation in these two words.

In the various forms nyge "to fly, float", 3s. pres.-fut. and 2s. imperative ngyg "fly, flies", 3s. pret. nygyas "floated" and in blegyow "flowers", only a yod, not a front vowel follows the phoneme /d/, although especially in the parts of nyge it seems highly likely that the preceding front vowel also played a part. It is significant that palatalisation must have occurred in nyge before assibilation for the rare final /dʒ/ to be possible in verbal forms consisting of the bare stem, unlike in beys "endures" in the verb *pesya, *pegya "to last, endure". This feature is therefore older even than Voc. Corn., since it pre-dates assibilation. It is not possible to tell from examples such as an g(e)yth whether palatalisation had already happened in such words when assibilation occurred elsewhere in Cornish, so it is not clear if nyge can be included in "First Palatalisation" or whether it was an isolated, earlier change. Nevertheless there seems no reason to doubt that /d/ > /dʒ/
occurred in these words at the same time, as soon a tendency developed to palatalise the phoneme in contact with a yod or front vowel. If so, "First Palatalisation" may have pre-dated assibilation.

The case of blegyow "flowers" in PA is more uncertain. It seems, on balance, that only two explanations of the palatal are possible: firstly that OC. blodon "flower" and *bledieu "flowers" were re-modelled on the basis of *ble(u)s "bloom, flower(s)" MIW. blawd B. bleuñv and therefore showed assibilation as MIC. *blesen, *blesyow, giving MIC. *blegen (LC. bledzhan) and MIC. blegyow; secondly that the same results were achieved showing g /dʒ/ < /d/ without assibilation because palatalisation occurred first and prevented it. The first scenario indicates that the word shows "Second Palatalisation" and properly belongs in the following section, while the second requires that the separate sound change /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/ had occurred before assibilation and therefore that it was older than Voc. Corn., as in the case of nyge above.

It is impossible to choose categorically between these options, but it might be noted that PrimC. *blødieu always contained yod after the phoneme /d/ and by the end of the Old Cornish period, if not earlier, a front vowel also preceded the consonant. Since it seems likely that nyge contained a palatal before the date of assibilation, there is every reason to suppose that the yod in *bledieu would have caused the change as soon as a tendency towards palatalisation arose. It would then be reasonable to link this with "First Palatalisation" in an ge(y)th, providing further evidence that the sound change pre-dated assibilation. The words nyge and blegyow may then demonstrate that front vowels could cause a tendency towards palatalisation before /d/ as well as following it, that a following yod could cause the same effect and that preceding /n/ was not necessary in every instance.
A further irregularity in early palatalisation, as previously mentioned, occurs in MIC. *chy < OC. *ti, which is the only word in which unvoiced /t/ became palatalised /t/ > /t̚/ > /tʃ/. Except in compounds, which can show assimilation and may be ignored here, only one exceptional archaic form with /t/ occurs in the whole of the Middle and Late Cornish periods.\textsuperscript{266} The earliest textual example of *chy with palatalisation is the late fourteenth century, since *ti was apparently unpalatalised in OC. and the word happens to occur in CF, the earliest MIC. text. However, there exists place-name evidence to suggest that the change happened in the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{267}

The compound *agy "inside" may suggest either that OC. *a di existed prior to palatalisation, thus showing the associated /d/ > /d̚/ > /dʒ/ in the voiced phoneme, or else may be a rare example in which the mutation *ch- /tʃ/ > *g- /dʒ/ is shown in the orthography. This may not have been a meaningful distinction in the mind of a speaker, who may at any period have been immediately aware of the semantic link between the two words. If so, the sound change may have developed in the voiced and unvoiced phonemes side by side, even though the latter sound change occurred only in this single word in extant Cornish. Contradicting this, however, is the failure to represent the initial mutation in *yn e *chy, where the phoneme, as an apparent isolate in this position, may have been considered along with more frequent loans such as *changya as unmutatable. If New Lenition were not fully developed, then one would expect such initial mutation to be any more than sporadic.

It seems that "First Palatalisation" was older than the Charter Fragment. The indication from place-names that *ti > *chy occurred in the thirteenth century may narrow this down, if the voiced phoneme followed

\textsuperscript{266} *yn ow thy a piyadow PC 334, discussed by N.J.A. Williams, "Four Textual Notes on the Middle Cornish Drama", BBCS 22 (1966-8), p. 237. See § 5.9.5 (ii) below.
the same development as its unvoiced counterpart, to between the start of the twelfth century (Voc. Corn.) and the mid fourteenth (PA). It may be that Old Cornish orthography could not show palatal /t´/ because the graph ch was used in words like chespær for /k/; equally there was no available graph for /d´/ either. The sounds may or may not have reached the stage /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ at this time, but the stage /t´/ and /d´/ may have been tense enough to avoid the lax articulation involved in assibilation. In the case of /t´/, the phoneme never stood in intervocalic position because internal /t/ had everywhere become /d/ at the time of lenition. Since in any case there are no examples with /nt´/, palatalisation of this phoneme could not in any event conflict with assibilation.

iii. "Second Palatalisation /z/ > /z´/ > /dʒ/

Unlike "First Palatalisation", it appears that this sound change affected the earlier phoneme /d/ only where it had previously become /z/ by assibilation. This was necessarily in internal position since assibilation did not occur in initial position and the extant evidence suggests that palatalisation was not generally tolerated in final position, so MIC. pygy "to pray" but MIC. my ath pys "I pray thee" were respectively written with g [dʒ] and s [z]. It is inherently probable that palatalisation of /z/ [z] went through an earlier stage [ʒ] before it became [dʒ], although the orthography would not have shown this. The phoneme was presumably in the process of falling together with the reflex of "First Palatalisation" /dʒ/ < /d´/ < /d/ (although it occurred in different positions) since there is no difference in Middle Cornish spelling conventions for these sounds.

267 CPNE, p. 77-78.
However, "Second Palatalisation" was not applied universally where it might be expected, unlike the earlier phenomenon. The common occurrence of forms such as *pesy* indicates that the tendency towards palatalisation before front vowels was probably incomplete and it is therefore arguable whether or not a general phonemic distinction between /dʒ/ plus front vowel (or perhaps yod) and /z/ plus back vowel had yet developed. In the earliest Middle Cornish both were apparently still /z/, but it is difficult to say with certainty if and when /z´/ and then perhaps /ʒ/ became universal before front vowels. The most conservative notation for all but the earliest Middle Cornish would require at least /z´/ (whatever degree of palatalisation was actually realised) in order to account for the tendency, compared to /z/ before back vowels. Even though these were effectively determined by position in relation to adjacent vowels, a less strict notation is justifiable because no narrow synchronic analysis of "Second Palatalisation" is possible on the basis of the orthography of a single text. It would be verging on the ridiculous to label g [dʒ] as /z´/ but s [z] or [dʒ] as either /z/ or /z´/ according to position throughout the Middle Cornish period. Since the study of this phoneme is necessarily diachronic, it seems appropriate to use /dʒ/ to show the ultimate realisation of the palatalised phoneme. Moreover, if the palatal treatment of /z´/ > /(d)ʒ/ tended to fall together with the results of /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/ from "First Palatalisation", as the representation of both sounds as g tends to suggest, it would have become increasingly distinct from /z/.

The continued variation of s and g before front vowels is alone enough to suggest that /dʒ/ was not yet generalised by the time of the Ordinalia, unless such spellings with s are always simply archaisms. This seems unlikely because of their high frequency and their continued appearance in later Cornish. To argue that s was commonly restored
by analogy with words where the phoneme was followed by a back vowel would be to accept the theories of Pedersen and George despite the lack of evidence for large scale re-modelling, while positing the opposite sequence of sound changes. That would be to say that analogy frequently caused the palatalised phoneme /dʒ/ to revert to the earlier assibilated state /z/. This is no better supported than Pedersen and George's assertion that palatalisation prevented assibilation in some environments and that the distribution was then modified by analogy, except in so far that no earlier spellings indicating palatalisation are found in Vocabularium Cornicum or in the Charter Fragment. Outside verbal paradigms, there seems little reason to suppose that analogy could have been more than a minor force in "Second Palatalisation". Had this not been true, one would expect it to become suddenly regularised (either becoming general or being eliminated in certain identifiable environments), but this cannot be shown to have occurred in any period. The whole history of the sound change appears to be slow and irregular, which makes dating difficult.

The absence of written palatalisation in the Charter Fragment, the earliest extant Middle Cornish, is much better explained by the model presented here than by that of Pedersen and George precisely because it does not depend on large scale analogical re-modelling. Except where rhymes may occasionally show otherwise, for example dyscrygyk/dywysyk and treys/scryg in PA given above, it seems far better to accept written forms as a general guide to the phonology represented therein. It is impossible to be sure of the level of deliberate archaism or scribal conservatism in the orthography. Nevertheless the retention of two graphs for different stages of the same sound change in a single document is an indication that palatalisation was probably neither very regular nor very old at the time that it was written down.
"Second Palatalisation" by and large occurred only in a limited range of words in PA, with a few less predictable examples; this range of words grew somewhat wider in the Ordinalia, as did the number of words showing palatalisation outside these predictable groups. It is not inherently surprising that less commonly used words should have been slower to show phonological change than more common words, given that the sound change was by no means complete. This is borne out by the fact that even in PA the single most frequent incidence of g for earlier s occur in parts of the verb "to be" after the particles ny(ns) and nans. It appears that, as in "First Palatalisation", a preceding /n/ or a front vowel in a preceding syllable could contribute to the likelihood of a palatal spelling. Normally, however, it is significant that a front vowel nearly always follows the affected consonant.

One striking example to the contrary is MIC. o "was" (imperfect) ModB. oa V. oé W. oedd in MIC. nevngo, nanso "(then) it was" MIW. neut oedd and in MIC. ny(n) go "it was" W. nid oedd. The vowel in OC. *neu(n)d was probably /œ/ and that in MIC. o < OC. *oi was probably /ui/ > /o:/ > /ɔ:/ . The palatal tendency may have begun when the surrounding vowels, especially following /o:/ < /ui/, still retained their rounding and therefore their height, even though full palatalisation may not have developed until much later. If it was only observed in the orthography when the vowels had already been lowered then it would show that /z/ was certainly phonemically distinct from /z/ and that palatalisation did not rely solely upon the contemporary environment.

Nonetheless, it is reasonable to assume that surrounding front vowels would have had a similar effect in a later period as in an earlier period and therefore that /z/ could probably be palatalised at any time during much of the history of Middle Cornish. It should be noted that the
above examples are not cases of (/nt/ >) /ns/ > /nz/ > /ndʒ/ because /n/ is intrusive here, cf. B. ne(n)d, before earlier assibilated /z/ < /d/. They would nonetheless fall together with that change after voicing of the phoneme /ns/ > /nz/ (and probably a new palatal variant /ns´/ > /nz´/).

Curiously, the remainder of the spellings showing g for earlier /z/ in PA amount to a mere handful compared to the otherwise universal s spelling, which occurs even before front vowels. Apart from the single instance of cregyans "belief" these are all examples of MlC. gy "thou, thee" (more frequently se, sy). While the stem in cregyans is one of the most commonly found with palatal spellings in later texts, examples of gy may have been especially likely to show phonological change before less frequently used words, since it might be expected that these would retain a conservative phonology for longer. Spelling conventions would be expected to change more slowly still in less frequent words, perhaps explaining the small number of cases found.

The range of affected words is larger in the Ordinalia but most lexemes showing palatalisation continue to come from a restricted range of groups of words. Curiously the verb "to be" does not show palatal spellings in the Ordinalia as frequently as in PA, where it is nearly universal before front vowels, but otherwise there are far more words affected. As in PA, parts of "to be" do not cause palatalisation in the frequent word mar(s) "if" (B. mar(d)) but this may be contrasted with kyns, kyng "before, rather than" in the Ordinalia with a high front vowel and palatalisation. Cases of gy for sy are far more frequent. The roots *crys- "believe", *pys- "pray" are frequently palatalised, showing both s and g before front vowels but only s before back vowels; the ending -yk (and derived -ygon and -gy) is often found with preceding g /dʒ/ in, for example, the words anfugy, cuthygyk. The occurrence of gage for gase
"to leave" seems to indicate that a final front vowel was later lowered in this word but the wide range of other words showing g /dʒ/ seem regularly to have a following front vowel.

It is particularly telling that examples of g for s are almost entirely absent before a back vowel, showing that the role of analogical re-modelling was probably slight. The example *hobersen* "habergeon" may show analogical /z/ before a final syllable containing /ə/ for borrowed /dʒ/; it is likely, though not certain, that this is orthographic only, where s for /dʒ/ (or /ʒ/) would show that a general confusion between the two sounds had developed. The same seems to be shown by the rhyme of *treys* "feet" with the loan *scryg* "screech". It seems that such a confusion would arise out of the increasing uncertainty between the two sounds that would have grown as the tendency to palatalise was realised in increasing numbers of words with /z/ from earlier /ʒ/.

The very fact that both s and g (or i/j) varied in the same positions in otherwise identical words like *gase*, *gage* tends to invalidate the theory that palatalisation occurred instead of assibilation in internal position, even accepting Pedersen's restriction that this only happened where an unaccented front vowel followed. It seems illogical that scribal practice should use s as well as g, j, i, where s in words like *martesen* could so evidently mean /s/ (> /z/), especially where even this could be written as *martegen*, unless such a palatal (whether fricative or affricate) derived ultimately from the sibilant. The fact that the early texts are replete with examples of internal <s> for OC. /d/ would be far better explained as the results of assibilation than by a far-reaching process of analogy that was strangely reversed in later Cornish. Simply, such attempts to integrate two separate sound changes in the same phoneme appear unjustifiable.

The question of whether earlier /ns/ < /nt/ showed palatalisation shows a further interesting development in the Ordinalia. This phoneme occurs in PA in *nansow* "valleys" and *gerensa* "love" but is never written with palatalisation. In the Ordinalia, however, /s/ is a common spelling in examples such as *bolungeth* "will", *bryangen* "throat" and *kerenge* "love", all with earlier assimilation to /ns/ of original /nt/. In fact, the graph /s/ is a rare variant of /s/ seen notably in *tressa* for *trege* "third". It seems possible that voicing /s/ > /z/ may not have occurred by the time of PA, making it impossible for /z/ > /dʒ/ to have occurred in these words.

Jackson believed that comparable voicing of /s/ occurred in Breton in the fifteenth century.\(^{268}\) It is significant that his "New Lenition" occurred in Cornish very much as it did in Breton, contrary to his belief.\(^{269}\) That is not to say that voicing /s/ > /z/ necessarily occurred at the same time as it did in Breton, although it seems that /ng/ /ndʒ/ would not have been written for earlier /ns/ unless voicing /ns/ > /nz/ had previously occurred. Since the orthography also possessed /tʃ/ in such positions in loan words, e.g. *chechys* "caught", *plynchya* "to pinch", it seems from the spellings found that /ns/ did not become /ntʃ/.\(^{270}\)

It must be noted first of all that the evidence of PA is slight concerning the series of changes /ns/ > /nz/ > /ndʒ/, especially since palatalisation occurs only in limited circumstances in PA anyway. Nevertheless there may be a connection with the curious fact that MlC. *tresa* (< OC. *tridi*) never occurs for the frequent *tressa* with the otherwise rarer spelling /s/, although it does occur as *trege* with

\(^{268}\) HPB § 1079, p. 762.

\(^{269}\) See HPB § 506 n.2 and commentary by George, PHC § 19.4.1 (2). Jackson included medial voicing.

\(^{270}\) *chechys* PA 48d, *plynchya*, 130b.
palatalisation. Possibly there may have been a by-form with unvoiced /s/, perhaps the result of analogy, which co-existed with the form showing a palatal.

It is not clear why this should have been de-voiced if original /s/ was voiced elsewhere in Middle Cornish, so presumably the two events could not have been contemporary.) If so, it is possible that nanssow was spelt with ss in order to emphasise the distinction between /s/ and /z/ < /ð/. On the other hand, ss does occur for /z/, albeit as a less frequent variant of s. The word kersa "love" (passim) in PA only occurs in the Ordinalia once as kerense but ten times as kerenge. It is difficult to know whether /s/ > /z/ had happened by the time of PA since s and ss were always used for this phoneme in Middle Cornish because the graph z was unavailable, being an occasional alternative for th /ð/.

5.9. Palatalisation in Late Middle Cornish

The division of the conventional Middle Cornish period into "Early Middle Cornish" and "Late Middle Cornish" is essentially arbitrary: here it serves a purpose purely because palatalisation occurs in a wider range of words in the later texts than in the earlier texts. Another convenient division might be equally valid, since there is no sharp distinction between the orthography of the Ordinalia and the later saints lives in the way that there is, for example, between Old and Middle Cornish. It is not clear which of the plays Bewnans Meriasek ("The Life of Meriasek") and the newly discovered Life of St. Ke (hereafter BK for Bewnans Ke) is the

---

271 tressa OM 2664; trege RD 339.
272 PHC § 13.2.8 (3), p. 207. I am not convinced that an analogy was made with nessa "next", which is never found in Cornish with the meaning "second"; however, secund does occur (e.g. OM 16), perhaps replacing earlier C. *{(e)yl B. & MiW. ell, ModW. ail "second". George suggests irregular /z/ > /ss/ in tressa, not the inherently more likely de-voicing /z/ > /s/, apparently inconsistent with the entirely conventional belief expressed at § 13.5.6 (c), p. 274, that the phonemes had fallen together.
older of the two. They apparently came from Cornwall to Wales together, since they are both glossed in a seventeenth century manuscript in the National Library of Wales and had presumably not been separated at that time. Many readings in BK are obscure or corrupt, probably because the present manuscript is an incomplete late sixteenth-century copy of an earlier manuscript. Since BM shows pre-occlusion (even though this may be by later alteration, see § 2 above) and BK does not, the latter will appear in the chronological sequence of this study as though it were slightly earlier. This may or may not be so, but this assumption is made purely for the sake of convenience until evidence to the contrary may be forthcoming.

5.9.1 The Life of St. Ke (BK)

By and large, "First Palatalisation" is regular in BK. The tenses of the verb "to have" that appear in the text always show a palatal. The future tense happens to be by far the most common example: an gevith, an gevith, angeveth "(he) will have", nyn g[e]vyth, nyngevyth "(he) will...".
not have" (fut.), nan gevas, nangevas "that (he) had not, that (he) has not had" (pret.), an geva "(he) had" (imperf.), yngevea "(he) would have had" (pluperf. cond.), ren geffa "(he) have" (opt.), an geffa "(he) may have" (pres. subj.).  

The unique phrase me an darvith "I'll get it" (cf. W. darfod B. darvoud) apparently contains an accusative, not dative, pronoun; irrespective of the morphological considerations, the lack of palatalisation before an etymological back vowel is likely to be regular, although it is without any direct parallels.

The word de(y)th appears as expected without a palatal in the singular in the phrase deith ha nos, dy(e)th ha nos "day and night", nos ha dyth "night and day" and in kensa deth "the first day"; likewise the plural occurs in ha dythyow... "and days...", in neb dythyow "some day" (lit. "some days"), rum dythyow "by my days!" and after the article in an dythyow "the days".

The only example of a palatal is found after the numeral vn "one" in the example vngyth a dhe "one day coming", since the word does not happen to occur after the article. The word dyawl, dyow[l] "devil" follows the same pattern in cans myl deawl "a hundred thousand devils", a thyawl cows "speak (thou) of a devil!", nagh dyawl... "deny [the] devil...", after ha "and" and ew "is", as well as in the plural dewolow "devils" (no article); it has a palatal after the article in the instance an Jowl, an jowl(e) "the Devil".

---

277 an gevith BK 20h, 49e, 411d, 429a, angevith 52c, 343c, an gevith 211g, 337f, 436e, angevith 336f, 429d, yngevea.67d, ren geffa 301d, 330e, an geffa 173d. Note that all examples are used correctly for the 3s.m., unlike the widespread misuse of this form for other persons in TH and CW below.

278 me an darvith BK 300b. This is a rare verb, of which the only other inflected persons in MlC. are numdarfa BM 1477, 1868, numdarfe 3727 with a dative pronoun, correctly used. Apparently the fronted independent pronoun has allowed the dative infix to be interpreted as object, see § 5.9.3-4.

279 deith ha nos BK 63h, dyth ha nos 54i, dyeth ha nos 37d, nos ha dyth 424c, in kensa deth 255b, ha dythyow 289h, in neb dythyow 295b, rum dythyow 365d, an dythyow 304g.

280 vngyth a dhe BK 335d.

281 cans myl deawl BK 102f, a thyawl cows 88f, nagh dyawl 34h, ha dyawl 17i, ew dyawl 43f, 133d, 137h, ew dyawl[f] 20b, dewolow 63g, an Jowl [sic] 7f, 144h, 211f, 301f, 378g, an jowl 46a, An Jowl [sic] 18c, 168f. The distinction between upper case J and lower case j in the MS. is not always clear and in this relatively trivial matter the exx. quoted do not always follow Padel's readings. The word javal BK 13a, an javal 47a, 419e is an unrelated MIE. loan, see Middle English Dictionary, p. 377.
The word *chy* "house" largely follows the expected pattern, except for one instance. While no mutation might in any case be expected in *in chy* "in the house", *yth chy* "in thy house" (with provection after /θ/ probably cancelling any lenition) and *thum chy* "to my house", the phrase *mes a gy* "outside" seems to show a mutation after a "of, from". This is probably based on the antonym *a gy* "inside", but provides further possible evidence that the orthographical failure to mutate in *in e chy* "in his house" and in *the Chy an Govr heb paraw* "to the peerless man's house" may not have represented the spoken reality. It seems difficult to maintain that speakers would not have continued to analyse *mes a gy* as containing *mes a* "out of"+*chy* "house". The meaning "outside" and "outside the house" would be identical for most practical purposes and was in any case the basis for the phrase.

"Second Palatalisation" is regular in BK before front vowels, although it remains sporadic as in the earlier texts. The temporal particle *nans* only occurs in *nangev* "now it is, since", but the final consonant of the negative particle *nyns* is always palatalised before front vowels in the verb *bos* "to be": *nyn gew, nyngew, nyn gyw* "he, it is not", *nyngewa* "he is not" (< *nyns ew+ef*), *nyngys* "they are not" (pres.), *ny[n] ges, nyn ges, nynges, nyngoes* "there is not" (pres. existential), *nyn gegas* "thou art not", *nyn gvge, nyn gewgy* "he, it is not" (pres. locative). Before a back vowel, *s* is universal: *ynsos* "I am not", *nynsos* "thou art not" (pres.), *nynso* "he, it was not" (imperf.). There is a clear distribution of palatals before front vowels and non-palatals before back vowels.

---

282 *in chy* BK 188d, *yth chy* 221b, *thum chy* 314h, *mes a gy* 45g.
283 *a gy* BK 308h, *in e chy* 189f, 195f, *the Chy an Govr heb paraw* 183d.
284 *nangev* BK 419f, *Nyn gew* [sic] 302a, *ryn gew* 39f (7 exx.), *nyngew 15c* (7 exx.), *nyn gyw* 291c, *nyngewa* 64f, *nyngys* 25f, *ny ges* 187f [the missing <n> is likely to be a scribal error], *nynges* 20c (10 exx.), *nyngoes* 130e, *nyn gegas* 24a, *nyn gvge* 45c, *nyngewgy* 58c.
285 *ynsos* BK 213i, *nynsos* 43a, *ynsso* 21f, 23g.
The same pattern occurs in both the negative particle *nyns* and the perfective and optative particle *res* before parts of the verb *mos* "to go" that begin with a vowel. While *nynsa* "he goeth not, will not go" has *s* before a back vowel, the forms *nyngeth* "he, it went not" (pret./perf.), *regeth* "he, it has gone" (perf.), *reg elha* "may he, it go" and *regyllough* "may ye go" (pres. subj.) show palatal *g* before a front vowel. In fact, the particle *res* before vowels, unlike the shorter form *re* that occurs before consonants is quite poorly attested. Until the discovery of BK, the third person singular *regeth, re seth* "has gone" and the optative *re gymmy* "may thou kiss" were the only extant examples, so these additional instances may confirm the deduction that *res* could occur more widely before vowels in other preterite and subjunctive verbs.

It may seem curious that PrimC. *rid* did not acquire the nasal element */n/ to become **rens, giving **ren seth, **rengeth, **ren gymmy, **reng elha, **regyllough as did PrimC. *nid > MIC. nyns, nyn g– and PrimC. *neud > MIC. *nevng, nans, nan g–.* It also seems that the final dental element in MIC. *res*, unlike the shorter form MIC. *re* that was used before consonants, indicates that the word cannot be a direct cognate of CC. *ro OIr. ro MIW. ry/yr B. ra but is instead related to OW. *rit < ri+it.* Two related pre-verbal particles probably became confused before the Middle Cornish period, so that any earlier difference in meaning between them in Old Cornish or earlier is unclear. It is likely that the vowel in MIC. *re < PrimC. *rö* influenced the reflex of PrimC. *rid* so that it became MIC. *res* rather than **ry(n)s. In fact, the lack of a nasal element is probably the regular and expected development in

---

286 nynsa BK 276h, 282k, nyngeth 296c, regeth 336c, reg elha 148h, regyllough 102f. Also note the unrelated but similar re govwan "by (St.) John!" BK 196b with /dʒl/, cf. re Jowan 394a, 394d.
287 NCED, Appendix vii, p. 197. See discussion at § 5.8.3 above.
288 The same happened in some dialects of Breton, principally Vannetais. It is not clear whether this was a SWBr. sound change or a parallel development in both, but cf. North Welsh yndi < ydy.
Cornish, whereas it may have arisen in *nyns, nans by a process of reduplication of /n/ in the sequence /nVd/ > /nVnd/, motivated by the acoustic similarity of the following /d/ and exceptionally resulting in pre-nasalisation /d/ > /nd/.

This could not happen in *rid because it did not contain /n/. Since B. nend also occurs, the process may have happened sporadically during the SWBr. period.

Two forms of the verb-noun bos "to be" occur in a dependent clause construction: ow bosa "that I am" is (incorrectly) compounded with the first person singular ending –af and e vosa stands for e vos ef “that he is” with a suffixed pronoun. Only the second of these could plausibly be expected to have a palatal before an etymological front vowel, as *e voga, but no doubt the vowel of ef “he, him” was never sufficiently close for this to occur.

