



Blanca María Prósper

University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Celtic Theonymy at the 14th F.E.R.C.AN. Workshops
Review of the book: Matijević, K. (Ed.). (2016). *Kelto-Römische Gottheiten und ihre Verehrer. Akten des 14 F.E.R.C.AN.-Workshops, Trier 12–14 Oktober 2015*. Rahden: VML Vlg Marie Leidorf. 296 p.

Voprosy onomastiki, 2018, Volume 15, Issue 3, pp. 242–249
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.040

Language of the article: English

Blanca María Prósper

University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Celtic Theonymy at the 14th F.E.R.C.AN. Workshops
Рец. на кн.: Matijević, K. (Ed.). (2016). *Kelto-Römische Gottheiten und ihre Verehrer. Akten des 14 F.E.R.C.AN.-Workshops, Trier 12–14 Oktober 2015*. Rahden: VML Vlg Marie Leidorf. 296 p.

Вопросы ономастики. 2018. Т. 15. № 3. С. 242–249
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.040

Язык статьи: английский

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.040
UDC 811.15'373.21 + 21/29

Blanca María Prósper
University of Salamanca
Salamanca, Spain

CELTIC THEONYMY AT THE 14th F.E.R.C.AN. WORKSHOPS

Review of the book: Matijević, K. (Ed.). (2016). *Kelto-Römische Gottheiten und ihre Verehrer. Akten des 14 F.E.R.C.AN.-Workshops, Trier 12–14 Oktober 2015* [Celts-Roman Deities and their Worshipers. Proceedings of the 14th F.E.R.C.AN. Workshops, Trier, 12–14 October 2015]. Rahden: VML Vlg Marie Leidorf. 296 p.

Ancient inscriptions containing divine names and religious terms are of the utmost importance for the appreciation of Celtic religion in its various forms. These sources have never been systematically documented and analysed, which constitutes the goal of the F.E.R.C.AN. project launched in 1998 by the Austrian Academy of Sciences. For the time being, a number of publications have been produced on the outcome of the F.E.R.C.AN. workshops, in which new findings and etymologies, terminological problems, several questions concerning the sociology of religion, and methodological issues are discussed. In a nutshell, some preliminary results of the F.E.R.C.AN. project are: a more nuanced view of all the elements contained in the votive formulae; the distinction between theonyms and epithets; the identification of several layers of theonyms; and the detection of theonymical synonyms (the so-called *interpretatio Romana*). This review deals with most of the questions addressed by the participants of the Trier workshop in 2015, highlighting a number of specific etymological and methodological issues.

Keywords: Celtic religion, Celtic languages, Latin epigraphy, Indo-European language reconstruction, theonymy.

Acknowledgements

This work has been financed by the Spanish Government (MINECO FFI2012–30657: *La antroponimia indígena indoeuropea de Hispania: Estudio comparativo*).

© Prósper Blanca María, 2018

The fourteenth volume of the F.E.R.C.AN. series is devoted to Celto-Roman divinities and their worshippers, in other words, to the almost inextricable fusion of Celtic gods who have only become known to us through Roman epigraphy and the works of classical authors. Their original essence has been distorted in many senses by this secondhand reception. The indigenous perception of their relations to the Roman pantheon is a further, long-standing problem. This is why the subject of this book is deliberately left open to different interpretations from specialists in the fields of linguistics, epigraphy, archaeology, ancient history, and comparative mythology. In this review, my perspective will always remain that of a linguist, aimed broadly to discuss linguistic hypotheses and offer different insights when necessary, but all the while refrained from criticizing any aspects of the historical, archaeological or sociological interpretation of religion.

The studies composing this volume are ushered in by *R. Wiegels* with an introduction that wonders about the nature of Celtic religion as handed down to us and pleads for a sociological approach to votive practice and a focus on dedicants, in this way adding a pragmatic dimension to the usual formal and semantic work on divine names (DNs). *K. Matijević* has conducted a thorough monograph on *Hercules Saxanus*. The dedicants were mostly, but not exclusively, militaries, and most of the stones have been uncovered in Germania Superior (where some of the earliest testimonies omit the mention of Hercules), but also in Italy and Noricum. The name is related to the dangerous works of mineral extraction in quarries, as revealed by its Latin etymology *saxum* ‘rock.’ It remains unclear whether this DN is covering an indigenous one. *B. Sergent* tackles a study of the DN *Sucellus*, well-attested in Germania, Belgica, Narbonensis, etc. He concludes that this god is a protector of wood craftsmanship, rejects the validity of conclusions drawn on the comparison with foreign divinities, and emphasizes his relationship with Silvanus. His name is traditionally taken to mean ‘good striker’ or ‘having a good hammer,’ because he is represented bearing a hammer or mallet, although he is also depicted holding a pot. The expert in mythology that he is, Sergent tries to reconstruct the features of this divinity, *faute de mieux*, on the authority of the surviving monuments. Unfortunately, the traditional etymological account is itself uncritically based on iconography (one does not quite see why nobody cares about the attributes of *Dagda* ‘the good god’ when it comes to its etymological analysis, except that it seems too obvious to be challenged), just as it is full of vagaries regarding morphology, the internal syntax of the compound, and the IE comparanda. This may well be an older formation in which *cell-* is of verbal origin.¹

