

OLD IRISH NA *NNÍ*: A CASE OF *QUID PRO QUO*?

IN AN important and wide ranging recent study of certain aspects of the Celtic pronominal system Peter Schrijver (1997) has argued for survivals of an archaic inflection of the **kʷo-* interrogative/indefinite and the **so(-)/*to-* demonstrative entailing suppletion between an *i*-stem in the NA sg. n. (**kʷid*, and **sin* < **sim* in place of **tid* or **tod* respectively) and a thematic stem elsewhere (e.g. demonstrative nom. sg. masc. **so*, fem. **sā* < **se-h₂*, acc. sg. masc. **tom*, fem. **tām* < **te-h₂-m* and so on). The principal aim of this paper is to question Schrijver's view of the alleged neuter *i*-stem forms of the demonstrative and to present an additional piece of evidence relevant to the indefinite/interrogative paradigm.

As far as the demonstrative is concerned, it has long been recognised that in PIE **s-* was confined to the nom. sg. masc. and fem., all remaining forms of the paradigm being characterised by initial **t-* (see the full discussion in Schrijver, 1997, 9–14). On the basis of forms cited from a range of non-Celtic and non-Italic IE languages Schrijver (1997, 9) makes the noncontroversial comment that 'all languages point to PIE **tod*' in the NA sg. n. The basic developments in Celtic are then summarised as follows:

In Celtic, as in Latin, the **t-* of the oblique stem was replaced by **s-*, which was introduced from the PIE Nsgmf. Thus, in the Celtiberian inscription of Botorrita I, we find *śomui* (A 7) and *śomei* (A 8), which have been plausibly interpreted as the Dsgmn. and Lsgmn. of the pronoun **so* ... Less certain is the interpretation of *śaum* (A 8) as a Gplf ... The Old Latin accusatives m. *sum*, f. *sam*, plm. *sos* (Ennius) and the forms nsgf. *sa-psa* (Ennius, Pacuvius), Asgm. *sum-pse* (Plautus) point to a similar generalization of **so-* at the expense of **to-* in Latin. Here, forms with **to-* survive only in adverbs (*tum*, *topper* etc.). As is well known, the generalization of **so-* in the paradigm may be an Italo-Celtic development ... In Celtic too some traces of **t-* remain, the most obvious being OIr. *tó* 'yes' < **tod* 'it (is)' ... Apart from the initial dental stop, OIr. *tó*, neg. *nathó* < (**ne tod*) corresponds to W *do* 'indeed', neg. *naddo* 'indeed not' ... The formal difficulty of comparing these forms may be eliminated if we consider the possibility that W **to* was lenited to *do* as is common in the case of adverbs of manner ... If this explanation is correct, *naddo* must be analogical: *do*

was reinterpreted as the radical, unmutated form, which would be expected to lenite to *-ddo* after the negation *na* < **ne* ... The only Celtic language to have preserved the PIE declension more or less intact is Celtiberian ... The Gpl. *śoiśum* is attested in Botorrita II. The form *śos* has been interpreted as reflecting a Nsgm. *sos* (Eska 1989 s. v.), which is now compromised by Villar's demonstration that the sign hitherto transcribed as *s* should be read as *z*. The latter reflects old medial **s* or old medial or final **d*. Villar (1995: 17) proposes a choice between NAsg. **sod* (PIE **tod*) and a nsg. **sosi* (with apocope of *-i) ... However, there is no other Cl. evidence for a pronoun **sosi*, as Gaul. *sosin*, on which this is based, should probably be interpreted differently ... As an alternative, one may even go so far as to suggest that *śos* is a mistake for *śoś*, which would then be the Nsgm.: cf. the converse mistake in Gpl. *śoiśum* instead of expected **śoiśum*. Clearly, our present state of knowledge does not allow us to use *śos* as uncontroversial evidence. (Schrijver, 1997, 14–16).

Schrijver (1997, 42) concludes on the strength of an intricate discussion of various Irish and British demonstrative (plus Gaulish *sosin*) and anaphoric forms (OIr. nom. sg. m./f. *suide*, NA sg. n. *sodain*) 'that in PCl. a pronoun **sim* existed, which regularly became **sin*. This provided the NA sg. n. of the paradigm of **so* and **so-so*'. He goes on to suggest that the posited Proto-Celtic alternation between m./f. (presumably plus neut. outside the NA sg.) **(so)so/ā(-)* and NA sg. n. **(so-)sin* ultimately continues a pre-Celtic distribution of *-o-* (f. *-eh₂*) and *-i-* in a paradigm further characterised by the well supported suppletion between nom. sg. m./f. **s-* and **t-* elsewhere.

The incorporation of **sin* as the neuter of **so* is probably not a Celtic innovation. Strikingly, the archaic nature of this system (non-neuter **so/ā-*: neuter **si-*) is indicated by a similar system in the interrogative pronoun **kʷo-*: **kʷi-* in other IE languages: cf. OCS *k'ь-to* 'who?': *čь-to* 'what?' and Skt. *kás* 'who': particle *cit* < **kʷi-d* 'what?', *kím* 'what, why?' ... In Hittite, the NAsg.n. of *kās* 'this' < **k'os* is *kī*, *kē* < **k'i*. This lacks the final *-d which one would expect in the NAsg., but the correspondence in vocalism is striking. These parallels confirm the Celtic reconstructions suggested above. If we take into account that Celtic generalized the *s-* in the pronoun **so-/to-*, and showed a tendency to spread *-n as a marker of the NAsg.n., at least in nouns (OIr. *muir* – 'sea' < **mori* + -n), the pre-Cl. form of the neuter may well have been **tid* rather than **sim*.

