

Marcos MEDRANO DUQUE

PhD, 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>

****Ķerh₂-* and **Ķer-* Roots in Ancient Celtic Onomastics Against the Indo-European Background**

Abstract

It is well known that the root **Ķer-* ‘upper (body) part, horn’ and its secondary variant **Ķerh₂-* ‘head’ have enjoyed high productivity in all Indo-European languages, at least in the field of common names which was thoroughly surveyed in the past century by A. J. Nussbaum. However, these roots also left a large number of proper names in most western and southern daughter languages of PIE that on many occasions have not been satisfactorily identified or analysed to date. Such names have mainly been transmitted by the Roman epigraphic tradition, although some others can be found in Roman and Greek literary sources, so their phonetic structure may have been altered during the process of transmission. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to compile a comprehensive list of the onomastic traces of **Ķerh₂-* and **Ķer-* roots in ancient and medieval Celtic languages and, where possible, in the rest of the Indo-European languages, paying special attention to the derivational and compositional processes, morphological structures, and dialectal trends deducible from the distribution and frequency of occurrence of proper names. Each proper name or group of proper names has been individually parsed and further cognates outside Celtic branch have been sought in order to seek common formational isoglosses. Last, other unresolved semantic and lexical issues concerning Celtic and Indo-European common derivatives of **Ķer-* mainly found in the field of dendronymy (Greek κράνον/κράνεια ‘cornelian cherry’ and κέρασος ‘bird cherry’, Gaulish κόρνα, and Latin *cornum/cornus* ‘cornelian cherry’, etc.) will also be addressed at the end of the paper.

Keywords

anthroponymy; toponymy; theonymy; Indo-European; Celtic languages; etymology; morphology; derivation; Indo-European word formation

Acknowledgements

This work has been financed by the University of Salamanca in the framework of its Programa III. I would like to thank Professor Blanca María Prósper (University of Salamanca) for her permanent help, Shoni Lavie-Driver (University of Cambridge) for his useful comments on the formal aspects, and also the two anonymous reviewers of this article for their kind suggestions.

For citation

Medrano Duque, M. (2025). $*\hat{k}erh_2$ - and $*\hat{k}er$ - Roots in Ancient Celtic Onomastics Against the Indo-European Background. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 22(2), 94–121. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2025.22.2.018

Received on 22 March 2024

Accepted on 30 September 2024

Маркос Медрано Дуке

PhD, кафедра индоевропейской и классической филологии, Саламанкский университет (Plaza de Anaya S/N, 37008 Salamanca, España)

E-mail: marcos97md@usal.es

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5320-8150>

Рефлексы корней $*\hat{k}erh_2$ - и $*\hat{k}er$ - в древней кельтской ономастике на общеиндоевропейском фоне

Аннотация

Широко известно, что корень $*\hat{k}er$ - ‘верхняя часть (тела), рог’ и его вторичный вариант $*\hat{k}erh_2$ - ‘голова’ оказались чрезвычайно продуктивны во всех индоевропейских языках, во всяком случае в сфере апеллятивной лексики, которая была подробно описана Аланом Нассбаумом в конце прошлого века. В большинстве западных и южных языков-потомков праиндоевропейского оба эти корня дали также множество проприальных рефлексов, которые до сих пор не были идентифицированы и удовлетворительным образом проанализированы. По большей части эти имена дошли до нас в римской эпиграфической традиции, хотя некоторые могут быть найдены в римских и греческих литературных источниках, при этом в процессе передачи естественно происходило искажение их фонетического облика. Цель настоящей статьи заключается в том, чтобы собрать все ономастические рефлексы корней $*\hat{k}erh_2$ - and $*\hat{k}er$ - в древних и средневековых кельтских языках и по возможности в других индоевропейских языках, уделяя при этом особое внимание характерным для них деривационным механизмам, а также их морфологической структуре и диалектным особенностям, вытекающим из их пространственной дистрибуции и частотности. Каждое имя или группа имен анализировались индивидуально, для каждого случая автором искались родственные эквиваленты в других языках с целью установления общих словообразовательных изоглосс. В конце статьи также рассматривается круг нерешенных лексико-семантических вопросов, связанных с кельтскими и другими индоевропейскими апеллятивными рефлексам корня $*\hat{k}er$ -, в основном в сфере фитонимии (др.-греч. $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\omicron$ / $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ‘кизил обыкновенный’ и $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ ‘черемуха обыкновенная’, галл. $korva$, и лат. *cornum* / *cornus* ‘кизил обыкновенный’ и др.).

