



Blanca María Prósper

University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Language Change at the Crossroads: What Celtic, What Venetic, and What Else in the Personal Names of Emona?

Voprosy onomastiki, 2019, Vol. 16, Issue 4, pp. 33–73

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2019.16.4.044

Language of the article: English

Blanca María Prósper

University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Language Change at the Crossroads: What Celtic, What Venetic, and What Else in the Personal Names of Emona?

Вопросы ономастики. 2019. Т. 16. № 4. С. 33–73

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2019.16.4.044

Язык статьи: английский



Downloaded from: <http://onomastics.ru>



ИНСТИТУТ
РУССКОГО
ЯЗЫКА
им. В. В. Виноградова
РОССИЙСКОЙ
АКАДЕМИИ НАУК

DOI 10.15826/vopr_onom.2019.16.4.044
UDC 811.1:81'286 + 811.15'373.231 +
+ 811.124'37 + 930.2:003.071

Blanca María Prósper
University of Salamanca
Salamanca, Spain

LANGUAGE CHANGE AT THE CROSSROADS: WHAT CELTIC, WHAT VENETIC, AND WHAT ELSE IN THE PERSONAL NAMES OF EMONA?

This work deals with a number of arguably misinterpreted names found on inscriptions from Emona in Central Slovenia. While many of them have been recently attributed to an Indo-European, otherwise unknown dialect (associated with onomastic data referred to as “Iggian” or “North Adriatic”), the author shows that contact linguistics and Celtic dialectology are instrumental in their correct analysis, and that they all can be classified as either Eastern Gaulish or Italic. In the author’s view, existence of such linguistic or onomastic systems as “Iggian” or “North-Adriatic” is uneconomic and based on alleged phonetic and morphological features that remain unconvincing. An in-depth analysis of the names, including some novel readings of several Pannonian inscriptions, reveal that they are often the product of scribal misunderstandings or lack of experience, which can be explained based on the achievements of historical and typological phonetics and morphophonology in a wide Indo-European perspective. Historically, the studied names bear witness to the impact of late Venetic migrations to synchronically Celtic-speaking urban nuclei: the analysis shows that the Venetic layer seems to be superficial in Emona and mostly consists of forms attested elsewhere, which are occasionally reflected as they would be perceived by native speakers of a Celtic language. As for the names of Gaulish ancestry attested in Emona, they seem to have been transmitted by Gauls who were literate in Latin and well aware of the standardised transcription of Gaulish names. The analysis reveals regular differences between the scribal traditions of Ig and Šmarata, which, in their turn, support the phonetical and morphological argumentation.

Key words: Indo-European, Celtic, Gaulish, Italic, Venetic, personal names, Latin epigraphy, Emona, Pannonia, language contacts.

© Prósper Blanca María, 2019

1. Introduction: The Indo-European dialects of Pannonia¹

The existence of at least four Indo-European groups has been established for Pannonia in the last fifty years: Celtic, Venetic, Illyrian, and the most elusive of them, Pannonian, on which see [Anreiter, 2001]. Needless to say, we only have a refined knowledge of what to expect from the first two, while Illyrian is mostly defined by exclusion and Pannonian solely on distributional grounds, which is methodologically dangerous. Pannonian has been described as an IE dialect preserving /p/, where [r̥], [l̥] yield *-ur-* and *-ul-*, [m̥], [n̥] yield *-um-* (as in *Acumincum*) *-un-*, voiced aspirates merge with plained voiced phonemes, /eu/ is preserved, and /o/ and /a/ merge into /a/.²

On his part, in his classic work, Katičić isolated a specifically “Iggian” onomastic component [Katičić, 1976, 82–83]: he found “a significantly low percentage of specifically Noric and a relatively high percentage of specifically non-Noric Celtic names” in Emona, after which he claimed that “the native names recorded on the inscriptions from Ig are important in still another respect. Many of them are not Celtic at all but belong to the North-Adriatic onomastic system <...> the North-Adriatic names are better integrated into the onomastic system of ancient Ig and can therefore be regarded as its original component”. In the last years, a number of significant works focusing on the linguistic status of the materials from Emona and its surroundings have seen the light [see Stifter, 2012a; 2012b; Repanšek, 2016b; 2016c]. Leaving aside minor discrepancies, they have in common the belief in the existence of a non-Celtic and non-Italic layer, respectively labeled as “Iggian” (Stifter) or as part of the “North-Adriatic complex” (Repanšek, who treats it as distinct from “Pannonian”).

If we limit our research to place and river names, the usual caveats applying to prehistoric events and early IE river names come to mind. In essence, the arguments in favour of a Pannonian *viz.* North-Adriatic affiliation of these names rely on very meager evidence, occasionally gainsaid by recent discoveries³ and on personal

¹ A list of abbreviations is placed at the end of the article. Texts conducted in the Latin alphabet are rendered in SMALL CAPITALS; texts in the Venetic and other varieties of the Etruscan alphabet are in *italics*.

² This crucially depends on whether we choose to reconstruct a short or a long vowel and is consequently unfounded in most cases. For instance, Repanšek [2016c, 43, 46–47] has made a good case for two “Pannonian” DNS VIDASVS (< **uid^hoso-*, related to ‘wood, tree,’ cf. Olc. *viðarr*) and TEVTANVS (**teutono-*) with merger of /a/ and /o/. While this is quite possible in purely phonetic terms, from the point of view of morphology these examples fit equally well in a Continental Celtic pattern of forms in *-āso-* and *-āno-* [see Prósper, 2016a]. And, as we are going to see, they could even be renditions of Venetic /o/ when flanked by front consonants.

³ *E.g.* the PIN *Acumincum* can no longer be invoked as an instance of Pannonian toponymy, since the actual form was *Acimincum* judging by [EDCS, 30100912] (Bölcske, Pannonia Inferior, 191 AD). It is the product of the “rhyme effect” with the nearby PIN *Aquincum* (Budapest). Therefore, both the etymology which relates *Acumincum* to Lat. *acūmen* [Anreiter, 2001, 22–23] and the recent reconstruction **h₂ek-ṛn-ko-* ‘stone-’ [Repanšek, 2016c, 182] fail to convince.

interpretations of putatively diagnostic combinations of features, as in the Pannonian PIN *Teutiburgium*.⁴

If we focus on personal or DNs and try to prove the hypothesis that the populations of Pannonia under Roman rule employed a layer of specifically Pannonian names that showed recognisable levels of variation from town to town, we shall encounter a far less clearcut picture. Thus far, the individuation of this dialect is based on the impressionistic view that these names often have no direct cognates in Celtic territories, which, as we are going to see, is belied by recent discoveries or the product of deficient analysis. Additionally, the recourse to incompatible phonetics is a potentially misleading starting point, since the Pannonian alternative has many aspects in common with Italic, specifically Venetic, phonetics.

We have to bear in mind that there is a double “refraction” effect that results in the distortion of names when they are attested far away from their original homeland: first, we are familiar with the idea that languages in contact are often subject to adstrate/substrate misperception (thus, an onomastic item that has traveled with its bearer may undergo trivial changes caused by contact with other IE dialects). Second, there are intrinsic difficulties in the written representation of a foreign name: it may be spelled incorrectly from our point of view because there existed no writing tradition for it. For instance, *VOLTISEMAE* in Noricum [EDCS, 14400432] is in all likelihood an Italic superlative but shows archaic preservation of Italic *-isomo-* and a deviant rendition of the unstressed vowel of the suffix under Celtic influence (see below); and *PETVERNVS* in Pannonia is in my view an Italic distributive numeral but the initial labiovelar has been labialised [Prósper, 2016b, 40–41], equally under Celtic influence. To ascribe such isolated phenomena to the existence of a ghost dialect simply begs the question: either these are archaic Italic forms which cannot be attributed to an existing Italic dialect with any confidence (perhaps simply because the central part of the Italic continuum has been crosscut by so many overlapping innovations), or more likely we have simply to do with Venetic names with slight phonetic modifications but an unmistakable morphological structure.

In contrast to other accounts, I shall refrain from speaking about “onomastic systems” (since there is normally nothing systematic about them, except when we find locally restricted series of numeral-based PNs or compositional or derivational idiosyncrasies). Differences that cannot be reduced to phonetic or morphological variability are often a matter of local choice and cannot be straightforwardly related to the existence of different dialects.

In some cases, however, the apparent lack of parallels has provisionally spoken in favour of the idea that some PNs are neither Celtic nor Venetic. Take, for instance, *AVITVS AICONI* [CIL, 3, 3853], Emona/Ig. According to [Repanšek, 2016a, 325],

⁴ Ptolemy, *Geogr.*, 2, 15, 3 Τευτοβουργιον; It. Ant. 243, 4 *Teutiburgio*, a romanised Germanic form in Pannonia Inferior [cf. Scheungraber & Grünzweig, 2014, 337–338].

this is a hypocoristic formation **Aikkon-*. And yet, we now have a new PN referring to an Eraviscan woman, mentioned twice (differently!) as MAIACONIAE AECONIS FIL(IAE) VXOR(I) EIVS ERAV(ISCAE) and AMMAIONAE AECONIS FIL(IAE) VXOR(I) EIVS ERAV(ISCAE) on a military diploma from Dacia dating from 123 AD [cf. Eck & Pangerl, 2011, 239]. Accordingly, *Aico* is a Pannonian PN, and it is in all likelihood Celtic. At first sight, it may be related to Hispano-Celtic AEGANDVS, etc., from a root participle **h₂eik-nt-* ‘launcher’.⁵

In my view, the linguistic situation of this reduced territory probably bears testimony to intense relations between Gaulish and Venetic populations and a high degree of interference. Additionally, areal sound changes are mostly left unconsidered in the previous literature, with the undesirable result that the possible ties of seemingly isolated forms cannot be retrieved. And Gaulish dialectology is still an untrodden path: as we are going to see, one internal sound shift accounts for a number of puzzling but ultimately Celtic forms in Emona. In this work I lay no claim to exhaustivity, and doubtful readings and incomplete forms are mostly left unconsidered except when they have some bearing on the discussion.

2. The Celtic Names of Emona

2.1. Celtic labial consonant + short vowel coarticulation

Consonants are universally known to affect the quality of the adjacent vowels. This may provide the key to the baffling appearance of many names at Emona. Labial sounds, for instance, tend to lower the F1 and F2 values of the following vowel. As we are going to see, [a] yields [o] and [o] yields [u] in this area when these vowels are preceded by labial consonants.

2.1.1. Celtic [a] > [o]

The PN DEVONTIAE [CIL, 3, 3863], Emona/Ljubljana, is based on a Celtic form but responds to the peculiarities of Iggian morphology, according to [Stifter, 2012b, 252]. In my view, however, we have to start from **dēuāntī* (possibly yielding **dēuāntī* obeying the Celtic version of Osthoff’s Law). This is the active participle of a regular denominative present in *-ā-* found in dial. Lith. *dievótis* ‘say goodbye,’ Latv. *dievātiēs* ‘use God’s name in vain,’ OPr. *deiwuts* ‘saintly, blessed’ < **dejuāto-* [cf. Smoczyński, 2005, 82], the Celtiberian family name *teiuantikum*, gen. pl., Botorrita [see BBIII, coll. 1.23, 3.21] and the Oscan verb forms DEIVAST, DEIVATVD, etc. ‘swear,’ Bantia [ST, Lu 1]; DEVONTIAE is consequently not a close cognate of the Venetic PN DEIVONIS (Pannonia).

This may cast some light on another isolate formation from Emona: an IE ordinal **(H)neuṅ-to-* ‘ninth,’ enlarged by means of a suffix *-(i)io-*. It forms the base of the PN

⁵ Caesarobriga, Lusitania Emeritensis [see Prósper, 2016a, 186], and probably the cognomen AEGANTVS (Italica, Baetica), AECANDVS (Alburquerque, Badajoz, Emeritensis).

in the gen. sg. NEVNTHI in an inscription reading SATVRN(A)E / NEVNTHI / LIB(ERTAE) O(BITAE) AN(NORVM) L / POSVIT / HOSTILA ET VERI(VS) FIL(II), Ig/Emona [CIL, 3, 10776; cf. Stifter, 2012b, 257]. In view of the other examples, it hardly comes as a surprise that NEVNTHI does not look Celtic. The Celtic numeral ‘ninth’ should be attested as †NOVANTIVS [see Repanšek, 2016a, 330]. In point of fact, the PN NOVANTICO is attested in a military diploma found in Porolissum (Dacia), and an incomplete NOVANT(-) is attested in Moesia [CIL, 3, 8180]. This is why I have recently ascribed it to a non-Celtic, western Indo-European dialect, characterised either by a vocalisation [ŋ] > [un] or by a slight shift from the expected IE phonotactics, which actually predict *-unC-* and not *-un-* [see Prósper, 2018a]. In the first case we would expect an outcome [noũnti̯os], while in the second, which is *prima facie* the likelier of the two, an evolution [no.ũn.ti.ios] > [no.un.ti.ios] > [no.ũn.ti.ios] or [noũn.ti.ios] would be more probable, and comes close to the solution advocated by [Hamp, 1976b], who reconstructs an IE ordinal **neyno-*, later enlarged by *-to-*. Along the present lines, however, a new path offers itself: this is the local product of an ordinal form **neũanto-*, which has undergone backing of [a], yielding **neũnto-* > **neũnto-* and eventually perhaps **neũnto-* with loss of the medial syllable, as in CAVRV if the spelling is to be trusted. There is a reason why this is not the case with DEVONTIAE: if this is the approximate rendition of a sequence that was synchronically realised as [de:ũnti̯e:] or even [de:ũn.ti̯e:], it could not become a diphthong *-Vũ-* because the preceding vowel was long and the syllable nucleus was unlikely to be assimilated to the preceding glide: the sequence *-ēũ-* was still perceived as disyllabic and rendered <EVO>.

A Celtic affiliation of **neũanto-* is belied by the preservation of /e/. Such puzzling exceptions as the PIN *Neviodunum* (Pannonia Superior), may have a Venetic first member **neũ(i)io-* (in other words, it was adopted as a proper name, as often happens with the first member of productive toponymic compounds). We are put in the following quandary: either the underlying **neũanto-* is Celtic and then /eũ/ remains unexplained, or it is Italic and then not the expected ordinal ‘ninth,’ attested in Lat. *nōnus*, SP. *nou̯inis* ‘Novenius,’ possibly U. *noniar*. Accordingly, we cannot rule out the possibility that this is the superficially “celticised” version of an Italic participle **neũānt-* ‘renewing’ (cf. Hitt. *nēuahh-*, Lat. *novāre*, Gk. *νεάω*, etc.).

Another instance of the same phenomenon is probably the strange PN SECVNDVS BOLERIAVS [EDCS, 14400274], Emona/Staje, and TERTIVS EPPONIS BOLERIANI F [CIL, 3, 3816], Emona/Tomišelj or Podkraj. It is unlikely to be anything but an attempt to spell a local pronunciation of Lat. *Valeriānus*, probably with a considerable degree of integration in the Celtic onomastics of the area and probably suffix substitution in the first case.

Finally, an isolated MOSSONIS [CIL, 3, 3820], Emona/Ig, is the widespread Celtic PN attested as a nasal stem MASSO (and a pseudo-gentilic MASSONIVS) elsewhere (Narbonensis, Lugdunensis, Germania, Noricum, Dalmatia, etc.), possibly from a past participle **mad-to-* ‘overflowing’ or **m̥d-to-*.

The PN EBONICI is attested twice and only in Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3806, 10741], and could hypothetically refer to the same person. The edition respectively reads QVARTIO EBONICI F and Q(VINTI) EBONICI, which is not certain. In the first case, his wife is MAXIMA(E) OSTI F(ILIAE) and in the second AMATVNI MAXIMI F(ILIAE). Further connections remain unclear.

This phenomenon is not completely untraceable in Western Gaulish, but is only reflected in spelling under much more favourable circumstances (for instance in forms in which the *short* vowel [a], which is more prone to coarticulation than a long vowel, is flanked by two labials, as in MATRIBVVS MOPATIBVVS form *mak^ho- ‘child’).⁶

2.1.2. Celtic [o] > [u]

The nasal stem BVIO [CIL, 3, 3855], BVIONI [Ibid., 3826], BVIONIS [Ibid., 3799, 3814, 3826, 3866], Emona/Ig, apparently shows the assimilatory outcome of Celtic *bugjo-. Still, a distributional study of the forms involved shows a different picture. There are also two examples of BVGIA, BVGIAE and possibly --]GIO in Emona, which are the Celtic cognates of *vhugio.s.*, etc. in the Venetic record. As can be seen, the word formation is complementary, since the latter forms are thematic. This gives some air to the suspicion that BVGIA is a Venetic form transmitted by Celtic speakers. But, even if this were the case, *bugjo- preserves the cluster in the rest of the Celtic world.⁷ On the other hand, the simplex nasal stem *bugjō remains unattested except in the cases at issue. This opens the way to the possibility that the underlying form is *bojō (an attested PN that has additionally given rise to the pseudo-gentilic *Boionius*) with raising of [o] caused by the preceding labial. This, however, raises some questions about Eastern Gaulish PNs containing the cluster -gi-, since one could always object that the dialectal sound shift that has given rise to the unexpected sequence *bujo- is not the lowering of [o], but the assimilation of synchronic -gi-. As we are going to see, Celtic PNs in the Venetic record are illuminating in this sense.

