https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2025.22.1.004
UDC 81-112 + 81’272(460) + 811.134.2 + 811.15 + 811.15’33 + 811.163.1’342 + 81’02

Blanca María Prósper
PhD, Professor, Department of Indo-European and Classical Philology, University of Salamanca
(Plaza de Anaya S/N, 37008 Salamanca, Spain)
E-mail: indoling@usal.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7888-4817

Some Linguistic Considerations on a New Celtiberian Bronze

Abstract

This work tackles a preliminary linguistic analysis of a new Celtiberian bronze in the Latin alphabet, probably dating back to the mid 1st c. BC. As usual with objects that remain in private hands and cannot be directly studied by professionals, doubts on its authenticity will predictably hover over any attempt to interpret it. However, many traits of the text merit comment. The onomastic and appellative material of the new bronze will prove instrumental in confirming the existence of a western Celtiberian dialect, spoken by the *Arevaci*, characterised by: a) early loss of final dental sounds; the only case of final -s, ATTES, goes back to a heteromorphemic sequence *-t-s* and must consequently be ascribed to the phoneme /s:/ (which had a tense articulation, probably a geminate in intervocalic position), reflected by *-s* in Early Celtiberian; b) monophthongisation of all instances of an inherited diphthong /ei̯/, shared by the rest of Celtic Hispania (<EI> reflects the emergence of secondary diphthongs: the forms DIAINIM, ANEITTIQ show the effects of the sound change *-χt-* > *-i̯t-* well known from Brittonic and Romance); c) final nasals haphazardly show up as -M, -N or are even omitted, which is suggestive of their weakness. By contrast, the tendency of the cluster *-ti̯-* to assibilation is not detectable. The study will also confirm that forms, including a number of proper names, hitherto poorly or not attested in Hispano-Celtic are, in fact, to be traced back to Proto-Celtic. It goes without saying, this bronze has not been cleaned and the readings may change over time, pending a thorough revision of better photographs or direct handling of the object.

Keywords

Palaeohispanic languages; Celtic languages; Celtiberian; Indo-European language reconstruction; anthroponyms; ancient toponymy; historical morphonology

For citation

Prósper, B. M. (2025). Some Linguistic Considerations on a New Celtiberian Bronze. *Voprosy onomastiki, 22*(1), 104–122. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2025.22.1.004

Received on 25 November 2024
Accepted on 12 January 2025

© Prósper B. M., 2025

Бланка Мария Проспер
PhD, профессор кафедры индоевропейской и классической филологии, Саламанкский университет (Plaza de Anaya S/N, 37008 Salamanca, Spain)
E-mail: indoling@usal.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7888-4817

Лингвистические заметки по поводу недавно обнаруженной кельтиберской надписи

Аннотация

Настоящая статья содержит предварительный лингвистический анализ вновь найденной бронзовой таблички с надписью на кельтиберском языке, выполненной латинским алфавитом и относящейся, вероятно, к середине I в. до н. э. Как обычно бывает с предметами, которые находятся в частных руках и не могут быть напрямую изучены профессионалами, любая попытка интерпретации неизбежно наталкивается на сомнения в подлинности памятника. Тем не менее многие черты текста заслуживают комментария. Автор показывает, что ономастический и апеллятивный материал новой таблички может служить для подтверждения существования западного кельтиберийского диалекта, на котором говорили ареваки. Данный диалект характеризуется: а) ранней утратой конечных зубных; единственный случай конечного -s, ATTES, восходит к гетероморфемной последовательности *-t-s* и, следовательно, должен отражать фонему /sː/ (последняя имела напряженную артикуляцию), которой соответствует *-s* в раннем кельтиберийском; б) монофтонгизацией всех случаев унаследованного дифтонга /ei̯/, общего для остальной части кельтской Испании (в исследуемой табличке <EI> является вторичным дифтонгом: формы DIAINIM, ANEITTIQ демонстрируют результат звукового перехода *-χt-* > *-i̯t-*, хорошо известного по бриттским и романским языкам); в) конечными носовыми согласными, которые бессистемно отражаются как -M, -N или опускаются, что указывает на слабость их артикуляции. В изучаемом тексте отсутствует тенденция кластера *-ti̯-* к ассибиляции. Исследование показывает, что некоторые формы, включая ряд имен собственных, до сих пор плохо или совсем не засвидетельствованные в испано-кельтском, надежно выводятся из пракельтского. Разумеется, бронзовая табличка не была очищена, и в будущем, когда появятся фотографии лучшего качества или объект станет доступен для непосредственного изучения специалистами, чтение текста может измениться.

Ключевые слова

палеоиспанские языки; кельтские языки; кельтиберский язык; реконструкция праиндоевропейского языка; антропонимы; древняя топонимия; историческая морфонология

Для цитирования

Prósper B. M. Some Linguistic Considerations on a New Celtiberian Bronze // Вопросы ономастики. 2025. Т. 22, № 1. С. 104–122. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2025.22.1.004

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 25.11.2024
Рукопись принята к печати 12.01.2025

1. The text

The new document is in private hands (in fact, the owner has chosen to remain anonymous) and is known from a single photograph, included in the edition. It can be dated to around 50 BC, is written in the Latin alphabet with incised dots on face A. It was intended to be exhibited in public, since the four corners are pierced so as it could hang from a wall. In this work I shall focus mostly on linguistic, specifically dialectal and comparative aspects of the text, systematically neglected by the edition, whose comments are hardly professional and usually refer to other Celtiberian texts. It reads, according to [Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea 2024]:

MEDITTV· CLOVTIOQ· MEDITTO G
TARMESCVNE· NOVIOBRITŦIV· CENTOEL̲IQ
GORTAQVE· IGEDANCINV· GORTICAM
BRADIOCAM· DVREM· EMVSE· ANCANGEMNEQ
SAICLV· [—]ENINAICVM· DIAINIM· DV̲OQVE
CVAMO· ESDOVCOVNVN· COVRATOM
GVSTAICE· TRITANO· CORIOTERIQ· VE̲NINVNO̲
NARIOQ· MVGVR̲O· ARGENACIQ· CILIO· COELEIQ
AND[——]EA· ATTES· ANEITTIQ

2. The text architecture of the bronze: the first part

2.1. The subject: a Celtiberian onomastic formula and a city name

The subject of the first sentence is identical to the sequence MEDITTV· CLOVTIOQ· MEDITTO G / TARMESCVNE· NOVIOBRITŦIV· CENTOEL̲IQ / GORTAQVE· IGEDANCINV·. The first five words probably mean '*Medittō*, of the family of the *Cloutiocī*, son (*gentis*) of *Medittus*, from the city of *Tarmescō*'. It is evident that the extended onomastic formula contains an ablative informing of the provenance of the individual mentioned.[1]

As opposed to the transparent family name CLOVTIOQ(VM) gen. pl. (< **ḱle/ou̯to-*), MEDITTV and MEDITTO have few clear cognates, but for those mentioned by the editors: a Celtib. MEDDITVS STENNICO (Alcozar, Soria, Tarraconensis) and a MEDITIA (Braga/Bracara Augusta, Tarraconensis). In my view, MEDITTV reflects the nominative