Locative tenses of the verb bos "to be" in BK show a largely regular distribution of s and g. In the present locative, s occurs before back vowels in ethesaf, esave "I am", esos "thou art", esa, etheso (for *ethesa), "was", ethesa ef "he was", efeugh (a copying error for *eseugh), ethesough why "ye were". As well as nyn gvge, nyngewgy given above, ugy, vge "is" occur regularly with g, but a number of instances of g are also found before back vowels. With nyn gegas given above, these include de[ll] legys (for *del egys) "as thou art", Ethegas, Ethegus "thou art", yth ege "was", pletheya ef (for *plethega ef) "where was he?” and etegam (for *ethegan) "we are". The variation between esa and ega, ege occurs throughout Middle Cornish and may depend upon whether or not the following vowel was lowered prior to palatalisation. Since etegam may simply indicate that lowering occurred in the final syllable.

290 An alternative explanation given by Pedersen is less convincing, CCCG § 478 (2), pp. 319-20.
291 ow bosa BK 46h (cf. ow bosaf CW 78), e vosa 126e.
292 ethesaf BK 5b (5 exx.), esave 106d, esos 61a, esa 67f, etheso 22c, ethesa ef 139b, efeugh 102c, ethesough why 294c.
293 de[ll] egys BK 8f, Ethegas [sic] 79a, Ethegus [sic] 41a, yth ege 90b, pletheya ef 21c, etegam 4f.
after *ethegen regularly developed a palatal, this example is not especially irregular either. The examples nyn gegas, Ethegas and ethegus for *nyns esos, *yth esos may have come about after the reduction of the final syllable to schwa, but the motivation for palatalisation seems slight in these cases. It might be added that nyn gegas, nyn gvge and nyngewgy show a sequence of two successive palatals. As has been remarked, this is relatively rare in the corpus of Middle Cornish.294

As in the other texts, palatalisation of the final consonant of mar(a)s "if" does not occur before parts of bos "to be" and mos "to go, whether a front or back vowel follows. Examples include marsos, ma[r]sos "if thou art", mar sew, marsew, marse, marsyw "if he, it is", maresewhy, marsough "if ye are" (pres.), marse "if we were", Marso "if he was" (imperf.), mar s(v)es "if there is" (pres. loc.), mar sa "if he goes", marseugh "if ye go" (pres.-fut.).295

The third person plural of bos "to be" does not show the palatal treatment of ns > ng in BK. In final position, this would nor in any case be expected, e.g. kynthyns "although they are", yns "they are" (pres.), kyn fens "although they were" (imperf. subj.), e movns "they are" (pres. loc.).296 However, it does not occur with the reinforcing suffixed pronoun y "they" either, effectively in intervocal position: yns y, "they are" (pres.), na vons e "though they be not" (pres. subj.).297 The same occurs in the verb gul "to do": ny rowns "they do not", na rowns "that they do not" (pres.-fut.) in final position and del russans y "as they did" (pret.) in intervocalic position.298

294 It might loosely be termed "double palatalisation" if this did not tend to obscure the important distinction between "First Palatalisation" and "Second Palatalisation". It is therefore avoided here.
295 marsos BK 142g, ma[r]sos 131d, mar sew 270g, marsew 61e (4 exx.), marse 138f, marsew 32c, marsewhy 146h, marseough 320c, marse 106g, Marso [sic] 29a, mar ses 263f, marse 214c, 411b, mar sa 325f, marseugh 195c.
296 kynthyns BK 37f, yns 32g, 34d, kyn fens 216n [for pres. subj.], e movns 33b.
297 yns y BK 37g, 248h, na vons e 417c.
298 ny rowns BK 216d, na rowns 405c, del russans y 363c.
example is also found in *Te am grussa* "thou would make me" (pluperf. cond.) and appears to be assimilated /ss/ from /ks/, since the verb form is apparently a compound of the 3s. pret. *gwrug* plus the past marker –s– and the pluperfect and imperfect 3s. ending –a. It seems that /ss/ was immune from palatalisation, as discussed above.

The phoneme /ns/ < /nt/ also occurs in *myns* "amount" (*W. maint B. ment*), which occurs in effective intervocal position before parts of the verb *bos* "to be" and the relative particle *a*; it is noteworthy, however, that no instance occurs with *ng* that is comparable to *myng a rug du* in TH below. This is frequently found in such relative constructions meaning "those that, such that, all that", e.g. *myns a rug* "those that did" (pret.), *myns an geva* "what he had" (imperf.), *myns a vynhy, nyns a vynhe* "all that thou wouldst" (for *myns a vynhe*), *myns a wylly* "all that thou may see", *myns a geffa* "those that may get", *myns a gyffough* "as much as ye may get" (pres. subj.), *hammyns vs* "and those that are", *myns vs* "those that" (pres. loc.). The instance *myns del ens* "as many as they are" may be irrelevant since a following consonant would probably have rendered the affected phoneme immune from palatalisation. A similar phonetic environment occurs in *dyns an churl* "the churl's teeth" (*W. deint B. dent*), again without a palatal spelling. To this may be compared *sansolath* "holiness", in which palatalisation *ns > ng* would not be expected between back vowels. A compound of *myns* appears in *the gymmys a govy[th]* "to all those that...?" (*W. cymaint B. kement*). The unexplained loss of /n/ is nearly universal in this word in Middle Cornish

---

299 *Te am grussa* [sic] BK 47f.
301 *myns del ens* BK 408c.
302 *dyns an churl* BK 100c.
303 *sansolath* BK 219a, 262a.
304 *the gymmys a govy[th]* BK 37c. The added letters are given by Padel, but it is not clear which verb or meaning is intended. This does not affect the discussion at hand, however.
but it is not clear whether or not /−ns/ > /−s/ was voiced to /z/ as a result, presumably a prerequisite for palatalisation /z/ > /dʒ/.

With two possible exceptions, palatalisation is universal in the suffixed second person singular pronoun, whether as subject or object. After inflected verbs, it appears after manafy ge (< *ma nl[‘th(?)] fy gy) "so that you have/be not", oge (<*os+gy) "thou art", nagota ge (<*nag os+ta+gy) "that thou art not", py fega (*py+be+gy) "where wast thou" (pret.), may fyg[e] (<*may+by+gy) "that thou be", Kyn fegy (<*kyn+by+gy) "although thou be", refoga (<*re’th+bo+gy) "may thou have" (pres. subj.), ke ge "go thou", ke thegy "go thou" (imperat.). The last example has a reduplicated pronoun. An apparent exception is the imperative Na gorsy of uncertain meaning. In the context, it seems clear that Ke is addressing the ploughman in the singular, who has just been cursing King Teuthar. The most straightforward explanation is that this imperative represents a loanword *cors from the English verb "to curse" plus the suffixed pronoun sy "thou", meaning "curse (thou) not". It may be a regular exception to palatalisation because *cors+sy would have contained /s+z/ > /ss/ by sandhi.

The interjection gogy (*gew+gy) "woe to thee" occurs five times containing suffixed gy "thou". The inflected prepositions thege, the ge "to thee" occur for *thys+ge with an etymological front vowel

---

305 See Llawlyfr Cernywog Canol, § 18, p. 21; the same is seen in B., HPB § 1133, pp. 794-5. For examples in place-names, see CPNE, pp. 38 [*car-bons], 88 [*downans], 170 [nans].
306 manafy ge BK 72g, oge 25c (3 exx.), nagota ge 160f, py fega 195b, may fyg[e] 72h, Kyn fegy [sic] 68a, refoga 180j, ke ge 166f, ke thegy 368a. In the ex. manafy ge the <f> implies a lost infix, which would require substitution of 2s. by for 3s. bo in the pres. subj., see similar exx. in TH below, § 5.9.3, the alternative being to read <f> as a spelling for /w/ without infix. Both readings give good sense.
308 Teuthar is evidently the same king as Teudar in BM. His name in BK shows an interesting sound change seen in a few words like *bed(e)wen < bedewen ”beech” in place-names such as Penburthen, see § 5.2 above. Although WCB. /d/ in *tudwar would not normally avoid assimilation in /-dwVr/, cf. peswar (but peder with /-dVr/ > /-zVr/), the element wur /wax/ "man" probably become -ur /-ux/ as a suffix. It would then be protected by /l/ regularly. It does not need to be explained as a W. loan in order to by-pass assimilation, though that is not to deny any literary link, see the note at § 2.7 above. That it subsequently shows /d/ > /ð/ could date the play to later than BM, where Teudar seems to have /d/.
309 gogy BK 11d (3 exx.), Gogy [sic] 134a, gegy [for gogy] 303e.
following.\textsuperscript{310} These may be compared to the emphatic form \textit{thyso, theso} "to thee" with a following back vowel and no palatal.\textsuperscript{311} The forms \textit{the ga, thygo} and \textit{thysa} evidently have the same meaning, but it is more difficult to assign them to one category or the other.\textsuperscript{312} It seems that \textit{the ga} could stand for \textit{the ge} (\textit{\textless;*thys+gy}), as the spelling has been deliberately altered to half-rhyme with \textit{araga} (\textit{\textless;*aragaf}) "in front of me" with /g/ and this may represent lowering of the final vowel. On the other hand, \textit{thygo} seems to break the expected pattern. It seems unlikely that it could be the only example of \textit{thyso} to show a palatal, especially as the graphs \textit{o} and \textit{e} are difficult to distinguish in the manuscript. It is possible that the graph represents \textit{o} as a result of a misreading by the copyist. The example \textit{thysa} almost certainly represents \textit{thyso} with lowering and may therefore be considered to be regular. The only other inflected preposition that shows a palatal in BK is \textit{genegy} (\textit{\textless;*genas+gy}) "with thee", in which palatalisation is also apparently regular.\textsuperscript{313}

The verbs \textit{cregy, cresy} "to believe" and \textit{pegy, pesy} "to pray" largely follow the expected pattern. The verb-nouns appear as \textit{gregy} and \textit{pegy} with a palatal but also \textit{besy, bese} with no indication of palatalisation.\textsuperscript{314} In final position, \textit{s} is universal, e.g. \textit{cres, crys} "believe (thou)" (imperat.), \textit{pys} "pray (thou)", \textit{hag an crys} "that believe it", \textit{me a grys} "I believe", \textit{te an crys} "thou believest it", \textit{me a bys} "I pray" \textit{me agys pys} "I pray you", \textit{me ath pys} "I pray thee".\textsuperscript{315} The instance \textit{pege} seems to stand for \textit{*pes+ef} with a following direct object.\textsuperscript{316} The possibly related \textit{mer grys} "much vigour" may contain either etymological /s/ or /z/ < /d/, since the

\textsuperscript{310} \textit{thege} BK 344d, \textit{the ge} 185c (3 exx.).
\textsuperscript{311} \textit{thyso} BK 366c, \textit{theso} 67g (13 exx.).
\textsuperscript{312} \textit{the ga} BK 296d, \textit{thygo} 332g, \textit{thysa} 412c.
\textsuperscript{313} \textit{genegy} BK 342d.
\textsuperscript{314} \textit{gregy} BK 19e (4 exx.), \textit{pegy} 19h, 306k, \textit{besy} 108c, \textit{bese} 145b.
\textsuperscript{315} \textit{cres} BK 72e, \textit{crys} 252i, \textit{pys} 364g, 366c, \textit{hag an crys} 174a, \textit{me a grys} 22g (3 exx.), \textit{te an crys} 28g, \textit{me a bys} 111d, \textit{me agys pys} 177b, \textit{me ath pys} 42a (7 exx.).
\textsuperscript{316} \textit{pege} 110b.
etymology is uncertain.\textsuperscript{317} The nouns crygyans "belief" and pejadaw, pyjadow, peiadow "prayer" always have a palatal, although the latter is rare in BK with the spelling $j$ or $i$ rather than $g$.\textsuperscript{318} It is possible that this may indicate a different treatment of the phoneme (see § 5.9.5 (iii) below). In inflected parts of these verbs, $s$ appears before back vowels in \textit{Ny gresaf} "I believe not" (pres.-fut.), cresough "believe (ye)!" (imperat.) but $g$ is found before front vowels in hag $e$ pegyn "and we (will) pray" (pres.-fut.) and \textit{ef ath pegys} "he prayed thee" (pret.).\textsuperscript{319} The present subjunctive forms \textit{nan cryssa} "that believe not" and \textit{nath gresso} "that believe thee not" apparently contain /ss/ as described above.\textsuperscript{320}

The same three common words containing –sys (W. –dod B. –ded) occur in BK as in previous manuscripts, but spellings indicating a palatal are universal in medial position: dowgys "Godhead", \textit{e thowges, e thowgys} "his Godhead" (glossed \textit{ine thowges} "in his Godhead"), dengys "humankind", \textit{an d[r]yngys} "the Trinity", \textit{in Dryngys} "in the Trinity" and run drengys occur with $g$.\textsuperscript{321} A dubious word rengys rhymes with run drengys and probably contains /dz/.\textsuperscript{322}

Before the adjectival ending -ek, the phoneme /z/ from earlier /s/ as well as /d/ appears with palatalisation in a few words. The adjective in the phrase \textit{dv rajak} "God of grace" is derived from MIC. ras W. rhad with /z/ < /d/, but it rhymes with grajak "grateful" from the loanword MIC. gras < OFr. grace with /s/.\textsuperscript{323} Lowering of the final front vowel must have occurred after palatalisation, since the observed back vowel would

\textsuperscript{317} mer grys BK 185b.
\textsuperscript{318} Crygyans [sic] BK 55 (gloss), crygyans 32h, pejadaw 105c, pejadow 100g, pyjadow 3g, Peadow 171 (gloss), peiadaw 359i. See further below.
\textsuperscript{319} Ny gresaf [sic] BK 173a, cresough 139c, hag $e$ pegyn 359k, ef ath pegys 317d.
\textsuperscript{320} nan cryssa BK 20h, nath gresso 112c. The same may occur in ow thassans "my holy father" 170f, sperys sans 34a, spurrys sans 346g, spurryssans 1e [gl. spuryss mas "good spirit"] "holy spirit", if these collocations may be considered to have become compounded as the word division seems to show.
\textsuperscript{321} dowgys BK 41e [a mistake for dengys "humankind"], e thowges 41f, e thowgys 22c (gl. \textit{ine thowges}), dengys 23f, gengys [for dengys] 22f, an d[r]yngys 5d, in Dryngys 34c, 37g, run drengys 286b.
\textsuperscript{322} rengys BK 286a [rhymes with run drengys 286b].
\textsuperscript{323} rajak BK 29a, 48a, grajak 48g.
presumably have been incapable of causing it. Also rhyming with this pair is thekhyskajak with apparently the same sound change, although the meaning is unclear.\textsuperscript{324} Since the graph kh is not common, it seems from the sense of the words that this may be from a miscopying of *then kvskajak "to the sleepy one", containing MIC. cuske "to sleep".\textsuperscript{325} The double suffixed ending –aj–ak < *–es–ek may be compounded from an earlier form of the verb-noun *cuskes with an obsolete ending cognate with that seen in B. kousket, containing /zl/ < /d/. Palatalisation of /zl/ < /d/ is also seen in gallogak "powerful" < OC. galluidoc but not in the spellings gallas\textsubscript{e}k, gal(l)osak, gallos\textsubscript{e}k; the palatal spelling is also found in lag\textsubscript{a}jak "big-eyed" and apparently in torgak, an uncertain word rhyming with gallas\textsubscript{e}k.\textsuperscript{326} Either the latter has orthographical s for /dz/ or else [z´] and [dʒ] rhyme because they were phonemically identical in this position. It seems that torgak may show metathesis in the penult, since trosak "(infantry) men" (lit. "footed (ones)") fits the sense.\textsuperscript{327} Palatalisation of /zl/ does not apparently occur in bohosek (cf. bohogogyon below in BM), casek "warlike", peswar trosek "four-footed" and a dasek "oh spiritual father".\textsuperscript{328} Like grajak with /zl/ < /sl/ is marthojek "marvellous", retaining the front vowel.\textsuperscript{329} It is particularly noteworthy that grajak, lagajak, thekhyskajak and marthojek have the graph j rather than the usual g for the palatal. This may be compared to an jowl and pejadaw etc. above and the extension of the graph beyond these words may be merely a distinctive orthographical trait that is by and large confined to these variant spellings in BK.

\textsuperscript{324} thekhyskajak BK 48c.
\textsuperscript{325} cuske OM 2047.
\textsuperscript{326} gallogak BK 30c, gallas\textsubscript{e}k 246b, gallosak 37h (5 exx.), gallas\textsubscript{e}k 34a, gallos\textsubscript{e}k 202d, 269b, lagajak 29c, 48f, torgak 246d.
\textsuperscript{327} trosak BK 250d.
\textsuperscript{328} bohosek BK 106g, casek 266c, peswar trosek 202b, 269d, a dasek 266a.
\textsuperscript{329} marthojek BK 34c.
Likewise, a few words show palatal \(g\) before the adjectival ending \(-yk\). There are no examples of \(s\) before \(-yk\). While \textit{anfugyk}, \textit{anfvgyk} "unfortunate" (also a noun meaning "wretch", cf. \textit{anfusyk} in RD), \textit{dewygyk} "devout, zealous" (cf. \textit{dywysyk} in RD) and \textit{ponvogyk} "painful" (cf. \textit{ponfosyk} in RD) are spelt as expected, \textit{sethisgyk} "thirsty" (MIC. \textit{seghes B. sec'hed W. syched}) contains an unusual graph \(sg\) between front vowels that seems to represent a vacillation between a palatal and non-palatal representation of the phoneme.\(^{330}\) Since this rhymes with \textit{dewygyk}, this may represent a correction of \(s\) to \(g\) after the scribe had already written \(s\), in order to accord with the spelling in the previous line. If so, he probably intended \([z]\) or \([z^\prime]\) in the first instance, although the other examples show that there was nothing to forbid a palatal realisation. At least in BK, this appears to show that /\(z/\) and /\(d_3/\) were not distinguished synchronically and /\(z^\prime/\) could mean both \([z^\prime]\) and \([d_3]\).\(^{331}\)

The suffix \(-usy\) nearly always occurs with palatalisation, e.g. \textit{anfugy} "misfortune" (cf. \textit{anfusy} in BM below) and its rhyme \textit{trefugy} (of uncertain meaning), \textit{ankanvge} "grief", \textit{ethowgy} written for *\textit{e thowlugy} "his devilry" with \(g\) but \textit{cvthysve} "sorrow" with \(s\).\(^{332}\) A similar phonetic environment occurs in the verb-nouns \textit{ombarvge} "to prepare oneself", \textit{parugy} "to prepare", \textit{ygy} "to wail, scream" and in the words \textit{servugy} "servants" and \textit{derrygy} "downfall, ruin".\(^{333}\) The example \textit{ygy} may be compared to the spellings \textit{ow huga} in TH and \textit{ega} in CW below, indicating that the front vowel of the ending was sometimes lowered after palatalisation had already taken place. However, the vowel may have

\(^{330}\) \textit{anfugyk} BK 28h (3 exx., cf. \textit{anfusyk} RD 1370), \textit{anfvgyk} 233b, \textit{dewygyk} 426a (cf. \textit{dywysyk} RD 1520, 1521), \textit{ponvogyk} 18h (cf. \textit{ponvosyk} RD 1256), \textit{sethisgyk} 426b [note also internal /\(s/\) > /\(t/\)]. For a similar spelling with \(sg\), see \textit{crisgians} "belief" at § 5.9.3 below.

\(^{331}\) For the sake of diachronic analysis, the distinction is observed nonetheless.

\(^{332}\) \textit{anfugy} BK 118d, 303a, \textit{trefugy} 303c, \textit{ankanvge} 145h, \textit{ethowgy} 50f, \textit{cvthysve} 351h.

\(^{333}\) \textit{ombarvge} BK 272c, \textit{parugy} 4e, \textit{ygy} 419d, \textit{servugy} 88c, \textit{derryg} [with initial mutation, but the cause is lost by lacuna]. Note that the spellings indicate that a number of front vowels may have fallen together in this position, although this is beyond the scope of the present discussion.
been altered for an eye rhyme with *gregy "to hang" in the next line (with /g/) and *uge may have been the normal spelling.

Palatalisation occurs in *gegys "left" (p.pt.) but not in *gaysys (p.pt.).\(^{334}\) The graph s also occurs in the identical 3s. pret. am *geysys "left me"; this may incidentally be compared with num *gasas "he has not left me" without i-affection, in which a palatal would not be expected before a back vowel.\(^{335}\) No palatal occurs in *gasa "to leave" (cf. *gasa, gage above and W. *gadael) and would not be expected in *nyth gas "he will not leave" (pres.-fut.), gas "leave (thou)!" and *gesow "leave (ye)!" (imperat.), in final position and before a back vowel respectively.\(^{336}\) Similar to *gegys is *gweregys "cured" (p.pt.) with palatal g but reth gweresa, Reth weresa "may (he) cure thee" (pres. subj.) with /z+hl > /ssl/ in *gweres+ho (W. gwared).\(^{337}\) In the example in gosyth "thou shalt bloody him" (pres.-fut.), there is no palatal before a front vowel (W. gwaed-u B. gwad-añ) and in a rosa "that he gave" (pret.) < *a ros ef it seems that a final front vowel has been lowered without prior palatalisation of the consonant.\(^{338}\) The verb-noun kyfrangnya appears to be a misreading or earlier miscopying of *kysrangnya "to reign together" (MIC. kes– W. cyd–), in which palatalisation would not be expected before a consonant cluster.\(^{339}\)

By comparison, the verb-noun synge, syngy, sengy "to hold, seize" from earlier synsy shows a palatal in the vast majority of instances: *nyth synge fuer "I will not think thee wise" (lit. "hold thee"), me a syns "I hold", an syns dv "that hold him (to be) a god", me ath syns "I hold thee",

\(^{334}\) *gegys BK 252a, *gaysys 97e, 178h.
\(^{335}\) am *geysys BK 415b, num *gasas 119f.
\(^{336}\) *gasa BK 143c, 204g, *nyth gas 285i, gas 78b, Gas [sic] 291a, gesow 116g.
\(^{337}\) gweregys BK 131d, 252c, reth gweresa 110a [missing lenition after –th], Reth weresa [sic] 111e. It seems that bersys BK 293c and kegygys 118e (rhyming with velgygas 118c) are past participles, but the meaning of these words is unclear. The word kegygys may contain kes– "co–" with palatalisation.
\(^{338}\) in gosyth BK 325f, a rosa 296d.
\(^{339}\) kyfrangnya BK 34c. Here ngn means /ŋ/ and is irrelevant to the present discussion. A similar example occurs in ow qvrangny[a] "ruling over" < *gorregnya (Eng. reign) BK 251b.
mar synsough "if ye seize" (pres.-fut.), syngys "held" (p.pt.). The distribution of g before front vowels but s before back vowels and in final position is broken only by nyth synge fuer < *nyth synsaf fuer, probably an isolated analogical spread of g to this form. It may have been graphemic only, based on the loss of final f and the superficial resemblance to the verb-noun synge. Whatever the etymology of the verb (see §5.8.3 above), it must have contained /nz/, either through voicing of /ns/, borrowing or influence from Eng. seize or /ns/ < /nt/. It is clear from ancombrongy (Eng. encumbrance) that /ns/ could be palatalised from whatever origin, although it is curious that so few examples happen to occur in BK. A similar example is ankengy "grievous", which may be compared to ankynsy in PA and ankensy in PC.

Palatalisation of /nz/ < /ns/ < /nt/ occurs otherwise in BK only in Der gerynga "through love", although e gerensa "his love" and three instances of kerensa "love" occur with s. That the final front vowel has been lowered is clear from B. karentez W. carennydd (see above). This may be compared with hynsa W. hennydd B. hentez, which rhymes with Der gerynga yet is written with s. This contained a final front vowel that was later lowered, so palatalisation might be expected here. In kynsa "first", by contrast, the final vowel had always been a back vowel, explaining why this word is never found with a palatal in Middle Cornish. This seems also to have been true in gansa "with them", although it is not clear which of the various endings seen in the cognates B. ganto, gante OB. cantdo W. ganddynt MIW. gant(h)u, gant(h)unt is

340 synsough 249j, syngys 51b. The ex. fyngys 107c may not be a copying error for syngys (with /ʒ/ or /dʒ/), as the stanza is obscure and it may be from fynsyu “to finish” BM 3525. If so, /ʒ/ (or /ʃ/) was voiced to /zj/ (or /ʒ/), perhaps with subsequent affrication to /dʒ/.
341 ancombrongy BK 11a.
342 ankengy208h (cf. ankynsy PA 184, ankensy PC 1360).
343 Der gerynga [sic] BK 379a, e gerensa 55f, kerensa 109b (3 exx.).
344 hynsa BK 379b
345 kynsa BK 255b, yskynsa (for *ys kynsa "than (the) first") 245g.
seen in the Cornish form. While *genas* "with thee" has /z/ in final position as expected, the spelling *gansa* sometimes also stands for *ganso*, *gansso* "with him" with /ɔ/ > /ǝ/. The lack of palatalisation in these forms is regular; the spelling *ss* in *gansso* is interesting and may perhaps show that /s/ was not voiced. It is not clear, however, why voicing /s/ > /z/ should have been so sporadic in /ns/.

A few examples demonstrate that *s* occurred rather than *g* before a consonant: *Calesvol* "Excalibur" (W. *Caledfwlch*), *peswar* "four", *tarosvan* "apparition" and *hay worsvan* "and its illusion"(?). This probably protected it from palatalisation. The place-name *Rosewa* appears four times without a palatal and once with /ew/ > /ow/ in *Rosowa* (W. *rhos* B. *roz*), but intervocal *s* may mean either /z/ < /s/ or unvoiced /s/, whether or not the following vowel was especially close. The word *martesyn* "perhaps" with etymological /s/ does not show the palatal seen in *martegen* in PC and BM above.

