



Luka Repanšek

University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

***Loucita*: Etymological Notes on a Female Name from the Norico-Pannonian Onomastic Landscape**

Voprosy onomastiki, 2020, Vol. 17, Issue 3, pp. 51–64

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2020.17.3.034

Language of the article: English

Luka Repanšek

University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

***Loucita*: Etymological Notes on a Female Name from the Norico-Pannonian Onomastic Landscape**

Вопросы ономастики. 2020. Т. 17. № 3. С. 51–64

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2020.17.3.034

Язык статьи: английский



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



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

DOI 10.15826/vopr_onom.2020.17.3.034
УДК 811.15'373.231 + 811.133'373.231 +
+ 811.1/.2'01 + 811.21/.22'01

Luka Repanšek
University of Ljubljana
Ljubljana, Slovenia

LOUCITA: ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES ON A FEMALE NAME FROM THE NORICO-PANNONIAN ONOMASTIC LANDSCAPE

The undoubtedly Gaulish personal name *Loucita*, attested in the Norico-Pannonian onomastic area, is particularly interesting from the point of view of its word formation. Unambiguous parallels for such a derivative are difficult to find in Celtic onomastic material, the only possible but very uncertain candidate being a Goidelic river name Ἀργίτα, recorded by Ptolemy. Outside of Celtic, the name of a Germanic seeress *Vel(a)eda*, if it goes back to **uelētā-* (which is a probable but not the only possibility), is a potential case in point, which would then unavoidably imply that *Loucita* < **leuk-ēt-ā-* must somehow be based on the oblique stem with a generalised length of the suffixal vowel (**leuk-ēt-*) taken over from the nominative singular, where it was inherited. Since the category of lexicalised, synchronically unproductive dethematic *-*et*-stems in Celtic typically displays exactly that phenomenon, this etymological interpretation cannot be dismissed as ultimately improbable. Another reasonable possibility, however, would be to start from a feminine abstract **louk-i-/leuk-i-* ‘brightness, lustre’ (itself based on the thematic possessive adjective **leuk-ó-* by external derivation), to which *Loucita* could then represent a *barbātus*-type adjectival derivative **leuk-i-to-* ‘having lustre,’ exactly parallel to the type seen in Indo-Iranian colour adjectives. It is argued that the latter type probably does not represent thematic possessives of *t*-abstracts to *i*-stem adjectives but, contrary to the *communis opinio*, rather goes back to *to*-possessives of *i*-stem abstracts. Under both analyses, however, the name is an important addition to the Proto-Indo-European type of derivative in *-*ito-*, so far unambiguously identified only within Indo-Iranian.

К е у в о р д с: Celtic, Gaulish, Proto-Indo-European, Norico-Pannonian onomastic area, anthroponymy, word formation, etymology.

© Repanšek L., 2020

1. The evaluation of attestations

There are three attestations of the Gaulish female name **Loṽkītā* dispersed around the Norico-Pannonian onomastic area, each respective occurrence being a hapax. One finds LOUCITA [CIL, 3, 5289 = RICA, 318] in Hudinja (Slovenija), LOCITA [AIJ, 239 = RINMS, 146 = ILSI, 1, 87] in Mlada Gora by Šmarjeta (Slovenija), and LUCITA [CIL, 3, 14351] at Aquincum. These probably represent variants of one and the same Gaulish prototype and it is tempting to see them as instances of progressively younger phonetic shape: starting from LOUCITA /loṽkītā/ with the diphthong inherited from Proto-Celtic intact, LOCITA must logically represent its already monophthongised variant /lōkītā/, which then in LUCITA would show up already raised to a long *ū* (the process thus superficially matching the Proto-British shift in the back-vowel series) [cf. Meid, 2005, 274]. One should be careful, however, in making a *prima facie* assumption in the latter case. It is indeed true that sporadic instances of Gaulish monophthongisation of Proto-Celtic **ou* to what surfaces in the written sources as <o> = /ō/ are rather characteristic of Gaulish toponymy and anthroponymy in the Norico-Pannonian area — consider cases such as the second element of compound names in *-bona*, which must surely continue **b^houH₂-neH₂*- ‘dwelling (place)’ [see e.g. Bichlmeier, 2015, *ft.* 15], or instances such as ATEBODUUS beside BOUDIO [CIL, 3, 5247, 10795]. What we are witnessing in such cases must either be a sound change *in statu nascendi* or a language stage with an already completed process of monophthongisation but with a few recalcitrant items still exhibiting the old diphthong in the context of the appellative sphere, which is well-known for exhibiting a protracted reaction to the changes in the non-appellative language core. The first scenario is, of course, much more likely, also given the fact that the *ou*-variants do not seem to point to lexicalisations of any kind. It is far from certain, however, that LUCITA itself indeed represents the youngest developmental stage of this name and thus definitely points to an apparent push chain in the back-vowel series in “Eastern” Gaulish of approximately the 1st and 2nd centuries AD, especially in light of the fact that the latter monument does not seem to be younger than the ones still featuring a diphthong (or, for that matter, its still unraised monophthongal product). As far as can be glimpsed from the available material, there are no other unambiguous examples of an early Gaulish merger of long *ō* with *ū* in this area.