Vedic has evidence for *kád* (the normal n. counterpart of *kás*) beside petrified *kím* and *cit*. So long as it is not clear how **kʷo-*

and $*k^w i$ - were distributed in the NAsg.n. (semantic difference?; *o*- and *i*-forms distributed over different pronouns with subsequent leveling?), it is possible that PIE had both forms. In this context it is relevant to refer to Celtib. *sos*, which might reflect **sod* but is highly unreliable ... What the evidence suggests in any case is that the *i*-form did occur in PIE as the neuter of at least one *o*-stem pronoun, whence it may have spread to others. (Schrijver, 1997, 43).

Given the notorious diversity of PIE pronominal inflection, it is dangerous to extrapolate from one set of forms such as the $*k^w o$ -/ $*k^w i$ - interrogative/indefinite to another such as the $*so$ / $*to$ - demonstrative with a quite different suppletive pattern. Since, as Schrijver rightly observes (see above), Indic, Iranian, Slavic, Baltic, Greek and Germanic all point to a PIE NA sg. n. **tod*, Celtic **sin* alone would hardly suffice to reconstruct a pre-Celtic byeform **tid*. In fact, both Celtic and Italic offer good evidence for erstwhile **tod* in the shape of the already mentioned Old Latin *topper* ‘forthwith’ < **tod-per* (Walde and Hoffmann, 1982, II, 692), and Old Irish *tó*, *nathó* (along with W *do*, *naddo* in line with Schrijver’s persuasive argument above) < **tod*, **ne tod*. These are, of course, petrified forms no longer forming part of a paradigm but they do prove that Italic and Celtic had NA sg. n. **tod* at the time when this petrification took place. This stage must, of course, have preceded the already mentioned generalisation of **s*- throughout the paradigm, whether in both branches independently or at a putative Italo-Celtic stage. Since there is no reason to think that the particular constellations **tod-per* ‘forthwith’ and **(ne) tod* ‘yes (/no) indeed’ existed outside Italic and Celtic respectively, separate homogenisation of an anomalous paradigm seems more likely than a shared development at an anyway questionable Italo-Celtic stage. The PIE distribution **so*, **sā*, **tod* etc. thus certainly survived down to Italo-Celtic at least (for those believing in this phase) and very probably into Proto-Celtic and Proto-Italic themselves.

That being so, **sim* would have to be considered a relatively late prehistoric remodelling of **tod*, almost certainly within Celtic itself. Celtiberian *soz* then has a potentially crucial role to play in determining whether this innovation could have taken place as early as Proto-Celtic, and it must be said that recent developments have made the derivation from **sod* a good deal more likely than Schrijver supposed.

The idea that Celtiberian *z* could issue from *d* was first mooted by Meid (1993, 117–18) and Villar (1995; 1995b, 17–82) went on to develop this insight in tandem with his earlier opinion that Celtiberian *z* could arise from */s/* by intervocalic voicing. However, Untermaier (1997, 382–3 esp. n. 23 and 394–6 esp. n. 47) has since raised serious doubts about the dual origin of *z* from intervocalic *s* and lenited *d*,

arguing on etymological and other grounds that only the latter was represented by *z* in Celtiberian orthography, and a still more recent attempt (McCone, 2000, 485–6) has been made to corroborate this view that the only source of *z* (whether [z] or [ð] phonetically) was /d/ in leniting environments. To begin with, there are a number of instances in which *s* represents original /s/ between vowels in Celtiberian, notably *letaisama* (A.68) together with *sekisamos* (A.69) containing the Celtic superlative suffix *-isamo-*, the already mentioned pronominal genitive plural *soisum* (Bot. III.0.2) corresponding precisely to Skt. *teṣām* apart from systematically predictable *s-* for *t-*, and the less clear *kentisum* (Bot. III.11.24) plus *makasil Jm* (Bot. I.A.5). Conversely there are no reliable examples as yet of *z* continuing /s/ in this position. The otherwise highly problematical *noviza* (Bot. III.0.1) can be straightforwardly derived from the PC **nowiyo-* underlying Gaul. *novio-*, OW *nouid* (MW *newyd*) and OIr. *nuie* or *nu(a)e* ‘new’ on the assumption that Celtiberian underwent a typologically unsurprising strengthening *-iyV(-) > *-iðV(-) (> *-izV(-)?) also seen independently in British Celtic (e.g. W m. *trydydd*, f. *trydedd* ‘third’ < Brit. **tridið-os/-ā* < PC **tritiy-os/-ā*). This hypothesis (McCone, 2000, 485–6) makes it possible to derive *kabizeti* (Bot. I.A.3) from 3sg. pres. **gabiy-eti*, which could have replaced PC **gabi-ti* (McCone, 1996, 49) under the influence of 3pl. **gabiy-onti* underlying OIr. *gaibit*, *-gaibet* ‘take’. There are, of course, plentiful examples of *io* and *ia* in Celtiberian sources but these can easily be taken to represent *-yo/ā-* rather than the rarer variant *-yo/ā-* (see Uhlich, 1993, and McCone, 1997, 311–12). The conventional derivation of *kabizeti* from a somewhat problematical subjunctive **gabiseti* (e.g. Meid, 1993, 90–91) then becomes unnecessary and the strongest evidence currently available for Celtiberian *z* < /s/ disappears.