Most of the many instances of intervocalic /z/ < /d/ and /s/ < /l/ (or perhaps still unvoiced /s/) occur in plurals before the ending –*ow*, –*aw*. As these are extremely frequent, the significant examples for the purposes of this discussion are the rhymes between /z/ < /d/ and etymological /s/ respectively: *canhasow/grasaw* "messengers; thanks" (B. *kannadoù* W. *cenhadau*; OFr. *grace*), *ganhasow/grasow* (ditto), *cosow/fasaw* "battles; faces" (B. *kadoù* W. *cadau*; OFr. *face*),

---

346 *gansa* BK 119e, 163e. It was probably not the ending seen in B. *gante*, since palatalisation might be expected in Cornish before a front vowel, giving perhaps **gange**, **ganga*. Forms with –*nt* in Welsh are analogical, like *gansans* in TH. Unfortunately there are no OC. inflected prepositions attested.

347 *genas* BK 130b, *gansa* 65f (4 exx.), *ganso* 207b, *gansso* 206c.

348 *Calesvol* BK 432j, *peswar* 272g (3 exx.), *tarosvan* 65g, *hay worsvan* 75d [Padel emends this to *hay darosvan*, which fits the syllable count and gives good sense. The loss of the lenited initial is a puzzling feature, as there seems also to be metathesis, whether or not a scribal error is involved.

349 *Rosewa* 15f (4 exx.), *Rosowa* 80c. The etymology of the second element may be the personal name *MIC. Eua W. Efa* "Eve", although the place-name is not cited in CPNE. See BK, contents, p. 4.

350 *martesyn* BK 170e.

351 The spelling –*aw* for –*ow* is a unique feature of BK, appearing otherwise only in glosses of words from BK in Bodewryd MS. 5E (see above). BK and BM must have been together at this time.
gwlasow/fasow "countries; faces" (B. gladoù W. gwlad), gwlasaw/grasaw "countries; thanks", kenwesow/gwerhesow "autumn dwellings; virgins" (W. cynhaeaf+*bod, cf. hafod; B. gwerchez W. gwyry, gwyryf), lagasow/fasow (B. lagadoù W. llygad+-au), rasaw/grasaw "graces; thanks" (W. rhad), tasow/fasow "fathers; faces". As half rhymes are common in Middle Cornish, these might seem insignificant except for the fact that no such rhymes occur in any other text. It appears to be a matter of deliberate policy on the part of the scribe to choose complete rhymes over half rhymes so frequently in BK. Although this evidence is not unequivocal, since these instances can still be taken as half rhymes only, it tends to suggest that /s/ had been voiced to /z/ and that this had fallen together with /z/ < /d/ in intervocalic position.

It may be added that there are a few additional pairs of this sort in which one of the words either merely resembles a plural or is of uncertain meaning or derivation: canhasow/fyanhasow "messengers; anxiety", gveresow/bersow "cures, remedies; [uncertain word]" (W. gwaredd), kentresow/arluthesow "[uncertain word]; ladies" (W. arglweddies), ysow/besow "(types of) cereal, cereals; ring" (B. edoù W. yda; B. bizou). The etymology of fyanhasow (cf. RD fyanasow, fyenasow) is unknown, as is the meaning of bersow and kentresow, both hapaxes. It is clear that besow contains /zl/ < /sl/ while ysow contains /zl/ < /ldl/. If trosow means "surf(s)" then it contains /sl/ like its rhyme fosow "walls" and proves nothing here. The rhyme brysyon/bleysyon is probably misread for brysyow/bleysyow "mind, thoughts; pleasures" (W. brydiau;

352 canhasow BK 333a, grasaw 333c, ganhasow 270f, grasaw 270e, cosow 209e [for casow, cf. 196d], fasaw 209a, gwlasaw 344c, fasow 344f, gwlasaw 352a, grasaw 352b, kenwesow 188c, gwerhesow 188a, lagasow 306f, fasow 306g, rasaw 179b, grasaw179d, fasow 264b, fasow 264d.
353 See § 4.2.3 above.
354 canhasow BK 308c, fyanhasow 308a, gveresow 438d, bersow 438e, kentresow 438a, arluthesow 438b, ysow 123f, besow 123d.
355 fyenasow RD 708, fyenasow 17.
356 trosow BK 168e, fosow 168d.
MIC. *plesya* "to please"), although the second word is uncertain. The words *bresyon* "great ones" (pl. of adj. *bras* "great"), *Gwysyon* "fellows" (pl. of *gwas*) and *nygysyow, negysyow* "messages" (pl. of *negys*) also have /s/ followed by yod without palatalisation.

A unique example is *algow* "cliffs" with /ndʒ/, apparently showing that /nt/ > /ns/ must have been voiced to /nz/ before palatalisation would have been possible. It is difficult to believe that *lg* represents medial /lʃ/ < /lˈ/, as in examples such as *gerynga, keren*sa given above. Since both the preceding and following vowels must have always been back vowels in *algow*, the only cause for palatalisation must be the preceding /l/. The only direct parallels in BK are *cansaw* and its rhyme *skyansow*, both with /nt/ > /ns/ and probably voicing to /nz/. The word *corsow* (OFr. *course*) may be ignored here, since it has been shown that /rs/ in *mars* "if" was probably never palatalised.

It is clear that infixed –s– in verbal endings does not appear with palatalisation even before front vowels (see CW below) in Middle Cornish, but *galsaf, gallaf* (an error for *galsaf*) < *galsof* "I have gone, become" may not contain this. It is probably a formation based on a defective verb 3s. *gallas, galles* "has gone", with inflected endings modelled largely on the verb *bos* "to be". It is possible that –as, –es is the preterite ending corresponding to MIW. –as B. -as but it may equally be an ending containing /d/ > /z/ since the verb has no known parallels and is highly irregular in taking no pre-verbal particles.

---

357 *bresyon* BK 105a, *blyseyon* 105b.
358 *bresyon* BK 184b, 245c, *Gwysyon* [sic] 91a, *nygysyow*306b (3 exx.), *negysyow* 124d. Note that the latter is one of a few such plurals in which yod may or may not occur, e.g. *nygysow* OM 1004. There is also an instance of a verb-noun *nygys*as < *neges*os BK 256g (3 exx.), but this has no yod.
359 *algow* BK 378e.
360 *cansaw* BK 190h, *skyansow* 190e.
361 *corsow* BK 256b.
362 *galsaf* BK 18b (4 exx.), *gallaf* 414a; *galsof* OM 373.
363 *gallas* PA 245c, *galles* BM 479. Nance’s *gal+esof* is unconvincing, NCED, Appendix viii, p. 207. For parallels in Welsh, see CCCG, § 460 (note 2), p. 298, although the first element is unexplained.
Possible evidence that /s/ sometimes remained unvoiced in intervocal position is seen in the form *wrusyl* < *(g)wruthyl* "to do", containing etymological /θ/ (W. *gwneuthur*) and rhyming with *cvsyl* "counsel" (obs. W. *cusul* B. *kuzul*).\(^{364}\) It may have been an isolated sound change in order to force a rhyme.\(^{365}\) If /s/ had everywhere been voiced to /z/ in such positions, to create a new phoneme /s/ in intervocalic position for the sake of a single word might seem unlikely. On the other hand, /s/ in *cvsyl* would also be expected to become /z/, so subsequent voicing in *wrusyl* by analogy would seem probable. The variation between *Moddras*, *Modres* "Modred" and *Moddreth*, *Mod(e)reth* is more interesting, since this is the only Middle Cornish word with etymological /z/ < /d/ in which the phoneme is confused with /θ/.\(^{366}\) For this confusion to happen, final de-voicing must have occurred; this is discussed further at § 4.2.2 above. Nonetheless, the same caveat must be applied, since de-voicing of /z/ to /s/ in final position does not provide any evidence that internal /s/ had been voiced to /z/. Overall, only words such as *grajak* and *marthojek* above, which show /ç/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ and /s/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ respectively, show that internal /s/ (and /ç/) must have been voiced in some phonetic environments.

5.9.2 The Life of St. Meriasek (BM)

"First Palatalisation" occurs regularly in BM. Examples of the verb "to have" are spelt with palatal *g* /dʒ/ in the following tenses: *angeves*, *nangeves* (pres.), *angeveth*, *nyngeveth*, *nynsefeth* (fut.), *renceffo*, *mengeffo*, *Kyn geffo* [sic], *nangeffo* (pres. subj.), *an geffa*, *nan geffa*

\(^{364}\) *wrusyl* BK 140h; *wruthyl* OM 194; *cvsyl* BK 140g. See § 4.2.1 above.

\(^{365}\) See § 4.2 above.

\(^{366}\) *Moddras* BK 436b (rhymes with *arlothes* "lady" with /s/ 436a), *Modres* 420d (rhymes with *viternas* "queen" with /s/ 420e), *Moddreth* 427a, 430a, *Modreth* 213b (3 exx.), *Modereth* 394b.
Of these, the striking example is *nynsefeth*, which shows *s* for the phoneme that, according to the discussion so far, must be */dʒ/ < */d'/ < */d/* and should not ever have been */z/*. The rarity of comparable examples is significant, found only in two cases in TH (both in JT, discussed below) in the same verb *nyn sevas* (pres.) "hath not" (cf. TH *angeves, an Jevas*) and *nynsevith* (cf. TH *an gevith, an Jevith*). Since the homilies date from a transitional period between Middle and Late Cornish, almost certainly between 1555 and 1558, they are only half a century later than the date of the manuscript of BM, which is 1504.

It is equally significant that earlier manuscripts never employ *s* for */d'/ in this verb, which of course occurs extremely frequently to denote possession. This seems to represent a confusion of */dʒ/ < */d'/ < */d/* with */dʒ/ < */z'/ < */z/ < */d/* in late Middle Cornish, limited exclusively to the third person singular masculine forms of the verb. Presumably the sound in question was [dʒ] /dʒ/ < */d'/ (comparable with the non-orthographic rhyme *scryg/treys* above) and the spelling *s* is a recognition that the results of "Second Palatalisation" were often [dʒ] by the time of BM.

Possibly only the stage [ʒ] was commonly realised in the earlier texts for */z'/, unless it is a coincidence that no examples of orthographic *s* for the results of "First Palatalisation" occur. It seems from the lack of *s* for "First Palatalisation" in any other words that the spelling is merely a rare analogical form. It is not certain whether hypercorrect [z] was substituted

---


368 *nyn sevas* TH 49.23-24 (in fact, an error for f. *nys tevas*, but this is not significant here: for further such substitutions, see § 5.3-4), cf. *an gevas* TH 8a.17, *an Jevas* 17.9 (total 12 exx.); *nynevith* 40.7, cf. *an gevith* TH 26.15, 57.19, *an Jevith* 22a.6 (total 3 exx.). Note that an incorrect assertion that *nyn sevas* and *nynsevith* are unique was given by the present author, *A Description of the Middle Cornish Tregear Manuscript*, p. 42.

369 The homilies are best described as MIC. rather than LC., since its conservative and literary (but macaronic) Cornish resembles the earlier period. See T.Z. Chaudhri, *A Description of the Middle...*
for [dʒ] in speech as well as spelling, but *yn sevas* and *ynsevith* point to an attempt at elevated speech by the scribe of TH.\textsuperscript{370} This is borne out by the general style of his translation, which is replete with cornicised English and religious terminology. It does, however, demonstrate an awareness of "Second Palatalisation" /z/ > /dʒ/ as a vernacular "corruption" that probably cannot have been established universally for it still to be open to hypercorrection of this kind.

"First Palatalisation" is otherwise regular in BM. The word *de(y)th* appears after the definite article as *in geth* "in the day", *in gethna* "that day" and after the numeral "one" as *vn geth* "one day".\textsuperscript{371} The form *devle* "devil" pl. *dewolow, dewolov* is similarly unaffected but *an iovl(e)* occurs after the article.\textsuperscript{372} The example *nygyogh* "fly (ye)" demonstrates that /d/ plus yod gave /dʒ/ in this word.\textsuperscript{373} The graph *gy* here means /dʒ/ and is not found for /dʒ/ without a following yod or front vowel.

Finally, BM has nine examples of *chy* "house" prefixed variously by words such as *ov* "my", *in" "in, inside"*, *vn "one", dis "to thee" and occurring in the phrases *an keth chyna* "that self-same house", *in keth chyma* "in this very house".\textsuperscript{374} The word found as *ag(e)y* "in, inside" in PA and the Ordinalia is always spelt *achy* (4 exx.).\textsuperscript{375} This is an unusual spelling for intervocalic /dʒ/ and is presumably on the basis of the simplex *chy* with which it must have still been clearly linked in the mind of the scribe. Possibly it was seen as an initial mutation with the division

---


\textsuperscript{371} *in geth* BM 4455, *in gethna* 2850, *vn geth* 4010.

\textsuperscript{372} *devle* BM 1235, 2395, *an iovl* 139, 782, *an iovle* 775 (19 exx.), *dewolow* 145, *dewolov* 916. The form *devlugy* "devilry" BM 2096 shows 2nd, not 1st Palatalisation in the ending, so it is cited below.

\textsuperscript{373} *nygyogh* BM 4331.

\textsuperscript{374} *chy* [no particular prefixed element] BM 640 & 4293; *ov chy* 250& 1150; *in chy* 275; *vn chy* 1396; *dis chy* 635; *an keth chyna* 645; *in keth chyma* 993.
*a chy and he disliked writing g which meant /g/ (lenited c, k /k/) in that position, because only the medial graph g meant /dʒ/.

Incidentally, the derivative word colgy "college" cannot show regular "First Palatalisation" because assimilation would have occurred to block it, so it might be thought that it shows "Second Palatalisation" as in hensy "ruin" cited above. However, it was presumably adapted from Eng. college (Fr. collège < L. colegium) and may show unusual syncope, having been reinterpreted as containing lenited *gy < *dy "house". This shows that it must have been borrowed after "Second Palatalisation" was in place, at least when the phoneme /z´/ had reached the stage /ʒ/, if not /dʒ/. It is unnecessary to posit that the word was shaped by an awareness of Medieval Latin on the part of Cornish clergy, and it seems certain that it cannot be an early loan from Latin. Most likely is that it represents a contraction of compounded *coleg /dʒ/ "college" + gy "house" [lenited] with syncope *colegy > colgy based on unusual initial stress, to which may be compared LC. ardar "plough" < OC. aradar. This may be evidence that colgy was borrowed from English, where college is stressed on the first syllable, rather than from French. The word is thus not substantially different from any other example of chy "house".

The only other known case of apparent /dʒ/ < /g´/ occurs in the famous place-name tyndagyel "Tintagel", which happens to occur in

---

375 achy BM 1537, 1869, 2234, 2260.
376 colgy BM 2688, 2699, 4407. On hensy, see also § 5.8.1 above.
377 The word was probably acquired from English, although possibly directly from French at the same time as it was borrowed into English. For the cultural and linguistic influence of French in England and Cornwall at this time, see Cambridge History of the English Language, vol. iii, pp. 368-71. It may have been acquired through English, but owing to the dominance of French at the time of PA and even at the time of the Ordinalia, it is likely that it was a roughly contemporary loanword in both.
378 ardé Pryce, ACB K1r-Bb4v; aradar Voc. Corn. 344 (copied by Lhuyd, AB 43b). The stress in this word was previously regular (cf. W. aradr B. arar, alar) until the second vowel arose by epenthesis. It appears the stress remained on the ante-penult. It was then regularised by syncope, although this could alternatively be analysed as a form of metathesis /-VdV-/ > /-dV(V)-/.
That the second element ought to be *tagell "constriction, neck" (WB. *tagell) is apparent from the geography of the site in North Cornwall. The local pronunciation has long had /dʒ/ and seems well established. It is probably due to the influence of the Arthurian tradition from outside Cornwall that has altered the local pronunciation, so this example is probably not a real instance of palatalisation.

"Second Palatalisation" occurs across an even wider range of lexemes in BM than it does in the Ordinalia, in the same way that a greater range of words are found with orthographical palatalisation in the Ordinalia than in PA. However, the change /z/ > /dʒ/ is by no means universally shown in the orthography of BM; considering that s and g occur in free variation in many words and that s is still slightly more common overall, it would seem that the change was probably still incomplete. This is at least true of the literary register of the language, if indeed that differed substantially from speech.

The principal exception to this state of affairs in BM is the verb bos "to be", notably after the negative particle ny(ns) W. ni(d) B. ne(d) V. ne(d), nen(d) and the temporal particle nans meaning "now, ago" MIW. neu(t). Whereas in PA "Second Palatalisation" is almost exclusively represented as g /dʒ/ in the orthography after these particles (with one exception among 31 examples), it was noted above that palatalisation in nyns is written in in only one case, nyngese "it was not, there was not" out of 88 examples in the Ordinalia, and in only instance, nynsugy, with palatalisation in the verb itself rather than in the particle. This curious

379 tyndagye BM 2214.
380 See CPNE, pp. 84, 214, 307.
381 Padel dates instances with /dʒ/ from at least 1207, *A Popular Dictionary of Cornish Place-Names*, p. 163. This is supported by John of Cornwall's *Dindaiol*, probably ca. 1154, see Curley, *Speculum* 57 (1954), pp. 222-3, 239, 244. For the variation of Initial t and d in *dyn “fort”, see CPNE, pp. 84-5.
382 See § 5.7.3 above.
reversal of the situation found in PA is continued in BM, where in fact none of the 51 examples are written with g. This is a surprising statistic.

In the present tense, examples occur with the negative particle in the forms nynsos, nynsoys "thou art not" (three examples), nynsyv, Nynsyv "he, she, it is not" (17 examples) and nynsyns "they are not" (one example).383 There are nine examples of nansyv, Nansyv "(now) it is".384 The present locative occurs once in Nynsesos "thou art not" and twice in nynsusy "he, she, it is not".385 The present existential occurs twelve times in the negative as nynsus, nynsues "there is not" and twice as nansus "(now) there is".386 In the imperfect tense the forms nynsen vy "I was not" and nynso, Nynso "he, she, it was not" (three examples) are found; a single example of the imperfect locative occurs in nynsese "there was not".387 Added to these, the negative particle occurs after two forms of the verb mos "to go" in the present tense, of which neither nynseth "thou goest not" (three examples) nor nynsa "goes not" (two examples) shows the change /z/ > /dʒ/.388 There happen to be no examples of the particle res before a vowel in either verb.

This curious lack of orthographical palatalisation is also found in all other parts of the verb "to be" in BM. For the most part, the phoneme /z/ occurs in final position without a following enclitic pronoun: these examples are therefore not discussed here, since (with a very few exceptions, discussed below) "Second Palatalisation" is never normally observed in such positions in Middle Cornish. However, the remaining examples should be listed here, since palatalisation might otherwise have been reasonably expected to occur in these at least as often as it does in

384 nansyv BM 682 (8 exx.), Nansyv [caps. sic] 1872.
385 Nynsesos [caps. sic] BM 848, nynsusy 1019, 1403.
386 nynsus BM 366 (11 exx.), nynsues 291, nansus 3949, nansus 1554 [a scribal error for <nansus> with extra minim: the correction is assumed here].
387 nynsen vy BM 3700, nynso 1532, 2495. Nynso BM 1801, nynsese 3586.
the parallel cases in PA. In the short present and short imperfect tenses, only *mar syns y *"if they are" (W. *ynt B. *int-i) and *ens y *"they were" (W. *oeddent B. *oant V. *oent) occur respectively.\(^{389}\)

All other instances occur in the locative tenses because these are etymologically compounds of the "short" tenses with the prefix *es-* and consequently contain /z/. This is apparently a former particle corresponding to W. *yd-* in *ydwyf "I am" and B. *ed-* in the literary language and Leon dialect *edo "there was". A corresponding "long" present tense also existed in Breton until the early modern period, although it is now obsolete.\(^{390}\) In Cornish, the consonant of the particle had evidently undergone universal assibilation /d/ > /z/ before the earliest attested Middle Cornish. This is represented in BM in the present tense in *ythesen, esen "we are", ythesogh, esogh, esough "ye are", *vsons "they are", *kynthusons "though they are" and in the imperfect in *pan eses "when thou wast", *kyn theses "though thou wast", *ythese, ese "he, she, it, there was" and *nynsese "he, she, it, there was not".\(^{391}\) In none of these cases is palatalisation written – again surprising for a late MIC. text.

The form of the third person plural forms *vsons and *kynthusons appear to have been influenced by the third person singular of the present locative, the only form which probably does not contain the reflex of the particle *yd. The examples *vsy "is, are" and *nynsusy "is, are not"\(^{392}\) seem to be equivalent to ModW. *y sy(dd) OB. *isi and may therefore contain /z/ < /s/\(^{393}\). However, the use of these forms is so similar to MIB. (a)edy that

\(^{388}\) *nynseth BM 2409, 2823, 3361, *nynsa 657, 2347.

\(^{389}\) *mars yns y BM 1806, *ens y 1810.

\(^{390}\) R. Hémon, *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton*, § 139 (3 & notes), pp. 204-5.


\(^{392}\) *vsy BM 1714 (4 exx.), *nynsusy 1019, 1403 (also discussed under *nyns above). For these, in turn, to contain initial <u> for expected <y>, the influence of the present existential MIC. *us, eus W. *oes B. *eus must presumably have altered all of the third person forms.

\(^{393}\) On the latter, see R. Hémon, *op. cit.*, § 139 (1), esp. n. 2, pp. 203-4.
it seems that the two forms may well have been blended.\footnote{ibid., § 139 (3), pp. 204-5.} If so, this could only have happened when /s/ in OC. *isi was later voiced. The forms nyngvgy in PA and nynsugy in the Ordinalia, given above, show that palatalisation in vsy > vgy had previously occurred despite the lack of examples in BM; this once again suggests that in some cases s /z/ was palatalised first to /z´/ and later g /dz/ irrespective of its origin.

Similarly, no palatalisation is found with forms of the verb bos "to be" after mar(a)s "if" B. mar(d), even if a front vowel follows /z/. It should be recalled, however, that this exception was also universal in the earlier texts. Examples in BM include mersyv "if it is", mar sewe, mara sywe "if he is", marsogh "if ye are", mar syns y "if they are" and the existential mara sus, mar sus, marsus "if there is".\footnote{mersyv BM 14, mar sewe 1041, mara sywe 3732, 4352, marsogh 951, mar syns y 1806 (also cited above), mara sus 635, mar sus 1203, 2643, 3435, marsus 1373, 3319.} The same pattern follows parts of mos "to go" in the cases marsama, mar a saff "if I go", in which no palatalisation would be expected between back vowels;\footnote{marsama BM 3288, mar a saff 1109.} as well as marseth, mar seth "if thou goest" and mar segh "if ye go", in which g does not in any case appear despite the following front vowel.\footnote{marseth BM 3259, mar seth 4315, mar segh 588.}

There are no examples of kyns "before" with either verb in BM, but kyns es, kyns ys meaning "rather than" occurs without palatalisation (cf. kyngys, kyn gys cited above from the Ordinalia).\footnote{kyns es BM 259, kyns ys 2254.} It seems clear, at least, that the deciding factor must be the relatively lax quality of the preceding vowel of MlC. mars and its variant maras.\footnote{The variant maras apparently contains an epenthetic vowel with the same quality as the preceding syllable: it is reasonable to suppose that the conditions for palatalisation would be unaltered by this.}

In contrast to the lack of palatalisation in the previous examples, elsewhere in BM the feature is written much more widely than in the earlier texts. In one extremely common group of words, the second
person singular dependent pronoun, $g$ occurs universally in this text. This is true both after conjugated prepositions such as $gyso$ \( gy, thysogy, thyso gy, dysogy, dyso \) gy "to thee", \textit{the orthys} \( gy "from thee", ahanes \) gy "of, from thee" and \textit{genes they} \( gy "with thee" \( n \) and after verbs such as \textit{na ylta} \( gy, ny elte \) gy, \textit{ny eltegy} "thou canst not", \textit{a wylste} \( gy "that thou sawest", nan guythte \) \( gy "(that) thou keepest him not", me ath wor \( gy "I'll put thee", myny \) gy "thou wilt" and \textit{ressawhyagy} (< \*re sawyo \( gy "heal thee").\footnote{Of these, \textit{genes they} has a reduplicated pronoun \textit{they} $\langle d\ddot{a} \ddot{z}i \rangle < \text{OC}. \*didi$ with initial mutation; all but the last three verbal forms given above are compounded first with the enclitic pronoun \textit{te} (cf. B. \textit{ne c'hallez-te ket} "thou canst not") and then the reinforcing pronoun \textit{gy} < \text{OC}. \*di$ seen in the other examples. The imperatives \textit{kegy, ke\( \ddot{z} \)egy} "go (thou)" show single and reduplicated pronouns respectively.\footnote{An interjection \textit{gogy} "woe (to) thee" also occurs, apparently a compound of \textit{gew} "woe" and \textit{gy} "thee".\footnote{The assibilated form $sy /zi:/$ seen in earlier texts is not found in BM, despite a large number of examples. As in the earlier texts, the frequent occurrence of religious terms makes these a particularly good source of examples showing a variation between $g$ and $s$ for earlier $/d/$. As well as \textit{venegycter} "blessedness" with $g /d\ddot{a}l/$, there is \textit{benesygter} "blessedness" with apparent $s /z/$.\footnote{There is one example apiece of \textit{beseth} and \textit{vygeth} "baptises" [3s. pres.-fut.] (W. \textit{bedydd B. badez}), while the verb-noun \textit{begithia, vegethya, begythy} and the past-participle \textit{begythys} show only forms with $g$.\footnote{Further free}
variation of $g$ and $s$ is seen before front vowels in devgys, devsys "Godhead" (W. duwdod). In contrast, only galosek, gallosek "powerful" occur for galogeck in the Ordinalia (OC. galluidoc) and only drensis, drensys "Trinity" W. trindod is found for drenges, drynsys (all with initial soft mutation) seen in the earlier texts.\(^{406}\)

The word cregyans "belief" and its antonym dyscregyans, thyscregyans "disbelief, unbelief" always show $g$ before yod, but the verb-noun cresy W. credu B. krediñ (and a variant cresyae created for a forced rhyme) has $s$ despite the following front vowel.\(^{407}\) On the other hand, $s$ always occurs in this verb before etymological back vowels in del grese "as I believe", ny grese vy, ny grese "I believe not", creseff "I believe" (< *cresaf W. credaf B. kredan) and cresugh "believe (ye)" (imperative).\(^{408}\) The subjunctive neb na cresse "whoever believes not" < *cresso seems to be derived from *cres+ho with /ss/ < /z+h/;\(^{409}\) there are no subjunctive forms with $g$ in Middle Cornish, so it may be presumed that /ss/ was exempt from palatalisation.

