

Ten New Indo-European Etymologies for the Celtic Languages

Jouna Pyysalo

Abstract

This paper presents ten new etymologies between the Celtic and the Indo-European languages in a contribution to the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European parent language. The items compared are:

1. OIr. *oenach*- ‘an injury/wound’ : OSax. *ēndago*- ‘day of death’ : Hitt. *ḫingan*- ‘Seuche, Pest, Todesfall’; 2. OIr. *airecht*- ‘assembly, meeting, conversation’ : LAV. *vyāxa*- ‘Versammlung’; 3. OIr. *cumachtae*- ‘pouvoir, puissance’ : TochB. *ekaññe*- ‘possession, equipment’, AV. *aṣṭi*- ‘Erreichung’; 4. OIr. *ás*- ‘croissance, fait de grandir/grossir’ : Maced. *ἄξο*- ‘ύλή’; 5. OBret. *iolent* ‘precentur’ : Lat. *hariolā*- ‘wahrsagen’; 6. Midlr. *cīch*- (f.) ‘weibliche Brust’ : RV. *kīkasā*- ‘Brust-bein’;
7. OIr. *nái*- ‘human being, person’: TochA. *napen*- ‘Mensch’; 8. OIr. *tol*- ‘Wille’ : RV. *turá*- ‘Willfähig’; 9. OIr. *nūadat*- ‘hand, wrist or arm’ : RV. *nodhā*- ‘Elefant’; 10. OIr. *aiged* ‘visage’ : OHG. *agsiuni*- ‘species : Aussehen, Angesicht’.

I. OIr. *oenach* ‘some kind of injury or wound’ (DIL 485)

1.1 Old Irish preserves the forms (see also GOI §66):

- OIr. *oenach*- (m/n?) ‘some kind of injury or wound’ (DIL 485)
OIr. *áenach*- (m/n?) ‘some kind of injury or wound’ (DIL 10, 485).

1.2 The two items belong together (ablaut OIr. o-/a-) and are correctly separated from OIr. *oenach*- ‘reunion’ in DIL. However, they are not treated in LEIA and there is no Indo-European etymology that I am aware of. Hence we are left with the observation that the formation is a derivative with the commonplace suffix PCelt. * *-āko*- implying a root OIr. $\sqrt{\text{oen-}}$ $\sqrt{\text{aen-}}$ ‘injury, wound’.

1.3 Regarding the Goidelic root it should be noted that there is no etymological connection between OIr. *oen-/aen-* and PIE $\sqrt{\text{in-}}$ ‘Gewalt, Untat, Kränkung, Qual’ (IEW 10):

Hitt. <i>inan-</i>	(n.) ‘Krankheit, Erkrankung’ (HEG 1, 358, <i>i-na-na-aš</i>) ¹
RV. <i>enás-</i>	(n.) ‘Frevel, Sünde, Gewalttat’ (WbRV 300)
RV. <i>an-enás-</i>	(a.) ‘fehlerlos, sündlos’ (WbRV 62, EWA 1, 268)
gAv. <i>aēnah-</i>	(n.) ‘Gewalt-, Übel-, Untat, Frevel’ (AIWb 21).
LAv. <i>inao-</i>	(pr.) ‘vergewaltigen, kränken’ (AIWb 21, <i>inao^{ti}</i> [3sg])
LAv. <i>inti-</i>	(f.) ‘Vergewaltigung, Kränkung, Qual’ (AIWb 367)

The absence of initial laryngeal in Hitt. *inan-* is incompatible with OIr. $\sqrt{aen-}$ (PIE **haein-*), and the etymology is to be sought elsewhere.²

1.4 After this delimitation there remains only a single possible etymological candidate in the entire Indo-European material known to me, viz. the isolated Germanic stem

OSax. *ēn-dago-* (m.) ‘Todestag : day of death’ (ASächsWb 15).

The root PIE **hain-* (ablaut: PIE **haein-* **haoin-*) underlying the Celtic and Germanic forms is of particular interest, because it is functions as the derivational base of the Hittite word for ‘fate, pestilence, death’³ as indicated below:

PIE $\sqrt{hain-}$ ‘Seuche, Pest, Todesfall, Tod’

PIE **ha^o* in-
Hitt. *hin-* (n.) ‘plague’ (HED H, 299, *hinnaz* [sgAbl])⁴

OSax. *ēn-dago-* (m.) ‘Todestag : day of death’ (ASächsWb 15)

PIE **ha^o* inēahko-
OIr. *oenach-* (m/n?) ‘some kind of injury or wound’ (DIL 485)
OIr. *denach-* (m/n?) ‘some kind of injury or wound’ (DIL 10)

PIE **hainKon-*
Hitt. *hingan-* (n.) ‘Seuche, Pest, Todesfall’ (HEG 1, 251)⁵

1 For this etymology of Hitt. *inan-* ‘eine bestimmte Krankheit’ cf. HED 1/2, 365, which I find acceptable despite the artificial counterarguments of Kloekhorst (HIL 448).

2 In this paper a single laryngeal (cover symbol PIE **h*), phonetically a glottal fricative with voiceless and voiced variants PIE **h*/*h* is reconstructed. PIE **h* was always accompanied by a vowel PIE **a* (functionally the *Schwa Indogermanicum* of the Neogrammarians) thus appearing in diphonemic pairs PIE **ha* **a^h* (for details see Pyysalo 2013).

3 Hitt. *hingan-* is usually compared to W. *angeu-* ‘death’ : OIr. *éc-* ‘idem’ (cf. HED H, 300), but the vocalizations are incompatible and an alternative is needed.

4 Puhvel (HED H, 299) emends the form in XIV 14 + XIX 1 vs. 8-9 as *hin(g)amaz*, which is possible but by no means necessary as it is possible to equate the latter directly with OSax. *ēn-* ‘death’.

