ON THE TREATMENT OF IE *ō IN HISPANO-CELTIC AND RELATED MATTERS

Villar 1989 has recently conducted a useful survey of the evidence for the treatment of IE *ō in final syllables (with attention also to its treatment in other positions) in Hispano-Celtic[1]. His analysis of the raising of *ō > ū (eventually) in final syllables as an environmentally regulated, progressive change is eminently sensible. However, there are a number of additional diachronic phonological and morphological details which, I believe, need to be factored into the assessment of the question, and which cast some doubt on Villar's conclusions.

I. THE TREATMENT OF IE *ō IN FINAL SYLLABLES

Villar 1989: p. 199 lists the morphological categories attested in the Hispano-Celtic corpus in which IE *ō occurred in the final syllable:

(α): non-neuter n-stem nom. sg. *-ō (< *-ōn)
(β): o-stem dat. sg. *-ōy (< *-o-ey)
(γ): gen. pl. *-ōm
(δ): non-neuter o-stem nom. (and acc.?)[2] pl. *-ōs (< *-o-es and *-o-ns, respectively)
(ε): o-stem gen. sg. (← abl. sg.) *-ōd (< *-o-Vd)

Of these, (α) - (δ) are uncontroversial. As for (ε), Villar 1989: p. 201 notes that 'algunos estudiosos hayan llegado a poner en duda la identificación del genitivo celtibérico en -o con la desinencia de ablativo temático (y de genitivo en balto-eslavo) *-ōd'[3], but accepts unequivocally de Hoz' 1990 identification of some Lepontic forms in -u as o-stem gen. sgs. as corroboration of the ablatival origin of the Hispano-Celtic gen. sg. in -o. The forms that de Hoz discusses have heretofore been analysed as non-neuter n-stem nom. sgs. in -ū < *-ō, and I am not yet persuaded that this is not the correct analysis. De Hoz' main evidence for his analysis is the form Plialeθu in the personal name uvamoKozis Plialeθu (Prestino), which he interprets as an o-stem gen. sg. patronymic. However, in view of the existence of other Lepontic o-stem gen. sg. forms in -ī, e.gg., aśKoneTi (PID 274), aśouni (PID 302)[4], our slight knowledge of Lepontic onomastics and

---

[2] It is unclear whether acc. pl. maTuś (Botorrita A6) is an o- or u-stem noun.
[3] These are Hamp 1971: p. 225[14] and Eska 1988, who regard the Hisp.-Celt. o-stem gen. sg. in -o as continuing archaic IE o-stem gen. sg. *-os.
[4] We may also note that Cisalpine Gaulish, which seems to be closely allied to Lepontic, has o-stem gen. sgs. in -ī only.

onomastic formulae, under which a significant Ligurian substratum lays, and the obscurity of the form *Plialeθu* itself, the question of the morphological origin of the Hispano-Celtic gen. sg. in -*o* can not yet be said to be settled[5]. But, for purposes of argumentation, I will continue to consider the Hisp.-Celt. *o*-stem gen. sg. in -*o* as relevant to the discussion of the treatment of IE $*\bar{o}$ in final syllables in Hispano-Celtic.

Villar 1989: pp. 199-200 then lists the realisation of IE $*\bar{o}$ in Hispano-Celtic in the morphological categories mentioned supra:

(α):   non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg. is always -<u>
(β):   *o*-stem dat. sg. is usually -<ui>; he mentions that there is a possible form in -<oi> in an inscription recently discovered in Medinaceli, viz.,]*r̃PośoPoi*[6], but the existence of presumably dat. sg. *ueiTui* in the same inscription makes this somewhat doubtful[7].
(γ):   gen. pl. is attested both as -<om> and -<um>
(δ):   non-neuter *o*-stem nom. pl. is attested both as -<oś> and -<us>
(ε):   *o*-stem gen. sg. is always -<o>

On the basis of this distribution, Villar 1989: p. 201 proposes that IE $*\bar{o}$ tended to be raised to $\bar{u}$ in final syllables in Hispano-Celtic in the following progression:

(ζ):   in environment __ *n*#, IE $*\bar{o}$ > Hisp.-Celt. $\bar{u}$ already complete

(η):   in environment __ $\left\{\begin{matrix} y \\ m \\ s \end{matrix}\right\}$ #, IE $*\bar{o}$ > Hisp.-Celt. $\bar{u}$ in progress[8]

(θ):   in environment __ *d*#, IE $*\bar{o}$ > Hisp. -Celt. $\bar{u}$ does not begin during the period of attestation of the Hispano-Celtic corpus

Assuming that the raising of IE $*\bar{o}$ > Hisp.-Celt. $\bar{u}$ in final syllables in any environment is a late development, as is indicated by the vacillication in vowel quality in categories (γ) and (δ) (Villar 1989: p. 201), two problems of diachronic phonology arise with this analysis. The first is that, on the testimony of the great majority of Indo-European languages, the rule $*n > \emptyset / \bar{V}$ __# was implemented at a very early date in Indo-European. This rule, of course, affected the non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg., yielding nom. sg. $*-\bar{o}$. Greek has nom. sg. -ων, but the -ν# is not ancient. It was restored to level the paradigm after subsequent intra-Hellenic phonological developments made the sequence -$\bar{V}n$# phonotactically acceptable again (Schindler 1974: p. 5). The early raising of IE $*\bar{o} > \bar{u}$ in Hispano-Celtic non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sgs., then, had nothing to do with its occurrence before $*-n$#.

