

# Ten New Etymologies between Old Gaulish and the Indo-European Languages

Jouna Pyysalo

## Abstract

This paper belongs to a series of articles designed to contribute to the solution of one of the central problems of Indo-European linguistics of today, the comparative etymology of Indo-European languages. The ten new Indo-European etymologies for Old Gaulish presented are:

1. OGaul. *asia-* ‘secale’: Lith. *asỹ-* ‘Schachtel-, Schafthalm’; 2. OGaul. *nemnali-* ‘célébrer’: RV. *námna-* ‘sich beugen/neigen’; 3. OGaul. *mapalia-* ‘kindlich’: TochA. *mkälto-* ‘jung, klein’; 4. OGaul. *mas* ‘gl. metallum’: TochA. *msāš* ‘imo: from beneath’; 5. OGaul. *cunobarro-* ‘Tête-de-Chien’: CLu. *paraia-* ‘hoch’; 6. OGaul. *marco-* ‘horse’: TochA. *markā-* ‘move’; 7. OGaul. *slēbino-* ‘montanus’: TochB. *šale* ‘mountain, hill’; 8. OGaul. *cobro-* ‘love, desire, greed’: TochB. *kakāpo-* ‘desire, crave, want’; 9. OGaul. *mallo-* ‘langsam, träge’: TochB. *mälle* ‘dull’; 10. OGaul. *bilio-* ‘Baum’: TochB. *pilta-* ‘leaf, petal’

## 0. On the method and methodologies

0.1 In the reconstruction the comparative method is thoroughly followed. In particular each reconstruction and its features are independently confirmed by means of two branches, i.e. according to the principle of postulation. In addition, all the phonemes, reconstructions and sound laws are based on measurable features of the data.

0.2 The etymologies are obtained through successive application of the decision method of the Indo-European etymology originally outlined by Schleicher 1852b: iv-v.<sup>1</sup> In practice the comparisons are intersections of the possible PIE prototypes of the data implying a higher success rate for the etymologies than usual.

0.3 Methodically the PIE phoneme inventory and the sound law system are those presented in Pyysalo 2013. In particular only one laryngeal, a glottal fricative with a voiceless and voiced variant PIE *\*h/h̥* (≡ Hitt. *h̥*), is reconstructed for the proto-language. The PIE glottal fricative was always accompanied by the vowel PIE *\*a* (≈ Neogr. *\*ə*) and the two items always appeared together in the diphonemic

---

1 For a precise formulation of the decision method, see Pyysalo (2013: 475-477).

pairs PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>a* *\*ah* *\*fi<sub>1</sub>* *\*afi* (strict phonotactic selection).<sup>2</sup> As an illustration, instead of Neogr. *\*p<sub>1</sub>ater-* or LT *\*ph<sub>2</sub>ter-* both the vocalic and the consonantal segment are reconstructed together as PIE *\*pah<sub>1</sub>ter-* (in the combined notation of the two historical theories  $\approx$  *\*pəh<sub>2</sub>ter-*) in the glottal fricative theory.

0.4 Both the phoneme inventory and the sound law system presented in Pyysalo 2013 are being tested, verified and completed with the sound laws still missing (usually applying to individual subgroups and languages) in the Proto-Indo-European Lexicon <http://pielexicon.hum.helsinki.fi> (PIE Lexicon). In this platform the Indo-European sound laws are digitized and arranged into sound law scripts in chronological order, subsequently automatically generating the Indo-European data from the reconstruction. Consequently the etymologies presented in this paper will also appear digitally generated in the PIE Lexicon in the future.

## 1. OGaul. *asia* ‘secale’

### 1.1 From PLINY’S gloss *secale Taurini sub Alpinus asiam uocant* a stem

OGaul. *asia-* can be extracted. (f.) ‘secale : Roggen : rye’ (EtDiPC. 323)

1.2 The current etymology is based on an emendation of an extra initial sibilant to OGaul. *[s]asia*. This in turn enables the comparison of the form with the later Celtic forms such as:

MidCymr. <i>haidd-</i>	(m.) ‘hordeum’ (GPC II: 1814, <i>haidd</i> )
MidBret. <i>heiz-</i>	(.) ‘orge’ (DeBret. 325, <i>heiz</i> , <i>heizen</i> )

The rules of the laryngeal theory allow a further connection with the root IEW 880 in a manner hesitatingly explained by Matasović (EtDiPC. 323):<sup>3</sup>

The PIE root is probably *\*seh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘to sow’, but derivations are difficult: the Celtic forms must be from the zero-grade *\*sh<sub>1</sub>s-*, Skt. *sasya-* (and Ved. *sasa-* ‘food, corn’) are from *\*sh<sub>1</sub>es-*, while Hitt. *sesa-* might represent *\*seh<sub>1</sub>s-* and *\*sh<sub>1</sub>e<sub>s</sub>-*, but the meaning and formation of this word are somewhat uncertain (Kloekhorst 2008: 749). Perhaps one should reconstruct a PIE neuter *\*sh<sub>1</sub>es* / *\*sh<sub>1</sub>s-os*.

1.3. From the comparative point of view (Pyysalo 2013:175-6) this reconstruction is not possible due to the insurmountable difficulties in the postulation of Møller’s *\*E = \*h<sub>1</sub>*, which is not sufficient to explain the ‘a-vocalism’ in Celtic. The ‘European

2 In terms of the cover symbols of the laryngeal theory the comparative solution therefore would be expressed as LT *\*h<sub>2</sub>* *\*h<sub>2</sub>* *\*h<sub>2</sub>* *\*h<sub>2</sub>* (where LT *\*<sub>2</sub>*  $\equiv$  PIE *\*a*).

3 For the original suggestion and its rationale, see Hamp *apud* Matasović (EtDiPC. 323).

a-vocalism' reflects PIE \*a, which in turn implies PIE \*h/hi. In the absence of PIE \*h/hi in Hitt. *šeša-* the forms cannot belong together. Consequently an alternative etymology is required for OGaul. *asia-* 'secale' outside the quoted later Celtic gloss.

Comparatively there are reasons to doubt whether the emendation of Old Gaulish was motivated in the first place: Namely, without the emendation it is possible to compare the Old Gaulish form directly to the items

OGaul. <i>asia-</i>	(f.) 'secale : Roggen: rye' (EtDiPc. 323)
Lith. <i>asỹ-</i>	(f.) 'Schachtel-, Schafthalm' (LiEtWb. 124, <i>asỹs</i> )
Latv. <i>aši-</i>	(f.) 'Schachtelhalm' (LiEtWb. 124)
Gr. ἦϊα	(n.) 'Getreidehalme, Spreu' (GEW 1:625, ἦϊα κριθάων)
Lat. <i>aristā-</i>	(f.) 'Granne an der Ähre, Borste' (WH 1:67, <i>arista</i> ).

Formally the quoted forms imply a root PIE \*haes- with the initial laryngeal confirmed in

Hitt. <i>ḫaš-</i>	(n.) 'Span o.ä.' (HEG 1:194-5).
-------------------	---------------------------------

A semantic parallel for the alternation is readily obtained if we additionally compare the later Celtic items discussed above with Baltic in

Lith. <i>saĩdi-</i>	(.) 'Spitz- oder Riesgras' (LiEtWb. 755)
MidCymr. <i>haidd-</i>	(m.) 'hordeum' (GPC II: 1814, <i>haidd</i> )
MidBret. <i>heiz-</i>	(.) 'orge' (DEBret. 325, <i>heiz, heizen</i> ).