5 The attested forms are written Hitt. *he-en-ka-an*, *hi-in-kán*, *hi-in-ga-an*, *hé-en-kán*, *hi-in-ga-na-aš* [sgG], see also Oettinger 1979a, 175, Melchert 1984a, 94, HED H, 296-301, and HIL 395-6.

Hitt. *hinganant-* (c.) ‘Seuche, Pest, Todesfall’ (Hitt. *hi-in-ga-na-an-za*)⁶

With three Indo-European sub-branches confirming the root its postulation is methodically acceptable, but naturally additional cognates would be most welcome.

2. OIr. *airecht-* ‘assembly, meeting, conversation’

2.1 Goidelic contains an archaic compound:

OIr. *air-echt-* (m. *u-) ‘assembly, meeting, conversation’ (DIL 25).

2.2 The respective Celtic formation is reasonably well preserved (see LEIA A-43 & EtDiPC 123):

MidW. <i>araith-</i>	(f.) ‘conversation’ (EtDiPC 125, GPC I, 176)
MidW. <i>areith-</i>	(f.) ‘conversation’ (EtDiPC 125, GPC I, 176)
ModBret. <i>areih-</i>	(f.) ‘dispute’ (EtDiPC 125)
ModCorn. <i>areth</i>	(f.) ‘XX’ (EtDiPC 125).

The underlying compound consists of the prefix PCelt. *ar^e/_o-, a root PCelt. *aK- and the suffix PCelt. *tu-, but despite the transparency of the formation no completely satisfactory etymology has emerged.⁷

2.3 In order to determine the nature of the ambiguous velar or the root PCelt. *aK- (≡ PIE *h₂aeK-) and the character of the cover symbol PIE *h (≡ PIE *h or PIE *h̄) I compare the equally isolated Iranian compound in

LAv. <i>vy-āxa-</i>	(m.) ‘Versammlung’ (AIWb 1477)
LAv. <i>vy-āxana-</i>	(a.) ‘in der Versammlung sprechend’ (AIWb 1477)
LAv. <i>vy-āxman-</i>	(n.) ‘Versammlung’ (AIWb 1477).

The Celtic and the Iranian forms define a root PIE *haekah- ‘assembly, meeting, gathering’ (≈ *h₂ekh₂-).

6 Rieken (1999, 426) compares Hitt. *hingan-* to TochB. *enkäl-*, *enkalwa* ‘Leid’, but the broader semantic field ‘feeling, emotion, passion’ (see Adams, DTochB 78-9) doesn’t match with Hittite.

7 I agree with Matasović that it is possible to derive the Celtic words from PIE *h₂eg- ‘sprechen’ (IEW 290f., LIV², 256), but Old Irish points to a primary meaning ‘assembly, meeting’ from which the meaning ‘conversation’ was then developed. Due to this a root with identical meaning is to be sought first and foremost.

- 2.4 Regarding the ablaut bases of the root the following remarks should be noted:
- (a) MidW. *ar-aiith* requires PIE **haekah·Σ-* → **hakh·Σ-* → PCelt. **ak·Σ-*.
 - (b) OIr. *air-echt-*, MidW. *ar-eith-*, Bret. *ar-eih-* and Corn. *ar-eth-* agree in PIE **ehakah·Σ-* → **ehkh·Σ-* → PCelt. **ek·Σ-*.
 - (c) LAV. *vy-āxa-*, *vy-āxana-* and *vy-āxman-* require PIE **haēkah·Σ-* and/or PIE **haōkah·Σ-* with an ambiguous long vowel.

3. OIr. *cum achtae* ‘power’

- 3.1 Old Irish preserves a compound noun and a related adjective

OIr. *cum-achtae-* (n.-*io) ‘power, strenght, might’ (DIL 169)
 OIr. *cum-achtach-* (a.) ‘gl. potitus : puissant’ (LEIA C-285-6).

- 3.2 The formation is correctly compared to the Celtic parallels by the authors of LEIA (C-286) and Matasović (EtDiPC 215):

OCorn. *chefuidoc-* (a.) ‘gl. omnipotens’ (LEIA C-286, EtDiPC 215)
 OW. *com-oid-* (m.) ‘power’ (EtDiPC 215, GPC I, 708)
 MidW. *cyfoeth-* (sb.) ‘richesse : wealth’ (EtDiPC 215, GPC I, 708).

- 3.3 With regard to the etymology the views expressed in LEIA (C-286) should be carefully observed:

‘Dérivé neutre suffixé en *-tio-* sur le verbe *con-icc* ‘il peut, il arrive à’ Thurn. Gr. 128. D’après le correspondant gall. *cyfoeth* ‘richesse’ (cf. mcorn. *chefuidoc* gl. *omnipotens* Voc.), le dérivé nominal semble avoir pour base un degré fléchi, **kom-okt-*, où le th. verb. **ōnk-/ēnk-* a perdu très tôt sa nasale (Thurneysen Gr. 128).’

The problematic absence of nasal in Celtic, making the direct derivation of OIr. *cum-achtae* (without nasal) from OIr. *con-icc-* (with nasal) impossible, traces back to the Neogrammarian theory of syllabic nasals.