Likewise, only pesy, besy "to pray" (cf. B. pediñ) and thy fysy "to pray (to) her" occur with $s$ for the verb-noun, along with as me reth pesys "I have prayed thee": all before a front vowel where a spelling with $g$ might be expected.\(^{410}\) In the case of pesef(f), pesa, pese "I pray" < *pesaf B. pedan, the following back vowel would not be expected to cause palatalisation in any case.\(^{411}\) The forms me a pysse, me a bysse "I would pray" and ny ages pesse "we would pray you" (cf. MIB. petse) are probably examples of the pluperfect used as conditional, not the imperfect (MIB. pede), although it is only the double graph ss that suggests any

\(^{406}\) galosek BM 177 (4 exx.), gallosek 179, drensis 500, drensys 994, 4414.
\(^{407}\) cregyans BM 827 (7 exx.), dyscregyans 1764, thyscregyans 2369, 3499, cresy BM 834 (4 exx.), cresyae BM 1865.
\(^{408}\) del grese BM 1530, 4372, ny grese vy 4077, ny grese 4465, creseff 4415, cresugh 3153, 3170.
\(^{409}\) neb na cresse BM 1213.
\(^{410}\) pesy BM 404 (28 exx.), besy 973, 3592, 3855, thy fysy 3589, me reth pesys 3615.
\(^{411}\) pesef BM 46, 211, peseff 323, 1007, 4286, pesa 2778, pese 4309.
difference between the forms.\textsuperscript{412} If this is not purely an orthographical feature, the group /ss/ < /z+s/ probably avoided palatalisation. It is not certain whether the final vowel would have been close enough to cause the change in parts of the imperfect with a following front vowel, which had only /zl/; but this seems relatively unlikely.\textsuperscript{413}

The related noun *peyadov, peiadow* is perhaps the most interesting among this group of words.\textsuperscript{414} It is the only example of "Second Palatalisation" that is written with internal *y* or *i* rather than *g*. The example *ow fysadow* "my prayers" in the Ordinalia shows that the phoneme had already undergone assimilation, although *piyadow, pyiadow* also occur. It is difficult to account for the unusual spelling with internal *y* or *i*, which is unparalleled in the other texts. However, *i* and *j* occur initially as well as *g*, as may be seen in the pairs *an gevan, an ievan* "the fiend, devil", *an ioul, an jawl* "the devil" and *an geves, nan geves, nyn jeves* "he has not" in the Ordinalia. Since vocalic *i* and *y* are used in free variation, it is doubtless only the spelling that is exceptional.

In fact, the word *volnogeth, bolnogeth, volnogeth* "will" is also a curious example.\textsuperscript{415} As in earlier texts, it is always written with palatal *g* in BM. In the Ordinalia, the older form *bolungeth* (cf. B. *bolontez* < L. *voluntatem*) occurs side by side with forms showing the metathesis that is seen here in BM. The examples found are *volnogeth, volnegeth* and *bolenegoth*, the latter with metathesis of the vowels of the penult and ultima as well as an epenthetic vowel between /n/ and the palatalised phoneme.\textsuperscript{416} If the preceding /n/ was a contributory factor to the

\textsuperscript{412} *me a pysse* BM 544, *me a bysse* 1080, *ny ages pesse* 3111. The imperfect tense is only rarely used as a conditional in MIC.: the pluperfect is almost universally used instead.
\textsuperscript{413} PHC, § 7.4.5, p. 136; H. Lewis, *Llawlyfr Llydaweg Canol*, § 51, p. 55. It might be most likely in the impersonal of the imperf. and pres.-fut., 2s. & 1pl. pres.-fut. and 1s. & 1pl. pret., however.
\textsuperscript{414} *peyadov* BM 128, *peyadov* [altered from *piiadov*] 560, *peiadow* 132, *peiadov* 2189, 3624, 4015, *peyadow* 143.
\textsuperscript{416} See § 5.8.3 above.
conditions for palatalisation, as was discussed above, it is interesting that /n/ and /dʒ/ were subsequently separated by metathesis in this word. The form *bolunseth with orthographical s, it seems clear that this must be a case of "Second Palatalisation" rather than "First Palatalisation". It would seem that assibilation must have previously occurred, just as it did in ow fysadow. Since a following /d/ did not prevent assibilation in this example, according to Toorians' analysis, there is no reason to suppose that a following /θ/ could do so either. 417 There is no need to add further categories to those set out by George for exceptions to assibilation.

The range of words with spellings indicating palatalisation in BM is not, however, largely confined to commonly used words with religious meanings, as in the earlier texts. The word bohosek, bothosek "poor" < OC. bochodoc has s, but the plural bohosogyon, bohogogyon "poor ones, poor people" appears three times with s and twice with g (ignoring the second g in these examples, which means /g/ here) and the related Bohogogneth "poverty" also shows palatal g. 418 Despite the lack of examples of *bohogek, it seems that palatalisation occurred first of all in the adjective because OC. –oc became MiC. –ek (see galogek, galosek < OC. galluidoc above). It appears that the vowel of the ending was close enough to cause palatalisation after it was unrounded /o/ > /œ/ > /ɛ/. The other forms may not be analogical, since /o/ might be close enough to be a contributing factor to a more palatal articulation, despite there being no

417 See § 5.2 above.
front vowel. The similar examples lagasek "keen-eyed, big-eyed" (cf. LC. 
lagadzhek, W. llygad B. lagad) and skyansek "clever" < OC. scientoc 
show assibilated s without palatalisation. The adjective genesek "born" 
also has s in this position, but the derived nouns genegygva "(manner of) 
birth" and genesygeth "(occasion of) birth" respectively show g and s.

In the example clevegov “diseases” (W. clefydau, B. kleñvedoù), 
the plural of cleve(y)s "disease" (W. clevyd B. kleñved), it seems difficult 
to see why there should be a palatal before the back vowel of the plural 
ending unless a form *clevesyow with yod existed – but this does not 
occur in the WB. cognates. Possibly this may be seen as an exception 
in which where the preceding front vowel had a sufficient palatalising 
effect. It is easier to see why cowgegyow "inward thoughts" (W. ceudod 
hollow" B. kev "cave") should be written with a palatal, since there is 
yod written. The latter example may be compared to cowsys, cowgys 
"spoken" (past participle, cf. B. komzet) with s. Since palatalisation is 
almost never observed in final position in Middle Cornish (with limited 
exceptions, as discussed below), **cleve(y)g and **cowsyg, **cowgyg 
are impossible forms. It may also be noted that cowgegyow is an example 
of "Double Palatalisation", containing two successive phonemes written 
with g for s. It also occurs in the early section of BM that was re-written 
at a later date. These examples may be compared with dewysyow 
"sheep" (cf. devidgyow in CW below) and preggyow (cf. prys "meal"), 
whose singular forms always have final s /z/, probably [s].

The words densis "mankind" (W. dyndod), gesys "left" (cf. W. 
gadael) and gueresys "healed" have s where g would be possible, for

---

419 lagasek BM 1018, 3813, skyansek 377 (cf. AB 105b).
420 genesek BM 2287, genegygva 850, genesygeth 4387.
421 clevegov BM 1457, cleves 1374 (4 exx.), cleveys 4289.
422 cowgegyow BM 149.
424 See § 2.7 above.
425 dewysyov BM 2981 (cf. devidgyow CW 1070), preggyow 1972 (cf. prys PC 456).
example in *tanges* (WCB. *tan* "fire", MlC. –*sys* W. –*dod") "blazing, conflagration" < *tansys.*\(^{426}\) As discussed above, the present subjunctive *regen guerese* "may (he) heal us" presumably has /ss/ and could not therefore have appeared with *g.*\(^{427}\) On the other hand, *dewogys* "bled" occurs with expected *g*, while the verb-noun *dewosa, dewose* "to bleed" (W. *dy–*, gwaedu B. *diwadañ*) and the third person present-future *an dewoys* "bleed(s) him" retain earlier *s* before back vowels and in final position respectively.\(^{428}\) Forms such as *sengys* "held" seen above in the Ordinalia do not occur with *g* in BM. Inflected parts of the verb-noun *sensy* "to hold" occur frequently with *s*, for example *senses, sensys, sensis* "held" (p.pt. or 3s. pres.-fut.), *ny sense, Ny sensevy* "I hold not", Senseff "I hold" and *re sensa* "may (he) hold, keep" (pres.-subj.).\(^{429}\) The form *golvygyen* "radiance" shows the palatal: it appears to be a plural of MlC. *golowys* LC. *goloûas* (probably itself a plural of MlC. *golow* "light" W. *golau* B. *gouloù*).\(^{430}\) The ending in the word *lovrygyan* “leprosy” may be compared to B. *sklêrijenn, teñvalijenn* and seems to contain yod.\(^{431}\) If this contains etymological /s/ voiced to /z/, as it seems, one may compare *varthegyon* “marvels” (< *marthus* “marvellous”) in the Ordinalia.

The same variation between *s* and *g* is also found before other endings containing front vowels. The words *anfusy* "misfortune" (cf. obs. W. *anffiodiad*) and *devlugy* "devilry" (cf. W. *diawl* B. *diaoul*, WCB –*us*) are made to rhyme, either as mere orthographical variants for the same palatal sound or else demonstrating some sort of awareness that the two realisations of the sound were interchangeable.\(^{432}\) The verb-noun *brusy*,

---

\(^{426}\) *densis* BM 888, *gesys* 1254, *gueresys* 1700, *tanges* BM 2106.

\(^{427}\) *regen guerese* BM 1758.

\(^{428}\) *dewogys* BM 1556, *dewosa* 1575, *dewose* 1584, 1619, *an dewoys* 1652.


\(^{430}\) *golvygyen* BM 3681; *golowys* PA 248c; *goloûas* AB 62a; *golow* PA 64c.

\(^{431}\) *lovrygyan* BM 1356; see Nance, NCED, pp. 100, 193.

\(^{432}\) *anfusy* BM 2095, 3421, 3514, devlugy 2096.
"to judge" (cf. W. _brawd_ B. _breud_) does not appear as _brugy_ as it does in the Ordinalia.\(^{433}\) In _vestrigy_, _mestresy_ "masters" (W. _meistr(i)aid_ B. _mistri_) both _s_ and _g_ occur, but only _s_ is found in _servysy_, _serve sy_ "servants" (pl. of *_servyas_, Eng. + WCB. –_iad_), _trewesy_ "grievous" (cf. W. _trueni_ B. _truez_) and _treysy_ (pl. of OC. _troet_) "starlings."\(^{434}\)

A number of examples in BM break the nearly universal rule in Middle Cornish that _g_ never occurs for _s_ in final position: these are _calge_ "many", _falge_ "false", _me an felge_ "I will slit him" and _polge_ "a while" (in which silent final –_e_ is borrowed from English and French orthography).\(^{435}\) This development is not found in PA or the Ordinalia and seems to be strictly limited to the group –_lg_ < –_ls_ in these words. The cognates B. _kalz_, B. _fals_ < OFr. _fals_ (or perhaps directly from L. _falsus_\(^{436}\)), B. _faout_, B. _poulzig_ < OFr. _pouls_ show that the origin of /zl/ could be either voiced /sl/ > /zl/ or else assibilated /dl/, with palatalisation possible in both cases. This is supported by the examples _martegen_ and _martesen_ in both BM and the Ordinalia, which are equivalent to B. _martese_ < mar+teu+se "if that comes" and contain /zl/ < /ls/.\(^{437}\) It happens that _bryonsen_ "throat" (see above) with /–nz–l/ < /–ns–l/ only occurs with _s_ in BM for _bryangen_ in the Ordinalia.\(^{438}\)

Similarly, _kerensa_, _kerense_ "love" (B. _karantez_) always has _s_ in BM for _kerenge_ in the Ordinalia.\(^{439}\) No palatalisation occurs in the frequent _wosa_, (a)_wose_ "after" or the derived _aywosa_ "after her,

\(^{433}\) _brusy_ BM 4054, _vrusi_ 4087.

\(^{434}\) _vestrigy_ BM 198, _mestresy_ 3313, _servysy_ 3262, 3373, 3801, _serve sy_ 4275, _trewsy_ 975, _treysy_ 2399, _troet_ Voc. Corn. 516 glossed L. _turdus_ AS. _staer_, cf. _trodzhan_ Lhuyd AB 10b, 156b "stares", “Adar y Drydion, L. _sturnus_). Thus _treysy_ in BM seems to mean “starlings”, see Nance, NCED, p. 171, but it is stated that it “seems to refer to something that one crushes underfoot”, p. 190. The text of BM 2397-9 reads _Duk kernov hag oll y dus / indan ov threys me as glus / poren kepar ha treysy_ “Duke of Cornwall and all his folk / under my feet I will paste them / exactly as ... (?)”, where C. _glus_ may be compared to WB. _glud_ “bird-lime” (noun), “sticky” (adj.), W. _gludio_ “to stick” and B. _gludennek_ “viscous”. Stokes’ tenuous _treythy_ “perhaps connected with W. _traeth_ ‘sand’ “, notes to BM, p. 274, may be rejected.

\(^{435}\) _calge_ BM 2046, _falge_ 777 (12 exx.), _me an felge_ 1273, _polge_ 659 (5 exx.).

\(^{436}\) See J.F.R. Piette, _French Loanwords in Middle Breton_, p. 118.

\(^{437}\) _martegen_ BM 61, _martesen_ 3291.

\(^{438}\) _vryonsen_ BM 780, _bryonsen_ 1620, _vreonsen_ 1651.
notwithstanding", unlike \textit{wosa, woge, wege} in the Ordinalia.\footnote{\textit{kerensa} BM 123, 2629, \textit{kerense} 403 (13 exx.), \textit{gerense} 2997, 3040, \textit{gerensa} 4325.\textit{wosa} BM 22, 104, 999, \textit{wose} 1073 (4 exx.), \textit{awose} 723, 1635, 3698, \textit{a wose} 1129; \textit{aywosa} 837.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{wose} BM 22, 104, 999, \textit{wose} 1073 (4 exx.), \textit{awose} 723, 1635, 3698, \textit{a wose} 1129; \textit{aywosa} 837.\textit{attense} BM 3447 [the etymology is discussed in NCED, entry "otta", p. 123, but is doubtful], \textit{pensevyk} 489, 3022, 3209 (cf. \textit{pendeuig} Voc. Corn. 170).\textit{thensa} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{attense} BM 3447 [the etymology is discussed in NCED, entry "otta", p. 123, but is doubtful], \textit{pensevyk} 489, 3022, 3209 (cf. \textit{pendeuig} Voc. Corn. 170).\textit{thensa} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.} It is perhaps also coincidence that \textit{hensy} "old house, ruin" (WCB. \textit{hen+ty}) occurs rather than \textasteriskcentered{\textit{hengy}} seen in place-name elements.\footnote{\textit{thensa} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{attense} BM 3447 [the etymology is discussed in NCED, entry "otta", p. 123, but is doubtful], \textit{pensevyk} 489, 3022, 3209 (cf. \textit{pendeuig} Voc. Corn. 170).\textit{thensa} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{attense} BM 3447 [the etymology is discussed in NCED, entry "otta", p. 123, but is doubtful], \textit{pensevyk} 489, 3022, 3209 (cf. \textit{pendeuig} Voc. Corn. 170).\textit{thensa} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.\textit{hensy} BM 1307; see CPNE, p. 130.} Likewise, \textit{attense} "behold him" occurs rather than \textasteriskcentered{\textit{attenge}} and \textit{pensevyk} "prince" (OC. \textit{pendeuyig W. pendeuyfig}) for the unattested but perhaps possible \textasteriskcentered{\textit{pengevyk}}.\footnote{\textit{densa} BM 40 (6 exx.), \textit{thensa} 2719, \textit{Densa} [sic] 672, 2944, \textit{tarosvan} 2566 (cf. \textit{taruutvan} Voc. Corn. 493). But see teroge, § 5.8.3. above.\textit{densa} BM 40 (6 exx.), \textit{thensa} 2719, \textit{Densa} [sic] 672, 2944, \textit{tarosvan} 2566 (cf. \textit{taruutvan} Voc. Corn. 493). But see teroge, § 5.8.3. above.} The words \textit{densa} "good man" (W. \textit{dyne B. den WCB. da}) and \textit{tarosvan} "phantom" (OC. \textit{taruutvan}) probably could not have shown palatalisation, no front vowels follow the relevant phoneme.\footnote{\textit{densa} BM 40 (6 exx.), \textit{thensa} 2719, \textit{Densa} [sic] 672, 2944, \textit{tarosvan} 2566 (cf. \textit{taruutvan} Voc. Corn. 493). But see teroge, § 5.8.3. above.} \footnote{\textit{densa} BM 40 (6 exx.), \textit{thensa} 2719, \textit{Densa} [sic] 672, 2944, \textit{tarosvan} 2566 (cf. \textit{taruutvan} Voc. Corn. 493). But see teroge, § 5.8.3. above.}

Overall, it is curious that BM shows palatalisation in a wider range of words than is found in PA and the Ordinalia, yet spellings with \textit{g} are perversely somewhat less common compared to those with \textit{s} in the majority of groups of words affected. Palatal spellings are always associated with neighbouring front vowels, except in a very few words like \textit{bohogogyon} where analogy is almost certainly responsible. It is difficult to explain the apparently improbable statistic that no palatal spellings occur in parts of the verb \textit{bos}, where they should be common, yet \textit{gy} "thou, thee" is universal in BM for earlier \textit{sy}. The absence of palatalisation after \textit{mar(a)s} "if" follows the pattern seen in the earlier texts, even where a front vowel follows \textit{/z/}. Where expected according to the distribution found in PA and the Ordinalia, palatal spellings are still no more than sporadic and unpredictable in BM.
5.9.3 The Tregear Homilies (TH)

The extant twelve translations of the thirteen Catholic homilies by Edmund Bonner were all written by the same hand, who it has been presumed was John Tregear, while the rather longer catena that is added in place of the expected thirteenth homily was written in a different hand. Consequently the spelling conventions adopted by the second scribe sometimes differ from those of the first, although on a general level they are broadly similar and are both within the Middle Cornish orthographical tradition. It is, however, a potentially significant difference as regards the representation of any given phoneme, so a distinction is maintained where it is relevant between the twelve homilies by John Tregear [JT] and the catena Sacrament an Aulter [SA].

As in the case of the earlier texts, "First Palatalisation" is generally regular in TH. The verb "to have" is normally found in forms similar to those seen above, e.g. an gevas, an gefas, (n)an Jevas "hath (not)" (pres.), an Jevith, an gevith "shall have" (future), an geffa, an Jeffa "may have", nan geffo "(that) may have not" (pres. subj.); an geva "had" (imperf.), an Jeva "had" (pret.& imperf.). No forms of this verb happen to occur in SA, but there are a few slight irregularities in JT. As well as nyn sevas "hath not" and nynsevith "shall not have" compared above with the similar cases in BM, the form dell gevas "as hath" (pres.) might be amended to read *dell [an] gevas. This may be attributed to a simple

---

444 T.Z. Chaudhri, A Description of the Middle Cornish Tregear Manuscript, pp.2-4. It is not certain whether either of these scribes was the translator: this was presumably Tregear himself in at least the first twelve homilies. D.H. Frost, Cornish Studies 11 (2003), series 2, pp. 291-307, believes that the author of the third was probably Thomas Stepyn.

445 an gevas TH 8a.17 (error for pl. *as tevas), 17.7 (error for f. *as tevas), 18.5, 51.2 (probably error for f.), an gefas 10a.12, 43.18, nan Jevas 16a.4, 18.13, an Jevas 17.9 (error for f.), 29a.16 (error for pl.), 30a.13, an Jevith 22a.6 (error for 1pl. *ny a[ge]n bith), an gevith 26.15 (error for 1pl.). 57.19, an geffa 4a.1, 21a.12, an Jeffa 25.4 (error for pl. *as teffa), nan geffo 20.15, an geva 4.2 (imperf., error for pl. *as teva), nan Jeva 28.12 (pret., error for 1pl. *ny a[ge]n be), 30a.6 (pret., error for 2pl. *why a[ge]s be), 34.6-7 (pret.), an Jeva 46.15-16 (imperf.).

446 dell gevas TH 51.2-3 (probably error for f. *dell as tevas).
omission based upon the occurrence of a medial line break; the particle and infixed pronoun are in any case implied by the following g, so no meaning is lost in any event. The contractions found in the equivalent ModB. verb may be compared, e.g. en deus > 'neus “he has”, he deus > 'deus “she has”, o deus > ‘deus “they have”.

It is possible, but unlikely, that a further irregular instance may be found in ny nygefyn "(we,) we will not have". This could be based by analogy on ny(n)gefyth "will not have", with the first person plural ending –yn substituted for a perceived third person singular ending. If so, it would also show loss of the infixed pronoun n /n/ before the palatalised consonant. Perhaps the writer lost sight of the dative infixed construction and declined the third person singular form instead of using the regular ny gen byth, *nyn byth with n or gan, gen correctly infixed. Many of the preceding examples are in fact used for persons other than the third person singular masculine, especially when the subject precedes the verb. This is frequent in spoken Breton, so that ni 'no plijadur (< *ni en devo) "we will have fun" occurs for the correct ni hor bo plijadur.

A further development is to add personal endings to the verb, which occurs in TH in the phrases a vongy "that they had" (pret.) and del voums y "as they had", apparently abbreviated from *[as te]vongy < as teva. These were evidently re-modelled on *bons, *bons y "they were", but they could equally have been meant for the grammatically masculine *[an ge]vonsy < an geva with the plural ending compounded. A similar process happened in MIB. a meump (< 1s. am eus, 2pl. –mp),

447 This example should probably be feminine *as tevas to agree with the implied singular of gwlasow "countries, nations", but the confusion may be due to the masculine pow "country" in the previous phrase. The opposite confusion occurs in neb astevas "who(ever) has" TH 30a.2 (pres.) for *neb angevas and similarly why as tevith "ye shall have" 31a.8 (fut.) is used for *why algefs bith. These confusions do not occur in PA, the Ordinalia or BM but are found in CW (see further below).
448 ny nygefyn TH 10a.10.
449 *ny gen byth PA 731; *nyn byth unattested, but cf. ny an bythe "we shall have" CW 662.
450 a vongy TH 4.6, del voums y 28.12 [the latter in fact badly translates "than they had"].
hon deus "we have" (cf. 3s. en deus) for regular MIB. hon eus. It seems that the purpose was to make the distinctions clear between different persons of the verb after the use of the infixed dative pronouns had become confused. It is possible that nygefn may represent an attempt at this in the future tense. On the other hand, in this context the same meaning could be expressed with the verb cafos "to get", so the example could equally be understood as correctly inflected * ny ny gefyn /ni gevyn/ with /g/. There is no way to be absolutely sure which verb the scribe intended in this instance, but the latter remains most likely.

As in the previous texts, in Jeth "in the day" (lit. "per day"), an Jeth "the day", hethew in Jeth "today" occur regularly with a palatal alongside pub dith, pup dith "every day" and an presont dith ma "this present day" with expected /d/. The form vn dith "one day" shows no palatal, which may be compared to the variation between vn deyth, un geyth in the Ordinalia and vn geth in BM seen above. On the other hand in dith hethew, in dith hethow "today" occur three times without the palatal, a failure that is found in no earlier text. The example an dyth seen in CW (at least ostensibly a later text: see below) may be influenced by [a]n sythvas dyth "the seventh day" in the previous line, with a word inserted. These are such rare exceptions to the expected palatalisation and an g(e)yth is so common in Middle Cornish that it seems certain that these two cases in TH are hypercorrections. It is highly unlikely that they represent a genuine variation unattested in the other texts since the sound change is almost entirely predictable within the small range of words in which it occurs. The word dyowle "devil" occurs only once without the

---

452 in Jeth TH 8.2, an Jeth 18.3-4, 47.18, hethew in Jeth 27a.1, 37.4, 48.15, pub dith 5.3, pup dith 39.5, an presont dith ma 34.4-5.
453 vn dith TH 41.4, 47.15 (twice).
454 in dith hethew TH 17.15-16, in dith hethow 41a.19, 48.2.
455 an dyth CW 416; may fon sythvas dyth "so that the seventh day may be" CW 415.
456 No examples of this type of regular "First Palatalisation" occur in SA.
article in BM; as in the Ordinalia, the plural *an dywolow* "the devils" does not show a palatal after the article.\(^{457}\)

The irregular "First Palatalisation" seen in *chy* "house" occurs frequently in the twelve homilies of JT, as usual retaining the same form irrespective of the article or any other words preceding it.\(^{458}\) More interesting is the unique *wargy* "inwards", contrasted to *warves* "outwards".\(^ {459}\) As in the case of *agy*, which could equally be from OC. \(^{*}a\ di\) or else represent an initial mutation of *chy*, it could be argued that \(^{*}war\ di\) existed alongside *chy* in all periods and therefore represents a more or less regular case of "First Palatalisation". The more common *agy* "within, inside" occurs frequently in JT but *achy* occurs once in SA in a form that occurs otherwise only in BM.\(^ {460}\)

Despite the fact that TH dates from a transitional period between Middle and Late Cornish, "Second Palatalisation" does not occur any more uniformly than before. There is no reason to suppose that the phonology of TH is particularly conservative, since the translation is of poor quality and yet the translators clearly had a good knowledge of both spoken and written Cornish. There was probably no sharp divide between these registers, which in part may account for the equal distribution of forms with *s* and *g*, but they are in such free variation in the majority of words that palatalisation must have still been incomplete. The suggestion that analogous restoration of /z/ for /dʒ/ could still be in operation up to three or four centuries after the original sound change is highly implausible. Yet this would have to be true in order to explain the high frequency of forms with *s* before front vowels in JT (TH) according to the

\(^{457}\) *dywol* TH 34.13, *an dywolow* 28.8

\(^{458}\) *chy* [no significant element preceding] TH 21a.5, *in chy* "in the house" 17a.10, *an chi* 33.13, *an chy* 40.12, *han chy* "and the house" 40.10, *thean chy* "from the house", *in y chy* "in his house", *in the chy ge* "in thy house" 41.4-5. See § 5.9.5 (ii) below.

\(^{459}\) *wargy* TH 26a.20, *warves* 26a.18.