The case that could potentially be adduced in support of an early raising in the back-vowel series is the place-name *Crucio* (TP, 4/2), today Groblje pri Šentjerneju (Slovenia). But there is absolutely nothing that would force one to connect the name *directly* to the likes of Welsh *crug* ‘hill(ock)’ and Irish *crúach* ‘id.’ as there is no positive evidence that Celtic **krouko-* did have a possessive *jo*-adjective by its side¹ and the stem **kreu-k-* is not diagnostically Celtic at all. It is very likely that **kr(e)u-k-* *vel sim.*

¹ Note here that British *Pennocrucio* has compound-induced suffixation and is therefore completely uninformative in this respect.

is indeed what is hiding behind the place-name at question, but it certainly does not have to be etymologised as part of the Celtic toponomastic legacy, let alone point to a full-grade root [see Repanšek, 2016, 189–191]. Neither is the Norican pair of personal names COUTIA (Šentvid na Glini) [lupa, 2353] and CUTIO (Poetovio) [CIL, 3, 4083] helpful in any meaningful way, as their etymology is unknown, and even if the names did belong together, CUTIO could of course theoretically represent the zero-grade variant. Bringing in the not unlikely possibility that LUCITA may also quite easily owe its ⟨u⟩ to Latinisation, either by reinterpretation or phonetic substitution, or that it either contains the zero grade of *leuk- or else has been influenced by appellatives that undoubtedly go back to such derivatives, caution is advised in including this example among the evidence for possible early raising of Gaulish *ō. Regardless of the source of the ⟨u⟩, however, LUCITA still probably — and at least indirectly — adds up to the attestations of Gaul. *Loukītā.

The latter is interesting for a rather different reason, however, which is its unique word formation. Since *Loukītā is a monothematic name and its root-etymology is more than obvious, one could first think of a hypocoristic derivative to the widespread Celtic element *louko- < PIE *leukó- ‘bright, shiny,’ but the sequence *-ītā is not found among the productive Gaulish feminine hypocoristic suffixes or suffixal conglomerates. Nor is it likely that we are dealing with a short name (*Kurzname*) to an extrapolated first member of a compound such as a putative (but unattested) *Louceto-mārā-. Since a PCelt. *louk-et- is assured by the relatively abundantly attested *Loucetius*, also spelled *Leucetius*,² a linguistically indubitably Gaulish epithet of Mars, the existence of such a compound is, of course, more than a theoretical possibility. It is true that it is exactly in such a quintisyllable that weakening and even syncope of the auslauting sequence -et-o- would be expected and both are in fact even assured by cases such as MOGETIMARUS [Corpus, NOR, 155] and MOGIT-MARUS [CIL, 3, 3325], perhaps also MOGITU- [CIL, 12, 731] [see Sims-Williams, 2015, 325]. This would, however, be a unique case of a *Kurzname* reflecting late and sporadic phonetic changes of its derivational base. An evolution envisaged as *Louceto-mārā > *Loucit(o)-mārā → *Loucitā thus rather fails to convince as an elegant solution. Taken at face value, this leaves us with two distinct possibilities as to the name’s etymological interpretation.

2.1. Towards an etymological proposal 1

Under the caveat that ⟨i⟩ in an inscriptional attestation of an etymologically opaque Celtic word must be considered ultimately ambiguous, one of the conceivable theoretical possibilities would be to project the name back to the feminine form

² Both from Germania superior, including two singular attestations with ⟨ou⟩ from Britain [CIL, 7, 36 = RIB, 1, 140] and Gallia Lugdunensis [CIL, 13, 3087]. See [Scheungraber, 2020, 357–359] for a full and up-to-date list of attestations.

of a thematic adjective **leuk-ēt-o-* > PCelt. **louk-īt-o-*.³ Such an explanation would have to start from PIE **leuk-é-t-* ‘the bright one,’ an externally derived individualisation of the underlying denominal possessive **leuk-ó-* ‘bright,’ functionally comparable to the standard transition to a nasal stem, in this particular case actually reflected in LOUCO from Dunaújváros [RIU, 5, 1224] < **leuk-ó-n-* ‘id.’. This type of derivative behaves as a descriptively hysterodynamic base and can be immediately paralleled with the likes of Gr. ἀργής, -έτ- ‘white; shiny, bright; flashing, gleaming.’ The latter goes back directly to **H₂erǵ-é-t-*, itself derived from **H₂erǵ-ó-* = Gr. ἀργός ‘white; bright; flashing (quick)’.⁴ As is well established, the nominative singular of such and other dental stems regularly ended in PIE **-ēs* by early assimilation and degemination of the cluster **ts* (followed by analogical but systematic lengthening of the suffixal vowel in imitation of the resonant stems, where such compensatory lengthening was the result of Szemerényi’s Law). As is clearly demonstrated by the parallel Greek declensional pattern ἀργής, -ῆτ-, the length of the suffixal vowel could undergo subsequent generalisation in the individual branches, the same levelling process being also securely attested for Celtic in just such a stem. As unambiguously shown by its steady high front vowel in the root as the result of raising (**e* > **i* / __ V[+high]) and the Primitive Irish attestation VELITAS (Gsg.) > *fileth* /f’il’əθ/, OIr. *fili* ‘seer; poet’ < **uīlth* < PCelt. **uelīs* < PIE **uelēs* (Nsg. to **uel-é-t-*) is a solid proof that inherited stems in *-et-* obviously underwent a comparable sort of ablaut flattening. Note, however, that the synchronically productive group of dental derivatives in *-et-* (all deverbal agent nouns) typically end in **-i* < *-eh* < **-et-s* in the Nsg. and accordingly display a steady **-et-* throughout the oblique stem.⁵ Since PCelt. **louk-īt-t-* would most certainly have belonged to the recessive type, quite possibly with the properties of a lexicalised petrifact, the survival of the albeit secondary but nevertheless synchronically unproductive length in the suffix is at least feasible. That being said, a PCelt. **louk-īt-t-* as the derivational base of **louk-īt-ā-* convinces only if the latter represents the reflex of a synchronically productive type of feminine.