The second is that a rule $*d > \emptyset / \bar{V}$ __# very probably was implemented in Hispano-Celtic prior to the time when IE $*\bar{o}$ began to be raised to $\bar{u}$ in final syllables. One may compare

[5]   I intend to defend the analysis of the morpheme as continuing archaic IE *o*-stem gen. sg. $*-os$ in the near future. In the meantime, another piece of phonological evidence against the ablatival analysis will arise in the course of this paper.

[6]   Villar 1989: pp. 199, 201, has]*r̃PośPoi*, but this, presumably, is a typographical error, since the <o> between <ś> and <Po> is plainly visible in the photograph provided by Fatás 1985: p. 427. Untermann 1990: p. 368 reads this graphemic sequence as two forms, viz.,]*r̃Poś : oPoi*, which seems plausible to me, though I can

not see the word-dividing puncta clearly in Fatás' photograph.

[7]   It is hard to know what -<oi> might represent if it is not (an archaising?) dat. sg. The options would presumably be limited to a neuter *o*-stem nom.-voc.-acc. du. noun, or a masc. nom. pl. or fem. or neut. nom.-acc. du. pronoun. Whether any such form would suit the syntactic context remains to be seen.

[8]   As indicated supra, it is uncertain whether __ *y*# really belongs here.

the case of Latin, in which -*d#* was lost in this environment before the end of the third century B.C. (Leumann 1977: pp. 228-229 §230; see also Hamp 1984: p. 184[8])[9], and note also that there is no indication of its preservation in Hispano-Celtic whatsoever. The putative resistance to raising of IE *ō (< abl. sg. *-ōd) in the Hisp. Celt. *o*-stem gen. sg., then, could not have been due to its occurrence before *-*d#*[10].

In view of these further considerations to Villar's analysis, it seems that we really have evidence for only two discernable conditioning factors in the progressional raising of IE *ō > Hisp.-Celt. *ū* in final syllables:

(ι): in environment __#, which includes non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg. *-ō < *-ōn and putative *o*-stem gen. sg. -ō ← abl. sg. *-ōd, the raising, which is complete in the non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg., occurred first. That it did not affect the *o*-stem gen. sg. at all indicates that the vowel of the desinence was not long[11].

(ϰ): in environment __C#, which includes *o*-stem dat. sg. *-ōy, gen. pl. *-ōm, and non-neuter *o*-stem nom. pl. *-ōs, the raising is still in progress. Among these categories, the raising was probably completed first in environment __ *y#*, since only *y* is [+ high], then in environment __ *m#*, since raising before nasals is a common development, and finally in environment __ *s#*. Such a chronology is borne out by the relative distribution of <o> and <u> in the respective categories.

II. THE TREATMENT OF IE *ō IN MONOSYLLABIC WORDS

It is hard to assess the value of the evidence for the early Celtic treatment of IE *ō in monosyllabic words. OIr. *cū* 'hound' < *kwō(n) and *dū* 'earth' < *dʰǵʰō(m) indicate that the treatment was as in final syllables, but Thurneysen 1946: p. 58 §89 plausibly suggests that the vocalism in these instances may have arisen in analogy with that of polysyllabic non-neuter

---

[9] It is preserved in Plautus in acc.-abl. sg. pronouns in pre-vocalic position (Leumann 1977: pp. 462 §367 [3c], 559 §418 I A [2bβ], 561 §418 I A [2bγ2]).

[10] Even if the rule *d > Ø / V __# was implemented subsequent to the beginning of the development of IE *ō > *ū* in final syllables in Hispano-Celtic, the fact that the development was still in progress after the implementation of the rule, as is proved by the gen. pl. -<om>/<um> and masc. *o*-stem nom. pl. -<oś>/<us> variations indicates that putative *o*-stem gen. sg. -ō [← abl. sg. *-ō(d)] should have been raised to *-*ū*.