[1] I shall not repeat here my arguments against the opinion of other scholars, especially Jordán Cólera [2003], according to whom ablatives following onomastic formulas do not actually belong to them, but refer to an agent, mentioned in the ablative case, who grants hospitality to the person or group mentioned first (to be translated as X, of the family Y, hospitality given by Z) [see Martínez Chico & Prósper 2021]. The place of the ablative in this document leaves no room for doubt as to the incorrectness of this idea.

stem of the agent noun **med-ēt-/-et-* ‘caretaker, healer, etc.’, in L. *medeor*, OIr. *midithir* ‘to judge’, etc., while Gaulish probably has a derivative of the oblique stem **med-et-* in MEDETICCA [CIL 13: 3503] (Belgica), MEDETVS (Aquitania, Britannia, etc.), though **med-eto-* is conceivable. The geminate <TT> may be put down to the “littera”-rule. While **med-ēt-* may be deverbal, it could alternatively derive from a thematic noun **medo-* preserved in L. *modus*, and then the correct derivation is **mede-et-*, in the wake of [Nussbaum 2004].[2]

As for TARMESCVNE, the editors simply ignore the obvious when they say that an ablative should have terminated in <D> or <S> and that -E is unlikely to reflect Early Celtib. *-ez*. As contended in [Prósper 2022] and former works, however, the Celtiberian outcome of PCelt. **-ḓ#* was *-ø* after consonants, and a fricative *-s̲*, eventually *-ø*, after vowels. Loss of final dentals is consequently expected in this area and date.

NOVIOBRITŦIV remains unexplained in the edition, in spite of its obvious connection with the western Hispano-Celtic place name *Eburobrittium* (Pliny, *N. H.* 4, 113), possibly Obidos in Lusitania Scallabitana. The detoponymic adjective is attested as EBV/ROBRITTI/ENSI, dat. sg. [Figueira & Encarnação 2017] (Viseu, Lusitania Scallabitana). Western Hispania abounds with compounds not attested anywhere else in Europe, whose second member denotes elevated places or strongholds: beside the well-known cases of **-brig-* and **-dūno-*, we find **-okelo-* and **-bendā* ‘hillock’. Now we have two instances of **-brittio-* we may take it for granted that it formed part of a pattern of place name formation. It may go back to **b^{h}ŗ-tó-* ‘brought’, as may be the case with *Briti-venda* (Britannia), MATRIBVS BRITTIS (Germania), or, more probably, to **b^{h}ŗǵ^{h}-tó-/-ti-* ‘arisen, fenced off; elevation’, a match of L. *fortis* (cf. E. *fort*), Old L. *forctes*, *forctus* in Paulus ex Festo [Lindsay 1913: 74, 91] and Skt. *pari-bŗḍhá-* ‘fortified’. This is now buttressed by the etymology of Gk. ἄφρακτος, ἄφαρκτος ‘without fortifications’ [Van Beek 2022: 402–408]. It is interesting to note that most matches are compounds. **nou̯io-brittio-* is a ‘new hillfort’, formationally comparable to *Noviodunum* (Moesia) or *Noviomagus* (Gaul, Britannia).[3] The phonetics of *-brittio-* can be variously explained: the geminate may be due to resyllabification and fortition of *-t.i̯-*, but it may be argued that there has been an assimilatory process *-χt-* > *-tt-* in westernmost

[2] In addition, the fact that the text reads MEDITIA/MEDAMI may mean that the father thought both forms had the same origin, whether this is ultimately true or not (cf. OIr. *medam* ‘judge’, which, however, goes back to **med-amon-* with a refashioned suffix).

[3] It follows that the slightly divergent second letter that the editors cautiously transliterate as <T> was probably intended as a <Ŧ> after all.

Hispania.[4] As for the syntactic role of NOVIOBRITŦIV in the sentence, if it is a place name, it follows that it must be a thematic ablative in *-*ūd*, which agrees with TARMESCVNE, revealing that the city had, as often happened in Celtiberia, a second name. TARMESCVNE is based on the place name *tarmeskom*/*tarmesko* on coins.[5] If the derivation *tarmeskom* → *tarmeskū* indicates that the second city was a colony of the first, **nou̯i̯o-britti̯o-* may even have appellative value, and is comparable to the Spanish univerbations *Pueblonuevo*, *Villanueva*.

CENTOEL̲IQ GORTAQVE· IGEDANCINV forms part of the subject and is the only phrase left before the direct object. Its word order is comparatively regular, and it means 'and the city of the *centoelicī igedancinī*', where GORTA is a nom. sg. and CENTOEL̲IQ(VM) IGEDANCINV(M) are detoponymic adjectives in the gen. pl. referring to its inhabitants. This, again, means that the city had two names, *Cenduedia Igedanca* vel sim.

GORTA is certain to be the word for 'city' after the publication of the tessera of Briviesca (Burgos), which reads ROLENICAS GORTAS KAR 'hospitality of the city of R.', by [Martínez Chico & Prósper 2021], where former theories on the derivative *gortika* can be consulted.

While Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea [2024: 199] favour a reading CENTOEL̲IQ for the 1st gen. pl., they allow for the alternatives CENTOEDIQ, CENTVELIQ and, crucially, CENTVEDIQ, for which they, again, find no parallels. And yet, this form has a perfect match in the divine name DEAE CENDVEDIAE, dat. sg. [ERPL: 4] (S. Esteban del Toral / Interamnium Flavium, León, Tarraconensis), in all likelihood a derivative of **kentu*- 'first', and in the recently published C̲OL/A̲IAE CENDV/ERIAE [cf. Gómez Pantoja 2020].[6] If, in view of C̲OL/A̲IAE, CENDVERIAE, CENDVEDIAE is an epithet meaning 'first' (built on the model of **uχsed(i)i̯o*- 'superior', **anded(i)i̯o*- 'inferior') and is identical to the place name, it follows that the inhabitants of the city at issue bore a name that is a derivative of the same place name, namely *Cenduedicī*.

The place name underlying *igedancinī* or its namesake is attested, as observed by the editors, as *konbouto*/*ikezankom* on coins [MLH-1: A.74], where *konbouto* reflects a Celtic **kom-φlou̯to-* 'confluence', and the detoponymic suffix *-*īno*-, as usual, is used in order to avoid a sequence of velar suffixes. In sum, this document, whatever its nature, involves at least an individual and a city.

---

[4] It should be stressed that we know little about possible variants or geographic distribution of this form, which might not belong to the dialect of the Arevaci in which the document is in my view written, where I would expect an evolution *-*iχt*- > -*iⁱt*- > -*i*/*īt*-.

[5] Reading by [Jordán Cólera 2005: 1027]. Previously read *bormeskom*/*bormesko* by [MLH-1: A.81].

[6] The original suffix is likely to be *-*edi̯o*-. The variant with /r/ is not due to "rhotacism", as Gómez Pantoja contends, but to a trivial dental-to-dental dissimilation typically giving a liquid, which would also be the case if the reading of the form discussed here turned out to contain a /l/.