¹ In lieu of an IE root **kelH-* ‘to smite’ I would posit **kel-* ‘to protect.’ Thus, the **h₂su-kel-mō(n)* would be the god ‘having a good protection or **kel-m₂*’ > agentive ‘protecting well, providing good protection’ and the expected thematic result built on the oblique stem is **h₂su-kel-mn-o-*. There are many similar compounded names in different Indo-European branches, all of them belonging to the sphere of religion, cf. the Luwian thematized proper names like *Tarhunta-zalma*, etc., and also in Cilician priest names like Τροκο-ζαρμας, the OHG *Ans-helm*, and the ultimately identical athematic formation has survived in the Skt. proper name *Su-śarman-*. The details can be consulted in [Prósper, 2015] (not discussed in this work). If OIr. *soicell* ‘generosity, kindness’ is a cognate of *Sucellus*, the traditional etymology is untenable.

The worshippers of *Sucellus* could hardly be expected to understand the DN, let alone relate it to hammers or pots, something we are perfectly aware of from Classic mythology. When it comes to linguistic analysis, any hints obtained from the social class of the worshippers, the iconography or even the mythology, turn out to be fruitless, which is not to say that these disciplines are not complementary: their particular conclusions simply do not impinge on related fields as frequently or as convincingly as we would like, and Sergent's conclusions on the origin and specialization of this divinity are neither underpinned nor threatened by etymological speculation. *N. Mathieu's* contribution is devoted to *Segomo*, an indigenous epiclesis of Mars, which he correctly identifies with an agent noun in *-mon-* 'victorious.' It is worth mentioning in this respect an interesting work [Weiss, 2017] according to which the Italic divinity, transmitted in Latin as *Semo*, is identical and can be explained by way of consonant lenition from PItal. **seyVmōn*.

B. Rémy studies a number of indigenous divinities of the Vocontii and the social status of the dedicants. Some of these divinities are very poorly attested, for instance, ALLOBROG(-), whose dedicant possibly stems from Vienne. We have to point out, however, that this isolated dedication does not make this the eponymous divinity of the *Allobroges*, but at most their protector, secondarily bearing their name. As regards the dedication to ALAMBRIMAE, I would not lay much weight on it: the inscription is lost for all I know, and, if it is related to the mount still known as *Alambre*, the derivation *-(i)mo-* is next to impossible and either the reading or the segmentation here are erroneous. Finally, the most interesting name in the area is grossly misinterpreted by previous works that Rémy handles with a prudent distance: a DN ANDARTAE is usually held to go back to a prefixed form of **artā* 'she-bear.' To begin with, there is no indication that the original female name was not, as expected, **artī*.² This would be the best explanation of the DN ARTIONI (Bern): an individualizing or a possessive nasal stem derived from **artī*. The internal syntax of this compound has never been brought to bear on the matter, but it is crucial to it: a 'very much bear' is an absurd, but literal translation, and the alternatively posited 'big bear,' which automatically turns an intensive or local *and-* into an augmentative prefix (see the state of the art on its connections in [Evans, 1967, 137]), disguises the problem and thus is simply not an option. The form **and-arto-* is a prefixed past participle going back to IE **h₂γd^hi* or **h₁γdo* and **h₂r-tó-* 'fixed, composed, built,' and consequently identical to Lat. *artus*, Skt. *ṛtá-*. While this is far from settling the question of the phonetic outcome of a Celtic sequence #HR₂C-, the coincident Italic and Celtic forms point to *ar-* being phonetic in this case. Accordingly, **Andartā* probably means 'well-fixed, staying firm'

