

## HOW TO DEFINE CELTIBERIAN ARCHAISMS?

Karl Horst Schmidt

As concerns the term *archaism* ('Archaismus'), J. Knobloch 1963, 156, gives the following definition of the concept: "In der historischen Sprachforschung ist (*residuärer*) A ... eine Altertümlichkeit, die die konservativeren Sprachen aus der Grundsprache bewahrt haben". In our context, however, Celtiberian (CI) archaism stands for at least four different facts:

- I. CI archaisms correspond to the reconstructed form of one or the other Celtic language.
- II. CI archaisms are conditioned by the position of CI as one of the *Marginal Languages* which—in contrast to Gallo-Brittonic as *Central-Celtic*<sup>1</sup>—have preserved features of earlier Proto-Celtic.
- III. CI archaisms fall together with the development of linguistic features in east Indo-European (IE) languages including Greek, without being attested in Italic and Germanic.
- IV. CI archaisms possibly reflect Proto-IE.

Ad I. As concerns fact no. 1, examples are mainly attested in phonetic development, e.g.

1) Old Irish (OIr.) *bóthar* 'a road' is traced back to *\*bou-itro-*, literally 'cow-passage', which would have given Early OIr. trisyllabic *\*bóathar*, and thence *bóthar*. This derivation would account for the palatal *-thr-* in the Mod. Ir. plural forms *boithre*, *boithribh* (O'Rahilly 1946, 160); cf. also *LEIA-B* 75: "c'est un composé *\*bou-itro-* 'passage de boeufs', avec un nom d'instrument sur la racine *\*ei-/i-* 'aller'." The palatal *-thr-* in Mod. Ir., deduced by O'Rahilly l.c., is now confirmed by CI *boitos* in Botorrita IV A 2+3: *bouitos* : *ozeum* :

---

<sup>1</sup> In the *separation theory* (Ausgliederungstheorie) Gallo-Brittonic (Gallo-Britt.) is defined as *Central-Celtic* vs. CI, Goidelic (Goidel.), Lepontic (Lep.) as early separated *Marginal Languages* (cf. Schmidt 2005, 281).

+[--] [--]i : *turuntas* : *tirikantos* : *kustai* : *bize[tus]*<sup>2</sup> “Einen Viehweg (*bouitos*, neutraler *s*-Stamm) von ... Fuß (Gen. Pl. *ozeum*), ihn (-z-) soll sie (= *touta* ‘die Bürgerschaft’) heraushauen (*bizetus*) zum Nutzen (Dat. *kustai*) von Turunta (Gen.) und Trikant (Gen.)”<sup>3</sup>

2) IE *C<sub>rs</sub>C-* > Celtic (excluding CI) \**CarC-* or \**CrasC-*: OIr. *tart* ‘thirst’ < \**tr<sub>o</sub>stu-*, Gaulish (Gaul.) TARTOS (personal name) vs. IE *C<sub>rs</sub>C-* > CI *CarsC-* (with preserved *sC-*): “Las leyendas monetales *Barskunez* y *Baskunez* ..., posiblemente de Viana, Navarra, reproducen el ablativo de un topónimo probablemente celta de formación en nasal \**barskū-*, que a su vez proviene de \**bhr<sub>s</sub>-* ‘elevado’ y se relaciona con ai. *bhr<sub>s</sub>ti-* y lat. *fastigium* ‘elevación’”<sup>4</sup> “El apelativo *arznas* (K.1.1, Botorrita) procede de indoeuropeo \**pr<sub>s</sub>-no-*, y es por lo tanto una forma idéntica a airl. *rann* ‘parte’” (Villar und Prósper l.c.).

As concerns OIr. *tart* ‘drought, thirst’, Thurneysen 1975, 131, reconstructs “an original consonant-group” “Skt. *tr<sub>o</sub>ṣṭáh* ‘dry’, OE. *þurst*, beside Gk. *τέρσομαι*, etc.” IE relatives of CI \**barskū-* are OIr. *barr* ‘point, top’, Gaul. *barro-* ‘head’.