³Note that since this is a name, we could also be dealing with an athematic **leuk-ēt-*. To this *Loucita* would then quite unproblematically represent an instance of a short name of the type observable in the case of NERTA (to **nerto-* ‘strength’), or GIAMA (to **giamo-* ‘winter’).

⁴As an aside, note that despite the otherwise well-founded doubts as to the existence of such a thematic adjective in the case of PIE **H₂erǵ-*, Gr. ἀργός being also derivable from **arg-ró-* by dissimilation, the Histrian river name *Argao** (most likely from **H₂erǵ-ó/eH₂-yo-n-*) decisively shows that such a base was in fact available in the proto-language (see [Repanšek, 2014a] for the etymology).

⁵A distribution not paralleled by the reflexes of holodynamic *t*-stems (synchronic *ot*-stems), which exhibit a unitary asymmetry between the Nsg. in **-ūs* < **-ōs* < ***ot-s* (as proved by Brythonic and indirectly by Goidelic) and oblique **ot-*. Note here that Rieken’s proterodynamic type **CéC-ot-/*CC-ét-s* [Rieken, 1999, 92], set up to explain the difference in the ablaut between, e.g., Lat. *teges*, *-et-* ‘roof’ and Goth. *mitaps**, *-ad-* ‘measure,’ does not exist. The *teget*-type is clearly based on a thematic stem (by nature incapable of quantitative ablaut) and as such does not belong together with the likes of PGmc. **metað-* or, for that matter, PCelt. **lukot-* ‘mouse,’ which is obviously deradical.

There are two pieces of parallel evidence that could speak in favour of such an interpretation. The first is Ptolemy's rendering of a Goidelic river name Ἀργίτα, which could conceivably stand for Early Goidelic **Argūtā* < PCelt. **argītā* < **arg-ēt-ā-* (as already suggested by [de Bernardo Stempel, 2000, 103]) ← PIE **H₂erǵ-é-t-*. The alternative hypothesis, originally proposed by [Pokorny, 1950, 130] and defended by [Sims-Williams, 2000, 6] as well as myself [Repanšek, 2014b, *ft.* 24], would rather see in this attestation an Early Goidelic /Argædā/ < PCelt. **Argantā* < **H₂erǵ-nt-e-H₂* (to PIE **H₂erǵ-nt-ó-* 'silvery'), but this admittedly rests more or less on the fact that there are numerous parallels to such a *v̥*ddhied *nt*-derivative (especially productive in toponymy),⁶ whereas **arg-ēt-ā-* as a derivational type cannot really be brought in line with any other available Celtic data (especially since a direct comparison with *Loucīta* would create a circular argument). It is to be noted, however, that Ptolemy's <ιτ> in this particular entry does not tally well with his <Ἐδ> in Ἐδρου for /ædros/ < **Antros*, which indubitably reflects the Early Goidelic outcome of **-ant-* (> **-ānt-* > **-āent-* > **-æd-*). This may be a rather strong argument against the **Argantā* hypothesis, though neither can there be any kind of reassurance that Ἀργίτα indeed reflects **arg-īt-ā-* < **arg-ēt-ā-*, given that it could also simply go back to a *barbātus*-type derivative **arg-i-tā-* with a short **i* in the internal suffix (on which more shortly). Be that as it may, due to the ultimate ambiguity of its underlying word formation Ἀργίτα simply cannot be used as a secure parallel that would significantly help to account for the morphology lurking behind *Loucīta*.

A more promising piece of comparable morphology, however, is the Old Germanic⁷ female name *Vel(a)eda* ~ Οὐ[ε]λήδα/βελήδα attested by Tacitus, Cassius Dio and Statius (see [Schuhmann, 1999, 136] for the full list of attestations), a form corresponding closely to the already mentioned OIr. *fili*. Although the original length of the vowel in the suffix is made uncertain by the discrepancy between the spelling (<ae> = <η>), which seems to speak strongly in favour of /ē/, and the metrical evidence, which demands a short *ě*,⁸ it is significant that the overt feminisation here apparently involves an accent shift, so **uel-ēt-ā-* > PGmc. **uel-ěð-ā-*. This stands in stark contrast with simple thematisations of similar dental stems, in which the dental suffix seems to retain the accent. Consider in this respect OE *hæle* 'man; hero' < **hal-éz* (in favour of the retention of the old, inherited **-z* as opposed to the theoretically possible **hal-ēþ*

⁶ Though necessarily reaching back to a time before the generalization of the adjective's endocentric substantivisation 'silver (metal).'

⁷ *Pace* [Schuhmann, 1999, 137 *ff.*]. There is absolutely no need to see in this name an early Celtic loanword into Germanic. His arguments in favour of an apparently unraised **ē* in what he assumes to be a genuinely Celtic word do not withstand closer scrutiny.