Given that a Botorrita IV has now appeared (F. Villar, C. Jordán et. al., 2001) and that there are rumours of further significant finds on the site, all but the most solidly supported claims about Celtiberian phonology and morphology are provisional insofar as new material may contradict them. That said, in the present state of knowledge it appears that lenited /d/ was the only source for Celtiberian *z*, the upshot being that *soz* (Bot. I.A.2) is a NA sg. n. that continues PC **sod*. This would be quite compatible with following *aucu*, which could perfectly well be a neuter *u*-stem on purely formal grounds.

The clause in question reads *soz auku arestalo tamai* and directly follows what is now generally agreed to be a sequence of clauses stating of an area sacred to two gods (cf. Meid, 1993, 34–6) that it is not allowed (thrice repeated *nekue(…)litom*) therein to place anything on top (of something else; *uer-taunei*, see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 529), to place anything (anywhere; *taunei*, *t-* = /d/, see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 524) or to take anything away (*tizaunei*, /dī/ ‘from’ followed by /d/ lenited to [z]; see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 528). Hitherto problematical *auku* (*k* = /g/; see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 498) might

have an exact cognate in OIr. *ó/g/úag* ‘whole, complete, intact, inviolate’, which on the basis of the exclusively Middle Irish attestations recorded in *DIL* could be an old *u*-stem just as well as an *o-/ā*-stem adjective. Notwithstanding Vendryes’ (1960, *O*, 13) statement that ‘aucune étymologie plausible n’a été proposée’, a basic meaning ‘whole, complete’ makes a link with the formally compatible root **aug-* ‘grow, increase’ < PIE **h₂eug-* (Lat. *aug-ere*, Goth. *auk-an*, Lith. *áug-ti* etc.) semantically viable on the assumption of PC **aug-u-* ‘increased, grown up’ (see Wackernagel and Debrunner, 1954, 463–5 on the PIE ‘Kategorie von Eigenschaftsbezeichnungen auf *-u-*’; note that these are frequently deverbal and that there are exceptions to the prevalent zero grade of the root). The most straightforward of several proposals (see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 524) regarding *ā*-stem dat. sg. *tamai* from a formal point of view is that it represents /dāmai/ and has an exact cognate in OIr. *dám* ‘retinue, followers’ < PC **dāmā* (< **dōmo/ā(-)* ‘pertaining to the house’, a ‘vrddhi’-derivative of **domos* ‘house’ as argued by Campanile (1974; cf. McCone, 1992, 194). *Arestalo* (or *-aso?*) looks like the gen. sg. of an *o*-stem, whether it is taken as a proper name or as a title meaning ‘chief, president’ or the like (so Meid, 1993, 40–41; see Wodtko in Untermann, 1997, 497). In view of the omission of **esti* ‘is’ in the preceding *litom* clauses, the same may be assumed for *soz aucu arestalo tamai*, which may thus be tentatively translated as ‘that (setup) is inviolate for Arestalos’/the president’s followers’. This would make good sense in relation to the immediately preceding prohibitions against adding or subtracting anything and would correspond nicely to the injunction *honce loucom ne quis violatod* ‘let no one violate this grove’ in a Latin inscription adduced by Meid (1993, 37) as a typological parallel.

Interpretation of Celtiberian *soz* as a direct continuation of **sod* is thus not only virtually inevitable phonologically but also quite viable morphologically and semantically. It follows that inherited **tod* simply became **sod* (probably [soð]; see McCone, 1996, 81–7) as a direct result of the generalisation of **s-* throughout the paradigm in Proto-Celtic and survived virtually unchanged into Celtiberian. That being so, **tid* cannot have existed at any stage and remodelling of **sod* to **sim* could only have taken place some time after the Proto-Celtic period, if it occurred at all.

As Schrijver saw (see above), this development requires the trigger of at least one pronoun with an old opposition between **-i-* in the NA sg. n. and **-o/ā-* in the rest of the paradigm and this brings us to the interrogative/indefinite with its well attested variants **kʷo-* and **kʷi/e-*, to which might be added **kʷu-* in certain adverbial formations (e.g. McCone, 1993, 174–5: note that the **kʷum-kʷe-*, taken there to underlie the pronominal forms *cucci* ‘as far as him/it’ of OIr. *co* ‘as far as’ < **kʷuts* comparable with Lat. *usque* < **kʷuts-kʷe*, may have a further reflex in the second element of Lat. *ubi-cumque* ‘wherever’, *qui-cumque* ‘whoever’ etc.). It seems unlikely that **kʷo-* and **kʷi/e-*

correlated with indefinite and interrogative function, since these seem to have been differentiated solely by accent in PIE as in Ancient Greek, the indefinite being enclitic and the interrogative accented (e.g. Szemerényi, 1989, 220; Beekes, 1995, 203). Despite significant differences of detail in their reconstructions Szemerényi (1989, 220–221) and Beekes (1995, 203–7) both argue that the original pronominal stem was $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - with a distribution matching that of the anaphoric pronoun $*i\text{-}(h_1)e$ - (Szemerényi, 1989, 218–20; Beekes, 1995, 202–3 and 205; Schrijver, 1997, 51–70): e.g., sg. m./f. nom. $*k^w i\text{-}s$ ($*k^w e$ according to Beekes), acc. $*k^w i\text{-}m$, n. nom./acc. $*k^w i\text{-}d$, m./f./n. gen. $*k^w e\text{-}s(y)o$ and so on. Szemerényi (1989, 221) ascribed the development of $*k^w o\text{-}$ to a tendency to replace thematic looking *e* with *o* from corresponding demonstrative **to-* forms, whence gen. sg. $*k^w o\text{-}syo$ on the model of **tosyo* and so on. Beekes (1995, 203), on the other hand, speculated that $*k^w o\text{-}$ was the adjectival counterpart of pronominal $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - in PIE and that later ‘in different languages $*k^w o\text{-}$ took the place of masc./fem. $*k^w e$, $*k^w im$, $*k^w e\text{-}$, while the old form was retained in the neuter’ (Beekes, 1995, 207). To note just two further recent proposals, Rix (1976, 186–7) posited nom./acc./instr. $*k^w (e)i$ - but an opposition in the other cases between animate $*k^w o\text{-}$ and inanimate $*k^w e\text{-}$, while Meiser (1998, 164–6) opts for interrogative-indefinite $*k^w i\text{-}$ versus exclusively interrogative $*k^w o\text{-}$.