[11] Schmidt 1991: pp. 364-365 now defends the ablatival hypothesis by suggesting a development *-ōd > *-od > *-o; the shortening, he claims, 'läßt sich analogisch durch das Muster anderer Kasus erklären: Nom. Akk. Sg. *-os*, *-om* führt zu Vokalkürzung in dem Abl. Sg. *-od* (statt *-ōd); eine vergleichbare Analogie hat im Ostbalt. gewirkt: Nom. Akk. Sg. *-as*, *-am* bewirkt Abl. Sg. *-ād* (statt *-ōd, aber mit Beibehaltung der Quantität)'. But Schmidt's comparison with Baltic does not stand up (one may note that other suggestions for the origin of the Baltic vocalism have been made, e.g., Stang

1966: p. 44, 181, inter alios): Gaul. 3. neut. nom.-acc. sg. anaph. pron. *id* (Chamalières; Lezoux) indicates that *-*d#* would not have been lost after short vowels, in which case, according to Schmidt's proposal, we should find Hisp.-Celt. **-*od*, which is never attested. And even if one thinks to a sequence *-ōd > *-ō > *-o, one finds that there is no support in Continental Celtic for the shortening of final long vowels; cf. Hisp.-Celt. non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg. -*ū* < *-ō, never **-*o*.

We may further note that had a levelling of the stem vowel occurred in the *o*-stem paradigm in Hispano-Celtic, one would expect it to have occurred throughout the paradigm. But we find loc. sg. -*ey* and dat. sg. -*ūy* (< *-ōy); the former would surely have been realised as *-*oy*, a common development in the Indo-European languages (cf. Hamp 1970), and the latter would have been susceptible to shortening, since long diphthongs throughout the Indo-European languages tended strongly in that direction (Brugmann/Delbrück 1897: pp. 203 §222, 796-804 §§926-933). There seems to be little support, then, for Schmidt's proposal of an analogical shortening having occurred as suggested supra.

n-stem nom. sgs.[12] Villar 1990b: p. 390 accepts Thurneysen's view and suggests that Hisp.Celt. *śua* 'thus' (Botorrita A2) continues **swō* (< instr. sg. **swoh₁*), which underlies Goth. *swa* thus' and Gk. ὥς'as, like' (with secondary *-s*), with lowering of IE **ō* > Hisp.-Celt. *ā*. As a comparandum, he cites Gaul. 2. sg. impv. DA 'give (thou)!' (Aûtun), which, following Thurneysen 1946: p. 58 §89, he takes to continue IE **dō* (< **deh₃*) directly. There is some reason, however, to suspect that the form may, in fact, be Latin (Meid 1980: pp. 17-18 = 1983: p. 1034). But if it is Celtic, it probably does not continue IE **dō* directly, since there was a strong tendency in Celtic to eliminate paradigmatic ablaut[13] in favour of a generalised nil-grade vocalism; cf. Gaul. 3. sg. perf. δεδε (e.gg., *RIG* G-27, 28) < **de-dh₃-e*[14] (or **dʰe-dʰh₁-e*) and Lep. 3. sg. perf. *TeTu* (Prestino) < **de-dh₃-u* (or **dʰe-dʰh₁-u*), in which **de-doh₃-e/u* (or **dʰe-dʰoh₁-e/u*) would have been inherited[15]. The 2. sg. impv. of the base **deh₃* in Gaulish, then, would probably have had a short vowel.

Other commentators, including myself (1989a: pp. 101-102), have sought to compare Hisp.-Celt. *śua* with OLat. *suād* gl. 'sīc' (Festus). However, Villar 1990b: p. 390 believes that 'el paralelo latino *suad* no es del todo satisfactorio ya que de hecho esa forma no está representada en ninguna lengua fuera del latín' and remarks that 'sólo el latín de entre las lenguas indoeuropeas han desarrollado un ablativo femenino en *-ād*'. While is is true that ablatives in *-ād* (and *-īd* and *-ūd*)[16] are an Italic innovation, such an innovation also occurred in later Avestan (Reichelt 1909: p. 168 §326). Though there is no unambiguous evidence for the existence of an *ā*-stem abl. sg. in **-ād* in Celtic, we should be mindful of the fact that Italic is the Indo-European group to which Celtic is most closely related, and that had a Celtic abl. sg. in **-ād* existed, any fossilised debris might be expected to have been preserved as adverbs after the functions of the ablative were absorbed by another case through syncretism;[17] cf. Greek adverbs in -ω < *o*-stem abl. sg. **-ōd*, inter alia (Schwyzer 1939: pp. 549-551). Hisp.-Celt. *śua* could possibly be such an example, as also could the prep. (← adv.) *enTaŕa* 'within' (Botorrita A6), which seems best compared to Lat. *intrā* 'within'; that Lat. *intrā* 'within', that Lat. *intrā* continues an **intrād* is assured by its Oscan antonym **ehtrad** 'outside'[18]. The Italic evidence, of course, does not guarantee that *enTaŕa* continues an old ablative in **-ād*, since it could also continue instr. sg. **-ā* (< **-eh₂-h₁*) (cf. Skt. *antaŕā* 'within'), though I am more inclined towards the Italic comparison, given its proximity to Celtic.