⁸ [Schuhmann, 1999, 137–138] seems to make a good case for favouring the non-metrical evidence over Statius' *ě*. I do not think it is at all likely, however, that these difference could in any way point to two variants of one and the same name [*pace* Weiss, 2018, *ft.* 22], since it is not a consonantal stem we are dealing with here but a derived, fully fledged feminine variant, whose derivational base must have been fixed as either **uel-eθ-* or **uel-ěθ-*.

with a restored dental cf. Old Norse *halr*), oblique *helið* < **hal-it*- < **hal-ét*- versus OE *helið* = OS *helið* < **haliθa*- < **xal-éth-a*- < **kol-ét-o*-. The obviously conflicting behaviour of the feminine **CEC-ēt-ā*- as against a purely thematised **CEC-ét-o*- in Germanic should at least reinforce the possibility that the likes of possible Celtic **arg-īt-ā*- and **louk-īt-ā*-, if they are that, do not go back to any kind of purely structural thematisations of underlying **arg-é-t*- and **louk-é-t*-, in which one would probably expect the *e*-grade of the suffix (cf. in this respect the divine epithet *Loucetius* < **louk-é-t-īo*- that securely attests to a short vowel in the suffix). Rather, seeing that we are dealing with female names, these should be based *directly* on **arg-īt*- < **arg-ēt*- and **louk-īt*- < **leuk-ēt*-. Note, however, that in the case of the Proto-Germanic name, a **uel-ēð-ā*- (under this scenario unavoidably with a short **e*)⁹ could also be based on an external possessive derivative of the underlying feminine abstract noun **uel-é-t*- ‘seeing,’¹⁰ so **uel-e-t-ó/éH₂*- ‘endowed with seeing’ > ‘seeress,’ in which one would of course expect just such an accent shift.¹¹

2.2. Towards an etymological proposal 2

Another and, in terms of its structural transparency, significantly more promising solution would start from an acrostatic abstract noun **l^h/uk-i*- ‘brightness,’ itself externally derived from **leuk-ó*- ‘bright’ (> Gr. λευκός ‘shining, resplendent’), to which the thematic base lying behind the female name **le/ouk-i-te-H₂*- would then represent a substantivisation of an externally derived possessive adjective in *-to-* (the so-called *barbātus*-type derivative) ‘having brightness’ > ‘bright, lustrous’.¹² An immediately comparable morphology is found in a set of Indo-Iranian

⁹ This would, however, inevitably mean that the name must have been recorded either prior to the general Proto-Germanic raising of unaccented short **e* to **i* and after the fixation of the accent on the first syllable (**uel-ēð-ā*-) or still at the **uel-ēð-ā*- stage, which given the relative lateness of the sources is not at all probable and would, moreover, seem to be a rather secure indication of the original length of the suffixal vowel.

¹⁰ For the type see now [Pinault, 2018, 360].

¹¹ The same holds true of *Loucetius*, at least as a theoretical possibility and in case that the latter derivative is not superficially agentivised (that is to say, equipped with **-īo*- as the productive Celtic agentive suffix upon the equation of the base with the productive synchronic type of agent noun in **CEC-et*-, on which see [Irslinger, 2002, 46–47; Repanšek, 2014b, 245 ff.]), or even hypocoristic in nature (as is its exact Latin equivalent *Lūcetius*), but in fact based on a possessive adjective in **-(i)īo-* to the underlying abstract **leuk-é-t*- ‘shining, brightness,’ producing in effect an epithet **leuk-e-t-(i)īo-* ‘shiny, bright, lustrous’ (→ substantivised as ‘the lustrous’) of a comparable semantic range as **leuk-é-t*- (→ **leuk-ét-īo-*) ‘the lustrous one’.

¹² As intimated by the likes of Gr. λοῦσσον ‘pith of the fir-tree’ < **louk-i-o*- ‘of brightness = whiteness,’ an external possessive derived from an acrostatic substantive could evidently copy the strong-stem vocalism of the derivational base (exactly as was the case with endocentric possessives, cf. Gr. πολὺ- ‘much’ for PIE **pélH₁-u-/p^hlH₁-éu-*).

colour-adjectives **ráud^hita-* ‘reddish brown, bay’ < **H₁ról/éud^h-i-to-*,¹³ **ǵ^hárita-* ‘yellowish green’ < **ǵ^ho/elH₃-i-to-*, **HáHita-* ‘gleaming, glistening; of variegated colour’ < **Hól/éH-i-to-* (?), and **ǵiáHitá-* ‘bright, white’ < **kǵió/éH₁-i-to-*,¹⁴ whose essentially suffixal *-to-* seems to be confirmed by their peculiar feminines in *-nī-* < **-n-iH₂-*,¹⁵ which are built directly to **ráud^h-i-*, **ǵ^hár-i-*, **(H)áH-i-*, and **ǵiáH-i-* (Ved. *róhinī-*, *hárinī-*, *énī-* ~ *enī-*, *śyénī-*) [see Wackernagel & Debrunner, 1954, 327, 591], and whose accent, being bound to the full-grade root¹⁶ in what was to all purposes a possessive adjective,¹⁷ speaks strongly in favour of an acrostatic derivational base.

It should be noted that these examples are not normally viewed as *barbātus*-type possessives but rather as thematic possessive adjectives to feminine *t*-stem abstracts,¹⁸ that is to say **H₁réd^h-i-t-* ‘redness’ (itself based on **H₁réd^h-i-/H₁rud^h-éi-* ‘having redness’) → **H₁reud^h-i-t-o-* ‘having redness.’¹⁹ The only unambiguous proof of this type, however, comes from RV X.112.3ab *háritvatā vārcasā sūryasya / śrēṣṭhai rūpāis tan_uvaṃ sparśayasva* ‘Let your body be touched by the most beautiful shapes of the sun, by the (sun’s) goldenness, possessing lustre,’ where *hárit-* ‘goldenness’ *vel sim.* as the derivational base of the possessive adjective in *-vant-* and thus by necessity substantival in nature stands in stark (and also unique) contrast to Ved. *harít-* ‘the golden/tawny one (sc. horse/mare)’ < **ǵ^helH_{1/3}-i-t-*.²⁰ Since one cannot be certain that this is not in fact a nonce formation, back-derived from *harít-* itself, and because other examples of allegedly comparable word formation usually adduced in support

¹³ *hárita-* (fem. *hárinī-*) appears exclusively as a substantivised adjective ‘a/the russet (sc. horse/cow)’ in the Ṛgveda (cf. the predominant use of *éta-* ~ *énī-*), but note that such usage is evidently secondary and not attested at all for *hárita-* ‘golden (as an equivalent of *hári-*); yellowish green.’