In the absence of the acute in Lithuanian a root PIE \*shaeid(añ)- can be postulated on basis of the two sub-branches.

1.4. With regard to the ablaut of the root PIE \*hasi- note that in addition to the root with Lith. *a-* (≡ Lat. *a-*, OGaul. *a-*)

Lith. <i>asỹ-</i>	(f.) 'Schachtel-, Schafthalm' (LiEtWb. 124, <i>asỹs</i> )
-------------------	---

there is a parallel form with PIE \*e attested in:

Lith. <i>esỹ-</i>	(f.) 'Schlachtelhalm' (LiEtWb. 124, <i>esỹs</i> [sgN]).
-------------------	---

In order to explain the lack of colouring effect in System PIE (Pyysalo 2013) the early universal colouring effect of \*h<sub>2</sub> has been restricted to the environments

PIE \*hae \*eah → \*ha \*ah → OIr. *a*, Lat. *a*, Gr. *α*, Lith. *a*, OInd. *a*, etc.

Similarly the 'a-colouring' is absent when PIE \*e and PIE \*a are not immediately adjacent to each other as is the case in:

PIE *\*eha* *\*ahe* → *\*eh* *\*he* → OIr. *e*, Lat. *e*, Gr. *ε*, Lith. *e*, OInd. *a*, etc.

Accordingly Lith. *esỹ-* reflects PIE *\*ehasih₂-* → *\*ehsih₁-* → Lith. *esỹ-*.

## 2. OGaul. *nemnali-* (vb.) ‘célébrer’

2.1. Old Gaulish preserves a verbal stem:

OGaul. *nemnali-* (vb.) ‘célébrer’ (DLG. 234, *nemnaliIumi* [1sg])<sup>4</sup>

2.2. The meaning of the verb has been inferred from the Goidelic noun attested in the Glossary of Cormac (TdCh 85):

OIr. *nemall-* (sb.) ‘célébration (de la messe)’ (DIL. 477)

2.3. Delamarre (DLG) does not report an etymology, and I would like to open the discussion with the following note: A formal and semantic match exists if the Celtic formation is understood as compound OGaul. *nemna-li-*.

(a) The first part of the compound, OGaul. *nem·na-*, can be directly associated to the Old Indo-Aryan intensive reduplications

RV. <i>nám-na-</i>	(intM.) ‘sich [D] beugen/neigen’ (WbRV. 711)
RV. <i>ádhi nam·na-</i>	(intM.) ‘sich hinbeugen über [L]’ (WbRV. 711) <sup>5</sup>
OGaul. <i>nem·na-li-</i>	(vb.) ‘célébrer’ (DLG. 234, <i>nemnaliIumi</i> [1sg])

Semantically the Celtic meaning can be understood on the basis of the abstract meaning of the root preserved, e.g., in

RV. *námas-* (n.) ‘Ehrerweisung, Verehrung, Anbetung’.<sup>6</sup>

(b) Under these circumstances the second part of the compound OGaul. *·li-*

OGaul. *nemna-li-* (vb.) ‘célébrer’ (DLG. 234, *nemnaliIumi* [1sg])

has to contain the meaning ‘celebrate/celebration’, and it can be therefore quite naturally compared to the respective Proto-Italic formation *\*·li-* ‘Fest’ in examples such as

Osc. <i>uesul·lio-</i>	(.) ‘Feste der Göttin uesuna’ (WbOU. 851-2, <i>uesulliaís</i> )
Lat. <i>opā·lio-</i>	(n.pl.) ‘Fest der Ops’ (WH 2:215, <i>opālia</i> )

4 In OGaul. *nemnaliiumi beni* ‘Je célèbre la femme’ (Châteaubleau, Lambert TdCh. 81).

5 The attested forms are RV. *ánamnata* [3sg] and RV. *ádhi (...) namnate* [3sg].

6 See Grassmann WbRV. 711-2 for the item and its derivatives.

Lat. *sat-urnā-lio-* (n.pl.) ‘Saturnalien (WH 2:483, *saturnālia*)

2.4. The parts of the intensive reduplication RV. *nám-na-* ≡ OGaul. *nem-na-* and the broader context of the PIE root can be given a precise etymology as follows:

(a) The first part of the intensive RV.  $\sqrt{nam-}$  ≡ OGaul.  $\sqrt{nem-}$  obviously belongs to the root PIE *\*nem-* ‘biegen, neigen’ (IEW 754) also attested in OGaul. *nemétom* (OIr. *nemed-* ‘sanctuary’, LEIA N-17, DLG. 233-234).

(b) The second part of the intensive, i.e. the root RV.  $\sqrt{na-}$  ≡ OGaul.  $\sqrt{na-}$  ‘biegen, beugen, neigen, ehren’ corresponds to the Old Anatolian in

Hitt. *nah-* (vb1.) ‘(sich) fürchten, vorsichtig sein’ (HEG N:246)

With regard to the short quantity of Hitt. *nah-* ≡ RV. *·na-* ≡ OGaul. *·na-* (implying PIE *\*neah-* with PIE *\*e*) note that I have demonstrated in Pyysalo (2013: 104-110) that PIE *\*eah* ( $\approx h_2$ ) resulted in a short vowel /a/ instead of a long vowel /ā/. Thus, against the *communis opinio*, the short vowel /a/ does not appear only in special circumstances such as Pinault’s Law (1982), but is the regular development.

(c) The extension PIE *\*nah-i-* functions as a Hittite imperative stem and the base for an iterative in Hitt. *·ške/a-*

Hitt. *nahi-* (vb1.) ‘Ehrfurcht erweisen’ (HEG 2:245-8, *na-ah-ḫi*)  
 Hitt. *nahiške/a-* (vb.iter.) ‘sich dauernd fürchten’ (*[na]-ah-ḫe-eš-ki-mi*)

This root is also the starting point of the extension PIE *\*neahi-m-* attested both in Rig-Veda and Old Celtic:

RV. *nem-* (pf.) ‘sich beugen, sein Macht weichen’ (WbRV. 710)  
 RV. *nemi-* (f.) ‘Radkranz, Radfelge’ (WbRV. 755)<sup>7</sup>  
 Galat.  $\delta\rho\nu\cdot\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron$  (n.) ‘heiliger Eichenhain’ (IEW. 215,  $\delta\rho\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ )

The multiple identities OGaul.  $\sqrt{nem-}$  ≡ RV.  $\sqrt{nam-}$ , OGaul.  $\sqrt{na-}$  ≡ RV.  $\sqrt{na-}$  (≡ Hitt.  $\sqrt{nah-}$ ) and Galat.  $\sqrt{\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu-}$  ≡ RV.  $\sqrt{nem-}$  are not accidental, but reflect a larger derivational PIE isogloss preserved between Celtic and Indo-Iranian.

### 3. OGaul. *mapo-* ‘son, boy’

#### 3.1. An Old Gaulish noun *\*mapo-* ‘fils, garçon’ is attested in compounds

<sup>7</sup> According to Mayrhofer (EWA 2:56) RV. *nemi-* ‘Radfelge’ has no etymology. I find this is surprising, because the noun can be quite naturally understood as deriving from an original meaning ‘sich beugend’, thus being a derivative of the perfect RV. *nem-*.