Ключевые слова

антропонимия; топонимия; теонимия; индоевропейские языки; кельтские языки; этимология; морфология; деривация; индоевропейское словообразование

Благодарности

Данное исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке Саламанкского университета. Автор выражает благодарность профессору Бланке Марии Проспер (Саламанкский университет) за ее постоянную поддержку, Шони Лави-Драйверу (Кембриджский университет) за его полезные соображения, касающиеся формальных аспектов исследования, а также двух анонимных рецензентов за их ценные комментарии и предложения.

Для цитирования

Medrano Duque M. **Ķerh*₂- and **Ķer*- Roots in Ancient Celtic Onomastics Against the Indo-European Background // Вопросы ономастики. 2025. Т. 22, № 2. С. 94–121. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2025.22.2.018

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 22.03.2024

Рукопись принята к печати 30.09.2024

1. Introduction

The present paper aims to compile, categorize, and study individually each of the onomastic derivatives that both roots have produced, firstly, in all preserved Celtic languages and secondly, in other Indo-European dialects that also inherited these roots. Through this systematization of the available common names and onomastic data, we will try to draw some conclusions about the behaviour of **Ķerh*₂- and **Ķer*- in the various languages, as well as the characteristics that distinguish them from each other on a geographical, onomastic, and linguistic level.

Once the exposition of the proper names has been concluded, a brief section will be dedicated to lexical and etymological matters, so we will try to solve some formal coincidences detected a long time ago in and outside Celtic linguistics.¹

Finally, before turning to the individual analysis of each one of the forms and onomastic categories, we have considered it necessary to include in the following lines some of the general thoughts of A. J. Nussbaum, who devoted a now classic monograph to the study of these two roots and their distribution in the languages [Nussbaum 1986]. A secondary aim of ours is, naturally, to complete Nussbaum's thorough research by adding up all proper names known to date and updating it with the findings and epigraphic discoveries of the last decades.

¹As for the previous compilation attempts, Delamarre's second dictionary ought to be introduced here [Delamarre 2019]. In several sections of his work (namely, *s.v. carno-*, *carnu-* [Ibid.: 185–187], *s.v. caruo-* [Ibid.: 188–189], *s.v. cernu-* [Ibid.: 206–207], *s.v. ceruo-* [Ibid.: 207], *s.v. craro-* [Ibid.: 249–250]), this author offers long and useful lists with the alleged derivatives of the abovementioned roots. However, in many cases, these analyses lack phonetic, morphological, and derivational coherence, so that a deeper and more comprehensive study is necessary (see also his first work [Delamarre 2003: 108, 128–129] for a similar treatment of the extant data).

2. $*\hat{k}erh_2-$ and $*\hat{k}er-$ vis à vis once again

The roots under study in this work, both the set form $*\hat{k}erh_2-$ and the *aniṭ* one $*\hat{k}er-$, were collected by Pokorny in his dictionary in the same entry [IEW: 574–577] and, undoubtedly, they both present two of the most astonishing series of derivatives documented for the reconstructed language. They are represented in every one of the Indo-European branches, encompassing multiple semantic spheres in the inventory of inherited common nouns and virtually all the onomastic (sub)categories in Celtic and other languages mainly pertaining to the Western and Mediterranean Indo-European landscape.²

In the first place, Nussbaum initially rejected the traditional equation whereby the meanings of these roots were said to be distributed according to their form, that is, the root set $*\hat{k}erh_2-$ would cover those derivatives that meant ‘head’ (e.g. Skt. *śiraḥ*³, Av. *sarah-* ‘id.’, but Hitt. *karā(uar)* < $*\hat{k}(e)r(e)h_2-$ and Gk. *κέρας* < $*\hat{k}erh_2s$ ‘horn’), while to the *aniṭ* root $*\hat{k}er-$ would correspond ‘horn’ without apparent exceptions and with the productive derivations in $*-nV-$ and $*-u/*-uV-$. Indeed, the semantic distribution of all these derivatives does not operate systematically in these terms in the languages. On the contrary, there are semantic and formal confluences that invalidate this hypothesis. In addition, to this intricate semantic framework must be added a grammatical difficulty inherent to proper names, i.e. that very often proper names do not have a transparent translation, preventing us from accessing their synchronic meaning.