¹⁴ The **-i-* as the suffix proper is assured by YAv *rao^hđita-* ‘red,’ *za^hrita-* ‘yellowish green,’ and *aēta-* ‘patchy’ as well as by Ved. *e* < **aHi* in both *éta-* and *śyeta-*.

¹⁵ Otherwise only met with in *pát-nī-* ‘mistress’ (to *páti-* ‘master’) and in gamonyms to thematic stems such as *indra-* → *indrāñī-* ‘Indra’s consort’ in imitation of **deṃu-ó-* ‘of the sky’ (itself a genitival = vr̥ddhi derivative of **dǵi-eṃ-/*dǵi-u- ~ *di-u-*) → **deṃu-o=H₁nole-H₂-* ‘of the one of the sky’ (with the logical switch to Indo-Iranian **-ī-* in what was reinterpreted as an athematic derivational base).

¹⁶ **ǵiáHitá-* is not really an exception since it very obviously copies the accent of its near synonym **ǵiáit-á-* ‘bright white’ < PIE **k^hueit-ó-*.

¹⁷ In other words, clearly not as a result of endocentric substantivisation (contrast the likes of Ved. *párvata-* ‘mountain, rock’ ← **per-uṇ-tó-*, *śrómata-* ‘renown’ ← **k^hleu-mṇ-tó-*, etc.).

¹⁸ See especially [Pinault, 1980, 32; Klingenschmitt, 1992, 133; Widmer, 2005, 179; Pinault, 2011, 155–156; Steer, 2015, 129–130; Nussbaum, 2017, 261].

¹⁹ One would, however, probably expect end accentuation in such a possessive, cf. Ved. *hemantá-* ‘winter’ < **‘having the state of being during winter (time)’* < **ǵ^heim-en-t-ó-* (not a genitival derivative!) ← **ǵ^heim-én-t-* (= Hitt. *gimmant-* ‘winter time’ under one view of things), PGmc. **suerða-* ‘sword’ < **s(H₂)u-er-t-ó-* **‘having the state of being (in) sharp(ness)’* ← **s(H₂)u-ér-t-* [see Nikolaev, 2009, esp. 474].

²⁰ Normally without the accompanying nouns except for RV IX.107.8c and RV I.115.3a, where its head viz. *ásva-* ‘horse/mare’ is overtly expressed. This is matched perfectly by *rohít-* ‘the bay one’ (usually referring to a mare and later on in AV IV.4.7 and in the Brahmanas (e.g. TS VI.1.6.5, ABr. III.33, JBr. III.262) specifically to a deer/female antelope) and follows naturally from the fact that both are individualised *i*-stem adjectives.

of **CéC-i-t-* type abstracts, viz. PGr. **mél-i-t-* ‘honey’ < **mél-i-t-*, **álp^h-i-t-* ‘barley-meal’ < **álb^h(H₂)-i-t-*, are much more likely to go back to individualised *i*-stem adjectives **mél-i-t-* ‘the dark one’²¹ (to **mél-i-* ‘dark (in colour)’ ← **mél-i-* ‘darkness (of colour)’ and **álb^h(H₂)-i-t-* ‘the white one’ (to **álb^h(H₂)-i-* ‘white’ ← **álb^h(H₂)-i-* ‘whiteness’ ← PIE **alb^h(H₂)ó-* ‘bright white’) than to **mél-i-t-* ‘darkness (of colour)’ and **álb^h(H₂)-i-t-* ‘whiteness,’ the analysis proposed above would seem to be a very reasonable, if not an altogether safer alternative. It is true that the accent placement of Vedic adjectival *harít-* and *rohít-* does not match their formal Greek parallels (note that recessive accent is also confirmed by PGmc. **méliða-* ‘honey’ — a secondary, purely structural thematization of **mél-i-t-*), while it is exactly the substantival *harít-** that appears to do so. But this discrepancy is easily explicable if one considers that the derivational base of the individualised *-i-t-* formation was in fact a proterodynamic *i*-stem adjective (for *harít-* directly confirmed by Ved. *hár-i-/hár-ay-* ‘golden (in colour)’ < **ǵ^hélH₃-i-/ǵ^hǵH₃-éǵ-*), so that **CéC-i-/CeC-éǵ-* → **CéC-i-t- ~ CeC-í-t-*; else, **álb^h-i-t-* as opposed to **H₁reud^h-i-t-* etc. (which, even synchronically, is still very much an adjective, albeit a definite form of that) could also well exhibit overt substantivisation by way of accent retraction. However that may be, it can definitely be proposed that if what is true in the case of PIE **H₁reud^h-* ‘(to be/make) red’:

- **H₁reud^h-* ‘(to be/make) red’
- abstract **H₁róud^h-o-*
- internally derived possessive **H₁roud^h-ó-* (**H₁reud^h-ó-*)
- abstract **H₁róud^h-i-/H₁réud^h-i-*
- externally derived possessive **H₁réud^h-i-to-*
- internally derived possessive **H₁réud^h-i-/H₁rud^h-éǵ-*
- individualisation **H₁réud^h=i-t-*
- ?→ abstract **H₁réud^h=i-t-*
- ?→ externally derived
- possessive **H₁réud^h=i-t-o-*

and PIE **ǵ^helH₃-* ‘(to be)? greenish yellow’:

- **ǵ^helH₃-* ‘(to be)? greenish yellow’ *vel sim.*
- abstr. **ǵ^hólH₃-o-*
- int. poss. **ǵ^he/olH₃-ó-*
- abstr. **ǵ^hólH₃-i-/ǵ^hélH₃-i-*
- ext. poss. **ǵ^hélH₃-i-to-*
- int. poss. **ǵ^hélH₃-i-/ǵ^hǵH₃-éǵ-*
- indiv. **ǵ^hélH₃=i-t-*
- ?→ abstr. **ǵ^hélH₃=i-t-*
- ?→ ext. poss. **ǵ^hélH₃=i-t-o-*,

²¹ Cf. [Meier-Brügger, 2014, 203] for a similar opinion.

it is reasonable to conclude that the same must also hold for PIE **leuk-/*luk-* ‘become bright, shine forth (ingress.)’:

- *leuk-/*luk-* ‘become bright, shine forth (ingress.)’
- abstr. **lóuk-o-* ‘brightness, light’ (→ nom. loci ‘clearing,’ cf. PGmc. **lauxa-*, etc.)
- int. poss. **leuk-ó-* ‘having brightness, light’
 - abstr. **leuk=é-t-* ‘shining’ (→ ext. poss. **leuk-e=t-ó-^l-(i)io-*)
 - indiv. **leuk=é-t-* ‘the shining, bright one’ (+/- thematisation)
 - fem. abstr. **lóuk-i-/*léuk-i-* ‘shining, brightness’
 - ext. poss. **léuk=i-to-* ‘having brightness,’
 - *léuk-(i)io-* ‘id.,’ etc.
 - int. poss. **léuk-i-/*luk-éj-* ‘id.’
 - indiv. **léuk=i-t-* ‘the one having brightness’
 - ?→ fem. abstr. **léuk-i-t-* ‘brightness’
 - ?→ ext. poss. **léuk-i-t-o-* ‘having brightness.’

The likelihood of *Loucita* to be so derived would of course increase if one were able to point to the existence of the underlying derivational base within Celtic itself (be it the proterodynamic *i*-stem adjective, such as the pair *hári-* vs. *háríta-* in the case of Vedic, or the *i*-stem abstract). As it turns out, such evidence does indeed seem to be available viz. the first member of a dithematic female name LEUCI-MARA [CIL, 3, 5265 = AIJ, 57 = RICA, 143] attested at Celeia (if taken at face value and not as a case of weakening of an — otherwise unrecorded — **Leuko-mārā*).²² It goes beyond a well-established fact that cases of spellings with ⟨eu⟩ in the Latin alphabet of what would otherwise be expected to consistently show up in the written sources as ⟨ou⟩ for PCelt. **ou̯* < **eu̯*, **ou̯*, **u̯u̯* (the latter more specifically /__V[-i]) are hardly unusual as far as Gaulish (predominantly) appellative material is concerned. Since it seems to have been solely **eu̯* that occasionally fails to surface as ⟨ou⟩ in our sources, never an etymological **ou̯* (cf. [Sims-Williams, 2007, 313] for the observation), such instances cannot be dismissed as mere spelling variants. As I tried to show in [Repaňšek, 2020, 94–95], ⟨eu⟩ in Gaul. IEVRV (3 sg. act. pf. ‘has given/bestowed’) is probably best understood as a residual spelling in a stereotyped verbal form, which would imply that ⟨eu⟩ for old, inherited **eu̯* is probably best seen as a case of archaic/archaising spelling. This, however, will hardly satisfy as an explanation in the case of an isolated personal name such as LEUCIMARA,²³ especially in an area where

²² For the discussion of the phenomenon see [Sims-Williams, 2013, 38–40]. If DEUI-GNATA [CIL, 3, 11646] is a case in point and should indeed be interpreted as a purely phonetic variant of **DEUO-GNATA*, LEUCI- for possibly original **LEUCO-* then finds a perfect parallel. Since the inscription is relatively late (2nd c. AD), this possibility simply cannot be ruled out.

²³ On the other hand, such an approach could probably offer a convincing enough account for similar oscillations in the case of the epithet LEUCETIUS ~ LOUCETIUS, given that the latter belongs to a very different onomastic category.

contemporaneous cases of <ou> for PIE **eu* seem to be equally commonly attested (bear in mind, though, that *Loucita* ~ *Locita* is not necessarily a case in point; as was shown above, the latter derivative could just as easily reflect an original *o*-grade, provided it indeed goes back to **lóuk-i-to-*).²⁴ Coupled with the fact that in the same onomastic area the place-name *Neuiodunum* for expected **Nouiodunum* < Gaul. **Nou(i)io-* exhibits the exact same trait, it is reasonable to think that at least for the purposes of the Norico-Pannonian *Namenlandschaft* interference from the side of Pannonian cannot be *a priori* excluded. But would this then mean that in case the name is not altogether Gaulish, LEUCIMARA is a hybrid?²⁵ Or that one can still indirectly see it reflecting a Gaul. **louki-* though one overlaid by the phonetic shape of a genuinely Pannonian **leuki-*? In such an event, the first alternative would seem far less attractive, since *Neuiodunum* also does not look like a proper *vox hybrida* (if it is, this would be a unique case of an autochthonous adjective being compounded with Gaul. **dūnon*).

AIJ — Hoffiller, V., & Saria, B. (1970). *Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslawien. 1: Noricum und Pannonia superior*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Bichlmeier, H. (2015). Alte und neue Ideen zum Namen der Raab/Rába/Raba. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 69(1), 7–31.