\(^{460}\) *agy* TH 36a.2 (5 exx.), *achy* 61a.27. It seems that *achy* is misused as a noun.
theories of Pedersen and George. Since it is certain that JT could not have existed before its English exemplar published in 1555, it cannot possibly be a modernisation of earlier material. This charge could easily be levelled at any of the Middle Cornish plays, so the phonological evidence of TH is more unambiguous due to its narrow dating.

Forms indicating a palatal in the verb "to be" are about as frequent as those with orthographical assibilation. The temporal particle *nans is strikingly rarer in TH than previously, occurring only twice in nansew, nannsew "now it is". The perfective particle res occurs only once in the example reseth "has gone". The negative is much more frequent: the present tense occurs in JT nynsoff (1s.), nynsew, nyn sew, nyngew, nyn gyw (3s.), ny gon(e) (ny), nynsone, nyngone ny (1pl.), nyn sowgh why, nynsowgh why (2pl.), SA negew, ne gew, nyn gew (3s.), ny gyns (3pl.).

The imperfect tense has JT ny(n)go, nyn go, nynso, nyn so (3s.), ny sens y (3pl.), SA nyn go. The locative present has JT ny(n) gesan (ny) (1pl.), ny(n) sugy, ny gugy, ny gusy, ny susy etc. (3s.), nyn segow why (2pl.), nyn gesans, nyn gusans, nysugens y (3pl.), SA nyn gegy (3s.), ny geran, Ne geranny [sic] (1pl.). The locative imperfect has JT ny gesa, nyn sega, nyn sesa (3s.), SA ny gesa. The existential present has JT nynses, nyn sus, ny gues, ny gus etc., SA nyn gus, Nyn gvs [sic], ne gus. In total, the particle nyns shows final s in 60 cases and g in 35 cases in JT but has g in

---

461 Pedersen had not of course seen TH, since it was only discovered in 1949.
462 nansew TH 45a.6, nannsew 49a.3.
463 reseth TH 21a.18.
464 nynsoff TH 59.10 nyngew 1a.15, 52a.3, nyn gew 55a.15, 56a.5, nyn sew 7.22-23 (6 exx.), nynsew 21a.6 (10 exx.), Nyn sew [sic] 24a.15, Nensew [sic] 48a.10, ny gone 7.4, 10.20, ny ne gone 10a.1, ny gone ny 27a.4-5, ny gon 10a.5, nynsone 7a.4, nyngone ny 24.4, nyn sowgh why 33.7, nynsowgh why 33.12, negew 59.10, ne gew 59a.10, 65.9, nyn gyw 59a.15 (7 exx.), ny gyns 59.20.
465 nyngo 2a.14, nygo 4.12, nyn go 12.20, nynso 4a.6 (11 exx., 13a.2 deleted), nyn so 13a.18, ny sens y 32.24-15, nyn go 61.16 (5 exx.).
466 nyn gesan ny TH 9a.5, ny gesan ny 9a.6 (5 exx.), ny gesan 22a.5, ny sugy 8.16, ny gugy 16.2, ny gusy 21.14 (3 exx.), ny gesy 22.9, ny susy 23a.6, nynsugy 16a.2, 34.13, nyn sugy 25.20, 29.2, Nensugy 22.7 [sic], nyn segow why 16a.12, ny gesans 15.7, ny gusans 53.5, nysugens y 25.16, nyn gey 65a7, 66.20, ny geran 59.11, Ne geranny [sic] 63a.5.
467 ny gesa 2a.13, nyn sega 2a.15, nyn sesa 34.12 (3 exx.), ny gesa, 59a.7, 60a.2.
all 25 cases in SA, showing at least in this verb a greater tendency to palatalise in SA. The phoneme /n/ is lost on 30 occasions out of 95 in JT and 9 out of 25 in SA. Surprisingly, /n/ is frequently lost before orthographical s as well as g. The fact that palatalisation of nyns > ny(n)g often precedes a back vowel demonstrates that unusually the motivation for palatalisation appears to come from the preceding front vowel and /n/, whether or not the nasal is lost in the process.

The third person singular of the present locative *nyns usy and imperfective locative *nyns esa seem to show that speakers of Cornish may have been uncomfortable with palatalising both phonemes /z/ > /dʒ/ in the same word, since out of fourteen examples ny gugy occurs only once in JT and nyn gegy occurs twice in SA, while *ny gega does not occur. Equally, only one example of ny susy and three of nyn sesa in JT show no apparent palatalisation of either phoneme, although the latter are out of a total of only five in JT and two in SA. The remaining examples are about equally divided between those that show palatalisation of the first or of the second /z/, except that SA has too few instances to give a useful statistic. Overall, it is noticeable that palatalisation is more frequent after the negative particle than in earlier texts, though still far from universal. The loss of /n/ in nyns (as it cannot be compared to the isolated scribal error in ny go for *nyn go in PA), appears to be a significant later Middle Cornish sound change, amounting to roughly a third of the total examples.

The fact that the scribe of SA writes ny geran, Ne geranny "we are not", while JT or his scribe writes ny gesan and ny(n) gesan ny, is one of the many characteristic traits that distinguishes SA as the work of a different individual, since rhotacism /z/ > /r/ never in fact occurs in JT at

\footnotesize{\textit{nynses TH 7a.9 (12 exx.), Nyn ses [sic] 9.15, nyn sus 10a.8, nynsus 18.5, ny gevs 7a.16, ny ges 10.11, 10.12, ny gues 53.3, ny gus 53a.6, 57a.18, nyn gus 61.29, Nyn gvs[sic] 64a.27, 65a.22.}
The scribe of SA does not, however, write \( r \) consistently: *e thesan ny* "we are" may be compared to *erany* of the same meaning.\(^{469}\) The potentially confused pronunciation of \(/z/\) and \(/r/\) can only mean that \(/r/\) was an apical, not a retroflex sound. It seems that rhotacism must constitute a direct sound change \(/z/ > /r/\), since these two sounds are articulated close to the alveolus and do not have the palatal quality of \(/dz/\). This sound change is not attested prior to the composition of the homilies in the sixteenth century, but it seems to demonstrate that unpalatalised \(/z/\) sometimes survived in this position until at least this date. There is no evidence to show that rhotacism occurred more widely, but in these few words at least it must have prevented any subsequent palatalisation, even though it is otherwise common in that text.

Palatalisation occurs more rarely in the verb "to be" when it does not follow the negative or temporal particle. In the present tense *engy* "they are" occurs only once in JT for *ythyns, ens y, ensy* of the same meaning and *kyn thynsy* "although they are" (a total of six instances with *s*); there is one instance of *ens sy* in SA.\(^ {471}\) Only *ythyns* could not presumably show palatalisation, since the phoneme is final. In the imperfect tense *ens* "they were" has expected final *s* but *ens y, ons y* occur with internal *s*; the preterite *dell vonsy* "as they were" occurs once and the present subjunctive *vons y, vonsy* "that they may be" occurs 5 times in JT and twice in SA.\(^ {472}\) These examples might be compared to *mowns* "they

---

\(^{469}\) This is taken to be Thomas Stephyn by D.H. Frost, *Cornish Studies* 11 (2003), series 2, pp. 291-307, who signed his name with Tregear on several of the other homilies. It may be added that an individual's orthographical or speech habits could have changed over time, if parts of JT were contributed to by the author of SA. Discrepancies might be accounted for by a different scribe but the same translator. In any case, any such discrepancies remain useful for comparison.

\(^{470}\) *e thesan ny* 61.24-25, *erany* 65.9.


are” (W. y maent B. emaint) with expected final s but y mowngy in JT and e mownys y in SA showing a variation of s and g in medial position.\textsuperscript{473}

In fact, the third person plural ending –ns with the suffixed pronoun y occurs in a range of other common verbs and inflected prepositions, but palatalisation is nonetheless curiously infrequent. As well as a[s te]vongy, dell [as te]vouns y given above, the following verbs could be cited: nysugens y "they are not" (cf. ny gusans), vsans y (cf. vsans), y thesans y "they are" (pres. loc.), esans y, y thesans y "they were" (imperf. loc., cf. esans, y thesans), mar towns y "if they come" (pres.-fut.), ny rowng enioya "they shall not enjoy", rongy, ronsy, rons y, ronnys y "they do", Ny rons y "they do not" (pres.-fut.), rens y "they would" (imperf.), russens y (cf. mar crussens "if they did"), russans y "they did" (pret.), rellans y, rellens y "they may" (pres. subj.), vynsans y "they would", ny vensans y "they could not" (pluperf. cond.), Na illansy "they cannot" (cf. fattellellans "how can they...?").\textsuperscript{474} Of these, only a[s te]vongy, ny rowng enioya and rongy have a written palatal. It is worth noting that g is superficially final in ny rowng enioya but of course is followed by a front vowel across word boundary and is not therefore especially irregular, despite appearances.

Prepositions inflected in the third person plural are an interesting group of words in this regard because forms in TH such as gansans y "with them" for earlier gansa appear to be a new formation with final –ns.\textsuperscript{475} It seems that these were re-modelled on the verbal endings in the above examples in order to avoid confusion with ganso "with him, it"
when the final vowel was presumably unstressed and liable to be reduced to schwa.\textsuperscript{476} That these forms do not occur previously suggests that any such reductions had not begun seriously to threaten the distinctions between different persons by the time of the earlier texts, so the problem had not apparently needed to be addressed. Further examples in JT include \textit{thethans y} "to them", \textit{the wortans y} "from them" and \textit{ragthans y}, but the only example in SA is \textit{in an sy} "in them".\textsuperscript{477} It may be remarked that overall, very few verbs and inflected prepositions with the third person plural ending \textit{–ns y} are written with \textit{g}. In the light of previous evidence, one would expect that a preceding /n/ and a following front vowel would be an especially good environment for palatalisation. Since \textit{g} is elsewhere written freely for /dz/ in TH, it seems impossible not to conclude that examples of \textit{s} in these cases do indeed stand for /z/.

The locative and existential tenses of \textit{bos} "to be" similarly show very little internal palatalisation. In the locative present, the principal exception is the third person singular \textit{vgy}, \textit{vsy} "is", occurring in these forms 26 times and 43 times respectively in JT.\textsuperscript{478} Variant forms occur in JT in \textit{esy}, \textit{vugy}, \textit{vse}, \textit{vsa} "is", \textit{mar suga}, \textit{mar sugy} "if he, it is", \textit{may thusy} "that he, it is", \textit{kynthusy} "although he, it is", \textit{na gussy} "that is not" (in which \textit{g} means /g/), \textit{pan dresy} "what is...?" (contracted from *\textit{pandra usy}) and \textit{y thusy} "it is".\textsuperscript{479} Added to the examples seen above in the second element of \textit{ny(n) sugy}, \textit{ny(n) gusy} etc., a total of 34 examples have \textit{g} and 54 have \textit{s} in JT. In SA, \textit{vge} occurs twice, \textit{vse} only once, \textit{vgy} 6 times and \textit{pandresy} and \textit{pandregy} once each within three lines of the text.\textsuperscript{480} Added to \textit{yn gegy} given above, there are nine cases with \textit{g} and two with \textit{s} in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ganso} PA 7c; OM 185; PC 631; RD 67; BM 477.
\item \textit{thethans y} TH 23.6, 44a.6, \textit{the wortans y} 22a.6, \textit{ragthans y} 23.6, \textit{in an sy} 59a.19.
\item \textit{vgy} TH 1.14 (26 exx.), \textit{vsy} 19a.9 (43 exx.)
\item \textit{vge} TH 59.13, 64.14, \textit{vse} 59.21, \textit{vgy} 59.20 (6 exx.), \textit{pandresy} 63.5, \textit{pandregy} 65.3.
\end{itemize}
The most curious of these forms are *vse, vge, vsa, mar suga* with apparent lowering of the final vowel. The context shows that there is no doubt that these represent the same part of the verb, so it appears that lowering happened irrespective of whether the palatal was written. These forms are unique to TH, so it appears to have been a new departure from the standard forms. It seems therefore that palatalisation had already occurred sporadically before the front vowel before it was lowered.

In other persons of the locative, the prefix *es– < *ed–* is rarely written with the palatal. Examples in the present tense include *ethesoff, ythesave* (probably with –*vy*), *y thesa ve "I am", y thesas "thou art", es(s)an ny, eson ny, esyn ny, y than (ny) "we are", ny(n) gesan (ny) "we are not", nyn segow why "ye are not", mar suga "if ye are", ny gesans, ny gusans, na gusans, nysugens y "they are not", vsans (y), y thes (ny) "they are", may thusans "that they are" [JT], *e thesa (ve), e thesa (vy) "I am"* and the four examples *ny geran, Ne geranny [sic], e thesan ny and erany "we are (not)"* given above [SA]. In total, 33 cases have *s* (and one has *ss*) in JT compared to just *nyn segow why* and *nysugens y* with *g*, while five have *s* in SA and the other three cases have rhotacism. In the imperfect locative (which also serves as an existential in the 3s.), there are also very few forms with *g*: in JT only one instance of *nyn sega* and two of *mars sega* show the palatal, while *y the(s)sa, ythesa, I thesa [sic], es(s)a "there was, were", may thesa "that there was, were", ny gesa, nyn sesa "there was, were not", po nagesa "or there was, were not"* and *pethesa "what was...?"* occur with *s* or *ss* in the third person singular; in SA *ny gesa* and *e thesa* are spelt with *s*. In total, 38 examples in JT

---


482 *nyn sega* TH 2a.15, *mars sega* 43a.1, 55.18, *y thesa* 1a.10 (7 exx.), *y thes* 43.19 (error for *y thesa*), *y thesas* 56a.12, *ythesa* 4a.2, *I thesa* [sic] 7.6, *esa* 6a.12 (22 exx.), *essa* 12a.2 (4 exx.), *may thesa*
have s and six have ss, but only two have g; in SA all three instances have s. The plural occurs only in JT in the examples cited above esans (y), y thesans (y) and may thesans, again with s written for the phoneme.

It seems to be no coincidence that all nine instances in which the prefix es– is written with g in TH occur in a sequence of two such phonemes: in nyn segow why, nysugens and nyn sega the element occurs after the negative particle nyns W. nid B. ned V. occ. nend and in mar suga, mar sugy, mars sega it occurs after mar(a)s B. mard. Moreover in none of these is the first /z/ < /d/ apparently palatalised; since it seems that the final /z/ of mar(a)s is never written with g in Middle Cornish, it does not appear that that the first phoneme could have been palatalised and subsequently exchanged with the second by metathesis. This latter example may be contrasted with mar sesow given above with s in both phonemes, as well as mar sewa "if he is", mar sesta "if thou art", mar sowhy "if ye are" in JT and mar sees "if there is" in SA with regular s. Conversely, ny geran and Ne geranny show palatalisation of the first phoneme and rhotacism /z/ > /r/ of the second.

Although these examples are very few, it seems once again that speakers generally preferred one palatal /dʒ/ and one unpalatalised /z/ in a sequence of two such phonemes, although the order was not apparently important. In a few cases in SA, unpalatalised /z/ was rhotacised, at least when it stood second in such a sequence. The single instance of erany shows that this may have occasionally happened in other instances, at least in the speech of some individuals. Overall, the tendency to palatalise seems to have been very slight in these words in TH unless another /z/ preceded the affected phoneme. That it was nonetheless possible, despite

---

18a.16, 32.18, ny gesa 2a.13, nyn sesa 34.12 (3 exx.), po nagessa 55.18, pethesis 55.20, ny gesa 59a.7, 60a.2, e thesa 60.3–4.

mar sewa (< *mars yw ef) TH 23.19, mar sesta (< *mars esos+t) 48.23, mar sowhy 16a.12, 49a.8, mar sees 62a.10. The contracted mar sesta is a locative but st < s+st could not be palatalised here.
the nearly universal occurrence of s in these examples, is clear from the unique y thegen for ythesen in the Ordinalia. In the intervening century or so, it seems that there was no substantial increase in the tendency to palatalise /z/ > /dʒ/ in parts of bos "to be" by the time of TH.

The second person singular dependent pronoun is nearly always written with a palatal in TH, but unlike in BM there are occasional forms that retain s. It occurs as a reinforcing pronoun or object after inflected prepositions, verbs, nouns and verb-nouns in the possessive construction (in the latter as the object of the verb), as well as in one instance as the object of an imperative. Examples of the single pronoun are warthebyn ge "against thee", theso ge, thege (< *thys+ge) "to thee", theth offendia ge "to offend thee", theth naha ge "to deny thee", the sight ge "thy sight", gwra ge "do thou...!", in the chy ge "in thy house", fatell caraff ve ge "how I love thee", fatell ra ve the cara ge "how I do love thee", theth hurtya ge "to hurt thee" [JT], these (< *thys se), the gee (< *thys ge) "to thee", the orybe gee "beside thee", genas ge "with thee" and osa (< *os+se) "thou art" [SA].

A few instances of reduplicated pronouns occur in esta ge, esta se (< *esos+ta+se) and ostage (< *os+ta+se) in JT. In total, only one in nineteen examples in JT and two in five examples in SA are written with s. The examples thege, these, the gee and osa are interesting in that two successive phonemes /z+z/ apparently gave /z/ or /dʒ/ by assimilation rather than /ss/ by sandhi. It is probable that genas ge could not have been pronounced with [−z dʒ−] except in careful speech and is therefore merely a written form of *genage with /dʒ/.

484 warthebyn ge TH 9a.20, theso ge 10.1, 10.4, 44.3-4, thege 13.20, theth offendia ge 10.6, theth naha ge 10.7, the sight ge 10a.9, gwra ge 18a.13, in the chy ge 41.4-5, fatell caraff ve ge (for *fatell [y’th] caraff ve ge) 43.9-10, fatell ra ve the cara ge (for *fatell [w]raffe ve the gara ge with lenition of the verb-noun missing) 43.12, theth hurtya ge 48.17, 48.19, these 60.30, the gee 62.31, tha orybe gee 62.29, genas ge 63.1, osa 61a.25, 62.30.

485 esta ge TH 7.15, 43.8, 43.15, esta se 48.16, ostage 44.2. It is probable that −ta (usually limited to the verb “to be”) is merely an unstressed form in which provection after s prevented assimilation.
Religious vocabulary again makes up one of the most significant groups of words showing palatalisation, although this is by no means universal. The noun *blonogath* occurs once in SA but 19 times so spelt in JT, once as *blonegath* and a further 9 times as *blonogeth*.\(^{486}\) It is never spelt with *s* in Middle Cornish, although it has been argued above that this was probably possible. All of these examples show metathesis of */Vn/> */nV/* before the palatalised segment of earlier *bolungeth* in PA (cf. *bolnogeth* in BM), apparently in order to separate the group */ndʒ/*, then further metathesis of */bol–/> */blo–/* (cf. *vlonogeth* in BM) to separate */ln/* created by the first metathesis. Since this is the only MIC. word to show metathesis as well as palatalisation (no doubt subsequently), it is not clear whether the two phenomena are related, although there may be a related phenomenon in *kerengeak*, cited below, which appears in syncopated forms such as *kerngeek*. Possibly the unusual sequence of alveolar consonants in these words was liable to simplification. It seems safest to regard these changes as subsequent, unusual developments.

Unlike in BM, only *g* occurs for */z/* < */d/* in *benegitter*, *benegyttar*, *benegytter* in JT and *benegicter* in SA.\(^{487}\) The noun *begeth*, *beseth* "baptism" occurs in JT with both graphs and the derived *besythia* "to baptise" and *besitthis* "baptised" (p.pt.) both have *s*.\(^{488}\) While *crowsyys* "crucified" occurs once in JT with *s*, variation of *s* and *g* is seen in *dewses*, *dugys*, *dusys*, *thugys* "Godhead", *omskemenegy*, *omskumenesa* "to excommunicate", *spyrygian* "spirits" (cf. *spurissans* "holy spirit" < *spyrlys+sans* with */z+s/* > */ss/*) and *drynsys*, *drinsis*, *dringys*, *dryngys*,

\(^{486}\) *blonogath* TH 1a.11 (17 exx.), 60.15, *vlonogath* 13a.17, 50a.13 [with initial mutation], *blonegath* 23a.5, *blonogeth* 1.12 (9 exx.).

\(^{487}\) *benegitter* TH 9.7, 31.12, *benegyttar* 41.8, *benegytter* 42.6, 47a.2, *benegicter* 66a.17. Note that */kt/* is assimilated to */tt/* in JT but not in SA (from *benesyk* "blessed"—*ter*, not original L. *benedictio*).

The example *omskemenegy, omskumenesa* must show /zl > /dʒl/ despite /g/ in the cognate B. *eskumunugañ* < Med.L. *excommunicare*. This verb appears to be a new formation based upon various spellings of the past participles *[om]skemynys* in BM and *[om]schumunys* in CW, since a verb *skemyna* "to make accursed" seems to be a back-formation from *omskemuna* "to excommunicate" (W. *ysgymuno*). It may be that palatalisation occurred in *omskemenegy* but not in *omskumenesa* due to a variation of verbal endings selected by the scribe, only the first of which contained a front vowel. On the other hand, similar variation occurs in *vsy, vsa, vge* by the lowering of an unstressed vowel and so it seems clear only that *s* and *g* were both possible.

The verb *cresy, crysy* "to believe" is far more common with *s* than with *g* in JT, a total of 19 occurrences compared to one each of *cregy, crege*. In SA, *cregy* appears twice. On the other hand, various spellings of *crygyans, cregians, crygeans* "belief" (11 examples) and *discregyans, discrigians, thiscrygyans* "unbelief" (3 examples) are found only with *g* in JT; similarly, one example each of *criggyans, thiscrigians* occurs in SA. The most interesting of these is *crisgians*, in which the graph *sg* is almost unique for this phoneme. Either it must be an error based upon vacillation between the two sounds or else an attempt to represent a partly assimilated sound /z´/, perhaps [ʒ]. Even so, as the only exception from regular *g*, it seems that palatalisation was nearly universal

---

489 crowysys TH 47.11, dewses 1a.9, dugys 12a.9, dusys 12a.16, 15.8, thugys 15.3 [with initial mutation], omskemenegy 39.9, omskumenesa 39.13, sprygian 35a.9, spurissans 36.10 (8 exx.), drynsys 1a.14, 1a.15, drinsis 1a.16, dringsys 5a.5 (3 exx.), dryngys 12a.4 (3 exx.), dringis 30.15 [all exx. of drynsys etc. show initial mutation after the article or compounded in "in the."].
490 The parasitic /m/ in the Cornish is by analogy with the reflexive prefix *om–*. See NCED, p. 52.
491 skemynys CW 212, omskemynez 1207, 1253, 1511, omsken[if]ynys 1213, omskemenys 1266, vmskemynez 1596, omskemyynys 1646, skemyna 1214; omschununys BM 1250, 2388, schumunys 2430.
493 cregy TH 59.11, 65a.16.
494 crygyans TH 16a.4 (7 exx.), cregians 18.17, crisgians 42.8, cregians 55.5, crygeans 54a.11, discregyans 7a.18, thiscrygyans 57.7, discrigians 57.17, criggyans 60a.19, thiscrigians 66a.5.
495 See § 5.9.1 for the similar spelling sethisgyk "thirsty".
before yod in the ending. The past participle occurs with s in JT as cryses, cresys "believed" and a related adjective discrysik "unbelieving" also has s, despite the following high front vowel in these instances.\textsuperscript{496} In me a grys "I believe" it seems that /zl/ occurs as expected; similarly the present subjunctive a crissa, a crisse, na grise "may (not) believe" (< *cryssos < *crys+ho) would not be expected to show a palatal.\textsuperscript{497} There is a case of the past participle cryge with a palatal in final position.\textsuperscript{498} The similar verb-noun pesy "to pray" appears twice in JT and once as pege in SA.\textsuperscript{499} 

In SA, expected final s occurs in me agis pys, compared to one apiece of eff a pegis and eff a pesys "he prayed" (pret.) with internal g and s respectively.\textsuperscript{500} The related pesadow "prayer" appears in both JT and SA, but the latter also has peiadow.\textsuperscript{501} Surprisingly, given that the homilies are a religious text, this is not a common word in TH.

Apart from religious vocabulary, the single most common word with variation of s and g is kerensa "love", occurring 28 times; it also occurs once with s as garensa and twice with g as carenga.\textsuperscript{502} More significant is the derived word kerengeak "loving", which also appears in the various spellings kerngeek, kyrngeak, kernsyak, kerengyk and kerengyak.\textsuperscript{503} Of these, only a single instance of kernsyak has s. The word kerensa seems to have lost final /ð/ (W. carennydd B. karantez), so the adjective is probably from *kerensethek with medial th /ð/. The loss of this sound in internal position seems to be irregular, perhaps by analogy with *kerenseth > kerensa. It is possible that the affricate quality of the sound was lost, initially giving yod and ultimately raising the previous

\textsuperscript{496} cryses TH 20.15, cysys 34a.12, 54.8, discrysik 24.9.

\textsuperscript{497} me a grys TH 39.5, a crissa 19a.13, a crisse 53.17, na grise 20.11.

\textsuperscript{498} cryge TH 16a.6.

\textsuperscript{499} pesy TH 9a.8, 35.5, pege 66.13. The latter is probably a verb-noun rather than an imperative.

\textsuperscript{500} me agis pys TH 59.8, eff a pegis 22a.12, eff a pesys 23.11.

\textsuperscript{501} pesadow TH 6a.2, 39a.13, 63.27, peiadow 62.15.

\textsuperscript{502} kerensa TH 1.24 (25 exx.), gerensa 24a.5 (4 exx. with initial mutation), carenga 20a.2, 20a.3.

\textsuperscript{503} kerengeak TH 2a.19 (3 exx.), kerngeek 3.7, kyrngeak 4a.18, kernsyak 41.16, kerengyk 10a.14, kerengyak 30a.16, 30a.18.
vowel. This would seem to be a good explanation for the nearly universal palatal in this word, which is not as common in *kerensa, carenga in this text. Oddly, it seems from the examples above that the syllables following the palatalised phoneme were not contracted; instead, three out of nine show syncope of the previous syllable. It has been suggested that, as in bolungeth, the sequence of alveolar consonants in *kerensethek was awkward and liable to simplification.