Ever since the Venetic or Celtic inscription of Oderzo was edited by [Prosdoci, 1984], it has been repeatedly asserted that the PN *Kaialos* cannot be ascribed to any language in particular.⁸ I disagree: *kajalo- and CAIALA (Aquitania) constitute a likely cognate of the Celtib. PIN *kaio* on coins [MLH, 1, A.82] and then goes back to *kag-(i)jo- ‘walled precinct’ via *kajjo-. Therefore, it cements the idea that -alo- is in all the extant

⁶ Cf. [CIL, 13, 8725], Noviomagus Batavorum (Germania Inferior).

⁷ On the family of IE *b^hug- in Gaulish and Venetic [cf. Prósper, 2019a, 36–39]. A dat. BVCIONI is attested only once with certainty, and also in Emona. But in view of the form of the <G> in COINGE, it could be read BVGIONI. There is a single case of BVIA in Emona [CIL, 3, 10745], which, characteristically, turns out to be a ghostword: all that remains to be seen after the destruction of the left hand of the stone is [-]VIA or [-]NIA.

⁸ For instance, according to [Marinetti & Solinas, 2014, 81], “*Kaialo*- ha inoltre il suffisso -alo-, che — come più volte ditto — è tipico delle forme leponzie, e che in venetico si trova in onomastica passibile di attribuzione celtica (Boialo-, Tivale- <...>). La base del nome (*Kai(o)*-) non è particolarmente significativa”.

cases a denominative Gaulish suffix. The same reduction of the cluster can be seen in the Celtic PNs VEPO CAION(IS), CAIO BOVDION(IS) [CIL, 3, 10795], Neviodonum/Drnovo, Pannonia Superior. In sum, *Kaialos* was a person who bore a name of Celtic origin in the Venetic area, which does not necessarily mean that he spoke a Celtic dialect. Like many Celtic names transmitted in the Venetic record, this PN is not certain to be Lepontic. The suffix *-alo-* is always denominative, but names containing it are neither synchronically used as patronymics nor derived from PNs themselves.

The fact that this stem never shows the structure **kag-*, however, is statistically intriguing. There is a related Eastern Gaulish layer of PNs going back to present participles that show the same stem: CAIANTAE, CAIANTIVS [CIL, 3, 4755], Noricum, and CAIANTAI [CIL, 5, 4039], Piubegae, VH. Since there is no verbal stem **kag-je/o-*, these could be the match of Lat. *capiens* (cf. Gk. κάπτω, Goth. *haffjan*), and then the last, peripheral remnants of the verb stem **kap-i-*, replaced by **kabi-* in Continental Celtic (cf. Celtib. CABINT, *kabizeti*, MW. *caff*) and **gabi-* in Goidelic (on the distribution of the examples illustrating the different stages [see Prósper, 2016a, 63–64]. And it could even be the case that **kajalo-* is in fact the redone product of an agent noun **kapi-lo-*, preserved with slight modifications to accommodate it to the synchronic verbal stem or suffix in Gaul. CABILVS, CABILO, possibly CAILARO, nom. [CIL, 12, 655] Narbonensis, ^BToch. *kapille* ‘fever’ (< **kap-je-l-jo-*), Lat. *capulus* ‘handle’.

By contrast, the following names of the Venetic record are probably reflective of Gaulish PNs containing *-gi-*:

- *Laions*. (FN, Isola Vicentina, VH, 2nd c. BC), possibly [?]LAIONI. F. [CIL, 1, 2672], Este, VH, may go back to Celtic **lag(u)-(i)jo-* ‘small’;

- *Bro.i.jokos* (FN, Calalzo [LV, 157, 167]) is unanimously taken from Gaul. **mrogi-* ‘territory,’ attested to the north as BROGI(A)E (Noricum), BROGIO (Aquincum, Pannonia);

- *Bo.i.ii.a.l.na.i*, dat. (GN, Este), *Bo.i.ii.o.s* (PN, Este [LV, 18]), and *Bo.i.knos* (FN, Este [Ibid., 46]) transparently reflect Gaulish names. The first is a woman’s married name that bears witness to her husband descending from *Boios*, in turn from **bog-(i)jo-* or **boj-(i)jo-* ‘fighter’.⁹

The spelling clearly reflects that the first glide of *-i.i-*, as expected phonetically, forms a closing diphthong with the preceding vowel. A possible interpretation would run as follows: it is conceivable that Proto-Italic had already simplified the clusters *-gi-* and *-hi-* into *-ii-*. In all likelihood, however, either original *-gii-* was preserved, or the velar segment was recovered because the form stood in a synchronic relationship with others in which it was. But if Venetic *-hi-* tended to be effaced in all contexts, this cluster will have undergone irreversible assimilation or simplification. As a consequence, a Celtic cluster *-gi-* had no match in Venetic and would have been perceived as *-ii-*, both if Venetic [g] in *-gii-* was phonemically a voiced stop /g/ or a lax voiceless segment /g̊/.

⁹ In view of *anokopokios* (S. Bernardino di Briona, from **ando-kom-bog(i)jo-*), VERCOMBOGI (Noricum), ABRESTVBOGIV (Chartres), ADBOGIVS (Germania Superior), NAMANTOBOGI (Lugdunensis), these names cannot go back to CCelt. **b^houg-*, *pace* [Uhlich, 2002, 417].

In sum, these cases cannot be used to bolster the idea that Gaulish *-γi-* had undergone full regressive assimilation or loss of the velar fricative sound and, accordingly, *BVIO* is not likely to go back to **bug(i)io-*.

The nasal stem *BVTTONI*, *BVTTONIS* is peculiar to Pannonia Superior (twice in Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3801, 3819], one in Solva and one in Carnuntum). It has been plausibly compared to Ven. *hu.t.to.s.* (three times in Cadore), and we may add the (Celtic) FN *butijakos* (Cadore). Note that, even if the suffix is probably Celtic, Venetic also attached it to vernacular Venetic FNs, as in *vho.u.go.n.tiiaka* or *o.s.tiiako(-)*.¹⁰ Again, the only version of this PN found outside Pannonia is *BVTTVS*; a pseudo-gentilic *BVTTIVS* is attested in southern Italy, and is probably Italic given the existence of an Oscan name *Buttis* in Cumas [ST, Cm 14]. In fact, only two cognomina *BVTTVS* and *BVTTA* (from Noricum) are likely to be Celtic in view of their location, but none of them appears in an indigenous onomastic context. This could, in principle, seem to be a trivial detail, were it not because, given the above consideration, we cannot jettison the idea that *BVTTO* continues an older *BOTTO*, itself a nasal stem attested as *BOTTONIS* in Klagenfurt (Noricum), besides many cases of *BOTTIVS*, *BOTTA*.

In turn, the Celtic form **botto-* is a likely match of OIr. *bot* ‘penis,’ MW. *both* ‘boss of shield’. All these forms regularly go back to IE **guosdo-*, attested in OHG. *questa* (PGerm. **kwasta-*), **guosdi/o-* in OCS. *gvozďi* ‘nail,’ Cz. *hvozd* ‘thick forest,’ and **guosdi-* in OAlb. (Gheg) *gjet* ‘foliage’. Consequently, contrary to most accounts [e.g. EDPC, s.u. *buzdo-*], the PCelt. preform must have been **bozdo-*, not **buzdo-*, since all the alleged Gaulish cognates showing medial *-u-* and <ϑϑ> or <ss> can be safely disposed of [pace DLG, 92–93] and are to be traced back to **b^hud^h-tu-/tó-* [see Prósper, 2017a].¹¹ Additionally, the inherited form probably lacked the sexual connotations exclusive to Goidelic.

2.1.3. The problematic sequence <EA>

A few hitherto uninterpreted names make the nagging impression that the same factor may affect still another context: one instance of a PN (gen.) *BEATVLONIS* [CIL, 3, 3876, *lost*], Emona/Ljubljana, is explained by [Stifter, 2012a, 261] as a local derivative of Lat. *beatulus*. Still, it is surprising that this diminutive is not attested anywhere else, and still more that it has been transferred to the nasal stems. In my view, this is nothing but the local version of a PN attested as *BETVLONIVS* (pseudo-gentilic, Pannonia, Dalmatia), *BETVLICI* (gen., Liguria), *BETVLO* (nom., Dalmatia). Given the derivatives *BETVNVS*, *BETVCA* (Hispania), *BETVTIVS* (VH), etc., this PN goes back to **g^ueĭh₃-tu-* ‘food’

¹⁰ Marinetti & Solinas [2014, 82 and fn.] go so far as to suggest that <*b*> stands for <*f*> in the form *butijakos*, due to a crossing of the respective values of <*b*> and <*f*> as in Auronzo.

¹¹ In fact, it has passed unseen in former works (including my own) that the sequence *MONI ... BVϑϑVT-TON* *IMON* in the spindle-whorl of Saint Révérien, which I have translated as ‘bear in mind this little token of affection,’ is highly reminiscent of the inscription borne by Latin rings that reads *pignus amoris habes*.

or alternatively to **g^uetu-* ‘pitch,’ from which **g^uetu-lo-* ‘birch’ derives.¹² The second is more likely for phonetic reasons, but is also morphologically more plausible given the existence of Lat. *betulla*, borrowed from Gaulish in this form, perhaps because the medial syllable bore the stress in this kind of derivatives of *-u*-stems¹³ and/or the lateral sound was not velarised in the donor language.

Under a unified account, this means that, in a fraction of Eastern Gaulish at least, short central or posterior vowels tend to be rounded, backed, and raised when preceded by labial consonants. In this area, this has only a centralising effect on /e/ with no phonemic consequences. Since neutralisation of /e/ and /a/ is not completed, a context-bound shift [ɛ] > [ɜ] (an open-mid central unrounded vowel) is disregarded in writing. Occasionally, as in *BEATVLONIS*, it may have been “unpacked” or segmentalised into two phonemic units as a result of hypocorrection, by which subphonemic traits fail to be disregarded by the listener. Unpacking is a compromise solution (otherwise a well-known feature of language contact), and in this case, as a consequence, /e/ becomes clumsily reflected as <EA> and not as <E>.¹⁴ On one likely scenario, the scribe would be reproducing names for which he had no sufficient background. The converse phenomenon, namely the fronting of a back vowel when it follows a palatal consonant can now be held to lie behind the strange rendition of original /o/ in two PNs of the same inscription from Emona [CIL, 3, 3855], which is lost and handed down in a drawing and reads *CONIVGI LASCIO/ANTIE Q SVBLOANI F(ILIAE)*. See more on this sequence <OA> below.

In sum, a number of puzzling traits of the onomastics of Emona may be brought together under an overarching explanation, specifically assimilation of the F2 value of a short vowel to the preceding consonant. While this is obviously the phenomenon behind several Pannonian Celtic cases of [o] > [u], as well as **iā-* > **iæ-* and **iā-* > **iā-* (see below), backing of [a] > [o] when following a labial sound seems thus far peculiar to Emona and results in neutralisation; backing of /e/ must only have had a slight centralising effect that had no far-reaching implications for writing, and did not make up for the contextual loss of contrast between the phonemes /a/ and /o/.

2.1.4. Continental Celtic [a:] > [ɔ:] as a sporadic case of vowel dissimilation

If the above observations have any diagnostic value, local instances of preservation of /a/ in this context must be identified as a synchronic /a:/, as in *ADNOMATVS*

¹² *BIETVM(A)RA* (Dunaújváros/Intercisa, Pannonia Superior), whose first member is identified by [KPNP, 98] with *bitu-* ‘life’ with an (at least in this region) unmotivated diphthongisation, poses problems. It seems, in principle, more reasonable to relate these forms to *BIATVCCO* (Belgica), and to reconstruct a verbal noun **bija-tu-* ‘nurture,’ itself (as if) from **g^uiieh₃-tu-*. Unfortunately, the left hand of the inscription of *BIETVMARA* is destroyed, so it cannot be demonstrated that the name is complete; and the stone is so badly notched that one is entitled to wonder if the right reading is not [A]_{DIETVMARA} or [AD]_{IETVMARA}.

¹³ Cf. a similar claim for forms in *-ú-iko-* or *-ú-isto-* (with reduction and eventual absorption of the glide *-i-*) in [Prósper, 2018c].

¹⁴ As in the cases of Lat. <NGN> for <GN>, mostly attested in Rome and Naples, and then suspect of Oscan interference.

(< **ad-nāmāto-*), MATERIV (< **māter(i)jō* ‘mother-’), MATSIV (**māt(i)jō*), MANV (< **māno-* ‘good’), AMATV (< **amāto-*, a past participle possibly related to the Celtib. FN AMAONICVM [CIL, 2, 2739], Segovia, in turn from a middle participle **amamno-* or **amāmno-*), SVADRV (Pannonia Superior, < **suādro-* ‘soft’). The application of this rule to short vowels but not to long ones is natural, since the coarticulation does not cover a sufficient portion of a long vowel to lead to a phonemic shift.

There is, however, an apparent exception: ADNOMATVS, twice in Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3819, 10740], is an obvious match of ADNAMATVS [see Prósper, 2016a, 83–87]. It has been explained [cf. Stifter, 2012a; 2012b] as an example of Gaulish rounding of Celtic /a:/, otherwise found in BLOTVRIGI (Britannia, from **mlātu-*), IONO (Châteaubleau tile, from **jāno-*), RINOTI (Rezé lead tablet, from **prināti*, similar, but not identical to OIr. *renaid* [cf. Lambert & Stifter, 2012, 153, 161]), the Hispano-Celtic PN CADROIOLONIS, gen. [EDCS, 11701112], Coruña, Callaecia Lucensis (< **kadro-iālo-*), and probably the Gaulish PNs IOTVRIX (Pannonia) and βιτουιουτουο, both on coins (from **-jātu-*, see below).¹⁵

This phenomenon can, of course, be understood as a sporadic consequence of the lack of phonemic contrast between /a:/ and /o:/ in Celtic. Interestingly, however, it is unlikely to be phonetically conditioned, since /a:/ is normally preceded by [n], [l] or [j] when it is reflected as <o>. Accordingly, it is implausible that this should be a “neogrammarian” sound-change, by which the inherited realisation of Celtic /a:/ had shifted to a back and/or rounded vowel, like [ɔ:] or [ɔ:] in most or all contexts. Adherents to this theory, apparently supported by a similar process in Brittonic,¹⁶ would have to explain why, if this were the case, it would surface so sporadically in Continental Celtic and, to my knowledge, never in the context that would definitely have favoured it (as opposed to, e.g. Irish *már* > *mór*).¹⁷ As claimed above, /a:/ fails to show up as

¹⁵ And then meaning not ‘having a beautiful field’ as I have suggested elsewhere, but something closer to ‘receiving a beautiful praise,’ ‘highly praised,’ from **jeh₂-lo-*, as in MW. *iawl*, OIr. *dál* ‘request’.

¹⁶ McCone [1996, 149–150] puts this down to the imbalance created in the system around the 2nd c. by the monophthongisation of /aj/ > /ɛ:/, which may or may not have applied to Gaulish.

¹⁷ I am, by the way, noncommittal as to the meaning and segmentation of MARCOSIOR in the spindle-whorl of Autun, universally taken to mean ‘I shall ride (or be ridden)’. But, besides the fact that Celtic had more straightforward ways of expressing the notion of ‘riding,’ I find it very unlikely that it goes back to a factitive in *-ā-*, which could have meant ‘I shall make or be made horse-like, turn or be turned into a horse’ or to a denominative of the type ‘I will be-horse you’. The alternative reconstruction of a verb stem in *-ō-* [cf. Peters, 1999] strains imagination given the unexpected /o/ vocalism and the fact that this is an unusual present stem formation. While interpunctuations in this text seem arbitrarily placed on the whole, the fact that the first line reads MARCOS.IOR could point to an alternative word division and interpretation as MARCOS IOR^(-?) MATERNIA^(E?) ‘Marcos dedicated (this) to Maternia’: two instances of this verb form occur in southern Gaulish in the Greek alphabet, where we find ειωραι [Lejeune, 1994], Nîmes, ειωρου [RIG-1, 153], Vaucluse, in southern Gaul beside central Gaul. IEVRV and IOVRVS, ultimately from a reduplicated perfect **pe-porh₃-*. If the reason for the discrepancies in spelling is that the latter forms are compounds, our form would be an archaism in the area. Finally, the use of a dat. fem. ending <-A> for <-AE> in MATERNIA is a typical trait of regional or at least not specifically urban Roman language, both in the Italian Peninsula and elsewhere. It has not been suggested to my knowledge that MATERNIA could be a DN.

<o> in the area of Emona even when this is favoured by a preceding labial, in spite of the contextual backing of the short phonemes /a/ and /o/. In fact, this is an example of what Ohala [1981] has successfully described as immediate dissimilation caused by the listener. If listeners hear a sequence of elements that share some acoustic property, they can decide that this property only belongs to one of the elements, and that the other only has it by way of coarticulation. Consequently, they divest the second one of the allegedly spurious feature(s) and thus reconstruct its “right” form. Some comparable evidence from Slavic adduced by [Ohala, 1981, 187–188; Alderete & Frisch, 2007, 384–385] reveals that the front vowel /a/ shifted to back /ɑ/ in the environment of palatal or palatalised consonants, because the listeners took the /a/ that they heard as a distorted /ɑ/ and consequently they hypercorrected it.