We must conclude, then, that *śua* does not provide decisive evidence for the treatment of IE **ō* in monosyllabic words in Hispano-Celtic, since it is susceptible to two non-confirmable analyses[19].

---

[12] Villar 1990b: p. 390 is wrong to say that the opinion expressed by Thurneysen is generally considered to be correct. Among the other standard Celtic handbooks, Pedersen 1909: p. 250 §157 says that in monosyllabic words '[d]er auslautende Konsonant schwindet aber, und der Vokal unterliegt denselben Änderungen der Qualität wie im Auslaut mehrsilbiger Wörter', while Jackson 1953: p. 301 §14 believes that Thurneysen's view is 'less satisfactory' than that expressed by Pedersen.

[13] The base **deh₃-* 'give' belongs to such a paradigm; cf. Ved. 1. sg. pres. *dádāmi*, 1. pl. *dadmási*, Gk. 1. sg. δίδωμι, 1. pl. δίδομεν. The Latin paradigm has been extensively remodelled (Leumann 1977: pp. 527-528 §402).

[14] With non-colouration by the laryngeal across a strong morpheme boundary.

[15] One may also note that early OIr. *dáu* 'two', reconstructed by Thurneysen 1946: p. 58 §89, 182 §287, as **dwōw*, is now considered by Cowgill 1985: pp. 20-25 §§10-16 to continue uninflected **duwo*.

[16] Forms in *-ēd* continue instr. sg. **-ē* (< **-eh₁*) and are therefore hypercorrexions.

[17] By the dative, in my view (1988: p. 117³).

[18] The *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (*CIL* i² 581 = x 104) has two instances of EXSTRAD, but the final *-d* surely 'represent[s] a conscious archaism absent in speech, in deference to the solemnity of the text', in view of the phrase IN AGRO TEVRANO (in another hand) at the end of the inscription (Pulgram 1978: p. 189).

[19] It is worth calling attention to the preposition attested by Gaul. *du-ci* lit. 'to here' (e.gg., *GLG* 3.10, 11, 12.10, 16, 13.12), OIr. *du*, *do*, OW *di*, MW *y* 'to', all

III. The Treatment of IE *ō in Non-Final Syllables

None of the evidence available in Hispano-Celtic for the treatment of IE *ō in non-final syllables, in my view, is unambiguous. I have previously suggested that 3. sg. fut. impv. *TaTus* (Botorrita A8, 10) continues *dō-tōd* (< *deh₃-), with full-grade vocalism of the base (1989a: pp. 104, 142 §10 [1], 169 §104 [1]), but in view of Villar's 1989: p. 204[11] comparison with Gk. δότω and Lat. *datō*, must agree that *TaTus* most probably has nil-grade vocalism of the base.

Villar 1989: p. 204 suggests that the Hispano-Celtic non-neuter *n*-stem paradigm as reflected by, e.g., nom. sg. *melmu* (Botorrita B2), gen. sg. *melmunoś* (Botorrita B1, 7), indicates that the lengthened-grade vocalism of the nom. sg. suffix *-ōn was extended to the oblique declension as well, and concludes that the regular treatment of IE *ō in non-final syllables in Hispano-Celtic was *ū*. However, since the rest of Celtic, both Continental and Insular, indicates unambiguously that IE *ō regularly fell together with *ā in this position at an early date (Pedersen 1909: pp. 47-48 §32 [1]; Thurneysen 1946: pp. 35-36 §51 [b]), it would be prudent to scrutinise the evidence closely before we accept that Hispano-Celtic had a divergent treatment, as Villar proposes.

Like Villar, I have also assumed that the suffix in the oblique declension of non-neuter *n*-stems in Hispano-Celtic was generalised as lengthened-grade *-ōn- after the nom. sg. (type Gk. nom. sg. τρίβων, gen. sg. τρίβωνος) (1989a: pp. 130, 143 §10 [3]). But it now seems to me to be preferable to think that the suffix of the oblique declension was generalised as full-grade *-on- (type Gk. nom. sg. ἄκμων, gen. sg. ἄκμονος); such a supposition is supported by Lep. dat. sg. *aTilonei* (PID 263), *Piuonei* (PID 271), nom. pl. *ariuonePos* (Prestino). A full-grade suffix is also the rule in the Ogam corpus, e.gg., gen. sg. MOINENA (CIIC 147), OGTENAS (CIIC 450 = EChMW 390)[20], INISSIONAS (CIIC 161), BIVAIDONAS (CIIC 504)[21], and must also be reconstructed for later attested Insular Celtic (Pedersen 1913: pp. 108 §452, 110 §454; Thurneysen 1946: p. 212 §330). An early Hispano-Celtic paradigm nom. sg. *melmu*, gen. sg. *melmonoś*, then, would have been analogically remodelled after the vocalism of the suffix in the nom. sg. to nom. sg. *melmu*, gen. sg. *melmunoś*, in order to level the paradigm.