CIL — Mommsen, T. et al. (Eds.). (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Corpus — Raybould, M. E., & Sims-Williams, P. (2007). *A Corpus of Latin Inscriptions of the Roman Empire Containing Celtic Personal Names*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.

de Bernardo Stempel, P. (2000). Ptolemy's Celtic Italy and Ireland: A Linguistic Analysis. In P. Sims-Williams, & D. N. Parsons (Eds.), *PTOLEMY: Towards a Linguistic Atlas of the Earliest Celtic Place-names of Europe. Papers from a Workshop, Sponsored by the British Academy, in the Department of Welsh, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 11–12 April 1999* (pp. 83–112). Aberystwyth: CMCS.

ILSI 1 — Lovenjak, M. (1998–). *Inscriptiones Latinae Sloveniae* (Vol. 1–). Ljubljana: Narodni muzej Slovenije.

Irslinger, B. (2002). *Abstrakta mit Dentalsuffixen im Altirischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Klingenschmitt, G. (1992). Die lateinische Nominalflexion. In O. Panagl, & Th. Krisch (Eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.–26. September 1986* (pp. 89–135). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

²⁴ The same feature recurs in LEUCO[---] on the votive inscription for Vulcan [CIL, 3, 11699 = RICA, 56], but if this is to be restored as *LEUCONIUS, which is in fact quite probable, we would most likely simply be dealing with a Roman gentilic of a much wider distribution. Note, however, that the immediately preceding MOGET[---] is a genuinely Gaulish hypocoristic.

²⁵ **-māro-* 'great' < **meH₂-ró-* as a second element in dithematic compounds does not seem to appear with any indubitably non-Celtic elements in this region; cf. [Meid, 2005, 92–122] for a useful overview of the material.

- lupa* — Harl, F., & Harl, O. *Ubi erat lupa* (Bildatenbank zu antiken Steinendkmälern). Retrieved from www.ubi-erat-lupa.org
- Meid, W. (2005). *Keltische Personennamen in Pannonien*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (2014). Zur Bildung von urindogermanisch **melit-*, Honig'. In N. Oettinger, & Th. Steer (Eds.), *Das Nomen in Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen* (pp. 202–204). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Nikolaev, A. (2009). The Germanic Word for 'Sword' and Delocative Derivation in Proto-Indo-European. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 37, 462–488.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2017). Agentive and Other Derivatives of “*τόμος*-Type”. In C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit, & G.-J. Pinault (Eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014* (pp. 233–266). Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Pinault, G.-J. (1980). Instrumental et adverbial prédicatif (en marge de “Genetiv und Adjektiv”). *LALIES*, 1, 31–33.
- Pinault, G.-J. (2011). L'origine déictique du genre féminin en indo-européen. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 106(1), 129–182.
- Pinault, G.-J. (2018). Formation des composés de rection verbale du type védique *bharadvāja-*, grec *Φερέπολις*. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 113(1), 329–369.
- Pokorny, J. (1950). The River-Name *Argita*. *Journal of Celtic Studies*, 1, 130.
- Repanšek, L. (2014a). Fluvius Argao, quis in sinum Argo fluit? In N. Kazansky (Ed.), *Indoeuropeiskoe jazykoznanie i klassicheskaia filologija XVIII. Materialy cheniĭ, posviashchennykh pamiati professora Iosifa Moiseevicha Tronskogo, 23–25 iunija 2014 g.* [Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology XVIII. Proceedings of the 18th Conference in Memory of Professor Joseph M. Tronsky, June 23–25, 2014] (pp. 814–820). St Petersburg: Nauka.
- Repanšek, L. (2014b). Two Notes on Gaulish Morphology. *Acta linguistica Petropolitana*, 10(1), 239–254.
- Repanšek, L. (2016). *Keltska dediščina v toponimiji jugovzhodnega alpskega prostora* [Celtic Legacy in the Toponymy of the South-Eastern Alpine Region]. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- Repanšek, L. (2020). Opombe k problematiki tretje osebe ednine perfekta h korenem s strukturo **C(R)eH-* v keltščini [Notes on the 3rd Person Perfect Singular to **C(R)eH-* Roots in Celtic]. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 26(2), 91–110.
- RIB — Colingwood, R. G., Wright, R. P., Tomlin, R. S. O., & Hassall, M. W. C. (1965–2009). *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain* (Vols. 1–3). Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford Books; Stroud: Alan Sutton.
- RICA — Visočnik, J. (2017). *The Roman Inscriptions from Celeia and its Ager*. Celje: Celjska Mohorjeva družba.
- Rieken, E. (1999). *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- RINMS — Šašel Kos, M. (1997). *The Roman Inscriptions in the National Museum of Slovenia*. Ljubljana: Narodni muzej Slovenije.
- RIU — Barkóczi, L., Burger, A. Sz., Fitz, J., Fülepi, F., Lőrincz, B., Mócsy, A., Márton, E., Redő, F., & Soproni, S. (1972–2001). *Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns* (Bd. 1–6). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- Scheungraber, C. (2020). *Altgermanische und altkeltische Theonyme: Die epigraphische Evidenz aus der Kontaktzone. Ein Handbuch zu ihrer Etymologie*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schuhmann, R. (1999). Aurinia und Valeda: Zwei germanische Seherinnen. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, 34, 131–143.
- Sims-Williams, P. (2000). Degrees of Celticity in Ptolemy's Names: Examples from Wales. In P. Sims-Williams, & D. N. Parsons (Eds.), *PTOLEMY: Towards a Linguistic Atlas of the Earliest Celtic Place-names of Europe. Papers from a Workshop, Sponsored by the British Academy*,