Brugmann’s reconstruction was motivated by the Indo-Iranian root variation PIIr. **CanC-* : *CaC-*, which he explained as reflecting an earlier alternation PIE *CenC-* : *CṅC-* (see Pyysalo 2013, 284–332 for details and literature). The theory resulted in the generalization of nasal to all forms of the root, and subsequently the idea found its way to the etymological dictionaries and the discussion. As detailed in Pyysalo (2013, 284–322) Brugmann’s reasoning is essentially internal and therefore not necessarily correct. In this case both the root forms with and without nasal are externally confirmed, thus tracing back to the proto-language as such. Here the Pokorny-root **enek-* (IEW 316–318) is reconstructed with a throughout nasal despite the fact that the Indo-European data implies two distinct roots, one

with and other without nasal. The root without nasal is undisputed due to the ablaut PIr. \bar{a} : a : \emptyset and PToch. $*a-$ in PIE $*hak-$ ‘gelangen, erreichen, treffen, teilhaftig werden, besitzen’ (ablaut: PIE $*haek-$ $*haok-$)

RV. $\acute{a}ś-$	(pf.) ‘erreichen, gelangen’ (WbRV 135, $\acute{a}śa$ [3sg]) ⁸
RV. $aś-$	(aoM.) ‘gelangen, erreichen, treffen’ (WbRV 135, $aśta$)
LAv. $frāš-$	(vb.) ‘sich teilhaftig machen’ (AIWb 360, $frāšənti$)
gAv. $frō-sya-$	(vb.) ‘erreichen, treffen’ (AIWb 360, $frōsyāt$ [3sg])
TochB. $ekaññe$	(f.pl.) ‘possession, equipment’ (DTochB 75, $ekaññe$)
TochA. $akāntsune-$	(m.) ‘Geld, Besitz’ (Poucha 1, $akāntsune$).

3.4 In the existence of a root PIE $*hak-$ the difficulty of the absence of nasal in the Celtic forms is apparent, since these forms can be directly compared with their Indo-Iranian counterparts as indicated below:

PIE	$\sqrt{haek-}$ $\sqrt{haok-}$
RV. $aśtá-$	(pt.) ‘erreicht’ (WbRV 136, $aśtá hárti$)
AV. $aṣṭi-$	(f.) ‘Erreichung’ (WbRV 145)
OIr. $cum-achtae-$	(n.-*io) ‘pouvoir, puissance’ (EtDiPC 215)
OIr. $cum-achtach-$	(a.) ‘gl. potitus : puissant’ (LEIA C-285-6)
OCorn. $chef-uidoc-$	(a.) ‘gl. omnipotens’ (LEIA C-286, EtDiPC 215)
OW. $com-oid-$	(m.) ‘power’ (EtDiPC 215, GPC I, 708)
MidW. $cyf-oeth-$	(sb.) ‘richesse : wealth’ (EtDiPC 215, GPC I, 708)

Although this outline leaves the relation between PIE $\sqrt{hak-}$ and the root $*enek-$ (IEW 316-318) open, I hope to return to the issue in a separate paper—also addressing the embedded sound law problem of Celtic.

4. OIr. $ás-$ ‘Wachstum’

4.1 The early Irish language contains a (verbal) noun

OIr. $ás-$	(n.m.) ‘croissance, fait de grandir/grossir’ (LEIA A-92).
------------	---

4.2 Several verbal stems belong to the main entry (see DIL 53), including

OIr. $ro \acute{a}s-$	(pf.) ‘il a grandi’ (LEIA A-92, $ro \acute{a}s$ [3sg])
OIr. $\acute{a}sa-$	(vb.) ‘grandir’ (LEIA A-92, $\acute{a}said$ [3sg])
OIr. $for-\acute{a}sa-$	(vb.) ‘gl. proficit’ (LEIA A-92, $for\acute{a}sa$ [3sg], $for\acute{a}sat$ [pl])

Beyond this point the Celtic languages provide no additional hints of the shape of the underlying PIE root. With regard to the broader Indo-European connections I have nothing to add to LEIA’s (A-93) statement on the current standard etymology:

8 For the correspondence with details see Pyysalo (2013, 304).

‘[C]’est sans motif sérieux qu’on a proposé un prototype **pāt-to-*, à rattacher à gr. *πατέομαι* ‘je me nourris’ et à got. *fodjan* ‘nourrir’ (...) (IF II 370); cf. Pok. 783.’

4.3 In order to provide an acceptable etymology I would begin with a brief excursion on the semantic field of the PIE roots with meanings ‘growth’ and ‘greatness’. One of these is now attested in the Anatolian forms belonging to a root PIE **selah-* **solah-* in

Hitt. <i>šalhanti-</i>	(sb.) ‘Wachstum, Gedeihen’ (?) (HHand 140)
HLu. <i>salhanza-</i>	(sb.) ‘greatness’ (CHLu 2.5.3, (LIGNUM) <i>sá-la-ha-za</i>)

These abstract meanings are derived from a concrete one embedded in the logogram HLu. LIGNUM ‘tree, wood’, also appearing in the determinative ‘GIŠ’, of yet another derivative of the root:

Hitt. <i>šalhuria-</i>	(GIŠ.) ‘Pfeiler, Pfosten’ (HHand 140, HEG S, 767).
------------------------	--

Similarly the root OIr. *√ás-* with abstract meaning ‘growth, greatness’ can be formally and semantically compared to a gloss of Hesychius with a concrete meaning in

Maced. <i>ǎǎo-</i>	(m.) ‘ύλή’ (LSJ 172).
--------------------	-----------------------

4.4 With regard to the details of the reconstruction it is to be noted that

(a) Macedonian follows the Greek rules of accentuation. In the absence of circumflex in Maced. *ǎǎo-* the root-vowel was short (PIE **haéKso-*). In contrast the Goidelic root reflects the long grade PIE **haēKs-* and/or PIE **haōKs-*.

(b) Macedonian and Old Irish belong to the centum languages, which leaves both a plain velar and a palatovelar possible. As the root PIE **haKs-* ends in sibilant, it is also impossible to define the voice and/or aspiration of the cover symbol K unless unambiguous data is added to the data discussed (for this possibility see IEW 773, Lith. *úoga* etc.).