3) CVRSV > Celt. (except CI) *CVRRO-* vs. CI *CVRSV-*: OIr. *oll* ‘ample’, Gaul. *ollo-* vs. CI *olzui* (dat. sg.) (Schmidt 2008, 192). The CI record implies a modification of the etymological connections put together by Vendryes, *LEIA-O*, 20 f.

4) IE \**k<sup>w</sup>* and \**k<sup>w</sup>* coincide in CI *kw* vs. OIr. *c*, lenited *ch*, Gallo-Britt. *p*: CI *ekualakos*, *equeisuique* (Wodtko 2000, 118 f.), derivations from IE \**ek<sup>w</sup>os* ‘horse’: OIr. *ech*, Gallo-Britt. \**epo-* (Pokorny 1959, 301).<sup>5</sup>

5) IE \**k<sup>w</sup>e* enclit. ‘and’ (Pokorny 1959, 635 f.): CI *-kwe* vs. OIr. *-ch-*, lenited < \**kwe*, Lep. *pe* (Le Vase de Latumarus: Lejeune 1971, 74; 79 f.) < \**kwe* by interference of Gaulish.<sup>6</sup>

Summing up the evidence of fact no. 1, we come to the conclusion, drawn by Schmidt 2008, 192:

“Kib. [Keltiberische] Archaismen in der Lautentwicklung, zu denen die hier vorliegenden Fälle gehören, haben ihre Parallelen auf anderen Ebenen der Sprache (Morphologie, Syntax). Sie ermöglichen die Rekonstruktion eines älteren kelt. Grundsprachenmodells und sind Argumente für die frühe —vor dem Goidel. erfolgte— Ausgliederung der kib. Marginalsprache aus dem Zentralkelt.”

<sup>2</sup> Villar *et al.* 2001, 103; 112; 120 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Schmidt 2004a, 205 (with the addition of ‘neutraler *s*-Stamm’).

<sup>4</sup> Villar und Prósper 2005, 200; cf. also Schmidt 2008, 191 f.

<sup>5</sup> Jordán 2004, 68 f., Wodtko 2000, 118 f.; cf. also Gaul. *Equos* (Coligny: Lambert 1995, 19; 111): Gaul. archaism preserved in the Calendar of Coligny.

<sup>6</sup> On the history of the IE conjunction \**k<sup>w</sup>e* in Celtic cf. Wodtko 2000, 206.

Ad II. As concerns fact no. II, the main criterion for the definition of CI as a Marginal Language, is the preservation of ProtoCeltic *\*kw* in CI, Goidelic and in some examples of Archaic Gaulish, the development of the enclitic conjunction *\*kwe* > *-pe* in Lepontic (cf. I.5) being explained by interference, i.e. the influence of neighbouring Gaulish.<sup>7</sup>

1) There are also differences between the Marginal Languages and Central-Celtic in the field of vocabulary. An example is the word for ‘healthy’, ‘health’: OIr. *slán* ‘healthy, health’, *slántu-* ‘health’ (*LEIA-S*, 126 f.), Lep. *slaniai* (dat. sg.): *Slaniai Verkalai pala* ‘pierre tombale pour Slania Verkala’ (Lejeune 1971, 80 f.), CI *Lentioko Slaniaz* ‘tésera de Slania’ (Villar 1999; Schmidt 2006a, 350).<sup>8</sup>

Since *\*slánia* in CI and Lep. is a nominal derivation from the adjective *slán* ‘healthy’, it must be regarded as a more original formation than OIr. *slántu-* ‘health’ which is marked by the verbal noun ending in *-tu* (cf. Schmidt 2006a, 350).

As far as I know, a reflex of Celtic *\*slán* is not attested in Gallo-Britt.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the etymon probably has been lost in Celtic after the separation of the speakers of the Marginal Languages, being replaced in Brittonic by *\*yeh<sub>1</sub>k-/yh<sub>1</sub>k-* ‘to cure’ (Pokorny 1959, 504).