In the case at hand, the sporadic occurrence of <o> is due to a dissimilatory change which never affected the whole system. The listeners felt that the sound [a:] was a front vowel only because it was distorted by the influence of the preceding consonant, and in order to correct the anomaly, they factored out the front articulation (thus failing to parse it as phonemic /a:/). Place of articulation is a robust cue in all our cases. In both the Slavic and the Celtic case, two adjacent [-back] segments are thus avoided. As a result, speakers of Continental Celtic dialects analysed [a:] as a back vowel. Crucially, since dissimilation implicates normalisation, i.e. reversal to a previous situation, no new segments can be expected to emerge from it. Accordingly, the speakers phonologised this sound as /ɔ:/ when they had to decide how to put down in writing a number of forms of which, characteristically, they had no previous experience. In turn, this was only possible due to the circumstance that /ɔ:/ had already gained a place in the system as the result of regional monophthongisation [ou] > [ɔ:] and probably nasal loss and compensatory lengthening of a preceding [o], for instance in the acc. pl. ending *-ons*. Therefore, the geographic distribution of one of these changes may prove diagnostic for the other. In point of fact, monophthongisation is ascertained for most of the regions at issue: for Late Gaulish (Rezé, Châteaubleau) in the very same documents; in Pannonia/Noricum to judge from the Latin and Venetic records [see Prósper, 2019a], and in westernmost Hispania as an areal feature revealed by Latin epigraphy. Whether this innovation actually caught on in more or less vast regions or remained a matter of individual choice is impossible to ascertain.

Paradoxically, Ohala’s scenario for immediate dissimilation, when applied to this case, tends to suggest that Celtic /a:/, which comes from IE /a:/ and /o:/ in all but the final syllables, was realised in most contexts as a front, not a back vowel, as sometimes assumed. In the case of *ADNOMATVS*, where the long vowel is followed by a labial sound, dissimilation must have been favoured by a concomitant vowel-to-vowel dissimilation or disharmony, which thus avoids a sequence *-CāCā-* (an irregular and poorly attested phenomenon as would be expected, which is usually anticipatory in nature and implies planning on the part of the speaker, as in Lat. *formosus*, *rotundus* > Sp. *hermoso*, *redondo*). Under the assumption that /a:/ had a more back or rounded pronunciation than

its short counterpart (a common phenomenon in the languages of the world), the graphic stability of the second /a:/ (which, additionally, would be expected to show the effects of coarticulation with the preceding labial) is unaccounted for. What is more, this may have favoured its further fronting in the Eastern side of the Empire, as we are going to see.

This phenomenon has an amazingly close parallel in the DN *Δωμᾶτηρ for Δᾶμᾶτηρ (Aegae, Aeolic Asia Minor, 2nd c. BC),¹⁸ and in Messapic *Domatriaš* for *Damatrias* (Uria, tombstone [cf. MLM, 7 *Ur*]), both in the gen. sg., referring to a priestess of Demeter. These forms contain a sequence of *-CāCā-* in which the first consonant is a coronal and the second a labial sound, and there is no question of substrate influence (additionally, the whole sequence reads *tabarios D{r}omatriaš*, where *tabarios* is rendering **tabarās* ‘of the priestess’ and consequently shows another dissimilated <o> for <a> and the incorrect addition of a suffix).

Of course, one can always revert this argument by assuming that whatever the actual articulation(s) of IE /a:/ in Continental Celtic, a secondary [ɔ:] arose in pockets of early monophthongisation that would have automatically pushed most realisations of /a:/ into a more front place to safeguard the articulatory distance. This, in turn, would have resulted in occasional dissimilation as depicted above. In that case, it would bear testimony to the emergent system of five long vowels in different areas, but would neither prove nor disprove that the pre-existent system contained an /a:/ that was realised in most contexts as [ɔ:] or even [ɔ:]. We can provisionally point out that the Venetic record does not contradict this idea. While a diphthong /ou/ is filtered into Venetic as /o:/, as in the GN LOXINA [CIL, 1, 2802], Este, and the FN *lo.g.sii(ai)* [LV, 33], Este, the GN TOTICINAI [CIL, 1, 2809], Este, the PN TOTICI [CIL, 5, 798], Aquileia, (< **tout-iko-*), and the DN *vrotah*, probably realised as [fro:ta:i], dat. [LV, 252, 253], Idria, < **sre/ou̯tā* [see Prósper, 2019a, 33–35], the phoneme /a:/ was identified with Venetic /a:/, as in the PNs *na.i.šo.i.*, dat., Este [LV, 79] < **nāyi-sto-* ‘standing on a ship, commander,’ REIDAVIVS, Verona, VH, < **restāu(i)jo-*, or the GN *Ruma.n.na*, [Ibid., 30–31] Este, < Gaul. *Rūmāno-*, and in turn ultimately or directly from Lat. *Rōmānus*.¹⁹

Intriguingly, this paves the way for a different hypothesis on the origin of ADNOMATVS: it could go back to **-namāto-*. This would mean that the rounding of the first vowel is actually due to coarticulation, and that this has also operated regressively, as in Cat. *omplir* < *implēre*, It. *dopo* < *de post*.²⁰ Under this assumption, the second vowel must equally be long in order to remain unaffected. This is the last nail in the coffin of the unwarranted (and illogical) idea that this PN somehow goes back to a present part **ad-nāmant-*, but that for some reason none of the surviving instances shows a trace of the nasal in the suffix and reveals, contrary to nearly universal opinion, that

¹⁸ τᾶς τε / [Δ]ῶ[μ]ατρος καὶ τᾶς Κό[ρρ]/ας [see AAeg, 42]. Confusion with δῶματα seems less likely for such a well known divinity.

¹⁹ Cf. for this etymology [Pellegrini & Prosdocimi, 1967, 162–163].

²⁰ These examples are taken from [Recasens, 2014, 85].

the reconstruction of a (prefixed) negated verb form meaning ‘not-loving’ is wrong [cf. Prósper, 2016a, 83–87].

In my view, however, there could be an indirect clue hinting at an original **-nāmāto-*. An unnoticed, ultimately Iggian instance of this PN is attested on a list of persons from Pannonia as AELIVS P(VBLI) F(ILIVS) IVL(IA) ANNAMATVS EMON(A), Rome [CIL, 6, 32640]. While it is, of course, compatible with the idea that Iggian scribes lacked the expertise to render Celtic names correctly and perceived a back vowel as their own /o/, one does not quite see why this would exclusively happen at Emona, nor why Roman scribes should produce a more correct form. But as implied above, the cause of dissimilation is auditory. It happened at Emona because in this way it corrected a sequence perceived as having undergone strong coarticulation in order to normalise it, and this, predictably, failed to be the case in Rome, where it was taken at face value. Accordingly, I believe the complex interpretation of *ADNOMATVS* as a Celtic form adopted by the “para-Venetic” dialect of Ig [Stifter, 2012a, 547, fn. 22] to be unfounded. In sum, consonant-to-vowel coarticulation can only be proved for vowels following, not preceding labial consonants.²¹

2.2. The sequence *-ŷ(i)jV-*

A PN *TVROIVS*, *TVROIO* [CIL, 3, 10724–25] in Emona (Šmarata) poses special problems. It has been traced back to **k^uturo-ĵio-* ‘fourth’ by [Stifter, 2012b, 257], followed by [Repanšek, 2016a, 332]. This analysis appears unconvincing to me, since the inherited IE formation is **k^utur-(i)ĵio-*, with regular deletion of the thematic vowel in the course of derivation. In my view, this form can only be traced back to **k^utur-ouĵ-(i)ĵio-* and bears witness to an idiosyncratic evolution of *-ŷ(i)ĵi- > -(i)ĵi-* which, however, is more common in Celtic after a long vowel [see Prósper, 2016b, 67–68]. Let us now examine its closest relatives.

In all likelihood, the ultimate source of the Celtic ordinal-based names whose suffix contains the sequence *-Vŷ-(i)ĵio-* is **oxtāŷ-(i)ĵio-* ‘eighth’. Since the ordinal became **oxtū* in Common Celtic, this form was reanalysed and a new suffix *-āŷ(i)ĵio-* was thereby created; it was first employed to build new variants of the related ordinal ‘fourth,’ and thereupon spread to its immediate neighbours, ‘third’ and ‘fifth’. The Proto-Celtic form for ‘fourth’ which was remodeled was **k^utur-(i)ĵio-*, attested only in peripheral names like the Hispano-Celtic forms *TVRROS* (Asturias), *TVRROS* (Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel, graffito), *TVRRIONIS* (Paços de Ferreira, Porto, in which the evolution stopped short of the final stage of glide absorption).²²

²¹ A similar phenomenon could explain the Brittonic DN *DEAE ARNOMETE* in Brough-on-Noe (Derbyshire), usually taken to stand for *ARNEMETIE*. If, as is very likely, the scribe intended to write *ARNOMETIE*, this name would testify to two consecutive instances of hypercorrection.

²² Consequently, *TVRROMI* (Cantabri [see Prósper, 2016a, 18]) can be analysed as a late construction **k^utur(i)ĵio-mo-*. Since the stone is lost, one could toy with alternative readings like *TVRRONII*, which is equally unparalleled, however, except for a genitive *TVRIONI* (Venetia et Histria) and a pseudo-gentilic *TVRIONIVS* (Valladolid, Vaccaei).

The new suffix $-\bar{a}u(i)\bar{i}o-$ is attested in TVRIAV[---] (Badajoz, Baetica, reading uncertain, perhaps TVRIA+M[\bar{i}]), TVRRATIVS (Noricum) and TORRAVIVS (Noricum), all of them going back to $*k^u\text{tur}(i)\bar{i}-\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$. Similarly formed PNs are $*k^u\text{enxt}-\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$ in the EN *Pixtavi* and the PN PINTAIVS (Bonn, Germania) and $*trit-\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$ in the PN TIRDAI (gen., Clunia, Tarraconensis). The Hispano-Celtic PN TVRAIVS, TVRAI (gen.) is quite common among the Astures, and probably goes back to $*k^u\text{tur}-\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$. If this is right, then $*k^u\text{turó-}$ is the oldest ordinal inherited by Celtic from its immediate ancestor, and this would make these forms extremely archaic even in comparison with Hittite and Indo-Iranian, which preserve only $*k^u\text{tur}-(i)\bar{i}o-$.

But then, how have the forms in $-ou(i)\bar{i}o-$ come into being? This is not an easy question to answer. To begin with, we cannot get rid of these forms by declaring them “non-Celtic,” given the existence of PENTOVIVS, PINTOVIVS, PENTOVIECO, etc. ‘fifth,’ in the realms of the Celtic Cantabri. A graffito edited as P(VBLI) ENTOVI from Haltern (Germany [EDCS, 46500167]) is more likely to read PENTOVI, and a (lost) PONTOVI from Ravenna (Aemilia) is the same PN with Sabellic influence. Celtib. *Tirtouios* ‘third’ (Botorrita) shows the same suffixation. Finally, TVROIVS has a full match in TVROVIVS (Salamanca, Lusitania Emeritensis [Ibid., 22400453]). Again, their immediate antecedents are likely to be $*trit\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$, $*k^u\text{tur}(i)\bar{i}-\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$ and $*k^u\text{enxt}\bar{a}u-(i)\bar{i}o-$. One may hypothesise that these forms were corrected early on in analogy to their respective ordinals $*tritó-$, $*k^u\text{turó-}$ and $*k^u\text{enxtó-}$, and that this is why an $**\text{oxto}u(i)\bar{i}o-$ was never created.

An assimilatory change (or, again, a scribal misperception) $-u\bar{i}- > -\bar{i}\bar{i}-$ is quite conceivable.²³ But in view of the rest of the Pannonian materials, this is not what we would expect to find. Nonetheless, this PN is exclusively attested in Šmarata (see below) and in a definitely Venetic onomastic context. Italian Venetic often fails to render intervocalic $-u-$ in Celtic names, probably because it has a fricativised outcome of PIE [u] and, as explained above, it ignores Celtic lenited voiced segments in the neighbourhood of $-i-$. Accordingly, if the seemingly Gaulish PN $*\text{turo}u\bar{i}o-$ was adopted by Venetic speakers and integrated in the tradition of Venetic families in Alpine Italy, this is the only logical rendition.

Interestingly, this removes an important obstacle to the following hypothesis: Emona/Ig shows a predominance of Celtic names, and the Venetic names we find there have been divested of those features that are, in principle, incompatible with Celtic. In this particular sense, Celtic operates as the substrate dialect which transmits foreign forms in accordance with its own phonetics.

²³ Under a slightly different analysis, this could be a case of monophthongisation, by which a sequence syllabified as $-ou.\bar{i}o-$ evolves locally into $-\bar{o}.\bar{i}o-$, while $-o.u\bar{i}o-$ tends to evolve into $-o.\beta\bar{i}o-$ (which might be the case of TVROBI in Lusitania if it has the same origin), for reasons related to the morphological analysis carried out by the speaker. Cf. R. Jakobson’s remarks *apud* [Watkins, 1955, fn. 6] on OCS. *lovljq* ‘to catch’ vs. $*\text{darujq}$ ‘to give’.

2.3. /e/ and /a/ variation in Eastern Gaulish

Finally, this has some bearing on the moot question of <E> for expected <A> in Pannonia, occasionally put down to Greek, Illyrian or Celtic substrate.²⁴ Given the affected contexts, it can be described as context-sensitive vowel fronting, by which [a] yields [æ] or possibly [ɛ] when preceded by a palatal glide. Some Celtic examples have passed unseen as far as I know, however, and have given rise to rather uneconomic etymological explanations:

- IENTVMARVS (Noricum, twice in [CIL, 3, 4731]) is a match of IANTVLLA, -VS (Noricum; VH), IANTVNA (Pannonia Inferior), and of course IANTVMARVS, IANTVMARA (Noricum, Pannonia), in turn identical to OIr. *étmar* ‘jealous’. Its first member, attested in OIr. *ét* ‘jealousy,’ goes back to the zero grade of an action noun **iēm-tu-*, **iṃ-teu-* from the root **iēm-* ‘stretch out’. While it could be objected that the sequence <IEN> is reflecting the /e/ grade of the root, context-bound fronting is a more economic solution;

- ADIETVMARVS [CIL, 3, 10867] (Zagreb, Pannonia Superior)²⁵ directly corresponds to ADIATVLLVS (Noricum), ADIATVMAR[AE?] (Belgica), ADIATVRIX (Pannonia Superior), Αδιατουσσια (Bouches-du-Rhône), chieftain *Adiatunnus* (Caesar). All these PNs go back to the action or object noun **iēh₂-tu-*, attested as an appellative form in OIr. *áth* ‘ford, passage’ (cf. also **iēh₂-nu-* in the Lat. DN *Iānus*). The long vowel /a:/ is indirectly confirmed by the dissimilatory rendition in the coin legends IOTVRIX (Pannonia) or ΒΙΤΟΥΙΟΤΟΥΟ (name of a chieftain), to my mind, from **bitu-iātu-o-* ‘(having the) causeway of life / the world?’ (Longostaletes [RIG-4, 143, 73]).

Former interpretations involve more complex and, in my opinion, less plausible phonetic processes and alternations and, crucially, fail to see the local nature of the forms purportedly containing an /e/ grade of the root: thus, for [KGP, 212], **iēt-* is a nasalised variant of **iēt-* ‘place oneself firmly’. Hamp [1976a] makes the point that there is an ablaut alternation **iēt-/iṃt-* and correctly speaks in favour of a root **iēm-*; but then he confusingly derives *-iātu-* from a root **iHt-*, continued in Skt. *yatate* (which is untenable from the point of view of both phonotactics and historical phonetics) and assumes an “ex machina” *-u-* stem. The resulting form would look so similar to a hypothetical compound variant *-iṃ-ti-* that it eventually replaced it. The account of these forms in [EDPC] is confuse and essentially contradictory: it derives both IANTVMARVS and ADIETVMARVS from **iāntu-*, in turn from **iēt-* (with *-n-* spread from the present stem) with nasal loss; but it concedes that an original, later shortened **iāntu-* could go back to **iēh₂-* (whereby the nasal remains unexplained).

What all these scholars fail to see, is that the problem is not the now-you-see-it-now-you-don’t nasal, whose disappearance they variously ascribe to prefixation

²⁴ See an overview and the references in [Adamik, 2011] and [Simon, 2018].

²⁵ As regards a stand-alone case of BIETVMARA (Dunaujvaros/Intercisa, Pannonia Inferior), I am unable to discern anything at all to the left of <I> in the photographs provided by the online databases; the editor restitutes [ET] BIETVMARA so as to explicitly coordinate the two feminine names, which is syntactically unnecessary in this kind of text. Accordingly, a reading [AD]IETVMARA has more to recommend itself.

or the alternation of simple *vis à vis* nasalised root variants, but the unequivocally secondary front vowel in both cases, only attested in eastern Gaulish. On the other hand, this is not the only instance of the context-bound shift [a], [a:] > [æ], [æ:]. The feminine PN VENIXEMAE is attested three times in Emona: see [Veranič & Repanšek, 2016; CIL, 3, 3797, 3820], beside one case of VENIXAMAE [CIL, 3, 3825].²⁶ The arguments collected against its Celticity and its identification with VENIXAMVS in Aquitania and Germania by Repanšek (such as the difference in gender, the vernacular context or the differences in the spelling of [xs]) are not cogent, and tiptoe around the basic problem of a descriptively “shorter” superlative suffix *-samo-* than Common Celtic *-isamo-*. Medial *-e-* is not necessarily the product of weakening (laxing) of the posttonic vowel, which is usually manifested by outright syncope in the superlative forms.²⁷ In fact, it reflects the outcome of the fronting of [a] when it follows a dental or alveolar sound. On a possible etymology **uenik-isamo-* and an early, possible Common Celtic wave of vowel syncope (depicted as *-ŵkis- > -ŵks- > -cs- > -xs-*) [see Prósper, 2018c].