The extant IE languages, then, provide no conclusive evidence as to the distribution of $*k^w o\text{-}$ and $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - in the parent language. Whether triggered by $*so\text{-}/*to\text{-}$ or some other mechanism, it is not even completely certain that $*k^w o\text{-}$ had begun to penetrate the paradigm of the interrogative/indefinite pronoun in PIE itself. If it had, this seems more likely to have occurred in oblique cases such as the genitive than in the nominative or accusative and $*k^w o\text{-}$ may well have been no more than an optional variant alongside an older $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - form at certain points in the paradigm (e.g. the m./f. oblique *à la Rix*). Two pieces of evidence have been offered (see above) in support of the contention that $*k^w o\text{-}$ was in competition with $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - everywhere except the NA sg. n. or alternatively in the m./f. as opposed to the neut. paradigm in PIE. The first is an opposition in the singular of the Old Church Slavonic paradigm between a reflex of $*k^w o\text{-}$ referring to persons (e.g. nom. *k’-to* ‘who?, anybody’, acc./gen. *kogo*) and a reflex of $*k^w i\text{-}e$ - referring to things (e.g. nom./acc. *č’-to*, gen. *česo* ‘what?, anything’). The second is the Skt. particle *cid* (< $*k^w id$) and NA sg. n. *kim* set against a paradigm otherwise entirely based on $*k^w o/ā$, namely sg. nom. m. *kas*, f. *kā*, acc. m. *kam*, f. *kām*, NA n. *kad* or *kim*, gen. m./n. *kasya*, f. *kasyās* etc. (interrogative; corresponding indefinite *kaš-cid* etc.). Since neuters are more liable to petrification (e.g. Lat. *topper*, OIr. *tó* and *nathó* above) than corresponding masculines and feminines, Skt. *cid* alone would merely confirm extra-Indic evidence for an earlier paradigm with a stem $*k^w i\text{-}$ and would hardly suffice to associate this specifically with the neuter. However, as a

paradigmatic variant NA sg. n. *kim* (with nonpalatalised *k*- spread from *ka-* < **k^wo-* and the thematic nouns' neut. *-m* for pronominal *-d*, presumably in order to distinguish the form from *cid*) is more significant. That said, these OCS and Old Indic data need reflect no more than the particular resilience of the neuter, or its NA sg. at least, in the face of post-PIE innovation (cf. Beekes' view quoted above) and fall well short of demonstrating PIE suppletion between neuter **k^wi-*, whether generally or just in the NA sg., and **k^wo-* elsewhere. Consequently the contention that such suppletion existed in Celtic must stand or fall on internal evidence, which might in turn prove to have a bearing on the wider question of the PIE paradigm.

Whatever their precise derivation, it seems clear that the mostly predicative nom.(/acc.) base forms of the interrogative/indefinite pronoun in Old Irish emanate from the **k^wi/e-* stem (see *GOI* 288–90 and 292). One may tentatively propose m./f. *cía* (MW *pwy*), unstressed *ce* or *ci* (the latter probably originating in hiatus) < **k^wē* < **k^we-i*, n. *ci* < **k^wid* and, bearing in mind the possibility of *cía* etc. < **k^wēh* < **k^wēss* < **k^wē'st* with following copula on occasion, *cid* < **k^wiðeh* < **k^wid-est*. However, predicative gen. sg. *coich* 'whose' may reflect penetration of **k^wo-* into the oblique cases insofar as it can be plausibly ascribed to a remodelling of **coí* < **k^wosyo* (cf. pred. *aí* 'his, its' < **esyo*; Schrijver, 1997, 57) under the influence of gen. sg. *neich* and/or *cáich* (cf. *GOI* 292). The OIr. pronouns *nech* 'anyone, someone', *cáich* 'everyone, each one' with their British (e.g. MW *neb*, *pawb*) and probable Gaulish (*nep-on/-i*, *papon/-i*; Lambert, 1994, 170–171 and 146) cognates clearly continue Proto-Celtic **ne-k^wo-* and **k^wāk^wo-* respectively. Both obviously have indefinite **k^wo-* as their second element and this is equally obviously preceded by negative **ne* in the case of the former. The latter has no neuter and might be compared structurally with Lat. relative *quisquis* 'whoever, everyone who' (*GOI* 292) except that the reduplicated stem is indefinite **k^wo/ā-* in its (secondarily?) uninflected fem. and inflected masc. form respectively. If so, it can be interpreted as **kwā-* 'anyone (f.)' plus **k^wo-* 'anyone (m.)', i.e. 'anyone at all' or 'everyone'. As pronouns, both stems inflect solely as *o*-stems but as proclitic adjectives *cach* 'every' (or *cech*; MW *pob*) and *nach* 'any' they also had fem. *ā*-stem forms most clearly seen in gen. sg. f. *cecha/cacha*, *nacha* (-*cha* < -*che* in proclisis).

