



Blanca María Prósper
Marcos Medrano Duque
University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Ancient Gaulish and British Divinities: Notes on the Reconstruction of Celtic Phonology and Morphology

Voprosy onomastiki, 2022, Vol. 19, Issue 2, pp. 9–47
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2022.19.2.015

Language of the article: English

Blanca María Prósper
Marcos Medrano Duque
University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

Ancient Gaulish and British Divinities: Notes on the Reconstruction of Celtic Phonology and Morphology

Вопросы ономастики. 2022. Т. 19. № 2. С. 9–47
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2022.19.2.015

Язык статьи: английский



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



named after the first President
of Russia B.N.Yeltsin

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

СТАТЬИ

DOI 10.15826/vopr_onom.2022.19.2.015
UDC 811.15'344 + 811.15'373.23 + 811.1'37 +
+ 811.124:930.27 + 2-144 + 94(3)

Blanca María Prósper
Marcos Medrano Duque
University of Salamanca
Salamanca, Spain

ANCIENT GAULISH AND BRITISH DIVINITIES: NOTES ON THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CELTIC PHONOLOGY AND MORPHOLOGY

The linguistic study of Celtic divinities attested on Latin inscriptions has proved instrumental in disclosing a number of facts about ancient religion, the relationship with the Roman rule, and the spread of indigenous or syncretic cults. In fact, minor divinities were worshipped on a local basis only, but even under such unfavourable circumstances they managed to become partly integrated in the religious system of the Roman Empire: they acted in the sphere of the higher gods for a time before they vanished for ever, and they must have been much more common than our fragmentary sources suggest. Crucially, the study of their names also provides priceless clues about the early stages of Celtic phonology and morphology, it also helps illuminate insufficiently known aspects of the evolution of Continental and Insular Celtic and their interaction with Latin. In this work, the authors focus on several hitherto misinterpreted Celtic divine names from Britannia (MEDOCIO, ARNOMECEIE, BRACIACAE, ARCIACONI, COROTIACO) and Gaul (MEDVTONI, COBRANDIAE, CENTONDI, ROQVETIO, SINQVATI) and try to test their relative importance for Indo-European language reconstruction, distant cultural relationship of ancient populations, ancient religion with special attention to the interaction of major Roman divinities with minor Celtic ones, Latin and Celtic phonetics and morphology, loan phonology and the spread and adaptation of the Latin alphabet to write texts in the indigenous Celtic languages and foreign names in Latin epigraphy.

Key words: Celtic languages; Gaulish religion; Celtic phonology; Indo-European onomastics; Indo-European word formation; Latin epigraphy; Latin alphabet; Celtic theonymy

1. Palatalisation in provincial Latin, palatalisation in Early Brittonic? A reassessment of the evidence of divine names¹

A Caledonian individual called *Lossio Veda*, a relative (either a nephew or a grandson) of *Vepogenus*, devoted this bronze plate to an apparently syncretic, Romano-Celtic divinity *Mars Medocius*, the protector of the otherwise unknown human group of the *Campenses*, and to his *paredra*, the *Victory* of “our Emperor Alexander Pius Felix.” The inscription reads:

DEO MARTI MEDOCIO CAMP/E(N)SIVM ET VICTORI(A)E ALEXAN/DRI PII FELICIS AVGVSTI
NOS(TR)I / DONVM LOSSIO VEDA DE SVO / POSVIT NEPOS VEPOGENI CALEDO (Colchester, Essex,
Britannia, AD 222-235) [RIB-1, 191].

In spite of the fact that the stone was unearthed in 1891, the divine epithet MEDOCIO has never been accorded anything near a scientific etymology. While the plausible connection of this form with **med-* ‘to measure, take care’ [LIV, 423, ¹**med-*] goes at least as far back as [Haverfield, 1890, 216], following a suggestion by Whitley Stokes, its word formation has been systematically neglected.

This form cannot be taken at face value, but as an instance of <CI> for <TI> (see below). It may be traced back to a Celtic agent noun (originally perhaps an action noun) **med-ūt-* ‘ruler’. The primitive holokinetic paradigm has been reconstructed as follows: nom. **med-ōt-s*, acc. **med-ot-ŋ*, gen. **ŋd-t-és*, dat. **ŋd-t-éj*. Consequently, it is the perfect match of Goth. *mitaps* ‘measure’ < **med-ot-s* [cf. Vijūnas, 2009, 254]. In most languages, the phonetic outcome of the oblique cases would jeopardise the paradigmatic uniformity. For that reason, the strong variant *-ot-* of the suffix and the full grade **med-* of the root were consistently spread from the accusative stem. OIr. *coimdiu*, gen. *coimded* ‘ruler, chief’ may unproblematically be traced back to **kom-med-ūt-s*, *-med-ot-os* (as correctly reconstructed by [Schumacher, 2004, 482]) and not, as often assumed, to a compound **med-dūt-s* (cf. L. *sacerdōs*), a derivative **med-ūūt-s*, let alone a highly anomalous **med-īūt-s*.²

MEDOCIO is a derivative in *-iio-* of the Insular Celtic oblique stem **med-ot-*, and points to the Brittonic paradigm being identical to the Irish one. As a consequence, we would expect this epithet to be attested as † MEDOTIO. We may then hypothesise that at a Proto-Celtic stage prior to the spread of the full grade of the root, the paradigm looked like this: nom. **med-ūt-s*, acc. **med-ot-am*, gen. **amd-ot-os*.

In Hispania, especially in the territory of the Arevaci, we find this noun in a number of thematic personal and family names all over Hispania: ARGANTO MEDVTICA (Saelices,

¹ A list of abbreviations is placed at the end of the article. Texts in the Latin alphabet are rendered in SMALL CAPITALS; texts in (varieties of) the Etruscan alphabet are in *italics*. Throughout this work, /i/ and /u/ will be treated as separate phonemes, and not as positional variants of /i/ and /u/.

² See [Vijūnas, 2009, 254] in favour of **med-ūōt-*, [De Bernardo Stempel, 1999, 438] for **medyots* (sic!).

Cuenca), ATILIAE MEDVTTIQ(VM) (San Esteban, Soria), RVSTICE / MEDVTTIQ(VM) (Clunia, Burgos), C(AIVS) IVLIVS BARBA/RVS MEDVTTI/CORVM (Barcebalejo, Soria), L AEMILIVS MEDVTVS MIR(OBRIGENSIS) (Garlitos/Mirobriga Turdulorum, Badajoz), and a late pseudo-gentilic name M(ARCVS) MEDVTTIVS / FVSCVS (Vilches/Baesucci, Jaén). Finally, MEDVTTVS CATVRONIS F (Hardomilje, Dalmatia, 1st c. AD) [AE, 1907, 249], was a MILES COH(ORTIS) I / BRACARAVG/VSTANORV[M].

One single Hispanic example of this form may belong to Celtiberian appellative vocabulary. Recently, thanks to new photographs, Olcoz Yanguas & Medrano Marqués [2008] have come up with a reading *mezutos* instead of *metuutos* in the Celtiberian Bronze *Res*. The traditional reading *metuutos*³ was slightly inconvenient in view of the unexpected *Pleneschreibung* <tu-u>. The form *mezutos* removes the last obstacle to the reconstruction of an inherited noun **med-ūt-s*. If this is not a personal name but the genitive of the athematic appellative, as suggested by [Prósper, 2014a], this would mean that the long grade of the suffix spread to the rest of the paradigm, as in most masculine nasal stems.

In addition to *mezutos*, the fricative realisation of the medial dental sound, which in Hispania evolved into [ð] in intervocalic position, is now confirmed by an inscription from Villaminaya (Toledo), originally read as follows: NEZVTVS / CAECILI / LVCANI / SERBVS / H(IC) S(ITVS) EST [AE, 1987, 675]. Velaza [2008, 369–370] has corrected NEZVTVS into MEZVTVS, which he traces back to **med^hu-* ‘mead, honey’. While we believe his reading,⁴ as well as his phonetic explanation for the use of <Z> as reflective of a Celtiberian intervocalic dental segment (usually spelt <z> in the Iberian script, but <D> in the Latin alphabet), to be correct, we have to observe that this name is more likely to reflect a thematic **med-ūt-o-*, with or without further changes in the original meaning.

A lost Gaulish dedication reading MEDVIONI / [.]C[.] / [V(OTVM)] S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO) was unearthed in Noves (Bouches-du-Rhône, Narbonensis) [CAG-13-02, 227]. Despite its unparalleled form, and the slightly outlandish sequence <VIO>, one must allow for the possibility that <I> is a misreading for <T>. In that case, we have here a divine name **medūt-ū* related to government or kingship, in all likelihood a nasal stem with relational or possessive meaning. MEDVTONI may accordingly be considered as the Gaulish counterpart of Brittonic MEDOCIO, and shows that the long grade of the suffix, originally exclusive to the nominative form, was generalised, as in Hispano-Celtic. This conclusion is underpinned by the attestation of a *pagus Medutius* in the *Tabula Alimentaria* of Veleia (Liguria) [CIL, 11, 1147], identified with Valmozzola in Parma (Emilia-Romagna).

The original oblique stem **md-t-* was not completely lost, however: a number of Hispano-Celtic dedications that must be attributed to the *Cantabri Vadinienses*

³ See [MLH-4, K.0.6; MLH-5, 260].

⁴ In fact, the only available photograph seems to confirm this point: though most of the last vertical stroke of <M> is missing, the general ductus and the available room between this and the following letter lead us to believe we have to read <M>, not <N>, which would leave us with an unparalleled name.

exhibit the thematised stem **andot-o-* (ultimately from **ṁd-ot-*): M(ONVMENTVM) / ANDOTO VBALA/CINO VADONIS F(ILIO) / VAD(INIENSI) (Liegos, León) [ERL, 357], M(ONVMENTVM) / ANDOTI FL/AVI ARENI F(ILII) (Puerto de San Isidro, León) [CIL, 2, 2696; ERL, 356], ARENVS ANDOTI (Riaño, León) [ERL, 364]. This seems to suggest that the suffix underwent leveling, and thereupon this variant was relegated to onomastics and a uniform stem **medot-* or **medūt-* took its place. Alternatively, if we assume that paradigm split took place somewhere down the line, **andot-* is the only remnant of a different appellative word that developed strong cases and had a related meaning but remains unattested.⁵ If the first (and intuitively simpler) possibility were accepted, the individual name *Andotus* would be an extremely archaic relic. From the synchronic point of view, the ultimate cognacy of these forms would be unrecoverable for most speakers, especially if it was dialectally conditioned.

In sum, all these forms constitute the *disiecta membra* of one single original paradigm. While this form may be unproblematically projected back to the protolanguage, its restricted distribution, as well as its meaning, are compatible with an early Celto-Germanic innovation, or even with a Celtic loanword in Germanic. MEDOCIO is, so to speak, the missing link that allows us to reconstruct the structure and Ablaut of this paradigm in Proto-Brittonic: the root vowel /e/ of the strong cases, as well as the full grade /o/ of the suffix, which was originally restricted to the accusative stem, must have spread to the rest of the paradigm. We may then reconstruct a paradigm nom. **med-ūt-s*, gen. **med-ot-os* for this dialect and language stage and for the Goidelic branch. While MEDOCIO is in all likelihood a proper name, we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that it could be directly translated by locals as “to the god Mars, holder of the leadership of the Campenses.”

A Brittonic divinity attested as DEAE ARNOMECTE in Brough-on-Noe (Derbyshire) [RIB-1, 281] may be simply taken to stand for † ARNEMETIE. The immediate reason for this is the identification of the city of Buxton, also in Derbyshire, with *Aquis Arnemeza* [Geogr. Rav., 2012, 106, nr. 57]. If, as is very likely, the sequence the scribe actually intended to write was ARNOMECTE, this name would contain two errors: <o> for <e> and <CI> for <TI>. For the process behind *-neme-* > *-nome-*, see [Prósper, 2019b, 45, fn. 21]. In what follows, we shall focus on the problem of <CI> for expected <TI>. First of all, the synchronic cluster *-tj-* in MEDOCIO and ARNOMECTE requires an explanation, since these divine names are endowed with an IE suffix of appurtenance *-ijō-*. Their incipient palatalisation can only be put down to early loss of syllabicity. The suffixes *-jō-* and *-ijō-* are, in fact, likely to have merged in Celtic early on [see Malzahn, 2011, fn. 18, with literature].

⁵At first sight, one is tempted to relate this name to ANDETIVS, ANDETIACAE, which are attested in Venetia et Histria and derive it from a prefix **ando-* ‘inside.’ Still, there is an unsurmountable problem related to the derivational suffix, which is *-to-*, not *-tjō-* or *-djō-* as expected in this kind of deadverbial formations.

According to [Jackson, 1953/1994, 91] “though some of these changes were completed late, all had their beginnings, and some their full development, while Britain was still a part of the Roman Empire. Nevertheless, there is no certain evidence for any of them having occurred in Britain.” In order to state the problem correctly, we may have to introduce a subtle distinction here: while palatalisation and its rendition may be put down to Latin interference, reduction of *-i̇io-* to *-i̇o-*, which constitutes the precondition for palatalisation, had probably taken place at a previous stage in both languages.

Latin syllables containing the sequences /u.V/, /i.V/ have undergone early hiatus resolution by homorganic glide epenthesis if we accept that their phonetic structure was [u.ɥV], [i.ɥV]. Accordingly, the Late Latin pervasive process we are dealing with here may be more precisely described as one of loss of syllabicity, which turned trisyllabic into disyllabic structures through elimination of the second nucleus. Thus, *L. tenue* ‘soft’ [‘te.nu.ɥe] became [‘ten.ɥe]. The resulting sequences immediately became subject to subsequent changes, in our case coalescence triggered by palatalisation of the stop by the following glide. While the inception of this process, which leads to varied Romance outcomes, is often invisible in texts employing standard Latin orthography, documents reflecting oral features, such as the Vindolanda Tablets, directly reflect this change: “*I longa*” is habitually employed to mark that the syllable boundaries have shifted and that the syllable onset is now [i̇] in such forms as *PRE-TIO*, *CVPIO* [see Cotugno, 2015]. As observed by Cotugno, preceding coronals play a predominant role in the resolution of hiatus. The use of <I> for this purpose recurs elsewhere in the Roman Empire, as in the archives of La Graufesenque in France and the Sulpicii in Pompeii.

This having been said, the occurrence of Latin <CI> for <TI> is widespread and points to incipient palatalisation and merger of *-k(i)̇i-* and *-t(i)̇i-*. Its attestation in indigenous names all over the Roman Empire may respond to the Latinate pronunciation and even transmission of a Celtic name and suggests that the scribes tended to use <CI> if they were unfamiliar with the name. According to [Recasens, 2014, 131], confusion may have proceeded through the following stages: a) a front velar stop shifts to an (alveolo-)palatal stop; b) the resulting realisations [ç, ʝ] are interpreted as /t, d/ by listeners. If this is correct, the rendition <CI> for expected <TI> can only be put down to hypercorrection.

We may wonder, however, why we find hardly any cases of <TI> for orthographic <CI> in the epigraphic record. It is very unlikely that both spellings are covering a single affricate sound [tʃ] and that the merger of *-k(i)̇i-* and *-t(i)̇i-* had been completed: a considerable number of Romance dialects preserve the difference between these clusters because coarticulation has given rise to two different affricates, respectively [tʃ] and [tʃ]. According to [Aski, 2001], the classic authors are silent about the articulation of [k̇i] but become, from the 5th c. AD, rather voluble about the change [ṫi] > [tʃ]. This probably means that this change started at an earlier date, and that, consequently, a high number of cases of <CI> for orthographic <TI> (from the 2nd c. onwards) is what we

would actually expect. In her view, “prior to palatalization of /tj/, estimated to have been in the second or third century, assimilation of the dental and the velar to the following yod produced a range of surface variants which, in some cases, overlapped, as the articulation of the dental retracted toward the palatal and that of the velar moved forward. This phonetic variation, which was generated during the first stage of change, continued undisturbed until palatalization of /tj/ to a dental affricate forced speakers to assign the range of surface variants to either /tj/ or /kj/, a categorization process based on speakers’ perceptions.”