In sum, there is a tendency to the coarticulation of *ia/ā-*, *sa-* in Pannonia and Noricum, but it is comparatively late and not pronounced enough to be phonemically unambiguous (probably a near-open front vowel [æ]), so that the scribes hesitate between a rendition <A> or <E> and mostly follow the spelling conventions. The tendency is more visible, to the point of neutralisation, in a number of language systems when [o] or [a] are flanked by two sounds with a (very) high F2 value, like palatals, dentals and alveolars, causing a fronting and unrounding effect in the neighbouring vowels, as in the Thessalian dialect of Histiaeotis, where we have *χρόνον > χρόνευ*, *-αῖος > -αιεϛ*, *τοῖϛ > τεῖϛ*, and in Tsakonian.²⁸

Comparably, this explains why Messapic shows the regular evolution *-Cios* (> *Cias*) > *-C'es* in the nom. sg. masc. of family names in *-(i)jo-*, as in *Θeotorres*, *Taotorres* (< **teūtōr-(i)jo-*), related to Lat. *tūtōr* and the Apulian-Calabrian gens *Tūtōria*, from IE **teuH-*; *Blatthes* (< **blāt-(i)jo-*), from IE **b^hlh₃-tō-* ‘blooming’, or *Artorres* (< **artōr-(i)jo-*) ‘assembler’, from IE **h₂er-*, which may be related to the gens *Artōria*; possibly also *Haštorres*, if from **sh₂(n)k/k-* (cf. Lat. *sānctus*, etc.), and then very roughly

²⁶ See [Krahe, 1929, 125] and [Stifter, 2012b, 257] who correctly posit VENIXEM(-) PETONIS instead of VENIX EMPETONIS in [CIL, 3, 3820].

²⁷ The parallel adduced by [Repanšek, 2016a, 326], VOLTEREGIS beside VOLTREGIS and VOLTREX, probably simply attests to the scribal perception of breaking of the tautosyllabic cluster and anticipation of the following vowel. The cluster itself has come into being as the final product of the regular syncope of medial Venetic *-u-* and cannot be brought to bear on this issue. When a “stop + liquid” cluster is broken, the inserted vowel usually copies the vowel that appears to the right of the cluster, and this rule may apply, as in this case, across morpheme boundaries. This is the pattern behind most ascertained cases of Sabellic epenthesis and operates systematically in some languages like Winnebago (currently labeled as “Dorsey’s Law”).

²⁸ Cf. [Méndez Dosuna, 2007, 374–376] for the right description of this phenomenon in phonetic terms and its explanation as auditory in nature.

comparable to the (ultimately Oscan?) gentilic SACRATORIA [CIL, 10, 4322], Capua, or Marrucianian [S]ACRACRIX [ST, *Mv* 7].

3. The Venetic names of Pannonia

In this section I shall set out to etymologise a number of Venetic PNs whose rendition has puzzled scholars and decisively contributed to the notion of a third, non-Italic and non-Celtic IE family having allegedly been present in Emona.²⁹

3.1. LASCIOANTIAE and family

A lost inscription from Emona is only known from a transcription dating to 1534. The transmitted text reads as D M S / BVIO VIBI F / V POSVIT SIBI / ET CONIVGI LASCIO / {A} NTI(A)E Q SVBLOANI F / Θ(OBITAE) AN(NORVM) XXXX ET F(ILIO?) FIBIONI [CIL, 3, 3855; EDR, 155648], Emona/Ljubljana [see the details in Šašel-Kos, 2017, 443]. At first sight, the ligature <OA+N> found twice seems a mistake, but this is an unusual one. On the other hand, the presence of <i> is baffling: the only other certain attestation of this form is LASCINTIAE [CIL, 3, 3895] (Emona), but Repanšek [2016a, 329] plausibly reads a similar incomplete PN as [LA]STIONTIAE [CIL, 3, 3792], Emona, which cements the idea that this is a -*ie/o*- present form. This verb form is highly reminiscent of Lat. *lascīvus*, an adjective derived from an older adjective **las-ko-* by [EDLIL, s.u. *lascīvus*]. The Pannonian PNs LASCI (gen., Szomor, Hungary), and LASCA (Siscia) may be identical to the ‘lost’ base of the Latin form, if *lascīvus* is not deverbal.³⁰ The Venetic pseudo-gentilic LASTORIVS is the corresponding agent noun [cf. Prósper, 2018b]. The same connection between LASCINTIAE and LASTORIVS is established by [Untermann, 1961, III], who posits a present in -*sko-*. But, if the transcription is correct, [o] is preceded in both cases by sounds with a (very) high F2 value. This resulted in the centralisation of the back vowel into an open-mid central rounded vowel [ə], which the scribe was unfamiliar with and has consequently “unpacked” into two segments, and reflected as <OA>.

²⁹ I shall only take into account the certain cases. Repanšek [2016a; 2016b] has made a case for the interpretation of QIEMONI in the sequence QIEMONI V(IVVS) F(ECIT) [see Veranič & Repanšek 2016], Emona/Ig, as a Venetic PN in the nominative Q(V)IEMONI(S), which he traces back to the agent noun **k^uiĵē-mon-* ‘quiet, restful’. There is a number of considerations to be made, however. While he is right in most points and it is unlikely that this form is inflected for the dative case, this leaves us with an agent noun for a stative verb, and, in any event, we have to reconstitute a missing nominative ending (that it should continue an *i n d i g e n o u s* apocopated patronymic in -*is* is unfounded). A different path opens itself if we take into account the sequence C(AIVS) IEMONIVS in [CIL, 3, 758], Novae, Moesia Inferior (lost). Repanšek has dismissed the connection. The segmentation given by [CIL] is very plausible, however, because the name forms part of a series of *tria nomina* arranged to occupy consecutive lines of the text. Consequently, it is not unwarranted to segment QIEMONI as Q(VINTVS) IEMONI(VS): it is not uncommon to find an abbreviated, endingless gentilic: comparable Pannonian cases would be C GALLONI(VS), POMPONI(VS), APONI(VS), P AELI(VS), Q SABINI(VS) and M DOMITI(VS).

³⁰ For the first example, cf. a similar opinion in [KPNP, 274], which rightly expresses doubts as to its Celticity.

Additionally, it is obvious that the sequence *-k̄i-* has undergone palatalisation. In our case, I am reticent to label this phenomenon as regional instance of the ongoing confusion of the Latin sequences *-ciV-/tiV-*. A change [kj] > [tj] is more common than the reverse. This may have proceeded through the following stages: a) a front velar stop shifts to an (alveolo-)palatal stop; b) the resulting realisations [c, ʝ] are interpreted as /t, d/ by listeners.³¹ In other words, the incipient Venetic tendency of [kj] to become [c] is then variously reflected by Celtic scribes, as <ci>, <c> or, for the auditory reasons mentioned above, <ti>. The present form of this verb may in consequence be reconstructed as **lask-jo/e-*, which in principle can be equated with the deadjectival type of *saevus* ‘savage’ > *saeviō* ‘behave savagely’.

3.2. VOLTOGNAS. Is it so isolated?

The PN VOLTOGNAS [CIL, 13, 13402], 2nd–3rd c. AD, Emona/Šmarata, is etymologically comparatively transparent but shows an unexpected feature. It has been explained as a morphological rarity by [Stifter, 2012b, 260], who posits a plausible if unparalleled **-ǵn̄h₁-t(i)-* (his translation ‘begotten/born by desire’ should be corrected to have active sense, however). Others have more or less explicitly opted for a hybrid form with an Illyrian second member. But, besides the problem of the centum/satem classification of Illyrian, a hybrid compound in which no member is a proper name *or* a form borrowed because the recipient language has no counterpart for it, is most unlikely. What is more, given the internal syntax of this governing compound, the language in which the IE phonemes /a/ and /o/ have merged into /a/ would be the language to which the whole form belongs. In turn, this means that this evanescent dialect of Indo-European borrowed a Venetic past part or action noun. This idea, as a consequence, does not withstand scrutiny.

In sum, it is preferable to classify VOLTOGNAS as a Venetic PN, and I believe it to be an anomalous rendition for **uoltu-gno-*. As in the case of LASCIOANTIAE, the scribe has been faced with a Venetic PN with a centralised variant of /o/ when flanked by alveolar consonants, perhaps an open-mid central rounded vowel [ɔ], so that the whole sequence would sound [-ɥnɔs]. Since this time it is contained in an inflectional ending, which typically confronts the hearer with a more limited choice, he opts for phonologising it as /a/.³² If the scribe had perceived something he could parse as the indigenous (Gaulish) *-os*, he would probably have translated it into Latin *-us* (since the rendition of inflectional morphology often hesitates between the Latin and the indigenous shape

³¹ Phonetic interpretation by [Recasens, 2014, 131].

³² Again, this might prove diagnostic for the distinction of Venetic short and long vowels. If a Venetic name, for instance, shows a consistent rendition <o> even when the corresponding sound was flanked by palatal or alveolar consonants, we have to assess the possibility that it is rendering /o:/, as in MOLOTAE (see below).

of the morpheme).³³ It should be noted, however, that stress may have played a role in view of TATSORIAE (see below). Given that “both energy (and its perceptual correlate loudness) and duration are common phonetic correlates of stress” [Gordon, 2006, 141], stressed vowels may be longer than their unstressed counterparts, which could have favoured the erroneous perception of two consecutive phonemes in the case of LASCIOANTIAE in spite of the syllable being closed. Since the vowels affected by the phenomenon described here occur in Venetic forms, one can only conclude that the anomaly is due to the fact that in this context Celtic preserved the difference between /a/ and /o/, while Venetic tended to neutralisation.

VOLTVPARIS [CIL, 3, 3791, 3798], gen. sg., Emona/Ig, is nearly identical to the base of the Venetic FN *vo.l.topariko.s.* [LV, 209], Calalzo di Cadore, and similar to VEROPARIS (Zuglio/Iulium Carnicum, VH) and IOPARI (gen., Aquincum, Pannonia Inferior). In view of the fact that it has enjoyed broad acceptance, Repanšek [2016a, 328–329] has traced the second member of the compound back to **p̄rh₃-i-* “both in Ig and in Venetic”. On a more economical account, all these PNs are simply Venetic, and then continue the same compositional procedure as Lat. *opiparus*, *puerpera*, etc. Preservation of /a/ in the neighbourhood of a labial segment can be readily taken as proof of its non-Celtic origin and small degree of local integration (as opposed to BOLERIAV/NVS). At all events, we cannot jettison an unexplored possibility: it could be the match of Lat. *pār*, *paris* and perhaps *parri-cīda*, *pāri-cīda* [cf. EDLIL, s.u. *pār*], if these forms go back to **pāri-* ‘equal, similar, matching’.

The father’s name in SVRVS VOLTIELI [CIL, 3, 10748], Emona/Ig, possibly contains an Italic diminutive in *-elo-* built from an Italic PN VOLTIOS (attested all over Italy), ultimately (as if) from **u̯l̥Ht-(i)io-* [cf. Untermann, 1961, 131]; cf. the same PN with Celtic phonetics in VLATTIA, VLATTIVS (Alpes Cottiae/Maritimae; Germania, Liguria, etc.). Repanšek’s comment [Repanšek, 2016a, 331]: “the problematic suffix has no obvious parallels within North-Adriatic name formation,” is difficult to follow, insofar as this is exactly the diminutive formation we expect to find in any Italic language, in this case Venetic (an analysis he finally concedes), and there is no need to postulate a ghost category. Note there is a number of parallel formations in Venetia et Histria, namely a cognomen VOLTIAVO (dat.) and a father’s name VOLTIIETIS (gen.).

3.3. BVCTOR, BVCTORIS

The PN BVCTOR, BVCTORIS [CIL, 3, 3823], Emona/Ig, exhibits the agent noun suffix *-tōr-*, which definitely points to an Italic origin of the name. It is in all likelihood

³³ The apparent obstacle that we find ENIGNVS in other texts is irrelevant: by the same token one could suspect *-<os>* in ADGINNOS, ANNIOS (Noricum), not to speak of LICCAVI, LICAIOS and LICCAVS on the same stone (Pannonia Inferior) of containing something other than a thematic vowel. There is, for instance, a well-known alternation of dat. sg. *-<o>*, *-<oi>*, *-<vi>* and *-<v>* in the west of the Iberian Peninsula, for which it is a strenuous task to distinguish indigenous proper from latinised forms, and different dialects from scribal preferences.

of Venetic origin judging by the pseudo-gentilic *FVCTORIO*, *FVCTORIAE* [CIL, 5, 8422], Aquileia, and the fact that the inscription shows the equally Venetic PNs *ENINNAE* and *VOLTEREGI*. Consequently, I assume that **fuktōr-* has been adapted to Celtic phonetics in the only possible way: Gaulish had no phoneme /f/ (except in contact with /r/), and, additionally, Gaulish scribes were prone to perceive the Venetic outcome of the IE intervocalic voiced stops as identical to their own lax voiceless segments, which go back to the IE voiceless stops [cf. Prósper, 2019a].³⁴

3.4. BVQVORSA

The PN *BVQVORSA* (twice [CIL, 3, 17040 = AIJ, 131, 133], Emona/Ig) definitely looks like a compound. Stifter [2012b, 259] traces it back to a derivative **bug-ur-tiā*, but the required devoicing and the suffixation raise too many questions, since IE derivatives are comparatively predictable, whatever their ultimate filiation. In my view, it is more likely to reflect a Venetic compound **fugi/o-ur-ti-(i)o-* (with the same stem **urti-* as Lat. *divortium* or Ven. *e[-]vortei*) or, more probably, **fugi/o-ur-ssō-*, in which the second member is the same past participle as in Lat. *vorsus* and its numerous compounded variants and the Umbrian compound *trahuorfi* (<**trāns-ur-ssō-*). In either case, this form has evolved into **fugur-ssō-* with syncope of the second vowel. Both the loss of *-i-* in the second syllable of a polysyllabic form and the reduction *-ouV-* > *-uuV-* > *-uV-* are regular, and, in the second case at least, probably areal. Consequently, Venetic *fuguo-* was perceived as **βuǰuo-* and regularly rendered <BVQVO> by Celtic-speaking scribes in Emona. The root **b^heug-* is continued, for instance, in Lat. *fungor* ‘enjoy, perform’ and Skt. *bhunakti* ‘to enjoy, use, consume’ and is always found in the zero grade (cf. [LIV, 84–85] *2*b^heug-* ‘jmdm. nützen, Nutzen bringen’). This form consequently means something like ‘turned towards pleasure/joy.’ See [Prósper, 2019a, 36–39] for this and other similar forms in Celtic and Venetic.

3.5. TATSORIAE: reflections on the problem of the nasal-to-fricative transition in the Italic languages and Latin

In a recent work [see Prósper, 2018b], I have suggested that the second name of *SEXTILIAE TATSORIAE*, dat. [CIL, 3, 10722], Emona/Šmarata (1st c. AD) is likely to go back to an agent noun **tḡd-tōr-* ‘shaver’.³⁵ The sequence <TS> is rendering the product of Italic /s:/. While the primitive form was probably **tend-tor-*, fem. **tend-tr-ī*, Latin

³⁴ In other words, I think the effects of language contact have been underestimated. These names can by no means be taken at face value, *as per* [Repanšek, 2016a, 334], who reckons with “*the simple deaspiration of the inherited voiced aspirated consonants *b^h, *d^h, *g^h and *g^{wh} to b*” in Ig; this account is not very different from that of [Stifter, 2012b, 255]: “a language where the PIE voiced aspirate **b^h* had become plain voiced *b*”.

³⁵ One may be allowed to assume there is a sociolinguistic reason behind the fact that indigenous office names are more commonly found as pseudo-gentilics than as PNs: if they were once used as nicknames distinguishing a particular person, their descendants may take them on and pass them along as gentilics.

shows a secondary /o/-grade root, ultimately matching the present stem *tondeō*: cf. masc. *tōnsor*, fem. *tōnstrix*, past participle *tōnsus*. In Venetic, the allomorph **t̥nd-* was probably taken from the original past participle **t̥nd-to-* obeying the “Italic rule” and consequently reflects an older state of affairs than Latin does. The masculine variant of the suffix has been generalised and a further, synchronically patronymic suffix *-(i)jō-* has been added.

The underlying form is **tanssōr-(i)jā*. It contains a tense or long sibilant /s:/, perceived or realised in this context as an affricate [tʰ] (as in Hittite, Basque or Romanesco, as well as, e.g., British English *mince* [mɪnts]), which attests to the phonetic difficulties of the nasal-fricative transition and the consequent insertion of an excrement *-t-*.³⁶ It should be noted that *g r a p h i c* omission of the nasal in coda position is trivial across languages and phonetic writing systems and is not necessarily caused by nasal weakening [cf. Méndez Dosuna, 2007]. This renders any assumptions on weakening and loss of a nasal in Italic exclusively based on this phenomenon unconvincing. The Venetic outcome of *-Vns-* is nearly certain to have been *-V̄s-* as in Latin, both on cross-linguistic grounds and on the strength of sequences like *.e..s. te.r.monio.s. de.i.vo.s.*, from **ens termonijōns deijōns*.

To my mind, the sequence *-nts-* in a Venetic form either reflects the intermediate step between *-ntʰt-* and *-nss-* or is the product of misperception by native speakers of Gaulish, which did not preserve *-ns-* nor, *ex hypothesi*, *-nss-* from dental clusters (as implied by **banssu-* > OIr. *bés* ‘custom, habit’). What is more, the slight fronting of the vowel [o] when flanked by coronal consonants detected in other Venetic forms from Emona may apply to this case, too: if <A> is intended to reflect the open-mid central rounded vowel [ɔ], *TATSORIAE* can be traced back to the full-grade form **tond-tōr-* built on the model of the past participle **tond-to-*, in which case it is a full match of Lat. *tōnsor*. In Venetic, however, coarticulation is suggestive of the root vowel being synchronically short in this context, as can be inferred from the above arguments.

