THE DEICTIC PRONOMIAL *KEY IN CELTIC

Here are a handful of forms in the Celtic dialects that continue the Indo-European deictic pronomial *key. Some of these, like OIr. cen ‘apart from; without’, MW amgen, MC ken, MBr. quen ‘other’ (orig. ‘on this side’; cf. OIr. cenalpande gl. ‘cisalpina’ Sg. 127 b 8) < *ke-nā, and its derivative OIr. cennlar ‘(this) world; region, district’, with suffix *-lero-, are easily analysed. But the majority still require an adequate treatment and will be discussed here.

1. OLD IRISH cē

The Old Irish deictic particle cē has been interpreted as an original particle by Pedersen, who develops it from *ke/i by lengthening in auslaut. Marstrander, on the other hand, regards it as continuing a fossilised thematic loc. sg. *key < *ke-y. Thurneysen and Lexique étymologique C–51 report both explanations, but leave the question as unsettled. A third alternative may now be introduced, viz. that cē continues a fossilised masc. nom. sg. *key; on the vocalism, cf. non-neuter nom. sg. OIr. cīa, MW pwy, MC pyw, MBr. piw < *who? < *kōe < *kōey. That this may be the correct analysis is supported by the interpretation of Gaul. cī in § 2.

2. GAULISH duci

For the loc. sg. of *key we should expect a form with nil-grade vocalism and null desinence, i.e. *ki. This form, in fact, is attested in the Gaulish (La Graufesenque) conjunction duci, which has been interpreted by Thurneysen, no doubt correctly, as literally meaning ‘hierzu’. Since cī ‘here’ is not governed by the preposition du ‘to’ (OIr. du, do, OW di, MW y), which would require a form descended from dat. sg. *ke(s)mey, or perhaps from *ke(y) < *ko-ey (should it have adopted thematic flexion), it must be a fossilised loc. sg. Thus through the combined paradigmatic testimony of OIr. cē and Gaul. cī we are afforded confirmation that they continue masc. nom. sg. *key and loc. sg. *ki, respectively.

---

5. The Cornish and Breton forms, of course, continue p[ ]yw yw.
8. A possible alternative is that cī could represent instr. sg. (> dat. by syncrism) *iē < *i-hā; this would not change my argument, as instr. sg. *iē is a member of the same paradigm as loc. sg. *ki.
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3. Ogham KOI and a Gaulish Ghost Form

The enigmatic Ogham form KOI is attested nine times in the Irish epigraphic corpus. Macalister and MacNeill have persuasively surmised that it is equivalent in meaning to the HIC IACIT on Latinised memorial stones of the same period, and Marstrander has rightly analysed it as a loc. sg. continuing *koy. However, since we have already seen that Gaul. ci represents the original loc. sg. form of this base, KOI must be interpreted as a remade form, based, of course, upon the ever-spreading thematic declension.

Loth thought that he had found the Gaulish cognate of KOI in an inscription from Cavaillon. The full text of this inscription, as now read by Lejeune, is: ατεσ-ατ | εμαγομ | τι | ουνα | κου. In his interpretive remarks, Lejeune calls attention to the phonological difficulty of Loth's equation, viz., that the digraph ov is equivalent to u in Roman characters, and that "koi (< "koy") would be dat., not loc. sg. Moreover, his new division of words and interpretation, which are supported by the inter-puncts, are so compelling as almost to exclude any others: ατες ατεμαγωμεν ουνακουλ is an "épitaphe à formulaire de curatelle: "A. pour A. fils de O." There can be no doubt that kou is a ghost form.

4. Gaulish isoc

This form from the Chamalières inscription is probably an adverb 'so, thus'. I have elsewhere suggested that it continues the Continental

9R. A. S. Macalister, Corpus inscriptionum insularum celticarum I [CICC] (Dublin 1943) nos. 22, 26, 34, 38, 48, 98, 120, 156, 163.
11Marstrander, Études 8 (1911) 144. But the variant form *KI, thought to be attested once, and discussed by all commentators, has proven to be a ghost form; see Macalister, CICC, no. 156, where he corrects his earlier misreading. I should like to thank Dr Damian McManus for confirming Macalister's corrected reading (personal communication, 15 July 1988). Based upon his personal inspection of the stone, he is satisfied that KOI was definitely the original reading, and... would not disagree with Macalister's CICC record except that his sketch should present the two o-vowel notches a little less boldly than it does'.
12J. Loth, 'kou dans une inscription gauloise de Cavaillon et l'oghamique KOI', Revue des Études Anciennes 20 (1918) 38-42.
14P.-Y. Lambert, Études Celtiques 16 (1979) 141-69, opts for a different division of words, leaving him with isoc (155), which he interprets as a pronoun of undetermined flexion (157); the final c he believes is the product of sandhi with the following word, cant. Belá Kowal, Indogermanische Forschungen 92 (1987) 243-55, reads the form as isos (246) and interprets it as masc. acc. pl. (251). But to judge from the drawing and photograph in M. Lejeune et R. Marchal, 'Textes gaulois et gallo-romains en cursive latine', Études Celtiques 15 (1976) 151-71, p. 159 and pl. xiv, respectively, the final character is probably d.
Celtic demonstrative stem *isto-, as seen, for example, in Lepontic masc. nom. sg. *isōs (Vergiate) and Hisp.-Celt. fem. acc. sg. *sTam (Luzaga).  

The final -c, then, probably continues the deictic enclitic particle *-kes, which is attested in a wide range of the Indo-European languages, but is particularly promiscuous in the Italic dialects. Fleuriot is probably correct in principle to compare isoc to Umb. esuk, issoi 'sic', though its precise morphological analysis remains unclear. While the Umbrian adverb clearly is a fossilised ablative or instrumental, we cannot be sure of the Gaulish form, since the quantity of the -o- is unknown. Were it etymologically an ablative (-o < *-o) or an instrumental (-o < *-oki) we would expect the -o- to have become -u-. For the present no sure explanation is in sight.

5. Middle Cornish keth

The Middle Cornish deictic demonstrative keth 'that, the above mentioned' has been derived from *ke-khe by Pedersen. But the ambiguous Cornish orthography, in which the digraph th may represent either the voiced or voiceless dental spirant, cannot discharge the accuracy of his proposal. So the fact that keth is always construed with the definite article, e.g. an keth map eth alemma 'that same Son who went hence', as is also found with the demonstrative pronoun pyth (y = /e/) 'what', e.g. an pyth a wren, my ny wothyen, rag ny wylyn 'what I did, I knew not, for I did not see', may cause one to wonder whether the dental element of keth is analogically after that of pyth (< *petV).
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18 Pedersen, Vergleichende Grammatik II, 198 § 118 (4).
19 See H. Lewis, Lawlyfr Cernywe g Canol argraffad newydd (Caerdydd 1946) 39 § 37 n.
20 Ordinale de resurrectione domini nostri Ihesu Christi, line 2509 in The ancient Cornish drama II (ed. and transl. E. Norris, Oxford 1859) 188.
21 Passio domini nostri Ihesu Christi, lines 3021–2, in Norris, Ancient Cornish drama I (Oxford 1859) 462. The same syntax is also found with MBr. pes: see R. Hemon, A historical morphology and syntax of Breton (Dublin 1973) 128–9 § 76 (7).