Under these premises, allophonic variation, here ascribed to the first stage, may not have been strictly symmetrical at the time of our epigraphic sources, and probably progressed faster from the beginning in the case of $-t(i)\bar{i}$ - (in fact, the inception of the change may have been earlier than usually assumed, since its effects are visible in the 2nd c.). A pronunciation of $-t\bar{i}$ - as [tʲ] in lower registers would be difficult to parse for non-native scribes, due to the retraction of the tongue inherent in assimilation of the coronal to the following glide. Coronal backing may have occasionally given rise to a realisation [cʰ], parsed as underlying /kʲ/ long before velar fronting was distinctly perceived and caused a velar to become ambiguous to the speakers in the same context. As a consequence, $-t(i)\bar{i}$ - surfaces as <CI> in the epigraphic record far more often than expected, while <TI> for orthographic <CI> is vanishingly rare: a few instances of TRIBVNITIAE POTESTATIS, PATRITIVS can be put down to morphological confusion with more common suffixes. The final outcome of $-t(i)\bar{i}$ - is the dento-alveolar /ts/, but the outcome of $-k(i)\bar{i}$ - varies across Romance dialects. Since we are discussing the epigraphic reflection of the early stages only, the typological generalisation that $-t(i)\bar{i}$ - is usually palatalised later than $-k(i)\bar{i}$ - does not apply. Furthermore, the assumption that full palatalisation of coronals presupposes that of dorsals has been found to be too restrictive by [Bateman, 2011, 592]. In fact, she has concluded that languages with only coronal palatalisation outnumber those with only dorsal palatalisation. In sum, there is no implicational relationship between the latter two places of articulation.

The abovesaid paves the way for new interpretations of Early British divine names: an altar devoted to BRACIACAE, another epithet of Mars, or, given the mismatch in the morphological expression of gender, a paredra of Mars in asyndeton, was uncovered in the same county as ARNOMECEIE:

DEO / MARTI / BRACIACAE / Q(VINTVS) SITTIVS / CAECILIAN(VS) / PRAEF(ECTVS) COH(ORTIS) /
I AQTIVANO(RVM) / V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) (Bakewell, Derbyshire, Britannia, 2nd c. AD) [CIL,
7, 176; RIB-1, 278].

BRACIACAE has traditionally been taken from Celtic **mraki*- ‘barley,’ attested in OIr. *mraich* ‘malt,’ MW. *brag*, etc., and consequently classified as a divinity of ritual intoxication. Since malt is just the staple from which beer is made, not beer itself as a valuable product, however, the divinity is literally depicted as a ‘maltster,’ not as a divine force inducing raving, trance, or religious ecstasy: this Dionysiac side

of the presumed origin of the epithet has the flavour of confirmation bias and lacks independent support.⁶

It has been repeatedly claimed, as a counterargument, that this epithet is a match of the alleged attestations of a Gaulish village *Braciacus*, now *Brassac* (Auvergne). *Braciacus* is, however, an artificial scholarly latinisation of the original name, since its attestation dates back to the 9th c. AD. This apparent solution may come as a relief to those scholars uneasy about such an arbitrarily assumed facet of Mars as a god of malt or beer, but in point of fact it simply evades the problem. It has been overlooked that *Braciacus*, BRACIACAE are at least equally likely to reflect **bratiāko-*, a derivative of Celtic **brātu-* ‘judgement,’ attested in OIr. *bráth*, MW. *brawd* ‘judgement,’ βρατου in Gaulish δεδε βρατου δεκαντεν/μ ‘in gratitude dedicated the tithe’⁷ if it is an ancient instrumental in **-tu-h₁* (see also the place name *bratuspantium* ‘where judgement is pronounced,’ literally ‘place of the one pronouncing judgement’?), and in the base of L. *grātu-ītus* ‘free’. Alternatively, the base of this form could be the past part. **brāto-*, continued in L. **grātus*, O. *bratom* and perhaps Gaul. βρατου.⁸ Finally, it could be traced back to a byform **brāt(i)-*, also attested in Italic, in O. *brateis datas* ‘in return of a granted favour’ and L. *grātēs* (acc. pl., *plurale tantum*), taken from an action noun **g^urā-t-* by [Rix, 2000]. In fact, Prósper [2014b] has traced a number of Celtiberian forms back to this very form or variants thereof: K.6.1 (Luzaga, north of Guadalajara) contains an appellative form *barazioka* that is derived from **brāt(i)-(i)io-*, and the “second name” of the Celtiberian town *Segisama Brasaca*, only found on one inscription that reads D(OMO) SECISAMA BRASACA (Tarraco) [CIL, 2, 4157], undoubtedly goes back to **brāti-ākā*. Its precise location is unknown, but the rest of the ancient and modern cases of *Segisama* are comparatively northern and western names.

The problems inherent in the semantic evolution of these forms cannot be sidestepped: **g^uerH-* ‘Zustimmung bekunden’ [LIV, 210] is attested in MW. *barnu* ‘to proclaim, judge,’ OIr. *barn* (n.) ‘judge,’ Gaul. BARNAVNOM ‘judging/judged’ (middle present part., Larzac [cf. Lejeune et al., 1985, 135, fn. 52]). The meaning is consequently different from that of the Italic forms, where the notion of thanksgiving, also

⁶For this attribution and the attestations of this word, see [DLG, 85]. The [Vind. Tab., 3, 646] in fact mentions an individual OPTATO BRACI{I}ARIO. The latter word alludes to his office as a maltster, rather than as a beer brewer. Pliny (Nat. Hist., 18, 62) ascribes *bracis* to the “Gauls”: *genus farris quod Galli bracam vocant*, and *cervesia* (Nat. Hist., 22, 164) to “Gaul and other provinces.” The malting process includes cereal soaking, germination, drying, grinding to obtain flour, mixing with water, and eventually fermentation to obtain beer.

⁷No fewer than fourteen cases. The segmentation and interpretation of the stereotyped formula follows [Szemerényi, 1974].

⁸Other similar forms possibly built from **brat-(o)-* are: the place name *Bratananium* (abl. *Bratananio*, Tab. Peut., 4, 3, Rhaetia), the individual name BRATVLOS (Nasium, Belgica, see [Burnand & Lambert, 2004]), and the pseudo-gentilic name Q BRATONIVS GRATVS (Iuliacum, Germania Inferior, see [Meißner, 2010] for the ultimate identity of the Gaulish and Latin forms), BRATO VETERANVS (nom., Noviomagus Batavorum, Germania Inferior) [CIL, 13, 8718].

found in Gallo-Greek, is primary and that of granting a favour is comparatively early but conceptually secondary, according to [Rix, 2000].

The personal name *Mandubracius* (a chieftain of the Trinovantes in Caesar, *B. Gall.*, 5, 20) has been taken to be a bahuvrihi compound, meaning ‘having the buttocks of a young horse’ [see KGP, 154–155], which is slightly far-fetched in view of the fact that it relies on an unsupported semantic interpretation of the Celtic ancestor of Gallo-Latin *braca* ‘pant, trouser’. *Mandu-* is, *pace* [DLG, 215 and many others], much more likely to be a match of OIr. *mind* ‘badge, honour, signal,’ L. *mendum* ‘error, physical blemish,’ from an IE adjective **m̥n̥-dʰh₁-ú-* ‘putting one’s mind on something’.⁹ Cf. also the Greek aorist part. μᾶθών ‘having learnt,’ from **m̥n̥-dʰh₁-ónt-*. A similar construction is **m̥ns-dʰh₁-eh₂* in Skt. *medhā-*, Av. *mazdā-* ‘wisdom, spiritual force,’ where the zeroed form **m̥ns-* is the compositional variant of IE **menos* ‘sense’. In sum, *Mandubracius* (also transmitted as *Mandubratius*, see [GPN, 100]) is likely to reproduce an ancient formula meaning ‘who has judgement over honours/marks’ (whether the reference is to war deeds or to divination), or simply ‘solemnly pronouncing judgement’. If one were allowed to venture further connections, Celtic **ekyo-mandu-* in the place name † *Epo-manduodurum*¹⁰ could be a cognate of Skt. *aśva-medha-*, designating the horse sacrifice ritual, whose second member has resisted a convincing etymological attribution thus far. In short, its second member could be traced back to **m̥ns-dʰh₁(h₂)-ó-*. We can also mention to this effect the Gaulish ethnic name *Viro-manduī* (Gallia Belgica, preserved in the place name *Vermandois* in northern France), which is reminiscent of the Sanskrit personal name *Nṛ-medha-* (a hero who was a favourite of Agni in RigVeda, 10).

Yet another divine name may weigh in on this problem:

DEO ARCIACON(I) / ET N(VMINI) AVG(V)ST(I) / MAT(-) VITALIS / ORDINATVS V S L M (York, Britannia, 3rd c. AD) [RIB-1, 640].

In all likelihood, this is a local divinity protecting the village or area called **Artiāko-*. It is paralleled by *Artiaca* (Arcis-sur-Aube, Aube, France) in It. Ant. (361, 4) (*Arciaca* in later sources). The modern place names *Arsago Seprio* (Varese), *Arzago d’Adda* (Bergamo) in northern Italy belong here, too. Some coins from mints of northern Hispania read *arzakoz* [MLH-1, A.36] and probably reflect yet another instance of the same place name [see Prósper, 2012].

Other forms containing the same sequence *-tiāko-*, however, exhibit no signs of incipient palatalisation. Take, for instance, an interesting set of British examples:

DEO MARTI / COROTIACO / SIMPLICIA / PRO SE V(OTVM) P(OSVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO) (Martlesham, Suffolk, Britannia) [CIL, 7, 93a = RIB-1, 213].

⁹ Cf. [GPN, 223], based on an idea by D’Arbois de Jubainville.

¹⁰ Deduced from the following attestations: *Epomanduo* (Tab. Peut., 2, 2); *Epamanduoduro* (It. Ant., 386, 4); E[POM]ANDVODVRO (Meikirch, Switzerland, around 193 AD) [AE, 2004, 991].

It is obviously related to a personal name attested twice, in all likelihood with the same form:

DEO APOL/LINI CVNO/MAGLO CO/ROTICA IV/TI FIL(IA) V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO)
(Nettleton, Wiltshire, Britannia) [RIB-3, 3053];

D(IS) M(ANIBVS) / CAESORIA CORO[TI]/CA (Great Bulmore, Wales, Britannia) [CIL, 7, 127; RIB-1, 371].

Coroticus is also the name of a Brittonic chieftain of the 5th century, to whom St Patrick addressed his *epistola ad Coroticum*.

In all likelihood, these names go back to a Celtic compound **koro-φoti-* from Indo-European **koro-poti-* ‘warlord, leader of the army,’ attested in a Lusitanian personal name COROPOTI (gen., Torrejón, Cáceres, early 1st c. AD); edition by [Gamallo Barranco & Gimeno Pascual, 1990, 283]. This name is in turn probably identical to the Iranian personal name Κηρπατης (dat. sg., Galatia), which has been traced back to an Iranian compound **kār(i)a-pati-* ‘Führer von Volks- oder Heerstruppen’ [see Dressler, 1967, fn. 42]. This suggests that this is a very old, inherited compound, and consequently its formation predates the derivational process which resulted in Celtic **kor-jo-* ‘army’.

2. Some reflections on the fate of Indo-European /p/ in Celtic

2.1. ROQVETIO: rage and desire

Three votive inscriptions found on the same location (Cabasse, Var, France), in the ancient *pagus Matavonicus* (Forum Iulii, Gallia Narbonensis) and published in recent years have brought to light a hitherto unknown Gaulish divinity:

1) PRIMIO C(AI) IVLI / LIBERTVS ROQV/[ETI]O V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO) [ILN, 163];

2) IVLIA LAETA / ROQVETIO / [V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO)] [AE, 1998, 882];

3) OPTA(TVS) V(OTVM) / ROQVETI/O S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO) [AE, 1998, 883].

According to the editors [Borréani & Gascou, 1998], the second and third examples show great differences in the quality of their engraving, the latter being rather poor and possibly commissioned by a slave. The first and second examples at least seem to have been produced by the same workshop in the first half of the 1st c. AD. Their linguistic analysis is circumscribed to the comparison of a number of names beginning with <ROC> and the identification of a suffix *-et-jo-*.¹¹ For all we know, ROQVETIO is

¹¹ We are only aware of one etymological attempt to explain this divine name: Delamarre [2007, 155] ignores the uniformly attested sequence <QV> and lemmatises it as *Rocetius*, allegedly from **ro-cēt-jo-* ‘grand bois.’

a local divinity. In what follows, we will try to show that this name has far-reaching consequences for the reconstruction of Common Celtic and the preservation of ancient structures and fragments of religious beliefs in peripheral areas of the Indo-European continuum.

2.2. What does <QV> stand for in Gaulish?

The use of prevocalic <QV> in a “*p*-Celtic” dialect like Gaulish remains an unresolved issue. When discussing this phenomenon, most handbooks resort to the trite “conservativeness of religious and institutional vocabulary” without the slightest degree of conviction. For instance, the month name EQVOS in the Coligny Calendar (Ain, Lugdunensis) [RIG-3] has been quietly identified with Gaul. *epos* ‘horse’. This simply begs the question, since, to begin with, the Calendar contains words with /p/, like PRINNI and POC. As opposed to most of the listed months, EQVOS bears no adjectival suffix. Therefore, it cannot be taken to mean ‘the month of the horse,’ let alone ‘the month devoted to the goddess Epona’ (as a matter of fact, this divine name straightforwardly belies the notion that sound change fails to take place in religious vocabulary), but simply ‘the horse’. This is only an easy escape route: names do not fail to undergo sound changes,¹² even if there is a certain liberty when it comes to putting them down in writing (mostly when the bearer of the name has some control over its transmission, as in the case of Roman patrician families). Archaism amounts, in this regard, to conscious resistance to the application of spelling conventions when these are updated to respond to established sound change. It may even lead to spelling pronunciations, especially among the upper literate classes, artificially reverting change in a few forms for some speakers, but normally making an at best marginal impact on the system as a whole.

It is rather obvious that Gaulish could not introduce an artificial phonemic contrast and a semantic split in order to differentiate two uses of a single word. The alleged preservation of IE /kʷ/ or /kʰ/ in several Gaulish forms is contradicted by their consistent evolution to /p/ in Lepontic (by some accounts another word for an archaic stage of Gaulish), in Galatian Ἐπόνη (= *Eponī*, cf. [Bosch, 1967, 78–84]), in the earliest Gaulish record (Southern Gaulish in the Greek alphabet), and in Hispano-Celtic, where the consistent spelling <P> in names in the Latin alphabet is suggestive of [p] already existing as an allophone of /kʷ/ at least in some positions when the Iberian script was still in use in Celtiberia, and possibly even before it was adopted [see Prósper, 2016, 183, fn. 144].

In conclusion, the uncommon Gaulish sequence <QV> can be put down to loss of syllabicity in a Celtic sequence in which *-ku-* originally constituted a syllable, separated from the following nucleus by a consonant that has been lost in the meantime.

¹² On the contrary, at least one subclass of names — place names — is more prone to reduction in local pronunciations, because high frequency of use propitiates it. Cf. [Devine & Stephens, 1994, 141–142].

As we will explain at length in this work, this is only possible when the onset of the next syllable was IE /p/.

EQVOS can be seamlessly traced back to an old Indo-European possessive compound **pekú=ph₂-o-* ‘protecting cattle’ > ‘tasked with or related to cattle raising,’ perhaps directly referring to a month in which the climatic conditions played an important role in animal husbandry.¹³ It is accordingly the perfect match of Skt. *paśu-pā-* ‘protector of cattle’. QVIMON[-] is an intercalary month also attested in the Coligny calendar. It definitely looks like an agent noun, but it is inadvisable to build anything on this form, since Pinault has proposed to read QVSMON (see [Pinault, 1996], on a suggestion by Marcel Brot). All that can be discerned on the photographs is an ‘*longa*,’ however, and consequently an agent noun **kupi/ī-mon-* < **kupi/ē-* (see below) can be considered.

Several divine names of northern Gaul have been brought to bear on this matter, and routinely considered as illustrative of the same “conservative language”. The divine name SINVATI is attested twice: it occurs abbreviated as SILVANO SINV and in full as DEO SINVATI (dat., Géroville, Belgium, Treveri) [CIL, 13, 3968, 3969]. It has been compared to the Marsian dedication to VICTORIE SEINQ (Trasacco, Samnium) [CIL, 1, 388] by [Ernout, 1971, 83], who reconstructed an epithet suffixed by *-āti-*, a marker of both appurtenance and provenance common to Celtic and Italic, but proposed no etymology. This would be the derivative of a small, non-Celtic place name. In our view, however, SINVATI is likely to reflect a dative of the active present part. **sink^u-nt-* > **sink^u-ant-* ‘pouring (streams of water, riches, etc.)’ [cf. LIV, 523, **seik^u-* ‘ausgiessen’] with trivial omission of <N> in coda position, and a match of the Skt. f. present part. *siñcatī*.¹⁴ In view of the Marsian testimony, one could very tentatively classify this epithet as a provincial Latin relic,¹⁵ or more likely as the syncretic fusion of Silvanus with an autochthonous river divinity **sink^uant(-i)-*.¹⁶

SEQVANA was the goddess of the river Seine, which probably gave their name to the tribe of the *Sēquanī*. It goes back to an adjective **seik^u-Vno-*, built from the same root as SINVATI. Both names belong to northern Gaul, but one is naturally reluctant to attribute them to peripheral Gaulish, not least because they find their place in the oldest layer of the hydronymy of Europe. They probably became integrated in Gaulish without much phonetic adaptation, because this dialect already had a new contrastive

¹³ Cf. [Scarlatà, 1999, 307]. While loss of /p/ has not irretrievably blurred the compound boundaries in this case, where a secondary contrast /p/ — /kʷ/ has emerged, we cannot say the same of other obscured compounds whose second member was conceivably **ph₂-ó-*, e.g. *Ambiorix*, if the etymological suggestion by [Lindeman, 2006] is rescued from oblivion.