2.2. An intriguing verb form

This text shows the unmarked Early Celtic word order SOV. The subject is immediately followed by the direct object GORTICAM BRADIOCAM. GORTICAM means 'public, related to or issued by the city', and is now certain to be a derivative of GORTA. BRADIOCAM is, as the editors observe, identical to *barazioka* in *gortika Lutiakei augis barazioka* 'document in Lutiaka entirely *barazioka*' [MLH-4: K.6.1] (Luzaga, Guadalajara, Tarraconensis).[7] The first words of the document immediately preceding these refer to the two beneficiaries: *arekoratikubos karuo kenei*: 'for the citizens of *Arekorata*, for the ?issue/offspring of *Carvus*'. In spite of the editors, the word order is quite clear, and can only be "determinatum + determinans", as usual in Celtiberian sequences of "noun + adjective", and matching the identical sequence of K.6.1. The opposite is only found in detoponymic adjectives, e.g. "X-*ika kar*", meaning 'hospitality of/by'. GORTICAM has been substantivated, and is accompanied by an adjective BRADIOCAM endowed with an adjectival suffix.

It was hitherto uncertain whether *barazioka* contained a noun in *-ti̯o-* + adjectival *-i̯oko-*, matching the Celtic and Italic forms L. *gratia*, Gaul. βρατου, etc. [cf. Prósper & Medrano Duque 2022]. Now the dilemma is solved. It is no easy task to identify **brad-*. In principle it could contain the same root **g^{u}ŗH-* as the above forms, but the extension points to an agentive compound **g^{u}ŗH-d^{h}h$_{1}$-ó-*, possibly 'expressing approval' or 'granting a favour'.[8] But the meaning of BRADIOCAM is still uncertain: it could have something to do with friendship or mutual favours, or it could merely allude to the legality or enforcement of the agreement. Both this and [MLH-4: K.6.1] could be *tabulae hospitales* of a more complex scope and goal than the shorter indigenous *tesserae hospitales*, and are known thus far mostly from Latin documents. This document and K.6.1 provide a link between Celtiberian *tesserae* and Latin *tabulae* in Hispania.

What follows must be the verb. DVREM is immediately reminiscent of *tures*/*dures* in a number of documents, like [MLH-4: K.23.2] (Burgo de Osma, Soria, Tarraconensis), Torrijo del Campo [cf. Ezquerra Lebrón & Vicente Redón 1999], and [MLH-4: K.0.7] (Gortono). As per [Prósper 2011; and Martínez Chico & Prósper 2021], *tures*/*dures* is the 3rd sg. of a sigmatic preterite **dū-reχs-t* 'issued, ordered'.[9] The corresponding past participle occurs as a nom. sg. f. DVRETA in [ERPL: 266] (León/Legio Gemina), with debuccalisation and loss of [χ] in the cluster *-χt-*, and as

[7] The adverbial *augis*, lit. 'strongly' (< **h$_{2}$eu̯g-* 'to grow, become strong') is related to *auku* in [MLH-1: K.1.1] (Botorrita/Contrebia Belaisca).

[8] Note that the similar form often reconstructed for Celtic *bardos* 'praise singer' may continue a compound**g^{u}ŗHs-d^{h}h$_{1}$-ó-* with early laryngeal loss (the original phrase is preserved in RV. *gíras dhā-*, Av. *garō dā* 'praise').

[9] An aorist **to-wreĝs-t* had been proposed by [Rubio Orecilla 1999: 154].

a nom. sg. f. *dureita* in [MLH-4: K.23.2] (Osma, Segovia, Tarraconensis), DVREITA in [Untermann & Villar 1999], with the change *-χt-* > *-i̯t-*, peculiar, as far as I know, to the Arevaci, a people who inhabited parts of the present provinces of Burgos, Soria, Segovia and Guadalajara.

In this document, the verb in personal form confirms the etymology with /d/. Second, it has a direct object GORTICAM 'public (document)' for the first time, too, thus underpinning the translation of *taruodureska dureita eskeinis gortika* in [MLH-4: K.23.2][10] as 'Tarvodurean-issued public document' (where *gortika* is adjectival).

For the sake of clarity I reproduce here the table of the sequences at issue, incorporating the present text.

Celtiberian documents containing a verb **dū-reg-*

Origin and Reference	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	Word order
	agent	verb **dū-reg-*	patient	beneficiary	place	
Torrijo [Ezquerra Lebrón & Vicente Redón 1999]	*launi*	*tures*	*eskenim*	*olzui* / *ʔobakai*	*ʔobakai*	2 3 1 4 5
Gortono [MLH-4: K.0.7]	*bundalos*	*dures*			*gortonei*	2 1 5
Osma [MLH-4: K.23.2]	*taruodureska* (← Tarvodurum)	*dureita*	*eskeinis gortika*			1 2 3
León [ERPL: 266]	SALDANICA (← Saldania)	DVRETA		LOLLIANO		4 2 1
[Untermann& Villar 1999]	TARVODVRESCA (← Tarvodurum)	DVREITA		LIGORIQVM		2 1 4
[Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea 2024]	MEDITTO / CENTVEDIQ GORTA IGEDANCINV	DVREM	GORTICAM BRADIOCAM	EMVSE / ANCANGEMNE		1 3 2 4

[10] In the dual system, as per [Jordán Cólera 2005]. To my mind, this writing system, which distinguishes voiced *vs*. voiceless obstruents, is restricted to the Arevaci.

As usual, the editors refute my interpretation without properly citing it and propose to interpret *dures*, DVREM as a noun or adjective. They vaguely speak of a desinence *-es* and *-em*, which makes one wonder, first, what their definition of desinence may be, and second, even assuming they are not speaking in very precise terms, how this word could possibly belong to a non-existent *-e-* stem. By their account, the bronze of Torrijo is left without a verb.

DVREM is undoubtedly a verb form. It conceivably goes back to a 1st pl. **dū-reχs-me*, where the cluster has given rise to *-mm-* obeying the general tendency of clusters of /s/ + sonorant to assimilate in Celtic, and final *-e* has been apocopated (like final *-i*). On a different assumption, it is a 3rd pl. and stands for †DVREN. However, since *tures*/*dures* is a sigmatic aorist, we would expect a 3rd pl. **dū-reχs-ant* > **dūressan*. DVREM, as a consequence, poses a problem for this reconstruction.

According to Jasanoff [2012], **h₃reǵ-* formed a Narten present and a long-vowel preterite. No Irish *-t-* preterite can be unambiguously traced back to a sigmatic aorist, except for *at-recht* 'arose', which matches the 1st sg. Gk. ὤρεξα 'stretched out', Toch.B *reksa* 'spread out', and L. *rēxī* 'directed'. The question revolves around whether L. *rēxit* inherits an old sigmatic preterite, or whether only *suregit*, attributed to Livius by Paulus ex Festo [Lindsay 1913: 380–381], is inherited, or whether both have somehow come down from Proto-Italic. Based on this evidence, Jasanoff reconstructs for the Irish form *-recht* a long-vowel preterite 3rd sg. **h₃rēǵ-t*, 3rd pl. **h₃reǵ-n̥t*, which generalised the /e/ grade of the root early on. If Celtib. *dures* were amenable to the same explanation, we would have to reconstruct 3rd sg. **dūreχt*, 3rd pl. **dūregant*. The 3rd sg. **dūreχt* would have evolved into **dūreχ* and thereupon **dūre*, and the 2nd sg. **dū-reχ-s* would have become **dūres*.