OGaul. <i>mapodia-</i>	(PNf.) ‘-’ (DLG 216-7, <i>mapodia</i> [sgN])
OGaul. <i>mapono-</i>	(GN.m.) ‘-’ (DLG 216-7, <i>maponos</i> [sgN]) <sup>8</sup>
OGaul. <i>maponio-</i>	(PNm.) ‘-’ (DLG 216-7, <i>maponius</i> [sgN])
OGaul. <i>maposo-</i>	(PNm.) ‘-’ (DLG 216-7, <i>maposi</i> [sgG]).

3.2. The respective noun is broadly attested in the Celtic languages:

Ogam. <i>maqo-</i>	(m.) ‘Sohn’ (SOGam. 204, <i>maqi</i> , <i>maqui</i> [sgG])
Celtib. <i>mapo-</i>	(.) ‘Sohn’ (DLG. 216-7, <i>mapo</i> [inscr. de Cajarc L-86])
OBrit. <i>mapo-rito-</i>	(ONn.) ‘le Gué-du-Fils’ (RS 412, <i>maporiton</i> )
ModCymr. <i>mab-</i>	(m.) ‘fils’ (IEW 696, <i>mab</i> [sgN])
ModCorn. <i>mab-</i>	(m.) ‘fils’ (PECA 75, <i>mab</i> [sgN])

In Goidelic there is also a stem with a root-final geminate, implying an extension PCelt. \*maq-q- build upon PCelt. √maq- in

Ogam. <i>maqo-</i>	(m.) ‘fils’ (SOGam. 204, <i>maqqi</i> [sgG])
OIr. <i>macc-</i>	(m.) ‘fils’ (LEIA M-1-2, <i>macc</i> , <i>mac</i> [sgN]).

3.3. With regard to the etymology Delamarre (DLG. 217) writes:

On a proposé d’expliquer le celtique \**mak<sup>w</sup>os* par une dérivation de *magu-* ‘petit garçon, enfant’ (voir à ce mot) : \**maghu-* → \**maghu-o-* → celtique \**maguo-* et gémination \**mak<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>o-*, tout comme britton. \**merkkā* ‘fille’ (gall. *merch*, bret. *merc’h*) de \**mergā* (cf. lituan. *mergā* ‘fille’) ; ou, alternativement, \**magu-kos* → \**mag<sup>w</sup>kos*. IEW 696, Szemerényi *Kinship* 65, K.H. Schmidt *EC* 16 (1979), 121.

This remains problematic due to the incompatibility of PCeltic \**k<sup>w</sup>* (without geminate) and PIE \**ghu* in the rest of the group (including Old Irish).<sup>9</sup> Although the difference of voice can (and will) be explained below our primary goal is a direct Indo-European parallel. Regarding this I would like to quote the extension PCelt. \**maq-a-*<sup>10</sup>

OGaul. <i>mapa-</i>	(PN.) ‘Young <sup>(?)</sup> ’ (ACSS. 2:413)
OGaul. <i>mapalia-</i>	(PN.f.) ‘kindlich’ (ACSS. 2:413)
OGaul. <i>agedomapati-</i>	(PN.m.) ‘face of young/child (?)’ (ACSS. 2:413)

8 For the wide literature on OGaul. *maponos* consult Delamarre (DLG. 216-7).

9 Thus Go. *magu-* (m.) ‘Knabe, Knecht, Sohn : παις, τέκνον’ (GoEtD. 240, *magus* [sgN]) belongs to OIr. *mog-* (m.) ‘garçon, serviteur’ (LEIA M:70, *mog dē* ‘servant of god’, *moga* [G]) and OIr. *maug-* ‘Slave : slave’ (HbGerm. 253).

10 In addition to the feminine extension in PCelt. \**-a-* there is an extension \**-i-* attested in OGaul. *mapinius* (PN.), OGaul. *mapillus* (PNm.) ‘Fiston’ and OGaul. *mapilla* ‘Fifille’.

Of particular interest is OGaul. *mapalia-*, a feminine in PCelt. \*·iā- from PCelt. \**maqal-*, a base almost identical with that of a derivative in *·to-* of Tocharian A:

TochA. *mkäl-to-* (a.) ‘jung, klein’ (LeTokh. 298-9, Poucha 233)<sup>11</sup>

With self-explanatory semantics only a brief formal observation is required: In addition to the quoted vocalizations there is also a root in PIE \*o:

OGaul. *esu-mopa-* (PN.m.) ‘son of Esu-’ (ACSS. 2:413, *esumopas* [sgN])  
 OGaul. *mopati-* (GN.) ‘young, child’ (ACSS. 2:627)  
 OGaul. *agedomopati-* (PN.m.) ‘face of young/child (?)’ (ACSS. 2:413)  
 OGaul. *mopi-* (PNm.) ‘youngling’ (ACSS. 2:627).

The PIE root forms can be explained with the ablaut PIE \*o : e : Ø:

- (a) PCelt. \**moq-* requires PIE \**moahkʷ-* (without compensatory lengthening)
- (b) PCelt. \**maq-* requires PIE \**meahkʷ-* (without compensatory lengthening)
- (c) PToch. \**mk-* requires PIE \**mahkʷ-* (with a loss of PIE \*a ≈ Neogr. \*ə)<sup>12</sup>

3.4. The problem of the Proto-Celtic alternation *kʷ* : *ghʷ* can be understood as follows:

(a) Due to the collision of aspirated and non-aspirated voiceless stops in Celtic the labiovelar of PCelt. \**maq-* \**moq-* can stand for a voiceless aspirated velar \**kʷh* (≡ PIE \**kahy-*) instead of unaspirated \**kʷ*.

(b) The voiced (aspirated) labiovelar \**gʷh* (≡ PIE \**gahy-*) is the voiced counterpart of \**kʷh* (≡ PIE \**kahy-*), and the sole difference between the forms is the voice of the glottal fricative PIE \*h : h̥. Hence it is possible to reconstruct

PIE \**meahkahyō-* → Trad. \**makʷho-* → PCelt. \**maqo-*  
 PIE \**meafīgahyō-* → Trad. \**magʷho-* → PCelt. \**mago-*.

11 Also in the derivative TochA. *mkältorñesi-* (a.poss.) ‘parvitatī’ (Poucha 233).

12 Naturally it remains possible that PToch. \**mk-* is from PIE \**me/oahkʷ-*, but this would require a heavier syncope rule than the one suggested here.

## 4. OGaul. mas ‘metallum’

### 4.1. There is an Old Celtic gloss

OGaul. *mas-* (n?) ‘gl. metallum’ (LEIA M-23).

4.2. The form has no Celtic parallels or external connections that I would be aware of.

4.3. With regard to the Indo-European etymology I begin with an observation concerning the original meaning of the word Gr. μέταλλον, for which Frisk (GEW 2:216) provides the following translations:

Gr. μέταλλο- (n.) ‘Grube, Mine, Bergwerk, Mineral, Metal’.

In other words this early concept of ‘metal’ derives its meaning from a ‘hole in the ground, pit, mine’, and ‘mineral, metal’ is the ‘(un)earthed (product)’. Hence the absent Greek etymology can be sought from Tocharian items quoted below:

Gr. μέταλλο- (n.) ‘Grube, Mine, Bergwerk, Mineral, Metal’  
 TochA. *msās* (adv.) ‘imō : from below’ (Poucha 235)  
 TochB. *maṃtsasá* (advL.) ‘under(neath)’ (DTochB. 441).