¹⁴ Cf. *jhubhiḥ siñcatīr iva* (RigVeda 10, 21, 3) ‘like (the women) pouring with ladles.’

¹⁵ Both forms show the regular, inherited phonotactics, which prescribe that a nasal infix should remain consonantal. If this is an athematic formation (something that can be true only if this form does not belong to a language in which /a/ and /o/ have merged), its likely transitive-causative function must be put down to the nasal infix. See [Kulikov, 2000] for an interesting study of the covariance of transitivity and athematicity in the Vedic nasalised presents, including *siñc-*.

¹⁶ See [LRP, 153] for the discussion of other European river names of this origin.

/kʷ/ in its phonemic system (however low its functional load) before it spread northwards from its original locus.

QVARIAT(IVM) (gen. pl., Eburodunum, Alpes Cottiae) [CIL, 12, 80], *Quariates* (Pliny, Nat. Hist., 3, 35) is an ethnic name of the Gallia Narbonensis. The oft-invoked relatedness of this form with *kʷario- ‘cauldron,’ reflected in Gaulish as *pario- [see Guyonvarc’h, 1964], must be definitively abandoned. Stifter [2004] has ingeniously argued that this is a derivative of *ko(m)uari- or *ko(m)uariō-, an adjective attested in OIr. *coäir*, MW. *cywair* ‘orderly, fair,’ or an abstract *ko(m)uariā, since a PCelt. cluster -mu- became -mū-, underwent regressive assimilation and was simplified to -u-. Accordingly, *Quariates* must have been syllabified as /kuuariates/. While this connection has the advantage of linking a Continental with an Insular Celtic form, it demands a leap of faith: Stifter assumes that <QV> may be rendering both prevocalic and preconsonantal /ku/, as in the form QVPRINNO in Châteaubleau, often equated to the name COMPRINNVS. True, the use of <Q> before <V> follows a Latin non-standard orthographic habit, by which <Q> may occur instead of <C> preceding a vowel /u/ in epigraphy (as in PEQVNIA, MERQVRIO). In fact, it is often found in indigenous onomastics, like the potter’s name AQVTIVS (Aquitania), QVNAVONIS (Britannia), and the name MOSQV[-] QVPITI (Noricum), which must be compared with MOSICVNI, MOSICA (Noricum). As everybody knows, this ultimately mirrors the use of Greek *qoppa*, itself an unnecessary sign. As the Greek alphabet irradiated from the colonies of southern Italy and was adapted to write the Italic languages with the help of Etruscan mediation, this sign was reutilised to note the outcome of the voiceless labiovelars, and it was entirely discarded in Venetic, where it was replaced by <kv>. And yet, the limited use of <Q> for <C> in preconsonantal position provided a useful indexical resource that could be used, for instance, to facilitate the interpretation of abbreviated forms.¹⁷

By contrast, <QV> does not render prevocalic /ku/. A minimal contrast between /p/, /ku/ (or /kʷ/) and /ku/ must have existed in Gaulish judging by EQVOS vs. VCVETE. Since there are for the time being no certain alternations of prevocalic <QV> vs. <CV> for the same Gaulish word, the different spellings cannot be held to occur haphazardly. In Latin, whose writing system constitutes the model for Gaulish, there is a robust phonemic contrast, manifested in the minimal pairs *quī* vs. *cuī*, *equī* vs. *vacuī*, *aquam* ‘water’ vs. *acuam* ‘I may/shall sharpen’. Gaulish prevocalic <QV> vs. <CV> must in principle be taken to reflect this very contrast. Consequently, we can hardly take the phonemic structure /kuuariates/ for granted. If this etymology has anything to recommend itself, the initial syllable must have undergone extreme phonetic reduction. But since language contact is involved, Latin may simply have adapted word-initial *kʷuV- as *kuV-/*kʷV-: Early Latin *ko(m)-uV- no longer existed and new compounds had the form

¹⁷ This also applies to the indigenous languages: in Hispano-Celtic derived family names in the genitive plural, the expected orthographic sequence <ICVM> is often actually written <IQVM> or <IQ>.

con-vV-; in addition, word-initial **kuuV-* in polysyllabic forms is virtually nonexistent.¹⁸ Reduction is occasionally found in Gaulish in compound boundaries, as in CVNVANOS (a chieftain name on coins from Alise-Sainte-Reine, Côte-d'Or), ultimately from Celtic **kuno-g^ua/ono-* 'dog-killer,' etc., and also indirectly in names borrowed or transmitted by speakers of other languages, as in Venetic *Verkvanoi*, rendering **uērkuānos* < Gaul. **uērkuuānos* < **uērkoūanos* < CCelt. **uφer-ko(m)-g^ua/onos*, as opposed to apparent Gaulish preservation of the disyllabic sequence in [TA]SCOVAN(I) (Mainz/Mogontiacum, Germania Superior).

In point of fact, we cannot even be sure that the ancient name was *Quariates*. Pliny's text has a *varia lectio* *Quadriates*, and the Arch of Susa [CIL, 5, 7231], erected in commemoration of the covenant between Augustus and several Alpine tribes, reads QVADIATIVM. Given that the sequence /dr/ is infrequent in Latin, these hesitant spellings cast doubt on the very existence of a form *Quariates*, as well as on its putative Celtic ancestry (it might even be Ligurian).

In support of his view that /kuu/ can be rendered <QV>, Stifter [2003] additionally adduces the name QVORDAIONIS (gen., Hasenbach, Noricum) [CIL, 3, 5523; ILLPRON, 160], a compound from **ko(m)-ordajon-*, whose second member may be a derivative of Celtic *ordo-* 'hammer'. In point of fact, according to [Casali, 2011, 8], sequences in which the involved vowels are identical "regularly fail to undergo glide formation." Thus, two adjacent identical vowels can result in a limited number of phonetic realisations: a long vowel (if the system has a contrast of vowel length), a short vowel (through deletion of one vowel, cf. Sp. *lo odio* ['loðjo] 'I hate it'), both of which would be spelt †<CORD>- in the case at issue, or a hiatus, ideally reflected as †<COORD>-.¹⁹ In the last case, an epenthetic glottal stop may occasionally emerge between the vowels. This is consequently not directly comparable with the contact of different vowels: for instance, *-o.e-* may be pronounced [oe] or [oē], which in turn tends to be optimised over time as [oi] or [ue].

Interestingly, there are two further attestations of this name in the area, in fact at close quarters, namely QVORDNI (Gmund, Noricum, lost) [CIL, 3, 4728; ILLPRON, 102], *recte* QVORDAI? and QVORDI[-] (Teurnia, Noricum) [ILLPRON, 485]. Their uniform rendition discredits the idea that <QVO> is an anomalous spelling of /ku.o/.

¹⁸ One has to make allowances for *allegro* pronunciations occasionally manifested in the epigraphic record, such as PEQVARIA, which anticipate Proto-Romance correction. The tendency was counteracted for some time in stilted style, as shown by hypercorrections of the type found in CVARTVS. The latter is most unlikely to reflect actual phonetics, but indirectly testifies to the ongoing loss of a contrast. In fact, when both spellings alternate for the same form in verse, as in *relicuus* vs. *reliquus*, the first is tetrasyllabic and the second trisyllabic (irrespective of the reasons for the preservation vs. reduction of /ku.o/, and of the mono- or bisegmental nature of the entity spelt <qu>). Cf. [Janssen, 1956].

¹⁹ Such apparent exceptions as American Spanish *peleé* 'I fought' [pe.'liɛ], as opposed to standard Iberian Spanish *peleé*, do not result from monophthongisation in a sequence of identical vowels, but attest to the spread of a stem *pele-* generated in *allegro* realisations like [pe.le.'ar] > [pe.'lɛar] > [pe.'liar] 'to fight.'

All things considered, the assumption of a Celtic filiation for this form has nothing to recommend itself. Its derivational base could be identical to L. *cordus*. This adjective applies to animals, as in Varro (*De re rust.* 2, 1, 19): *dicuntur agni cordi qui post tempus nascuntur*, and to cereals reaped later than usual, as in Paulus ex Festo [Lindsay, 1913, 57, 13]: *corda frumenta quae sero maturescunt*. What these phenomena have in common is delayed maturation, but the ultimate cause for this is an interruption in the normal course of things: in both cases we are dealing with living beings whose growth has been impaired (*in utero* or under the ground). *Cordus* is well attested as a cognomen and forms the base of the gentilic name *Cordius*. It can even lay claim to being considered a member of the exclusive club of Roman praenomina [see Chase, 1897, 135]. It is consequently tempting to assume that **k^uordos* was its Venetic match, and that this name goes back to a Proto-Italic adjective **k^uordo-*. Consequently, L. *cordus* may be traced back to **k^ur₃-dh₃-ó-* ‘giving/given a cut, slowed down’.²⁰

We shall next address a number of Lepontic forms showing <ku> in prevocalic position and their putative Gaulish cognates:

a) The individual name *kuašoni* (gen. sg., patronymic, Mezzovico-Vira, 5th–4th c. BC) probably derives from a thematic form attested in Germania much later as a potter’s name CVASVS. In addition, in Central France, near Clermont-Ferrand, a personal name COASO is mentioned by [CAG, 3, 146]. If it is the nominative of a nasal stem, it could be a perfect match of the Lepontic form. If one were to indulge in speculation, an old adjective **ko(m)-ad-sth₂-ó-* ‘ready’ would be a conceivable preform, related to L. *astus* ‘cunning,’ from **ad-sth₂-u-* [cf. Vendryes, 1922]. These forms may have been synchronically parsed as compounds, and the juncture *-o.a-* was consequently realised as a non-optimal diphthong [u̯a] or a hiatus [u.a], which were phonemically ambiguous and hence variously spelt. The comparable scribal hesitation in Gaulish CVETIC, COETIC < **ko(m)-eti-k^ue* (both in Larzac, cf. [Lejeune et al., 1985, 74]) militates in favour of incipient but incomplete hiatus resolution.

b) The individual names *atekua* (nom. sg. f., Stresa, 2nd–1st c. BC), ATECVA (Ornavasso, 30–55 AD) and *kualui* (dat. sg., patronymic, Vira nel Gambarogno, 4th c. BC) may have preserved the sequence **ku.ūV-* unchanged under the pressure of their base, if this was an athematic monosyllabic nominative **kū* ‘dog,’ rather than **ku.ūo-*. Untermann [1995, 737] derived *kualui* from a personal name COVVS, purportedly found on Gaulish coins. We have not found the actual reference, and he may in fact be mistakenly referring to a personal name COVOS SABINAIVS attested in Lägole di Cadore in Venetic context.²¹ If it were Celtic, we could reconstruct the agent noun **kouppó-* ‘wrathful’ or ‘full of desire,’ corresponding to the object noun preserved in Skt. *kopa-* m. ‘wrath,’

²⁰ [EDLIL, s.u. *cordus*] rejects the association of these forms with a root **skerd-* ‘to cut.’ In fact, the reconstructed (neo-)root, attested in PGerm. **skarda-* ‘cut up, short’ is **skerd^h-* ‘to pierce, damage?’, also in OIr. *scerdaid* ‘to peel off,’ Lith. *skerdžiù*, etc., and is thus incompatible with Latin at least.

²¹ COVOS had been studied by Untermann [1961, 153] who compared a barely legible COVVS in Germania (in fact, COVIA is also attested twice in Italy).

OE. *hēaf* m. ‘mourning’ (< **kóypo-*), beside OE. *hēof* m. ‘id.’ (< **kéypo-*).²² This may cast some additional light on such names as *VERCOVIO*[NIS] (Noricum)²³, possibly from **uφer-kouφ-(i)jo-* ‘very wrathful,’ or *COVIOMARVS* ‘great in wrath’ on Pannonian coins. It follows that **kouV-* is preserved as a rule in Gaulish. The sequence (-)*ko.ɥV-* in other polysyllabic compounds of sundry provenance is equally spelt <COV>:- cf. *COVIROS*, *RICOVERIVGVS* (Saites) [CIL, 13, 1048], [TA]SCOVAN(i) (Mainz).

It necessarily follows that the Gaulish divine name attested as *VCVETE*, *VCVETIN* [RIG- 2/1, L-13], Alise-Sainte-Reine, Côte d’Or) can by no means go back to **uk^uet(i)-* as formerly assumed in the footsteps of [Schmidt, 1986]. The progressive tendency to loss of syllabicity observed for the above forms suggests that <CVE>, following Latin usage, may be reflecting a synchronic disyllabic sequence [ku.ɥe]. This name is most likely to be an *-i*-stem compound, possibly from **oku-* ‘sharp’ (which requires some special pleading regarding metaphony or vowel assimilation) + **ueth₂-i-* ‘sayer’ [see Mees, 2008, 133] or perhaps an action noun **ueih₁-ti-* that evolved into an agent noun ‘who goes, pursues,’ and *-Cu.ɥV-* was probably still perceived as a compound juncture.

To recap, we are most sceptical as to the possibility that either Gaulish or Lepontic have preserved /k^u/, /k_u/ unchanged even at the earliest stages of their documentation, and assume they fell together as /p/ early on.²⁴ Gaulish <QV> in prevocalic position is reserved to the outcome of IE **kup-* or to loanwords. We can distinguish *-kuV-* <QV> from *-ku.ɥV-* <CV> in Celtic forms in the Latin alphabet, probably mirroring common Latin usage. Based on the little evidence available, there is no reason to believe that the use of one or the other was contingent on workshop preferences or regional variation. *A fortiori*, merger of secondary **k_uV-* with the outcome of PCelt. /k^u/ and /k_u/, never took place in a Celtic *p*-dialect.

The fate of these sequences is somewhat different in some parts of Hispano-Celtic, where the tendency to assimilation and loss of syllabicity in (-)*Co.ɥV-* > (-)*Cu.ɥV-* > (-)*C_uV-* > (-)*C.C._uV-* is earlier and more pronounced, as transpires from the western names *DOCQVIRVS*, if from **doko-uro-*, *QVERATI* (gen., Caurium, Vettones) [CILCaceres-4, 1302], if from **ko(m)-uerā-to-*. One relevant example comes from Celtiberia: *QVIRAVM* (gen. pl., Segovia, Arevaci) [ERS, 49] can be explained as an ethnonym **kouīr-āuo-* <

²² See [Seebold, 1970, 256] for the Germanic forms, in fact seldom associated with the Sanskrit one in current scholarship.

²³ This form is unrelated to *VERCOBIVS* (Rome) [CIL, 6, 2926], featuring a soldier from Cremona. It probably goes back to **uφer-kom-b(i)jo-* and contains an agent noun **b^hiH-ó-* ‘foremost fighter.’

²⁴ Forms with a transparent etymology have undergone the shift /k^u/ > /p/, but they are unfortunately late: see *pe* < **k^ue* (1st c. BC). An epigraphic argument has been put forward *against* the possibility that Lepontic had /p/ at the earliest stages of its documentation: if there had been a phonemic contrast /p/ — /b/, the Lugano alphabet would have used two signs, as it did for the other stops, and not one [cf. Rubat Borel, 2005]. However, <φ> for /b/ is attested once in the 5th c. BC, and generalisations are premature, given the fragmentary nature of the available evidence. The letters <p>, <k>, <ɥ> are normally used for stops in Cisalpine Celtic, rendering both unvoiced and voiced stops. The letter <χ> can be employed both for /k/ and /g/; <θ> is only sporadically attested.