Nech and *nach* are particularly interesting because they have the quite irregular looking NA sg. n. *ní* 'anything, something' and *na* 'any' respectively, these being sometimes combined as the *na nní* 'anything whatever' (lit. 'any anything') appearing in the title of this paper. Pedersen (*VKG* I, 245–6) reconstructed the preform of *ní*, *na* as **ne-k^wid* in the context of a discussion of the early loss of *-d* in Celtic but made no attempt to justify this derivation in detail and subsequently (*VKG* II, 212) hedged by positing neuter **ne-k^wod* or **ne-k^wid* alongside masc.

**ne-*k^w*os*, again without going into specifics. Thurneysen's fuller discussion reaches a similarly vague conclusion: 'Neuter *ní*, pretonic *na* with gemination, is peculiar, suggesting as it does a basic form **nēq^w* instead of **neq^wod* (or *-q^wid*) which one would have expected. It is true that *-d* disappeared very early (§ 177), and a parallel instance of the loss of a final vowel is furnished by Gaulish *-c* (= Lat. *-que*, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 16, 287), though this word, unlike *ní*, is always enclitic and unstressed. The length of the vowel (as against *nech*) is quite regular in Irish (§ 44 b); its quality (*-i* instead of *-ē*) may be due to the influence of *an-i'* (GOI 311).

More recent developments in historical Celtic phonology make a satisfactory resolution of these problems and apparent inconsistencies possible. To begin with, Thurneysen's tentative ascription of the vocalism of *ní* to the influence of *aní* (neut. article *a n-* plus deictic *-i*) is eminently plausible, given that 'a relative clause may be preceded by either *aní* (§ 474), *ní* ((a) above) or *nanni*'; from these a hybrid form *anní* has developed as early as MI. 90^b13' (GOI 310). That being so, the original vocalism is likely to be reflected by proclitic *na* < **ne h-* (which did not mutate a following consonant but probably prefixed /h-/ to a following vowel). This would then continue **nek^w* rather than **nēk^w* and thus have the same short vowel as the **nek^w-os/-om* underlying masc. nom./acc. *nech* as well as the **nek^w-i/-ū* underlying masc./neut. gen. *neich* and dat. *neuch* respectively.

Schrijver (1997, 56) reasons that 'the general loss of final **-d* must have taken place before lenition in view of the fact that the infixed pronoun of the 3sgn. (< **ed*) causes lenition in OIr. (Cowgill, 1975: 52 ...). Villar's already mentioned demonstration that the grapheme *z* represented lenited *d* in Celtiberian, including in postvocalic final position as in 3sg. fut. ipv. *-tuz* < **-tōd*, combines with Gaulish and Insular Celtic evidence to make it likely that lenition of voiced stops to voiced fricatives had already taken place in Proto-Celtic in the relevant environments (McCone, 1996, 81–7) while at the same time ruling out the possibility of Proto-Celtic loss of final postvocalic *-d* (probably [-ð]) as this would have resulted in Celtiberian **-tu* not *-tuz* and so on. If interpreted straightforwardly as *buet(i) id* 'let it become' (McCone, 1991, 118; cf. Lambert, 1994, 157), Gaulish *buetid* on the Chamalières inscription shows that *-d* (probably [-ð]) was retained in Gaulish, at least after a short vowel. Even if the final *-tu* of the strange Gaulish 3pl. *biontutu* (Larzac) derived from fut. ipv. **-tōd*, which seems far from certain (see Lambert, 1994, 66 and 170), this would only point to loss of *-d* after a long vowel there (cf. Lat. *id* 'it' but 3sg. fut. ipv. *violato* from older *violatod*). Schrijver's (1997, 177) proposed derivation from **buetide* is arbitrary, given the lack of good evidence for loss of final vowels in Gaulish, and is predicated on the assumption that *sosio* < **sō-siod* proves loss of final *-d* there. This, however, seems quite uncertain ('l'analyse n'en est pas sûre' according to Lambert, 1994, 137) and there

is something to be said for simply taking *sosio* as gen. sg. of the **so-* (pre-Celtic **so-/to-*) demonstrative continuing PIE **tosyo* (Skt. *tasya* ‘his’ etc.). Given that the inscription in question (Lambert, 1994, 136–7) is inscribed around the neck of a vase, the name of the object could easily be dispensed with, the upshot being a translation of BUSCILLA SOSIO LEGASIT IN ALIXIE MAGALU as ‘Buscilla placed his (M.’s) in Alisia for Magalos’, an equivalent of ‘vase’, ‘offering’ or something equally obvious being understood after *sosio*.

On balance, then, the evidence currently available suggests that a voiced dental stop *-d* or, rather, fricative *-ð* still survived in Gaulish *id* and that the subsequent developments to **eð* and **e* (see Schrijver, 1997, 62–3 on the generalisation of the *e*- over the *i*-stem of this pronoun in Celtic) can be traced no further back than Insular Celtic. That being so, loss of *-*ð* will have occurred after the probably Proto-Celtic lenition of voiced stops (see above) but before the lenition of the voiceless stops to the corresponding voiceless fricatives and voiced stops in Goidelic and British separately (see McCone, 1996, 83–4 and 87–92). As long as 3sg. n. **eð* had become **e* before lenition acquired (morpho)phonemic status, it might be expected to conform to existing sound patterns in the language and acquire the following lenis allophone characteristic of certain consonants after a vowel. If the argument that limited (morpho)phonemicisation of lenition could have occurred during the Insular Celtic period (McCone, 1996, 97–8; 1997b, 390–393) is accepted, loss of *-ð* must have been an Insular Celtic development. Even if it is not, an Insular Celtic date remains perfectly feasible.