However, there does seem to be a clear semantic contrast within the notion of ‘horn’, since the forms with laryngeal in coda position are associated with horn as a material, while, on the other hand, the *aniṭ* derivatives are associated with horn as an object. This could be explained through the addition of the suffix $*(e)h_2-$, which creates collective-abstract nouns, to be later understood through resegmentation as part of the root coda.⁴ Thus, a hypostasized secondary root would have arisen, as productive or even more than the original one. As will be seen, following

²Due to the low number of derivatives in some of the subcategories, in this analysis we have divided the proper names into five main groups: anthroponyms (PNs, i.e. ‘personal names’), toponyms (PINs, comprising choronyms, hydronyms, oronyms, etc.), names of deities (DNs, comprising both theonyms *sensu stricto* and epithets), ethnonyms (ENs), and demonyms/origionyms (ONs), i.e. names identifying people in relation to their place of origin or living. Naturally, when a name belongs to a specific subcategory, this will be specified in the text.

³The zero grade in the Vedic form can be explained through an analogy to the oblique stems of this paradigm, e.g. gen. sg. *śiṛṣṇāḥ*, but in any case, we would expect a parallel outcome to that in Greek and Iranian, †*śaras-*.

⁴In the same vein, on Gk. *δέμας* ‘bodily frame’ and its possible origins starting from a root name $*do/em-$ ‘that what has (been) built’ plus a derivational morpheme $*-h_2-$ and not as a direct reflex of a purported verbal set root $*demh_2-$ ‘to build’, see [Nikolaev 2010].

the conclusions inferred from the general onomastic analysis, it is in fact possible to trace some morphological and derivational tendencies which, far from being isolated, shed new light on the behaviour of these roots in the daughter languages.

In the second place, in the field of Celtic common names, it is observed that only the *aniṭ* root had continuity, either in the full grade (see below) or in the zero grade of the root, but always by means of the suffixes *-*no*- (or *-*nu*-⁵) and *-*uo*-: zero grade 1) **Ķ_g-no/u-* ‘upper part of the body, horn’ > PCelt. **karno/u-* > Gal. *κάρνυξ* ‘(Galatian) trumpet’ — and the synonymous thematic form *κάρνον*, glossed by Hesychius as *τὴν σάλπιγγα Γαλάται* — plus its adjective *καρνάριος*, and in Brittonic MW. *carn* and OBret. *carn* ‘hoof’;⁶ and 2) the possessive **Ķ_g-uo-* ‘having horns’ > PCelt. **karuo-* ‘horned (animal)’ → ‘deer, stag’, present in W. *carw*, Co. *carow* and Bret. *karō*⁷ (cf. also the exact *comparanda* in lengthened grade AToch. *šaru* and BToch. *šerwe* ‘hunter’ and full grade L. *cervus*).⁸

As for the forms coming from the *e*-grade, we can compare the PCelt. derivatives of **kernā* ‘angle, corner’, MĪr. *cern*, MW. *cern* ‘id.’, MBret. *quern* ‘top’, in the latter case showing a semantic shift ‘that is in the upper part (of the head)’ → ‘that is sharp/curved’ → ‘angle, corner’; while those with an *o*-grade of the root derive from **kornV-* ‘horn’, OĪr./W. *corn*, etc. Again, only this same nasal suffix is maintained, both in the *e*-grade feminine counterpart and in the *o*-grade of the root, here with an undetermined stem vowel due to the same historical problem mentioned above. On these forms, see [Matasović 2009: 190–192; Zair 2012: 94–95].