3.6. ENIGNVS, ENINNAE

In contradistinction to oral consonants, nasal consonants are not easy to discriminate acoustically in terms of place of articulation; a velar nasal is especially difficult to identify and, crucially, still more so when it occurs next to another nasal and to high vowels [cf. Wireback, 2010]. For instance, native speakers of Spanish are hard pressed to distinguish Eng. *king* from *kin*; therefore, when they try to reproduce the former noun, they will typically take the familiar spelling at face value and “unpack” the English phoneme /ŋ/ into /ng/. A sequence [ɲŋ] would be in all likelihood

³⁶ The best parallel in the Venetic record is the appellative *a.n.sore.s.* that occurs in a fragmentary context ([LV, 203], Calalzo). I have reconstructed an Italic noun **antʰtōr-*, ultimately (as if) from **h₂ŋ- + dʰeh₁-tor-* ‘constructors; officials?’ with zero-grade of the root by the “Italic rule”. This presupposes a past participle **antʰto-* (< **h₂ŋ- + dʰh₁-to-*) with very early context-bound laryngeal loss and the same prefix as in U. *ampentu* ‘touch’, O. *avafaket* ‘erected’ [WOU, 94–95].

identified with a geminate alveolar [n:] and rendered <NN> (or alternatively the nasal component would be disregarded and it would be rendered <GN>) by the speaker of a language in which that sequence did not exist, in our case Eastern Gaulish. A Gaulish scribe probably barely managed to produce the correct representations for Latin words containing [ɲn] that he was acquainted with and perhaps pronounced [ɣn] or [gn].

One thing we know for certain, thanks to the Venetic syllabic punctuation, is that names containing *-gno-* still behaved synchronically as compounds or, at least, were sensitive to morphological boundaries, in that the cluster is treated as a tautosyllabic anlaut. The cluster is known to be heterosyllabic in Latin for metrical reasons [cf. Marotta, 1999]. While there is a plethora of arguments in favour of the hypothesis that the actual realisation of Latin <gn> was [ɲn],³⁷ only very indirect clues can lead us to similar conclusions for Venetic. One of them is language contact.

Stephens [1978], who elaborated on the typological argument suggesting that the existence of at least one sequence of voiced obstruent plus nasal implies the existence of at least one sequence of unvoiced obstruent plus nasal, has cogently claimed that Latin could not have had the initial cluster *gn-*, since it did not possess its voiceless counterpart *cn-* (descriptively, both etymological *kn-* and *gn-* are rendered *gn-* and end up as a simplified *n-*, e.g. respectively in *nīxus* and *nātus*). On the strength of this, *gn-* must have represented [ɲn]. In consequence, if Venetic had a tautosyllabic cluster <gn>- in the second member of compounded names, it is, like in Latin initial position, very likely to have been realised as [ɲn].³⁸ Russell [2014] has come up with the novel idea that Gaulish, contrary to the usual account, did not possess two suffixes *-gno-*/*-cno-*, but only the one that goes back to **-ǵnh₁o-* and is also inherited by other IE

³⁷ See [Baglioni, 2014] for a recent defense of this position. Romance philology has traditionally ignored the internal Latin facts and often starts from a stage [ɣn]. This would have to account for such disparate outcomes as palatalisation (Italian and Western Romance languages, including /j̄n/ in Engadine and Southern Italian), velarisation (/ɰn/ in other dialects of Southern Italian), labialisation (/mn/ in Rumanian), and assimilation (/nn/ in Sardinian).

³⁸ Stephens' account is merely phonetic and noncommittal as to the phonemic status of this sequence, however, which has been variously assessed. The existence of such minimal pairs as *agnus* and *annus* beside *amnīs* containing *-ɲ.n-*, *-n.n-* and *-m.n-*, as well as, for some time at least, that of *gn-*, *n-*, *mn-* in initial position, speaks in favour of the existence of a phoneme /ɲ/ with a reduced functional load. But they are best treated as the prenasal variants of the corresponding oral stops, in accordance with their respective origins as /g/, /t/ and /b/, the first being an allophone of /g/ and the other two the product of neutralisation between oral and nasal stops. Since [ɲ] is *also* an allophone of /n/, it may have been inherently unstable. Given the progressive loss of morphophonemic alternations (as in *decet* vs. *dignus*), native speakers may have parsed *-ɲ.n-* as /ngn/. By contrast, *rex*, *regō* vs. *regnum* may have propitiated a unitary velar pronunciation, which might go some steps towards explaining divergent outcomes like those of Sp. *seña*, *leño* vs. *reino*. Note that pre-documentary Latin must have known the medial sequences *-Vɲxn-* (> *-V̄xn-* > *-V̄n-*, as in *sānus*, *quīnī*), from *-nk-n-*, vs. *-ɲ.n-*, from *-gn-* and *-ngn-* (as in *agnus* vs. *i(n)-gnoscō*). In my view, *-Vnxn-* gave *-V̄xn-* and thereupon evolved into *-V̄in-* in Venetic after the transition formants perceived as a palatal glide gained phonemic status [see Prósper, 2018a].

dialects. This suffix was spelt respectively with <C> and <K> in Latin and Greek in order to distinguish it from their own sequence <GN>/<γV>, employed to render [ŋn].

This problem has some bearing on the question of ENIGNVS [CIL, 3, 3793, 3871] vs. ENINNAE [Ibid., 3823, 3870], both in Emona/Ig and Ljubljana. In the Venetic record, the second member (or suffixoid) *-gno-/-cno-* contained in the Gaulish counterparts of these names are unanimously represented by means of *-kno-*, and they are uniquely employed as PNs and not FNs. I am not inclined to consider these names as loanwords proper (which could *ex hypothesi* have given rise to a limited contrast *kn-* vs. *gn-* not shared by Latin), since, among other considerations regarding the place of proper names in the language system, speakers of Venetic would have had no difficulties in assimilating them to their own patterns (that is to say, to the Venetic sequence *-ŋno-*). On the contrary, the use of *-kno-* needs clarification, since it presupposes a scribal decision unrelated to Latin practice. Therefore, I maintain the view that ENIGNVS, ENINNAE are different renditions of a name containing [ŋn], the former being the spelling expected from a scribe trained in contemporary Latin, and the second being due to auditory failure to perceive the velar component of the velar nasal (as in Histonium [CIL, 9, 2893] SINNV for SIGNVM). Interestingly, a stand-alone case of SINIFER comes from Pannonia Superior ([CIL, 3, 10994] Brigetium). This name should probably be kept separate from ENNAE OPPALONIS F, dat. [Ibid., 3793], Emona/Ig, ENNAE VOLTANIS F, dat. [Ibid., 3802], Emona/Ig, and ENNAE RVTI F, dat. [Ibid., 3821], Emona/Ig, which is obviously also Venetic in view of ENNAE, dat. [CIL, 5, 4966], Rogno, VH.³⁹ As for RVTI, see below.

The Celtic names in *-kno-* which have been transmitted in the Venetic record pose no obstacle to this idea. Since Celtic actually had lexical items with a distinct anlaut **kn-*, there is no objection to Continental Celtic **gn-* being preserved as such. Thus, the Latin and Venetic rendition *-<CN>-*, *-<kn>-* is the way in which these two languages and their respective scripts transcribed both tautosyllabic sequences *(-)gn-* and *(-)kn-*, which their own systems equally lacked.⁴⁰

³⁹ Repanšek assumes alternation in the position of the geminate in a hypocoristic form: **Enn-inā = *En-innā* [Repanšek, 2016a, fn. 18]. While this could be true (doubling of the wrong consonant is in fact a well-known scribal mistake), it leaves us with another *hāpax*.

⁴⁰ Russell goes further and asserts that we do not expect the sequence <GN> to be found in Gaulish forms. Consequently, he dismisses the alleged counterevidence presented by spellings like GNATA in indigenous Gaulish inscriptions because they could be Latin, but this is unconvincing. To begin with, allowances must be made for some local variation in the use of the Latin alphabet for indigenous epigraphy. The contrast of tautosyllabic *gn/cn* must have been restricted to the initial position, where /g/ was on the way to total effacement and it was convenient to distinguish them, whereas only tautosyllabic *-gno-* existed in medial position, and was predictably rendered *-cno-*. By the time putatively Latin-speaking scribes adapted their writing system to Gaulish, on the other hand, the Latin standard spelling *gn-* must have been largely artificial, and the voice contrast Gaul. *-kn-* vs. *-gn-* (> *-xn-* vs. *-yn-*) may even have been completely neutralised.

3.7. VOLTARO and its roots in Italian Venetic

A sizable number of Italic formations attested in Pannonia share a common stem **uoltV-*. This is likely to go back to past participles or action nouns like **u̥l̥H-tó-/tu-* with laryngeal loss (see below).

The masculine nasal stem PN VOLTARO, occurring in six cases [CIL, 3, 3785, 3818, 10744–10745, 10747], Emona/Ig, remains, however, unexplained. In my view, it is a possessive or “Hoffmann” derivative of a noun **uoltar*, which looks very similar to the well-known Venetic nouns *vontar* and *augar*. While these are traditionally interpreted as substantivised neuter adjectives in *-āri*, this point has never been substantiated.

What is more, the noun *vo.n.ta.r.* in Alpine Venetic (Cadore), attested only once in the formula *per vo.l.te.r.ko.n. vo.n.ta.r.*, and taken to mean ‘by free will’ since [Lejeune, 1952] looks rather suspect. The isolated *vo.n.ta.r.* has no recognizable structure and no parallels, and its attribution to the root **uen-*, repeated uncritically ever since, is unconvincing. First, this root has a more restricted sense ‘to command, conquer, win’. Second, it is unlikely to appear in the /o/ grade, even if Lejeune speaks in favour of a noun in *-tā* of the type of Gk. βρόντη. Why it is adjectivised only to be substantivised again remains unclear.

Alternatively, I suspect this form of being a misreading for a very similar-looking (and hitherto unattested) *vo.l.ta.r.* In fact, the drawing provided by [Pellegrini & Prosdociami, 1, 487], reproduced in [Morandi, 2017, 370], reveals a crucial difference in the ductus of this alleged <n> and those of the rest of the text: in this one, the third, rightmost stroke stands in an angle of 45 degrees with regard to the second, while the other three show at that place a more open, diagonal stroke that stands at right angles with the second. Additionally, the second stroke is shorter in <n> than in <l>. To my mind, in our case this means that this stroke is the interpunction, and the small dot that Lejeune identified with the actual interpunction is just a notch in the metal that the scribe avoided by displacing the real interpunction (a small vertical line, like in the rest of the text) slightly upwards, and in this way creating the confusion.

This has a number of interesting consequences: first, VOLTARO is a Venetic, not an “Iggian” or “Venetoid” PN. It is probably a possessive formation, and means something like ‘powerful’ or ‘willing’. Accordingly, its feminine counterpart may have been *Voltarona*, *Voltaronia* or even *Voltaroneia*, but by no means a present participle *Voltaronti*.

It is a much disputed matter whether LASCONTIAE, LASCIOANTIAE, DEVONTIAE are participles at all: see the discussion in [Šašel-Kos, 2017], who has identified these forms as following an innovative pattern, by which feminine counterparts are created to masculine names in *-on-*. Cf. also the idea that “the latter suffix must have been in use in Ig as a productive means to form gamonyms from underlying male names” [Repanšek, 2016a, 327; elaborating on Stifter, 2012b, 258]. Still, according to usual procedure in comparative linguistics, phonetic explanations take precedence over morphological or lexical ones. The last outpost of this argument is the case of VOLTARONTI, which seems

to be derived from a PN or a secondary adjective. It occurs in two inscriptions as a nom. sg. VOLTARONTI [CIL, 3, 3877]⁴¹ and as a dat. VOLTARONTI [Ibid., 3860], in fact another nominative, as cogently corrected by [Repaňšek, 2016a, 326–327]. As far as I can see, a third example of two datives VOLTARONTIA and VOLTARONTIAE [CIL, 3, 3876] does not exist, since the stone is lost and the reading seems based on a drawing of the 17th c. (which, in fact, does not mention this PN at all). In lack of a direct autopsy, I seriously doubt the existence of such a participle (or feminine-forming derivational device). If this form exists, it must be a late denominative to Ven. **uoltar*. The lack of suffixation is unexplained, unless this verb is in fact deadjectival to **uoltaro-*, itself back-formed from the nasal stem **uoltaron-*.

Finally, the new reading *vo.l.ta.r.* saves us from reconstructing an adjective in *-āri-*, since its derivative would in all likelihood have been **uoltāriō*. More generally, adjectives in *-āri-* did not exist in Venetic any more than they did in Latin (where, as is well known, they result from a dissimilated *-āli-*). As Lejeune himself candidly confessed [Lejeune, 1952, *fn.* 42], “ici encore <...>, nous procédons par induction à partir des faits latins, mais sans témoignages vénètes connus”. In fairness, this idea has always silently relied on a number of Sabellic forms containing *-āri-* which, if we exclude O. *luisarifs*, FLVSARE and U. STAFIARE, cannot be put down to dissimilation of laterals. Most recently, however, Poccetti [2013, 210–211] has shown that they are still amenable to an explanation via confusion of liquids: a number of Oscan forms exhibit an *-r-* where they should have *-l-*, as in *sarīnu* = ‘(Porta) Salina’. As a consequence, Poccetti plausibly suggests that we could be dealing with a dissimilatory process affecting forms which also contain a nasal sound, and adduces Pael. CASNAR, Lat. *coquinaris* (as opposed to O. *dekkviarim*) and the recently uncovered Oscan festival name *minnaris* (from **mēnāli-b^hos*) on a *Iuvila capuana* (see above).

The Venetic forms containing a variant of this suffix, whatever their ultimate analysis and dialectal attribution, all show *-(i)iar(i)io-* of whatever origin and are FNs: PNs *ka.i.tiariio.i.*, *e.nopetariio.i.*, *klutiiari.s.* (all three from Padua) or the extended *-(i)iar(i)iko-* in Alpine Venetic: *nisiariko.ns.*? (Monte Pore, Belluno), *de.i.piiariko.s.* (Cadore), and in forms of undetermined etymology.⁴² The inflection and segmentation

⁴¹ In [CIL, 3, 3877], VOLTARONTI exhibits a very intriguing trait: <NTI> is written in full, in spite of this short inscription containing no fewer than 12 ligatures (some of them very unusual, like <S+E>). In view of the photograph provided by [EDR, 135195], in which one can see that the place occupied by the alleged sequence <TI> is damaged, I would read VOLTARONN+.

⁴² The PN SEVERO SACCIARI (Emona/Ig) is probably non-diagnostic. Given the Latin origin of the onomastics of this inscription, one may toy with the possibility that this is simply the Roman name *Saccarius*, in turn an office name from *saccus* ‘sack-maker’ which is sporadically found as a gentilic in Dalmatia, and once again reflecting lack of accuracy on the part of the Iggian scribes (perhaps specifically the misplacing of *-i-*). A PN SACCARVS has recently surfaced on a Siscian lead tag, however [RLSiscia, 428]. But it may have been abstracted from the gentilic or reflect incipient palatalisation. Finally, in view of VASSA SACCAVI FI(LIA) in Carnuntum it may be a Celtic name, and then simply the occasional product of a rare noun + secondary suffix combination.

of the noun or substantivated adjective *.e.kupetari.s.* ‘funerary monument’ beside *.e.kupetabo.s.* (Padua) is ambiguous (*-ā-ri-* or *-ā-r(i)jo-*).

It immediately follows that *-ar*, at least in *auga.r.* and *vo.l.ta.r.*, is likely to be the Venetic outcome of IE *-r̥* in word-final position. What is more, this could be, if not the Proto-Italic, at least the Latino-Venetic outcome. On the strength of the comparison of Latin with other IE heteroclitic formations, Frotscher [2012, 84] believes *-er* (in Lat. *iter*) to be the continuant of PIE *-r̥* in final position, while *-or* (> Lat. *-ur* in *iecur*) is associated to labial contexts. To my mind, an inherited auslaut *-ar* would equally have given *-er*. The extant evidence of this auslaut presupposes an original sequence *-ās* (cf. *iubar*, *instar*), so we have no proof of what would have happened to *-ar*. But we know for certain that *-a(C)* tends to give *-e(C)* in final syllables (**prismo-kap-s* > *princeps*; **arti-fak-s* > *artifex*; **tubi-kan* > *tubicen*; **per-da* > *perde*).

The alternative form *vo.l.ta.r.*, like its hypothetical derivative VOLTARO, has the obvious advantage of containing a well-known Italic sequence **uolt-*, but is not altogether transparent either. In my view, it may ultimately go back to an amphikinetic neuter **uelH-t̥r̥*, **u̥lH-t̥n-és* like the one reconstructed by Tichy [1995, 61] for **h₁ej̥i-t̥r̥*, gen. **h₁i-t̥n-és* ‘das Gehen, Weg,’ which has a locative **h₁i-ter-i*. This paradigm could have been leveled in Venetic or earlier into **uoltar*, **uoltan-* (with /o/-grade of the root in the strong cases either by paradigm leveling or under the influence of the following [ɪ]), which could also explain three cases of an athematic dative VOLTANI OPPALONIS in Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3821] (cf. [Repanšek, 2016a, 331] for the correct morphology) and an athematic gen. VOLTANIS, equally in Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3802]. Both could consequently be *-i*-stems derived from the oblique stem **u̥lHtn-V/C-* > **uolt̥n-* > **uoltan-*, and not trivial names in *-ano-* as contended by [Untermann, 1961, 130, fn. 270].⁴³

In that case, it is tempting to compare it with *a.u.ga.r.* ‘monument (?)’, the only other substantivised neuter adjective in *-āri-* listed by Lejeune. Under a different interpretation, *a.u.ga.r.* could be a remarkable archaism, the exact match of Av. *aogara* ‘strength, power,’ from **h₂eug-r̥*.⁴⁴ This form is an unlikely candidate to be an adjective in *-āri-*, since this is by definition a secondary suffix only attached to independent nominal forms, which is hardly the case with **h₂eug(o)-*. Whether this has any bearing

⁴³ The case of VEITRONI BVTONNIS FILIO [CIL, 3, 3819], Emona/Ig, lost, remains ambiguous: the son’s name may be a near-cognate of OAv. *važdra-* and Lat. *vehiculum* < **ueǵ^he-tlo-*, Skt. *vahitra-* ‘ship’ and may be a direct match of VEITOR (Maniago, VH < **ueǵ^h-tor-*), but a regional Celtic change *ueK-* > *ueK-* cannot be ruled out [see Prósper, 2018a; 2019a, 16–17]. But it could be the case that it is a misreading of VEITRONI, in which case it would preserve the strong stem of the reconstructed noun intact.