5. OBret. *iolent* ‘precentur’

5.1 Old Breton preserves a verbal stem preserved in a gloss:

OBret. <i>iola-</i>	(vb.) ‘precentur’ (LEIA A-31, <i>iolent</i> [conj3pl]).
---------------------	---

5.2 The verb recurs in Welsh and Old Irish, both languages also confirming a long root variant with PIE **ō* (in W. *aw* = OIr. *á*):

W. <i>iola-</i>	(vb.) ‘ich lobe, preise’ (GPC 3738, <i>iolaf</i> [1sg])
W. <i>eir-iola-</i>	(vb.) ‘dringlich bitten’ (GPC 2365, <i>eiriolaf</i> [1sg])
W. <i>iawl-</i>	(.) ‘Gebot, Lob’ (LEIA A-31, <i>iawl</i> [sgN])
OIr. <i>áilid</i>	(vb.) ‘eifrig wünschen, erbitten, erfliehen’ (DIL 16).

Pokorny (IEW 501) hesitatingly attaches the forms to the root IEW. *ǵiā- : ǵiō- ‘bestrafen, rächen’, but the semantics is far-fetched, if not outright impossible. As far as I am aware, however, no competing etymologies exist.

5.3 In the absence of plausible Indo-European cognates I would quote an Italic compound yielding a perfect match with the Celtic items in PIE *o:

Lat. <i>har-iolo-</i>	(m.) ‘Wahr-sager’ (WH 1, 635, <i>hariolus</i> [sgN])
Lat. <i>har-iolā-</i>	(prM.) ‘wahr-sagen’ (WH 1, 635, <i>hariolor</i> [1sg]).

The first part of the compound belong to the better known formation
 Lat. *haru-spec-* (m.) ‘Eingeweide-schauer, Wahr-sager’ (WH 2, 635)
 Fal. *hara-spec-* (m.) ‘id.’ (WH 2, 635, Fal. *haras(pex)*)

which implies that the meaning ‘sagen’ belongs to the segment Lat. *iolā-* = W. *iola-*.

5.4 The Italo-Celtic root can be reconstructed with PIE *ǵiol- and PIE *ǵiōl- (or PIE *ǵiāhl-?). Since PIE *h/h̥ is also possible in the root-initial position the data is ambiguous with regard to the precise proto-form in PIE. It can be, however, hoped that future comparison calibrates the prototype when further connections of the root are explored.

6. Midlr. *cīch-* ‘weibliche Brust’

6.1 LEIA (L-95-96) presents a following entry:

Midlr. <i>cīch-</i>	(f.) ‘weibliche Brust : female breast’ (DIL 114-5)
---------------------	--

6.2 The Goidelic stem represents a widespread Celtic isogloss (PCelt. √kīk-):
 OGaul. *cīc-ollo-* (PN) ‘Gros-Muscles (?)’ (DLG 116. *collus*, RDC 34)⁹

9 For the well-preserved root in Gaulish onomastics, see Delamarre (DLG 115): ‘Thème de NP: *Cic-ollus* ‘Gros-Muscles’ ? (RDC 34) et *Cicinus*, surnoms de Mars (*Marti Carro Cicino*, HI 1012, cf. *Cicena* au Larzac, en 2b1), *Cicto-uanus* ‘Tueur de musclés (d’athlètes)’?, *Cicca*, *Cicedu* (RIC 4, n° 106), *Cicetus* (*Cinge-*?), *Cicarus*, *Cicorellius* DAC 207, *Cicadius* 693, *Cicereius* 839, *Cige-toutos* (Lezoux) ± ‘Champion- de-la-

OIr. <i>cīc-car-</i>	(sb.) ‘avide, vorace’ (DLG 116, DIL 114)
OBret. <i>cīc-guan-</i>	(sb.) ‘gl. fuscina’ (EtDiPC 204)
OCorn. <i>chic-</i>	(sb.) ‘gl. caro’ (DLG 116, EtDiPC 204)
MidBret. <i>quic-</i>	(sb.) ‘Fleisch’ (EtDiPC 204)
MidW. <i>cig-</i>	(m.) ‘Fleisch : meat’ (GPC I, 477, <i>cig</i>)
ModBret. <i>kig-</i>	(m.) ‘Fleisch’ (ModBret. <i>kig</i> , DLG 116)

6.3 LEIA (C-96) and Delamarre (DLG 116) correctly reject Pedersen’s (VKG 1, 51) tentative comparison with Gr. κῆκος (f.) ‘Kraft, Stärke’ (GEW 1, 582), which ‘ne s’impose pas’. Unaware of competing proposals (see LEIA C-95-96, DLG 116 and EtDiPC 204) I would compare the Celtic formation to an ancient compound

RV. *kīk-asā-* (f.) ‘Brust·bein’ (f.pl.) ‘Brust·rippen’ (WbRV 327).

The Vedic form is also without etymology (see Mayrhofer KEWA 1, 214 and EWA 1, 355), but it is readily understood that the second part of the compound RV. *·asā-* ‘Bein, Rippe’ (PIE **haosēah-*) belongs to the root

PIE √*has-* ‘Bein, Rippe, Knochen, usw.’ (Ablaut: PIE **has-* **haes-* **haos-*, IEW 783)

CLu. <i>haša-</i>	(n.) ‘Bein’ (DLL 43, <i>ha-ša-ti</i> [plAbl])
RV. <i>kīk-asā-</i>	(f.) ‘Brust·bein’ (f.pl.) ‘Brust·rippen’ (WbRV 327)
Lat. <i>oss-</i>	(n.) ‘Knochen : bone’ (WH 2, 225-6, <i>os, ossis</i> [sgG])
Gr. ὄστο·κόπο-	(m.) Bez. einer Knochenkrankheit’ (GEW 2, 436)
Hitt. <i>hašai-</i>	(n.) ‘Knochen, Gebeine, usw.’ (HEG 3, 237).

Consequently the morpheme RV. *kīk-* is the carrier of the meaning ‘Brust’. In order to account for the absence of second palatalization, the quantity and the accent of RV. *kīk-* it is necessary to reconstruct PIE **kđhik-* → PIIr. **kīhik-* → RV. *kīk-* ‘Brust’, a perfect formal and semantic match with PCelt. **kīk-* ‘Brust’.¹⁰

6.4 The root PIE **kđhik-* is attested in two subgroups, i.e. the correspondence is well-defined. However, more support for the formation may emerge in the future.