4.4. The Tocharian root (ending in an assibilated dental  $\sqrt{mts-}$ ) is accompanied by a parallel root with a sibilant extension (TochA.  $\sqrt{ms-}$ ). The Old Gaulish gloss can be attached to the latter with an identical semantic development as in the dental extension:

OGaul. *mas* (.) ‘gl. metallum’ (LEIA M-23)  
 TochA. *msās* (adv.) ‘imo : from beneath’ (Poucha 235)  
 TochA. *maṃsāntās* (.) ‘-(?)’ (Poucha 213, DTochB. 441)

Finally it should be noted that the fragment TochA. *//// koṃ msāsträ* [3sg] *āyā* *////* possibly contains a verbal stem with an approximate meaning

TochA. *msāṣ-* (prM.) <‘set (down)’ vel sim. (?)> (Poucha 227)

if TochA. *//// koṃ* is indeed the word for the ‘sun’ functioning as the subject of the sentence.



## 5. OGaul. *cuno barro-* (PN.) ‘Tête-de-Chien’

### 5.1. Old Gaulish preserves a personal name

OGaul. *cuno-barro-* (PN.) ‘Tête-de-Chien’ (DLG. 68, *cunobarrus*).<sup>13</sup>

5.2. The meaning of the second part of the compound name is known on the basis of a well preserved formation in the later Celtic languages:

OIr. <i>barr-</i>	(.) ‘sommet, cîme, pointe, bout’ (LEIA B-19)
ModBret. <i>barr an pen</i>	(.) ‘sommet de la tête’ (DLG. 68)
ModCymr. <i>bar-</i>	(.) ‘sommet’ (DLG. 68)
ModCorn. <i>bar-</i>	(.) ‘sommet’ (DLG. 68)

The geminate PCelt. *\*rr* can only represent PIE *\*rs*, and

RV. *bhṛṣṭí-* (f.) ‘Spitze, Zacke’ (WbRV. 964, *bhṛṣṭí-*)

is usually referred to as the Indo-European etymology (cf. IEW 108-109).<sup>14</sup> Even if the Old Indo-Aryan forms are kept distinct from Celtic it should be noted that the Celtic forms can be compared to certain Armenian verbal stems as well as numerous other items quoted by Pokorny (IEW 108-9) including

Arm. <i>baṛna-</i>	(vb.) ‘to raise’ (HIL. 737, <i>baṛnam</i> [1sg])
Arm. <i>ham-baṛna-</i>	(vb.) ‘raise up’ (DTochB. 372, <i>ham-baṛnam</i> )

from PIE *\*bĥaernēah-* or PIE *\*bĥaersnēah-*.

5.3. Since an etymology exists the problem presented by the Celtic is the lack of gemination in the forms:<sup>15</sup>

OGaul. <i>baro-</i>	(PN.) ‘Tête’ (OGaul. <i>barus</i> [sgN])
OGaul. <i>su-baro-</i>	(PN.) ‘Bonne-Tête’ (DLG. 68, <i>subarus</i> sgN])

To these Delamarre also adds an extension in *\*-io-*

OGaul. *sacro-bario-* (PN.) ‘-(?)’ (OGaul. *sacrobarii* [sgG]).

---

13 Also in OGaul. *Uendu-barrus* ‘Blanche-Tête’ if Delamarre’s equation *\*Uindo-barros = v.irl. Findbarr*” is correct despite the problematic difference between OGaul. *e* : OIr. *i*.

14 Although this is formally and semantically acceptable, it should be noted that there is now an alternative etymology quoted by Mayrhofer (EWA 2:277).

15 See also OGaul. *Combaromaro-* (PN.) ‘Grosse-Tête’ (*Combaromarus* [sgN]).

The absence of gemination in these forms has to implicate that the forms never had the extension *\*·s-* but represent a shorter form of the root. The etymology of the short Celtic root  $\sqrt{\text{bar-}}$  is attested in Slavic

Rus. <i>bor-</i>	(.) ‘Art Hirse’ (IEW 108)
KIRus. <i>bor-</i>	(.) ‘Art Hirse’ (IEW 108)
SCr. <i>bâr-</i>	(.) ‘Art Hirse’ (IEW 108)

With regard to these items I would like to make the following final notes:

(a) A parallel is now possibly preserved in the more recently found Tocharian:

TochB. <i>pāre-</i>	(m.sg.) ‘dome’ (?) (of palace) (DTochB. 366) <sup>16</sup>
OGaul. <i>baro-</i>	(PN.) ‘Tête’ (DLG. 68, <i>barus</i> [sgN])
OGaul. <i>su·baro-</i>	(PN.) ‘Bonne-Tête’ (DLG. 68, <i>subarus</i> )

(b) The Old Gaulish extension in *\*·io-* can be compared to Luwian in

CLu. <i>paraia-</i>	(a.) ‘hoch’ (HIL. 737) <sup>17</sup>
OGaul. <i>sacro·bario-</i>	(PN.) ‘-(?)’ (DLG. 68, <i>sacrobarii</i> [sgG]).

(c) The zero grade of the root is likely preserved in:

Thrac. βρία-	(f.) ‘πόλις, τεῖχος’ (GEW 2:658) <sup>18</sup>
OGaul. <i>sado·bria-</i>	(f.) ‘-(?)’ (ACSS. 2:1283, <i>sadobria</i> )
OGaul. <i>solo·bria-</i>	(ON.) ‘Soulièvres, dép. Deux-Sèvres’ (ACSS. 2:1610).

5.4. Finally a reservation regarding TochB. *pāre-* should be noted: Whereas the connection between CLu. *paraia-* ‘hoch’ and the Celtic forms is virtually certain, there are Greek forms sharing the long quantity of the root vowel of Tocharian:

TochB. <i>pāre</i>	(m.sg.) ‘dome’ (?) (of palace) (DTochB. 366)
Gr. βῆρι-	(f.) ‘Turm, Palast’ (GEW 1:220, βῆρις, βῆρεως)
Gr. βῆριδ-	(f.) ‘Turm, Palast’ (GEW 1:220, βῆρις, βῆριδος).

It may, therefore, be advisable to connect these two forms with each other and separate them from the rest of the group.

16 In the context TochB. *āšce sonopālya keryiše pāre ra matsi māsketar.*

17 Written CLu. *pār-ra-ia-an-za, pār-ra-i-ia-[ti], [p]á[r-r]a-ia-ti.*

18 Frisk’s scepticism towards Thrac. βρία- standing for /βρια/ is now justified due to the absence of initial digamma in LinB. *ri-jo-* (cf. also TochA. *ri-*).

## 6. OGaul. *marco-* ‘horse’

6.1. An Old Gaulish noun for ‘horse’ is preserved in

OGaul. *marco-* (m.) ‘s. Frz. *marc* ‘frester, Pic. *merc*’ (ACSS. 2:424)

6.2. The meaning of the form has been inferred from an exact match with the later Celtic item

OIr. *marc-* (m.) ‘i.e. *ech* = Pferd : *cheval*’ (LEIA M-19).

In addition there is an Old Celtic gloss

OGaul. *μάρκα-* (f.) ‘ἵππον : Streitroß’ (LEIA M-19, *μάρκαν* [sgA])

which in turn represents the ancient base of the derivative

OIr. *marcach-* (m.) ‘*chevalier* : *cavalier*’ (LEIA M-19-20, *marcach*).

This interpretation is supported by other Old Celtic data (e.g. Galat. *τρι·μαρκισία* ‘berittener Krieger mit zwei Dienstleuten’ WH 2:79) and there is no doubt of its correctness.