From this point, a new paradigm may have been born, with an analogical 3rd pl. **duren(t)*. As is well known, 3rd sg. forms are highly influential on the rest of the paradigm, and it is only natural that the 3rd pl. was targeted first. The 1st and 2nd pl. would in all likelihood have evolved into **dū-reg-me* and **dū-reχ-te* somewhere down the line. Whether this was the end of the story, or these forms lost their obstruent in analogy to the simpler ones, cannot be ascertained. It follows that the *-s-* found in the 3rd sg. must be secondary. Now we may consider at least two different scenarios.

A. As assumed in former works, there was a sigmatic aorist of this root, also in Proto-Celtic [cf. LIV: 304]. This explains *dures*, but not DVREM if this is the 3rd pl. McCone's meritable refinement of Watkins' explanation of the Irish *-t-* aorist as going back to *-s-* aorists [cf. Watkins 1962: 159–162] requires a high number of steps and does not rule out the possibility that root aorists were involved in the making of the emergent category [cf. McCone 1991: 65–69].

B. Only a root-aorist survived in Celtic. The 3rd sg. was inherently unstable and threatened by regular sound change, and became sigmatic in analogy to sigmatic

preterites and sigmatic subjunctives, a spreading category in Indo-European. Root ablaut may have been given up early on. Similar processes are known elsewhere: Greek root aorists often shift to sigmatic inflection. As Willi [2018: 421] observes: "once final stops were lost in prehistoric Greek, the pivotal 3 sg. forms threatened to become lexically unrecognisable (**peh$_2$ǵ-t*, **i̯eu̯g-* > **pā*, **i̯eu̯*). With an added *s*-morpheme, however, **pāg-s*[*-t*] > **pāk-s*, **i̯eu̯g-s*-[*t*] > **i̯eu̯k-s* produced word-final clusters that preserved the root-final velar". Even when they do not, we have 3rd pl. forms that are sigmatic by analogy, e.g. 3rd sg. ἔβη, 3rd pl. ἔβαν 'went', but 3rd pl. ἦσαν 'they were', ἔθεσαν 'they set up'. In Slavic, loss of final consonants resulted in the 3rd sg. of sigmatic aorists being replaced by thematic forms, as in OCS. 3rd sg. *vede* 'led' replacing **vě* < **u̯ēd-s-t*. Root aorists like 3rd sg. *da* < **dā-t* have sigmatic byforms like *dastъ* < **dā-s-t*.

2.3. A coda of two datives: EMVSE ANCANGEMNEQ

These two words constitute the coda of the sentence containing the beneficiaries of the action expressed by DVREM, are inflected in the dative case, marking out the beneficiary of an action, and regularly appear to the right of the verb. It cannot be put down to chance that both of them end up in <E>, are coordinated by <Q(VE)>, and contain the zero grade of participial/agentive formations.

EMVSE is an athematic dative. It definitely looks like the oblique stem of an amphikinetic perfect participle suffix **-u̯os-*, *-us-* (see [Rau 2017] for details). As a consequence, we may provisionally reconstruct a regular **h$_1$e-h$_1$m-us-éi̯* 'to the possessor, beneficiary, receiver', whose base is identical to that of L. *ēmī*, from **h$_1$e-h$_1$m-*, corresponding to a thematic present **h$_1$emo*/*e-* attested in L. *emō*, OIr. *-eim* 'to take' [cf. Schumacher 2004: 290–292; LIV: 236]. Celtic may have inherited an athematic aorist **h$_1$em-*, **h$_1$m-*, as contended in [LIV: 236]. It would have been straightforwardly refashioned into a *-t-* aorist, which would account for the OIr. preterite 3rd sg. *-ét*, but this could hardly have been **em-s-t* at any stage, or it would have given **īs*. The Latin prefixed preterites like *sumpsī* or *dempsī* can lay no claim to antiquity.

EMVSE obeys the rule by which perfect participles are built from the weak stem: for a similar aniṭ root ending up in a nasal, cf. the pattern of RV. *jaganvā́ṁs-*, *jagmúṣ-* 'who is gone'. While Celtic has not eliminated the perfect, which only survives as a preterite for some verbs, the perfect participle has been lost, at least in Insular Celtic,[11] and such relics can only be explained because they have been substantivated.[12]

[11] Amphikinetic forms, redone as *-t-* stems and matching Greek and Germanic, are found in OIr. *bibdu* 'guilty one', OIr. *fíadu* 'witness'. The first is probably analogical and the second is an inherited special case. Germanic has another lexicalised case of the fem. in *-us-* in *berusjos* 'parents'.

[12] Note that if **-u̯ōs* > **-u̯ūs* had spread from the nominative we would have exactly the same form.

One caution must be added here, however: this possibility implicates that IE / eː/ is still written <E> in this document. The fact that the initial <E> has a somewhat different shape and looks like a capital letter according to [Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea 2024: 214] may be relevant for this matter or not. According to [Schrijver 1991: 343–357], however, long vowels were shortened in pretonic syllables when before sonorants, but not before obstruents, in Celtic, Germanic and Italic. Zair [2012: 145] concludes that *-h_1- and *-h_3- were lost in pretonic syllables without lengthening a preceding vowel. Under any of these formulations, the outcome of a pretonic oblique stem *h_1e-h_1m-*us*- can only be **emus*-. Note, finally, that, if the Sabellic future perfect in -*us*- were ultimately based on a perfect participle suffixed by -*u̯ūs*-, -*us*-, O. PERTEMVST ‘will have prevented, forbidden’ [ST: Lu 1] (Banzi/Bantia) would contain the same formation and the medial vowel would be justified. See [Zair 2014] for a different possibility.

ANCANGEMNEQ provides a rare example of an agent noun in -*mon*-, independently identified in many branches including Anatolian, and comparatively productive in Celtic (in Old Irish only living on in its enlarged variant -*(ii̯)amon*- but for a few fossilised instances).[13] The root is Celtic **keng*- [cf. LIV: 555, **(s)kenǵ*- ‘hinken’] and the corresponding agent noun would be **keng-mū*, **kang-mn-ós* ‘walker’. As a consequence, our dative **kang-mn-éi̯* has preserved the original ablaut, but, crucially, it has also inserted an intrusive vowel -*e*- between root and suffix. Interestingly, this would come to confirm that epenthesis of -*e*- is regular in a Hispano-Celtic sequence -*RKN*- (see below on ARGENACIQ). Indeed, if -*mn*- had been postvocalic early enough, dissimilation would have taken place and we would probably find *-*eu̯nei̯*, which provides a relative chronology for these changes.[14] Simplification of the cluster -*Cmn*- postdated the split-up of core-Indo-European in view of the divergent outcome of the suffix in forms like IE *$h_2eḱ$-*mn*- ‘stone’, shown by the Skt. gen. sg. *aśnas* as opposed to the Gk. derivative ἄκμη ‘peak’ [cf. Nussbaum 2010].[15] **kang-mnV*- could have become **kangnV*- early

[13] Cf. [Remmer 2002–2003]. Forms like Gaul. MARTI SEGOMONI *vs*. Ogamic *segamonas* render this account doubtful and suggest thematic stems have also been pivotal in the emergence of -*amon*-. Both Gaulish and Irish have generalised the full grade of the suffix. Irish usually derives -*mon*- stems from nominal and verbal stems.