⁴⁴ An interesting cognomen from Rome [CIL, 6, 10649] in the formula T(ITO) AELIO AVGARIONI is probably unrelated. It is more likely to be a continuant of the Celtic form **oyi-gar-(i)jo-* ‘shepherd’ (literally: ‘sheep-caller’), attested in OIr. *oegaire*. The initial diphthong may be due to the characteristic Latin interpretation of Celtic [ou] as [au]. If it is an Italic cognate thereof, by contrast, it may be due to the “Havet-Thurneysen-Vine” Law as laid out by [Vine, 2006], but this is unlikely in view of such cognates as Gaul. ADGARIONTAS (Chartres).

on the disputed origin of Lat. *augur* is debatable: see [Weiss, 2017] for an explicit denial of the equation *aogar* = *augur* suggested long ago by É. Benveniste.⁴⁵

The phrase *per vo.l.te.r.ko.n. vo.l.ta.r.*, like its western Euganean counterpart *o.p. vo.l.tiio leno*, contains two words built from the root ¹**uelH-* ‘be able, command, overpower, etc.’ [see LIV, 676] in Lat. *valeō* (for their structure and Celtic cognates see now [Prósper, 2017b]), or from the nearly-homonymous root ²**uelh₁-* ‘to choose, want’ [LIV, 677–678]. Both cases might consequently have contained a *Wortspiel*. The formula *o.p. vo.l.tiio leno* probably means ‘by free/sovereign will,’ and, if the phrase *per vo.l.te.r.ko.n. vo.l.ta.r.* conveys a similar meaning, *vo.l.ta.r.* may have meant something like ‘will’ or, alternatively, ‘power, capacity.’ Interestingly, the adjective *vo.l.te.r.ko.n.* may be derived from the locative ³**u_lH-tér-i* without further ado.⁴⁶ Finally, note that MW. *gwladyr* ‘prince, leader, powerful’ in all likelihood goes back to ⁴**uelH-tro-*. In turn, this is in my present view likely to be the exocentric thematic derivative of our reconstructed form ⁵**uelH-tr* ‘endowed with power’, and not, as often assumed, an instrument noun.

3.8. ΜΟΙΟΤΑ: an uncertain reading

The feminine PN ΜΟΙΟΤΑ, Emona/Ig [CIL, 3, 3785, 3804], Emona/Iska Vas, [AIJ, 140], has been traced back to ⁶**mogiotā* (< ⁷**mag^h-* or ⁸**meǵ-*), related to ΜΟΓΕΤΙΣ in Noricum [cf. Stifter, 2012b, 255]. Still, the suffix *-i-ot(-o)-* is very unusual, and the eastern Celtic evolution *-gi-* > *-yi-* > *-ij-* is unreliable (see above). After checking the photographs provided by the online databases, I come to the following conclusions: the text of [CIL, 3, 3785] is unreadable at precisely that point (as transpires from the original edition), and the accepted reading relies on the comparison with the other two texts; in turn, [AIJ, 140] speaks in favour of an alternative reading ΜΟΛΟΤ[A]; thirdly, only [CIL, 3, 3804] actually reads ΜΟΙΟΤΑΕ, but <ι> stands slightly above the writing

⁴⁵ If we assumed that *aogarə*, *augur*, and *augar* are identical forms, Frotscher’s [2012] conclusions on the fate of PIE ⁹*-r̥ in Italic would have to be rephrased as follows: -r̥ gives Italic (or Latino-Venetic) -ar. In Latin, before the action of the RUBL rule, -ar is darkened into -or (> -ur) when a labial or velar sound immediately precedes, which embraces the case of *augur* (older *auger*, *augeratus* according to Priscian). Elsewhere, -ar yields Lat. -er in all contexts. *Cicer* ‘chickpea,’ by contrast, reflects original -er# and remains unaffected. Incidentally, this alternative explanation is supported by the fact that the proposed evolution -r̥ > -er is *ad hoc*, i.e. it is merely invoked to tally the attested auslaut, while -ar- is the Italic prevocalic outcome of -r̥-. Since it is the regular outcome of *samprasāraṇa* in Sabellic (cf. U. *okar* < ¹⁰**h₂ok-ri-*), it is additionally suggestive of a longer history for Lat. *imber*, *acer*, etc.

⁴⁶ In any event not from ¹¹**uoltar* itself, *pace* [Pellegrini & Prosdocimi, 2, 203], who had recourse to a preform ¹²**voltar* to explain *vo.l.te.r.ko.n.*, but never called into question their own reading *vo.n.ta.r.*, to which they ascribe “il significato sacrale del lat. *venia*”. While these scholars [Ibid., fn. 2] seem to reconstruct a short vowel /a/ which in their view is freely rendered <a> or <e>, this is blatantly contradicted by their comparison of the couple “*voltio-*: ¹³**voltar*” with U. “*stafljo-*: *staflari-*”, since U. STAFLARE(M) in all likelihood goes back to ¹⁴**stad^hl-āli-*. Neither is the reconstruction ¹⁵**uelH-tro-* > ¹⁶**uoltro-* → ¹⁷**voltr-iko-* with *samprasāraṇa* defended by [LV, 340] plausible, if the FN *kuprikon.io.i.* [Ibid., 139], Padua, is anything to go by (though the tendency of -i- to be syncopeated may have been more marked in the Alpine territories).

line, while the next line down is completely erased. Accordingly, it might be safer to allow for the possibility that all of them actually mention a person called *Molota*, a Venetic feminine PN already attested as *MOLOTAE* [CIL, 5, 7500], Chieri/Liguria, and in the indigenous *moloto .e..n.oniia* [LV, 91], Este.

While I have formerly toyed with the possibility that it goes back to **m̥h₃-eto-* (which entails problems concerning the /o/ grade of the root and the intransitive nature of the verb), I am presently inclined to consider the possibility that it goes back to a deinstrumental possessive adjective **mōlō-to-* of the type Lat. *aegrōtus* ‘sick,’ and possibly akin to Lat. *mōlīrī* ‘labour, strive’ and, crucially, *mōlestus*.

3.9. PLETOR, PLATOR

PLETOR and PLATOR are often treated as variant forms of the same PN. Nonetheless, once we factor out the corresponding pseudo-gentilics, we find out that PLETOR is exclusive to Venetia et Histria, and PLATOR to Dacia and Dalmatia, besides its occurrences in the Messapic record and two in Oscan in the Greek alphabet [cf. Zair, 2016, 219]. Since PLETOR is an obvious agent noun, we would expect it to be based on the past participle following the “Italic rule”. In fact, it must be derived from **plē-to-*, and is a cognate of Lat. *-plētus*, which in turn corresponds to a present form **plē-īo/e-* attested in Lat. *pleō* and the pan-Italic quasi-participle **plē-no-*. Accordingly, the Iggian form must be of Venetic, not Balkanic ancestry.

3.10. LASSONIAE

VOLTREX LASONIS [CIL, 3, 3824], LASON[IA]E VOLTANI [Ibid., 3790] (Emona/Ig), VOLTAE LASSONIAE PLANI F [Ibid., 10723] (Emona/Šmarata) are the three attestations of a PN going back to an Italic adjective found in Lat. *lassus* from **lad-tó-*, which has no obvious Celtic counterparts.

3.11. TALSI

TALSI [CIL, 3, 3811], Emona/Ig, is identical to TALSÆ, dat. [EDCS, 14400274], Wieting, Noricum. As observed in a number of studies [cf. Stifter, 2012b, 253], a cluster *-ls-* is totally anomalous in Gaulish, although [Katičić, 1976, 182] did include it in his Pre-Gaulish Celtic wave (in this case at least erroneously in his own terms, since the PN is now attested in Noricum). As usual, it fits well into Venetic. While the root, vocalism, and derivation are unclear for any language, it is not unwarranted to reconstruct **i̥h₂-tijo-*, which would have regularly given **tlāt(i)jo-*.⁴⁷ **tl-* is an unstable anlaut in Italic, but possibly more resistant in Venetic, where medial *-tl-* is preserved (as in *klovetlo*,

⁴⁷ Note, however, that if we posit an agent noun **i̥h₂-ti-* as the base of this PN, the outcome **talti-* might be regular under a modified version of the “palma-rule”. This problem will be addressed in a work in preparation [see Prósper, *in press*].

magetlon), than in Latin (cf. *lātus* ‘borne, broad,’ and the PIN *Lātium*) or Sabellic. This would place the Latin and probably Sabellic simplification of *#tl-* after the separation of Venetic, and, *a fortiori*, before *-tl- > -kl-*. If this sequence was metathesised in Venetic proper or only in Alpine Venetic we do not know at present. Synchronic *-tj̄-* appears more prone to affrication after a nasal or liquid segment. A Celtic origin cannot be ruled out, however, since a comparable metathesis of **Cl-* has taken place in Hispano-Celtic *TAL TICVS*, etc. [cf. Prósper, 2014, 208], and affrication may turn out to be an areal feature. The best parallel in this region is Venetic *BVQVORSA*, which might contain a sequence *-rtj̄-* (see above). The FN of *VOLTIOMNVS TAESALOCVS* (Prodani, Istria, VH) may be related. In view of the photograph, an alternative reading *TALSALOCVS* cannot be ruled out, in which case this would be a derivative of **tals-alo-*. *-alo-* is a typical Gaulish patronymic suffix, which would mean that this is a Celtic (or early celticised, possibly at a stage **taltʰo-*), not a Venetic name. The next question is, obviously, why a Celtic or Venetic sequence *-tj̄-* should be less prone to coarticulation in present participles, like *DEVONTIAE*, *LASCIOANTIAE* or *STANONCIAE* (Siscia, Pannonia) [cf. Prósper, 2018b]. In these cases, the suffix is more resistant to change for morphophonemic reasons, since the masculine paradigm (and perhaps the nom. fem. if it preserves its original morph *-ī*) contains no *-i-*, and consequently the palatalisation of the cluster must be at its first stages.

3.12. POPTEIVS

The PN *PO{P}TEIVS*, *POTEI* [CIL, 3, 10723], Emona/Šmarata, is usually tiptoed around, but is a likely derivative of **poti-* ‘lord,’ whether a direct rendition of a synchronic sequence *potij̄o-* or presupposing a more complex derivational history. Once again, the extra-letter shows that this PN was virtually unknown in the area, and that the listener hypercorrected a tense voiceless segment and produced a sequence <PT> that was alien to Celtic, but probably not to Venetic.

3.13. FIRMO PROVIO

The PN *FIRMO PROVIO*, dat. [CIL, 3, 3797], Emona/Ig, is matched by a feminine *PROVIA* in Pannonia [RLSiscia, 407–408]. Both PNs are derived from **pro/ō-uo-*, an inherited deadverbial adjective meaning ‘first, foremost’. It is very likely to be Italic. Its cognates are: Skt. *pravaṇā-* ‘willing, inclined,’ OHG. *frō*, OS. *frao*, OEng. *frēa* ‘master, mister’ (**frawan-*), Goth. *frauja* ‘master, lord,’ OS. *frōio*, OIc. *freyja* ‘mistress, lady; name of a goddess’. In turn, **prō-uo-* is attested as such in OHG. *frouwa* ‘wife, woman’; cf. OS. *frūa*, MLG. *frūwe* ‘wife, woman’ from PGerm. **frōwōn*, etc., and also Attic Gk. *πρωρα* ‘prow’ (< **prōu-r-iā*) and in OCS. *pravъ* ‘right’.

3.14. DECOMONIS

The PN *DECOMONIS*, gen. [CIL, 3, 3802], Emona/Ig, goes back to Italic **dekomo-* ‘tenth,’ and can be nothing but Venetic, especially in view of the expression *dekome.i. die.i.* ‘on the tenth day’ in the Tavola d’Este.

3.15. Italic **lajpo-* and the Proto-Italic sound change *#da- > #la-*

The PN LAEPIVS [CIL, 3, 3804], Emona/Ig, occurs as the FN of a Venetic PN PLETOR and is obviously related to the PNs LAEPA, LAEPOCVS, LAEPOCA (VH), a pseudo-gentilic LAEPICVS (Dalmatia), LAEPONIVS (FN, VH). Further details concerning etymology are obscure, but the distribution clearly favours an Italic ascription, and its direct relation with the Lusitanian DN LAEPO (dat. sg., area of Cabeço das Fráguas, Pousafoles, Guarda, Portugal) and LAEBO (with trivial intervocalic voicing) in the indigenous inscription of Cabeço das Fráguas, is once again suggestive of the Italic dialectal filiation of Lusitanian I have long subscribed to.

Accordingly, I would favour the reconstruction of an adjective **deh₂ip-o-* ‘the giver, distributor, munificent,’ which is semantically satisfactory for a DN and shows the Italic shift *#da- > #la-* [see Prósper, 2019b]. This form is indirectly preserved in the resuffixed Greek noun *δειπνον* ‘meal’ (either regularised from **dai₂pno-*, a secondary full grade from **dīpno-*, or even a *v̥rddhi*-formation posterior to laryngeal metathesis, by which **dh₂ipnó- > *dih₂pnó- → *deī(h₂)pno-*). Such Germanic forms as OEng. *tīber*, *tīfer*, OHG. *zebar* ‘sacrificial animal, sacrifice’ (with short *-i-*!), MHG. *ungezibere* ‘impure animal, not fit for sacrifice,’ OIc. *tīvor* ‘offering?,’ from PGerm. **tībra-*,⁴⁸ may be traced back to **dh₂i-p-ró-* with laryngeal metathesis. This casts some doubts on the convenience of correcting the transmitted Goth. *aibr* ‘offering’ into †*tibr*, since the expected form would be †*teibr*. As Sergio Neri (Munich) has pointed out to me (p.c.), the PGerm. form may be a continuant of **deī(h₂)p-ró-* with *v̥rddhi*, since **dih₂pró-* would have given **dipró-* by the action of the *Wetter* rule as recently formulated in [Neri, 2017]. This particular derivative of the root **deh₂-* shows the accumulation of *-i-* and *-p-*, otherwise only found as alternative enlargements in **deh₂-i-* ‘to distribute, give out,’ and **deh₂-p-* ‘to tear, devour, banquet,’ respectively continued, for instance, by Gk. *δαίμων*, Gk. *δαπάνη* ‘banquet,’ Lat. *daps*, *damnum*, Arm. *tawn*, etc.⁴⁹

3.16. RVTIVS and other Venetic forms for ‘red’

ENNAE RVTI F, dat. [CIL, 3, 3821], Emona/Ig, contains a PN **Ruto-* or **Rut(i)jo-*. The pseudo-gentilic RVTIVS [CIL, 5, 932, 1150, 2677], Aquileia and Este, VH, is indicative of its Venetic origin. While [Schaffner, 2016–2017] is probably right that the underlying form is an adjective meaning ‘red,’ there is a number of precisions to be

⁴⁸ See [Schaffner, 2001, 260–267] for a rich discussion of the vocalism and consonantism. His final proposal to reconstruct two different Germanic forms **dipró-* and **deipro-* with *v̥rddhi* to match Gk. *δειπνον* is ingenious but problematic in that the root cannot be identified.

⁴⁹ Garnier [2015] favours an (otherwise poorly attested) root **dep-* ‘presser vivement,’ of which **dap-* would be a neo-zero grade. He disregards the clear Germanic evidence for *-ī-* and explains away Gk. *δειπνον* (fn. 18) as a pre-Greek **dap-no-*, apparently accepting with former scholarship that it has undergone anaptyxis (> **dapino-*) and then metathesis (> **dai₂pno-*) and eventually the attested form. But see [Rieken, 2017] on an overlooked Anatolian instance of this root which confirms the presence of a laryngeal sound: Hitt. *taḫūp(p)aštai-* ‘slaughtering block,’ from a possessive adjective **dh₂p-s-tó-*.

made. To begin with, this is not a Latin gentilic but, given its distribution, a Venetic pseudo-gentilic. Secondly, it is not, as he states, of Gaulish origin, since the distant *comparandum* RVTIO (*recte* RVTTO?) in [CIL, 13, 2756], Augustodunum/Autun, is not certain to belong here at all. This scholar ingeniously relates this name to IE $*h_2reu-$ ‘to shine,’ from which an abstract $*h_2ru-ti-$ was built. He identifies it in Lat. *rutilus* ‘red, shining’ < $*h_2ruti-lo-$, and OIr. *ruithen* ‘shine’ and the EN *Rutēnī* (Narbonensis) < $*h_2rutej-no-$.⁵⁰ The idea that *Rutilius* goes back to $*rutielijo-$ and presupposes a PN $*Rutius$, in turn an early exocentric derivative $*h_2rutiō-$ ‘brilliant’ [see Schaffner, 2016–2017, 108–109], is attractive. This is consequently the base of the Venetic pseudo-gentilic $*Ruti-jo-$.