6.3. The Proto-Indo-European root is confirmed through an exact match with Germanic (see IEW 700):

OHG. *marah-* (.) ‘Pferd’ (LEIA M-20)

OEng. *meorh-* (m.) ‘horse, steed : Pferd’ (ASaxD. 674)

OIcl. *mar-* (m.) ‘Pferd’ (ANetWb. 380, *marr* [sgN])

In this data the problem is not the etymology, but the unusually narrow semantic field of the PIE root, practically restricted to forms with nominal meaning ‘horse’. This is exceptional in the sense that similarly as we find the noun

RV. *ásva-* (m./f.) ‘das Ross’ (WbRV. 140)

associated with a finite stem with the meaning ‘move(ment)’

Dhātup. *śáva-* (vb1A.) ‘go, move, change, alter’ (KEWA 3:315)

it can be expected that there is a broader root to which OGaul. *marco-* originally belonged to. Forms of this kind are now attested in Tocharian, where multiple verbal and adjectival meanings match the Celtic and Germanic root as such:

TochA. <i>markä-</i>	(pret.) ‘move’ (DTochB. 442, <i>markäs</i> [3sg])
TochB. <i>snai-märkär</i>	(a.) ‘niṣkaluṣā : not turbid’ (DTochB. 441)
TochA. <i>snemärklune</i>	(vb.sb.) ‘ahārya- : immovable’ (DTochB. 442)
TochB. <i>märkwaci-</i>	(a.) ‘legged’ (DTochB. 454, štwer märkwaci)
TochB. <i>märkwatce-</i>	(sb.) ‘thigh’ (DTochB. 454, <i>märkwatce</i> )
TochB. <i>snai-markär</i>	(a.) ‘not turbid, clear : anāvilah’ (DTochB. 441). <sup>19</sup>

Regarding this note the following:

(a) Semantically the Tocharian cognates display nominal meanings ‘thigh’ and ‘leg(ged)’ and the verbal meaning ‘move’ indicating that the (adjectival/verbal) meaning of OGaul. *marco-* ‘horse’ was ‘the legged/moving one’.<sup>20</sup>

(b) The identity OGaul.  $\sqrt{\text{mark-}}$  = OEng. *meahr* = TochAB.  $\sqrt{\text{märk-}}$ /*mark-* implies a root Neogr. \**mark-*. The short quantity /a/ is confirmed by Tocharian in which the shortening of Osthoff’s Law did not apply except for the diphthongs *āi* and *āu* before consonants in the dialect A.<sup>21</sup>

(c) In this connection I would like to underline that the appearance of the vowel Neogr. \*/a/ should not be understood as a necessity to postulate that item into the proto-language, since the sequence *eh<sub>2</sub>* (≡ PIE \**eah*) did not result in a long, but a short vowel /a/, i.e. PIE \**meahrko* → OGaul. *marco-*.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, all examples of Indo-European /a/, even if not resulting from PIE \**hae*, can represent PIE \**eah*. Consequently no counterpart of Neogr. \*/a/ as an independent phoneme is reconstructed in the glottal fricative theory (Pyysalo 2013).

6.4. The ambiguous velar of PIE \**meahr*-*K-* can be demonstrated to be an extension in the following manner:

(a) An alternative extension is attested in an identity between Greek and Germanic

PIE * <i>meahr</i> Kēah-	
Hes. μαρικᾶ-	(f.) ‘κίναϊδος’ (WH 2:41, μαρικᾶς · κίναϊδος)
OHG. <i>meriha(n)-</i>	(f.) ‘Gl. <i>equa</i> , <i>iumentum</i> : Stute’ (Kluge: <i>Mähre</i> )
OIcl. <i>merr-</i>	(f.) ‘Stute’ (ANetWb. 385). <sup>23</sup>

(b) Also the unextended root PIE \**meahr-* is attested in Greek and Sanskrit:

Gr. ἄ-μαρό-	(vb.) ‘ἀκολουθεῖν, πείθεσθαι’ (GEW 1:86, ἀμαρεῖν)
-------------	---

<sup>19</sup> TochB. *snai-märkarce* (a.) ‘not turbid, clear : anāvilam’ (DTochB. 441).

<sup>20</sup> Note that the existing etymology of TochAB.  $\sqrt{\text{mark-}}$   $\sqrt{\text{märk-}}$ , originally suggested by van WINDEKENS (LeToch. 290) and still supported by Adams (DTochB. 442) is incorrect: Gr. βρακεῖν belongs a root with a semantic field meaning ‘hand’, not ‘thigh, leg, foot’.

<sup>21</sup> For the restriction of Osthoff’s Law in Tocharian A see Pyysalo 2013:166-170.

<sup>22</sup> For the rule PIE \**eah* → IE /a/, see Pyysalo 2013: 104-110.

<sup>23</sup> Note that OIcl. *merr* can alternatively belong to OHG. *merha(n)-* (f.) ‘Gl. *equa*, *iumentum* : Stute’ or represent a collision of both forms.

OInd. *marāla-* (m.) ‘Pferd’ (KEWA 2:588, *marālas*).<sup>24</sup>

In this manner it is provable that there existed a root PIE *\*mahr-* ‘to move, leg, legged’ for which further parallels can be hoped to emerge in the future.<sup>25</sup>

## 7. OGaul. *slēbino-* (PN.) ‘montanus’

### 7.1. Old Gaulish preserves a personal name

OGaul. *slēbino-*(PN.) ‘montanus’ (ACSS. 2:1592, *slēbinus* [sgN]).

7.2. The translation of Stokes is based on the standard segmentation of the suffix PCelt. *\*-ino-* and the later form of the Celtic root preserved in Old Irish:

OIr. *slíab-* (n.) ‘Berg, Gebirge’ (LEIA S-131, *slíab*, *slebe* [sgG]).

7.3. I am not aware of a direct Indo-European etymology,<sup>26</sup> but in a broader derivational context I would like to point out that the Celtic forms can be compared to the oblique stem TochB. *šle- šli-* ‘mountain, hill’ (without an etymological labial or labiovelar in the root-final position) in:

TochB. <i>šle-</i>	(obl.) ‘mountain-, hill-’ (DTochB. 651-2, <i>šlentse</i> )
TochB. <i>šle-taš-</i>	(sb.) ‘commander of the mountain(s)’ (DTochB. 668)
TochB. <i>šle-šše-</i>	(a.) ‘prtng to a mountain or hill’ (DTochB. 652)
TochB. <i>šli-ye-</i>	(a.) ‘prtng to a mountain or hill’ (DTochB. 669). <sup>27</sup>

The stems TochB. *šle- šli-* belong to the forms displaying a root in the *\*e*-grade in:

TochB. <i>šale-</i>	(m.sg.) ‘mountain, hill’ (DTochB. 651-2, <i>šale</i> , <i>šalem</i> )
TochB. <i>šāle-yāst-</i>	(sb.) ‘mountain-precipice’ (DTochB. 652)

Although essentially a root etymology I cannot see other possible starting point for the currently isolated Celtic items.

24 The formation and suffix of the Old Indo-Aryan form is not immediately obvious, but its connection to the items quoted is hardly to be disputed.

25 As a possible candidate, note especially Hitt. *maḫrai-* (<sup>U2Uc.</sup>) ‘Wadenbein’ (HEG 2:226, *ma-aḫ-ra-en* [sgA] = KBo 17.30.ii.2). As the discussion of the relation of this gloss would require several pages I hope to return to this in some other connection.