Tribu’ (plutôt que ‘Tribu d’athlètes’, mais pt *ē*. -*toutos* = v.irl. *tuath* ‘gauche, mauvais’, même sens alors que le suivant), *Cice-laiius* (Cologne, DAC 871), *Cice-laius* CIL XIII 1140, ‘Petit-Muscle’ avec *laius* de **laguo-* ‘petit, faible’.

10 The root RV. √*kīk-* is possibly also attested in RV. *kīk-aṭa-* (m.) ‘EN eines nichtarischen Volksstammes’ (WbRV 327, KEWA 1, 214, EWA 1, 355 *kīkaiāh* [pIN]), since there are dozens of examples of a suffix OInd. *·aṭa-* in the Sanskrit corpus.

7. OIr. *nái-* ‘human (being)’

7.1 Old Irish preserves a noun meaning ‘human being, person’ in a gloss
 OIr. *nái-* (m.) ‘*nái* .i. *duine*’ (LEIA N-19)

7.2 In addition the following stems can be attached to the entry:
 OIr. *noe-* (m.) ‘a human being, person’ (DIL 479, *noe*, *noi*)
 OIr. *nae-* (f.) ‘woman’ (LEIA N-19 *nae* .i. *ben*, etc.)
 OIr. *nei-* (f.) ‘woman’ (LEIA N-19 *nei* .i. *ben*, etc.).

Regarding to the Indo-European etymology LEIA (N-19) quotes two artificial comparisons, first OIr. *nia* ‘son of sister, nephew’ (DIL 478) and secondly Gr. *ναίω* ‘j’habite’, correctly rejecting both. As far as I am aware of no other etymologies have been suggested, and the best that can be said on the basis of Irish is to observe that the two forms like OIr. *nái-* and OIr. *nei-* imply a lost PIE phoneme X in *nVXi-, where X = PIE *p, *s, or *u.

7.3 The character of the lost sound is revealed by Tocharian, where the following formation has been preserved in dialect A:

TochA. <i>napen-</i>	(sb.m.) ‘Mensch’ (Poucha 140, <i>napem</i> , <i>napenäs</i> [plObl])
TochA. <i>napem ši-</i>	(a.) ‘homilis, humanus’ (Poucha 140, <i>napem ši</i>)
TochA. <i>napes-</i>	(sb.m.) ‘Mensch’ (Poucha 140, TochA. <i>napesässi</i> [plG])

The forms require an immediate predecessor PToch. *napai-, which provides a match with Old Irish.¹¹

7.4 The following observations can be made regarding to the original PIE ablaut required by the Celtic:

- (a) OIr. *nái* (m.) requires PIE *nēahpio- or *nōahpio- (with a long root vowel)
- (b) OIr. *noi-/noe-* (m.) requires PIE *noahpio-
- (c) OIr. *nae* (f.) requires PIE *naehpiēah- (with a root in PCelt. *a)
- (d) OIr. *nei* (f.) requires PIE *nahepiēah- (with schwebeablaut)

Tocharian, on the other hand, is relatively ambiguous with regard the vowel quality, but on the basis of the meaning and quantity the base PIE *noahp- with *o as in OIr. *noi-/noe-* can be reasonably assumed for the root, although PIE *neahp- with *e remains equally possible.

11 Van Windeken’s early etymology (LeTokh 309), comparing LAv. *nāfa-* (m.) ‘Verwandschaft, Familie’ (AIWb 1062), is semantically inferior. However, a distant relationship (via root etymology) remains possible.

8. OIr. *tol-* ‘volonté, désir, désir charnel’

8.1 Old Irish preserves a noun:

OIr. *tol-* (f.) ‘will : Wille’ (DIL 598, OIr. *tol*, *tuile* [sgG])

Pokorny’s proto-form PCelt. *tulā- (IEW 1061) is confirmed by oblique cases

OIr. *tuile* [G] and OIr. *tuil* [D] indicating a root vowel PIE *u.

8.2 The derivates include (for the forms, see also DIL 598-9):

OIr. <i>ro-tholo-</i>	(vb.) ‘plaire’ (LEIA T-101, in <i>rontolomar</i> [rel1pl])
OIr. <i>tolach-</i>	(a.) ‘volontaire’ (LEIA T-101)
OIr. <i>toltur^N-</i>	(pl.) ‘désir’ (LEIA T-101)
OIr. <i>tolna-</i>	(vb.) ‘plaire’ (LEIA T-101, <i>tolnatar</i> ‘qui plait’)
OIr. <i>toltanach-</i>	(a.) ‘volontaire’ (LEIA T-101, SOgam 239).

In addition, the last-quoted form is now equated with

Ogam. *tulotanagi(a)-* (.) ‘willfähig (?)’ (SOgam 239)

by Ziegler.

8.3 With regard to the etymology the authors of LEIA discuss a possibility of connecting the formation to the root PIE *tel- *tol- (IEW 1061, Lat. *tolerare*, etc.) via a hypothetical noun with a hypothetical meaning ‘fait de supporter, de laisser faire, bonne volonté, bon plaisir’. Although this is also opted by Pokorny no concrete parallels for the meaning ‘will’ are attested, which means that the idea is hardly helpful from the comparative point of view.

In the absence of an external etymology I would like to quote the Vedic adjective:

RV. *turá-* (a.) ‘Willfähig : willing’ (KEWA 1, 514, MonWil 450).