A particularly significant Insular Celtic sound change was a general apocope of final *-i* (see McCone, 1996, 100–103) that paved the way for the development of a peculiarly Insular Celtic opposition between absolute and conjunct verbal inflection. Since this far reaching morphological adjustment can hardly have happened overnight, *-i* was presumably lost at a rather early Insular Celtic date. The unproblematical assumption that loss of *-ð* < *-d* took place still earlier has the welcome consequence of solving the problem of OIr. proclitic neut. *na* ‘any’ at a stroke by positing **nek^wið* > **nek^wi* > **nek^w* in Insular Celtic, whence **nek^w* > **ne h-* > OIr. *na* (non-mutating except for probable prefixing of *h-* to a vowel) by a well-known set of Primitive Irish developments. This derivation applies a set of generally acknowledged sound changes quite straightforwardly to the morphologically unexceptionable preform **nek^wið* < **nek^wid* by means of an uncontradicted relative chronology (1) *-ð* > *-Ø*, (2) *-i* > *-Ø*. Its very success and the lack of a viable alternative provide strong grounds for adopting this chronology and for preferring **nek^wid* over **nek^wod* as the precursor of OIr. *na* (and stressed **né* < **ne*, allowing for remodelling to OIr. *ní* ‘anything’ in the manner described earlier). It remains to consider the not inconsiderable further phonological and morphological ramifications.

Celtiberian arguably underwent apocope of *-i* but, if so, this can hardly have been old and probably did not occur until after adoption of the Iberian script (McCone, 1996, 14–15). A direct connection with the similar Insular Celtic phenomenon thus never seemed likely and can now be regarded as impossible for the simple reason that the Insular Celtic apocope of *-i* was preceded by a loss of *-ð* that certainly did not take place in Celtiberian. It follows that neither *-ð* > *-Ø* nor *-i* > *-Ø* was as early as Proto-Celtic. It has already been seen that loss of */d/* [*-ð*] does not seem to have occurred in Gaulish and the contrast between Gaulish dat. (formerly loc.) sg. *-rigi*, *Atemaguti* and OIr. *oíntu* < IC **oinotūt* < **oinotūt-i* (McCone, 1978 and 1996, 100–102) precludes Gaulish loss of *-i*. Since loss of *-ð* or *-i* in Gaulish can only be asserted on the basis of special pleading, our present state of knowledge regarding Continental Celtic leaves no serious alternative to the view that both of these sound changes and the major morphological innovation of absolute/conjunct inflection triggered by loss of *-i* were Insular Celtic innovations. Recognition of Insular Celtic as a shared genetic stage in the evolution of Goidelic and British to the exclusion of Continental Celtic then becomes quite unavoidable (see McCone, 1996, 79–81 and 98–104).

As far as morphology is concerned, the following early Insular Celtic (and in essentials probably also Proto-Celtic) paradigm for negative plus indefinite can be postulated with confidence (*-d* probably [*ð*] phonetically). Replacement of the inherited ending by the regular *o*-stem gen. sg. **-ī* seen in Insular Celtic and Gaulish is hardly surprising but may well not yet have been a feature of the Proto-Celtic paradigm.

sg.	masc./fem.	neut.
nom.	<i>*nekʷos</i> (> OIr. <i>nech</i> , MW <i>neb</i>)	<i>*nekʷid</i> (> OIr. <i>na</i> ; >> OIr. <i>ní</i>)
acc.	<i>*nekʷom</i> (> OIr. <i>nech</i> ; Gaul. <i>nepon?</i>)	<i>*nekʷid</i> (> OIr. <i>na</i> ; >> OIr. <i>ní</i>)
gen.		<i>*nekʷi</i> (> OIr. <i>neich</i> ; Gaul. <i>nepi?</i>)
dat.		<i>*nekʷiū(i)</i> (> OIr. <i>neuch</i>)

This Celtic evidence combines with that of Skt. NA n. *kim* (alongside *kad*) versus *ka-* elsewhere and of OCS reflexes of animate **kʷo-* vs. inanimate **kʷi/e-* to make it virtually certain that the NA sg. n. of the interrogative/indefinite pronoun/adjective had remained immune to the penetration of **kʷo-* and was invariably **kʷid* in PIE. Beyond this the precise distribution of **kʷo-* and **kʷi/e-* in the parent language cannot be established with any degree of certainty, although the comparative evidence points to the existence of a **kʷi/e-* form in every case of the paradigm. The two most efficient scenarios for generating the NA sg. neuter's particular resistance to **kʷo-*'s encroachment in at least three IE families, including Celtic, would seem to be a slightly modified version of Beekes' idea that **kʷo-* was the adjectival counterpart of **kʷi-* or Rix's suggestion that **kʷo-* had displaced **kʷi/e-* in the

oblique cases of the m./f. only in PIE. The latter hypothesis would make the NA sg. m./f. and the oblique neuter cases adjacent to **k^wo-* forms and hence more immediately exposed to paradigmatic pressure from that quarter than more distant NA sg. **k^wid*. Alternatively, the Old Irish evidence for adjectival nom. m. **nek^wos*, f. **nek^wā*, n. **nek^wid*, gen. m./n. **nek^wī*, f. **nek^w(iy)ās* etc. versus pronominal nom. m./f. **nek^wos*, n. **nek^wid*, gen. m./f./n. **nek^wī* etc. might be taken as evidence that m. **k^wo-* and f. **k^wā(-)* had first established themselves throughout the adjectival paradigm except for the NA sg. n. If so, adjective (*(*-)k^wos*, *(*-)k^wā*, *(*-)k^wid* etc.) and pronoun (*(*-)k^wis*, *(*-)k^wid* etc.) will then have interacted with each other in various ways in the IE daughter languages.