- in the Department of Welsh, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 11–12 April 1999 (pp. 1–16). Aberystwyth: CMCS.
- Sims-Williams, P. (2007). Common Celtic, Gallo-Brittonic and Insular Celtic. In P.-Y. Lambert, & G.-J. Pinault (Eds.), *Gaulois et Celtique continentale* (pp. 309–354). Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Sims-Williams, P. (2013). The Celtic Composition Vowels *-o-* and *-io-*. In J.-L. García Alonso (Ed.), *Continental Celtic Word Formation. The Onomastic Data* (pp. 37–50). Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca
- Sims-Williams, P. (2015). The Celtic Composition Vowels *-i-* and *-u-*. In G. Oudaer, G. Hily, & H. Le Bihan (Eds.), *Mélanges en l'honneur de Pierre-Yves Lambert* (pp. 313–331). Rennes: TIR (Université européenne de Bretagne).
- Steer, Th. (2015). *Amphikinese und Amphigenese*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Wackernagel, J., & Debrunner, A. (1954). *Altindische Grammatik. Bd. II, 2: Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, M. (2018). Veneti or Venetes? Observations on a Widespread Indo-European Tribal Name. In L. van Beek, A. Kloekhorst, G. Kroonen, M. Peyrot, Michaël, T. Pronk, & M. de Vaan (Eds.), *FARNAH. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky* (pp. 349–357). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Widmer, P. (2005). Der altindische *vrk̥*-Typus und hethitisch *nakki-*: Der indogermanische Instrumental zwischen Syntax und Morphologie. *Die Sprache: Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 45(1–2), 190–208.

Received on 31 July 2020

ABBREVIATIONS

Sources

ABr.	<i>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</i>	RV	<i>Ṛgveda</i>
AV	<i>Atharvaveda</i>	TP	<i>Tabula Peutingeriana</i>
JBr.	<i>Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa</i>	TS	<i>Taittirīya-Samhitā</i>

Languages

Gaul.	Gaulish	OS	Old Saxon
Goth.	Gothic	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Gr.	Ancient Greek	PGmc.	Proto-Germanic
Hitt.	Hittite	PGr.	Proto-Greek
Lat.	Latin	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
OE	Old English	Ved.	Vedic
OIr.	Old Irish	YAv.	Young Avestan

Grammatical labels

abstr.	abstract	ingress.	ingressive
act.	active voice	int. poss.	internally derived possessive
ext. poss.	externally derived possessive	nom.	nominative
fem.	feminine	Nsg.	nominative singular
Gsg.	genitive singular	pf.	perfect
indiv.	individualisation	sg.	singular

* * *

Repanšek, Luka

PhD, Assistant Professor
 Department of Comparative
 and General Linguistics
 University of Ljubljana
 Aškerčeva 2
 SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
 Email: luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si
 ORCID: 0000-0001-6530-7597

Репаншек, Лука

PhD, доцент кафедры сравнительного
 и общего языкознания
 Люблянский университет
 Aškerčeva 2
 SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
 E-mail: luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si

Лука Репаншек

Люблянский университет
 Любляна, Словения

LOUCITA: К ЭТИМОЛОГИИ ОДНОГО ЖЕНСКОГО ИМЕНИ НОРИКО-ПАННОНСКОГО ОНОМАСТИЧЕСКОГО АРЕАЛА

Статья посвящена галльскому женскому имени *Loucita* (вар. *Locita* и, возможно, *Lucita*, если последнее вообще входит в эту группу), отмеченному в норико-паннонском ономастическом ареале и представляющему особый интерес с точки зрения словообразования. Трудно найти однозначные параллели для такого деривата в кельтской ономастике — единственным возможным кандидатом можно считать гойдельский потамоним *Arúita*, записанный Птолемеем. Вне кельтского материала потенциальной параллелью может быть имя германской пророчицы *Vel(a)eda*, если возводить его к **uelētā-* (что вероятно, но не исключает и других возможностей), из чего неизбежно следует, что *Loucita* < **leuk-ēt-ā-* должно каким-то образом базироваться на форме косвенного падежа с долготой суффиксального гласного (**leuk-ēt-*), распространившейся на всю парадигму из формы им. п. ед. ч., где эта долгота является унаследованной. Поскольку категория лексикализованных, на синхронном уровне непродуктивных атематических **-et-*основ в кельтском обычно представляет собой именно этот феномен, эта этимологическая интерпретация не может быть отвергнута как невозможная. В любом случае, допустима и другая интерпретация: *Loucita* может представлять собой суффиксальное производное от абстрактного имени **louk-i-/*leuk-i-* ‘яркость, блеск’ (в свою очередь, образованного путем суффиксации от тематического притяжательного прилагательного **leuk-ó-*) по типу *barbātus* — **leuk-i-to-* ‘имеющий блеск’. Последнее демонстрирует такую же словообразовательную модель, которая обнаруживается у индоиранских прилагательных, обозначающих цвет, однако эти лексемы, вопреки общему мнению, скорее всего, не являются тематическими притяжательными прилагательными от абстрактных имен на **-t-*, образованных от прилагательных *i-*основы, доказательства существования которых кажутся слишком малочисленными. Тем не менее, независимо от принимаемой этимологической интерпретации, имя *Loucita*

является важным дополнением к праиндоевропейскому типу дериватов (с не просто структурной тематизацией!) на *-ilo-, на настоящий момент однозначно выявленному только в индоиранском.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: кельтские языки, галльский язык, праиндоевропейский язык, норико-паннонский ономастический ареал, антропонимия, словообразование, этимология.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 31.07.2020