² The equation of the proper names ARTVLA VS. VRSVLA in the same text [cf. Meißner, 2010] has been justly identified as a case of onomastic romanization; but the Gaulish form is glossed over and cannot reflect a purely indigenous development of the diminutive suffix (we would expect a form which is actually attested as ARTILLA, /arti:la:/, ultimately from **h₂rtk-ih₂*).

and is unrelated to the animal world (a connection anyway unsubstantiated by former studies and deprived of the much valued iconographic support). Similarly prefixed forms like the proper name COMARTIORIX (Bordeaux) may be similarly analyzed: either the first member of the compound is ultimately based on **kom-arto-* or it presupposes a possessive **kom-arti-* containing an action noun and belonging to the Latin inherited schema of *soll-ers*, *all-ers*.³ While it is uncontroversial that there is a CCelt. word **arto-* ‘bear,’ the occurrence of this etymon in Continental Celtic onomastics has been largely overestimated. The Helvetian ARTIONI, in spite of its obvious iconography (a sculpture of the goddess being worshipped by a bear), may be held suspect of covering a case of paremyology.

A. *Ferlut* tackles a study of the female divinities of Gallia Belgica which embraces a sociological perspective, relies on an exhaustive statistical approach and gives due importance to the dedicants, including their status and the prevalence of individuals of indigenous vs. Roman origin as compared to other Celtic-speaking provinces, as well as to rituals and regional sanctuaries. M. M. *Alves Dias*, M. J. *Correia* and C. *Gaspar* revise the Celtic identity of the Portuguese territory starting from the sound premise that it is impossible to find different criteria (ethnic, linguistic, etc.) overlapping anywhere. Taking into account the datings, the dedicants, and the historical and archaeological context, together with measuring the reliability of the readings (which, in fact, are often not to be entirely trusted), they proceed to detect Celtic divinities in Lusitania and analyse *Bormanicus*, the *Matres* and *Munidi* (dat.). J. L. *Ramírez Sádaba* has devoted his contribution to the Cantabrian divinities *Erudinus*, *Cabuniaegius* *Obbellecinus*. He provides an up-to-date review of their respective etymologies and derivation, and compares their forms to those of the Celtiberian DNs.

Now some words are in order about P. *De Bernardo Stempel*'s views on north-western Hispanic divine names. Unfortunately, as usual with this scholar, her tenets are unjustified and only intended to convince historians and epigraphists, since most of them do not bear scrutiny and no expert linguist would espouse them. I shall only mention a few of the numerous flaws I find in her interpretations. She plays with graphic conventions at will: if the attested instances of a DN AERNO show a digraph, this is likely to reflect an etymological diphthong or a sequence *-aie-* (see [Prósper, 2015], which she ignores), but she traces it back to **parniō-* by way of an *-i/ĩ-* anticipation rule whose scope and geographical distribution she has been modifying at will for twenty years to make it square with her own ideas, regardless of criticism. She mentions a divinity *Veroris* which she (not implausibly) traces back to **u(p)ero-rīx*. In doing so, she simply

³ The *Anarti* or *Anartii* (Caesar, Ptolemy, epigraphic record) are an ancient population that settled down in Dacia and whose ethnonym might be Celtic or not, but is certainly IE. In line with the traditional views, they have been interpreted as a compound containing the word for ‘bear’ [cf. Falileyev, 2007, 21]. Synchronically, however, this could only lead to a translation ‘having no bears.’ In my view, the base of this ethnonym is identical to Lat. *in-ers* ‘unskilled, not gifted,’ from **ǵ-h₂(e)rti-* (and then a rather typical exoethnic) or Av. *anarōta-* ‘lawless’ and is not even certain to belong to a dialect of western IE.