Since comparative evidence suggests that *TaTus* has nil-grade vocalism of the base, and that the oblique declension of the Hispano-Celtic non-neuter *n*-stem paradigm has been disturbed, we must conclude that there exists no unambiguous evidence with which to assess the treatment of IE *ō in non-final syllables in Hispano-Celtic at the present time.

---

of which immediately continue *dū. It is very likely that this preposition is to be reconstructed as *dō (< *doh₁); cf. OE OS tō, OHG zuo 'to' and the bound morpheme dō 'to' in OLat. dōnicum, Lat. dōnec 'until', quandō 'when(?)'. Since there would not have been any paradigmatic pressure upon the prep. *dō to adopt the vocalism of the non-neuter *n*-stem nom. sg., there is good reason to think that the regular Celtic treatment of IE *ō in monosyllabic words was *ū*, as Pedersen and Jackson state (see note 12). Since the analysis of Hisp.-Celt. *śua* as continuing *swō would involve a divergent treatment, it seems preferable to analyse *śua* as continuing *swād*.

Villar 1991: pp. 64-65 now treats Hisp.-Celt. TO (Peñalba de Villastar) as the preposition 'to'. Notwithstanding the vocalism (since IE *ō may have been preserved in monosyllabic words in Hispano-Celtic), the voicing of the dental obstruent indicates unambiguously that Villar can not be correct, since it was [+ voice] in the preposition 'to' in Celtic. The semantically null Old Irish preverb to-, later do-, continues the Indo-European sentence connective *to (cf. OHitt. ta-), which is the manner in which the TO of the Peñalba de Villastar inscription has been analysed by Ködderitzsch 1985: p. 216 and myself (1990b: pp. 106-107).

[20] Nash-Williams 1950: p. 213 reads OGTENLO (?), but McManus 1991: p. 65 has recently confirmed Macalister's 1945: pp. 427-428 reading as OGTENAS.

[21] The -U- in GAMICUNAS (CIIC 191), of course, belongs to the base, and the gen. sg. suffix retains the inherited nil-grade vocalism. Gen. sg. -CUNAS later appears as -CONAS, e.g., GLASICONAS (CIIC 252), after vowel affection has occurred. As Joseph 1990 has recently demonstrated, *cū* 'hound' is the only noun aside from *ben* 'woman' (see now Jasanoff 1989) to preserve paradigmatic ablaut in (Insular?) Celtic.

IV. THE FUTURE IMPERATIVE IN HISPANO-CELTIC

As a corollary to his discussion of the treatment of IE *ō in Hispano-Celtic, Villar 1989: pp. 202-204 treats the verbal forms in -*Tus* in the inscription of Botorrita[22]. I have also discussed this desinence (1989b), and am pleased to find that our independant analyses both agree that it continues IE 3. sg. fut. impv. *-*tōd* (with the secondary affixation of an additional morpheme, perhaps an anaphoric pronoun). We, however, differ on a number of details which I should like to address here.

But before considering -*Tus*, I note that Villar 1989: pp. 202-203 follows Adrados 1976: p. 40 = 1988: p. 585 and treats the form *neiTo* (A6) as a 3. sg. future imperative with proclitic negative particle, i.e., *ne-iTo*, and would translate the syntagm *neiTo Tiŕ[i]CanTam eni* (A6-7) as 'no vaya al trescantos'. As he notes, most other commentators, including myself (1989a: pp. 78-79), have taken *neiTo* to be the gen. sg. of a divine name *Neytos,* which is attested elsewhere in the ancient Iberian peninsula, and to be a complement of the the following acc. sg. *Tiŕ[i]CanTam.* Villar 1989: p. 203 believes that putative 3. sg. fut. impv. *iTo* does not appear as *iTus* because it does not have a definite referent, whereas forms in -*Tus* do (hence the affixation of an anaphoric pronoun).

Now, as Lehmann 1990: p. 366 has recently reminded us, the sentence, if not the discourse, is the basic unit of meaning, and such a syntactico-semantic perspective, I think, tends to cast doubt on Villar's analysis of *neiTo* as a future imperative verb with proclitic negative particle. Almost immediately following the syntagm *neiTo Tiŕ[i]CanTam eni,* the correlative construction *iomui lisTas TiTas sisonTi, somui iom aŕsnas PionTi* (A7) occurs. There can be no doubt that this sequence forms a well delimited, self-contained syntactic unit. The only form to intervene between the two sequences is *o[i]saTus*[23] (A7), another form in -*Tus*. Under Villar's interpretation, then, *o[i]saTus* must stand as a clause on its own. This, of course, is possible, but whether it is probable in a juridical text that otherwise, as far as it can be understood to-day, normally goes to some length to set out detailed instructions remains to be seen. (One could also ask what the definite referent that Villar's hypothesis concerning the -*Tus* forms requires may be. Furthermore, according to the result arrived at supra, 3. sg. fut. impv. *-*tōd* would be expected to yield Hisp.-Celt. *-*tū*.) Unless it can be demonstrated that *o[i]saTus* provides suitable semantics to stand as a contextually sound clause on its own, I prefer to retain my 1989a interpretation of *neiTo* as a gen. sg. divine name with 3. sg. fut. impv. *o[i]saTus* as the verb of the clause, which I would analyse syntactically as:

$$[_S[_{NP}e][_{VP}[_{PP}[_{NP}[_{N'}[_N neiTo][_N Tiŕ <i> CanTam]]][_{Postp} eni]][_{V} o<i> saTus]]]$$

To return now to -*Tus*, Villar 1989: p. 203, like de Hoz 1986: p. 57 and myself (1989b: pp. 218-219), suggests that the final -*s* of -*Tus* may be an affixed anaphoric pronoun, as Fleuriot 1981: 91 originally proposed in another context. But rather than a reduced form of the anapho-

---

[22]   I note that, in Villar's opinion, 'al menos algunas de las [formas] que aparecen con Δ*l,* (-*tus*) pueden encubrir categorías morfológicas no claras a primera vista' (1989: p. 202).

[23]   The form is usually read as *onsaTus*, though it is hard to be certain since the second character is immedia-

tely adjacent to the fracture in the tablet. I tentatively restore the second character as <i> only because the reading <n> makes no linguistic sense for me; see Eska 1989a: pp. 79-80.

ric pronoun *is[24], he takes this affixed pronoun to be the 3. masc. nom. sg. dem. pron. *so, largely guided, it would seem, by his proposal that the two sibilant characters of the Iberian script, viz., <š> and <s>, represent /s/ and /z/, respectively, in Hispano-Celtic inscriptions[25]. He thus reconstructs the prehistoric development of -Tus as *-tōd > *-tō → *-tōso[26] > *-tūzo > Tus = -/tu:z/ by apocope (1989: p. 204).

There are two queries (aside from those already expressed in the notes) to be put regarding such a reconstruction. The first is whether the proposition that a final vowel (or, in my view, a final syllable)[27] would have been apocopated so early in as otherwise as archaic a dialect as Hispano-Celtic can be countenanced. I am not aware of any evidence that points in this direction.

The second is that Villar's formulation requires that IE *ō > Hisp.-Celt. ū in a non-final syllable, which, as is demonstrated supra, remains an unproved, if not unlikely, proposal[28]. His general hypothesis, however, can be rescued by reconstructing the sequence *-tōd > *-tō → *-tōso(s) > *-tōzo(s) > *-tōz > -Tus = -/tu:z/, but this requires the preservation of IE *ō in a non-final syllable to a late stage in the sequence (though, as has been noted supra, there is no unambiguous evidence for the regular treatment in Hispano-Celtic), as well as an early apocope.

It is clear that the etymological analysis of 3. sg. fut. impv. -Tus remains an open question. In my previous article on -Tus, I left the question of the origin of the final -s unresolved (1989b: p. 219). I will conclude this paper by stating that my current opinion is that -Tus continues *-tōd > *-tō > *-tū → *-tū-(i)s > -Tus = -/tu:s/. The motivation for the affixation of the anaphoric pronoun remains the principal question. Since the use of an imperative verb is normally implemented with a concomitant rule that deletes a subject pronoun, I do not think that the pronoun was subsequently affixed for a discourse purpose. It seems more plausible to me that it may have been affixed in the 3. sg. in order to disambiguate inherited 3. sg. fut. impv. *-tū < *-tōd from inherited 2. sg. *-tū < *-tōd[29], yielding a Hispano-Celtic paradigm:

2. sg. *-tū < *-tō < *-tōd
3. sg. -tūs < *-tū-(i)s ← *-tū < *-tō < *-tōd

---

[24] Hamp 1975-1976 has shown that the original form of the non-neuter nom. sg. anaphoric pronoun was *ey, and that it has been remodelled to masc. *is in many Indo-European languages by analogy with the vocalism of neuter nom.-acc. sg. *id and the affixation of -s after the nominal flexion.

[25] To be published in a forthcoming article. I have not seen the full argument of Villar's proposal, but gather from Villar 1989: pp. 203-204 that he believes that /z/ arose from /s/ in intervocalic position. Of course, I can not comment upon an argument that I have not seen, but would note for the moment that such a development would diverge from the rest of Celtic (Is it an areal phenomenon, then?). In Insular Celtic, *s > h > Ø / V __ V (Pedersen 1909: pp. 72-73 §48 [3]; Thurneysen 1946: p. 84 §131; Jackson 1953: pp. 521-525 §117), and a similar treatment seems to me to have been incipient in Gaulish, as well, at least to judge from 3. sg. pret. sioχt-i (GLG 14.20) (with suffixed 3. neut. acc. sg. pronoun [so Eska 1990a: p. 6]) < *si-sog-t and SVIOREBE (RIG L-6), which seems to continue the etymon for 'sister'; cf. Skt. instr. pl. svásṛbhis and Lat. dat.-abl. pl.

sorōribus < *swesor-. Lambert 1989: p. 261 also regards these forms as reflecting the loss of intervocalic *-s-.