**kou̯iro-* < **kou̯uēro-* < **ko̯uēro-* ‘true’ in MW. *kywir*, Gaul. COVIRVS [cf. McCone, 1996, 49]. This adjective probably occurs as the first member of the Celtib. individual name *kuirorekiios* (Sasamón, Burgos),²⁵ from **kou̯iro-relēg-* (or **kom-u̯iro-relēg-* ‘leader of the assembly’ — cf. L. *cūria*). The spelling variation in the Celtiberian names SEGGVES (nom.), SEGOVETIS (gen.) < **sego-u̯et-*, and the thematic derivative SEGVETI, SEGOVESO (gen., dat. < **sego-u̯et-(i)io-*), all of them found in Burgos, bears witness to the same tendency to reduction. Cf. also the names DVITIQ(VM) (Saelices, Cuenca), DVATIVS, DVENIA (Lusitania), the divine name DVILLIS (Palencia), etc., which in our view presuppose the following evolution: CCelt. **dub̥uV-* ‘dark’ > **do̯u̯V-* > **do̯uV-* > HCelt. **du̯uV-* > **du̯V-* (see below), and NVAN(A)E (Ávila, featuring a woman from Uxama), which goes back to CCelt. **no̯uanó-* ‘ninth’.²⁶

2.3. Vestiges of **kup-* in Celtic: **kup-ró-*

[LIV, 359] reconstructs a root **keup-* ‘(innerlich) beben’. A verb built directly from this root is not attested in Celtic. But there are vestiges of an adjective **kup-ro-* ‘desiring’ which shows the typical structure of Indo-European deradical adjectives. It can lay claim to PIE status: Lycian B has a 3rd p. sg. present form *kupriti* ‘to love’ and a dat. sg. participle *kuprimi*. Both are probably based on a lost adjective **kup-ró-*.²⁷ CCelt. **ku̯oro-* evolved into **ko̯uro-* which became **kou̯uro-* and eventually **ko̯bro-*.²⁸ in all Celtic dialects except probably in Celtiberian, where the family name BOCOVRIQ(VM) is attested (Madrid, Carpetania) [AE, 1990, 579]. As noted by [Prósper, 2017, 224], this name is immediately redolent of several OIr. compounds: *milchobar* ‘desiring honey’ > ‘bear,’ the king’s name *Conchobar* ‘desiring dogs,’ or the personal name *Ólchobar* ‘desiring ale’ [cf. Watkins, 1962/1994]. The Celtiberian name **bō-kou̯uro-* or **bō-kou̯ro-* underlying BOCOVRIQ(VM) is an agentive compound (as if) from IE **g^{ou}=kupro-* ‘wishing for cattle’ (whether this must be understood as a name of mythic resonances or as mere craving for food, as in two of the above examples, we cannot say). This form is conceivably matched by the dedication ARA(M) BO/COROBR/EICOBO / TALVSICO/BO (Arroyomolinos de la Vera, Cáceres; see [Prósper, 2017] for this reading and segmentation). These two epithets allude respectively to the hillfort protected by this group of divinities, which

²⁵ New reading of [MLH-4, K.14.1] by Jordán Cólera [2010], who proposes a different etymology.

²⁶ On the origin and phonetics of all the above forms cf. [Prósper, 2015; 2016, 134–135, 162–163].

²⁷ See a recent review of the Anatolian forms and their origins in [Sasseville, 2020, 157, 266]. The idea that this very adjective gave its name to Cyprus has been discredited since [Neu, 1995], who believes the island’s name to go back to a Hurrian name for ‘copper.’ The intriguing alternative remains possible, however, that Aphrodite was associated with Cyprus because Proto-Greek still preserved an adjective **kup-ró-*, later lost in this branch.

²⁸ Through resyllabification to **ko̯.uro-*, triggered (or at least favoured) by the fact that these dialects preserved word-initial #*urV-* (where the minimum sonority distance is eventually reached by occlusivisation of [u̯]). By contrast, **kupnó-* came out as **kou̯no-* and **kapno-* ‘haven’ as **ka̯no-* in the same dialects, because #*unV-* was not a permissible sequence, given that [u̯] is more sonorous and the sonority distance between both sounds is greater (#*uCV-* would be simply absurd).

may have been called **bōkōro-bri-*, and the *gentilitas* they are associated with.²⁹ In sum, this kind of compound constitutes a valuable relic of Indo-European word-formation. Testimonies of this form are more difficult to track down in Gaul, among which we can mention COBRONIAE (Transpadana) [CIL, 5, 5997], COBROMARVS, COBROMARA ‘great in/by his/her desire’ (widespread in Pannonia), apparently with a substantival first member, possibly ADCOBROVATI (Dacia) [CIL, 16, 160].

In addition, Irish has a deadjectival verb *ad-cobra-* ‘to wish’ that derives from **kupro-*. A divine name recently attested on a mangled inscription found in Chassenon (Cassinomagus, Aquitania; 150–200 AD) [Hourcade & Maurin, 2013] has been read as [DEA]E . COBRANDIAE, a goddess worshipped as a *paredra* of MARTI GRANNO.³⁰ The text is quite clear and the onomastic context unmistakably Celtic, including the dedicant’s name [DV]BNODAGA. The segmentation is apparently reliable in spite of the incomplete state of the text. While it is tempting to reconstruct a present participle of **koβr-ā-* ‘wishing, demanding,’ a match of OIr. *ad-cobra-*, the voiced stop in the suffix *-nt-* is intriguing. However, a divine name BRIGINDONE or BRIGINDONI (for † BRIGANTONE/I < IE **b^hrǵ^h-nt-* ‘standing high’) is attested on another indigenous inscription from Auxey [CIL, 13, 2638]. This constitutes an argument in favour of the above etymology and points to incipient voicing of voiceless stops when a nasal preceded, a crosslinguistically common phenomenon. Other female divinities whose names are residual present participles of verbs related to will or desire are the Hispano-Celtic goddess VELONSAE (Navarra, Hispania Tarraconensis), ultimately from **uel(H)-ont-ih₂*, and the Paelignian goddess *Herentas* (< **ǵ^her-nt-*; cf. also the Hesychian gloss reading Ἐριέντης Ἀφροδίτης ἐπόνυμον).³¹

Still another instance of this phenomenon may be found in D(ECIMVS) VESCCIVS / CELER / CENTONDI / V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) (Alpes Maritimae) [CIL, 5, 7867]. A reading CENTONDI[O] cannot be jettisoned in view of the mangled state of the right hand.

²⁹ The *Talusic* are recently attested in an inscription that commemorates the H(OSPITIVM) F(ACTVM) / INTER TALVICORV(M) / GENTILITATEM ET / GADARENSIVM (Lusitania, unknown finding place) [AE, 2017, 672].

³⁰ If this is a single god; GRANNO is an epithet of Apollo everywhere else.

³¹ The alternative proposed by the [Hourcade & Maurin, 2013, 148], on a suggestion by J. Gorrochategui, namely a derivative of **kom-randā* that would mean ‘confinalis,’ is seductive at first sight but runs up against unsurmountable formational problems. To begin with, Gaulish **randā* ‘boundary’ is unattested thus far. It has been artificially recovered from place names attested from the Middle Ages onward and traced back to indigenous compounds in *-randā*, like the fictitious **ekyo-randā*, and are nothing but an influential invention of the 19th c. In fact, if this noun went back to **rannā* ‘part,’ like OIr. *rann* > *rand*, the sequence *-nd-* would be as secondary as in Middle Irish *-nn* > *-nd*, due to final vowel syncope and not shared by Brittonic (a point exemplified by OBret. *uuenrann* ‘white plot of land’ > Fr. *Guérande*). The proposed formal and semantic evolution are born out of an arbitrary blend of ICelt. **(φ)rannā* < CCelt. **ǵarsnā* ‘part’ with OE. *rand*, OHG. *rant* ‘edge, rim,’ etc.; the latter are continued by a plethora of Romance borrowings, which in turn form the base of many allegedly Gaulish place names. These have, in turn, an entirely different etymology **rom-ti-*, *-to-*, *-tā*, cf. Lith. *ramtis* ‘banister,’ which, if present in Celtic at all, would come out as **rontV-*.

We assume this form is a present participle or possibly the continuant of **kanto-φont-(i)io-* ‘having one hundred ways’. This compound would be related to the divine name *ELVONTIV* (dat., Genouilly, Cher) [CIL, 13, 1326], from **φelu-φont-(i)io-* ‘having many ways,’ as if from **pelh₁u=ponth₂-* [cf. Schmidt, 1991], and a close match of Skt. *śata-patha-*. The scribe hesitated about the correct reflection of a name he heard as [kæn'dondjo]-, for which neither he nor the commissioner had any previous experience, and consequently produced “phonetic” spellings, as with *BRIGINDONI* and *COBRANDIAE*.³²

As is well known, important and widespread divine names universally tend to be standardised. But in this case, we are dealing with lesser, possibly chthonic divinities. Their cult may have been especially successful among the lower classes, constituting the extant shreds of Gaulish popular religiosity (where the boundaries between religion and magic tend to be blurred), and their names are for this reason more likely to be erroneously reflected if their transmission was mostly oral, their devotees’ pronunciation was far from conservative and the names themselves, being of adjectival origin, more prone to show slight morphological variation (a phenomenon attested in the Latin epithets *Libentina/Lubentia*, *Potina/Potica*, etc.).

In a nutshell, the rendition of names belonging to popular religiosity anticipates phonetic traits, like contextually raised vowels and palatalised or voiced stops, which surfaced in orthographic writing much later or can be only indirectly recovered from the testimony of the daughter languages. This might be especially true of *BRACIACAE* and *COBRANDIAE*, the *paredrae* of Mars reviewed above (for which this is not a precise name if our conclusions on their functions and essence are right). Like other divine beings probably integrated in the system as epithets or functions of higher gods, these goddesses were only recorded in epigraphy at all because they were bound to a superordinate male god, whose name and divine attributes were by that time comparatively homogeneous all over the Roman empire, and in this way ensured the minor divinities in his sphere their share of short-lived celebrity. They must have been, so to speak, of twofold nature: they tended to embody traits of the major divinities, but were simultaneously invoked as independent beings considered able to channel the concerns of human beings, who also urgently wished, required and desired.

Celtic also possesses an adjective **kouno-* < **kouno-* < **kuφno-* < **kup-nó-*, possibly a (quasi-)participial form meaning ‘desired, desirable > beautiful’. This is exemplified by Celtib. *COVNEANCVS* (a Cluniensis, Aquae Flaviae/Chaves, Vila Real, Callaecia Lucensis) [CIL, 2, 2390], and the Celtiberian family name *COVNEIDOQ(VM)* (gen. pl., Segovia) [CIL, 2, 5779], in turn a match of Mlr. *cúanda*, *cúanna* ‘precious, fine’.

³² This is suggestive of incipient neutralisation of voice after nasals. If voiceless stops had lax realisations in most contexts, and intervocalic voiced stops were fricatives, such context bound confusion would be all but natural.

The Italic adjective **kup-ro-* has survived thus far exclusively in Sabellic. South-Picene has preserved in funerary context an adverb *kupri* (Capestrano) [ST, Sp, AQ 2], *kupirih* (Castignano) [ST, AP 2], from **kupr-ē(d)* ‘lovingly’. Venetic *kuprikonio.i.* (dat., father’s name, Padua) contains a name **kupr-iko-* [see Untermann, 1961, 103, 155] rather than an inverted compound **kupri-kon-* ‘desiring dogs’ [cf. Delamarre, 2004, 125]. It is also attested as a divine name: four Umbrian dedications to the *mater Cupra* on bronze tablets, which read *cupras matres* in the Umbrian alphabet (gen. sg. marking the destinatory of the dedication; Plestia) [ST, Um 17–20], later CVBRAR MATRER (Tadinum) [ST, Um, 7].³³ Varro has left us a gloss “*cyprum sabine bonum*” (Ling. Lat. 5, 159), which has promoted the association of Cupra with the *bona mater*. There is also a statuette devoted to [M]ARTI CYPRIO (Iguvium) [CIL, 11, 5805] (see [Calderini, 2001, 67–68] on the different interpretative possibilities), and a Sicel nymph transmitted as Κυπαρα by Strabo, Hesych, etc.³⁴ This is the indigenous name for a spring at Syracuse that was called Arethusa and personified as a nymph by the Greeks. Finally, a personal name Κυπαρα alternates with Κυπρα and Κυπυρα in Sicily, and is probably found in a recently published Greek inscription reading Κυπαρας εμι [cf. Antonaccio, 1999]. Κυπυρα and Κυπαρα could reflect divergent processes of anaptyxis, probably related to the Oscan filiation of Sicel: while Κυπαρα points to tautosyllabic *muta cum liquida*, Κυπυρα may respond to Latin influence or a heterosyllabic treatment of this kind of clusters. The onomastic evidence can be rounded out with the personal names: Umbrian CVBRENA / L(VCI) L(IBERTA) ALETIA (Iguvium, lost) [CIL, 11, 5854]; Etruscan *cupure*, and the pseudo-gentilic name *Cupronius*.³⁵

2.4. **kup-* in comparative perspective

Latin preserves a verb *cupiō* ‘to desire,’ whose formation is not entirely clear. According to [Meiser, 2003, 126, fn. 49], it must be secondary, since a verb of the 3rd class cannot have had a stem **cupī-* in the perfect and past participle forms. Therefore, either *cupiō* goes back to a lost compound, which was transferred to the *schwache Aoristklasse* in imitation of the compounded type *appellare*, or it has been built after the paradigm

³³ See Rocca [1996, 80–83]. This Picene divinity is also mentioned by such classical authors as Strabo: τὸ τῆς Κύπρας ἱερὸν (Geogr. 5, 4, 2, 20), or Silius Italicus: *litoreae fumant altaria Cūprae* (Punica 4, 342).

³⁴ See [Antonaccio & Neils, 1995, 269–270] for the dossier and alternative, but more unlikely, etymologies.

³⁵ Obviously, Greek influence on Sicily and Magna Graecia has irretrievably blurred the distinction between the indigenous goddess and the famous epithet of Aphrodite, *kypria*, which relates to her mythical birth in Cyprus (see an overview in [Calderini, 2001]). The personal names CVPRIGENIA (Olbia, Regnum Bospori) [CIL, 3, 7623] and CVPROGENIA (Puteoli, Latium et Campania) [CIL, 10, 1568], are instances of a Greek theophoric name alluding to Aphrodite, which celebrates the fact that she was born in Cyprus. Accordingly, all the extant forms can be unproblematically derived from **kup-ro-*, and it is unnecessary to view the South-Picene forms as continuants of **kup-ri-*, in spite of [WOU, 405–406]; see the discussion in [Calderini, 2001, 79].

of *concupiscō*, which virtually presupposes the existence of a present **concupiō*. Watkins [1994, 94, fn. 1] devoted some insightful words to this problem. In his words, “it is worth noting that just as the verb *ad-cobra* is a denominative to *accobur*, so is the Latin verb *cupiō* by its form (perf. *cupīvī*) a denominative from a lost root noun form **kup-*.”

Similarly, one could trace the following path: a noun **kupi-* existed in Italic, and possibly in Celtic, side by side to a stative present **kupē-īo/e-*, which had no past participle: its semantic and syntactic slot was occupied by an adjective *cupidus*, from **kupi=d^h(h₁)o-*.³⁶ Interestingly, this reconstruction is underscored by the Balto-Slavic evidence: Lith. *kūpėti*, OCS. *kypěti* ‘to boil, simmer’ can be traced back to **kup-eh₁-* ‘to be in a state of rage, boil with anger or lust’ with secondary vrddhi, due to their intensive meaning.³⁷

In turn, **kupi-* gave rise in Latin to a verb **kupi-īo/e-* of the denominative type exemplified by *fīnis* → *fīnīre* (perf. *fīnīvī*, past part. *fīnītus*). Its infinitive *cupēre*, however, can only be explained by assuming that, since the underlying noun had receded from use in the meantime, it was attracted to the type of *faciō*. *Cupīdō* ‘desire’ and its relation to these forms remains unclear.

Nussbaum [2004b] has drawn attention to another Latin relic that weighs in on this problem: *cuppēs et cupedia antiqui lautiores cibos nominabant* (Paulus ex Festo [Lindsay, 1913, 42]). In his view, *cuppēs* is the acc. pl. of an *-i*-stem **kuppi-* (< **koupi-*?). One wonders, however, if what we find here is the lost **kupi-*, and if in this case *-p-* was attracted to the expressive phonetics of the other forms, or anticipated the geminate expected in *cupedia*, attested as *cuppedia* from Plautus onwards (which can be taken at face value as a derivative of *cuppēd-*). Nussbaum has explained L. *cuppēdia*, *cuppēdō* (where the geminate has come into being by *Lex Iuppiter*) as the outcome of the derivational chain **koupó-* ‘appetitive’ → **koupēd-* > *cuppēs* ‘appetitive (one), glutton(ous)’ → **koupēd-(ō)n-* ‘desire, market for delicacies’.³⁸ Alternatively, we may reconstruct, allowing for expressive phonetics, an ancient collocation **kup-eh₁ deh₃-* ‘provide with commotion’ [see Kölligan, 2014, 157, on L. *albēdō*].