[14] For other forms containing this suffix with its original ablaut, like the place name *oilaunez*, *oilaune*, on coins, abl. sg. [MLH-1: A.56] (as if from **Hopi=u̯lH-mn*-), cf. [Prósper 2017: 87], with references.

[15] By contrast, **kangm̥nV*- would have become †*kangau̯n*-. The above solution explains *$h_2eḱ$-*mon*- ‘stone’ → **ak-mno*- > Gaul. *acauno*-, Galatian personal name Ἀκάννων: vowel epenthesis gave rise to Gaul. **akamno*-, and either the first or, if the relative chronology is the same as that of Hispano-Celtic, a secondary wave of dissimilation, yielded **akau̯no*- except in Galatian, and before -*bn*- > -*mn*-. If reliable, *Acmantum villam* (*De Translatione sanctorum martyrum*, 3, 7; 9th c.), today *Esmans* (Seine-et-Marne) may continue a possessive *$h_2eḱ$-*mn̥-tó*- ‘stony (ground)’.

on, and -*gᵊmn*- could have been restored in analogy to -*VmnV*- before the latter sequence became -*V̥nV*-. More probably, however, PCelt. -*K.mn*- became -*Kᵊ.mn*-; the ultrashort epenthetic schwa, automatically generated by the contact of a velar and a nasal sonorant, was subphonemic and could not trigger vocalisation of -*m*- nor generate a diphthong, and the cluster -*mn*- behaved phonotactically as if it were word-initial. The reason why it never became -*u̯n*- in Hispania may be that the schwa was phonemicised only after the dissimilatory wave that affected the whole of Celtic except Irish and possibly peripheral Gaulish. The suffix of the weak cases, in sum, had a postconsonantal and a postvocalic allomorph, respectively -*mn*- and -*un*-.[16]

The prefix is likely to go back to **ande* 'in(to)', in Gaul. *ande*, MIr. *ind*(-) 'in, into him/it' and MW. *an*(*n*)- 'in' (< PIE **h*$_1$*n̥dʰi*), and **ande-kang-mon*- preserves the original compositional structure attributed to internal derivatives of neuter abstracts. A prefix **ambi* 'around' cannot be ruled out, but is still preserved in Celtib. *ambitinkounei* [MLH-1: K.1.1] (Botorrita/Contrebia Belaisca), etc.

ANCANGEMNEQ is also reminiscent of OIr. *céimm* n. 'act of stepping towards, approaching, etc.', acc. pl. *inna cemmen* gl. 'gresus'; OW. *cemmein* gl. 'in gradibus', MW. *camm* 'step' (< Proto-British **kamman*, pl. **kammanī*). These forms ultimately go back to a protero-kinetic noun **keng-mn̥*, **kn̥g-men-s*,[17] with a generalised zero grade of the root. Its thematic derivative is attested in Celtib. *kamanom* 'path' [MLH-1: K.1.1] (Botorrita/Contrebia Belaisca); its Gaulish counterpart passed to Latin, where it was refashioned as *cammīnum*, and from there to the Romance languages, cf. Fr. *chemin*, Sp. *camino* 'path', etc. [cf. Stüber 1998: 64]. In Insular Celtic at least, the suffix has been remodelled and the above forms go back to **kanχ-sman*. This is also likely for Gaulish and for Celtib. *kamanom*, which otherwise would have become †*kangemanom*. Derivatives like **menmn̥* → **menmn̥-tó*- > Celtib. personal name MELMANDI, gen. sg. [CIL 2: 5790] (Guadalajara, Tarraconensis), on which cf. [Stifter 1999–2002], must have been created prior to the spread of -*s*-.

The coordinated datives may be syntactically governed both by DVREM and BRADIOCAM; in that case, it conveys the idea that the agreement (possibly complemented by another document exhibited in the city of the *Cenduediī Igedancinī*) states a favour granted to the holder of the tabula. Since a *hospitium publicum* in Latin *tabulae hospitales* is asymmetrical and favours the individual, usually a *peregrinus*, often entailing the granting of citizenship, it may be the case that: a) EMVSE is the 'holder' of the document, referring to 'the city', and ANCANGEMNEQ literally means 'incomer, foreigner'; b) EMVSE ANCANGEMNEQ has a single referent, the 'holder and newly-incorporated citizen', or c) EMVSE is

[16] For the Hispano-Celtic fate of **-r(H).mn*-, cf. [Prósper 2015: 30–35].

[17] The original genitive form is preserved as -*mēs* > -*mae* in OIr. *anmae* 'name'.

the individual, and ANCANGEMNEQ indicates that the agreement extends to the his offspring, as usual in the Latin counterparts of this kind of document [cf. Beltrán Lloris 2012].

3. The text architecture of the bronze: the second part

3.1. SAICLV· [—]ENINAICVM· DIAINIM· DVOQVE

SAICLV· [—]ENINAICVM looks like the subject and DIAINIM like the direct object of a new sentence, but it cannot be confirmed that the mangled word that follows is the verb. While the base of SAICLV is well attested in Soria, in the realms of the Arevaci, and related to Gaul. SAGILLIAE [CIL 3: 11788] (Noricum), etc., from **sagi-lo-* 'avid' with dialectal palatalisation **-Vgil̥o-* > *-Vg^{i}l^{i}o-* [cf. Prósper 2016: 175–176, 185], the appellative DIAINIM is unknown, but may be taken from **dī-agni-*, containing the action noun of **ag-* 'to carry, lead' (< **h$_2$eǵ-*) found in OIr. *áin* (f.), again with vocalisation of a velar sound in coda position. Note that *eskeinis* in [MLH-1: K.23.2] has been deemed doubtful by [Jordán Cólera 2005: 1018], who has proposed a reading *esainis*. While *eskeinis* partly matches *eskenim* (Torrijo), etc., *esainis* could be taken from **eχs-agni-*, possibly meaning 'order, requirement' (cf. OIr. *esáin* lit. 'driving away' > 'refusal to give hospitality'), especially in view of Celtib. *esatui*, dat. sg. (= L. *exactum*) in Torrijo; cf. also L. *exactiō* [see Prósper 2014: 131–132]. *Non liquet*. In turn, *eskenim* is likely to go back to **eχs-keng-(s)ni-*. That this should be the outcome of an older **kenχ-smn-i-* ← **keng-smn̥-* is speculative. If DIAINIM is a feminine, like its Irish cognates, it cannot agree with COVRATOM.