The word marthug(g)ian, marthussyan "marvels" occurs once with g, once with gg and twice with ss in JT.\textsuperscript{504} In SA the forms ma[r]vgian and marvgion occur within three lines of each other, so the missing <r> in the former is almost certainly a mere scribal error.\textsuperscript{505} Here the loss of internal /θ/ is interesting but probably unrelated to palatalisation, since a vowel intervenes before /dʒ/. This may be compared to spyrygian cited above. The example is interesting because ss occurs despite a following yod. The verb plansa "to plant" is also found with g before front vowels as blanges "plants" (3s. pres.-fut.) and plynges, plyngys "planted" (p.pt.).\textsuperscript{506} The phrase fatell rowng enioya cited above may be compared with myng a rug du "those that God made" in JT, where the preceding front vowel and /n/ seem to be responsible for palatalisation; otherwise myns a with the relative particle shows s three times and myns ew "those that are" occurs once.\textsuperscript{507} The verb-noun sensy "to hold" occurs once in JT and once in SA with s, but also in JT as sengy, syngy, singy with g.\textsuperscript{508} This may contain voiced /s/ > /z/ rather than /d/ > /l/ > /dʒ/, as discussed above. The phoneme /l/ < /l/ must also occur in cowgys "spoken" (p. pt.) B. komzet.\textsuperscript{509} The word negegath in SA must be cognate with W.

\textsuperscript{504} marthugian TH 2a.2, marthuggian 37a.19, marthussyan 38a.17, 49a.14.
\textsuperscript{505} mavgian TH 63a.24, marvgion 63a.26.
\textsuperscript{506} plansa TH 40.13, blanges 5.10, plynges 6.4, plyngys 32.10.
\textsuperscript{507} myng a rug du TH 2.5, myns a 7.22 (3 exx.), myns ew 20a.1.
\textsuperscript{508} sensyTH 49.19, 61.14, sengy 19a.5, syngy 33.4, singy 33.5.
\textsuperscript{509} cowgys TH 11.1.
negesydd "messenger", although "message" or "messengers" would seem to give better sense in the translation.\textsuperscript{510} In any case, these are clear examples in which original /s/ must first have been voiced to /z/, thus falling together with assimilated /z/ < /d/. It was evidently then palatalised to give g /dʒ/ in negegath, although the unstressed vowel in the ending seems later to have been lowered. In JT, there occurs a similar word genesegeth, genesegath "birth" W. genedigaeth B. ganedigezh, but s is written for /z/ (here < /d/) instead.\textsuperscript{511}

There are also many individual words in which it seems that s or g could have been equally possible: behosek "poor" (see above in BM), beransen "throat" (cf. bryangen in the Ordinalia), dehesy "to cast, throw", dynsys, densys "mankind", thisplesians "displeasure", gwandresy "foreigners, wanderers", (na) alsans "they could (not)", golosek, galosek, golosak "powerful" (cf. galogeck in RD), an welsan "the blade of grass", kynsa "first", vynsans y, vensans y "they would" (pluperf. cond.), nownsag "nineteen", plesya "to please", resak "to run", rewlisy "rulers" (for "magistrates"), skyggyow "shoes", sewsysy "successors", trosek in peswar trosek "four-footed", ow huga "screaming, roaring", wo(o)sa, wose, whosa, a wose etc. "after" [JT], golosak "powerful" and Na esyn(n)y "let us not...!" [SA].\textsuperscript{512} Of these, only skyggyow and ow huga have a palatal written.\textsuperscript{513} Palatalisation was probably impossible in besow "ring", hendasow, hyndasow "forefathers" and lusew; le(w)sew "ashes"

\textsuperscript{510} negegath TH 61a.21.
\textsuperscript{511} genesegeth TH 6a.16, 26.10, genesegath 8.6. Note that g means /g/ here.
\textsuperscript{512} behosek TH 6a.17, beransen 7a.12, dehesy 6a.7, dynsys 12a.16, 13a.3, densys 15.8, 56.5, thisplesians 7a.22, gwandresy 33.13, alsans 55.19, na alsans 55.19, golosek 5.6 (3 exx.), galosek 12a.2 (4 exx.), golosak 30a.1, 31a.1, an welsan 7.3, kynsa 2a.3, 2a.4, vynsans y 33.18, vensans y 36.14, nownsag 1.1, plesya 40.14, resak 30a.22, rewlisy 24a.11, skyggyow 8.10, sewsysy 49.16, trosek 2.8, ow huga [with unetymological h before *usa, perhaps from lost /θ/ of the particle < prep. orth], wosa 5.2 (19 exx.), a wose 13a.1, 13a.16, avosa 16.8 (3 exx.), a wosa 47a.13, A wosa [sic] 47.5, 51a.1, whosa 13a.10, woosa 28a.13, golosak 60a.25, Na esyn(n)y 65a.15.
\textsuperscript{513} The final unstressed vowel of ow huga has almost certainly been lowered, so this is quite regular.
with a following back vowel. The word fals "false" does not show the unusual final palatalisation of /–lz/ > /–ldʒ/ seen in falge in BM, nor does gwels "grass". The words martesyn, mertesyn "perhaps" and tryssa, tressa, trissa "third" do not recall martegen in BM and tryge, trege in RD. It is also worth mentioning peswar "four" and peswora "fourth". While the numeral never has palatalisation in Middle Cornish, Lhuyd gives padzhar, pesûar (masc.) and pedyr (fem.) as well as padzhûera, pazûera for the ordinal and pazûardhak "fourteen", which seem to represent both /zl/ and /dʒ/. Possibly this could not happen until /w/ was lost, in which case padzhûera is an attempt to hypercorrect from padzhar and pazûera.

5.9.4. The Creation of the World (CW)

The Creation of the World is a relatively short play, apparently because it was intended to be the first part of a cycle of plays recalling the Ordinalia: certainly it borrows heavily in places from OM, occasionally verbatim. It is described here for convenience as Late Middle Cornish, but the reality seems to be more complex. Although the manuscript

---

514 besow TH 49a.18, hendasow 3a.17 (4 exx.), hyndasow 6.5, lusew 6a.4, 6a.8, lesew 6a.11, lesew 6a.14, 9.12.
515 fals TH 19a.10 (6 exx.), gwels 7.1, 7.4, 7.5.
516 martesyn TH 4.1, 25a.6, 62a.22, 63.16, mertesyn 3.18, trissa 1.17 (6 exx.), tryssa 3.20 (15 exx.), tiusa 4.20 (probably scribal error for trissa), tressa 18a.12 (3 exx.), in tryssa "in his third" 47a.5.
517 peswar TH 1.1 (4 exx.), peswora 45a.14 (3 exx.).
518 padzhar AB 15c, 105b, 231a, 134, pesûera 231a, pedyr 231a, padzhûera 134b, pazûera 243b. It is possible that pesûera and pedyr are taken from MlC., but the others seem to be genuine.
519 The last four stanzas of the play (lines 2531-48) consist of a brief summary of the first day of the drama and invite the audience to return the next day, which would describe redemption through God's mercy: presumably the Passion. Stokes' edition notes the use of material from OM, p. 4 (foreword); for a detailed discussion, see P. Neuss, The Creation of the World, xxvii-xlxi.
520 George considers CW to be Late Cornish, PHC § 1.2.4, p. 10, although it was "... written in the tradition of MidC, and is a special case..." He accepts that it was written in only (my italics) "... a partly modernised orthography...", § 3.5.1, p. 40. His speculative date of ca. 1475 for the original composition seems to be rather too early: he also cites Nance's date ca. 1530-40, which he cites from R.M. Nance, Gwryans an bys [unpublished: no date]. Nonetheless, George's date is chosen in order to place the date of composition chronologically between the Ordinalia and BM, as he admits.
concludes with a signature containing the claim that a certain William Jordan wrote the play, dated 1611, it appears that he was the transcriber of an older drama. This suggestion was made by Stokes, who commented that the occurrence of certain forms in the English stage directions “seems to indicate a date prior to 1611”, and that the “mention of limbo... may tend to shew that the play was composed before the Reformation.” 521 In mitigation, it must be added that the fact that the stage directions are in English at all, whereas in BM and BK they are in Latin, might reasonably be suggested as a post-Reformation characteristic, or at the very least that the manuscript was composed rather later than these other two plays, when the use of the vernacular was growing under protestant influence.

In addition, Stokes listed a range of orthographical and phonological differences between the Ordinalia and CW.522 The most striking consonantal features are the large number of instances of pre-occlusion (see the chapter "Pre-occlusion") and the frequent appearance of the graphs $dg, j, sch, sh$ for /dʒ/ in addition to the variation of $s$ and $g$.523 In terms of morphology and orthography, the language varies between a level of archaism comparable to the Ordinalia and forms corresponding to Late Cornish.524 There seems little doubt that an essentially early to mid sixteenth century play was modernised and partly re-written at the beginning of the Late Cornish period, probably by Jordan. It appears that parts of it had been previously adapted and expanded from a version of OM, conventionally dated to ca. 1450.525 It may be safe to suppose that the original form of CW was composed ca.

\[521\] CW, p. 4 (foreword).
\[522\] ibid. Note that BM was still undiscovered when Stokes edited CW in 1862. The widespread use of final silent –$e$ to mark a long vowel is also of particular note in CW, a rare feature in the other texts.
\[523\] The graph $sh$ is also commonly used to mean /ʃ/ in loanwords (see the following discussion).
1530–1550, as did Murdoch.\textsuperscript{526} However, in the light of Stokes’ comments, the preference shown by Nance for a date before 1540 seems highly reasonable. Further precision than this does not seem possible.

Although a large proportion of the orthography remains unmodernised, it is difficult to distinguish between the veneer of Late Cornish re-spellings of Middle Cornish and any genuine Late Cornish forms that may have been added by Jordan. Since it appears that he did not compose the play, it seems best for practical purposes to consider the extant version of CW as later than TH on the grounds of orthography, even though it was almost certainly composed rather earlier. While sound changes such as pre-occlusion are evidently Late Cornish, it should be borne in mind that palatalisation may date from either the Middle or Late Cornish periods in any given instance. Since this is impossible to resolve, it seems that there is little choice but to analyse CW at face value.

"First Palatalisation" in CW is almost entirely regular, as in the earlier texts. The verb "to have", however, is remarkably infrequent: only *nagevas "that hath not" (pres.), *an gevyth "will have" (fut.), *an geffa "may have" (pres. subj.) and *an geva "had" (pret.) are attested.\textsuperscript{527} Of these, *ny an gevyth "we shall have" and *me an gevyth "I shall have" are used incorrectly for *ny a[ga]n byth and *me am byth, showing that the dative infixed pronoun was no longer meaningful, at least if the independent subject pronoun was fronted on the analogy of such a construction with the accusative infixed pronoun before other verbs, e.g. *te an crys "you (will) believe it".\textsuperscript{528} This may have been a factor in the loss of /n/ in *nagevas, since infixed −n− was no longer a necessary semantic element and there was no barrier to its assimilation.

\textsuperscript{527} *nagevas CW 257, *an gevyth 806, 809, 911, 1180, *an geffa 681, *an geva 2043.
\textsuperscript{528} *te an crys BK 28g. Note also ef astevyth CW 1378 for *ef an gevyth, with the 3s.f. or 3pl. verb.
As expected, *dyth* "day" appears with no palatal after a range of words such as the ordinals *tryssa* "third", *peswera* "fourth", *pempas* "fifth", *sythvas* "seventh" and in the phrases *yn whea dyth* "in six days" and *nos ha dyth* "night and day". One irregular instance *an dyth* has the definite article without palatalisation, although this immediately follows *sythvas dyth* in the previous line and seems to be a hypercorrection. Otherwise, *an gyth han noos* "the day and the night", *in gyth ha noos* "day and night" and *in geth hythew* "today" regularly have a palatal, in keeping with the pattern of all of the other texts.

The examples *an Jowle*, *an iowle* "the Devil", *than Jowle* "to the Devil" and *ren iowle* "by the Devil" are regular, but the phrase *par dell osta jowle* "as thou art a devil" shows a palatal despite the lack of a phonetic cause. This may be an isolated analogical instance or alternatively an indicator that earlier *dyawl* had been entirely replaced by the palatalised form, but the evidence of one instance is too slight. As in one isolated case cited above from the Ordinalia, the plural *an thewollow*, *an thevollow* "the devils" shows initial mutation of the masculine plural after the article. The mutation would apparently render these cases immune from palatalisation, but it is interesting that it only occurs otherwise in PC. Possibly the composer of *CW* had reference to a copy of the entire Ordinalia, not merely OM.

The word *chy* "house" is only found in *CW* with the force of an adjective in the phrase *der a[n] planatis mes [h]a chy* "by the outer and inner planets" (my emendations), but this is probably a reduced form of

---

an *tryssa dyth* CW 92, in *peswera dyth* 100, in *pempas dyth* 106, in *sythvas dyth* 415, *yn whea dyth* 413, *nos ha dyth* 1669, 1731.

*an dyth* CW 416.

*an gyth han noos* CW 85, in *gyth ha noos* 1281, in *geth hythew* 2104.


*an thewollow* CW 481, 2021, *an thevollow* 2010. See the note on the Ordinalia above.

Whether the subsequent two days are missing from the cycle of which CW forms the first, or whether they were never composed as intended, the lack of general evidence for plagiarism of PC and RD is most likely explained because the author would have used this material for the missing days.
the adverb which appears also as agy(e) "within, inside", used here as an adjective.\textsuperscript{535} This must be to reduce the syllable count, which is eight even as it stands, but should be seven to fit the stanza.\textsuperscript{536} To fit the meaning it would have to read *der a[n] planatis mes [hag] a chy. It is likely that de-lenited initial /tʃ/ is intended in chy, which would seem to show that initial /tʃ/ was lenited to /dʒ/ and that the semantic link between chy "house" and agy "inside" remained meaningful to speakers after the irregular "First Palatalisation" in this word. The archaic *ty occurs in gwreghty "wife", theth wrethty "to thy wife" and in gorty "husband", probably old compounds that pre-dated the change /t/ > /t̚/ > /tʃ/ in the simplex OC. ty > MlC. chy.\textsuperscript{537}

Finally there is one instance of the second person singular imperative nyedge "fly (thou)".\textsuperscript{538} This appears to be merely a Late Cornish re-spelling of MlC. nyg cited above from OM, in which orthographical final –e is written to show a long vowel.\textsuperscript{539}

"Second Palatalisation" is extremely frequent in CW, as noted by Stokes.\textsuperscript{540} Nonetheless, spellings indicating a palatal before a front vowel are by no means universal and s also appears here, while it remains the normal graph in final position as it is in the earlier texts. However, the palatal is very frequently spelt dg instead of g.\textsuperscript{541} Since dg is less common than g, it seems probable that the Late Cornish transcriber simply re-wrote g (and possibly sometimes s) as he saw fit in Late Cornish orthography. If so, it is quite likely that most of the examples of g are

\textsuperscript{535} der a planatis mes a chy CW 1409, agye 522 (3 exx.), agy 1801 (4 exx.).

\textsuperscript{536} This does not indicate that the line was necessarily copied from another source, since the syllable count is frequently wrong in MlC. texts; no similar line is known elsewhere in any case.

\textsuperscript{537} gwreghty CW 448, theth wrethty 942, gorty 894. The first two examples cannot show the common confusion of /θ/ and /χ/, as gwreg+ty should not contain a medial spirant (cf. CF 13 gwreg ty). The trigraphs ght and iht seem to mean /g+ʃt/ > /ktl/ and the subsequent assimilation /ktl/ > /tʃt/ respectively.

\textsuperscript{538} nyedge CW 2451.

\textsuperscript{539} See § 5.8.3 above.

\textsuperscript{540} CW, p. 4 (foreword).

\textsuperscript{541} The graphs sch, sh and j also occur, but these are limited only to certain words, discussed below.
Middle Cornish graphs copied from the earlier exemplar and that palatalisation in CW by and large represents a Middle Cornish sound change, even in the later re-spellings.

There are only a few examples of the verb "to be" after the temporal particle nans "now, since" and the negative particle nyns. The form nangew "now it is, since" occurs 9 times in the 3s. of the present tense.\(^542\) The negative particle is more frequent: ny[n]gof, nyngof "I am not", nynjew, nynsew, nyngew "is not", nyngens "they are not" (pres.), nyngęza, nyngessa "there was not" (imperf.), nynges, ny[n]ges, nyngëis, ny[n] geas "there is not" (pres. existential).\(^543\) There are 29 instances, of which one is spelt with j rather than g, and s is written in only one. Otherwise, these results seem to be similar to those seen in PA, the earliest substantial text, as well as those from BK. The change of nyns → *nyn g–, it may be recalled, is oddly infrequent in the Ordinalia and BM, although palatalisation is considerably more frequent otherwise in these texts than in PA. This also appears to be the case in CW.

In other parts of the verb "to be", the palatal occurs surprisingly rarely. The verb forms ythyns i "they are" (pres.) and na vans y "that they be not" (pres. subj.) have no palatal written; likewise the locative present appears in the verb forms ythesaf, y thesaf, yethesaf "I am".\(^544\) Only the imperfect locative forms ega, eža, ythesa "there was" and the same forms in the second elements of nyngęza and nyngessa "there was not" cited above show any obvious tendency towards palatalisation.\(^545\) In fact, only ega can be taken with any certainty to contain /dʒ/. It is reasonable to

\(^542\) nangew CW 1334 (9 exx.).
\(^543\) nygof CW 615, 668, nyngof 1148, nynjew263, nynsew 1048, nyngew 1094 (6 exx.), nyngens 1456, nyngęza 2426, nyngessa 2429, nynges 425 (12 exx.), nyges 482, nyngëis 1132, ny geas 1972. The four exx. nygof (2 exx.), ny geas and ny ges are missing the n-contraction (eds. Stokes, Neuss & Hawke), but this is so infrequent, as in the other texts, that it is almost certainly through scribal error.
\(^544\) ythyns i CW 2354, na vans y 2179, ythesaf 327 (4 exx.), y thesaf 1450, yethesaf 1696.
\(^545\) ega CW 827, eža 2456, ythesa 1048 (3 exx.).
assume that *essa in nyngessa is written with double ss to make it clear that /z/ is meant.\footnote{It is difficult to see how /ss/ or /s/ could be intended, despite the discussion of tryssa above.} This is probably because the previous /zl/ in nyns had been palatalised to /dʒl/: it has been remarked above that it seems possible that Cornish speakers felt uncomfortable with a sequence of two such sounds, which are correspondingly rare. In ythesa there is every reason to assume that /zl/ is meant; the graph ʒ in nyngeʒa, eʒa is ambiguous.

It is worth remarking that the graph ʒ means /ð/ or /θ/ in CF, that ʒ is used interchangeably with th for both sounds in PA and can also mean /s/, that it can occasionally mean /j–l/ in PA, the Ordinalia and in BM and also that there are a handful of instances for /ð/ in BM.\footnote{PHC tables 410 (p. 278), 514 (p. 334), 612 (p. 369), 614 (p. 371), 622 (p. 373), 632 (p. 377), 634 (p. 378), 635 (p. 379), 642 (p. 381), 644 (p. 382).} It does not occur in BK. By contrast, the graph z is almost unknown: the place-name nazare, nazareth "Nazareth" in PC is the only frequent instance, added to bez "until" and gwrez "done" (p.pt.) in CW.\footnote{nazare PC 1111 (11 exx.), nazareth 1117; bez CW 1495, gwrez 2189.} The graph ʒ can mean /ð/ in CW, but it can also occur where /zl/ or /dʒl/ might be expected. There is no reason to suppose that it necessarily represents a palatal rather than a sibilant in these instances, except that medial [j] and [dʒ] could be considered to be close sounds. Moreover, there is a general probability that, being a kind of modified z with a tail, the graph would be likely to be used for /zl/. Given that it appears that the use of ʒ was in decline throughout the Middle Cornish period, all of the instances in CW may represent scattered unmodernised elements of the earlier orthography.

As in previous texts, no forms of the verb "to be" cause palatalisation in the final segment of mar(a)s "if" before a front vowel in CW. These include marsew "if it is", mara sewa "if he is" < *mars yw ef, marsewhy "if ye are" < *mars ough why (pres.) and marsses, marsed "if
there is" (pres. existential).\textsuperscript{549} In the case of kyns es "before" and the identical kyns es "rather than", no instances have a palatal written (cf. kyngys, kyn gys "rather than" in the Ordinalia).\textsuperscript{550} There is no change in the phonetically similar myns es "as much as", which may be compared to myng a rug du "those that God made" cited from TH above.\textsuperscript{551} However in CW, myns a golla ortha vy "those that may listen to me", ha myns assentyas genas "and those that agreed with thee" and myns a ve "those that were" show no comparable change before the relative particle.\textsuperscript{552}

The second person singular dependent pronoun gy "thou, thee" is never found as earlier MlC. sy in CW.\textsuperscript{553} Roughly two thirds of the instances are spelt as gy, gye and ge, but curiously nine cases have been apparently re-spelt as sche, she. Whereas the former group virtually always appear after a vowel or a consonant other than s, conversely the latter are found almost exclusively after s. Following inflected prepositions, this distribution is demonstrated in geso gy, thezo gye, theso gy, thag(y)e (< thys+ge) "to thee" but drethas sche "through thee", genas s(c)he "with thee", ganas she "by thee", vnas sche "in thee", ragas she "for thee"; the exception tha worthis ge "from thee" also occurs as tha worthys sche.\textsuperscript{554} It might incidentally be remarked that while z can stand for /ð/, it almost certainly means medial /z/ before a back vowel in thezo gy, theso gy. The examples thysa, thyza, thezo, theso (with no suffixed

---

\textsuperscript{549} marsew CW 731 (6 exx.), mara sewa 742, marsewhy 2166, marsses 1193, marse 1594.
\textsuperscript{550} kyns es "before" CW 508 (3 exx.), kyns es "rather than" 616 (4 exx.).
\textsuperscript{551} myns es CW 281
\textsuperscript{552} myns a golla ortha vy CW 193, ha myns assentyas genas 247, myns a ve 2483. The word also occurs with s before consonants at CW 281, 311, 1726 and in a vyns tru "of as many things" at CW 2174.
\textsuperscript{553} To fit the syllable count, the two instances of ythose (CW 396, 568) have final silent –e and seem to represent *yth os without any suffixed pronoun. The lack of any other examples confirms this.
\textsuperscript{554} geso gy CW 50, thezo gye 2253, theso gy 2363, thage 805, thagy 2349, drethas sche 243, genas sche 248, genas she 2296, ganas she 1645, vnas sche 529, ragas she 817, tha worthis ge 810, tha worthys sche 268. Note that Stokes reading tha ganas she is probably in error (not noted in the corrigenda or notes), as tha "to" occurs below in the next line. Neuss gives genas she. Consequently, it should be noted that no equivalent of B. digant MIW. y gan is attested in Cornish.
pronoun) show the same variation of \( \tilde{z} \) and \( s \). The graph \( g \) does not occur in *thyso, theso* (an emphatic form) in Middle Cornish, which is clearly distinguished from *thag(y)e < *thys ge above.

Only \( gy(e) \), \( ge \) rather than \( s(c)he \) is generally found after inflected verbs, both as subject and object: *vynta gy, vynta ge "wilt thou", del welta ge "as thou seest", me a wra gy dean a bry "I (will) make thee a man of clay", ythosta ge, ythota gy "thou art" (pres.), prag y wresta gye "why didst thou", pew athe wrug ge progowther "who made thee a preacher?" (pret.), kooll ge thym "trust me", tast gy "taste (thou)", trust gy, trestge "trust (thou)", perch ge cove "remember, bear (thou) remembrance", clow ge ow leaf "hear (thou) my voice" (imper.). The example *cuske tha ge "sleep (thou)" (imper.) contains a reduplicated pronoun representing earlier thesy, thegy. Only the instance *pew ostashe "who art thou?" < *pew os+ta+se has \( sh \) after a vowel. None of these verbal forms end in \( -s \). The same distribution of \( s(c)he \) after \( -s \) but \( gy(e) \), \( ge \) after vowels and other consonants also occurs in the possessive construction with a suffixed reinforcing pronoun. This is true before both nouns and verb-nouns: *hath place she "and thy place", tha folly gye "thy folly", tha chardge ge "to charge thee" and *y bosta ge "that thou art"; the reduplicated pronoun appears in *theth pedn \( z \)a gy < earlier MIC. thegy. The instance *hath place she is not an exception because place is merely a re-spelling of earlier MIC. *plas and final \( -e \) is merely graphemic.

Excluding the two reduplicated forms (which simply follow the conventions of the earlier texts), \( gy(e) \), \( ge \) has not been re-spelt as *sche,

---

555 thysa CW 485, thy\( \tilde{z} \)a 1163, thego 739 (3 exx.), theso 1697.
556 vynta gy CW 254, vynta ge 2319, del welta ge 274, me a wra gy dean a bry 345, ythosta ge 822, ythota gy 2324, prag y wresta gye 885, pew athe wrug ge progowther 2346, kooll ge thym 650, tast gy 831, trust gy 896, trestge 2505, perch ge cove 1215, clow ge ow leaf 1426.
557 cuske tha ge CW 384.
558 pew ostashe CW 548.
559 hath place she CW 240, tha folly gye 1013, tha chardge ge 1065, y bosta ge (a late corruption of *the vos ge with the verbal particle replacing *the "thy" and \( -ta \) added before ge), *theth pedn \( z \)a ge 916.
she except after final s. Among 32 such examples of the simple dependent pronoun, only tha worthis ge and pew ostashe break this pattern. The former may be ignored as a mere failure to re-spell, since it follows the orthographical conventions of the other texts. The latter occurs only 19 lines after vnas sche, which may have been an analogical influence; it might equally be explained as an error based on a simpler form *osche < os gy without the first suffixed pronoun –ta.\textsuperscript{560} In any case, the distribution seems to be otherwise so clear that it is likely to be significant. The most simple explanation is that the sandhi group /–z+dʒ–/ became unvoiced to /–s+t∫–/. From a phonetic point of view, it seems inherently likely that this would be further simplified to /–s+∫–/ or merely /–∫–/. There is no automatic reason to suppose that this did not happen in earlier Middle Cornish, although the orthography did not represent such sandhi effects and no firm conclusions can be drawn.