26 LEIA (S-131) correctly rejects the comparison with OIcl. *šleppa-* (st.vb.) ‘gleiten’ (ANetWb. 515, *šleppa* [inf.]) on semantic grounds.

27 It is uncertain whether TochA. *šlem* ‘-(?)’ (Poucha 356, *šlem*) also belongs here, because the standard word with the meaning ‘mountain’ is TochA. *šul-* (m.) ‘mons : Berg’ (Poucha 349, *šul*).

7.4. In a broader context the Tocharian forms can be reconstructed as PIE *\*seloi-*, PIE *\*selahoi-* or PIE *\*sele/oahi-* depending on which extension of the broader Indo-European root we prefer to attach these to:

PIE $\sqrt{sol-}$ $\sqrt{sel-}$ $\sqrt{sl-}$	
PIE <i>*sole/o-</i>	(HEG Š:755f.)
Hitt. <i>šala-karta-</i>	(n.) ‘Hochmut’ (HHand. 140)
Lat. <i>in-solent-</i>	(pt.a.) ‘überheblich, übermäßig’ (WH 1:704)
Lat. <i>in-solentia-</i>	(f.) ‘Überhebung, Übertreibung’ (WH 1:704)
PIE <i>*solah-</i>	(HEG Š:765f.)
Lith. <i>salà-</i>	(f.) ‘Bodenerhebung im Morast’ (LiEtWb. 758)
Latv. <i>sala-</i>	(f.) ‘Höhe (im Morast)’ (LiEtWb. 758)
HLu. <i>salha-</i>	(.) ‘power’ (CHLu. 3.2.3, LIGNUM-la-ha)
HLu. <i>salhaza-</i>	(.) ‘greatness’ (CHLu. 2.5.3, (LIGNUM)sà-la-ha-za)
Hitt. <i>šalhanti-</i>	(.) ‘Wachstum, Gedeihen’ (?) (HHand. 140)
Hitt. <i>šalhiantia-</i>	(.) ‘Wachstum, Gedeihen’ (?) (HHand. 140)
Hitt. <i>šalhuria-</i>	(GIS.) ‘Pfeiler, Pfosten = GIS <sub>1</sub> šarhuli-’ (HHand. 140)
PIE <i>*soli-</i>	(HEG Š:767f.)
Hitt. <i>šali-</i>	(a.) ‘groß, angesehen’ (c.) ‘Erwachsener’ (HHand. 140)
Hitt. <i>šaleia-</i>	(vb.) ‘groß machen, großziehen’ (HHand. 140)

Regardless of the precise details of the reconstruction also the Indo-European origin of OGaul. *slēbino-* (OIr. *slíab-*) is reasonably well founded although there is no confirmation for the original shape of the determinative PCelt. *\*-b-*.

## 8. OGaul. *cobro-* ‘love, desire, greed’

8.1. Old Gaulish and Dacian preserve a root  $\sqrt{cobr-}$

OGaul. <i>cobro-mara-</i>	(PNf.) ‘wish+great’ (DLG. 120, <i>cobromara</i> )
OGaul. <i>cobro-uillo-</i>	(PNm.) ‘-(?)’ (DLG. 120, <i>cobrouillus</i> )
OGaul. <i>cobro-uio-</i>	(PNm.) ‘-(?)’ (DLG. 120, <i>cobrouius</i> )
OGaul. <i>cobro-nia-</i>	(PNf.) ‘-(?)’ (DLG. 120, <i>cobronia</i> )
Dac. <i>ad-cobro-uat-</i>	(PN.) ‘qui devine les désirs (?)’ (DLG 120). <sup>28</sup>

8.2. The root has a match in Goidelic (LEIA C-135) from where the meaning for the formation has been obtained:

OIr. <i>ad-cobra-</i>	(vb.) ‘wish, desire’ (DIL. 6, <i>accobra</i> [3sg])
OIr. <i>ad-cobor-</i>	(n.) ‘wish desire, lust’ (DIL. 3, <i>accobor</i> )
OIr. <i>mil-chobur-</i>	(.) ‘ours <- *qui aime le miel’ (DLG. 120) <sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup> In [sgD] Dac. *adcobrouati* (CIL XVI, 160).

<sup>29</sup> Note Delamarre’s comment: ‘On rapprochait anciennement de v.irl. *cobair* “aide, secours, assistance”, mais R. Thurneysen ZcPh 22 (1941), 26, a analysé *cobair* comme

OIr. *con-chobar-* (PN.) ‘Désir-de-Loup, Loup-Avide’ (DLG. 120)  
 OIr. *ól-chobar-* (PN.) ‘qui aime boire’ (DLG. 120)

8.3. Regarding the Indo-European etymology the Celtic formation is traditionally attached to Lat. *cupiō* with the details explained by Delamarre (DLG. 120):

la racine est celle du latin *cupio* ‘je désire’, *Cupra* nom de déesse = ombr. *Cubrar*, vénète NP *Kupri-konioi* dat. (Lingua Venetica 121 = *Conchobar* ? en composé inverse) et celle du hitt. *kup-* ‘préméditer, conspirer’, HED 4, 257. L’évolution phonétique serait *\*kupro-* > *\*kouro-* (= NP *Coura*) > *Cobro-*. HI 1055, Dottin 247, KGP 175, ETP 113, R. Thurneysen ZcPh 13 (1921), 106, LEIA C-135, IEW 596.<sup>30</sup>

8.4. Although the chain of developments *\*kupro-* → *\*kouro-* → OGaul. *cobro-* is possible I remain troubled by the difference between the vocalism PCelt. *\*o* vs. PIE *\*u* and limited scope of the proposed sound law(s). Thus—without rejecting the proposal—I would like to mention an alternative etymology with simpler assumptions.<sup>31</sup> This is based on the direct comparison of the root OGaul. *√cob-* with Tocharian, where the root is attested with an extension in *\*ni-*:

TochA. *kāpñe-kan-* (sb.) ‘amoris vox’ (Poucha 59, *kāpñekanam*).

In addition the root is preserved in the reduplicated

TochB. *kakāpo-* (pret.pt.) ‘desire, crave, want’ (DTochB. 151-2)

which is a preterite participle in *\*-u-* from a verbal stem PToch. *\*kakāpa-*.

Taken that this etymology is accepted it is possible to

1. Understand the vocalism of OGaul. *√cob-r-* original, i.e. representing PIE *\*o*.
2. Equate the stops of the roots OGaul. *√cob-* and TochAB. *√kāp-* and posit PIE *\*k(h)* and PIE *\*b(h)* for the stops.

In order to proceed from this point, especially to eliminate the ambiguity of the stops of the root and the root vowel, additional data are required.

un composé de *reth-* ‘courir’, *co(m)-fo-reth-*, ce qui annule le rapprochement.’

30 For OGaul. *coura* (PNf.) and OGaul. *couria* (PNf.) with /ou/ see DAG (1269, 1318).

31 Campbell (2004:133): ‘What is meant by the criterion of economy is that when multiple alternatives are available, the one which requires the fewest independent changes is most likely to be right.’