2) On the other hand, in spite of its character as a Marginal Language we also find examples of innovation in Goidelic as well, e.g.

a) OIr. *áth* ‘ford’ < *\*yā-tu-* < *\*yeh<sub>2</sub>-tu-*, root *\*yeh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to drive along’ (Pokorny 1959, 296; Rix *et al.* 2001, 309 f.). This is a Goidelic innovation which has replaced Celt. *\*ritu-* < *\*pr<sub>2</sub>-tu-* (Lat. *portus*, OHG. *furt*), preserved in Gallo-Britt.<sup>10</sup>

b) The use of OIr. *le/la* with a verbal noun as a substitute for earlier unattested OIr. *\*cét* + verbal noun “to convey the idea of concomitant or contemporaneous action” (Mac Cana 1983, 55): Irish ‘*Is lond in fer so*’, *ol Mani la sóud úad*, “‘What a bad-tempered fellow!’” said Maine turning away from him’ *TBC* Rec. I,1.1577 (*LU* 5855-6) vs. Welsh *efe a ddaeth atynt, gan rodio ar y môr* ‘he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea’ Marc. 6,48 = *venit ad eos am-*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the evidence quoted above (I 4 and 5) and see Schmidt 1988, 232 and 1992, 148 f. On the differentiation between Gallo-Britt. as *Central-Celtic* and CI, Goidel., Lep. as early separated *Marginal Languages* see footnote no. 1.

<sup>8</sup> On the gen. sg. ending *-o* cf. Schmidt 1999b *Uentioko* instead of *Lentioko* (Schmidt 2006a, 350 is a misprint).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the discussion of *slán* in *LEIA-S*, 126 f.

<sup>10</sup> Schmidt 2004b, 338; idem 2006, 350; Pokorny 1959, 817; Rix *et al.* 2001, 472 f.

*bulans supra mare*. The syntactic type is defined as follows: for the Irish: where the preposition *la* is used with a verbal noun (*la sóud úad*), for the Welsh: its use of the preposition *gan* with a verbal noun recalls the use of *la* with a verbal noun in Irish (*gan rodio ar y môr*). Since Welsh *can*, *gan*, Cornish *cans*, *gans* Old Breton *cant-*, Greek κατά are etymologically equivalent to Irish *cét-*,<sup>11</sup> the Irish construction *la sóud úad* ‘turning away from him’, i.e. *lella* with a verbal noun, must be explained as a substitute for non attested \**cét* with a verbal noun, all the more so, as the Irish preposition *le/la* ‘with’ itself is a late formation, restricted to Goidelic (cf. Müller 1992).

The prepositional construction in the Insular Celtic languages is caused by the loss of the participle, a development which is paralleled in Classical Armenian: *gay ar nosa gnalov i veray covown* Mt. 14,25 = ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν = *venit ad eos ambulans supra mare*.<sup>12</sup>

c) As regards sound development, Gaul. \**gdonio-*, which is attested as the second part of the Dvandva-compound TEUOXTONION (gen. pl. Vercelli) = \**dēuo-xdonion* < \**deiwo-ġ<sup>h</sup>donion* ‘deis et hominibus’, is a derivation of \**ġ<sup>h</sup>dem-*, \**ġ<sup>h</sup>dom-* ‘earth’ (Pokorny 1959, 414 ff.); \**ġ<sup>h</sup>dom-* ‘earth’: \**ġ<sup>h</sup>donios* ‘terrestre, mortel, humain’ = Greek χθών ‘la terre’: χθόνιος ‘terrestre, mortel, humain’; \**ġ<sup>h</sup>donios* is identical with the reconstruct of OIr. *duine* ‘man’ = Welsh *dyn*, Bret. *den* (Lambert 1995, 78 f.).

Ad III. There are a couple of features which meet the requirement of three basic principles:

a) They are attested in Celtic and eastern IE languages.

b) They are not attested in Italic.

c) On the basis of Leskien’s maxim of 1876: XIII, they are the result of common innovations.