In sum, there is reason to posit an Indo-European noun **kupi-* with generalised zero grade of the root. It helps explain the inflectional irregularities of L. *cupiō* ‘to desire’ (perf. *cupīvī*, past part. *cupītus*), and perhaps also Skt. *kupya-* ‘to rage’. This is a post-Vedic formation except for the isolated present part. *ákupyantah* in a corrupt passage (AtharvaVeda, 130). It also accounts for L. *cupi-dus* and the acc. pl. *cuppēs*, and can be integrated in the Caland system, since it is related to **kup-ró-* and probably

³⁶ Cf. for this formation Nussbaum [1999], Hackstein [2002].

³⁷ Cf. [EDBIL, 264; EDPC, 25] — these militate against the *ad hoc* reconstruction of a root **kueh₁p-* ‘sieden’ posited by [LIV, 374] exclusively on the strength of the Balto-Slavic forms.

³⁸ We warmly thank Alan J. Nussbaum (Cornell) for sending us his unpublished work.

to a stative present **kup-eh₁-*. The Celtic and Lycian verbs meaning ‘to desire’ are deadjectival to **kup-ró-*.

The Anatolian evidence is often overlooked but highly informative: Luvian has a root verb /kub/ solely attested as a 3rd p. sg. preterite *ku-up-ta* ‘to plot, scheme’ (in Hittite transmission). A different stem is reconstructed for Luvian as **/kubi-/* or **/kubi(ya)-/* in order to account for the attested action noun /kubiyad(i)-/ ‘plan’ and the derived adjective /kubiyadalla/i-/. There is also a Hittite 3rd p. sg. *ku-pi-eš-ke-ez-zi*. Melchert [1997, 87] simply reconstructs a present stem **kúpye/o-*, which he directly compares with the Sanskrit and Latin verbs, in turn directly traced back to **kup-jo/e-* in [LIV, 359]. It might be very tentatively assumed that the Luvian reconstructed stem is also denominal to **kup-* or **kupi-*.³⁹

There is an innovation, common to the Italic and the Celtic verb, by which innovative past participles in *-e-to-* are built to a number of deverbal stative presents (L. *tacēre*, *tacitus*, U. *taçez*) after the suffix *-ejo/e-* of the iterative-causative presents was reanalysed as *-ejo/e-*. It follows that ROQVETIO may be directly traced to CCelt. **qro-kuqe-to-*, the past participle corresponding to a stative present **kup-eh₁-*. It would mean something like ‘in a state of rage’. The old participle, like *tacitus*, behaves as an adjective, is essentially indifferent to voice and tense, and is disconnected from the aspect specifications of the finite verb. This explains the emergence (or at least the success) of the *-idus* type, which often replaces *-itus* in the same functional slot. This formation *may* have analogically replaced the original adjective **pro-kupi-t-o-*, preserved in Skt. *prá-kupita-*, or these may be parallel formations.⁴⁰

Sanskrit *prá-kupita-* is only attested in the oldest Sanskrit layer in RigVeda (2, 12, 2b): *yáh párvatān prákupitām áramṇāt* ‘who settled the quaking mountains’. It is definitely not the past participle corresponding to a deradical present in *-jo/e-*, for which we would expect † *kup-tá-*. The linking vowel *-i-* of *-ita-* has been introduced in some verbs in order to make the root form more transparent or for other, less clear reasons: in the causative, *-i-ta-* is regularly the case, e.g. *cod-i-tá-* (from *cod-áya-ti* ‘to set in motion’) [see Gotō, 2013, 139]. The Vedic causative present *kopáyati* ‘to shake’ should have a past part. **kop-i-tá-*. The actually attested *kupi-tá-* may consequently

³⁹ Skt. *kupáya-* ‘seething’ is an epithet of Agni attested once, in RigVeda (1, 140, 3). Interestingly, the suffix *-aya-* is usually denominative. So, one could venture the alternative possibilities that this adjective is based on a root noun **kup-* or possibly **kupi-*. This will of course remain speculative.

⁴⁰ The individual names ARQVICI, ARQ[VI]C(I) (gen., Salamanca, Lusitania Emeritensis) [ERPS, 9], ARQVITIVS [Vind. Tab., 2, 128], Britannia, ARCVITIVS [Ibid., 129] are very poorly attested, and then mostly in indigenous contexts. At first sight they may look like the only remnants of the Latin form transmitted by Paulus ex Festo [Lindsay, 1913, 19, 10]: *arquites arcu proeliantes*. Nonetheless, it can be unproblematically traced back to a variant **qare-kupit-(i)jo-*. Posttonic /e/ is syncopated in CCelt. **qare-* when it is used as an intensive prefix. See [Prósper, 2019a, 39–45]. In that case, it bears a striking resemblance to Classical Sanskrit *parikupita-* ‘agitated, wrathful.’

reflect the possessive derivative of the lost noun **kupi-*, which is not even certain to have been fully integrated in the verb paradigm.⁴¹

We may provisionally draw the following scheme, which traces back several peripheral forms to one single Indo-European etymon, conceivably belonging to the core poetic vocabulary of Indo-European:

 ?IE root-noun **kup-/kupi-* → **kupit(-o)-* ‘raging, quaking’ → **pro-kupito-* (the intensive meaning of the prefix, meaning ‘excessively, very’ when attached to adjectives, is an archaism found both in Celtic and in Sanskrit);

> Skt. *prá-kupita-* (once, RigVeda). Post-Vedic *kupitá-* may attest to the existence of the simplex, or, alternatively, may be decompositional to it, and then secondary in word-formational terms;

> CCelt. **φro-kupito->> *φro-kupeto-* by reinterpretation of this form as the (innovative) *-e-to-* participle of the stative present **kup-eh₁-iō/e-* ‘to be in a state of anger or commotion’ (in Balto-Slavic **kūpē-*, possibly in Hitt. *ku-pi-eš-ke-ez-zi*, perhaps indirectly in L. *cupē-d-*). Its base, **kup-eh₁* ‘with rage or commotion,’ is conceivably the instrumental of the root-noun **kup-*.⁴²

As regards the semantics of ROQVETIO, the notion of a divinity that trembles with rage and goes berserk, notably after ritual intoxication and when marching against the enemy’s forces, is of course not alien to Indo-European religion, witness such important male gods as Vedic *Indra*, the Roman *Mars*, literally ‘destroyer’ [see Prósper, forthc.], his Greek counterpart, Ares, called θοῦρος ‘furious,’ and especially the Germanic king of the gods, **wōðanaz*, attested in OHG. *Wuotan*, OIc. *Óðinn*, etc., whose name means ‘raging, furious,’ etc. One must, however, be cautious about the postulation of inherited, warlike semantic contents for some derivatives of this root. As noted by [Renou, 1997, 231–232], Skt. *prakup-* preserves the original meaning ‘to set in motion,’ and the aggressive nuance generally inherent in forms

⁴¹ Historically, it may reflect a formation in *-it* as explained by [Pinault, 1980; cf. also Widmer, 2005]: along these lines, **kupi-* ‘rage’ would be enlarged by an instrumental ending *-t-*, in turn thematicised, from which an adjective ‘full of rage > angry,’ like **reud^{h1}i-* ‘redness’ → **reud^{h1}i-t-* ‘with redness > red’ (by hypostasis evolving into ‘red thing’; cf. Skt. *rohit-* ‘red mare’) → **reud^{h1}i-t-o-* ‘characterised by redness’ (cf. Skt. *rohita-* ‘reddish,’ hypostasised as ‘reddish brown horse’); from here, a new layer of adjectives/nouns emerges that descriptively consists of denominatives in *-to-*. According to [Nussbaum, 2004a], by contrast, an adjective in *-i-* gives rise to a nominal *-t-* stem in *-i-t-*, which parallels those in *-o-* → *-e/o-t-*. In fairness, given the existence of decausative *-to-* adjectives, the *-i-to-* forms could be delocative derivatives to root nouns, and **kup-i* could be an ancient locative meaning ‘in rage.’

⁴² A compounded verbal adjective in *-eto-* ‘very desirable’ is less likely in so far as a present **kup-iō/e-* ‘to desire’ is not certain to have existed (its purported Sanskrit avatar is intransitive). A verb **keup-o/e-* is apparently only continued in PGerm. **heufa-*, an intransitive verb, which, if it belongs here, can in most cases be interpreted as denominative to the noun **kéupo-*, preserved in OE. *hēof* m. ‘mourning.’ Cf. OIc. *hjúfran* ‘regret,’ OE. *hēofian* [cf. Seebold, 1970, 256], but there are isolated strong verb forms like the Goth. pret. 1st p. pl. *hufum*. Most accounts favour a segmentation **keu-* ‘wail’ with an enlargement *-p-*. OIc. *hjúfa*, the only form quoted in this respect by [LIV, 359], is not certain to exist.

of this root in Classical Sanskrit is a function of the violent context in which they are inserted. It must remain for the time being in the dark, however, whether this was just the epithet of an important unmentioned divinity, or whether it had gained a status of its own as a minor local (and possibly chthonic) divinity, operating in the sphere of the higher gods.

2.5. Again on the relative chronology of Celtic loss of /p/

The abovesaid has relevant consequences for the date of weakening and loss of /p/ in Celtic, whose step-by-step evolution is generally held to have proceeded as follows: /p/ > /f/ > /h/ > ø. These changes illustrate one of the two commonly accepted pathways of lenition: “reduction toward deletion maintains the laryngeal state of the consonant, but weakens the oral articulation leading to debuccalization and eventual deletion, as in the sequence: p > f > h > ø” [cf. Bybee & Easterday, 2019, 270]. Its chronology, however, has been subject to debate in the last decades, and context-sensitive differences still await to be established.

2.6. Is there any testimony of CCelt. /φ/?

The use of <QV> in ROQVETIO shows that /p/ had not been effaced without a trace early enough for the resulting sequence to fall together with the outcome of /kʷ/ and /kʷ/: otherwise, a secondary /kʷ/ should have become /p/ in Gaulish. The question revolves around what the succession of stages was that culminated in loss of /p/ in the inherited sequence -upV-.

On the strength of the Lepontic personal name *uvamokozis* (Prestino, 6th c. BC) < *uφamo-gosti- < *(H)upm_g(H)o=g^hosti- ‘the one with the highest guests,’ Eska has put forward in several works the novel idea “that PIE */p/ was not lost altogether in Proto-Celtic in intervocalic position, but was continued as */φ/, and that it is attested in the Cisalpine Celtic idionym *uvamokozis* represented by the character <v>” [Eska, 2013, 40].⁴³

The above cited version of Eska’s argumentation is directed against [Isaac, 2007, 11–14], who had concluded that <uva> is the way in which the Lugano alphabet reflected either /u.a/-, realised [u.ɥa], or /ɥa/-, realised [ɥa] (an alternative certainly borne out by the obscure *uvtiauiobos* in Prestino and by Early Etruscan *auvileś*, where <uv> seems to be a digraph for /ɥ/). As remarked by Eska, /u/ and /ɥ/ are both rendered <u> in the Lugano alphabet. It is no less true, however, that we have no independent evidence for the rendition of /φ/ or /f/, and as a consequence the argument incurs circularity.⁴⁴ As observed by Isaac, one cannot assert that the Lugano alphabet would

⁴³ The idea that <v> could be noting a labiodental could find some eastern parallels in Venetic texts in which it seems to be doing double service [cf. Prósper, 2019a, 33], but in the latter case the reasons behind the process of simplification of <hv>, <vh> may have been different.

⁴⁴ In point of fact, only recently has an instance of the use of *qoppa* in the Lugano alphabet come to light in a form *quormsklq* of uncertain segmentation [see Rubat Borel, 2005].

not have pressed the digraphs <hv>, <vh> into service, if required, to render /f/ or /φ/. The purported difference between the two fricative sounds in Etruscan *vis à vis* Lepontic is irrelevant, since they resemble each other in articulatory terms more than [ɥ]. What is more, the sign /φ/ for bilabial fricatives is habitually used in Celtic studies, but virtually all languages having only one voiceless fricative labial phoneme actually have a labiodental /f/ with context-dependent variation (e.g. [φu] [see Foulkes, 1997, 271]).

Eska also claims that <uva> cannot be reflecting /u.a/ [u.ɥa], because, in that case, another character should be used, not an otherwise unemployed one, or none at all, given that this alphabet does not note geminates orthographically. But this is not a geminate, and the distinction is relevant if contrastive pairs opposed by syllable boundaries are involved: one would expect exactly this spelling to distinguish #uV- <u> from disyllabic #u.ɥV- <uv>. Epigraphic Latin, in spite of having no forms that begin with #i.ɥV-, writes *iuvāre*, *iuvenis* with <vv> so as to eliminate the ambiguity in the sequences #i.ɥV- (IVVENIS) and #Ci.ɥV- (NIVIS; note that Late Latin had no problems adapting the Gaulish plant name *ivus* ‘yew’).⁴⁵ The same applies to #CRu.ɥi.- in FLVVIVS, as opposed to #Cui.ɥiV- in CVIVS.⁴⁶

Drawing upon [Lejeune, 1971, 380], Eska further assumes that the Lepontic name *teu* (Vergiate), which goes back to *deṽ-ū, shows that intervocalic /ɥ/ in this context was omitted in writing from the earliest stages. And yet, this does not straightforwardly demonstrate that “/w/ was represented by <u> at least as early as ca. 500 BCE” [Eska, 2013, 35]. If /ɥ/ had been lost through dissimilation, *teu* may perfectly well be a regular spelling for /de:.u:/, /de.u:/, or even /deu:/ with resolution of the hiatus by glide formation, and not /de:ɥ:/ as implied by Eska’s formulation. See in this respect the fate of *deṽuo- in Latin: it becomes *deus* by context-bound loss of /ɥ/ preceding /o/ at an earlier stage, and in all likelihood contains a hiatus at least in formal phonostyles, and is parsed as /de.us/, while *dīvus* is the product of paradigm split and has simply arisen in imitation of the regular genitive. A similar case in point is nom. pl. *boves*, gen. pl. *boum* (consistently disyllabic in poetry) [see Cser, 2020, 29]. If the same applies to Lepontic, there would be a skewed paradigm with two stem allomorphs: nom. *de/ē(ø)-ū, gen. *deṽ-on-os, rendered <teu>, and (hypothetically) †<teunos>. It is consequently possible for /ɥ/ and zero to alternate in Lepontic within the same paradigm, as in Latin. If <eu> reflects a hiatus, it cannot be invoked in defence of the idea that the use of the orthographic sequence <uva> to render /u.a/ is anomalous.

⁴⁵ No second <v> is inserted in any other form containing -Cu.ɥV- (e.g. TENVE, not † TENVVE; SVAVIS #syā- and sva #su.ɥa-). Note that the assumption of glide epenthesis is indirectly supported by the lack of distinction of these sequences from those containing etymological -o.ɥV- that became -u.ɥV- by vowel reduction, like SENATVI, FLVERE, VIDVA.

⁴⁶ This is of course far from obligatory: in Republican epigraphy, and occasionally also later on, we still find the simplified spelling <v>, as in IVENTA [CIL, 1², 1603] or FLVIO [CIL, 1², 584, 9].

In what follows, we shall treat /u/ and /u̥/ as phonemes⁴⁷ and consider [u̥] as the prevocalic realisation of /u/, not as a bisegmental /u̥/; we shall consequently circumscribe /u̥/ to the formalisation of the heteromorphemic sequence *-u-u-*. Under this analysis, the glide [u̥]- was not a positional variant of the high vowel /u/, but, conversely, [u̥] was.⁴⁸ Under the premise that <uv> stands for a phoneme /u/, realised [u̥] in prevocalic position, the problem essentially revolves around whether the approximant historically continues IE /p/ or has come into being just as a hiatus-filler after all trace of /p/ was lost: a sequence #*u.a-*, resulting from complete loss of Indo-European /p/, would be expected to become either #*ua-* by glide formation or #*u.ua-* by epenthesis of a homorganic glide. The latter is a very common phenomenon in Indo-European languages, favoured by the previous existence of an intervocalic segmental approximant in the language system [cf. Blevins, 2008]. Languages frequently note intrusive glides in writing for varied reasons, often related to the use of different scripts and their limitations (as in Gaulish [i̯] or Mycenaean [i̯], [u̯]).⁴⁹ In our case, the scribe may have been trying to reflect the contrast between mono- and disyllabic sequences: #*uV-* <u> vs. #*u.V-* <uv>.⁵⁰

The sequences *-uV-* and *-uuV-* must have existed at least at the earliest stages of Celtic, but minimal contrasting pairs may have been rare. Later, after IE /p/ was replaced by a glide in this context, new instances of the contrast came into being. If <u> had normally been used in Lepontic both for /u/ and /u̥/ because they were positionally predictable in most cases, <uv> would have the virtue of eliminating the undesirable homography in the few cases in which there still was a contrast in prevocalic position.