omits the fact that it is only attested as a dative *VERORE*, which she again lemmatizes arbitrarily, leaving the ending completely unintelligible under her hypothesis (she does not mention the obviously Celtic *DEVORI* attested in Lusitania). She shows a total disregard of phonetic plausibility in defense of her etymological preconceptions. For instance, she rejects out of hand my etymological analysis of the divine epithet *MORDONIECO* without as much as mentioning it (and I am at a loss as to why a root **merd-* ‘stink’ could be far-fetched when a watercourse is involved), but in its stead she posits a place name **mori-dūno-*. In itself, this would not be implausible, were it not because there are hardly any toponyms in *-dūno-* in western Hispania and a long, tense vowel /u:/ is most unlikely to have merged with either /o/ or /o:/ (she never discusses any possible shortcomings in her own arguments). She is particularly resistant to criticism, and that is probably why she still fails to acknowledge that the DN *BANDVE* cannot be connected with Skt. *bandhu-* ‘connection, relative,’ because this is the product of Bartholomae’s Law and consequently a very common verbal abstract going back to **b^hend^h-tu-* (which in fact turns up in Celtic as **banssu-* ‘habit,’ see [EDPC, *s.u.*]). She has an utterly absurd notion of the syntax of the Latin inscriptions containing the sequence DN + epithet, which as everybody knows is systematically inflective for the dative, but in which she identifies epithets in *-<o>* as genitive plural forms in *-om* (which simply do not exist in Hispano-Celtic). Given that she often quotes herself without underpinning her tenets with any arguments, the reader is only left to wonder about their validity. She tiptoes around distributional problems which are crucial to our research. Sometimes, she has recourse to mere phantasy, as when she speculates about the existence of a Hispano-Celtic divinity *Belenos* under a Roman dedication to *Fons*, thus simply trespassing all the limits (in fact, a Celtic divinity **Belenos* has never existed, see [Prósper, 2017], and none of its variants are attested in Hispania). Finally, when she finds an idea acceptable, she often forgets who has published it twenty years ago and attributes it to herself, as she does with the evolution of western Hispano-Celtic **brig-* into **bri-* [Villar, 1995]. One could go on forever if only it were worth the trouble. This is simply unacceptable to put it mildly and, as the symptom of a persistent attitude, it threatens to compromise the credibility of the F.E.R.C.AN. project as a whole and recommends a more strict peer-reviewing policy.

M. Hainzmann has compiled the testimonies of *Apollo Grannos* and has exhaustively reviewed the (not so) different etymologies offered for his epithet. Admittedly, the metalanguage he employs for the purported evolution of divine names and their interpretations and translations, which is founded on De Bernardo Stempel’s own ideas, is hard to understand and, ultimately, to prove. In his view, *Grannos* was an independent Celtic divinity of “sun and healing” which was syncretized with *Apollo* in the wake of the earliest contacts of Greeks and Celts in the Narbonensis. In any event he should have included Matasović’s work [2009], and I have recently come up with different ideas on this alleged “sun-god” [Prósper, 2016, 159] (from a past participle **g^hrH-nó-* ‘grown; in full bloom’). *A. Falileyev* and *A. Kurilić* have

conducted a study of the divinities of Roman Dalmatia. They have taken the bother to re-analyse the monuments and establish their nature in a very nuanced study. They prudently assess the plausibility of ascribing stones to divinities otherwise unattested in the area. They have recourse to sensible linguistic arguments. They quite sensibly speculate with different possibilities regarding both readings and ascriptions, and make apt usage of Latin comparanda in epigraphy. On pp. 267–268 they offer alternative etymologies for *Tanarus*, which, as they conclude, is unlikely to be metathesized from *Taranus* (cf. *Tranis*, *Taranucus*), but could be related to **tanā* ‘time.’ In my view, *Tanarus* is nothing but a typical Celtic *-ro-* adjective with a full grade of the root as opposed to the IE inherited zero-grade type, which has undergone Joseph’s Law, is typical of river names and in fact goes back to **stenh₂-* ‘to thunder.’ Accordingly, **(s)tenh₂-ro-* can be reconstructed without further ado. I slightly differ from Falileyev and Kurilić in their consideration of a sequence *-uko-* in IOVI TARANVCO as a reduction from original *-u-āko-*. In fact, *-āko-* is not especially ancient, as shown by the fact that it is very rare in Hispano-Celtic. The Celtic languages, however, are unanimous in showing *-uko-* and not *-iko-*, in spite of this being the most common unstressed secondary suffix of adjectival formation. The proper name OLVSAMI (Chartres) has been traced back to **polHu-samo-* (cf. the discussion in [Viret et al., 2014, 38–39, 58, 67]), and CINTVSMVS is a well-known name from **kintu-samo-* ‘first.’ It follows that there is an early phonetic or morphological incompatibility of *-u-* stems and suffixes beginning by *-i-* (see a development of this idea in [Prósper, 2018], where I argue that the change presupposes a Common Celtic evolution in the realization of *-ú-iC-* across morphological boundaries as *-újC-* > *-úC-* > *-úC-*).

In sum, and in accordance with the F.E.R.C.AN. tradition, this volume presents us with a heterogeneous array of works. This makes the original purpose of the project somewhat unspecific, and its followers would be grateful for a more monographic approach and, sometimes, more serious linguistic analysis.

EDPC — Matasović, R. (2009). *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.