Stressed *ní* (unstressed *na*) ‘anything, something’ versus m./f. nom./acc. *nech*, m./f./n. gen. *neich*, dat. *neuch* is not the only NA sg. n. prounoun to display irregularity in relation to the rest of the paradigm in Old Irish and the explanation just offered for this divergence may help to explain at least one further instance, namely NA sg. *aill* ‘(an)other’ (and *alaill* ‘(an)other, a certain’) versus the *yo/ā*-stem *aile* (and *alaile*) in the rest of the paradigm. An abundance of comparative evidence guarantees PIE nom. sg. m. **h₂elyos*, f. **h₂elyeh₂*, n. **h₂elyod* that regularly resulted in the Proto-Celtic and Insular Celtic **alyo/ā-* supported by Gaulish *allos* ‘second’ (Lambert, 1994, 131, where the OIr. neut. is wrongly given as *all*) and MW *eil* ‘second’. The Latin variants *alis*, *alid* of *alius*, *aliud* ‘other’ would be relevant here, if they were influenced by indefinite *quis* ‘anyone’, *quid* ‘anything’ or *aliquis* ‘someone’, *aliquid* ‘something’, but plausible alternatives (Ernout, 1953, 97; Meiser, 1998, 168) render this explanation doubtful. Be that as it may, there is nothing inherently improbable about the analogical reshaping of inherited NA sg. n. **aly-od* to **aly-id* in Insular Celtic or earlier under pressure from **nek^w-os* with its completely identical paradigm except for NA sg. n. **nek^w-id*. Insular Celtic loss of *-d* and apocope of *-i* in that order will then have transformed **alyid* quite regularly into **aly*, which would then be likely to undergo assimilation to IC **aL'* (cf. McCone, 1997, 311–12). Although this preform would yield OIr. *aill* directly, it seems unlikely that an isolated palatal liquid would have survived long enough to become part of a much later general opposition between palatal and non-palatal phonemes in the Primitive Irish consonant system. A reasonable alternative would be to posit IC **aL'* to **aL*, which would then have been remodelled to the **aL'* underlying OIr. *aill* once *al'* with a palatal *l* had arisen throughout the remainder of the paradigm (OIr. *aile* etc.).

The above reconstruction of PC **nek^w-os(/-ā)/-id* supplies an instance of the basic pattern needed by Schrijver in order to transform demonstrative NA sg. n. **sod* (< **tod*) into **sid* and the case of OIr. NA sg. n. *aill* < **aly-id* indicates that the neuter *i*-form did succeed in replacing at least one inherited **-od* analogically. That said, this additional

Celtic evidence seriously undermines one crucial aspect of Schrijver's theory, namely the claim that the remodelling of **tod* or **sod* would have produced **sin* in accordance with a Celtic 'tendency to spread **-n* as a marker of the NA sg. n., at least in nouns (OIr. *muir* – 'sea' < **mori* + *-n*' (Schrijver, 1997, 43; see above). It has been argued (McCone, 1978, 36–7) that neuter *i*-stem nouns escaped apocope in Insular Celtic because they had replaced inherited NA sg.-*i* (still seen in Gaul. *boudi* 'victory'; McCone, 1996b, 110) with **-i-n* under the influence of the neuter *o*-stems' NA sg. **-o-n*. Nevertheless, it by no means follows that a similar development affected pronouns with their inherited neut. *o*-stem **-o-d* rather than **-o-n* and, indeed, the evidence of *na/ní* and *aill* shows quite conclusively that it did not. Schrijver's contention that **sin* was the Proto- and Insular Celtic NA sg. n. of the **so-(*to-)* demonstrative must, then, be rejected. It has been seen that the PC form was almost certainly **sod* and, if this had ever come under the analogical influence of the indefinite, the result would surely have been Insular Celtic **si(d)* not **sin*.

This is not the place to discuss Schrijver's (1997, 9–50) elaborate and ingenious account of various Celtic demonstrative and anaphoric pronouns in detail. The central idea is that many of the relevant forms ultimately derive from a system in which the **so-* demonstrative could be reduplicated and/or combined with the particle **de*, the upshot being the four stems **so-*, **so-de*, **so-so-* and **so-de-so-* with their respective NA sg. neuters **sin*, **sin-de*, **so-sin* and **so-de-sin* (Schrijver, 1997, 43). The linchpin of this construct is the already cited contention 'that in PCl. a pronoun **sim* existed, which regularly became **sin*. This provided the NA sg. of the paradigm of **so-* and **so-so-*' (Schrijver, 1997, 42). Analysis of Gaulish *sosin* as acc. sg. n. of reduplicated **so-so-* (Schrijver, 1997, 48) is crucial for establishing both this and the variant **so-de-so-* supposedly underlying OIr. *suide* 'the aforementioned', which can otherwise be straightforwardly derived from **so-de-o-* < **so-de-* with a shift in the inflected element for which OLat. acc. sg. m. *eum-pse*, f. *eam-pse* etc. > Class. Lat. *ipsum*, *ipsam* etc. (Ernout, 1953, 95–6; cf. Meiser, 1998, 163–4) provides a good typological parallel. Derivations such as OIr. *sin* 'that' < **sim* (Schrijver, 1997, 41–2) and NA sg. n. *sodain* 'the aforementioned' < **so-de-sin(-)* (Schrijver, 1997, 49) run up against the difficulty that retention of *-n-* can only be explained by positing a hitherto obscure following syllable. The preforms in question cannot then be reliably reconstructed as **(-)sin* plus some secondary extension, particularly since expected loss of *-n-* is presupposed by the more attractive derivation of the OW relative marker *hai* (MW *a*), nasalising OIr. NA sg. n. article *a* *(-s)a* and the probably identical OIr. prepositional relative marker *(-s)a* from *(-s)e n-* < **(-s)ē n-* < **(-s)oi n-* < **(-s)ohin* (Schrijver, 1997, 47–8 and 56; see McCone, 1996, 60, on OIr. gen. pl. art. *inna* for the basic phonetic development).