3.2. CVAMO· ESDOVCOVNVN· COVRATOM

In spite of [Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea 2024: 223], CVAMO is not likely to be an instance of the personal name allegedly attested once as CVAMI [cf. AE 2010: 658] (S. Martinho de Mouros, Lusitania Scallabitana), where all one can read on the photograph is CVMI. Taken at face value, CVAMO is an appellative form, possibly the superlative of an adjective **ke*/*oṷpó-* 'most eager/desired'.[18] While it looks like a genitive, omission of final -M cannot be ruled out.

Nothing is said in the edition about ESDOVCOVNVN. And yet, its structure is unequivocal. It is the genitive plural of a middle present participle **eχsdeṷko-mno-*,

[18] Both **kuHV-* and **kupV-* would have become **kṷV-* early on at consecutive stages, and would in all likelihood be reflected as <QV>. By contrast, **koṷV-* was prone to become **kuṷV-* in Celtiberian [see Prósper & Medrano Duque 2022: 24]. For conceivable comparanda, see Gaul. COVIOMARVS, Skt. *kopa-* m. 'wrath', OE. *hēaf* m. 'mourning' (< **kóṷpo-*), L. **koupēd-* (> *cuppēd-*) 'glutton(ous)'.

but an agent noun **eχsdeu̯ko-mū*, gen. *-ūn-os* is conceivable, too. **eχs-deu̯k-o/e-* is a perfect match of L. *ēdūcere* 'to lead out'. Insular Celtic has a thematic present **duk-o/e-* instead (cf. MW. *dwc* 'bring') [cf. LIV: 124, **deu̯k-*]. Whether it alludes to actual driving out or to some sort of exclusion (or even to bringing up, cf. L. *ēdūcāre*) is impossible to determine.

As usual, the editors have nothing to say about COVRATOM. This is, however, a transparent form, in fact the past participle of a weak stem **kuφr-ā-*, attested in OIr. *ad-cobra-* 'to wish', verbal noun *accobur* (< **ad-kuφro-*). PCelt. **kuφro-* 'desire', from **kupró-* 'beautiful' evolved into **kʊu̯ro-* > **kou̯ro-* and eventually **koβro-*[19] in most Celtic dialects. There is a number of Gaulish names based on this form, like COBROMARVS 'great by his/her desire' (widespread in Pannonia). The divine name [DEA]E . COBRANDIAE [Hourcade & Maurin 2013] (Chassenon/Cassinomagus, Aquitania, 150–200 AD) contains a present participle **kuφrā-nt-* [cf. Prósper & Medrano Duque 2022: 24–25]. The Celtib. family name BOCOVRIQ(VM) [AE 1990: 579] (Madrid, Carpetania) is an agentive compound **bō-kou̯ro-* from **g^{u}ou̯=kupro-* 'wishing for cattle'. It is higly reminiscent of several Old Irish compounds, like *milchobar* 'desiring honey' > 'bear,' and the names *Conchobar* 'desiring dogs', *Ólchobar* 'desiring ale' [cf. Watkins 1994: 92–94]. Celtib. COVRATOM testifies both to the intermediate stage **-uφr-* > *-ou̯r-* and to the existence of a PCelt. present **kuφr-ā-* > **kou̯r-ā-* > **koβr-ā-*. Accordingly, COVRATOM means 'wanted, desired' (< **kuφr-ā-to-*). It might, but need not, agree with CVAMO(M), and may be preceded by an agentive gen. pl., meaning 'sth. wanted by / according to the will of the ESDOVCOVNVN'. CVAMO could, in turn, be a genitive singular governed by an agentive ESDOVCOVNVN.

3.3. The final sequence: some onomastic items

The edition does not explicitly identify the sequence of eight forms, alternating the genitive singular and the genitive plural, as individual names followed by family names. They are preceded by GVSTAICE, in my view from **gustai̯kom*, obviously related to the nom. sg. *kustaikos* [MLH-1, K.1.1] (Botorrita/Contrebia Belaisca), deriving from a form attested as *kusta*, *kustai* (< **ǵus-t-eh$_2$*) possibly meaning 'use, usufruct' [cf. Prósper 2008: 49–53]. GVSTAICE can hardly be anything but a thematic locative in **-ei̯*. It is difficult to say if it syntactically belongs to the preceding text or heralds the list of names in the genitive that follow, since they may depend on the mangled AND[——]EA. GVSTAICE could also be adverbial: 'by choice, *libenter*', or may be dating the document or specifying its agency: in that case, GVSTAICE would be 'under the office of', governing the four magistrate names in the genitive, who

[19] Through resyllabification to **ko.u̯ro-*, favoured by word-initial *#u̯rV-*.

can, *mutatis mutandis*, be compared to the *quattuorviri* of a somewhat later *tabula hospitalis* [AE 2018: 978] (Peralejo, Soria, Tarraconensis). In what follows I shall tackle a brief etymological study of several of them.

TRITANO CORIOTERIQ(VM). The name underlying CORIOTERIQ is a likely compound of **korḭo-* 'army' (MIr. *cuire*, MW. *cordd* 'tribe, clan') and *-tero-*.[20] For names of a similar structure, cf. Thessalian Κόρραγος, Κορρίμαχος 'leading/fighting an army', Germ. *Chariovalda*, king of the Batavi, 'leading an army' in (Tacitus, *Ann*. 2, 11). The second member is attested in Indo-Iranian compounds and may go back to **-te/orh$_1$-ó-* 'piercing' [LIV: 632] or **-te/orh$_2$-ó-* 'overcoming, defeating' [Ibid.: 633]. Conceivable cognates, all of them with war-like nuances, are RV. *rathaṃ-tará-* 'overcoming chariots', *druhaṃ-tará-* 'overcoming falsehood' (with accusative inflection of the first member required by metrics), YAv. *ṯbaēšō.tara-* 'who overcomes hostility', but Skt. *tārá-* 'leading through, driving across', or the YAv. action noun *vītāra-* m. 'crossing,' RV. (8.5.6) *ávitāriṇī-* 'lasting', with an unexpected long vowel, given that these are *seṭ* roots. Nussbaum [2017] has called attention to an oxytone type of agent noun with /e/ grade of the root (R(e)-*ó-s*). The type is known from agentive nouns and passive verbal adjectives that derive from a type R(ó)-*o-*: cf. Germ. **berga-* 'mountain', OCS. *brěgŭ* 'bank', from **b^{h}erǵ^h-ó-* 'rising, risen'. An example well attested in Celtic compounds is **-ǵenh$_1$o-* 'born'. As regards the roots studied here, Gaulish has names in *-taros* (< **-tr̥H-ó-*), like BROGITAROS, Δηιοταρος, which match two Sanskrit adjectives *turá-* 'sore' and 'eager', from **tr̥h$_{1/2}$-ó-*. We may add the Lusitanian, non-Celtic personal name COROTVRETIS, gen. sg. [CIL 13: 7045] (Mainz/Mogontiacum, Germania Superior), in my present view from **ḱoro* + **tr̥H-e-t-* ← **tr̥H-ó-*, with a non-Celtic evolution of the sonorant (a TVRETEDIVS is attested in Raetia).[21] In sum, **-terH-ó-* would provide the hitherto missing form with /e/ grade deriving from a noun **tórH-o-*; cf. Skt. *tára-* 'a crossing'.