## 9. OGaul. mallo- ‘lent’

9.1. In Old Gaulish a personal name appears as a free morpheme and as a part of compounds:

OGaul. <i>mallo-</i>	(cogn.m.) ‘-(?)-’ (ACSS. 2:397, <i>mallus, malli</i> )
OGaul. <i>calo-mallo-</i>	(cogn.m.) ‘-(?)-’ (ACSS. 1:704)
OGaul. <i>canto-mallo-</i>	(PNm.) ‘-(?)-’ (ACSS. 1:754).

9.2. As far as I know, the Gaulish forms have not been connected to their cognates in the later language:

OIr. <i>mall-</i>	(a.) ‘hebes : langsam, träge’ (LEIA M:15)
ModCymr. <i>mall-</i>	(a.) ‘lent, mou, flêtri’ (LEIA M:15)
OIr. <i>malla-</i>	(vb.) ‘tarder’ (LEIA M:15, <i>mallaid</i> [3sg]).

9.3. In terms of Indo-European etymology the following forms are readily available for comparison, thus replacing all suggestions of the etymological dictionaries quoted:

MidLG. <i>mall-</i>	(a) ‘stupid, foolish’ (HbGerm. 258)
TochB. <i>mälle-</i>	(a.) ‘dull’ (DTochB. 449).

(a) Formally a minor issue regarding the reconstruction needs to be commented. The authors of LEIA (M:15) would explain the Celtic ‘a-vocalism’ with a zero grade root PIE *\*m̥lno-* → PCelt. *\*mallo-*. This is, problematic due to identity OIr. *mall-* = MidLG. *mall-* pointing to an immediate precedent with Neogr. *\*/a/* instead of a zero grade, not credible in Celtic.

(b) With the absence of Osthoff’s Law in Tocharian A and B the identity

TochB. *mälle* ≡ OGaul. *mallo-* ≡ OIr. *mall-* ≡ MidLG. *mall-*

allows for postulating a common prototype PIE *\*mēahlno-* for all languages involved.<sup>32</sup>

(c) Semantically the comparison presents no problems, but it should be mentioned that Pokorny (IEW 720) quotes OIr. *mall-* under the root 3. *mel-* ‘zögern’, which is not entirely unproblematic due to the semantic and formal difference between the forms.

32 For the restriction of Osthoff’s Law (also allowing PIE *\*e* for other languages than Tocharian) see Pyysalo 2013: 169<sup>356</sup>.



9.4. According to Orel (HbGerm. 258) PGerm. *\*malla-* (MidLG. *mall-* ‘stupid, foolish’) is ‘Probably, identical with Skt *malvá-* “thoughtless, foolish, unwise” (Heidermanns 400)’. This is otherwise accurate but instead of a direct match there are two extensions, PIE *\*mahl-n-* and PIE *\*mahl-u-*, the latter reflected in Old Indo-Aryan data preserving PIE *\*l-*:

PIE <i>*meahlu-</i> <i>*mēahlu-</i>	
AV. <i>malvá-</i>	(a.) ‘unbesonnen, töricht, unklug’ (KEWA 2:602)
OInd. <i>māhvyā-</i>	(n.) ‘Albernheit, Unbesonnenheit’ (KEWA 2:602)

(c) The two extensions imply a root PIE  $\sqrt{mahl-}$ , which according to Orel would be ‘Related to *\*malanan*. Holthausen AEEW 216, 221; Mayrhofer II 602; Pokorny I 716’. I remain doubtful with regard to this, since the underlying semantic field rather points to a root with meaning ‘to stay’.

## 10. OGaul. *bilio-* ‘arbre’

10.1. Old Gaulish and Old Irish confirm a base PCelt. *\*bili-* ‘Baum’ in

OGaul. <i>bilio-</i>	(PN.m.) ‘arbre’ (DLG. 75)
OIr. <i>bile-</i>	(n.) ‘arbre de grande taille, arbre sacré (LEIA B-50)
OGaul. <i>coro-bilio-</i>	(ONn.) ‘auj. Corbeil’ (DLG. 75)
OGaul. <i>bili-catu-</i>	(PN.) ‘-(?)’ (DLG. 75)

10.2. In addition there is a base PCelt. *\*billi-*

OGaul. <i>billio-</i>	(PN.m.) ‘tronc d’arbre’ (DLG. 75)
OGaul. <i>billio-magos-</i>	(ON.n.) ‘Champ-de-l’Arbre’ (DLG. 75)
ModFr. <i>bille-</i>	(.) ‘tronc d’arbre’ (DLG. 75)
Prov. <i>bilha-</i>	(.) ‘tronc d’arbre’ (DLG. 75)

Without an Indo-European etymology limited preliminary notes can be presented:

- (a) The gemination PCelt. *\*ll* represents PIE *\*ln*.
- (b) The initial of the root underlying the extensions PCelt. *\*bil-i-* and *\*bil-n-* is ambiguous (*\*bh-* *\*b-* and *\*g<sup>h</sup>-* remain possible).

10.3. An external etymology for Celtic is offered by Tocharian which preserves a dental extension *\*Bil·T-* (with an ambiguous TochB. *p-*)

TochB. <i>pilta-</i>	(n.) ‘leaf, petal’ (MA 348, LeToch. 358, DTochB. 388)
TochB. <i>pilta-</i>	(n.) ‘leaf, petal’ (DTochB. 388, <i>piltasa</i> , <i>piltās</i> )
TochA. <i>piltāk-</i>	(?) ‘-(?)’ (Poucha 181)

The Celtic and the Tocharian data exclude \*gʷ-, which leaves only \*bh- and \*b- as possible initials.

10.4. Regarding the two alternatives it can finally be noted that the alternative \*bh- is highly likely owing to the existence of two parallel but derivationally different PIE isoglosses:

- (a) PIE \*bafiol- (in extensions PIE \*bafiol-i- and PIE \*bafiol-t-)  
 Lat. *folio-* (n.) ‘Blatt (der Pflanze)’ (WH 1:523-4, *folium* [sgNA])  
 OGaul. βελιου·κάνδα- (f.) ‘millefolium’ (WH 2:523, βελιουκάνδας)  
 TochA. *pält-* (sb.) ‘folium’ (Poucha 176, *pält* [sgN], *pältwā* [plN])  
 TochA. *pältem-* (a.poss.) ‘folii’ (Poucha 176)
- (b) PIE \*baful- (in extensions PIE \*baful-i- and PIE \*baful-n-):  
 Hitt. *bulbuli-* (.) ‘Stamm, Balken<sup>(9)</sup>’ (HHand. 135)  
 Illyr. *tri-bulio-* (ONn.) ‘clover (?)’ (GEW 2.1050)  
 Gr. φυλία- (f.) ‘Art wilder Ölbaum’ (GEW 2:1050)  
 Ion. φυλίη- (f.) ‘Art wilder Ölbaum’ (GEW 2:1050)  
 Gr. φύλλο- (n.) ‘Blatt, Pflanze’ (GEW 2:1050, φύλλον)  
 Gr. τρί·φυλλο- (n.) ‘Trifolium, Klee’ (GEW 2:1050)  
 Gr. τρί·φυλλο- (a.) ‘dreiblättrig’ (GEW 2:1050)

According to Frisk (GEW 2:1051) the Greek items ‘Kann von lat. *folium* Blatt’ nicht getrennt werden, obwohl die Vokale nicht stimmen’. In order to sustain Frisk’s view it is necessary to first postulate an underlying root PIE \*bafi- (Neogr. \*bh-) with three extensions

PIE \*bafi·o-    PIE \*bafi·i-    PIE \*bafi·u-.