The most important of these features is feature no. 1, the inflected *relative pronoun* \**yos* in CI, already discussed by me several times,<sup>13</sup> which according to principle no. 1, is attested both in eastern IE languages (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Slavic, Phrygian) and CI, but not in Anatolian and Tocharian.<sup>14</sup>

Feature no. 1 also satisfies the requirement of principle no. 2, as Italic deviates from Celtic by the use of the interrogative pronoun \**k<sup>w</sup>o-/\*k<sup>w</sup>i-* in rela-

<sup>11</sup> LEIA-C, 83 f. “*cét-* uniquement préfixe et préverbe ‘avec’ ... Cétbaid correspond en effet au gall. *canfod*, nom. verb. de *canfyddaf* ‘je vois, j’aperçois, je découvre’”.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Schmidt 1999a, 211 f., idem 2002, 692 f.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. e.g. Schmidt 1996, 24 f. and recently idem 2007, 199-203.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Friedrich 1960, 68 and Krause und Thomas 1960, 165. As to the reconstruction of \**yos* in Armenian, cf. Schmidt 2007, 201. Szemerényi’s 1990, 223, explanation of \**yos* as an innovation of the *satəm* languages independently developed in Celtic, must be rejected.

tive function, paralleled in Anatolian and Tocharian (see above, footnote no. 14). As this development is pretty old, \*yos must be regarded as a common innovation of eastern IE and Celtic.

Feature no. 2 is the “desiderative formation marked by reduplication as well as by a thematically inflected *s*-suffix, which in roots ending in a resonant is preceded by a laryngeal” (Schmidt 1996, 23). The formation is attested in Indo-Iranian and Celtic (principle no. 1) and also meets the requirements of principles no. 2 —it is not attested in Italic— and 3 —its formation is a common innovation of part of the IE languages.

Feature no. 3 is the future in \*-syē-/\*-syo-, attested in Gaulish, Indo-Iranian, Baltic, Slavic and possibly Greek, but not in Italic. The record of Indo-Iranian, Slavic and Greek confirms the insertion of a laryngeal after roots ending in a resonant, in the same way as we find it in feature no. 2.

These three features prove early contact of Celtic with east IE languages including Greek,<sup>15</sup> as it has been already claimed by Kretschmer 1896 and Wagner 1969.<sup>16</sup>

Ad IV. There are, moreover, CI and Celtic archaisms which reflect Proto-IE, as e.g.

1) the preservation of the verbal noun, which did not develop to infinitive.<sup>17</sup> As pointed out by Thurneysen 1975, 445, the verbal noun is “used in place of the infinitive ... Syntactically it is a substantive: subject and object are expressed by a following genitive”.<sup>18</sup> As a rule, in the languages of the world infinitives have their origin in verbal nouns.<sup>19</sup>

2) Another example of early archaism in CI is the word order SOV (Subject – Object – Verb) with its correlation in noun groups (*determinans* preceding *determinatum*) and syntagmas (postposition, dependent subordinate preceding principal clause). This arrangement corresponds to type III of Greenberg’s *Basic Word Order Typology* (cf. Greenberg 1963, 66 ff.).

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Porzig 1954, 152 ff., numbering Greek among the east IE languages and recently Schmidt 2007.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also the later publications, e.g. Ködderitzsch 1993; Falileyev 2007, 2008. Schmidt’s theory of 1996 has been accepted and expanded by De Bernardo Stempel 1997; cf. also Isaac 2004, Stempel 1996, 309, Kalygin† 2006, Schmidt 2007. The question of early links between Celts and Slavs has been particularly investigated by the *Societas Celto-Slavica*, founded 2004 in Moscow by Viktor Kalygin, Seamus Mac Mathúna, Tatyana Mikhailova and Maxim Fomin; cf. Kalygin† 2006.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Schmidt 2006b.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also Brugmann 1906, 639.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Schmidt 2006b, drawing attention to parallels between Celtic and Kartvelian, the latter being a non-IE language which has preserved the verbal noun in place of infinitive.

3) Celtic lacks a verb ‘have’, as did Proto-IE “(e.g. Meillet 1923). Examination of the individual daughter languages shows that the various branches all display their own root for a verb ‘have’, which implies that the verb was not inherited from the proto-language, but developed after the proto-language split up” (Bauer 2000, 151). In Irish we find the differentiation between *temporary possession* (‘temporärer Besitz’) *tá ag* and *permanent possession* (‘permanenter Besitz’) (Hartmann 1954: 97).<sup>20</sup> This evidence stresses the character of “Pre-Indo-European as an Agreement Language of the Active Sub-type” (Lehmann 2005, 51-53).