Eska adds that the fate of *(H)*i̯uH̥ko-* > **i̯uu̯anko-* ‘young’ > **i̯ou̯anko-* > MW. *ieuanc*, OIr. *óac*, Gaul. IOVINCILLOS, and **i̯uu̯antūt-* ‘youth’ > OIr. *óitiu*, cf. L. *iuventūs*; Gaul. dat. IOVANTVCARO (epithet of Mars), is especially revealing and corroborates the assumption that Celtic **CuuV-* “always remained disyllabic” [Eska, 2013, 35]. Note that this particular example also involves a long assumed CCelt. rule

⁴⁷ See [Cser, 2020, 14–15] for the phonemic contrast of /u̥/ vs. /u/ in Latin, which is morphologically predictable in many cases, however.

⁴⁸ Or [u̥], see below 2.8. The difference is immaterial to the present argument. As we are going to see, /p/ surfaces as [β], [χ], [u̥] depending on context. But then, these realisations are derived by different rules from more than one underlying phoneme. As a consequence, the degree of opacity is too high, and we must limit our conclusions to surface contrasts.

⁴⁹ In fact, this has a conceivable parallel in CCelt. **louerno-* ‘fox,’ taken from **loperno-* by Schrijver [1998]. If *-u-* is a hiatus-filler here, and not a direct continuant of /p/, one does not quite see why the same cannot apply to *-upV-*. In any event, this form might go back to **loupp-*, like Skt. *lopāśá-* ‘fox, jackal.’

⁵⁰ This equally applies to a comparable example brought to bear by Eska: a graffito on pottery from Mantua, dating to the second half of the 3rd c. BC, reads *eluveitie* [cf. Vitali & Kaenel, 2000]. This personal or ethnic name is cogently taken from **φελu-φειτ-(i)ῖo-* ‘having many lands’ since [Thurneysen, 1923], and directly identified with the *Helvetiī* mentioned by Caesar. For Eska, <uv> testifies to vowel intrusion, caused by the difficulties the Etruscans had in pronouncing a sequence *-lu-*. This automatically means that <uv> may represent a disyllabic sequence in Etruscan, and also that it rendered Gaulish *-u.u-* in compounds, and the ethnic name could only be borrowed as *Helvetiī* in obedience to Latin phonotactic rules.

-u.ɥV- > *-o.ɥV-*. The laryngeal in **h₂iuh₁(e)n-* ‘young’ has indeed left a hiatus in Celtic and Italic, automatically filled by a homorganic approximant. The above generalisation about *-u.ɥV-* would be lethal to the assumption that <u> renders prevocalic /u/, pronounced [u̯], and ultimately from /uφ/, because we know this sequence did not remain disyllabic, but was eventually reduced to /u/.

A serious objection may be raised against such an overarching tenet, however. Since [i] and [u] are ranked at the same level in the sonority scale, loss of syllabicity of #*i*u.ɥa- to #*i*ɥa- is most unlikely to happen: the nonexistent distance in strength between the two segments preceding the syllable nucleus would have made the resulting sequence highly unnatural. The only alternative phonotactic structure would be #*i*.ɥa- (cf. Sp. *Juan* vs. *Iván* or L. *iuvencus* ‘calf’ vs. U. *iveka*, acc. pl. /iʉengaf/, *IVENGAR*, nom. pl.). This is why we have Sp. *joven* from *iuvenis*, despite the fact that other similar sequences regularly undergo Late Latin loss of syllabicity and subsequent processes like metathesis: *vidua* > Sp. *viuda* ‘widow’.⁵¹ This example is consequently far from probative.

As regards the other showcase example, **dru-uid-* ‘druid,’ the morpheme boundary must have been easily detectable (as in **su-uid-* ‘knowledgeable’). Reduction to #*druid-*, with two sonorants in the slope of the syllable head, or to #*druɥid-* with formation of a non-optimal diphthong /uɥ/, was unlikely to happen, especially if the resulting word was bound to be monosyllabic.⁵² The same applies to other instances beginning with clusters: **knuuV-* > MW. *cneu*, etc. ‘nuts,’ and the Gaulish personal name Κνουιλλα; **kruuV-* ‘blood, slaughter’ > MW. *kreu*, etc. By the same token, forms of the structure **Cu.ɥi.ɥV-* > **Cɥu.ɥV-*, if they existed (which is contingent on one’s preferences about the relative chronology of *-i̯o-* > *-i̯o-*), were hardly expected to become monosyllabic.

Preservation of disyllabic **CuɥV-* is apparently well attested in verbs: OIr. *im.sóí* ‘to turn around,’ MW. *amheuaf* ‘to disagree’ are traced back to **suh₁-é-ti*, allegedly a match of Skt. *suváti*, by [McCone, 1991, 109]. They have allegedly been thematised from the weak stem of an original present 3rd p. **seuh₁-ti*, pl. **suh₁-é/ónti* [cf. LIV, 538–539, **seuh₁-*]. But Celtic may have undergone paradigm leveling from the 3rd p. sg. and then these forms would continue the full grade **seuh₁-o/e-*. The same applies

⁵¹ We are not implying that change is always (or ever) teleologically driven towards “more natural” sequences, a premise many historical linguists would strongly oppose; we just mean that lack of reduction in this case cannot be extrapolated.

⁵² Obeying Sievers’ Law, similar sequences are alternatively pronounced as hiatuses by most speakers in our Spanish dialect: [kons. ‘trui̯r], [kons.tru. ‘ir]; the former is perfectly standard, but potentially harmful to the perception of the contrast with infinitives in -[‘trir], and the same applies to past participles in -[‘trui̯ðo] vs. -[‘triðo]. For the same reasons, the past of *dar* ‘to give’ is universally pronounced [‘djo] ‘(s)he gave,’ but that of *freír* ‘to fry’ is mostly realised [fri. ‘o], only distinguished from the equally disyllabic [‘fri.o] ‘cold’ by the place of the stress. Needless to say, the retention of hiatus is especially common in morpheme boundaries. In Vulgar Latin, [u] could be simply effaced in such complex sequences in isolated forms: cf. *februarius* > *FEBRARIAS* (Pompeii) [CIL, 4, 4182, etc.].

to OIr. *as.loí*, L. *luō*, usually taken from **luh₁-é-ti* ‘to set free, release’ [cf. LIV, 417, **leuH-*].⁵³ See also OIr. *as.noi* ‘to swear,’ *ad.noi* ‘to entrust,’ MW. *dineu* ‘to flow, spill,’ this time almost certainly from a full grade present **néu-o/e-* ‘to nod’ [cf. LIV, 455, **neu-*]; differently [EDCP, 295]. The occasionally adduced MW. *huan* ‘sun’ is a most unreliable form.⁵⁴

The last outpost of this idea is CCelt. **duyo* ‘two,’ f. **duuī*, as reconstructed by [Cowgill, 1985, 20–25]; cf. also [Uhlich, 1995, 22] for OIr. *dáu*, OW. *dou* (MW. f. *dwy* can be directly taken from **dyei*). He posits **duyo* > Early Irish **dou-*, and **dyV-* > proclitic *da*, *di*. The problem revolves around how early this happened (the Gaulish compositional variant *vo-* in the *dvigú*-compound *Vo-corī*, an ethnonym meaning ‘those having two armies’ presupposes a preform **duo-*). Many other scholars still reconstruct a stressed preform **duōy* (where *#dy-* > ICelt. *#d-*). An interesting paradox should be mentioned here: Cowgill’s main reason to reject **duōy* is the observation that it is only attested beyond doubt in Sanskrit; surprisingly, the Sanskrit connection is the main reason why **suh₁-é-ti* and **luh₁-é-ti* are reconstructed for *-soí* and *-loí* in the first place.

We may provisionally assume that things fare differently for sequences beginning with stops, where loss of syllabicity would be unproblematic. Take, for instance, the 3rd p. sg. subj. **b^huH-e-ti*, probably the immediate antecedent of Gaulish BVETI(D) (Chamalières, Lezoux). The resulting form **bu₁eti* never evolved into **bou₁eti*, either because *-u₁V-* > *-ou₁V-* was not a Common Celtic change after all, or because **bu₁eti* (cf. Skt. *bhuvat*) had become **bu₁eti* early on, and the initial cluster was eventually simplified, yielding OIr. *beith* ‘shall be’. McCone [1991, 122] believes extreme reduction of **bu₁e-* to **be-* to have occurred in analogy to the stem **b₁ui-* (OIr. 3rd p. sg. present form *biid*, Celtib. 3rd p. pl. *bionti*), but this change would have to be placed in Common Celtic and is eminently *ad hoc*.

In fact, McCone’s hypothesis is intended to save the following derivation [McCone, 1991, 132]: 3rd p. sg. OIr. *boí* ‘was’ < **bo₁e* < **bu₁et* << **b^huH-t*, the IE reconstructed athematic aorist; the Celtic form is achieved through paradigm leveling from a 3rd pl. **bu₁ent* (itself from **b^huH-ent*). But why the reduction **bu₁e-* > **be-* was not extended to the preterite remains unexplained. Of course, BVETI(D) might have remained trisyllabic (something the upholders of the idea that the sequence *-u₁V-* always remained disyllabic would certainly stand up for). But this would *ipso facto* compromise the CCelt. dissimilatory rule “*-u₁V-* > *-o₁V-*.” Conversely, if loss of syllabicity took place early on, other Irish forms not especially likely to result from analogical processes could be neatly explained. For instance, OIr. *baile* ‘place, farm, and, town’ could be traced

⁵³ The Latin form may directly continue **leu-* or may have been abstracted from compounds and is not decisive.

⁵⁴ Schrijver’s etymology **su₁alono-* < **suh₂-e/on-o-* [Schrijver, 1995, 334] relies on the possibility of laryngeal metathesis in prevocalic context and advocates a similar solution for Av. *x^hāng* (gen.) ‘sun,’ for which Lipp’s hypothesis (< **su₁uens* < **sh₂uen-s* [cf. Lipp, 2009, 307]) is more convincing, however. As a consequence, a root **se/ouh₁-* ‘turn, gyrate’ cannot be ruled out for the Brittonic form.

back to **buu_lio-* after all (ultimately a derivative of **b^huH-lo-*, conceivably through **b^huH_l-io-*), and this form has undergone the early change **buu_a- > *bu_a-*. Its base **b^huH-lo-* could be unproblematically related to Gk. φύλον, etc. (a possibility mentioned and rejected by [Zair, 2012, 176]).

The validity of the projection of a sound change *-u.ūV- > -o.ūV-* to Common Celtic is contingent on the interpretation of the *Paradebeispiel* **iōuan-*, itself suspect of being analogical to adjectival forms with a full grade of the root (specifically those in the comparative and superlative degree), and on the assumption that this change cannot have happened dialectally. Since, by recent accounts, /o_i/ and /u_i/ were probably neutralised in Old Irish [cf. Uhlich, 1995, 15–16], the preterite *boí* may have had /u/ in the first syllable all along, and Old Irish monosyllabic forms like *soí* or *loí* are not probative of the existence of this sound law, or, come to that, of a zero grade of the root matching that of the Sanskrit forms.

2.7. CCelt. /φ/ and the fate of clusters of labial + /ū/

An early, probably CCelt. evolution *-ubu_V- > -uβū_V- > -uβū_V- > -σū.ū_V- > -ou_V-* has been postulated in several works, like [Prósper, 2015]. It cannot be dismissed as *ad hoc*, since *-Vmū_V- > -Vμū_V- > -Vū.ū_V- > -Vū_V-* is hardly controversial, and *-Vφū_V- > -Vū.ū_V- > -Vū_V-* is deducible from similar environments in which it precedes a sonorant, albeit not proven. Sequences of a labial consonant + [ū] are universally dispreferred, and many languages (notably English, except for a few loanwords) lack these clusters; even in languages in which the sequence *bu-* exists, like Spanish, there are substandard varieties in which a realisation [gū] predominates.

By contrast, the form **b^huH-o-* resulted in **b^huo-* in PIE compounds as a consequence of primitive laryngeal loss (cf. Skt. *a-bhva-* ‘supernatural being’). The resulting **-buo-* became PCelt. **-bo-*: this transpires from such examples as the divine name *VIBEBOS* in Noricum, a match of Skt. *vibhu-* [cf. Prósper, 2019a, 144 for this and other examples]. A similar process took place in Proto-Italic, where it must have become **-βo-*, witness L. *superbus, probus*, O. *prufe*, the originally analytic future forms in *-fb-*, etc.

Uhlich [1989, 132] believes the Ogam letter <V> to reflect the cluster *-bu-* unchanged in compounded personal names with a first member **dubuo-* ‘dark’: *DOVAIDONA, DOVATUCI, DOVAGNI, DOVVINIAS*, etc. This cluster allegedly passed through a stage *-ūū-* and eventually became a voiced fricative (either [v] or [β]). If the latter stage had been reached in Primitive Irish, Uhlich would expect a spelling . Unfortunately, the considerably earlier Continental Celtic evidence is entirely ignored in his work and in most recent treatments of the problem. In addition, even supposing such an unstable cluster had survived so long, one would expect it to be rendered <BV> in Ogam and eventually yield [vv] or [ββ] in Old Irish on the strength of *-dū- > [ðv]* (cf. OIr. *fedb* < **uidūā* ‘widow’), *-nū- > [nv]* (cf. Oir. *menb* < **menūo-* ‘small’). Lowering of the preceding [u] is explained by Uhlich

as “the result of dissimilation against the heavy labial group that followed it,” which looks *ad hoc* and has no direct parallels, since the proposed vowel lowering can hardly be said to promote ease of articulation.

In our view, Ogam <V> instead of in the above names must be taken at face value and is simply rendering /u/. Accordingly, we may provisionally assume that all labial consonants underwent trivial regressive assimilation to a following /u/ in Common Celtic. The *Paradebeispiel* is **dubuV-* > **duβuV-* > **duβuV-* > **duu.uV-* > **douV-* ‘dark’ in obviously related names: NW. HCelt. DOVIDONA, DOVITERVS, Gaul. DOVILLICCO (Amiens) [CAG, 80–01, 160], Galatian Δοβηδων,⁵⁵ and of course Ogamitic DOVAIDONA, DOVATUCI, DOVAGNI, etc. Such Irish names as *Dubthach*, *Dubán*, *Dubaéd* apparently show the “wrong” consonantism but, interestingly, also the wrong vocalism, because in all likelihood they have been refashioned in analogy to the athematic adjective **dubu-* ‘dark’ after loss of *-u-* in intervocalic position that rendered the lexical affiliation of these names irretrievable. Consequently, they are hardly diagnostic of a change *-βu-* > *-β-*.

There may be other forms illustrating this development: in order to account for OIr. *boí* ‘was,’ we reconstruct **boue* < **bou.ue* < **buβue* < **buβue* < **bubue* < **bubuue*, which continues an early perfect **b^hu-b^huH-e* (ultimately from **b^he-b^huH-e*, indirectly reflected by Skt. *babhūva*, Gk. *πέφωκε* ‘is’).⁵⁶ McCone himself [1991, 124] derives OIr. *bieid*, *.bia* (3rd p. sg. future of the substantive verb) from **biuāset(i)* (< **bibuāseti* << PCelt. **bibūseti* < PIE **b^hi-b^huH-se-ti*, straightforwardly continued by Skt. *bubhūṣati*). This need not mean that, by the time the process conducive to lenition of /b/ in intervocalic position started, **bubuV-* could no longer be analysed as a reduplicated formation.⁵⁷ In our view, nothing disproves a *lautgesetzlich* development *-VbuV-* > *-VβuV-* > *-Vu.uV-* >

⁵⁵ With secondary fricativisation of /u/, as in the personal names Βηπολιτανος < **uero-litano-* ‘broad faced’ and Ορδοβητοϋ, in all likelihood from **ordo-ueχto-* ‘hammer fighter’ [see Prósper, 2015, 20, fn. 37].

⁵⁶ See [Prósper, 2015, 20, fn. 36] for former reconstructions. This one has been formerly proposed by [Schumacher, 2004, 250–254] with a different phonetic explanation: he starts from a secondary **bu-b-e* that gave ICelt. **buβe*. This accounts for MW. *bu* at the cost of special pleading for Irish, where **buβe* has been dissimilated to **buue*. As noted by Schumacher, MW. *bu* /bʷ/ cannot be taken from **boue*, but it can be regularly traced to **buβ-e*, on the base of **dubu-* > MW. *du* /dʷ/. Hence, we can accept the premise that Brittonic generalised the preconsonantal stem, as in the MW. 1st p. pl. *buam* < **buβ-* < **b^hu-b^huH-mé*. Since, at any rate, Schumacher’s hypothesis is based on analogical changes, its correctness would not influence the ideas put forward here, but only their application to specific forms of this verb.