With a regular change PIE *t₁ → RV. r the form can be readily compared to OIr. *√tul-* providing an Indo-European etymology.¹²

12 In the existence of duplicates with oblique in OIr. *tol-* (OIr. *toil* [A], *tole* [G], *toil* [D]), one wonders if there were originally two homonymous roots PIE *tul- and PIE *tol-. As I have not been able to confirm the latter I will restrict the discussion to the root PIE *√tul-*.

8.4 I have not been able to find additional parallels for the root PIE $\sqrt{tul-}$ in the rest of the group. It is, however, possible that the root is an extension $*\cdot l-$ of a primary root PIE $\sqrt{tu-}$ also possibly attested in

- (a) $\sqrt{tuk-}$
 RV. *toša-* (pr.) ‘befriedigt sein, sich erlaben’ (WbRV 546)
 LAv. *tusa-* (m.) ‘ein Held der iranischen Sage’ (AIWb 657)
 OInd. *tokṣya-* (fut.) ‘to satisfy, etc. (MonWil 452)
- (b) $\sqrt{tus-}$
 OInd. *toša-* (m.) ‘satisfaction, pleasure, joy’ (MonWil 456)
 RV. *tuṣáyanti-* (pt.f.) ‘zufrieden stellend’ (WbRV 546)
 Hitt. *tuške/a-* (vb.) ‘rejoice, be happy’ (HEG T, 464f., HIL 1040)
 Hitt. *para tuške/a-* (vb.) ‘sich freuen, gnädig sein’ (HHand 182)
 Hitt. *tuškeia-* (vb1.) ‘freuen, fröhlich sein; spielen’ (HHand 182)

Whether this is accepted or not the root PIE $\sqrt{tul-}$ is confirmed by two subgroups and therefore acceptable according to the standard procedure.

9. OIr. *núadat-* ‘hand, wrist or arm’

9.1 Old Irish preserves a noun

OIr. *núadat-* (sb.) ‘hand, wrist or arm’ (DIL 481).

9.2 In addition the following forms likely belong to the main entry:

OIr. *núadat-* (m.) ‘hero, champion, king (poetic)’ (DIL 481)
 OIr. *núadat-* (PNm.) ‘of kings of Ireland’ (DIL 481 *núadu, núadat*)

The personal name is also attested in archaic forms predating the change PCelt. $*\bar{o} \rightarrow$ OIr. *úa* (GOI §62):

OIr. *nodent-* (PNm.) ‘of kings of Ireland’ (DIL 481, *nodenti* [D])
 OIr. *nodont-* (PNm.) ‘of kings of Ireland’ (DIL 481, *nodonti* [D])

The alternation between the meanings ‘hand/arm’ and ‘hero/champion/king’ recurs in the archaic semantic fields of Indo-European roots and a parallel can be readily found, e.g., in OIr. *sab-* (sb.) ‘hand, palm, support, upholder, champion, leader’ (DIL 515). However, no Celtic cognates are available and there is no Indo-European etymology.¹³

13 Matasović (EtDiPC 350) compares the Goidelic forms to W. *nudd-* ‘mist, haze’, but the form has an etymological $*s-$ absent in OIr. $\sqrt{núad-}$. In addition the semantic side of the equation is difficult to understand.

9.3 As the Goidelic require an etymology I would like to compare the Old Indo-Aryan root $\sqrt{\text{nodh-}}$ attested in:

- RV. *nodhā-* (f.) ‘ein Elefant’ (EWA 2, 58, RV. 1.124.4)
 RV. *nodhās-* (PNm.) ‘EN eines Sängers’ (WbRV 756, *nodhās* [N])
 RV. *nodhās-* (PNm.) ‘EN eines Sängers’ (WbRV 756, *nódhas* [V]).

Although Thieme’s (1965) derivation RV. *nodhā-* ← PIIr. **naz-dhā-* ‘mit der Nase saugend’ lacks rigor (since PIIr. **azdh* → RV. *edh*, not **odh*), the argument for the meaning ‘elephant’ is acceptable.

9.4 With regard to the alternation between meanings ‘hand’ and ‘elephant’ one should note the existence of the noun:

- RV. *kará-* (m.) ‘die Hand’ (WbRV 314)¹⁴

When the word is applied to an elephant, it becomes to mean its trunk:

- OInd. *kará-* (m.) ‘Elefantenrüssel’ (KEWA 1, 166)

Hence it is possible to equate the roots RV. $\sqrt{\text{nodh-}}$ = PCelt. $\sqrt{\text{nōd-}}$ through an underlying prototype PIE **noudfi-*.

10. OIr. *aiged* ‘visage, honneur’

10.1 Old Irish preserves a noun

- OIr. *aiged-* (.) ‘visage, honneur’ (DIL 11 *aiged* [N], *aigthe* [G]).

In addition there is a variant with an alternative suffix vocalism

- OIr. *agad-* (.) ‘visage, honneur’ (DIL 11, *agad* [N]).

10.2 The stem OIr. *aiged-* has a direct parallel in Old Gaulish onomasticon:

- OGaul. *cali-aged-* (PNm.) ‘Dur-Visage (?)’ (DLG 34, *caliaged*)
 OGaul. *agedo-* (PNm.) ‘aspect, visage, face’ (DLG 34, *agedus* [sgN])
 OGaul. *agedo-uuro-* (PNm.) ‘à l’aspect franc’ (DLG 34, *agedouirus*)¹⁵

Regarding to etymology Vendryes (LEIA A-23) relates a possibility that OIr. *aiged* could be a derivate of the root IEW. **ag-* ‘mener, conduire’ (Lat. *agere* etc.)

14 Also note the respective adjective in RV. *kará-* (a.) ‘machend, wirkend, tätig’ (WbRV 314).

15 Also in OGaul. *agedo-mopati-* (PN) ‘au visage d’enfant’ and OGaul. *agedo-mapati-* ‘au visage d’enfant’ (PN) ‘idem.’ (see DLG 34).

from which the meaning ‘manière d’agir, contenance’ would have passed to ‘face’. As against this there is no formal confirmation that OGaul. *g* stands for PIE *ǵ, nor is the semantic shift supported by parallels in the data. Without match in meaning and ambiguity in the form it is more secure to admit that the Celtic root has no etymology.