[26] Villar 1989: p. 204 seems to regard *so as the Hispano-Celtic reflex of the 3. masc. nom. sg. dem. pron. *so (cf. Skt. sa, Gk. ό, Goth. sa [and Gaul. σο (RIG *G-154) according to Prosdocimi 1989: p. 204]), but within the inscription of Botorrita itself, we see that it, in fact, is šos (A2), with -s after the nominal flexion. Such an interpretation of šos is supported by Hamp's analysis (apud Eska 1989a: 82) of the indefinite pronoun ošCues (A3, 4) as the pronominal os (with appropriate o-grade vocalism in a combinatory form) plus indefinite *-kʷe (cf. Lat. quisque) plus -s after the nominal flexion.

[27] See previous note.

[28] He can not have IE *-ō > Hisp.-Celt. ū in *-tō prior to the affixation of putative *so, for it would contradict his theory on the treatment of *-ōd (which is argued supra to be ill-founded).

[29] See Forssman 1985: esp. pp. 190, 191, on the development of the future imperative paradigm in Indo-European.

Perhaps one can compare the various strategies employed to mark the plurality of 3. pl. athematic imperatives in Greek overtly (Schwyzer 1939: p. 802).

V. RECAPITULATION

(λ): IE *ō > Hisp.-Celt. ū in final syllables first in absolute final position, then in covered . position.

(μ): There is no unambiguous evidence for the treatment of IE *ō in Hispano-Celtic in monosyllabic words or in non-final syllables.

(ν): Morphological analyses of Hispano-Celtic forms must be based on securely established sound laws. When such information is not available, it is prudent to examine the development of the relevant feature elsewhere in Celtic.

(ξ): It is suggested that a reduced form of the anaphoric pronoun *is was affixed to 3. sg. fut. impv. *-tū, yielding Tus = -/tu:s/, in order to disambiguate it from 2. sg. *-tū.

Dublin   JOSEPH F. ESKA
Institute for Advanced Studies

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADRADOS, F. R., 1976: «Aportaciones a la interpretación del bronce de Botorrita», in *Actas del I coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la península ibérica (Salamanca, 27-31 mayo 1974),* ed. Francisco Jordá, Javier de Hoz y Luis Michelena, pp. 25-47. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
— 1988: *Nuevos estudios de lingüística indoeuropea.* Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
BRUGMANN, KARL, und BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK, 1897: *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*[2] i, *Einleitung und Lautlehre,* zwei Hälften. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.
COWGILL, W., 1985: «PIE *duwo '2' in Germanic and Celtic, and the nom.-acc. dual of non-neuter o-stems», *MSS* 46, pp. 13-28.
ESKA, JOSEPH F. 1988: «The origin of the Hispano-Celtic o-stem genitive singular in -o and related matters», *EC* 25, pp. 117-122.
— 1989a: *Towards an interpretation of the Hispano-Celtic inscription of Botorrita.* IBS 59. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
— 1989b: «The verbal desinence -Tus in the Hispano-Celtic inscription of Botorrita», *ZCPh* 43, pp. 214-222.
— 1990a: «Some proleptic pronouns in Gaulish», in *Matonis/Melia* 1990, pp. 3-12.
— 1990b: «Syntactic notes on the great inscription of Peñalba de Villastar», *BBCS* 37, pp. 104-107.
FATÁS, GUILLERMO, 1985: «Una tésera cortonense», in *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae,* duae partes, ed. José L. Melena, pp. 425-431. Vitoria/Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.
FLEURIOT, LÉON, 1981: «A propos de deux inscriptions gauloises, formes verbales celtiques», *EC* 18, pp. 89-108.
FORSSMAN, BERNHARD, 1985: «Der Imperativ im urindogermanischen Verbalsystem», in *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983),* hrsg. Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, pp. 181-197. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
HAMP, ERIC P., 1970: «Locative singular in -ει», *IF* 75, pp. 105-106.
— 1971: «'Fils' et 'fille' en italique: nouvelle contribution», *BSL* 66, pp. 213-227.
— 1975-1976: «The British interrogative pronominals», *SCelt* 10/11, pp. 59-69.
— 1984: «Über das Deklinationssystem...», *GL* 24, pp. 179-186.