⁵⁷ According to [Schumacher, 2004, 352–353], a preform **bibuāse/o-* was refashioned into ICelt. **bi-bās-e/o-* [biβa:he/o]-. This sequence underwent lenition (> **bV-β-*) and Early Irish dissimilation (> **bV-u-*). For this, the comparative base is limited, and mostly relies on the reconstruction of reduplicated forms for the paradigm of OIr. *benaid* ‘to hit.’ The proposed dissimilation would be questionable if the listener was aware of the sequence consisting of reduplication + root. It can be more precisely described as context-sensitive weakening, which seems restricted to **bib-*. This process is invoked to avoid the need to posit a change *-bu-* > *-βu-* > *-βu-* > *-uu-* > *-u-*: in Schumacher’s view, the *lautgesetzlich* outcome would be OIr. *-β-* (and then the future would be † *bebaid*, not *bieid*), in the wake of [Uhlich, 1989]. Schumacher explains Brittonic **bāhe-* as the dereduplicated outcome of ICelt. **bi-bāso/e-*. By the same token, these forms may have emerged in analogy to the *b-*stem.

- $V\underline{u}V$ -. Here, the secondary sequence - $b\underline{u}V$ - arose posterior to the shift - $b\underline{u}V$ - > - bV - in the *probus*-compounds.⁵⁸

2.8. CCelt. / ϕ / and the fate of CCelt. clusters of labial + /r/, /n/

Former approaches have failed to notice that the change just discussed looks strikingly similar to that of $*ku\phi ro-$ > $*kouro-$ > $*kouro-$ > $*ko\beta ro-$ ‘desire’ or $*su\phi no-$ > $*souno-$ > $*so\underline{u}no-$ ‘sleep’. All these developments can be subsumed under a single CCelt. rule $*CuBR-$ > $*C\underline{u}R-$. For our present purposes, - $BR-$ stands for at least five combinations of a labial consonant and a sonorant or approximant, in which the labial segment - $B-$ is assimilated either to the preceding nucleus (- $\phi n-$, - $\phi r-$), or to the following approximant (- $\phi\underline{u}-$, - $b\underline{u}-$, - $m\underline{u}-$).⁵⁹

CCelt. / ϕ / was not weakened if another vowel preceded it. A 3rd p. fut. preform $*\phi i-\phi ra-s-e-ti$ resulted in OIr. *ebraid* ‘will bestow,’ through the stages $*\phi i\phi ra-$ > $*i\beta ra-$ > $*e\beta ra-$. For the evolution of IE $*kap-ro-$ ‘goat’ > CCelt. $*ka\phi ro-$ > HCelt. $*ka\phi uro-$ > $*ka\beta uro-$ in the individual name CABVRVS, as opposed to - $\beta r-$ in the other Celtic branches, cf. [Prósper, 2017]. Judging by the western place name BLETISAM(AM) (> present day *Ledesma* in Salamanca) vs. Celtib. *letaisama*,⁶⁰ the initial cluster # $\phi l-$ was peripherally preserved in Hispania (though omission of / ϕ / in Celtiberian may be merely graphic for all we know), but was eventually lost everywhere. This points to a fricative or approximant realisation [β] or [β] that was unstable in anlaut, where inherited /b/ was still a stop. If the sequence had been identified with L. # $fl-$, it would undoubtedly have been spelt <FL>.

2.9. By way of conclusion

2.9.1. We have focused on loss of IE /p/ between two syllable nuclei, the first of which is a [+high][+back] vowel /u/, as in $*u\phi amo-$ ‘highest’. The last stages of this process were reached long after laryngeals were lost in the same context and the resulting structure had undergone hiatus-filling: - $u.HV-$ > - $u.V-$ > - $u.\underline{u}V-$.

2.9.2. For several scholars, the assumption of a change - $u\phi V-$ (> - $u.hV-$ > - $u.V-$) > - $u.\underline{u}V-$ > - $\underline{u}V-$ is strongly compromised by the idea that - $u.HV-$ > - $u.\underline{u}V-$ remained

⁵⁸ Jasanoff [1997, 181, fn. 20, 182], reconstructs a perfect $*b^hebh^uH-e$ that passed to $*b^he\underline{u}e$ in Indo-European by way of sporadic dissimilation and gave CCelt. $*bo\underline{u}e$. But the rule - $Vb\underline{u}V-$ > - $V\underline{u}V-$ > - $V\underline{u}V-$ need not be projected back to Indo-European. And, in spite of Jasanoff’s careful argumentation, it cannot be gainsaid by compounds like OIr. *subae* ‘well-being’ (< $*su-b\underline{u}i\underline{u}o-$).

⁵⁹ Note that, if the system had a contrast between /u/ and /u:/, the short vowel would be phonetically a lax [u] in most contexts (a fact we have ignored thus far for the sake of simplicity), and was consequently doomed to undergo dissimilatory lowering and merge with /o/ over time when tautosyllabic [u] (a context-bound outcome of / ϕ /) followed. Otherwise, the reconstructed intermediate stage $*Cu\underline{u}R-$ would have become $*Cu:R-$. In other words, when we describe the first stages of the evolution of this sequence, we may formalise it in phonemic terms as / $\underline{u}\underline{u}$ /, but assume that it was probably realised as [u\underline{u}] from the beginning (and probably also before / ϕ / became an approximant in this context).

⁶⁰ Both forms go back to a superlative form $*\phi letisam\underline{a}$ (< $*pleth_2-$) ‘broadest.’

disyllabic. In other words, it is difficult to understand why the sequence $-u\varphi V-$ passed through a stage $-u.\underline{u}V-$ before it was eventually reduced to $-\underline{u}V-$, if we assume that the preexistent sequence $-u.\underline{u}V-$ did not. As we have seen, however, the universal preservation of CCelt. $-u.\underline{u}V-$ may be fictitious: some of the putative examples are inherently unsuitable candidates to loss of syllabicity due to the complex structure of their onset and/or the existence of a morpheme boundary, and others may continue full grades and consequently do not even qualify as examples. If, on the other hand, a CCelt. change $-u.HV- > -u.\underline{u}V- > -o.\underline{u}V-$ were accepted, its outcome would be irrelevant for any processes affecting new cases of $-u.\underline{u}V-$ of whatever origin. Both motivation and reliable evidence for such an early dissimilatory change are lacking, however.

2.9.3. We may assume that $*Cu.HV-$ or $*Cu.\underline{u}V-$ (e.g. in Lindeman's variants) actually became $*CuV-$ at least in forms containing word-initial stops. This is most likely to have occurred in the case of $*b^hu.HV- > *bu.V- > *bu.\underline{u}V- > *b\underline{u}V- > ICelt. *bV-$. A sequence $*b\underline{u}V-$ resulting from laryngeal loss in *probus*-compounds was simplified to $*bV-$ prior to the above evolution (conceivably at a primitive stage common to Celtic and Italic at least).

2.9.4. A categorical reduction $-u.\varphi V- > -\underline{u}V-$ is inherently less likely than a many-stage phonetic evolution, however fast it came to an end. The descriptive formulation “/φ/ > ø” is what phonologists call “rule telescoping,” which disregards the step-by-step phonetic evolution of the sequence at issue. For this specific context, we may reckon with a leniting process $-u.\varphi V- > -u.hV- > -u.V-$, eventually $> -u.\underline{u}V-$ (by epenthesis) or $> -\underline{u}V-$ (by glide formation). This would not significantly differ from the usual evolution of /φ/ in onsets. Alternatively, we may follow another path to arrive at the same outcome, which illustrates the *alternative* leniting process: $-u.\varphi V- > -u.\beta V-$ (containing a voiced bilabial approximant) $> -u.\underline{u}V-$.⁶¹ At any rate, word-initial $\#u.V-$ or $\#u.\underline{u}V-$ would be especially prone to reduction, considering that the preceding word would often terminate in a vowel or diphthong. Apart from this particular context, for all we know, /φ/ may have evolved into [h] exclusively in onsets, specifically in word-initial and intervocalic position. This process may have started in the sequence [φu] for auditory reasons according to [Foulkes, 1997].

2.9.5. The evidence for the preservation a disyllabic sequence $-u.\varphi V-$ or $-u.\underline{u}V-$ (from $*-u\varphi V-$) in Lepontic or elsewhere is inconclusive. But it must be noted that if an intervocalic realisation [φ] survived at such a late date, it is surprising that its evolution in the separate dialects is so similar.⁶²

⁶¹ According to [Bybee & Easterday, 2019, 270], “sonorization increases the vowel-like properties of a consonant, including both voicing and a decrease in the degree of constriction in the oral cavity, as in the sequence: p > b > w”.

⁶² In Japanese, /p/ becomes /φ/ and then is further weakened to a voiced velar approximant merging with /w/ ([ɰ]) in intervocalic position, but lost elsewhere in contact with /u/. Takayama [2015, 639–641] notes that longer preservation in initial position, where /φ/ eventually becomes /h/, may have served a demarcative function. In fact, spontaneous, non-contrastive laryngeal epenthesis has been associated with prosodic domains [see Blevins, 2008, 83].

2.9.6. The change $-u.\varphi V- > -\underline{u}V-$ was in any event completed *only* after CCelt. /k_u/ or /k^u/ became /p/ in several Celtic dialects. Otherwise, nothing would have prevented IE $*(-)kupV-$ from becoming $*(-)pV-$, which is definitely belied by ROQVETIO. After $*ku.\varphi V-$ became $*k\underline{u}V-$ or $*k^uV-$, a new labiovelar phoneme /k^u/ or a new cluster /k_u/ arose, which seems to have been regularly rendered <QV> in Gaulish. It necessarily follows that Gaul. BVETI(D) was disyllabic. Forms containing <QV> are either foreign names, incorporated into the Gaulish language as it spread to formerly non-Celtic territories, or patrimonial forms going back to $*(-)ku\varphi V-$.

2.9.7. The predictable objection that <QV>, <CV> and <COV> are alternative outcomes or spellings of a single original sequence $*ke/ou(p)-$, and that ROQVETIO goes back to a Celtic agent noun $*\varphi ro-kou\varphi et-$, is most unconvincing in the present state of our knowledge. CCelt. $*kou-$ is likely to have been preserved in Gaulish, as transpires from VERCOVIO[NIS] (Noricum, if from $*u\varphi er-kou\varphi -(i)\dot{i}o-$), COVIOMARVS (Pannonia), etc. Untermann [1961, 153] additionally mentions a Venetic name *kove.t.ko.s*, attested on a rock inscription, for which he reconstructs a personal name $*kou\varphi et(-i)-$. If correctly read, this form could reflect an agentive form $*keu\varphi et-$ ‘raging’. Note that, since loss of syllabicity in $-(i)\dot{i}o-$ may have been considerably early, an agent noun $*ku\varphi -(i)\dot{i}o-$ or a possessive adjective $*ku\varphi i-(i)\dot{o}-$ would be expected to come out as $*kou.\dot{i}o-$ and eventually $*kou\dot{i}o-$ (see below).

The few surviving instances of <CV> are probably due either to the existence of a compound boundary $-ku-\underline{u}V-$ (VCVETE, VCVETIN) or to secondary, probably monoglottic derivation from nominative forms in $-\bar{u}$ ($\rightarrow -u\underline{u}-\bar{a}$ in Lep. *atekua*, ATECV̄A and $\rightarrow -u\underline{u}-alo-$ in Lep. *kualui*). Judging by the Celtic fate of IE $*b^huHV-$, the IE sequences $*ku.HV-$, $*ku.\underline{u}V-$ may have become CCelt. $*k\underline{u}V-$.

2.9.8. When /φ/ precedes a consonant:

a) /φ/ becomes [χ] in coda position whenever an obstruent immediately follows (conspicuously the dento-alveolars /t/ and /s/). The outcome merges with that of all labials and (labio)-velars. This change is partly shared by Italic.

b) /φ/ is regressively assimilated to a preceding [+back][+high] vowel if a sonorant /n/, /r/ or /l/, *ex hypothesi* also /l/, /m/, /j/, immediately follows. The resulting [ɥ] forms a falling diphthong with the preceding lax vowel, which is eventually lowered and phonemicised as /o/. In this way, an optimal diphthong is obtained that merges with CCelt. /ou/. A realisation [φ] is apparently preserved longer and voiced if vowels other than /u/ precede it (see above on $*ka\varphi ro-$ ‘goat’). Any dialectal differences based on shift in the syllable boundaries are difficult to track down, but may be occasionally deduced from the divergent outcomes, as in Celtib. $*kou\varphi ro-$ vs. $*koubro-$ in Gaulish and Insular Celtic.

- AE — Cagnat, R. et al. (Eds.). (1888–). *L'Année Epigraphique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Antonaccio, C. M. (1999). *Kupara*, a Sikel Nymph? *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 126, 177–185.
- Antonaccio, C. M., & Neils, J. (1995). A New Graffito from Archaic Morgantina. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 105, 261–277.
- Aski, J. M. (2001). Multivariable Reanalysis and Phonological Split. In L. J. Brinton (Ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1999. Selected Papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9–13 August 1999* (pp. 31–47). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bateman, N. (2011). On the Typology of Palatalization. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5, 588–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2011.00294.x>
- Blevins, J. (2008). Consonant Epenthesis: Natural and Unnatural Histories. In J. Good (Ed.), *Linguistic Universals and Language Change* (pp. 79–107). Oxford: OUP.
- Borréani, M., & Gascou, J. (1998). Le dieu *Roquetius* d'après trois inscriptions de Cabasse (Var). *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 121, 297–299.
- Bosch, E. (1967). *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından.
- Burnand, Y., & Lambert, P.-Y. (2004). Découvertes récentes d'une inscription gallo-latine sur pierre à Nasium — Naix-aux-Forges (Meuse). *Comptes-rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 148^e année, 2, 683–690.
- Bybee, J., & Easterday, Sh. (2019). Consonant Strengthening: A Crosslinguistic Survey and Articulatory Proposal. *Linguistic Typology*, 23, 263–302. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2019-0015>
- CAG — *Carte Archéologique de la Gaule*. 03: *L'Allier*, 1989; 13-02: *Les Alpilles et la Montagne*, 1999; 80-01: *Amiens*, 2009. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres.
- Calderini, A. (2001). *Cupra*. Un dossier per l'identificazione. *Evtopia*, 1, 45–129.
- Casali, R. F. (2011). Hiatus Resolution. In M. Van Oostendorp, C. J. Ewen, E. Hume, & K. Rice (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology* (Vol. 3, pp. 1–27). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444335262.wbctp0061>
- Chase, G. D. (1897). The Origin of Roman Praenomina. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 8, 103–184.
- CIL — Mommsen, Th. et al. (Eds.). (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- CILCaceres-4 — Esteban Ortega, J. (Ed.). (2017). *Corpus de inscripciones latinas de Cáceres. IV. Caucium*. Cáceres: Ediciones Universidad de Extremadura.
- Cotugno, F. (2015). *I longa* in iato nel *Corpus Vindolandense*. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 53, 189–206.
- Cowgill, W. (1985). PIE **duo* “2” in Germanic and Celtic, and the Nom.-Acc. Dual of Non-neuter *o*-Stems. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 46, 13–28.
- Cser, A. (2020). The Phonology of Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 118, 1–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12184>
- De Bernardo Stempel, P. (1999). *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Delamarre, X. (2004). Gallo-Brittonica: transports, richesse et générosité chez les Anciens Celtes. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 54, 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ZCPH.2005.121>
- Delamarre, X. (2007). *Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique*. Paris: Errance.
- Devine, A. M., & Stephens, L. D. (1994). *The Prosody of Greek Speech*. New York; Oxford: OUP.
- DLG — Delamarre, X. (2003). *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*. Paris: Errance.
- Dressler, W. (1967). Galatisches. In W. Meid (Ed.) *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet* (pp. 147–154). Innsbruck: Sprachwissenschaftliches Institut der Universität Innsbruck.
- EDBIL — Derksen, R. (2015). *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- 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.
- ERL — Rabanal Alonso, M. A., & García Martínez, S. M. (2001). *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de León: revisión y actualización*. León: Universidad de León.

