THE DEICTIC PRONOMIAL *ḰEY IN CELTIC

THERE are a handful of forms in the Celtic dialects that continue the Indo-European deictic pronomial *ḱey. 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) < *ḱe-nā, and its derivative OIr. *cenntar* '(this) world; region, district', with suffix *-tero-, are easily analysed.[1] But the majority still require an adequate treatment and will be discussed here.

1. OLD IRISH *cé*

The Old Irish deictic particle *cé* has been interpreted as an original particle by Pedersen, who develops it from *ḱe/i by lengthening in auslaut.[2] Marstrander, on the other hand, regards it as continuing a fossilised thematic loc. sg. *ḱey < *ḱe-y.[3] Thurneysen[4] and *Lexique étymologique* C–51 report both explanations, but leave the question as unsettled. A third alternative may now be introduced, viz. that *cé* continues a fossilised masc. nom. sg. *ḱey; on the vocalism, cf. non-neuter nom. sg. OIr. *cía*, MW *pwy*, MC *pyw*, MBr. *piu*[5] 'who?' < *$k^w\bar{e}$ < *$k^w ey$.[6] That this may be the correct analysis is supported by the interpretation of Gaul. *ci* in § 2.

2. GAULISH *ducí*

For the loc. sg. of *ḱey we should expect a form with nil-grade vocalism and null desinence, i.e. *ḱi. 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'.[7] Since *ci* '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. *ḱe(s)mey, or perhaps from *ḱóy < *ḱo-ey (should it have adopted thematic flexion), it must be a fossilised loc. sg.[8] Thus through the combined paradigmatic testimony of OIr. *cé* and Gaul. *ci* we are afforded confirmation that they continue masc. nom. sg. *ḱey and loc. sg. *ḱi, respectively.

[1] See E. Bachellery and P.-Y. Lambert, *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien* (Dublin and Paris 1987) C–63–4.

[2] H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen* I (Göttingen 1909) 294 § 198 (1), II (Göttingen 1913) 198 § 518 (4).

[3] C. Marstrander, 'Ogham XOI', *Ériu* 5 (1911) 144.

[4] R. Thurneysen, *A grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin 1946) 501 § 827.

[5] The Cornish and Breton forms, of course, continue *p(w)y yw*.

[6] See E. P. Hamp, 'Miscellanea Celtica: III. The British interrogative pronominals', *Studia Celtica* 10–11 (1975–6) 59–69, *passim*. He provides a convenient tabular display in 'The Indo-European Anaphora *ei* in Umbrian', *American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986) 398–400, p. 398.

[7] R. Thurneysen, 'Zu den Graffiti von La Graufesenque', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 16 (1927) 285–304, pp. 286–7.

[8] A possible alternative is that *ci* could represent instr. sg. (> dat. by syncretism) *ḱī < *ḱi-h_1; this would not change my argument, as instr. sg. *ḱī is a member of the same paradigm as loc. sg. *ḱi.

3. OGHAM **KOI** AND A GAULISH GHOST FORM

The enigmatic Ogham form **KOI** is attested nine times in the Irish epigraphic corpus.[9] Macalister and MacNeill have persuasively surmised that it is equivalent in meaning to the HIC IACIT on Latinised memorial stones of the same period,[10] and Marstrander has rightly analysed it as a loc. sg. continuing *$\acute{k}oy$.[11] 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 the form κουι in an inscription from Cavaillon.[12] The full text of this inscription, as now read by Lejeune, is: ατεσ · ατ | εμαγου | τι · ουνα | κουι.[13] In his interpretive remarks, Lejeune calls attention to the phonological difficulty of Loth's equation, viz., that the digraph *ov* is equivalent to $\bar{u}$ in Roman characters, and that *$k\bar{u}i$* ($< $ *$k\bar{o}y$*) would be dat., not loc. sg. Moreover, his new division of words and interpretation, which are supported by the interpuncts, are so compelling as almost to exclude any others: ατες ατεμαγουτι ουνακουι is an 'épitaphe à formulaire de curatelle: "A. pour A. fils de O." ' There can be no doubt that κουι is a ghost form.