There is at least one more Venetic PN going back to an IE form for ‘red’: REVSO DRVTI F [CIL, 3, 11304], Scarbantia, Pannonia Superior, can be unproblematically taken from $*h_1reud^h-s-o-$ and is the primary adjectival derivative of the neuter noun $*h_1reud^h-os$ found in Gk. ἔρευθος, Lat. (collective form) *rūbōr* ‘redness’. It consequently teams up with similarly formed pseudo-gentilics like LEVXSIVS ([AE 2012, 556], Este), from $*leuks-o-$, the derivative of a neuter stem $*leuk-os$ in Skt. *rocas-*, Av. *raocah-*; GEVSI(VS) ([AE 1993, 1286], Poetovio/Ptuj, Pannonia Superior), from $*geus-o-$, the derivative of $*geu-os$ in Skt. *javas-*, Av. *zauuah-* ‘swiftness, speed,’ and CLEVSIVS [EDCS, 08000771], Verona, from $*kleus-o-$, the derivative of $*kleu-os$ ‘glory’ in Skt. *śravas-*, Gk. κλέος. The PN REVSO can thus be placed side by side with Lat. *russus* from the zero-form $*h_1rud^h-s-ó-$ [on which see Höfler, 2015; Prósper, 2018b], and rounds out the set of derivatives of this root.

3.17. FEVCONTIS and FEVA in Emona/Šmarata. Can they be taken at face value?

While Repanšek is right that FEVCONTIS [CIL, 3, 10722–10724] and FEVA [Ibid., 10725] look like local renditions of *vho.u.go.n.ta*, *ho.u.vo.s*, etc., his further assertion that this constitutes a trivial case of preservation of /eu/ must be revised. In fact, I have tried to show that Venetic /eu/ is preserved everywhere, which means that, by this token, we would have to find an explanation for /ou/ in the western matches of FEVCONTIS and FEVA [see Prósper, 2018d]. The relevant forms were ignored or misinterpreted by Lejeune [LV, 110–111], who, as is well known, took Padua and Calalzo di Cadore as the only

⁵⁰ As I have contended elsewhere, however [see Prósper, 2016a, 37–38], *rutilus* is more likely to go back to a form with dissimilation of dental sounds, specifically $*h_2ruti-d^h h_1-o-$, like the rest of the Latin adjectives in *-ilus*. I am sceptical as to the existence of early, inherited denominative adjectives in *-lo-* with relational meaning. The evidence adduced by Schaffner is extremely sparse and can be often explained otherwise: OCS. *světīlŭ* ‘shining’ goes back to $*kwojt-i-lo-$, but it is more likely to be deverbative from the causative present form $*kwojt-ejo/e-$ in OCS. *světiti* ‘illuminate.’ The same probably applies to Gk. ποικίλος ‘many-coloured’ < $*poik-i-lo-$, for which the reconstruction of a noun $*poiki-$ ‘bunte Farbe’ looks highly artificial (the exact relationship with Skt. *peśala-* is uncertain, but this may continue an equally deverbative $*peik-e-lo-$). As for the adduced Germanic forms, $*jeki-la-$ ‘ice floe’ may originally be a diminutive (cf. Sp. *hielito*, Fr. *glacon* ‘ice cube’), and $*hurdi-la-$ in OEng. *hyrdel* ‘frame of intertwined twigs’ may equally be a late diminutive from $*hurdi-$ ‘wickerwork door.’

pockets preserving Venetic /eu/. His conclusion is gainsaid not only by the Pannonian examples but also by a number of etymological considerations [see Prósper, 2018d], but, even if we accept the match *fougont-* = FEVCONTIS, the identification of *fouvos* and FEVA presents us with an unsurmountable difficulty: the PNs *ho.u.vo.s*, *houvoniko.s.*, FOVONICVS [LV, 165, 198, 220] in Calalzo (with <h> = /f/) are attested exactly in the area in which Lejeune found his instances of /eu/. By all accounts, then, this particular name cannot contain original /eu/, and its relation to FEVA requires further deductions. In a previous work, I have traced both sets of names to Pltal. **folg-* ‘dazzle,’ and identified them respectively with Lat. *Fulgentius* and Lat. *fulvus* (< **folgu-o-* ‘bright, dazzling,’ ultimately from an athematic adjective preserved in Skt. *bhṛgu-* ‘mythical beings related to fire’) [cf. Prósper, 2018d, 31].

Venetic sequences of two labials, like **fou-* or **you-*, may have been comparatively prone to monophthongisation or loss of the second *-u-* by hypercorrection. This is arguably an early change, as far as original diphthongs are concerned, and only a tendency in the case of *-u-* from velarised *-l-*.⁵¹ This phenomenon can be termed “dissimilation at a distance,” and presupposes that the listener interprets the second labial as a side-effect of the existence of the first; since in this case it is just a glide, it is simply deleted. According to Ohala, dissimilation at a distance is possible because there is a high degree of articulation transferring features of a consonant to the other through the intervening vowel. The shared feature of the two sounds spreads onto the intervening segments and the listener erroneously attributes it to one, not both of them. This is, in fact, how consonant dissimilation, even across syllables, must have proceeded in Italic, where it operates almost regularly, in contradistinction to most languages: see, for instance, the Latin shift *-l-l- > -l-r-*, or Venetic *-r-r- > -r-l-* [cf. Prósper, 2019a, 24].

Interestingly, the contact-induced dissimilation that has given rise to FEVCONTIS and FEVA operates differently: to begin with, it is not an internal change, but must be put down to the Celticity of the scribes, who perceived Venetic [g] as their own lax voiceless [ġ], which belonged to the phoneme /k/ and was consequently rendered <c>. Second, it is effected by the listener factoring out the medial vowel, which is perceived as the consonantly-induced distortion of /e/. This is only to be expected, since, to begin with, the Celtic scribes must have been well aware of Venetic words frequently containing the sequence [eu] and of this being one of the main traits distinguishing

⁵¹ Cf. [Prósper, 2018d, 32, fn. 36]: in Aquileia, there is a DN FONIONI which I take from **b^hou(H)-ni-* ‘favourable’ (originally a noun), and there are two comparatively late cases of monophthongisation in the PNs *v.hogo[.n].ta* [LV, 24b], Este, *vhogotna.i*. [Ibid., 89], Este, and *hovo*, FOVONICVS [Ibid., 198, 220], Calalzo. The PNs *voto.s.*, *vote.i.iio.s.*, Este, may be traced back to a form of the root *(h)*uegth-*. The expected participle of the causative formation preserved in Lat. *voveō* ‘to offer’ is **uogth-e-to-* (> Lat. *vōtum*, U. *vufetes*). Still, U. *vufru* goes back to **uogth-ro-*. I contend **you-to-* replaced **youe-to-* and was thereupon monophthongised. The noun *vot.tso.m*. [Ibid., 188], Calalzo, may consequently go back to **you-(i)io-*. This additionally explains the gentilic FOVSCIVS (twice in VH, a *peregrinator*) as a hypercorrection.

both dialects. In addition, for the reasons stated above, they were conscious of their own system lacking the sequence $C^{[+labial]}V^{[+mid +front]}$. As a consequence, they hypercorrected the Venetic sequence *fou-* to *feυ-*. In sum, FEVCONTIS and FEVA are the product of a higher degree of scribal cautiousness in Šmarata than in Ig, at least as far as foreign names were concerned, which is consistent with their correct rendition of Venetic /f/. As observed above, this is an inescapable conclusion if FEVA has to be equated to *fouvos*.⁵²

We can conclude that the scribes of Emona and Šmarata, when faced with the need of rendering Venetic /f/, have made opposed decisions: Emona has “celticised” the forms containing it and imposed labial coarticulation to the following vowel. By contrast, the writing tradition of Šmarata has felt the need of identifying it with Latin [f], and additionally has gone so far as to boldly hypercorrect a “Celtic-looking” [ou], or even [o:], into [eu].

4. Conclusions

4.1. I have not found a single name in the area of Emona that cannot be explained as either Gaulish or Venetic. The existence of such linguistic or onomastic systems as “Iggian” or “North-Adriatic” is as uneconomic as it is impossible to prove. It is based on phonetic misconceptions (e.g. the need to explain why a diphthong /eu/ is preserved that runs counter to Lejeune’s doctrine on the matter) and alleged morphological peculiarities which remain unconvincing.

The Venetic layer seems to be superficial in Emona/Ig at least, and mostly consists of forms attested elsewhere, which are occasionally reflected as they were perceived by native speakers of a Celtic language. Venetic PNs are: BVQVORSA, BVCTOR, DECOMONIS, ENIGNVS/ENINNAE, ENNAE, FEVA, FEVCONTIS, LAEPIVS, LASCIOANTIAE, LASSONIAE, MOLOTA(E), NEVNTIVS, PLETOR, POPTEIVS, RVTIVS, [?]TALSI, TATSORIAE, VOLTARO, VOLTAE, VOLTOGNAS, VOLTREX, VOLTVPARIS.

Specifically, the deviant renditions are due to:

a) celtic scribes disregarding the voiceless labiodental phoneme /f/ (in Emona/Ig, BVQVORSA, BVCTOR), which was, however, correctly rendered in Emona/Šmarata (FEVA, FEVCONTIS);

b) a mismatch between the outcome of the PIE phonemes traditionally reconstructed as plain stops (e.g. /t/, /d/) in Venetic (probably realised as [t], [d] in every context) as opposed to Gaulish (respectively realised in anlaut position as

⁵² By contrast, this phenomenon is not expected to happen in vernacular Venetic, where, contrary to expectations, the distorted vowel between two identical consonants is not corrected. Thus, the PN CON-CERIO (Adria) presupposes the following steps: IE **penk^ue* > **k^uenk^ue* (by assimilation of labiovelars) > **k^uonk^ue* (by assimilatory rounding between two consecutive labiovelars) > **k^uonke* (by dissimilation of labiovelars) > **konke* (by consonant-to-vowel dissimilation) [cf. Prósper, 2016b]. This is probably a Proto-Italic phenomenon, since Lat. *quīnque* is necessarily analogical [cf. Kümmel, 2012–2013].

[t^(h)], [d] vs. inlaut [d̥], [ð]) [Prósper, 2019a]. The Venetic phonemic contrast may have been between tense and lax stops in every position (though we are in the dark as to the outcome of voiced aspirate phonemes), and the original Celtic contrasts have been distorted due to lenition. Thus, for perceptual reasons, original Venetic voiced phonemes may surface as voiceless stops in writing (as in FEVCONTIS, BVQVORSA), and Venetic intervocalic tense voiceless stops may occasionally be confused with clusters (POPTEIVS);

c) a mismatch between Celtic *-gn-/-kn-* vs. Venetic *-ɣn-* (in ENIGNVS/ENINNAE);

d) consonant-to-vowel Venetic coarticulation of [o] when flanked by front consonants (TATSORIAE, VOLTOGNAS, LASCIOANTIAE and perhaps SVBLOANI). The outcome is taken at face value in Emona/Ig. By contrast, in Emona/Šmarata the sequence *fou-* is perceived as the product of coarticulation, and consequently hypercorrected (FEVA, FEVCONTIS);

e) the fact that LASCONTIAE, LASCIOANTIAE, [LA]STIONTIAE presuppose a sequence **-k̄io-* and show ongoing palatalisation and the consequent auditory confusion experienced by non-native scribes.

4.2. A sizable number of names is of Gaulish ancestry, in all likelihood transmitted by Gauls who were literate in Latin and well aware of the standardised transcription of Gaulish names; the observed discrepancies from “central” or “standard” Gaulish are due to two trivial, unconnected changes:

a) fronting of [a], [a:] > [æ], [æ:] when an alveolar or palatal consonant precedes (in technical terms, context-bound raising of F2). This phenomenon has been noted for a long time in studies of Eastern Latin and may have been regular in vast areas of the Eastern Roman Empire. If it is an areal feature, its original locus is unknown: it affects Celtic, but also Greek forms (see the DN PRIEPO as far to the East as Alba Iulia, Dacia);

b) backing of [a] > [o] (DEVONTIAE, MOSSONIS, perhaps EBONICI), and [o] > [u] (BVTONI, BVIO), technically context-bound lowering of F2 and F1, as well as centralisation of [e] > [ɜ] (BEATVLONIS), take place exclusively when these vowels are preceded by a labial sound, either a stop, a fricative, a sonorant or an approximant. Since items affected by the shift [a] > [o] are not further affected by the shift [o] > [u], we can be reasonably sure that the first change counterfeeds the second and therefore must have taken place posterior to it.⁵³ Both changes have occurred before Celtic, Venetic, and Latin were in contact. As a consequence, all sequences strictly *c o m p a t i b l e* with synchronic Gaulish sequences of labial + vowel are preserved; that is to say, labial + [o] is *n o t* further raised to [u] in Venetic names which have been neither adopted by Gaulish speakers nor, *a fortiori*, transmitted to their children, like VOLTVPARIS (-ā-), POTEI, PO{P}

⁵³ For morphological reasons, the first vowel of common suffixes like *-alo-* does not undergo this change: cf. DRIBALO (dat.), whose root (< *d^(h)ɣb^h-?) is attested elsewhere in the *Keltiké*, but the whole form is only paralleled by another case in present-day Ucraina, OT OPALO, OPPALO, OPPALONI(S), regularly derived from *Oppos*.

TEIVS. By contrast, [a] is backed to [o] in the contexts in question (as in BOLERIANVS, NEVNITVS).

In fact, a three-stage change [o] > [u], [a] > [o], [e] > [ɜ] looks much like the internal system readjustment labeled “chaîne de traction” or drag chain in the French structuralist tradition [cf. Martinet, 1952, *II*]. If the evolution **botto-* > *butto-* proposed above has anything to recommend itself, the first change of the chain is more widespread than the other two and embraces the whole of Pannonia. As far as we know, this chain had no further-reaching consequences leading to dephonemicisation in our case. The proposed regularity militates in favour of an internally motivated change, and speaks against the idea that language contact is involved, and that these spellings reflect an elusive Iggian dialect that fails to represent unfamiliar names correctly.

4.3. Gaulish has not fricativised [u] into [v]. As a consequence, Gaulish speakers may interpret Late Latin [v] or [β] as their own lenited (fricativised) [β] from IE /b/ and phonologise it as /b/, spelled in the partially “celticised” BOLERIANI/BOLERIAVS by scribes who were insufficiently familiar with Latin onomastics or who, perhaps more probably, did not distinguish a Latin form distorted beyond recognition. Bear in mind, in turn, that Venetic occasionally confuses the Gaulish product of lenited IE /m/ with its own [v] (from [u]), as may be deduced from Alpine Venetic *klutavikos*. Conversely, in Ven. **kleumōn-*, possibly reflected as CLEVVONI in Noricum [EDCS, 14400432] (Aguntum), *-Vumōn-* may have been adopted as *-Vūβōn-* by Celtic speakers and then put down in writing by a bilingual scribe who chose <VV> for a name he had no previous experience of.

The lost epitaph [CIL, 3, 3855] (Emona/Ljubljana), on which cf. [Šašel-Kos, 2017, 443], contains an unparalleled instance of FIBIONIS for VIBIONIS. If the inscription was correctly read, this means that the scribe used <F> for Latin <V> this time. This is only to be expected since, as [Justeson & Stephens, 1989] have shown, fricativisation of [u] is a process of palatalisation starting in palatal contexts and/or positionally favourable contexts, namely in anlaut. In addition, it suggests that it had a labiodental articulation [v] that was alien to Celtic ears and therefore classed as an instance of /f/ (but bear in mind this is not entirely diagnostic, since a sound [β], the lenited outcome of IE /b/, would be unexpected in initial position anyway). As pointed out in former works, Šmarata displays traits not shared by Ig, where Venetic /f/ is universally reflected as . ⁵⁴

4.4. The putative examples of a Celtic assimilatory change *-gi-* > *-yi-* > *-ii-* are, in my view, ungrounded. The eastern Latin inscriptions, as well as those in the Latin and Lugano alphabets from Transpadana, normally use the sequence <GI> to render *-yi-*. By contrast, as I have tried to show above (2.1.2), the Venetic record does show Celtic

⁵⁴ Note that, since most languages have at most one labiodental, and this is usually /f/, it is idle to look for a phonetic cause for this phenomenon. With our extant materials, all we can say is that the scribal tradition of Ig favoured a spelling that conformed to Celtic patterns, as opposed to Šmarata, where it was automatically equated to its Latin counterpart.

forms with a simplified spelling, which is understandable since Venetic did not have that particular sequence, and perhaps neither [ɣ] (from /g^h/). The case of the dubious form MOIOTA may rest on a misreading of mangled stones; BVIO, etc., as we have seen, is not a reliable case of original *-gi-*. It is accordingly likely that Gaul. *-yi-* was preserved and rendered differently from etymological *a n d* synchronic *-(i)i-*.

4.5. As contended by [Repaňsek, 2016a, 324], “the use of gentile names clearly connects Šmarata with the rest of the north Adriatic, while the peripheral position of Ig is betrayed by the retention of the old patronymic formula”. But this is especially true when Venetic onomastics are used, which probably simply means that we are dealing with a Venetic colony. In turn, this justifies the comparatively careful (and occasionally hypercorrect) way in which Celtic scribes render purely Venetic names. In other words, it is not that we are dealing with “different onomastic systems,” whatever that vacuous expression actually means here, but with a different degree and social importance of Venetic infiltration, different scribal decisions, and a different choice and proportion of otherwise well-known Italic names. In point of fact, it cannot be ruled out that these structures are indigenous Venetic filiation formulas transferred to Latin epigraphy, and that the usual label “pseudogentilics” is therefore off the mark here, since it cannot be proved that integration in the Latin onomastic system was consciously targeted.