4) IE \**ne* negation (Delbrück 1897, 521-524) occurs in CI as *ne-* in various connections (Wodtko 2000, 269-275); IE \**nek<sup>w</sup>e* ‘and not’ precedes both CI *nekue* and other Celtic equivalents (Wodtko l.c.).

These examples which could be easily increased stress the archaic features both of Celtic as a whole and in particular of CI.

### BIBLIOGRAFÍA

- Bauer 2000: B. Bauer, *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European. The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*, Berlin-New York 2000.
- Brugmann 1906: K. Brugmann, *Grundriß der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* II.1, Strassburg 1906<sup>2</sup>.
- De Bernardo Stempel 1997: P. De Bernardo Stempel, “Celtico e antico indiano: in margine alle più recenti teorie”, in: R. Arena et al. (eds), *Bandhu: Scritti in onore di C. Della Casa* II, 717-734. Alessandria 1997.
- Delbrück 1897: B. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Zweiter Teil*, Strassburg 1897 = *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik* IV.2.
- Falileyev 2007: A. Falileyev, *Celtic Dacia: Personal Names, Place-names and Ethnic Names of Celtic Origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor*, Aberystwyth 2007.
- Falileyev 2008: A. Falileyev, “Celts on the Margins: Toponymic Notes”, in: *Celtic and other Languages in Ancient Europe*, Salamanca 2008, 145-152.
- Friedrich 1960: J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch. 1. Teil: Kurzgefaßte Grammatik*, Heidelberg 1960<sup>2</sup>.
- Greenberg 1963: J.H. Greenberg, “Some universals of Grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements”, in: J.H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Language*, Cambridge Mass. 1963, 58-90.

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Schmidt 1996, 17-18.

- Hartmann 1954: H. Hartmann, *Das Passiv. Eine Studie zur Geistesgeschichte der Kelten, Italiker und Arier*, Heidelberg 1954.
- Isaac 2004: G.R. Isaac, "The Nature and Origins of the Celtic Languages. Atlantic Seaways, Italo-Celtic and other Paralinguistic Misapprehensions", *Studia Celtica* 38, 2004, 49-58.
- Jordán 2004: C. Jordán Cólera, *Celtibérico*, Monografías de Filología Griega 16, Zaragoza 2004.
- Kalygin† 2006: V. Kalygin, "The Celts and the Slavs: On K.H. Schmidt's Hypothesis on the Eastern Origin of the Celts", *Studia Celto-Slavica* 1, 2006, 63-70.
- Knobloch 1963: J. Knobloch, *Sprachwissenschaftliches Wörterbuch*, Lfg. 2, Heidelberg 1963.
- Ködderitzsch 1993: R. Ködderitzsch, "Keltisch und Thrakisch", in: *Akten des ersten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologen*, Tübingen, 139-157.
- Krause und Thomas 1960: W. Krause und W. Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band 1. Grammatik*, Heidelberg 1960.
- Kretschmer 1896: P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen 1896.
- Lambert 1995: P.-Y. Lambert, *La langue Gauloise*, Paris 1995<sup>2</sup>.
- Lehmann 2005: W.P. Lehmann, *Pre-Indo-European*, The Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 41, Washington 2005.
- LEIA: *Lexique étymologique de l'Irlandais Ancien* de J. Vendryes, Dublin et Paris 1959 (A), 1981 (B), 1987 (C), 1996 (D), 1960 (M,N,O,P), 1974 (R,S), 1978 (T,U).
- Lejeune 1971: M. Lejeune, *Lepontica*, Paris 1971.
- Leskien 1876: A. Leskien, *Die Declination im Slavisch-Litauischen und Germanischen*, Leipzig 1876 [Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik 1963].
- Mac Cana 1983: P. Mac Cana, "Three Syntactic Notes", *Celtica* 15, 55-59.
- Müller 1992: N. Müller, "Die Präposition *la* im Altirischen", *ZCP* 45, 102-131.
- O'Rahilly 1946: T.F. O'Rahilly, "bóthar", *Celtica* 1, Fasc. 1, 1946, 160.
- Pokorny 1959: J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I. Band, München 1959.
- Porzig 1954: W. Porzig, *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Heidelberg 1954.
- Rix et al. 2001: H. Rix et al., *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden 2001<sup>2</sup>.
- Schmidt 1988: K.H. Schmidt, "On the Reconstruction of Proto-Celtic", in: G.W. Mac Lennan (ed.), *Proceedings of the First North American Congress of Celtic Studies*, Ottawa 1988.