10.3 A semantically more attractive etymology is found comparing the root PCelt. √ag- to

OHG. *ag-siunī-* (f.) ‘species : Aussehen, Angesicht, Gestalt’
(Tatian).¹⁶

As revealed by the identically formed compound OHG. *oug-siunī-* ‘Aussehen, Angesicht’ the meaning of OHG. *ag-* coincides with OHG. *oug-* ‘Auge’, whence also OGaul. *ag-* and OIr. *ag-* meant the same.

10.4 In conclusion I would like to discuss OGaul. *aced-* *acit-* and *acid-* mentioned in this connection by Delamarre (DLG 34). Due to the difference in vocalism OGaul. *acit-* (and *acid-*) are indeed better understood as belonging to OGaul. *acito-* ‘plaine, champ’ as suggested by the author.¹⁷ However, the personal name OGaul. *acedo-mopati-* (PN) constitutes an exact match with OGaul. *agedo-mopati-* (PN) except for the difference in voice, leaving little doubt that the forms belong together. An explanation for the alternation /c/ : /g/ can be sought from the PIE root underyling the voiceless root OGaul. √ac- ‘Auge’:

PIE √hak- ‘Auge’ (IEW 774, *ok-)

PIE *hae/ok-

OGaul. <i>ac-edo-</i>	(sb.) ‘visage’ (ACSS 1, 16, in <i>acedo-mopatis</i> [sgN])
Goth. <i>in-ah-</i>	(a.) ‘φρόντιμος : verständig : wise’ (GoEtD 11)
Goth. <i>ni-ukl-ah-</i>	(a.) ‘νήπιος : unmündig, kindisch’ (GoEtD 11) ¹⁸
Goth. <i>ahja-</i>	(vb.) ‘think : νομίζειν’ (GoEtD 11, <i>ahjan</i> [inf.])
Goth. <i>aha(n)-</i>	(m.) ‘Sinn, Verstand’ (GoEtD 11, <i>aha</i> [sgN])
Gr. ὄκνοϋς	(m.) ‘Bedenklichkeit, Scheu, Zögern’ (GEW 1, 373)
RV. <i>ákṣi-</i>	(n.) ‘Auge’ (EWA1, 42-3, WbRV 6, KEWA 1, 543)
gAv. <i>ašī-</i>	(n.) ‘Auge’ (AIWb 229 <i>ašibyā</i> [Y 32.10b], LAv. <i>aši</i>)

16 Lehmann (GoEtD 48) quotes the form as OHG. *acsiunī* [sic] with /c/, but against this Tatian has OHG. *agsiunī* (with /g/).

17 Delamarre (DLG 34): ‘E. Evans, GPN 131-132, doute de l’existence du mot *aged-* en gaulois à cause des doublets *aced-*, *acid-*, *acit-*, alternances orthographiques fréquentes. S’il n’y avait qu’un seul mot *acito-* ‘plaine, champ’ (voir à ce mot), *Agedo-mapatis* serait ‘l’enfant de la plaine’. Il est cependant probable qu’il y a deux mots différents *agedo-* et *acito-*. Cf. aussi E.P. Hamp, BCS 27 (1976-1978), 213.’

18 For the segmentation Goth. *ni-ukl-ah-* containing Goth. *ukl-* ‘strong’ = gAv. *ugra-* ‘idem’, see Pyysalo 2010, 235–36.

Despite plain velar in Pokorny's dictionary (see IEW 774 *ok-) Av. *š* = RV. *kṣ* confirms a palatovelar for the root. When the suffix PIE *·afī- was added to the root PIE *haek- this resulted in PIE *haegafī- with assimilation of voice. This is the root to which the voiced forms discussed above can be attached as follows:

PIE * <i>haegafī-</i>	‘Auge’
OHG. <i>ag-siumī-</i>	(f.) ‘species : Aussehen, Angesicht, Gestalt’ (Tatian)
OIr. <i>ag-ad-</i>	(.) ‘visage, honneur’ (OIr. <i>agad</i> [N])
OGaul. <i>cali-ag-ed-</i>	(PNm.) ‘Dur-Visage (?)’ (DLG 34, <i>caliaged</i>)
OGaul. <i>ag-edo-</i>	(PNm.) ‘aspect, visage, face’ (DLG 34, <i>agedus</i> [sgN])
OIr. <i>aig-ed-</i>	(.) ‘visage, honneur’ (OIr. <i>aiged</i> [N], <i>aigthe</i> [G])
OGaul. <i>ag-edo-uuro-</i>	(PNm.) ‘à l’aspect franc’ (DLG 34, <i>agedouirus</i>)

Similarly the general alternation of voice can be explained regularly with PIE *fī, the voiced variant of the ‘laryngeal’ (see Pyysalo 2013, 366-414).

Abbreviations

a.	adjective
A	accusative
Abl	Ablative
ACSS 1	Holder 1896
ACSS 2	Holder 1904
AIWb	Bartholomae 1904
ANEtWb	Vries 1961
ao.	aorist
ASächsWb	Holthausen 1954
AV.	Atharva-Veda
Av.	Avestan
c.	genus commune
CLu.	Cuneiform Luwian
CHLu	Hawkins 2000
conj.	conjunctive
W.	Welsh
D	Dative
DIL	Marstrandter (et al.) 1913ff.
DLG	Delamarre 2003 ²
DLL.	Laroche 1959
DTochB	Adams 1999
du.	dual
EtDiPC	Matasović 2009
f.	feminine
Fal.	Faliscan
G	Genetive
gAv.	Gathic Avestan
GEW 1	Frisk 1960
GEW 2	Frisk 1972