VENINVNO NARIOQ(VM). The base of the uninterpreted individual name VENINVNO, if the reading is right, may well go back to **dueni-gno-*, (as if) from **duHen-i=ǵnh$_1$-o-*. If this holds true, it is a match of L. *benignus*, on which see [Nussbaum 2003][22].

---

[20] The editors' speculations about the relation of this form with the Irish equative *-ithir* are idle, since this is an innovation not even shared by Brittonic, and can only have an adjectival basis; the Irish equative is probably unrelated to **-tero-* and presupposes *-is-* + abstract-forming *-et-*, as per [Jasanoff 1990]. The Continental Celtic comparative suffix, in spite of what they say, would certainly be **-is-tero-*, with the exception of forms deriving from adverbials. In fact, they rely on the authority of [McCone 1994], whom they cite erroneously and through an indirect source, however. Ironically, McCone took the equative from **-is-etero-*, in turn remodelled from **-is-tero-*.

[21] This name teams up with other similar formations: CORONERI 'army/war man, warrior' [CIL 2: 5595] (close to Braga/Bracara), and COROPOTI 'army/war-lord' [AE 1991: 977] (Cáceres, Lusitania Emeritensis).

[22] J. Gorrochategui (UPV) has kindly made the point to me that the editors may have missed a final <s>.

Note that both simplification of the initial cluster *du̯-*[23] and loss or absorption of the outcome of /g/ in a sequence *-iKn-* would be regular.

For [Ballester & Almagro-Gorbea 2024: 240], NARIOQ contains an unparalleled root. This is a puzzling assertion: NARIOQ(VM) is based on an ablaut variant of *$h_2$ner-* 'man, strength' in Gk. ἀνήρ, Skt., Av. *nar-*, SP. *nerf* (acc. pl.), etc. [cf. NIL: 332–334]. Nussbaum [2022: 213, 223] has devoted a rich dicussion to this problem, which I summarise here briefly adding some evidence: OIr. *nert*, MW. *nerth*, Gaul., Celtib. *Nerto-* (< **nerto-* 'strength, power') presuppose a derivation *$h_2$nr̥tó-* 'strong' → *$h_2$nértom* ('the strong' >) 'strength'. OIr. *ner* m. 'boar', MW. *ner* m. 'lord', L. *Nerō*, the western Hispano-Celtic ethnonym *Neriī* in (Pliny, *N. H.* 4, 112), and a DEO NERIO in Aquitania can be traced back to *$h_2$nero-* 'strong' and its derivatives. Hesych's gloss νωρεῖ· ἐνεργεῖ 'is effective' comes from *nōréi̯e/o-* 'to be strong, efficacious' ← *(h_2)nōró-* 'strong' ← *(h_2)nóro-* 'strength'. For Hitt. *innara-*, Luvian *ānnara/i-* 'forceful,' reconstruction of an ἔνθεος-bahuvrihi is conceivable: adjectival root *$h_2$ner-* 'strong' → R(ó)-*o-* *$h_2$nór-o-* 'strength' → **en-$h_2$noró-* 'forceful'. In my view, NARIOQ contains a long grade similar to that reconstructed by [IEW: 765] for OIr. *nár* 'noble', that is to say **nōro-*. It has a derivative *náire* 'magnanimity' (< **nōr-i̯ā*). They accordingly provide direct evidence for *h_2nōró-* 'strong'.

MVGVRO ARGENACIQ(VM). MVGVRO, MVGVRI is found in [EDCS-46400857] (Alcubilla, Soria, Tarraconensis) and goes back to **mogu-ro-*, either from the form preserved in OIr. *mug* 'child' or more likely from **mo/eǵh_2-u-* 'power'. Given that his family name ARGENACIQ contains a suffix *-āko-*, it could be based on a place name from *h_2r̥k-nó-* 'fenced off, encircled'. In that case, the pretonic cluster *-RK.(m)n-* at least has undergone epenthesis of a schwa eventually phonemicised as /e/, yielding *-R.ge(m)n-*. For several Hispano-Celtic forms showing the same change, see [Prósper 2016: 101–104].

CILIO COELEIQ(VM). The family name COELEIQ does not contain an original diphthong, if only because the suffix *-ei̯ko-* is non-existent. As the frequent name COELEA in Lusitania shows, the underlying suffix *-ei̯o-* became *-eo-*, to which *-iko-* is attached.

As regards ATTES ANEITTIQ, the editors have, again, missed a plethora of comparanda. This onomastic formula looks like a signature rounding off the text. ATTES can only be a nominative, since, as observed in [Prósper 2016: 146], at least three Celtiberian names in *-et-* are based on nursery words, like *anna*, *atta* and *acca*. This name is attested in the dative on an inscription reading [---] ATTETI SAICIO QVIRAVM A[—] [cf. ERS: 49] (Duruelo, Segovia, Tarraconensis).

[23] Cf. VENISAMORVM 'bonissimorum' [CIL 5: 7231] (Susa/Segusio, Alpes Cottiae), from **duHeno-*.

As for ANEITTIQ, I have repeatedly observed in former works and above, in the discussion of *dureita*/DVREITA, that a trivial change *-χt-* > *-i̯t-* has taken place in the dialect of the Arevaci, which justifies the idea that they spoke a Celtiberian dialect of their own [cf. Prósper 2022]. ANEITTIQ is nothing but a trivial *-iko-* derivative of **aneχti̯o-*, well attested as a name: cf. ANEXTIA [CIL 13: 10010, 124c] (Besançon/Vesontio, Germania Superior), ANECTIONIS [CIL 3: 11572] (Virunum, Noricum), Ανεκταιακ[-] [RIG-1: G-124] (Cavaillon, Vaucluse, Narbonensis), etc. [see KGP: 131]. This is the past participle of PCelt. **aneg-* 'to protect' [cf. EDPC: 35–36; Schumacher 2004: 198–200], found in OIr. *aingid*, *-anaig*, passive preterite *anachtae*. It is, to the best of my knowledge, not attested in Hispano-Celtic. An instrument noun **aneχ-tlo-* is attested in Gaul. ANEXTLOMARVS 'great by his protection' [CIL 13: 11583] (Langres/Andematunum, Belgica/Germania) and OIr. *anacul*, the verbal noun of *aingid*.

Abbreviations

Languages

Av.	Avestan	L.	Latin	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Celtib.	Celtiberian	MIr.	Middle Irish	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
E.	English	MW.	Middle Welsh	RV.	RgVeda
Fr.	French	O.	Oscan	Skt.	Sanskrit
Gaul.	Gaulish	OCS.	Old Church Slavic	SP.	South-Picene
Germ.	Germanic	OE.	Old English	Sp.	Spanish
Gk.	Greek	OIr.	Old Irish	Toch.B	Tocharian B
Hitt.	Hittite	Old L.	Old Latin	YAv.	Younger Avestan
IE	Indo-European	OW.	Old Welsh		

Other abbreviations

abl.	ablative	gen.	genitive	nom.	nominative
acc.	accusative	gl.	glossed	pl.	plural
dat.	dative	m.	masculine	sg.	singular
f.	feminine	n.	neuter		

References

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

Ballester, X., & Almagro-Gorbea, M. (2024). El bronce de Meditón, un nuevo texto hispano-céltico. *Estudios sobre Lenguas y Epigrafías Antiguas*, *21*, 155–260.