4. GAULISH *isoc*

This form from the Chamalières inscription is probably an adverb 'so, thus'.[14] I have elsewhere suggested that it continues the Continental

---

[9] R. A. S. Macalister, *Corpus inscriptionum insularum celticarum* I [*CIIC*] (Dublin 1945) nos. 22, 26, 34, 38, 48, 98, 120, 156, 163.

[10] R. A. S. Macalister, *Studies in Irish epigraphy* III (London 1907) 85; J. Mac-Neill, 'Notes on the distribution, history, grammar, and import of the Irish Ogham inscriptions', *RIA Proc.* 27 C (1908–9) 329–370, pp. 364–5. See also C. Marstrander, 'Kleine irische Beiträge', in *Festskrift til Professor Alf Torp paa hans 60 aars fødselsdag, 27. September 1913* (Kristiania 1913) 239–252, p. 250.

[11] Marstrander, *Ériu* 5 (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, *CIIC*, 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 *Corpus* record except that his sketch should present the two *o*-vowel notches a little less boldly than it does'.

[12] J. Loth, 'κουι dans une inscription gauloise de Cavaillon et l'oghamique *KOI*', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 20 (1918) 38–42.

[13] M. Lejeune, *Recueil des incriptions gauloises*: I. Textes gallo-grecs (Paris 1985) G–122.

[14] P.-Y. Lambert, *Études Celtiques* 16 (1979) 141–69, opts for a different division of words, leaving him with *soc* (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, *cantI*. Belá Kowal, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 92 (1987) 243–55, reads the form as *isos* (245) and interprets it as masc. acc. pl. (251). But to judge from the drawing and photograph in M. Lejeune et R. Marichal, '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 - *c*.

Celtic demonstrative stem *isto-, as seen, for example, in Lepontic masc.
nom. sg. iśos (Vergiate) and Hisp.-Celt. fem. acc. sg. śTaṁ (Luzaga).[15]
The final -c, then, probably continues the deictic enclitic particle *-ḱe,
which is attested in a wide range of the Indo-European languages, but
is particularly promiscuous in the Italic dialects.[16] Fleuriot is probably
correct in principle to compare isoc to Umb. esuk, issoc 'sic',[17] 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 (-ō < *-ōd) or an instrumental (-ō < *-oh₁)
we would expect the -ō- to have become -ū-. For the present no sure
explanation is in sight.

5. MIDDLE CORNISH keth

The Middle Cornish deictic demonstrative keth 'that, the above men-
tioned' has been derived from *ḱe-dhe by Pedersen.[18] But the ambigu-
ous Cornish orthography, in which the digraph th may represent either
the voiced or voiceless dental spirant, cannot diagnose the accuracy of
his proposal. So the fact that keth is always construed with the defi-
nite article,[19] e.g. an keth map eth alemma 'that same Son who went
hence',[20] 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',[21] may cause one to wonder whether the
dental element of keth is analogically after that of pyth (< *kʷettV-[22]).

JOSEPH F. ESKA

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

[15] J. F. Eska, 'The demonstrative stem *isto- in Continental Celtic', *ZCP*,
forthcoming.

[16] See R. von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte* II (Straßburg
1897) 228–30 § 289, and M. Leumann, *Lateinische Grammatik* I. *Lateinische Laut-
und Formenlehre* Neuausgabe (München 1977) 468–70 § 372.

[17] L. Fleuriot, 'Le vocabulaire de l'inscription gauloise de Chamalières', *Études
Celtiques* 15 (1976) 173–90, p. 186.

[18] Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik* II, 198 § 518 (4).

[19] See H. Lewis, *Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol* argraffrad newydd (Caerdydd 1946) 39
§ 37 n.

[20] *Ordinale de resurrexione domini nostri Jhesu Christi*, line 2509 in *The ancient
Cornish drama* II (ed. and transl. E. Norris, Oxford 1859) 188.

[21] *Passio domini nostri Jhesu Christi*, lines 3021–2, in Norris, *Ancient Cornish
drama* I (Oxford 1859) 462. The same syntax is also found with MBr. *pez*: see R.
Hemon, *A historical morphology and syntax of Breton* (Dublin 1975) 128–9 § 76 (7).

[22] See E. P. Hamp, 'British Keltic *peθ', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 17
(1957) 158–61, p. 161.