- Ernout, A. (1971). *Notes de philologie latine*. Genève, Paris: Droz.
- ERPS — Hernández Guerra, L. (2008). *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de Salamanca*. Valladolid: Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid.
- ERS — Santos Yanguas, J., Hoces de La Guardia, A. L., & Del Hoyo, J. (2005). *Epigrafía romana de Segovia y su provincia*. Segovia: Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad de Segovia.
- Eska, J. F. (2013). In Defense of Celtic /φ/. In A. I. Cooper, J. Rau, & M. Weiss (Eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (pp. 32–43). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Foulkes, P. (1997). Historical Laboratory Phonology — /p/ > /f/ > /h/ Changes. *Language and Speech*, 40, 249–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383099704000303>
- Gamallo Barranco, J. L., & Gimeno Pascual, H. (1990). Inscripciones del Norte y Sudoeste de la provincia de Cáceres: revisión y nuevas aportaciones. *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*, 17, 277–306.
- Geogr. Rav., 2012 — Schnetz, J., & Zumschlinge, M. (2012). *Itineraria Romana. Vol. 2: Ravennatis Anonymi cosmographia et Guidonis geographica*. Berlin, Boston: B. G. Teubner.
- Gotō, T. (2013). *Old Indo-Aryan Morphology and its Indo-Iranian Background*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- GPN — Evans, D. E. (1967). *Gaulish Personal Names*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Guyonvarc'h, Ch.-J. (1964). Le nom des *Quariates*. Notes d'étymologie gauloises et celtiques, 20. *Ogam*, 16, 428–429.
- Hackstein, O. (2002). Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 115, 1–22.
- Haverfield, F. (1890). *Roman Inscriptions in Britain, 1888–90*. Exeter: William Pollard & Co.
- Hourcade, D., & Maurin, L. (2013). Mars Grannus à Cassinomagus (Chassenon, Charente). *Aquitania*, 29, 137–153.
- ILLPRON — Hainzmann, M., & Schubert, P. (1986). *Inscriptionum Lapidarium Latinarum Provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- ILN — Gascou, J. (1985). *Inscriptions latines de Narbonnaise. Vol. 1: Fréjus*. Paris: C.N.R.S.
- Isaac, G. (2007). *Studies in Celtic Sound Changes and their Chronology*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Jackson, K. (1953/1994). *Language and History in Early Britain*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- Janssen, H.-H. (1956). Qu et gu en latin. In *Hommages à Max Niedermann* (pp. 184–190). Brussels: Berchem.
- Jasanoff, J. (1997). Where Does Skr. *bhāvati* Come from? In D. Disterheft, J. Puhvel, J. Greppin, M. Huld, & E. Polomé (Eds.), *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology* (pp. 173–186). Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Jordán Cólera, C. (2010). [K.14.1]: Una nota de epigrafía paleohispánica. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 172, 155–158.
- KGP — Schmidt, K.-H. (1957). *Die Komposition in Gallischen Personennamen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kölligan, D. (2014). O sufixo latino *-dō* e grego *-δών*: Orígem e desenvolvimento. In M. Viaro (Ed.), *Morfologia histórica* (pp. 154–189). São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Kulikov, L. I. (2000). Vedic Causative Nasal Presents and their Thematicization: A Functional Approach. In J. Ch. Smith, & D. Bentley (Eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995. Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995. Vol. 1: General Issues and Non-Germanic Languages* (pp. 191–210). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lejeune, M. (1971). Lepontica. *Études Celtiques*, 12, 357–500.
- Lejeune, M., Fleuriot, L., Lambert, P.-Y., Marichal, R., & Vernhet, A. (1985). *Le plomb magique du Larzac et les caractères gauloises*. Paris: C.N.R.S.
- Lindeman, F. O. (2006). Gaulish *Ambiorix*. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 55, 50–55.
- Lindsay, W. M. (Ed.). (1913). *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig: Teubner.

- Lipp, R. (2009). *Die indogermanischen und einzelsprachlichen Palatale im Indoiranischen. Band 1 : Neurekonstruktion, Nuristan-Sprachen, Genese der indoarischen Retroflexe, Indoarisch von Mitanni*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- LIV — Rix, H. et al. (2001). *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- LRP — Prósper, B. M. (2002). *Lenguas y religiones prerromanas del Occidente de la Península Ibérica*. Salamanca: EUSAL.
- Malzahn, M. (2011). Back to the Fields and to the Woods: Old Irish *iath* ‘Land, Field’ and *fiad* ‘Wild; Deer; Uncultivated Land’ Revisited. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 39, 116–128.
- McCone, K. (1991). *The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- McCone, K. (1996). *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. Maynooth: National University of Ireland.
- Mees, B. (2008). Case and Genre in Gaulish: from Mont Auxois to the Pont d’Ancy. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, 12, 121–138.
- Meiser, G. (2003). *Veni, vidi, vici. Die Vorgeschichte des Lateinischen Perfektsystems*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Meißner, T. (2010). *Bratonio gratias*: Bemerkungen zur festlandkeltischen Onomastik und Phraseologie. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 57, 97–106.
- Melchert, H. C. (1997). Traces of a PIE Aspectual Contrast in Anatolian? *Incontri Linguistici*, 20, 83–92.
- MLH-1 — Untermann, J. (1975). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum. Vol. 1: Die Münzlegenden*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- MLH-4 — Untermann, J. (1997). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum. Vol. 4: Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- MLH-5 — Wodtko, D. S. (1999). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum. Vol. 5: Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Neu, E. (1995). Zur Herkunft des Inselnamens Kypros. *Glotta*, 73, 1–7.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (1999). **Jocidus*: An Account of the Latin Adjectives in *-idus*. In H. Eichner, & H.-Ch. Luschützky (Eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae. In memoriam Jochem Schindler* (pp. 377–419). Prague: Enigma Corporation.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2004a). A *-t-* Party: Various IE Nominal Stems in **(o/e)t-*. Talk held at the 16th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, November 2004 (unpublished manuscript).
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2004b). Cool **-ēd-*: The Latin *frīgēdō* and Greek ἀληθῶν, τηκεδῶν, and ῥῆγεδανός Types. Talk held at the 23rd East Coast Indo-European Conference, Virginia Polytechnic and State University, 24–27 May 2004 (unpublished manuscript).
- Olcoz Yanguas, S., & Medrano Marqués, M. M. (2008). Revisión paleográfica de las inscripciones celtibéricas en signario paleohispánico alfabetizado. *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie 2*, 105–122.
- Pinault, G.-J. (1980). Instrumental et adverbe prédicatif (en marge de «Genetiv und Adjektiv»). *LALIES*, 1, 31–33.
- Pinault, G.-J. (1996). [Review of *The Gaulish Calendar* by G. Olmsted]. *Gnomon*, 68, 706–710.
- Prósper, B. M. (2012). The Hispano-Celtic Divinity *Ilurbeda*, Gold Mining in Western Hispania and the Syntactic Context of Celtiberian *arkatobezom* “Silver Mine”. *Die Sprache*, 49, 53–83.
- Prósper, B. M. (2014a). Some Notes on the Structure and Meaning of the Bronze ‘Res’. *Keltische Forschungen*, 6, 157–164.
- Prósper, B. M. (2014b). Time for Celtiberian Dialectology: Celtiberian Syllabic Structure and the Bronze Tablet from Torrijo del Campo (Teruel). *Keltische Forschungen*, 6, 115–155.
- Prósper, B. M. (2015). Celtic and non-Celtic Divinities from Ancient Hispania: Power, Daylight, Fertility, Water Spirits and What they Can Tell us about Indo-European Morphology. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 43, 1–56.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016). *The Indo-European Names of Central Hispania. A Study in Continental Celtic and Latin Word Formation*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

- Prósper, B. M. (2017). Linguistic Observations on Two Divinities of the Celtic Cantabri: ERVDINO, Divinity of the Yearly Cycle. CABVNIAEGINO, the Celtic Fate of IE *kHp- and the Gaulish Spindle Whorl from Saint Réverien. 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. (2019a). Celtic and Venetic in Contact: The Dialectal Attribution of the Personal Names in the Venetic Record. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 66, 131–176.
- Prósper, B. M. (2019b). Language Change at the Crossroads: what Celtic, what Venetic, and what Else in the Personal Names of Emona? *Voprosy Onomastiki*, 16(4), 33–73. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2019.16.4.044
- Prósper, B. M. (forthc.). Mars Veneticus and the ‘palma-Rule’. In F. Chiuseroli (Ed.), *Miscellanea di studi in onore di Diego Poli*. Rome: Il Calamo.
- Recasens, D. (2014). *Coarticulation and Sound Change in Romance*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Renou, L. (1997). Les éléments védiques dans le vocabulaire du sanskrit classique. In N. Balbir, & G.-J. Pinault (Eds.), *Choix d'études indiennes* (pp. 157–240). Paris: École Française d'Extrême Orient.
- RIB-1 — Collingwood, R. G., & Wright, R. P. (1965). *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain, I, Inscriptions on Stone*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RIB-3 — Tomlin, R. S. O., Wright, R. P., & Hassall, M. W. C. (2009). *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain, III, Inscriptions on Stone*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RIG-2/1 — Lejeune, M. (1988). *Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre*. Paris: C.N.R.S.
- RIG-3 — Duval, P. M., & Pinault, G. J. (1986). *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises. Tome 3: Les Calendriers (Coligny, Villards d'Heria)*. Paris: C.N.R.S.
- Rix, H. (2000). Oskisch *brateis bratom*, Lateinisch *grates*. In A. Hintze, & E. Tichy (Eds.), *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag* (pp. 207–229). Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Rocca, G. (1996). *Iscrizioni umbre minori*. Florence: Olschki.
- Rubat Borel, F. (2005). Lingue e scritture delle alpi occidentali prima della romanizzazione. Stato della questione e nuove ricerche. *Bulletin d'Études Préhistoriques et Archéologiques Alpines*, 16, 9–50.
- Sasseville, D. (2020). *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Scarlata, S. (1999). *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥gVeda*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schmidt, K. H. (1986). Keltiberisch *Tocoitos/Tocoitei* und gallisch *Ucuete/Ucuetin*. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 41, 1–4.
- Schmidt, K. H. (1991). [Review of *Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre, Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* by P.-M. Duval]. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 96, 362–365.
- Schrijver, P. (1995). *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Schrijver, P. (1998). The British word for ‘fox’ and its Indo-European origin. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 26(3-4), 421–434.
- Schumacher, S. (2004). *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Innsbruck: Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Seebold, E. (1970). *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben*. The Hague: Mouton.
- ST — Rix, H. (2002). *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.
- Stifter, D. (2003). [Review of *Kelten. Celts. Bilder ihrer Kultur. Images of their Culture* by H. Birkhan]. *Die Sprache*, 43, 237–243.
- Szemerényi, O. (1974). A Gaulish Dedicatory Formula. *Kuhn's Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 88, 246–286.
- Takayama, T. (2015). Historical Phonology. In H. Kubozono (Ed.), *Handbook of Japanese Phonetics and Phonology* (pp. 621–650). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511984.621>
- Thurneysen, R. (1923). Irisches und Gallisches. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 14, 1–12.
- Uhlich, J. (1989). *DOV(A)- and Lenited -B-* in Ogam. *Ériu*, 40, 129–133.

- Uhlich, J. (1995). On the Fate of Intervocalic *-u- in Old Irish, Especially between Neutral Vowels. *Ériu*, 46, 11–48.
- Untermann, J. (1961). *Die venetischen Personennamen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Untermann, J. (1995). Die vorrömischen Personennamen der Randzonen des alten Italien. *Namenforschung / Name Studies / Les noms propres*, 1, 732–738. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110114263.1.8.732>
- Velaza, J. (2008). La onomástica personal en la epigrafía romana de la Meseta Meridional: una aproximación. In G. Carrasco Serrano (Ed.), *La romanización en el territorio de Castilla-La Mancha* (pp. 367–383). Ciudad Real: Ediciones Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.
- Vendryes, J. (1922). *Sur quelques formations de mots latins. I. Les substantifs masculins en -a. II. Quelques dérivés de thème en -u- (-tu-)*. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, 22, 97–106.
- Vijūnas, A. (2009). *The Indo-European Primary T-Stems*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Vind. Tab. — Bowman, A. K., & Thomas, J. D. (1994–). *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses)*. London: British Museum Press.
- Vine, B. (2006). On Thurneysen-Havet's Law in Latin and Italic. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 119, 211–249.
- Vitali, D., & Kaenel, G. (2000). Un Helvète chez les Étrusques vers 300 av. J.-C. *Archäologie der Schweiz*, 23, 115–122.
- Watkins, C. (1994). *Varia II*. 1. Irish *milchobur*. 2. Old Irish *antar*. In L. Oliver (Ed.), *Calvert Watkins. Selected Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 92–96). Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Weiss, M. (2020). *An Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Widmer, P. (2005). Der altindische *vrkí*-Typus und hethitisch *nakki*-: Der indogermanische Instrumental zwischen Syntax und Morphologie. *Die Sprache*, 45, 190–208.
- WOU — Untermann, J. (2000). *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.
- Zair, N. (2012). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.

Received on 18 November 2021

ABBREVIATIONS

Languages

| | | | | | |
|---------|----------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|
| Av. | Avestan | IE | Indo-European | OHG. | Old High German |
| CCelt. | Common Celtic | L. | Latin | Olc. | Old Icelandic |
| Celtib. | Celtiberian | Lep. | Lepontic | OIr. | Old Irish |
| Fr. | French | Lith. | Lithuanian | OW. | Old Welsh |
| Gaul. | Gaulish | Mlr. | Middle Irish | PCelt. | Proto Celtic |
| Gk. | Greek | MW. | Middle Welsh | PGerm. | Proto-Germanic |
| Goth. | Gothic | O. | Oscan | PIE | Proto-Indo-European |
| HCelt. | Hispano-Celtic | OBret. | Old Breton | Skt. | Sanskrit |
| Hitt. | Hittite | OCS. | Old Church Slavic | Sp. | Spanish |
| ICelt. | Insular Celtic | OE. | Old English | U. | Umbrian |

Other abbreviations

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|-------|------------|-------|-------------|
| abl. | ablative | m. | masculine | pl. | plural |
| acc. | accusative | n. | neuter | pret. | preterite |
| dat. | dative | nom. | nominative | sg. | singular |
| f. | feminine | p. | person | subj. | subjunctive |
| fut. | future | part. | participle | | |
| gen. | genitive | perf. | perfect | | |

* * *

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
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7888-4817>

Medrano Duque, Marcos

Graduate Student
 Department of Indo-European and Classical
 Philology
 University of Salamanca
 Plaza de Anaya S/N,
 37008 Salamanca, Spain
 Email: marcos97md@usal.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5320-8150>

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

Медрано Дуке, Маркос

аспирант кафедры индоевропейской
 и классической филологии
 Университет Саламанки
 Plaza de Anaya S/N,
 37008 Salamanca, España
 E-mail: marcos97md@usal.es

Бланка Мария Проспер**Маркос Медрано Дуке**

Университет Саламанки
 Саламанка, Испания

ДРЕВНИЕ ГАЛЛЬСКИЕ И БРИТАНСКИЕ БОЖЕСТВА: К РЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ КЕЛЬТСКОЙ ФОНОЛОГИИ И МОРФОЛОГИИ

Лингвистический анализ имен кельтских божеств, отмеченных в латинских надписях, давно доказал свою продуктивность при изучении древней религии кельтов, отношений местных племен с Римом, распространения автохтонных и синкретических культов. Мелкие божества почитались лишь на ограниченных территориях, но, даже несмотря на это, их культам удавалось частично интегрироваться в религиозную систему Римской империи: прежде чем навсегда исчезнуть, мелкие божества получали место среди высших божеств, и, вероятно, число их должно было быть существенно большим, чем количество имен, нашедшее отражение в источниках. Что особенно важно, изучение имен этих божеств дает бесценные сведения о ранних этапах развития кельтской фонологии и морфологии, а также позволяет пролить свет на недостаточно хорошо известные аспекты эволюции континентальных и островных кельтских языков и их связь с латинским языком. В настоящей статье авторы исследуют имена кельтских божеств из Британии (MEDOCIO, ARNOMESIE, BRACIACAE, ARCIACONI) и Галлии (MEDVTONI, COBRANDIAE, CENTONDI, ROQVETIO, SINQVATI), которые до сего момента не получили удовлетворительной интерпретации. В статью предпринимается попытка использовать этот ономастический материал для решения

задач индоевропейской реконструкции, понимания культурных связей древних народов, древней религии (с особым вниманием к взаимодействию основных римских божеств и мелких божеств кельтского пантеона), латинской и кельтской фонетики и морфологии, языковых контактов, включая вопросы распространения и адаптации латинского алфавита для записи текстов на автохтонных кельтских языках, а также для записи иностранных (кельтских) имен в латинской эпиграфике.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: кельтские языки; галльская религия; кельтская фонология; индоевропейская ономастика; индоевропейское словообразование; латинская эпиграфика; латинский алфавит; кельтская теонимия

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 18.11.2021