- Schmidt 1992: K.H. Schmidt, "Celtic Movements in the First Millenium B.C.", *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20, Numbers 1 and 2, 1992, 143-178.
- Schmidt 1996: K.H. Schmidt, *Celtic: A Western Indo-European Language?*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 66, Innsbruck 1996.
- Schmidt 1999a: K.H. Schmidt, "Syntactica", in: J. Carey et al. (eds.), *Ildánach Ildirech. FS Pronsias Mac Cana*, Andover & Aberystwyth 1999, 211-214.
- Schmidt 1999b: K.H. Schmidt, "Review of Villar 1995", *ZCP* 51, 1999, 190-202.
- Schmidt 2002: K.H. Schmidt, "Hypotaxe und aktives Partizip in der Bibelübersetzung", in: P. Anreiter et al., *Namen, Sprachen und Kulturen. Festschrift für Heinz Dieter Pohl zum 60. Geburtstag*, Wien 2002, 685-689.
- Schmidt 2004a: K.H. Schmidt, "Review of Villar et al.", *ZCP* 54, 2004, 199-207.
- Schmidt 2004b: K.H. Schmidt, "Review of Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames, Fasc. 1 (Names in A-)", *ZCP* 54, 2004, 337-338.
- Schmidt 2005: K.H. Schmidt, "Grundzüge einer kontrastiven Betrachtung von Johann Caspar Zeuss "Grammatica Celtica" (1853) und Rudolf Thurneysen "Handbuch des Altirischen" (1909)", in: *Recht - Wirtschaft - Kultur. Festschrift für Hans Hablitzel zum 60. Geburtstag*, Berlin 2005, 277-292.
- Schmidt 2006a: K.H. Schmidt, "Review of Palaeohispanica, vol. 3", *ZCP* 55, 2006, 348-351.
- Schmidt 2006b: K.H. Schmidt, "Zum Verbalnomen im Keltischen", in: R. Bombi et al., *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*, Alessandria 2006, 1551-1557.
- Schmidt 2007: K.H. Schmidt, "Armenian and Celtic. Towards a New Classification of Early Indo-European Dialects", *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences* 175, 1, 2007, 199-203.
- Schmidt 2008: K.H. Schmidt, "Review of Villar/Prósper 2005", *ZCP* 56, 2008, 190-194.
- Stempel 1996: R. Stempel, "Review of Studies Polomé I. II.", *ZCP* 48, 1996, 306-310.
- Studies Polomé I., II. *Perspectives on Indo-European Language, Culture and Religion*, McLean Virginia 1991, 1992.
- Szemerényi 1990: O. Szemerényi, *Einführung in die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 4., durchgesehene Auflage, Darmstadt 1990.
- Thurneysen 1975: Thurneysen, Rudolf: *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Revised and enlarged edition with supplement. Translated from the German by D.A. Binchy and Osborn Bergin, Dublin 1975.
- Vendryes, J.: see under *LEIA*.



- Villar 1995: F. Villar, *A New Interpretation of Celtiberian Grammar*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 62, Innsbruck 1995.
- Villar 1999: F. Villar, “La tésera de *Slania* y los nombres de familia con determinante”, in: P. Anreiter und E. Jerem, *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica. FS für Wolfgang Meid*. Budapest 1999, 532-537.
- Villar et al. 2001: F. Villar et al., *El IV Bronce de Botorrita (Contrebia Belaisca): Arqueología y Linguística*, Salamanca 2001.
- Villar und Prósper 2005: F. Villar und B. Prósper, *Vascos, Celtas e Indoeuropeos: Genes y lenguas*, Salamanca 2005.
- Wagner 1969: H. Wagner, “The Origin of the Celts in the Light of Linguistic Geography”, *TPhS*, 1969, 203-250.
- Wodtko 2000: D. Wodtko, *Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*, Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum Bd. VI, Wiesbaden 2000.

*Karl Horst Schmidt*