On the other hand, the word thag(y)e (TH these, thege, the gee cited above) instead shows assimilation /–z+dʒ–/ > /–dʒ–/ without devoicing. The fact that this word is extremely common does not seem sufficient to explain the different phonetic treatment in external sandhi. The discrepancy can be explained by the fact that the simplex thys is the only such inflected preposition that consists of a stressed monosyllable prior to final /z/, whereas the unstressed ultima preceded it in words such as genas and tha worthys because the stress fell on the penult. It seems quite possible that devoicing in final position began in unstressed syllables and later spread to stressed syllables. This would imply that the final /z/ of thys was generally less likely to be unvoiced in Middle Cornish, although it does not preclude the possibility in absolute final. In

\textsuperscript{560} os gy PC 417.
any event, this would go a long way to explain why palatalisation /z/ > /dʒ/ does not generally occur in final position in Middle Cornish.

When the reinforcing pronoun was added in *genas she, tha worthys sche*, there may have been a tendency, at least by the time of CW, not to restore final /z/ in these words. As a result, devoicing could occur in */s+dʒ*/ > */s+tʃ*/ > */s+ʃ/*/ (probably becoming */ʃ*/ in speech), which was spelt as */s sche/, */s she*. In support of this, it may be noted that *sch, sh* does not occur for */dʒ/ in other words in CW, since this sandhi group would not otherwise generally occur. The example *hath place she* is an interesting example because MIC. *plas* is a borrowing from Fr. *place*, in which final /ç/ may or may not by then have become /s/.⁵⁶¹ It must be assumed that MIC. *fas "face", gras "grace"* < Fr. *face, grace* could cause the same phonetic effect,⁵⁶² there are no examples of final /θ/ before /dʒ/ in CW, but it seems likely that devoicing could happen. The corollary of this theory is that *ostashe "thou art"* cannot be an error based on *os gy*, as speculated above. It is likely that *os "art"* would behave like *thys* in this regard, being a stressed monosyllable with final /z/. There is no option but to regard this as an isolated analogical case.

As in other texts, religious vocabulary provides a large amount of evidence for palatalisation. The word *blonogath, vlonogath, vlanogathe* "will" always occurs with the double metathesis of */−Vndʒ−/ > */−nVdʒ−/ and */bVln−/ > */bIVn−/ seen above in the sequence *bolungeth > bolnogeth > blonogath* from early MIC. *bolonseth.*⁵⁶³ The words *dewges, devges* "Godhead" and *drengys, drenges, drengis* "Trinity" occur only with the

---

⁵⁶¹ See § 4 above.
⁵⁶² Presumably Fr. *plas, fas and grace* were borrowed into Cornish at the same time as they were borrowed into English, which may then have influenced the retention of /s/, unless voicing of final /s/ had already occurred in Cornish. The whole issue of voicing and de-voicing is complex and variable.
palatal spelling.\textsuperscript{564} By contrast, \textit{ow fehasowe} "my sins" seems to have \textit{lz} regularly before a back vowel.\textsuperscript{565} As in the other texts, the verbs \textit{cregy(e)}, \textit{gregye} "to believe" and \textit{pegy} "to pray" provide the largest number of examples.\textsuperscript{566} In final position and before a back vowel, only \textit{s} occurs in inflected parts of the verb: \textit{my ny gresaf} "I believe not", \textit{me an creys(e)} "I believe it", \textit{me a gr(e)ys}, \textit{me a gryes} "I believe", \textit{hag a leall gryes} "that loyally believe", \textit{a greys} "that believes", \textit{me ath(e) py(e)s(e)}, \textit{me ath peys} "I pray thee", \textit{me a b(e)ys} "I pray" (pres.), \textit{creys}, \textit{creis} "believe (thou)", \textit{cresow(g)h(e)}, \textit{creseugh} "believe (ye)" (imper.).\textsuperscript{567} In the phrases \textit{in gregyans na} "in that faith" and \textit{an grydgyan[s]na}, the palatal is written \textit{g} and \textit{dg} respectively before yod; the past participle \textit{cregys} also shows a palatal before a front vowel.\textsuperscript{568} This is exactly the expected distribution of \textit{s} and \textit{g} based upon earlier texts; moreover, apart from the wider use of final silent \textit{–e}, only \textit{an grydgyan[s]na} contains a graph that could not be expected in earlier Middle Cornish texts.

There are a few examples of \textit{sengys} "held" (p.pt.) and \textit{ny syngys} "he held not" (pret.).\textsuperscript{569} Palatalisation also occurs commonly in a wider range of vocabulary in CW, including items such as \textit{enfugy}, \textit{anfugye} "harm, misfortune", \textit{canhagowe}, \textit{canhasawe} "messengers" (sing. \textit{cannas}), \textit{tha garenga} "thy love", \textit{ow harenga} "my love", \textit{an garenga}, \textit{an garenxa} "the love", \textit{in oydge} "in age", \textit{sallugye}, \textit{salugy} "to salute" and \textit{ega} "to

\textsuperscript{564} \textit{dewges} CW 6, \textit{devges} 24, \textit{drengys} 126 (3 exx.), \textit{drenes} 154 (3 exx.), \textit{drengis} 709 (3 exx.).
\textsuperscript{565} \textit{ow fehasowe} CW 1170.
\textsuperscript{566} \textit{cregy} CW 574 (BL MS. only), 638, \textit{cregye} 1602, 2359, \textit{gregye} 1026, \textit{pegy} 2207.
\textsuperscript{567} \textit{my ny gresaf} CW 2379, \textit{me an creys} 152, 829, \textit{me an creysye} 167, \textit{me a gryys} 215, \textit{me a gryys} 534, \textit{me a gryys} 749 (5 exx.), \textit{hag a leall gryes} 2127, \textit{a greys} 2328, \textit{me ath pyys} 172 (4 exx.), \textit{me athe pyese} 617, \textit{me ath pyys} 746, \textit{me athe pyys} 2333, \textit{me ath pyes} 1389, \textit{me a bys} 1399, \textit{me a bys} 2105, \textit{creys} 172 (4 exx.), \textit{creys} 279, 943, \textit{cresowh} 116, \textit{cresowhe} 225, \textit{cresowgh} 1434, \textit{creseugh} 2166.
\textsuperscript{568} \textit{in gregyans na} CW 176, \textit{an grydgyan[s]na} 2317, \textit{cregys} 526 (3 exx.).
\textsuperscript{569} \textit{sengys} CW 1438, 2237, \textit{ny syngys} 2051.
These nearly all seem to contain minor irregularities, which should be mentioned here for the sake of completeness.

Like cregeye, thagye and agye given above, anfugye and sallugye are written with final –e after a vowel. This graph often means that the preceding syllable is long in CW (and occasionally in BM and BK), but is itself silent like final –e in English and French (evidently the origin of the graph in Cornish). However, in anfugye (cf. anfusy in BM) and sallugye (also salugy) it does not show length, so it is possible that these spellings indicate that unstressed final /–I/ had been lowered to /–je/ (or schwa /–ja/), but that the palatal quality of the vowel was preserved by developing semi-consonantal /j/. This may also be seen in the monosyllable yees "corn" with apparent /i:/ > /je:/.

The word ega (W. udo B. yudal) has a final back vowel that does not seem to be the result of lowering. The previous vowel shows the Late Cornish sound change /y:/ > /i:/ and subsequent lowering, probably representing /e:/ [e.], so this word can be shown to be phonologically part of the LC. corpus of CW, revised by Jordan in 1611. That is not to say whether or not the unrevised form was originally represented with a palatal spelling (that is, whether, say *uga or *usa was written), a point that can obviously not be reconstructed. More importantly, the only observable cause for palatalisation seems to be the preceding rounded front vowel, since the phoneme is followed by a back vowel.

The example in oydge Mic. oys (W. oed B. oad V. oed) is one of the rare cases of final /d/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ in the Middle Cornish plays where the palatal is written in final position (compare cryge in TH above). A
further case is *falge* in BM, although this shows a slightly different sequence of changes /lt/ > /ls/ > /lz/ > /ldʒ/. The instance in BM occurs in the line *in oydge me ew in orma* "in age I am now..." and appears to be exceptional. It seems reasonable to suppose that this is a Late Cornish form and that it may indicate that palatalisation could commonly occur in final position in Late Cornish, which is discussed further below.

The words *garenga*, *garensa* "love" and *canhagowe*, *canhasawe* "messengers" show the variation of *s* and *g* seen in the earlier texts. The former example conforms entirely to the usual Middle Cornish orthography. The form *canhagowe*, however, is unexpected. It may not be significant that it rhymes with *aradowe* "commands" < *arhadow*, since half-rhymes are common in Cornish verse. However, there is no trace of *yod* or a former front vowel following the palatal. As well as *ow fehasowe* cited above (W. *pechod* B. *pec'hed*), this may be compared with *cosow*, *cossowe* "woods" (W. *coed* B. *koad*), *esowe* "(types of) corn, corns" (sing. *yees* W. *ŷd* B. *ed*), *lagasowe* "eyes" (W. *llygad* B. *lagad*) with the same plural ending. It is nonetheless the only such exception and must be considered suspect as a genuine Middle Cornish example.

A number of instances of *s* occur before etymological front vowels, *gollousacke* "powerful" < earlier *galosek* above, *logosan* "mouse" < *logosen* (W. *llygoden* B. *logodenn*), *pensevicke* "prince" (OC. *pendeuig* W. *pendefig* B. *piñvidik*), *whansack* "wishful" < *whansek* (W. *chwant* B c’hoant). Two instances of *tryssa* "third" (W. *trydydd*, *trydedd* B. *trede*) have the usual MiC. graph *ss* (cf. *trege* in RD above, the only exception). This should represent /z/ but may have been devoiced to /s/, as discussed above – although the reason is unknown.

---

574 *gollousacke* CW 13 (here final –e does not indicate a long vowel and is meaningless), *logosan* 407, *pensevicke* 120, *whansack* 1794.
The graph ss also occurs in ganssy "with her", also gansy, gensy (W. ganddi MIW. gent(h)i B. ganti), which may show a failure to voice /ns/ > /nz/ because of the perception that the form was gans+hy "with+her" with /z+h/ > /ss/.

This word never has a palatal in Middle Cornish, despite the following front vowel. No palatal would be expected in any case before a back vowel in ganso, gansa, ganʒa, gonsa, gonʒa "with him", again demonstrating that the graph ĺ probably meant /z/.

The verb-noun gasa "to leave" (MIC. gasa, gage, gase W. gadael MIW. gadu) occurs with medial s and me a ase (with silent final –e, for the metre) has expected s in final position. The fact that gage is found in PC may indicate that the vowel of the verbal ending was lowered from an earlier front vowel. This is similar to wosa, woʒa "after" for earlier wose, wosa, woge, wege (W. wedi MIW. gwedi B. goude). It is likely from the use of ĺ elsewhere in CW that woʒa had /z/, although in this instance there is no way to be certain that it did not indicate a palatal. The word kensa, kynsa (W. cyntaf B. kentañ) has /z/ after a nasal element and a preceding front vowel. It may be the following back vowel that apparently protected it form palatalisation in all of the extant texts.

Where the affected phoneme occurs before yod, the palatal is nearly always written: devidgyow "sheep" may be compared with dewysyow cited above [BM] and mar(r)udgian, marodgian "marvels" with varthegyon [OM] varthegyon [PC], marthug(g)ian, marthussyan [JT] and ma[r]vgian, marvgion [SA]. Other than the fact that dg is written instead of g, the forms found in CW are entirely within the normal

575 ganssy CW 1338 (3 exx.), gansy 373, gensy 2462. This was not an unreasonable perception, although it is not historically accurate. Loss of i-affection is beginning to occur here.
576 ganso CW 294 (6 exx.), gansa 160, ganʒa 734, 1566, gonsa 604, gonʒa 1583. The first ex. is spelt as in most earlier texts, while the lowering i-ol > i-ɔl and the metathesis of vowels in gonsa, gonʒa is paralleled in TH. See T.Z. Chaudhri, A Description of the Middle Cornish Tregear Manuscript, pp. 37-8.
577 gasa CW 1968, me a ase 370.
578 wosa CW 1936, woʒa 1271 (8 exx.).
orthography of Middle Cornish. The only other indicator that these are later spellings is the loss of /θ/ in mar(r)udgyan, marodgyan that also occurs in SA. The example ny bydgyaf "I will not endure" < *ny besyaf has was mentioned above (cf. hy a begyas "it lasted" in PA).\textsuperscript{580} This can be shown to contain /dz/ < /z/ by rag trega in ioy a beys "to live in lasting joy" in BM, in which final yod is lost and palatalisation was apparently avoided. The example me a sewsye "I would follow" (pluperf. cond.) is not directly comparable because it does not contain /z/ < /d/.\textsuperscript{581} The verb-noun sewye "to follow" and ruth veyr a dus an sewyas "a great throng of people followed him" in PA show that the stem is *sewy-.\textsuperscript{582} It is not clear whether the pluperfect marker –s– /s/ had been voiced to /z/ when CW was composed. It is also worth noting that yod follows –s– due to metathesis *sewyse > sewsye motivated by the difficulty of articulating the cluster /–wjs–/. It may also have avoided palatalisation because –s– retained a morphophonemic value in distinguishing the pluperfect from the otherwise identical imperfect tense, i.e. *me an sewye.

This probably also explains why the pluperfect conditional ny vynsan "I would not", mensan, (y) fensan "I would", y fynses "thou wouldst", a vynsa "he, she, it would" and me a umsens "I consider myself" do not show a palatal in CW.\textsuperscript{583} Likewise, the preterite is marked by –s– in the examples neb a glowses "whom thou heardest" and na bredersys "thinkest thou not" (MlB. –sot > ModB. –jout).\textsuperscript{584} The past participles dowesy "chosen" (earlier dywysys, verb-noun dywys W. dewis), plesys "pleased" (verb-noun plesya W. plesio) and the adjective

\textsuperscript{579} marudgyan CW 1765, marrudgyan 2124, marodgyan 1876, 1898.
\textsuperscript{580} ny bydgyaf CW 1364, 1509, 1670.
\textsuperscript{581} me a sewsye CW 673.
\textsuperscript{582} sewye PA 116b, ruth veyr a dus an sewyas 108d.
\textsuperscript{583} ny vynsan CW 670, 700, mensan 1110, y fensan 1127, fensan 1264 (particle missing), y fynses 216, a vynsa 1129, 2357, me a umsens (Neuss) me a vinsens (Stokes) 280. Stokes’ reading of the latter gives poor sense. Although it can be difficult to distinguish u and v, his reading suggests MS. vmsens.
\textsuperscript{584} neb a glowses CW 770, na brederys 308.
false "false" also contain /s/\(^{585}\). This latter always occurs as falge in BM, cited above. Given that /s/ > /z/ is occasionally found with palatalisation elsewhere, e.g. martesen, marthussyan. It is surprising that /s/ is not voiced to /z/ and palatalised in CW in any examples. The words with s for etymological /s/ are too few to conclude that CW was composed before /s/ was voiced to /z/. Moreover, examples such as martegen in PC above show that /s/ could be palatalised even in the early Middle Cornish period. It is possible that CW is conservative in this regard, but it may equally be coincidence that no sporadic instances occur.

From a Middle Cornish perspective, frequent silent final –e, the graph ʒ/z/, the occasional LC. graph dg for /dʒ/ and pre-occlusion are the only especially abnormal features of the orthography of CW. It is highly likely that Jordan simply altered many instances of g to dg as he re-spelt words according the phonology of Late Cornish. However, features such as the increasing tendency to lower front vowels, for instance, occurs in BM and BK. It is therefore difficult to say how much LC. content there may be in CW, since there is no absolute distinction between the two in many instances. By and large, however, it seems that these orthographical revisions have left a great deal of Middle Cornish in the text. As far as palatalisation is concerned, it is not markedly more common in CW than in the other plays, or in the homilies, leaving many words unaffected.

5.9.5 Summary of the Late Middle Cornish Evidence

The distribution of spellings indicating a palatal in the latter half of the Middle Cornish period clearly follows closely the pattern seen in the earlier documents, although in general such spellings are considerably

\(^{585}\) dowesys CW 1403 (cf. dywysys PC 228, dywys 2183), plesys 1782 (cf. plesya BM 166), fals 1704. It might be noted that ny bleig thym "it pleases me not" CW 747 and mar pleag "(if you) please" 755 are
more common overall even than is true of PC and RD in the Ordinalia, which have palatal spellings more often than in PA and OM. The same distinction between "First Palatalisation" and "Second Palatalisation" seems to be valid, although BM and TH show early signs of confusion in the use of orthographical ns for the results of the former change. This does not necessarily undermine the separate treatment of the two sound changes in this work. The examples nynsefeth (BM), nynsevith (TH) for nyngewith "will not have" and nyn sevas (TH) for nyn gevas "had not" are such rare and comparatively late instances of s, where only g should have been expected, that it seems certain that they are merely hypercorrections for /dʒ/, based on later confusion of the sounds. Had the words affected by “First Palatalisation” participated in “Second Palatalisation” instead, they would have been expected to show assibilation in the earlier texts instead. Considering that the reverse is true, i is unlikely therefore that this s in forms such as nynsevith represented phonetic [z], but on the contrary showed that s for earlier /z/ often represented [dʒ] as the reflex of "Second Palatalisation". To this may be compared hobersen.

The question of whether the results of "First Palatalisation" /d/ > /d'/ > /dʒ/ and "Second Palatalisation" /z/ > /z'/ > /dʒ/ fell together entirely in later Middle Cornish, at least in certain positions, essentially revolves around the phonetic value of s before front vowels. The fact that j and i are found for s rather than g only in certain positions is also an important problem, especially since this is a spelling mostly associated with "First Palatalisation" throughout the Middle Cornish period. In the phonemes /ns/ and /ls/, the continued rarity of palatalisation appears to be dependent on prior voicing to /nz/, /lz/ and is therefore related to the much more frequent instances of palatalisation of the phoneme /z/ < /s/ in

irrelevant here because they contain /g/, cf. mar plek BM 306 etc. with devoiced final /g/ > /k/.
the later Middle Cornish texts than in the Ordinalia above. It may be added that the palatalisation of final /lz/ (< /ls/) in BM is of particular significance because palatalisation is not otherwise a feature normally found in final position in Middle Cornish, with rare exceptions. These and other points of interest are summarised in the following sections.

i. First Palatalisation /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/

Apart from a few irregular exceptions that appear to confirm the rule, "First Palatalisation" /d/ > /d´/ > /dʒ/ occurs universally as expected in the verb "to have", the words d(e)yth "day" and dyawl, deawl "devil" after the definite article and in the stem of the verb nyge "to fly". There are apparently no significant phonological developments in words affected by this sound change in the late Middle Cornish texts that were not already found in PA and the Ordinalia. However, the various irregular instances are worth considering here, as well as the orthographical representation of /dʒ/ in late Middle Cornish.

The examples nyn sefeth, nyn sevith and nyn sevas have been mentioned above and may perhaps be considered as regular examples, from a phonological point of view, despite the use of hypercorrect orthographical ns for /dʒ/. More instructive is me an darvith in BK, which shows that "First Palatalisation" did not occur before back vowels. The normal graph before front vowels is g in examples such as nyn gevas, ren geffo, although J occurs in a few cases such as an Jeffa, (n)an Jevas and an Jevith in TH just as it does in the Ordinalia. That this graph was abandoned in all but a handful of cases in the later texts probably indicates that it does not indicate a special, rare treatment /d´/ > /j/ but is merely an alternative graph for /dʒ/. If the fricative quality of the sound
had occasionally been lost, this would be expected to be a subsequent development, yet it is apparently an early spelling convention that seems to have increasingly fallen into disuse in this verb.

The use of initial J likewise does not occur in examples of the word d(e)yth with palatalisation in BK, BM or CW, although there are only seven examples with g, of which vngyth in BK and vn geth in BM follow the numeral "one" and the remainder follow the definite article or the preposition in "in" compounded with it. There are six examples with J in TH, while g does not occur in this word. The three examples in dith hethew, in dith hethow "today" are irregular in their failure to show a palatal and may be compared to yn deyth dyweth "in the last day" and an dyth "the day" in CW. The former has been explained as the result of alliteration and the latter as due to the influence of an sythvas dyth "the seventh day" in the preceding line, so these instances in TH seem also to be rare hypercorrections. The three instances of vn dyth "one day" in TH may be compared with the three of vn deyth in the Ordinalia and apparently represent a genuine variation with vn ge(y)th. It is probable that the palatal did not originally occur after vn "one" but sometimes occurred by analogy with the instances following the definite article.

Conversely, the word deawl, dyawl "devil" occurs with J and j after the definite article in BK, i in BM and J, i and j in CW (it does not occur after the article in TH). However, instances such as an Jowle occur here where capitalisation is conventional in English "the Devil" and French "le Diable". This is effectively a proper noun after the definite article (cf. W. yr Iesu "Jesus") in these languages and the retention of the graph J and its variants reflects a growing tendency in the later texts towards the modern use of capitalisation. The Ordinalia, by comparison, uses initial j, i and g interchangeably in perceived initial position in words affected by "First Palatalisation". It is evident that /dʒ/ did not lose its fricative quality to
become /j/ in these instances, since such a sound change would have had to have been reversed in order for g to predominate in the later texts. The spelling J in rare even in TH and is evidently a mere alternative orthographical practice to that of BK, BM and CW.

It appears from an dythyow in BK (cf. an deʒyow in the Ordinalia) and an dywolow in TH (cf. an dewolow, an dywolow in the Ordinalia) that these plurals never had a palatal in Middle Cornish and were not affected by analogy with the singular noun in either case. It has been noted that the stress in dewolow was on the syllable following /dV–l/ and that consequently the vowel may have been relatively lax compared to the vowel in the singular word. It may be added that the plural seems to be a development of unattested *an dyawlow with metathesis (and consequent rounding /a/ > /o/ after /w/) →–awl–l > →–wol–l/. The singular is monosyllabic in Middle Cornish according to the syllable count in examples such as ty dyowl gvra ow gortheby "thou devil answer me" in the Ordinalia, but OC. diauol (W. diafol, diawl B. diaoul) was probably three syllables. The yod in dyowl was apparently earlier a half-long vowel /i:/ and was reduced to short /I/ (or perhaps realised as short [I]) in the plural dywolow, dewolow, perhaps later /ε/. The plural never therefore had yod after /d/ as did the singular. By contrast, the stress fell on the syllable /dV–l/ in an dythyow, probably containing /eI/ > /iː:/ in the singular and shortened to /I/ in the plural (hence the spelling an deʒyow in the Ordinalia). This lowering seems to have been enough to avoid palatalisation, perhaps assisted by the rarity of the phrase.

Lastly, the imperative nyedge "fly (thou)" in CW is an apparently regular, albeit rare, example of "First Palatalisation" /d/ > /d`/ > /dʒ/ in

---

586 ty dyowl gvra ow gortheby OM 301, diauol Voc. Corn. 390.
587 For the PrimC. or early OC. diphthongisation of /i:/ > /eI/ before /th/ (cf. B. deiz "day", neiz "nest" etc.), see PHC § 7.2.3, p. 124. It seems that MIC. /eI/ was sporadically monophthongised again.
final position before earlier yod. It has been argued above (§ 5.8.4 ii.) that this is not in fact an irregular instance, even though "First Palatalisation" does not normally occur in final position. On the basis of the cognates W. neidio B. nijal there is every reason to suppose that the word was /nI:dj/ in Old Cornish and that consequently early palatalisation did occur.

**ii. First Palatalisation /t/ > /t´/ > /t∫/ in chy "house"**

The palatal ch /t∫/ is entirely regular and occurs virtually universally in the simplex noun MlC. chy < OC. ti in BK, BM, TH and CW just as in the earlier texts. The form –ty is limited to the compounds gwreghty "wife" and gorty "husband" in CW. The curious form colgy "college" ostensibly contains –gy on the pattern of –sy, –gy in place-names ("Second Palatalisation") but was evidently adapted from Fr. collège, perhaps through Middle English. It is not clear from the orthography whether ch /t∫/ was lenited to /dʒ/ in examples such as in e chy "in his house" or the Chy an Govr heb paraw "to the peerless man's house". That lenition was indeed possible is suggested by a gy, agy(e) and the variant achy in BM and TH (SA), as well as wargy "inwards" in TH (JT). Additional evidence occurs in the extended mes a gy "outside" (lit. "out of the house") in BK. This probably shows that mes a chy has the identical meaning in CW, although mes [h]a chy "inner and outer" is formally possible and would explain the lack of written mutation. This is not a problem, however, since achy for agy must have had /dʒ/ even though it was not spelt accordingly. Overall, this evidence seems enough to link OC. *a di > MlC. agy, achy (and OC. *war di > MlC. wargy)

---

588 See the archaic yn ow thy a piyadow PC 334, discussed by N.J.A. Williams, "Four Textual Notes on the Middle Cornish Drama", BBCS 22 (1966-8), p. 237. As a unique exception, it proves the rule.
589 The spirant mutation was no doubt rendered impossible by palatalisation.
showing "First Palatalisation" /d/ > /d’/ > /dʒ/ with the parallel change /t/ > /t’/ > /tʃ/ in the voiceless phoneme, despite the fact that the latter only occurs in OC. ti > MIC. chy. It is reasonable to deduce that chy is a regular example and that the two sound changes were contemporary, as speculated at § 5.8.4 ii. It is probable then that in e chy meant /m ə dʒi:/ and that the initial lenition of /t/-/d/ in this word in Old Cornish developed to /t’/-/d’/ and thence to /tʃ’/-/dʒ/.

**iii. Second Palatalisation /z/ > /z’/ > /dʒ/**

The change /z/ > /z’/ > /dʒ/ occurs in an even wider range of words in the later texts than it does in the Ordinalia. The spelling g is almost always found in place of s within the context of a front vowel or yod. The variant spellings i and j for the palatal are dealt with separately below and comments about g should in the meantime be taken to include these spellings (and dg in CW) in the following discussion. The distribution of palatal spellings before yod is also slightly different from that found before front vowels and will also be addressed separately.

The extent of palatalisation before front vowels, however, varies somewhat between these four texts: in BK, g is considerably more common than s, although not universal; in BM, the distribution of g and s is roughly equal; in the twelve homilies of TH (JT), palatals are written noticeably less frequently, while in the catena (SA) that replaces the expected thirteenth homily, g is the usual graph; in CW, g (and the LC. re-spelling dg) again predominates over s. However, there is no text in which s is entirely unknown before front vowels. It seems that the distribution of g rather than s does not increase steadily in the chronological sequence of the texts but was instead somewhat variable.
accoridng to the habits of individual scribes. This may represent different
levels of orthographical conservatism, or else it may equally show a
variation in the level to which palatalisation was realised in the speech of
different individuals. These two tendencies may both have occurred to
varying degrees, so the best available method would seem to be to take
spellings at face value as written, whilst accepting that they may not
always be an unequivocal guide.