DE HOZ, JAVIER, 1986: «La epigrafía celtibérica», in *Actas de la reunión sobre epigrafía hispánica de época romano-republicana (Zaragoza, 1-3 de diciembre de 1983)*, ed. Guillermo Fatás, pp. 43-102. Zaragoza: Fundación «Institución Fernando el Católico».

— 1990: «El genitivo céltico de los temas en *-o-*. El testimonio lepóntico», in Villar 1990a, pp. 315-329.

JACKSON, KENNETH, 1953: *Language and history in early Britain,* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

JASANOFF, JAY H., 1989: «Old Irish *bé* 'woman'», *Ériu* 40, pp. 135-141.

JOSEPH, LIONEL, 1990: «Old Irish *cú:* a naïve reinterpretation», in *Matonis/Melia* 1990, pp. 110-130.

KÖDDERITZSCH, ROLF, 1985: «Die große Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar», in *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen.* IBK 23, hrsg. Hermann M. Ölberg und Gernot Schmidt unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bothien, 211-222. Innsbruck: AMŒ.

LAMBERT, PIERRE-YVES, 1989: Review of Marichal 1988, *EC* 26, pp. 259-261.

LEHMANN, WINFRED P., 1990: «Syntactic change», in *Research guide on language change,* ed. Edgar C. Polomé, pp. 365-388. Berlín: Mouton de Gruyter.

LEJEUNE, MICHEL, 1985: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* i, *Textes gallo-grecs.* Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

— 1988: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* ii/1, *Textes gallo-étrusques, textes gallo-latins sur pierre.* Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

LEUMANN, MANU, 1977: *Lateinische Grammatik* i, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre,* Neuausgabe. München: C. H. Beck.

MACALISTER, R. A. S., 1945, 1949: *Corpus inscriptionum insularum celticarum,* two vols. Dublin: Stationery Office.

MCMANUS, DAMIAN, 1991: *A guide to Ogam.* Maynooth: An Sagart.

MARICHAL, ROBERT, 1988: *Les graffites de la Graufesenque.* Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

MATONIS, A. T. E., and DANIEL F. MELIA, 1990, Ed.: *Celtic language, Celtic culture: a Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp.* Van Nuys, CA: Ford & Bailie.

MEID, WOLFGANG, 1980: *Gallisch oder Lateinisch? Soziolinguistische und andere Bemerkungen zu populären gallo-lateinischen Inschriften.* IBS-V 24. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. [Reprinted in 1983 with minor changes under the same title in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* ii, *Principat 29/2, Sprache und Literatur (Sprachen und Schriften),* hrsg. Wolfgang Haase, 1019-1044. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.]

NASH-WILLIAMS, V. E. 1950: *The early christian monuments of Wales.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

PEDERSEN, HOLGER, 1909, 1913: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen,* zwei Bde. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

PROSDOCIMI, ALDO L., 1989: «Gaulish σονεμετος and σοσιν νεμητον. A propos of *RIG* I 154», *ZCPh* 43, pp. 199-206.

PULGRAM, ERNST, 1978: *Italic, Latin, Italian: 600 B.C. to A.D. 1260. Texts and commentaries.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

REICHELT, HANS, 1909: *Awestisches Elementarbuch.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

SCHINDLER, JOCHEM, 1974: «Fragen zum paradigmatischen Ausgleich», *Die Sprache* 20, pp. 1-9.

SCHMIDT, KARL HORST, 1991: Review of *Etudes Celtiques* XXV, 1988, *ZCPh* 44, pp. 363-365.

SCHWYZER, EDUARD, 1939: *Griechische Grammatik* i, *Allgemeiner Teil · Lautlehre · Wortbildung · Flexion.* München: C. H. Beck.

STANG, CHR. S., 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

THURNEYSEN, RUDOLF, 1946: *A grammar of Old Irish,* rev. ed. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

UNTERMANN, JÜRGEN, 1990: «Comentarios sobre inscripciones celtibéricas 'menores'», in Villar 1990a, pp. 351-374.

VILLAR, FRANCISCO, 1989: «Tratamiento de -ō en sílaba final. Algunas posibles formas de imperativo en celtibérico», *Veleia* 6, pp. 199-205.

— 1990a, Ed.: *Studia indogermanica et paleohispanica in honorem A. Tovar et L. Michelena.* Vitoria/Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea / Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

— 1990b: «La línea inicial del bronce de Botorrita», in Villar 1990a, pp. 375-392.

— 1991: «Le locatif celtibérique et le caractère tardif de la langue celtique dans l'inscription de Peñalba de Villastar», *ZCPh* 44, pp. 56-66.

— [Forthcoming]: «Las silbantes en celtibérico», in *Actas del V coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la península ibérica* (Köln). Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

WHATMOUGH, JOSHUA, 1933: *The prae-Italic dialects of Italy* ii, *The Raetic, Lepontic, Gallic, East-Italic, Messapic and Sicel inscriptions.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.