Evans, D. E. (1967). *Gaulish Personal Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Falileyev, A. (2007). *Celtic Dacia. Personal Names, Place-Names and Ethnic Names of Celtic Origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.

Matasović, R. (2009). Sun and Moon in Celtic and Indo-European. In T. A. Mikhailova, & S. Mac Mathúna (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of Societas Celto-Slavica* (pp. 154–162). Moscow: MAKS Press.

Meißner, T. (2010). *Bratonio Gratias: Bemerkungen zur festlandkeltischen Onomastik und Phraseologie. Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 57 (1), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484605909.97>

Prósper, B. (2015). Celtic and non-Celtic Divinities from Ancient Hispania: Power, Daylight, Fertility, Water Spirits and what they Can Tell us about Indo-European Morphology. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 43 (1/2), 1–56.

- Prósper, B. (2016), *The Indo-European Names of Central Hispania. A Study in Continental Celtic and Latin Word Formation*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Prósper, B. (2017). The Irreducible Gauls Used to Swear by Belenos. — Or did they? Celtic Religion, Henbane and Historical Misapprehensions. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 64 (1), 255–298. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zcph-2017-0007>
- Prósper, B. (2018). The Indo-European Personal Names of Pannonia, Noricum and Northern Italy: Comparative and Superlative Forms in Celtic, Venetic, and South-Picene. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 15, 2, 108–138. https://dx.doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.2.017
- Villar, F. (1995). *Estudios de celtibérico y de toponimia prerromana* [Studies in Celtiberian and Pre-Roman Toponymy]. Salamanca: EUSAL.
- Viret, J., Lambert, P.-Y., Stüber, K., Stifter, D., & Repanšek, L. (2014). *La défixion gauloise de Chartres*. Extrait des *Études Celtiques*, 39, 123–192, Paris: C.N.R.S. Éditions.
- Weiss, M. (2017). An Italo-Celtic Divinity and a Common Sabellic Sound Change. *Classical Antiquity*, 36, 370–389. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ca.2017.36.2.370>

Received 7 September 2017

ABBREVIATIONS

Av.	Avestan
CCelt.	Common Celtic
IE	Indo-European
Lat.	Latin
OHG.	Old High German
OIr.	Old Irish
PItal.	Proto-Italic
Skt.	Sanskrit

Prósper, Blanca María

PhD, Professor
Department of Indo-European and Classical
Philology
University of Salamanca
Plaza de Anaya S/N
37008 Salamanca, Spain
E-mail: indoling@usal.es

Проспер, Бланка Мария

PhD, профессор
кафедра индоевропейской и классической
филологии
Университет Саламанки
Plaza de Anaya S/N
37008 Salamanca, España
E-mail: indoling@usal.es

Бланка Мария Проспер

Университет Саламанки
Саламанка, Испания

КЕЛЬТСКАЯ ТЕОНИМИЯ НА 14 СЕМИНАРЕ ПРОЕКТА *F.E.R.C.AN.*

Рец. на кн.: *Kelto-Römische Gottheiten und ihre Verehrer. Akten des 14 F.E.R.C.AN.-Workshops, Trier 12–14 Oktober 2015 / Hrg. K. Matijević. — Rahden : VML Vlg Marie Leidorf, 2016. — 296 S.*

Древние надписи, содержащие имена божеств и религиозные термины, обладают исключительным значением для понимания кельтской религии в ее различных формах. Эти источники никогда ранее не систематизировались и не анализировались, это и является главной целью проекта *F.E.R.C.AN. (Fontes Epigraphici Religionum Celticarum Antiquarum)*, запущенного в 1998 г. Австрийской академией наук. К настоящему моменту результаты семинаров *F.E.R.C.AN.* нашли отражение в целой серии публикаций, где представлены новые находки и этимологические интерпретации, обсуждаются методологические вопросы, а также конкретные проблемы кельтской религиозной терминологии и социологии религии. В результате исследований, проведенных в рамках проекта *F.E.R.C.AN.*, удалось уточнить элементы, входившие в вотивные формулы, разграничить теонимы и эпитеты, идентифицировать несколько слоев теонимов, а также зафиксировать теонимические синонимы (так называемые *interpretatio Romana*). В настоящей рецензии анализируются результаты 14-го семинара *F.E.R.C.AN.*, состоявшегося в Трире в 2015 г., обсуждаются частные этимологические и методологические вопросы.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: кельтская религия, кельтские языки, латинская эпиграфика, праиндоевропейская реконструкция, теонимия.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 07.09.2017