Each of these extensions must have been further equipped with an extension PIE \*·l- as indicated in

PIE \*bafio·l-    PIE \*bafii·l-    PIE \*bafiu·l-.

These in turn could take an additional suffix ·Σ ≡ PIE \*·i(o)- \*·n(o)- or \*·t(o)- by means of which the actually attested forms emerge.

## Abbreviations

a.	– adjective
A	– Active
ACSS.	– HOLDER 1896-1904
adv.	– adverb
ANetWb.	– VRIES 1961
Arm.	– Armenian
ASaxD.	– BOSWORTH & TOLLER 1882-1898
AV.	– Atharva-Veda
Celtib.	– Celtic-Iberian
CHLu.	– HAWKINS 2000
CLu.	– Cuneiform Luwian
cogn.	– cognomen
D	– Dative
Dac.	– Dacian
DAG	– WHATMOUGH 1970
DeBret.	– DESHAYES 2003
DGVB	– FLEURIOT 1985
Dhātup.	– Dhātupāṭha
DIL	– MARSTRANDER et al. 1913ff.
DLG	– DELAMARRE 2003
DTochB.	– ADAMS 1999
EtDiPC.	– MATASOVIĆ 2009
EWA	– MAYRHOFER 1986-2000
f.	– feminine
G.	– Genetive
Galat.	– Galatian
GEW.	– FRISK 1960-1972
GN.	– name of a god
GPC	– BEVAN & DONOVAN 2003
Gr.	– Greek
HbGerm.	– OREL 2003.
HEG	– TISCHLER 1977f.
HHand.	– TISCHLER 2001
HIL.	– KLOEKHORST 2007
Hitt.	– Hittite
HLu.	– Hieroglyphic Luwian
IEW.	– POKORNY 1959
Illyr.	– Illyrian
int.	– intensive
iter.	– iterative
KEWA	– MAYRHOFER 1956-1980
Kluge	– KLUGE 1989
L.	– Locative
Lat.	– Latin
Latv.	– Latvian
LEIA	– VENDRYES et al. 1959f.
LeTokh.	– WINDEKENS 1976
LiEtWb.	– FRAENKEL 1962-65

Lith.	– Lithianian
m.	– masculine
M.	– medium
MA	– MALLORY & ADAMS 1997
MidBret.	– Middle Breton
MidCymr.	– Middle Welsh
MidLG.	– Middle Low German
ModBret.	– Modern Breton
ModCorn.	– Modern Cornish
ModCymr.	– Modern Welsh
ModFr.	– Modern French
MonWil.	– MONIER-WILLIAMS 1993
n.	– neuter
N.	– nominative
obl.	– oblique
OBrit.	– Old Brittonic
OCS.	– Old Church Slavic
OEng.	– Old English
Ogam.	– Ogam
OGaul.	– Old Gaulish
OHG.	– Old High German
Oicl.	– Old Icelandic
OIr.	– Old Irish
ON.	– name of a person
Osc.	– Oscan
PCelt.	– Proto-Celtic
PECA	– CAMPANILE 1974
pf.	– perfect
PIE	– Proto-Indo-European
pl.	– plural
PN.	– name of a person
poss.	– possessive
Poucha	– POUCHA 1955
pr.	– present
pret.	– preterite
Prov.	– Provencal
pt.	– participle
PToch.	– Proto-Tocharian
RV.	– Rig-Veda
sb.	– substantive
sg.	– singular
SOgam.	– ZIEGLER 1994
TdCh	– LAMBERT 1998-2000
Thrac.	– Thracian
TochA.	– Tocharian A
TochB.	– Tocharian B
Trad.	– Traditional (reconstruction)
vb.	– verb
WbOU.	– UNTERMANN 2000

WbRV. – GRASSMANN 1996  
 WH. – WALDE-HOFMANN 1938

## Bibliography

- Adams, Douglas Q. (1999). *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 10.) Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Bevan, G. A. & Donovan, P. J. (2003). *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*. Ail Argraffiad – Second edition. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Bosworth, Joseph & Toller, T. Northcote (1882-1898). *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Campanile, Enrico (1974). *Profilo etimologico dei cornico antico*. Pise: Pacini.
- Delamarre, Xavier (2003<sup>2</sup>). *Dictionnaire de la language gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. (Collection Hesperides). Paris: éditions errance.
- Deshayes, Albert (2003). *Dictionnaire etymologique du breton*. Douarnenez: Le Chasse-Marée.
- Fleuriot, Léon (1985). *Dictionary of Old Breton - Dictionnaire du Vieux Breton Historical and Comparative*. Toronto: Prepcorp.
- Fraenkel, Ernst (1962-65). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-II*. Heidelberg & Göttingen: Winter, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frisk, Hjalmar (1960-1972<sup>2</sup>). *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-III*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Grassmann, Hermann (1996<sup>6</sup>). *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 6. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Maria Kozianka. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Holder, A. – (1896). *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz. Erster Band A – H*. Leipzig: Teubner.– (1904). *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz. Zweiter Band I – T*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2007). *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Dissertation, University of Leiden. Url: <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/11996>
- Kluge, Friedrich (1989). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 22. Auflage unter Mithilfe von Max Bürgisser und Bernd Gregor völlig neu bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Koerner, Konrad (1982). “The Schleicherian Paradigm in Linguistics”, *General Linguistics* 22: 1-39.
- Kronasser, Heinz (1962-1966). *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache. Band 1. I Zur Schreibung und Lautung des Hethitischen. II. Wortbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (1998-2000). “La tuile gauloise de Châteaubleau (Seine-et-Marne)”, *Etudes Celtiques* 34, 57-115.
- Mallory, James P. & ADAMS, Douglas Q. ed. (1997). *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Marstrand, Carl J. S. et alii (1913ff.). *Dictionary of the Irish language*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Matasović, Ranko (2009). *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 9.) Leiden & Boston: Brill

- Mayrhofer, Manfred – (1956-1980). *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen I-IV*. Heidelberg: Winter.– (1986-2000). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen I-III*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Monier-Williams, Sir M. (1993). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Orel, Vladimir (2003). *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden-Boston: Brill
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (1982). “A neglected phonetic law: The reduction of the Indo-European laryngeals in internal syllables before yod”, in *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. Ahlqvist A. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 265- 272.
- Pokorny, Julius (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. Tübingen: Francke.
- Poucha, Pavel (1955). *Institutiones Linguae Tocharicae I: Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. (Monografie Archivu orientálního, 15.). Prag: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Pyysalo, Jouna (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.
- Sadnik, Linda & Aitzetmüller, Rudolf (1955). *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslawischen Texten*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Schleicher, August (1852b). *Die Formenlehre der kirchenslawischen Sprache, erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt*. Bonn: H.B. König.
- Tischler, Johann (1977f.). *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Tischler, Johann (2001). *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbruck: Institute für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Untermann, J. (2000) *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Handbuch der Italischen Dialekte 3. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vendryes, Joseph, Bachellery, Edouard & Lambert, Pierre Y. (1959ff.) *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Vries, Jan de. 1961. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Walde, A. & Hofmann, J.B. (1938). *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3., neuarbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann I-II. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Whatmough, Joshua (1970). *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Windekens, A. J. van (1976). *Le tokharien conronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. 1: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. (Travaux publiés par le Centre de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain, Fascicule XI.) Louvain, Centre internationale de dialectologie générale.
- Ziegler, Sabine (1994). *Die Sprache der altirischen Ogam-Inschriften*. Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft 36. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.