GoEtD	Lehmann 1986
Goth.	Gothic
GPC	Bevan & Donovan 2003ff.
Gr.	Greek
HED	Puhvel 1984ff.
HEG	Tischler 1977ff.
HHand	Tischler 2001
HIL	Kloekhorst 2007
Hitt.	Hittite
HLu.	Hieroglyphic Luwian
IEW	Pokorny 1959
inf.	infinitive
KZ	<i>Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen.</i> Göttingen. (Berlin, 1952-)
Lat.	Latin
LAv.	late(r) Avestan
LEIA	Vendryes, Bachelery & Lambert 1959ff.
LeTokh	Windekens 1976
LIV ²	Rix et alii 2001
LSJ	Liddell & Scott 1940
m.	masculine
M.	medium
Maced.	Macedonian
MidBret.	Middle Breton
MidW.	Middle Welsh
MidIr.	Middle Irish
ModBret.	Modern Breton
ModCorn.	Modern Cornish
MonWil	Monier-Williams 1993
n.	neuter
N	nominative
Obl.	Oblique (case form)
OBret.	Old Breton
OCorn.	Old Cornish
OW.	Old Welsh
OGaul.	Old Gaulish
OHG.	Old High German
OInd.	Sanskrit
OIr.	Old Irish
OSax.	Old Saxon
PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
pf.	perfect
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PIIr.	Proto-Indo-Iranian
pl.	plural
PN	personal name
Poucha	Poucha 1955
pr.	presens
PToch.	Proto-Tocharian

RDC	Nicole & Luginbühl 2001
rel	relative (form)
RV.	Rig-Veda
sb.	substantive (noun)
sg.	Singular
SOgam	Ziegler 1994
TochA.	Tocharian A
TochB.	Tocharian B
V	Vocative
vb.	verb(al stem)
VKG 1	Pedersen 1909
VKG 2	Pedersen 1913
WbRV	Grassmann 1996 ⁶

Bibliography

- Adams, D. Q. 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. [= DTochB] Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 10. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bartholomae, C. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. [= AIWb]. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Bevan, G. A. & Donovan, P. J. 2003. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*. Ail Argraffiad – Second edition. [= GPC]. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Delamarre, X. 2003. *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. [= DLG]. Paris: Éditions Errance.
- Fraenkel, E. 1962-65. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-II*. Heidelberg, Göttingen: Winter, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frisk, H. 1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-III*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Grassmann, H. 1996. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda, 6. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Maria Kozianka*. [= WbRV]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. [= CHLu]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Holder, A. 1896. *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*. Erster Band A – H. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Holder, A. 1904. *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*. Zweiter Band I – T. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Holthausen, F. 1954. *Altsächsische Wörterbuch*. [= ASächsWb]. Niederdeutsche Studien 1. Köln: Böhlau.
- Kent, R. G. 1953. *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon*. 2nd rev. ed. American Oriental Series, 33. New Haven (Connecticut): American Oriental Society.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2007. *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Dissertation. University of Leiden.
- Laroche, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. [= DLL]. (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'institut français d'archéologie d'Istamboul, vol. VI.) Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Lehmann, W. P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary Based on the Third Edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*. [= GoEtD]. Leiden: Brill.
- Liddell, H. G. & R. Scott, 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Marstrander, C. J. S. (& al.). 1913-76. *Dictionary of the Irish language*. [= DIL] Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Matasović, R. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* [= EtDiPC]. Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 9. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1956-1980. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen I-IV*. [= KEWA]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1986-2000. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [= EWA]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Melchert, H. C. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. (Ergänzungshefte für Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung Nr. 32). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Monier-Williams, M. 1993. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nicole J. & Th. Luginbühl, 2001. *Répertoire des dieux gaulois*. Les noms des divinités celtiques connus par l'épigraphie, les textes antiques et la toponymie. Paris: Éditions Errance.
- Oettinger, N. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, Band 64. Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl.
- Pedersen, H. 1909. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen 1* [= VKG 1]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pedersen, H. 1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen 2* [= VKG 2]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. [= IEW]. Tübingen-Basel: Francke.
- Poucha, Pavel. 1955. *Institutiones Linguae Tocharicae I: Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Monografie Archivu orientálního, 15. Prag: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984ff. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. [= HED]. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation, 1. Berlin-New York-Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Pyysalo, J. 2010. 'Fourteen Indo-European Etymologies in honorem Klaus Karttunen'. In Butters, A. M. & B. Tikkanen 2010 (eds). *Purvaparaprajñābhindandanam: East and West, past and present: Indological and other essays in honour of Klaus Karttunen*. Studia Orientalia, 110. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Pyysalo, J. 2013. *System PIE: The Primary Phoneme Inventory and Sound Law System for Proto-Indo-European*. Publications of the Institute for Asian and African Studies 15. Helsinki: Unigrafia.
- Rieken, E. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 44. Wiesbaden
- Rix, Helmut & M. Kümmel, Th. Zehnder, R. Lipp, & B. Schirmer. 2001 (eds). *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. [= LIV²]. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Tischler, J. 1977-. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. [= HEG]. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Thieme, Paul 1965. 'Drei rigvedische Tierbezeichnungen' KZ 79, 211-223.
- Tischler, J. 2001. *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbruck: Institute für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1946. *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Revised and enlarged edition. [= GOI]. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

- Untermann, J. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Handbuch der Italischen Dialekte 3. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vendryes, J., E. Bachelery & P.-Y. Lambert. 1959-. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. [= LEIA]. Dublin & Paris: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Windekens, A. J. van. 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. 1: La phonétique et le vocabulaire. [= LeTokh]. Travaux publiés par le Centre de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain, Fascicule XI. Louvain: Centre internationale de dialectologie générale.
- Walde, A. & J.B. Hofmann. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Ziegler, S. 1994. *Die Sprache der altirischen Ogam-Inschriften*. [= SOgam]. Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft 36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.