Conversely, the general absence of graphs indicating a palatal
before back vowels, except in words like ega where other factors towards
palatalisation can be deduced, is only to be expected. It is no defence to
say that g was unavailable because it meant /g/ in such positions, for three
reasons: (1) the graph g could mean /g/ before front vowels too, in
addition to /dʒ/, but its use for the latter was not a difficulty, because the
scribes were native speakers and understood better than modern scholars
can which sounds were to be represented; (2) moreover, even if g were
felt to be unavailable, both i and j were clearly available for palatal
sounds from the earliest period of palatalisation (e.g. nyn io in PA) until
the fifteenth century (e.g. grajak in BK); (3) the fact that nyn go appears
proves that the graph was indeed available for a palatal before back
vowels. It does not matter in the slightest that two of the examples above
are actually of “First Palatalisation”, since the important point is that the
graph g could demonstrably mean a palatal before a back vowel. If
“Second Palatalisation” was as early and as complete as “First
Palatalisation”, one would expect to see it used for the palatal sounds far
more frequently. It is telling that this is not the case.

An exception to this distribution in BM but not in BK, TH and CW
is that palatal spellings appear to be inexplicably rare in the verb "to be"
before front vowels, especially in the final /z/ of the particles nyns and
nans. In this regard, BM is similar to the Ordinalia, while such forms in
PA nearly always has g despite the rarity of palatal spellings elsewhere in that text. The reason for this exception being limited to the Ordinalia and BM is unclear. It may be due to deliberate archaism on the part of the two scribes, although why this should be limited in this way is also somewhat mysterious. There is very little else in the orthography to link these two documents that would not also be in common with BK and the unmodernised parts of CW. Neither is it obvious why a spelling that is so common in the verb “to be” in PA should only re-surface much later.

The absence of palatal spellings of the final /z/ in *mars* "if" before front vowels is a feature of the entire Middle Cornish period and seems to be a systematic exception to palatalisation that has not been remarked upon previously in any study. This is made clear by the absence of forms such as **marg, **mar g– even in the later texts. It so happens that /rz/ < /rd/ must have been extremely uncommon in Middle Cornish and that there are no instances of rg for rs.\footnote{590} This is largely because Brit. /rt/ was never voiced to /rd/ but was later spirantised to /r0/.\footnote{591} The group /rd/ in OC. *mard > MIC. mars (B. mard) apparently came about by contraction of SWBr. *ma "if" plus the perfective particle *ro plus the verbal particle *it.\footnote{592} It is nonetheless odd that instances such as marsyw always have s while nangev, nangew have g.\footnote{593} Although hobersen "haubergeon" in RD and Na gorsy "curse (thou) not" in BK have been explained respectively as a hypercorrection and an instance of /s+z/ > /ss/, it is possible that

\begin{footnotes}
\item 590 This remarks ignores loanwords that appear to contain /–rdʒ–/ and /–rz–/, e.g. scorgye "to scourge" (PA 130c) and boclers "bucklers" respectively, since these are not from /rd/. Note that /rz/ < /rs/ is never palatalised, but palatalisation of /z/ < /s/ is relatively rare and is dealt with separately below.
\item 592 The origin of CB. mar(d) is obscure, see Roparz Hemon, "A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton", Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975, § 198, notes 1 & 2, pp. 296-7. The etymology given here is derived from Hemon's but it seems clear that PrimC. *rit* is present in mars (see § 5.8.2).
\item 593 The fact that g may occur before back vowels in nango etc. in PA (see § 5.8.2) is dealt with above separately, but the evidence is clear that nans may show a palatal while mars apparently may not.
\end{footnotes}
palatalisation of /z/ was blocked after /r/ and that these loanwords may show this failure by analogy. This is an especially difficult question because there is no evidence other than *mars* in native words from which to draw any conclusions.

It has been suggested above that preceding /n/ before /z/ is a contributing factor towards palatalisation in words such as *kerense, kerenga* "love" and *bolungeth* "will". While /n/ and /l/ may be palatal [n´] and [l´] in such environments, the question of whether /r/ may have been palatalised depends upon its phonetic realisation. While retroflex [ɾ] could perhaps have a palatal counterpart [ɾ´], it is difficult to see from a phonetic point of view how an alveolar tap [ɾ] or trill [R] could be articulated with the blade of the tongue close to the hard palate because this would render it impossible for the tip of the tongue to tap or trill against the alveolus. It seems likely therefore that /ɾ/, if realised as an apical sound of this sort, would tend to make palatalisation of a following /z/ difficult or impossible. It would then follow that *hobersen* contained /z/ because speakers found it difficult to pronounce a palatal after /ɾ/, not because /s/ meant /dʒ/. The meaning of *Na gorsy* is questionable, but it could represent a unique failure in BK to write *gy* "thou, thee", rather than the earlier form *sy*, as a result of the preceding /ɾ/. An alternative possibility is described at § 5.9.1. It may be added, nonetheless, that this theory tends to reinforce the remarks made about the probable apical quality of /ɾ/ made at § 5.2 above, although there is no absolute evidence. In any event, the complete lack of palatalisation in *mars* before front vowels, in stark contrast to the treatment of *nyns, nans* and *res*, seems to be so exceptional that it demands a phonetic explanation.

Whether /z/ and /dʒ/ fell together entirely in later Middle Cornish is unlikely because (1) if "Second Palatalisation" did not generally occur in
contact with back vowels then /z/ remained distinct at least in certain positions (2) even in contact with front vowels, the spelling s is still so common, especially in BM and TH, that it seems unlikely that it merely a spelling for /dʒ/ in all instances (3) if speakers remained aware that s meant /z/ before back vowels, the free variation of s and g before etymological front vowels in words such as devgys, devsys and crege, cresy within the space of a few lines presumably means that varying degrees of palatalisation were in practice applied by different speakers or even by the same speaker on different occasions. This seems inherently likely because the level of phonetic motivation for palatalisation would not have been identical in all words but must have depended on the surrounding sounds. The final vowel in anfusy > anfugy was probably more likely to cause "Second Palatalisation" than the less close vowel in gase > gage. Ignoring occasional orthographical confusion of e with y and i, this is generally borne out by the more frequent occurrence of s before e than before y. For example, words in BK with earlier /z/ plus the suffix –yk have g in six cases and the compromise graph sg once but never have s, yet the suffix –ek, –ak is preceded by g twice and its variant j seven times compared to s fifteen times. Since a phoneme may represent a range of close sounds that are not meaningfully different for a speaker, slight variations in articulation could determine whether the phoneme was realised as [z], [ʒ] or [dʒ] in any given instance and consequently whether s or g seemed to be the most appropriate graph on that occasion. It is difficult to say exactly how high a front vowel needed to be in order to cause palatalisation, as this was evidently highly variable. However, it may be remarked that the higher the vowel, the closer it would be to

594 devgys BM 884, devsys 889, crege TH 19.14, cresy 19a.16
alveolar-palatal articulation. Equally, back vowels are not articulated near the hard palate, so would not participate.

This conclusion might reasonably be open to doubt in the light of the acknowledgement given above that the level of orthographical conservatism may also have been variable. This could even have been true within a single document if a scribe had generally conservative inclinations in spelling but occasionally forgot himself, or conversely if he generally represented contemporary speech as he heard it but sometimes used traditional spellings. It is impossible to find evidence that could not be potentially coloured by such considerations. It is therefore highly significant that differential distributions of $g$ and $s$, such as the example of $-yk$ and $-ek$ given above, tend to show that there was a phonological rather than a purely orthographical motivation behind the spellings that the Middle Cornish scribes selected.

This is seen most clearly in the distribution of $g$ and $s$ for $/z^j/ < /zl < /d/ \text{ before yod.}$ The word $cregyans$, $crygyans$ "belief" and its derivatives $dyscregyans$, $dyscrygyans$ "unbelief" are found in a bewildering array of spellings in Middle Cornish, but nevertheless the only example that does not have $g$ is $crisgians$ in TH (JT) with an intermediate graph (comparable only to $sethisgyk$ in BK above). It may be a testament to the sporadic nature of palatalisation that the only exception dates from the very end of the Middle Cornish period rather than an early text, although this may equally represent an attempted hypercorrection like $nyn sevith$ above. That both $s$ and $g$ occurred in the related $cresy$, $crygy$ makes it likely that a form $^*cresyans$ existed before palatalisation, that is to say "Second Palatalisation $/zj/ > /dʒj/$. It is unlikely (although formally possible) that this represents "First Palatalisation" $/dj/ > /dʒj/ \text{ in a form OC.} \quad **credias,$ since the verbal stem must presumably have been the
The simplex form and a sibilant often occurs even before a front vowel in *cresy, crysy* "to believe". The same comments apply to the early Middle Cornish example *dyscrygyon* "unbelievers" in the Ordinalia.

Other examples of *g* before yod are less open to the doubt that prior assimilation had not taken place. Late Middle Cornish examples cited above at § 5.9.1-4 include *clevegow* "diseases" (sing. *cleveys* W. *clefyd* B. *kleñved*), *cowgegyow* "inner thoughts" (W. *ceudod*), *golvygyen* "lights" (sing. *golowys* W. *golau* B. *gouloù*), and *preggyow* "meals" (sing. *prys* W. *pryd* B. *pred*) in BM and *skyggyow* "shoes" (LC. *esgizoù* W. *esgidiau*) and *spyrygian* "spirits" (sing. *spyrys* W. *ysbryd* B. *spered*) in TH (JT).

The word *dewysyov* "sheep" (W. *defaid* B. *deñved*) in BM has *s* but occurs again as *devidgyow* with the palatal spelling *dg* in CW. It is possible that *canhagow* "messengers" (sing. *cannas* W. *cennad* B. *kannad*) in CW is merely a variant of *canhasawe* in the same text, but had *-yow* with yod rather than *-ow*. The word *marthug(g)ian*, *marthussyan* [JT] and *ma[r]vgian*, *marvgian* [SA] "wonders" in TH, also *marodgyan*, *mar(r)udgyan* in CW, is one of only two words with /dʒ/ from /z/ < /s/ to show a palatal before yod in Middle Cornish, as demonstrated by the alternative plural *marthusow* (MIW. *marth* B. *marzhus*), although *varthogyon*, *varthegyon* in the Ordinalia show that this was not an especially late development. The same seems to have occurred in *aflythygyon* in the Ordinalia (cf. *avlethis* in CW), which apparently had earlier /z/ < /sl/. Other early Middle Cornish examples *hy a begyas* in PA (cf. *rag trega in ioy a beys* in BM) and *govegyon*, *govygyon* "sorrow, care, regret" in the Ordinalia (W. *gofid*) have been cited at § 5.8.2-4 above. Only two of the instances have *s* before yod, yet almost all of the instances with *g* (or *gg*) can be shown to be derived from singular or other

---

595 The exx. *kerengyek*, *kernsyak* etc. in TH cited at § 5.9.3 are not included because it is likely from the spellings listed above that the word remained trisyllabic (<*kerensethek*) and did not have yod.
simplex forms that also occur with final s /z/ < /d/. The phoneme /s/ must have been voiced early to /z/ in marthussyan, marthug(g)ian and aflythygyon for the forms with g and gg to have appeared throughout the Middle Cornish period. This may indicate that "New Lenition" happened sporadically throughout much of the history of the language on a word by word basis. The important point is that a phonetic cause can be shown to be responsible for the distribution of palatal and sibilant spellings, not mere orthographical conservatism. If this lesson is applied to the variation between s and g before front vowels as well as yod, the idea that s was no more than an archaic spelling in such positions seems to be flawed.

The spellings i and j for the palatal sound are normally features of "First Palatalisation" rather than "Second Palatalisation" in Middle Cornish. It has been noted at § 5.9.5 i. above that there is no reason to believe that this represents a phonological development rather than merely an orthographical practice. However, these graphs are found as occasional variants of g in instances of "Second Palatalisation". The practice of writing nyn iough "ye are not", nyn io "was not" in PA for nyn sough and nyn so, nyn go does not occur subsequently except perhaps in the lone example nynjew for nyngew, nynsew in CW, although this is more likely to be a Late Cornish re-spelling that happens to coincide with the practice in PA. The idea that g /dʒ/ lost its fricative quality to become i /j/, only for this to be later reversed and g restored, has been rejected under the comments on "First Palatalisation" and need not be reiterated here. This tends to suggest that i and j were always mere orthographical variants of g /dʒ/ rather than a separate sound change.

This idea seems to be undermined, however, by the fact that i and j by and large occur for s and g in only a very limited and distinct
distribution of words. The examples besadow in [PA], pyiadow, piyadow "prayer" and ow fysadow "my prayer" [Ordinalia] have been noted as the only cases in the early texts of Middle Cornish (§ 5.7.2-3 above). Despite the frequent occurrence of g in inflected parts of pesy, pegy "to pray", this pattern continues in the spellings pejadaw, pejadow, pyjadow, peiadow in BK, peyadov (once corrected from piiadov), peyadow, peiadow, peiadov in BM and pesadow [JT & SA], peiadow [SA] in TH (§ 5.8.1-3 above). There are no spellings of this word with g. The form with s is a mere occasional variant, although it is found throughout the Middle Cornish period. The other seven instances of j for g and s occur in BK before the ending –ak < –ek. The words rajak "of grace" (twice), grajak "grateful", lagajak "big-eyed" (twice), thekhyskajak [possibly for *then kvskajak "to the sleepy one"] and marthojek "marvellous" have been cited at § 5.8.1 above. The graph g occurs in gallogak "powerful" and torgak "anyone" (lit. "a footed one") and s occurs in fifteen examples. Of these, grajak and marthojek must show /s/ > /z/ > /dʒ/ while the remainder derive regularly from the previously assibilated phoneme /d/ > /l/ > /dʒ/.

It is initially difficult to see why *pegadow should not have occurred, since the graph g is allowed before an orthographic back vowel in ega "was", ow huga "screaming" and carenga "love". It may be observed that this is rare in the early texts and only occurs in the later texts when –a(−) in the final syllable resulted from the lowering of the vowel or its reduction to schwa. This, however, is not the case in peiadow, pejadaw, in which medial /a/ occurs in the stressed syllable. The very fact that there is no comparable instance tends to suggest that this was merely an orthographical feature rather than a change /dʒ/ > /j/.

596 It is likely that the example pletheya ef in BK (§ 5.8.1) is merely a miscopying of *plethega ef.
Traditional orthography did not apparently tolerate *g* for the palatal before a back vowel. This is probably the reason for *nyn iough, nyn io* in PA, although this restriction was entirely abandoned in the verb "to be" by the time of the Ordinalia, allowing the spelling *nyn go* as an exception to the normal rule. This was already an alternative spelling in PA. The only remaining difficulty with *peiadow* is that there is no obvious cause for palatalisation, especially since *s* is not generally replaced by *g* by analogy in inflected forms of *pesy* "to pray" where /z/ stands before a back vowel. Perhaps *pesadow* represents a form without yod before the suffix *–adow*, while the more frequent forms with *i* and *j* represent a form with added yod. This would explain the high frequency of palatalisation which is characteristic after yod. Nonetheless, it seems likely that yod was analogical rather than original in this word.

These conclusions are supported by the fact that *rajak, grajak, lagajak* and *theikhyskajak* all show apparent lowering of the vowel in the ending *–ek > –ak*, although the spelling *marthojek* is exceptional. The forms *gallogak* and *torgak* also break the pattern, but in general it seems that the rule was abstracted in BK to apply occasionally to back vowels which were the result of lowering as well as original back vowels in words such as *pejadaw*. It seems that this was a feature limited to the scribal practice of BK, which otherwise conforms largely to the normal orthography of Middle Cornish. Again, the very fact that these spellings are rare and not repeated in other texts indicates that they are probably mere orthographical variants. In short, it does not seem that a sound change /dʒ/ > /j/ occurred.

---

597 This was probably a plural OC. *pedad–ou* that was taken to be singular and was then re-interpreted as containing *–adow* W. *–adwy*. Assibilation was presumambly by analogy with the verbal stem *pes–*. See § 5.7.2 above.

598 The orthography is nonetheless distinctive in some ways, notably *–aw* for *–ow* in the plural.
Apart from marthussyan, marthug(g)ian, grajak and marthojek already mentioned, palatalisation of /z/ < /s/ in medial position occurs in a few instances in all of the late Middle Cornish texts. The infrequency of this is probably down to the fact that New Lenition (or medial voicing) was sporadic. If it did not occur, neither could the phoneme fall together allophonically with /z/ and undergo palatalisation. This was also the case in words with /ns/ and /ls/, such as nanssow. However, that it could occur, is shown by falge and algow, however they came to be palatalised.

Palatalisation of medial /z/ < /s/ is otherwise rare but occurs in all of the late Middle Cornish texts. Examples cited above at § 5.8.1-3 are ancombryngy "encumbrance, difficulty" [BK] < an combrynsy < MIE. encombrance, devlugy "devilry" [BM] (apparently from *deulus "diabolical"), martegen, martesen "perhaps" [BM] (B. marteze), cowgys "spoken" [TH: JT] and negegath "messengers" [TH: SA] (W. negesydd).\(^{599}\) The fact that aflythygon (sing. avlethis in CW) mentioned above and deulugy, devlugy occur in the Ordinalia indicates that this voicing also occurred occasionally in the earlier MlC. texts.

There are far too many instances of s for etymological /s/ before front vowels and yod to be cited here, but it is clear that these examples with g are extremely rare. Nonetheless, that they happen at all is highly significant. Since it shows that s /z/ < /s/ is palatalised in an identical fashion to s /z/ < /d/, and nobody would argue that the former spelling usually means /(d)ʒ/\(^{599}\), the natural conclusion must be that s /z/ < /d/ does not generally mean /(d)ʒ/ either. To argue the opposite would be to say that two different phonemes /s/ and /(d)ʒ/, once unvoiced and the other voiced, would be conventionally represented in an otherwise identical phonetic environment by the same graph s. This would be particularly

\(^{599}\) an combrynsy OM 2517, 2542.
absurd, since they are different in (1) voice or lack thereof; and (2) place of articulation, the first being an alveolar-dental spirant and latter an alveolar-palatal affricate (if already /dʒ/) or fricative (if still /ʒ/).

An exceptional development occurred in *calge* "many", *falge* "false", *me an felge* "I will slit him" and *polge* "a while" in BM (§ 5.8.2 above), in which /ls/ was apparently voiced to /lz/ and later palatalised to /ldʒ/ in final position. These words always have s elsewhere, even in the chronologically later texts TH and CW. It is possible that final de-voicing sometimes prevented this, if the same rules applied to Cornish as are observed in Breton. Only *me an felge* has etymological /ls/ < /lt/ (B. faout), whereas the rest have original /ls/. The only possible comparison is with *in oydge* "in age" < *in oys in CW (§ 5.8.4) with final palatalisation of /z/ < /d/, but it seems more likely that this unique instance is a Late Cornish alteration. No palatalised examples of final /nz/ < /ns/ are found, although this may well be coincidental since the examples cited here are so few. It is probable that this extension of the sound change from medial to final position is relatively late, perhaps at the turn of the sixteenth century when BM was written.

A number of conclusions may be drawn: (1) that it seems unlikely that /s/ was voiced only in the few words cited above and that it is therefore reasonable to conclude that /s/ was sporadically voiced throughout the Middle Cornish period, probably as an allophone; (2) that /s/ [z] fell together with /d/ > /z/ whenever this voicing occurred, which demonstrates the theory argued in this work that instances of "Second Palatalisation" with g and other palatal spellings had undergone assibilation at an earlier date; (3) that /s/ could be voiced in all medial positions, whether it was intervocalic or whether it was preceded by /n/ in

---

600 This seems likely, given the discussion at § 4.1 and § 4.3-4 above.
ancombrynsy (and presumably /l/) or by a semi-vowel such as /w/ in cowgys; (4) that this voicing could occur even in final position and was rarely palatalised in words such as fals > falge, although final de-voicing could probably have prevented this in most cases.

The difficulty that palatal spellings for /z/ < /s/ before front vowels and yod are rare is best accounted for by arguing that New Lenition was never any more than sporadic, as it remains today in Breton dialects. The palatalising tendency could happen at any time, given the right phonetic environment, so that /z/ could become /z'/ and then undergo various levels of palatalisation. This could also happen to the new /z/ voiced from /s/ in the same positions, when that occurred. It is also important that original /ns/ in ancombryngy would have fallen together with /ns/ < /nt/ and likewise original /ls/ in fals with /ls/ < /lt/. These must have been voiced to /nz/ and /lz/ in order for these phonemes to have been palatalised, according to this theory. It might be expected that, if /z/ < /s/ was palatalised far less often than /z'/ < /z/ < /d/ because the former could only happen after voicing had occurred, examples of ng /ndʒ/ and lg /ldʒ/ would also be less common than ns and ls, since palatalisation of /ns/ and /ls/ of whatever origin depended on prior voicing to /nz/ and /lz/. It is therefore inappropriate to treat the palatalisation of the assibilated phonemes /ns/ < /nt/ and /ls/ < /lt/ as a separate category from /z/ > /z'/ > /dʒ/, since the presence or absence of /n/ and /l/ before the affected phoneme became irrelevant once voicing /s/ > /z/ had occurred.

As predicted in the previous paragraph, examples with palatal spellings for earlier /ns/ < /nt/ and /ls/ < /lt/ are in fact relatively rare in the late Middle Cornish texts. Only the first twelve homilies (JT) of TH show ng of this origin in words other than the commonplace carenga, gerynga for kerensa "love" and bolnogeth, blonogath for *bolunseth
"will". The former has only s in BM and does not occur in SA; the latter occurs in a vast array of spellings with various combinations of metatheses, but does not occur in BK (see § 5.1-4 below). The only known examples of lg for original /lt/ are algow "cliffs" in BK and me an felge "I will slit him" in BM (§ 5.8.1-2).

Admittedly, a number of the instances in TH are merely various spellings of the derived adjective kerengyek, kernsyak "loving" < *kerensethek, apparently either trisyllabic or disyllabic as a result of syncope. More importantly, the third person plural verbal ending –ns occurs with a palatal in engy "they are", y mowngy "they are", a[s te] vongy "that they had", ny rowng eniyoa "they shall not enjoy" and dell rongy "as they do" (§ 5.8.3). Forms with ns, however, remain more common than those with ng in these verbal forms. Comparable examples also occur in myng a rug du "those that God made" and the forms plynges, plyngys "planted" (p.pt.) and blanges "planted" (3s pres-fut.) from the verb plansa (B. plantañ).

These developments are not found either in texts earlier than TH or in CW, apparently a later text. It has been asserted above (§ 5.8.4) that the Middle Cornish original of CW was in fact written before TH, even though it has been treated as a later text in this study because of its extensive corpus of Late Cornish forms that have been added or altered from earlier spellings. If so, it might seem that these instances of ng in TH mark the beginning of the transition to Late Cornish. That this was not entirely a late development, however, is shown by a number of examples in the Ordinalia: in addition to various spellings of bolungeth, bolenegoth and kerenge, kerensa, the examples vryongen, bryangen "throat" < OC. briansen (OB. brehant W. breuant) and kynghys, kyn gys,

---

601 The instance ankengy BK 208h (W.angen B. anken) is found as ankensy PA 184, PC 1360, but it is not clear whether the suffix contained /zl/ < /sl/ or /nzl/ < /nsl/ < /nt/. It has consequently been ignored.
"kyns ys" "rather than" (W. *cynt B. *kent) have *ng perhaps a hundred years earlier (§ 5.7.3). The forms *bryonsen, *vreonsen [BM], *beransen [TH: JT] and *kyns ys [BM] occur in later Middle Cornish only with s (§ 5.8.2-3). The word *fleyryngy "odour, stink" (B. *flaer) in the Ordinalia may also contain earlier /nz/ < /ns/ < /nt/, although the derivation of this rare suffix is uncertain and it may represent earlier /z/ < /s/.

It is certain at least that palatalisation of /nz/ from the voicing of earlier /ns/ < /nt/ (and probably /lz/ from /ls < lt/) became generally more frequent during the Middle Cornish period, although it was still relatively rare even in TH. It is only about as common as palatalisation of /z/ < /s/, which includes some examples of /nz/ < /ns/ that were not the result of previous assimilation. There is no reason to divide these two phenomena into separate sound changes if assimilation is taken to have been completed well before Second Palatalisation. Moreover, for examples with *ng to have occurred in the Ordinalia, voicing /s/ > /z/ must already have taken place. It is not certain whether this was true at the time of PA, which has only the instances gerensa "love" and nanssow "valleys" and shows a much more limited distribution of palatal spellings (§ 5.7.2).

In the light of these considerations, it seems that Middle Cornish "Second Palatalisation" always occurred in the sequence /z/ > /z̩/ > /dz̩/, irrespective of the earlier origin of this /z/. It could be the result of assimilation of the voiced phoneme /d̩/ > /z̩/, simple voicing /s/ to /z/, or else the assimilation of the voiceless phonemes /nt/ > /ns/ or /lt/ > /ls/ followed by the same voicing /s/ > /z/.}

The reason that First Palatalisation was able to happen much earlier was that the palatal phonemes involved must have come into existence before assimilation, so they were not affected by it. The dating of Second Palatalisation is much more difficult, since both it and New Lenition seem to have happened piecemeal between perhaps the early thirteenth
century and the seventeenth century, almost exactly the same dates as those proposed by Jackson for very similar phenomena in Breton. The place-name *Trevasec* (1284) also occurs as *Trevaieg* (1300) and *Trevagek* (1302), containing Brit. *tref*+*mad*+-*og* with /d/ > /z/. That is shows Second Palatalisation dates the sound change very precisely, in keeping with the evidence that has been cited from the texts.

This explanation has the merits that it is simple, relies very little upon analogy to account for exceptional forms and explains why palatalisation was able to affect phonemes of different origins that had fallen together in earlier sound changes. However, it follows that palatalisation in Middle Cornish was both untidy and sporadic, not to say incomplete even at the end of the period. This should not be a surprise, since it is not perhaps unreasonable to draw a general comparison with palatalisation in the dialects of Breton, a sporadic, incomplete tendency rather than a uniform sound change.