Although Schrijver's study has shed welcome light on some details of the Celtic pronominal system, it would seem that demonstrative *so(-) cannot possibly have developed a NA sg. n. *sim in Proto-Celtic and that Insular Celtic is most unlikely to have acquired a *sin in this slot. Rejection of this interpretation of *sin in turn deprives reduplicated *so-so- (and consequently also *so-de-so-) of the vital support potentially supplied by Gaulish *sosin*, which need be nothing more than a combination of demonstrative *so- with *sin (an expected PC sandhi variant, perhaps subsequently generalised, of NA sg. *sen 'one' < PIE *sem; see McCone, 1996, 55–6 on PC *e* > *i* before nasal plus obstruent). Once these central props have been removed, re-examination of some of Schrijver's other proposals may be called for.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Beekes, R. S. P., 1995: *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Campanile, E., 1974: 'Un arcaismo morfologico del celtico', *Incontri Linguistici* 1, 51–4.

Cowgill, W., 1975: 'The origins of the Insular Celtic conjunct and absolute verbal endings', *Flexion und Wortbildung (Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft)*, ed. H. Rix, 40–70. Wiesbaden.

DIL: Dictionary of the Irish language, based mainly on Old and Middle Irish materials (Compact edition), ed. E. G. Quin. Dublin, 1983.

Ernout A., 1953: *Morphologie historique du latin*. Paris.

Eska, J., 1989: *Towards an interpretation of the Hispano-Celtic inscription of Botorrita*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 59. Innsbruck.

GOI: A grammar of Old Irish, R. Thurneysen. Dublin, 1946, repr. 1998.

Lambert, P.-Y., 1994: *La langue gauloise*. Paris.

McCone, K., 1978: 'The dative singular of Old Irish consonant stems', *Ériu* 29, 26–38.

— 1991: *The Indo-European origins of the Old Irish nasal presents, subjunctives and futures*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 66. Innsbruck.

— 1992: 'The etymology of Old Irish *déis* "client(s)"', *Ériu* 43, 193–7.

— 1993: 'Old Irish *co*, *cucci* "as far as (him, it)" and Latin *usque* "as far as"', *Ériu* 44, 171–6.

— 1996: *Towards a relative chronology of ancient and medieval Celtic sound change*, Maynooth Studies in Celtic Linguistics 1. Maynooth.

— 1996b: 'Der Teller von Lezoux', in *Die größeren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler*, ed. W. Meid and P. Anreiter, 107–17. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 95.

— 1997: 'A note on palatalisation and the present inflection of weak i-verbs', *Dán do oide, essays in memory of Conn R. Ó Cléirigh 1927–1995*, ed. A. Ahlqvist and V. Čapková, 303–13. Dublin.

- 1997b: ‘Delbrück’s model of PIE word order and the Celtic evidence’, *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy (Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid)*, ed. E. Crespo and J. L. García Ramón, 363–96. Madrid, Wiesbaden.
- 2000: ‘Celtibérico, celta continental y celta común’, *Religión, lengua y cultura prerromanas de Hispania, Actas del VIII Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, ed. F. Villar, 483–94. Salamanca.
- Meid, W., 1993: *Die erste Botorrita-Inschrift: Interpretation eines keltiberischen Sprachdenkmals*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 76. Innsbruck.
- Meiser, G., 1998: *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
- Rix, H., 1976: *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.
- Schrijver, P., 1997: *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles*, Maynooth Studies in Celtic Linguistics 4. Maynooth.
- Szemerényi, O., 1989: *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt (3rd. ed.).
- Uhlich, J., 1993: ‘Die Reflexe der keltischen Suffixvarianten *-o- vs. *-io- im Altirischen’, *Akten des Ersten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologen*, ed. M. Rockel and S. Zimmer, 353–70. Tübingen.
- Untermann, J., 1997: *Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*, Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum 4. Wiesbaden.
- Vendryes, J., 1960: *Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien, M N O*. P. Dublin.
- Villar, F., 1995: *A new interpretation of Celtiberian grammar*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und Kleiner Schriften 62. Innsbruck.
- 1995b: *Estudios de celtibérico y de toponimia prerromana*. Salamanca.
- with C. Jordán, et. al., 2001: *El IV bronce de Botorrita (Contrebia Belaísca): arqueología y lingüística*. Salamanca.
- VKG: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, H. Pedersen. Göttingen 1909 (vol. I) and 1913 (vol. II).
- Wackernagel, J., and Debrunner, A., 1954: *Altindische Grammatik, Band II, 2 Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen.
- Walde, A. and Hofmann, J. B., 1982: *Lateinsches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.