As a language that once encompassed the best part of the Indo-European continent, Gaulish must have been stratified well before its names were put down in writing in the Latin alphabet. The Eastern Gaulish variety attested in Pannonia is notable for reflecting a higher degree of coarticulation than western Gaulish. The outcome follows a very consistent pattern which reveals that the sound shifts took place well before the writing practice set in. By contrast, the Venetic names are very hesitantly reflected, show deviant traits that cannot be original, and inconsistent spellings surface, since there is, to begin with, no expertise for Venetic names in this area.

AAeg — Bohn, R., & Schuchhardt, C. (1889). *Altertümer von Aegae. Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft*, 2. Berlin: Reimer.

Adamik, B. (2011). „Fehlerhafte“ lateinische Inschriften aus Pannonien. In S. Kiss, L. Mondin, & G. Salvi (Eds.), *Latin et langues romanes. Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire* (pp. 257–266). Tübingen: De Gruyter.

AE — Cagnat, R. et al. (Eds.). (1888–). *L'Année Epigraphique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

AII — Hoffiller, V., & Saria, B. (1970). *Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslawien. I: Noricum und Pannonia superior*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Alderete, J. D., & Frisch, S. A. (2007). Dissimilation in Grammar and the Lexicon. In P. De Lacy (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Phonology* (pp. 379–401). Cambridge: CUP.

Anreiter, P. (2001). *Die vorrömischen Namen Pannoniens*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.

Baglioni, D. (2014). Il nesso GN dal latino alle lingue romanze: questioni aperte e prospettive di ricerca [The Evolution of the Cluster GN from Latin to Romance: Open Questions and Perspectives].

- In P. Molinelli, P. Cuzzolin, & Ch. Fedriani (Eds.), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif X. Actes du X^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Bergamo, 5–9 septembre 2012* (pp. 3–24). Bergamo: Bergamo University Press.
- BBIII — Beltrán, F., Untermann, J., & De Hoz, J. (1996). *El tercer bronce de Botorrita* [The Third Bronze from Botorrita]. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- CIL — Mommsen, T. et al. (Eds.). (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- DLG — Delamarre, X. (2003). *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*. Paris: Errance.
- Eck, W., & Pangerl, A. (2011). Drei Konstitutionen im Jahr 123 für Truppen von Dacia Porolissensis unter dem Präsidialprokurator Livius Gratus. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 17, 234–242.
- EDCS — *Epigraphik Datenbank Clauss-Slaby*. Retrieved from <http://www.manfredclaus.de>.
- EDLIL — De Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- EDPC — Matasović, R. (2009). *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden, Brill.
- EDR — *Epigraphic Database Roma*. Retrieved from <http://www.edr-edr.it/>.
- Frotscher, M. (2012). The Fate of PIE final *-r in Vedic and Latin. In B. Nielsen Whitehead, Th. Olander, B. A. Olsen, & J. E. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The Sound of Indo-European. Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics* (pp. 73–96). Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Garnier, R. (2015). *Daps, epulum et sollemnis*: une famille méconnue en latin. In E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld, & B. Podolak (Eds.), *Words and Dictionaries. A Festschrift for Professor Stanisław Stachowski on the Occasion of his 85th Birthday* (pp. 127–137). Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.
- Gordon, M. K. (2006). *Syllable Weight. Phonetics, Phonology, Typology*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Hamp, E. P. (1976a). On some Gaulish Names in -ant- and Celtic Verbal Nouns. *Ériu*, 27, 1–20.
- Hamp, E. P. (1976b). Illyrian *Neunt(i)us*. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 81, 43–44.
- Höfler, S. (2015). Denominale Sekundärderivation im Indogermanischen: Eine Ochsentour. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 69(2), 219–243.
- Justeson, J. S., & Stephens, L. D. (1989). Cross-Linguistic Generalizations Concerning Frication of w. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 2, 247–254.
- Katičić, R. (1976). *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. The Hague: Mouton.
- KGP — Schmidt, K.-H. (1957). *Die Komposition in Gallischen Personennamen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- KPNP — Meid, W. (2005). *Keltische Personennamen in Pannonien*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Krahe, H. (1929). *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kümmel, M. J. (2012–2013). Etymologie und Phonologie: Umbrisch *amboltu*. *Die Sprache*, 50(1/2), 31–43.
- Lambert, P.-Y., & Stifter, D. (2012). Le texte gaulois de Rezé. *Études Celtiques*, 38, 139–143.
- Lejeune, M. (1952). Les bronzes votifs vénètes de Gurina (étude épigraphique). *Revue des études anciennes*, 54(3/4), 267–274.
- Lejeune, M. (1994). Notes d'étymologie gauloise: XII. Un verbe de dedicace *ειωρατ*. *Études Celtiques*, 30, 178–180.
- LIV — Rix, H. et al. (2001). *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- LV — Lejeune, M. (1974). *Manuel de la langue venète*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Marinetti, A., & Solinas, P. (2014). I celti del Veneto nella documentazione epigrafica locale [Celts of Veneto in the Local Epigraphic Documents]. In Ph. Barral, J. P. Guillaumet, M.-J. Roulière-Lambert, M. Saracino, & D. Vitali (Eds.), *Les Celtes et le Nord de l'Italie (Premier et Second Âges du Fer). Actes du XXXVI^e Colloque International de l'A.F.E.A.F.* (pp. 75–88). Dijon: RAE.
- Marotta, G. (1999). The Latin Syllable. In H. Van der Hulst et al. (Eds.), *The Syllable* (pp. 285–311). Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
- Martinet, A. (1952). Function, Structure and Sound Change. *Word*, 8, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1952.11659416>
- McCone, K. (1996). *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. Maynooth: St. Patrick's College.

- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (2007). Ex praesente lux. In I. Hajnal (Ed.), *Die altgriechischen Dialekte, Wesen und Werden* (pp. 355–384). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- MLH — Untermann, J., et al. (Eds.). (1975–). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- MLM — De Simone, C., & Marchesini, S. (2002). *Monumenta Linguae Messapicae*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Morandi, A. (2017). *Epigrafia Italica 2* [Italic Epigraphy 2]. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.
- Neri, S. (2017). *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz* [Wetter. Etymology and Sound Law]. Culture, Territori, Linguaggi 14. Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia.
- Ohala, J. (1981). The Listener as a Source of Sound Change. In C. S. Masek et al. (Eds.), *Papers from the Parasession of Language and Behavior* (pp. 178–203). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Pellegrini, G. B., & Prosdocimi, A. L. (1967). *La lingua venetica I. Le iscrizioni, II. Studi* [The Venetic Language I. The Inscriptions. II. Studies]. Padua: Istituto di Glottologia dell’Università.
- Peters, M. (1999). Gall(o.-Lat.) *marcosior*. In P. Anreiter, & E. Jerem (Eds.), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica. Festschrift Wolfgang Meid* (pp. 305–314). Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Pocetti, P. (2013). Eine neue kalendarische Angabe im Oskischen mit einem Exkurs über den Vornamen *Minis*. *Linguarum Varietas*, 2, 207–222.
- Prosdocimi, A. L. (1984). Una nuova iscrizione venetica da Oderzo (*Od 7) con elementi celtici [A New Venetic Inscription with Celtic Elements from Oderzo]. In M. G. Marzi Costagli, & L. Tamagno Perna (Eds.), *Studi di antichità in onore di Guglielmo Maetzke* [Studies in Antiquity in Honor of Guglielmo Maetzke] (Vol. 2, pp. 423–442). Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Prósper, B. M. (2014). Some Considerations on Metathesis and Vowel Epenthesis in Hispano-Celtic. *Wek^{os}*, 1, 207–216.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016a). *The Indo-European Names of Central Hispania. A Study in Continental Celtic and Latin Word Formation*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016b). The Indo-European Ordinal Numerals “Fourth” and “Fifth” and the Reconstruction of the Celtic and Italic Numeral Systems. *Die Sprache*, 51, 1–50.
- Prósper, B. M. (2017a). Two Divinities of the Celtic Cantabri: 1) ERVDINO, Divinity of the Yearly Cycle. 2) CABVNIAEGINO, the Celtic Fate of IE *kap- and the Gaulish Spindle Whorl from Saint-Révérien. In R. Häussler, & A. King (Eds.), *Celtic Religions in the Roman Period. Personal, Local and Global* (pp. 207–228). Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications.
- Prósper, B. M. (2017b). Proto-Italic Laryngeals in the Context C₁HC- and New Italic and Celtic Etymological Connections. *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia*, 19, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.19272/201704801004>
- Prósper, B. M. (2018a). The Venetic Agent Nouns in -tōr- Revisited. In J. M. Vallejo, I. Igartua, & C. García Castillero (Eds.), *Studia Philologica et Diachronica in Honorem Joaquín Gorrochategui* [Philological and Diachronic Studies in Honor of Joaquín Gorrochategui] (pp. 453–471). Vitoria: Publicaciones de la Universidad del País Vasco.
- Prósper, B. M. (2018b). The Venetic Names of Roman Siscia. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 15(3), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.031
- Prósper, B. M. (2018c). 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://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.2.017
- Prósper, B. M. (2018d). The Venetic Inscription from Monte Manicola and three *termini publici* from Padua: A Reappraisal. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 46, 1–61.
- Prósper, B. M. (2019a). Celtic and Venetic in Contact: The Dialectal Attribution of the Personal Names in the Venetic Record. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 66, 7–52.
- Prósper, B. M. (2019b). What Became of “Sabine l’”? An Overlooked Proto-Italic Sound Law. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 47(3–4), 1–51.
- Prósper, B. M. (In press). Mars Veneticus. To appear in a *Festschrift*.
- Recasens, D. (2014). *Coarticulation and Sound Change in Romance*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Repanšek, L. (2016a). *Quiemonis* and the Epichoric Anthroponymy of Ig. *Arheološki vestnik*, 67, 321–357.
- Repanšek, L. (2016b). New Evidence from the Onomastic Tradition of Ig. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 130, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2017.130.1.90>
- Repanšek, L. (2016c). *Keltska dediščina v toponimiji jugovzhodnega alpskega prostora*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Rieken, E. (2017). Heth. ^{NA4}*taḥūp(p)aštai-* u.ä. ‘Schlachtblock’ und die uridg. Wurzel **deh₂p-* ‘schlachten, zerfleischen’. In I. Hajnal, D. Kölligan, & K. Zipser (Eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag* (pp. 699–704). Innsbruck: IBS.
- RIG-1 — Lejeune, M. (Ed.). (1985). *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* (Vol. 1: Textes gallo-grecs). Paris: CNRS.
- RIG-4 — Colbert de Beaulieu, J.-B., & Fischer, B. (Eds.). (1998). *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*. (Vol. 4: Les légendes monétaires). Paris: CNRS.
- RLSiscia — Radman-Livaja, I. (2010). *Les plombs inscrits de Siscia* (Doctoral dissertation). École pratique des hautes études, Paris.
- Russell, P. (2014). From Compound to Derivative: The Development of a Patronymic “Suffix” in Gaulish. In J.-L. García Alonso (Ed.), *Continental Celtic Word Formation: The Onomastic Data* (pp. 201–214). Salamanca: EUSAL.
- Šašel-Kos, M. (2017). Emona and its Pre-Roman Population: Epigraphic Evidence. *Arheološki vestnik*, 68, 439–458.
- Schaffner, S. (2001). *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Schaffner, S. (2016–2017). Lateinisch *rutilus* ‘rötlich, gelbrot, goldgelb’, altirisch. *ruithen* ‘Strahl, Glanz’ und kymr. *rwt* ‘Korrosion’. *Die Sprache*, 52, 102–123.
- Scheuengraber, C., & Grünzweig, F. E. (2014). *Die Altgermanischen Toponyme sowie ungermanischen Toponyme Germaniens. Ein Handbuch zu ihrer Etymologie*. Vienna: Fassbaender.
- Simon, Zs. (2018). Keltischer Einfluss im Latein Pannoniens? Eine kritische Neubetrachtung. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 23, 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.5817/GLB2018-1-12>
- Smoczyński, W. (2005). *Lexikon der Altpreuussischen Verben*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- ST — Rix, H. (2002). *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Stephens, L. D. (1978). Universals of Consonant Clusters and Latin GN. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 83, 290–300. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110243253_290
- Stifter, D. (2012a). Eine V.I.P. zwischen Pannonien und Tirol. In P. Anreiter et al. (Eds.), *Archaeological, Cultural and Linguistic Heritage. Festschrift for Erzsebet Jerem in Honour of her 70th Birthday* (pp. 539–549). Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Stifter, D. (2012b). On the Linguistic Situation of Roman-period Ig. In T. Meißner (Ed.), *Personal Names in the Western Roman World. Proceedings of a Workshop Convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, Held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16–18 September 2011* (pp. 247–265). Berlin: Curach Bhán.
- Tichy, E. (1995). *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Uhlich, J. (2002). Verbal Governing Compounds (Synthetics) in Early Irish and Other Celtic Languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 100, 403–433.
- Untermann, J. (1961). *Die Venetischen Personennamen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Veranič, D., & Repanšek, L. (2016). Roman Stone Monuments in the Church of St. John the Baptist in Podkraj near Tomišelj. *Arheološki Vestnik*, 67, 297–320.
- Vine, B. (2006). On Thurneysen-Havet’s Law in Latin and Italic. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 119, 211–249.
- Watkins, C. (1955). The Phonemics of Gaulish: The Dialect of Narbonensis. *Language*, 31, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410887>
- 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>

Wireback, K. (2010). On the Palatalization of Latin /ɲn/ in Western Romance and Italo-Romance. *Romance Philology*, 64, 295–306.

WOU — Untermann, J. (2000). *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Zair, N. (2016). *Oscan in the Greek Alphabet*. Cambridge: CUP.

Received 5 August 2019

ABBREVIATIONS

Categories of names

DN	Divine Name	GN	Gamonym
EN	Ethnic Name	PIN	Place Name
FN	Father's Name (patronymic derivative)	PN	Personal Name

Places

VH	Venetia et Histria
----	--------------------

Languages

Arm.	Armenian	O.	Oscan
Av.	Avestan	OAlb.	Old Albanian
BToch.	Tocharian B	OAv.	Old Avestan
Cat.	Catalan	OCS.	Old Church Slavonic
CCelt.	Common Celtic	OEng.	Old English
Celtib.	Celtiberian	OHG.	Old High German
Cz.	Czech	Olc.	Old Icelandic
Eng.	English	OIr.	Old Irish
Fr.	French	OPr.	Old Prussian
Gaul.	Gaulish	OS.	Old Saxon
Gk.	Greek	Pael.	Paelignian
Goth.	Gothic	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Hitt.	Hittite	PGerm.	Proto-Germanic
IE	Indo-European	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
It.	Italian	PItal.	Proto-Italic
Lat.	Latin	Skt.	Sanskrit
Latv.	Latvian	SP.	South-Picene
Lith.	Lithuanian	Sp.	Spanish
MHG.	Middle High German	U.	Umbrian
MLG.	Middle Low German	Ven.	Venetic
MW.	Middle Welsh		

* * *

Prósper, Blanca María

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

Проспер, Бланка Мария

PhD, профессор кафедры 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

ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ЭВОЛЮЦИЯ В КОНТАКТНОЙ ЗОНЕ: КЕЛЬТСКОЕ, ВЕНЕТСКОЕ И ПРОЧЕЕ В ЛИЧНЫХ ИМЕНАХ ЭМОНЫ

Настоящая статья посвящена изучению некоторых прежде некорректно интерпретированных личных имен из надписей, найденных в Эмоне (*Colonia Iulia Emona*, ныне Любляна, Словения). Частично эти имена признавались индоевропейскими, частично — принадлежащими неизвестному диалекту, обозначаемому в литературе терминами *иггийский* или *северноадриатический*. Однако, по мнению автора, достижения контактной лингвистики и кельтологии позволяют корректно проанализировать эти имена и атрибутировать их как восточногалльские либо как италийские. Автор полагает, что признание существования «иггийской» и «северноадриатической» языковых или ономастических систем основывается на неубедительных фонологических и морфологических допущениях. Всесторонний анализ имен, включая новое прочтение некоторых паннонских надписей, позволяет сделать вывод о том, что они часто являются продуктом некорректного понимания и неопытности писца и могут быть объяснены на основе достижений исторической и типологической фонетики и морфонологии в широкой индоевропейской перспективе. С исторической точки зрения исследуемые имена свидетельствуют о влиянии поздних венетских миграций на кельтоязычное ядро городского населения: анализ показывает, что венетский слой в ономастике Эмоны носит поверхностный характер и состоит из форм, обнаруживаемых в других местах, которые в данном случае отражены так, как они могли быть восприняты носителем кельтского языка. Что касается галльского наследия в ономастике Эмоны, то эти имена были переданы галлами, хорошо знакомыми с латынью и со стандартной транскрипцией галльских имен в латинской графике. Анализ также выявляет регулярные различия в писцовых традициях, отраженных в надписях из Ига (*Ig*) и Шмараты (*Smarata*). Эти различия, в свою очередь, поддерживают фонетические и морфологические аргументы автора.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: индоевропеистика, кельтские языки, галльский язык, италийские языки, венетский язык, личные имена, латинская эпиграфика, Эмона, Паннония, языковые контакты.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 05.08.2019