Beltrán Lloris, F. (2012). *Hospitium* municipal y *civitas honoraria*. Una relectura de la tésera de hospitalidad de Herrera de Pisuerga. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, *181*, 245–259.

CIL — Mommsen, Th. et al. (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

EDCS — *Epigraphik Datenbank Clauss-Slaby*. Retrieved from http://www.manfredclauss.de

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

ERPL — Rabanal Alonso, M., & García Martínez, S. M. (2001). *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de León: revisión y actualización*. León: Universidad de León.

ERS — Santos Yanguas, J., Hoces De La Guardia, Á. L., & Del Hoyo, J. (2005). *Epigrafía romana de Segovia y su provincia*. Segovia: Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad de Segovia.

Ezquerra Lebrón, B., & Vicente Redón, J. B. (1999). El bronce celtibérico de Torrijo del Campo (Teruel). In F. Beltrán et al. (Eds.), *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras en la Hispania prerromana: Actas del VII Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas* (pp. 581–594). Salamanca: EUSAL.

Figueira, N., & Encarnação, J. (2017). Fragmento de estela romana de Viseu. *Ficheiro Epigráfico*, *147*, 3–7.

Gómez Pantoja, J. L. (2020). El dilema de Paramio. *Cuadernos de Arqueología de la Universidad de Navarra*, *28*, 157–166. https://doi.org/10.15581/012.28.007

Hourcade, D., & Maurin, L. (2013). *Mars Grannus* à Cassinomagus (Chassenon, Charente). *Aquitania*, *29*, 137–153.

IEW — Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.

Jasanoff, J. (1990). The Origin of the Celtic Comparative Type OIr. *tressa*, MW. *trech* "Stronger". *Die Sprache*, *34*, 171–189.

Jasanoff, J. (2012). Long-vowel Preterites in Indo-European. In C. H. Melchert (Ed.), *The Indo-European Verb* (pp. 127–135). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

Jordán Cólera, C. (2003). Acerca del ablativo que aparece en las téseras de hospitalidad celtibéricas. *Palaeohispanica*, *3*, 113–127.

Jordán Cólera, C. (2005). ¿Sistema dual de escritura en celtibérico? *Palaeohispanica*, *5*, 1013–1030.

KGP — Schmidt, K.-H. (1957). *Die Komposition in Gallischen Personennamen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lindsay, W. M. (Ed.). (1913). *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig: Teubner.

LIV — Rix, H., et al. (2001). *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Martínez Chico, D., & Prósper, B. M. (2021). A New Celtiberian Tessera in the Latin Alphabet from Virovesca (Briviesca, Burgos) and the Typology of Tesserae Hospitales. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, *68*, 167–196. http://doi.org/10.1515/zcph-2021-0008

McCone, K. (1991). *The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

McCone, K. (1994). An tSean-Ghaeilge agus a reamhstair. In K. McCone et al. (Eds.), *Stair na Gaeilge: in ómós do Pádraig Ó Fiannachta* (pp. 61–219). Maynooth: Roinn na Sean-Ghaeilge.

MLH-1 — Untermann, J. (1975). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum I. Die Münzlegenden*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

MLH-4 — Untermann, J. (1997). *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum IV. Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

NIL — Wodtko, D. S., Irslinger, B., & Schneider, C. (2008). *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Nussbaum, A. J. (2003). A Benign Interpretation: Latin *benignus* and the *bonus*-Rule, talk held at the *23rd East Coast Indo-European Conference*, *Harvard, June 2003* (unpublished manuscript).

Nussbaum, A. J. (2004). 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. (2010), PIE -Cmn- and Gk. τρανής 'Clear'. In R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, & M. Weiss (Eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig*

Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (pp. 269–277). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.

Nussbaum, A. J. (2017). Agentive and other Derivatives of "τομός"-Type Nouns. In C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit, & G.-J. Pinault (Eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages* (pp. 377–389). Bremen: Hempen.

Nussbaum, A. J. (2022). Derivational Properties of Adjectival Roots. In M. Malzahn, H. A. Fellner, & Th.-S. Illes (Eds.), *Zurück zur Wurzel. Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indogermanischen Akten der 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 16. September 2016 in Wien* (pp. 205–224). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Prósper, B. M. (2008). *El bronce celtibérico de Botorrita I*. Pisa, Roma: Fabrizio Serra.

Prósper, B. M. (2011). The instrumental case in the thematic noun inflection of Continental Celtic. *Historische Sprachforschung*, *124*, 250–267.

Prósper, B. M. (2014). Time for Celtiberian Dialectology: Celtiberian Syllabic Structure and the Interpretation of the Bronze Tablet from Torrijo del Campo, Teruel (Spain). *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). Proto-Italic Laryngeals in the Context *C*ḭ*HC*- and New Italic and Celtic Etymological Connections. *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia*, *19*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.19272/201704801004

Prósper, B. M. (2022). The Sibilant Sounds of Hispano-Celtic: Phonetics, Phonology and Orthography. *Journal of Language Relationship*, *20*, 1–24.

Prósper, B. M., & Medrano Duque, M. (2022). Ancient Gaulish and British Divinities: Notes on the Reconstruction of Celtic Phonology and Morphology. *Voprosy Onomastiki*, *19*(2), 9–47. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2022.19.2.015

Rau, J. (2017). The Derivational History of the Perfect Participle Active. In C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit, & G.-J. Pinault (Eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages* (pp. 377–389). Bremen: Hempen.

Remmer, U. (2002–2003). Das indogermanische Suffix *-mon-* im Altirischen. *Die Sprache*, *43*, 171–211.

RIG-1 — Lejeune, M. (1985). *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises. Textes gallo-grecs*. Paris: CNRS.

Rubio Orecilla, F. (1999). Aproximación lingüística al bronce de Torrijo (Teruel). *Veleia*, *16*, 137–157.

Schrijver, P. (1991). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Schumacher, S. (2004). *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Innsbruck: Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

ST — Rix, H. (2002). *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Stifter, D. (1999–2002). A Contribution to Celtiberian Etymology. *Die Sprache*, *41*, 56–72.

Stüber, K. (1998). *The Historical Morphology of N-Stems in Celtic*. Maynooth: National University of Ireland.

Untermann, J., & Villar, F. (1999). Las téseras de Gadir y Tarvodurum. In F. Villar et al. (Eds.), *Pueblos, Lenguas y Escrituras en la Hispania Prerromana, Actas del VII Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas* (pp. 719–732). Salamanca: EUSAL.

Van Beek, L. (2022). *The Reflexes of Syllabic Liquids in Ancient Greek. Linguistic Prehistory of the Greek Dialects and Homeric Kunstsprache*. Leiden: Brill.

Watkins, C. (1962). *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb*. *I. The Sigmatic Aorist*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.

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.

Willi, A. (2018). *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zair, N. (2012). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.

Zair, N. (2014). The Future Perfect in Oscan and Umbrian, and the *ō*-Perfect in South Picene. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, *112*, 367–385. http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12032