Finally, it should be pointed out that over the last few decades some authors have occasionally defended that these Celtic onomastic derivatives may be related

⁵The apocope or loss of sounds in *Auslaut* common to the Brittonic and Goidelic branches (c. 6th CE) does not allow us to know whether it was originally a thematic formation or, on the contrary, a *-u*-stem, as in L. *cornū*.

⁶The absence of derivatives of this protoform with a zero grade in the Goidelic branch is remarkable. The documented Old Irish words for ‘horn’ are *benn*, clearly from PCelt. **band-no-* ‘peak, top’, and *adarc* (MĪr. *adharc*), whose etymology is still disputed, as it has traditionally been tried to be compared with Bas. *adar* ‘id.’ and with Gaul. *adarca/αδάρκης*, the name given to the foam of the sedge (Plin. *Nat.* 32. 140. 6 *et al.*), but without great success to date [cf. Tovar 1986: 686].

⁷Again, the Goidelic group seems to have discarded this zoonym in favour of others also present in the other Celtic dialects: *dam* < PCelt. **damo-/damato-* ‘domesticated animal’, *elit*, *ailit* < PCelt. **elan(t)ī* ‘fallow deer, hind’, and *erp*, *erb* < PCelt. **erbā* ‘roe deer, fallow deer’.

⁸As we can see, by way of a mere note — since it exceeds the grammatical limits of proper names — the category of zoonymy also has numerous derivatives of both roots. In addition to those already noted and the derivatives of **Ķ_h₂-s-* that will be set forth below, in Greek we have attested *κρανίος* ‘meagre, *Argyrosomus regius*’, so called probably because of the shape of its head, and the already mentioned *κάρνος*, ‘ram’ ← ‘horned (animal)’, both with a zero grade of the *aniṭ* root. See below for the discussion about dendronymy. For an alternative to the traditional etymological analysis of L. *cervus*, cf. [Prósper 2016: 23–24].

to the zoonyms meaning ‘heron’ or ‘hornet’, giving rise to exotic proper names that can hardly be explained on the basis of those zoonyms [see Delamarre 2017: 261–263; 2009: 75–79, *inter al.*]. The present semantic discussion starts out of the Celtic family, in other Indo-European cognates whose semantic evolution has resulted indeed in those concepts: in Baltic Lith. *širšuo*, *širšionas*, OPr. *sirsilis* ‘hornet’, in Slavic *сръшенъ* and Serb. *sr̂sljén* ‘hornet’, in Italic L. *crābrō* ‘wasp’, and in Germanic OE. *hurnet(u)* and OHG. *hurnūz* ‘hornet’ (> Ger. *Hornisse*) [cf. IEW: 576; Nussbaum 1986: 248–260].⁹

As far as the semantic development is concerned, one could think that originally it presented either a possessive structure ‘having horns/antennae (animal)’, or a *pars pro toto* denomination type, by which, starting from the obviously prominent element of the animal, it came to refer to the animal as a whole. Furthermore, this semantic position has been justified by appealing to the importance of these animals within the Indo-European mythological traditions (see the various works of Delamarre [2003: 128–129; 2009: 75–79; 2019: 249–250] and Lacroix [2010]).

Certainly, all of them — including the Celtic toponymic examples — derive from the same PIE protoform with variations in the secondary suffixation added to the primary sibilant suffix (namely, $*\hat{k}rh_2-s-ro(n)-$, $*\hat{k}rh_2-s-e/on-$, and $*\hat{k}rh_2-s-il-jo-$). Nevertheless, and regardless of whether the existence of the alleged Celtic derivatives is proven, the semantic phenomenon that has taken place here is transparent: the meaning ‘(element) having horns’ has survived in zoonyms exclusively, evolving into common nouns with the general meaning ‘horned animal’ that apply, as we have observed in parallel in the referents of the derivatives of the possessive formation $*\hat{k}r-uo-$, mainly to ungulate mammals (cf. also the full grade in PGerm. **her-uta-* ‘deer’, ONr. *hjørtr*, OHG. *hiruz* (> Ger. *Hirsch*), etc.).

On the other hand, $*\hat{k}rh_2-s-ro-$ had a relatively high productivity in Celtic toponymy, but, as we shall see, given that its referents are different (humans, places, divinities), its meaning must also necessarily be diverse, conditioned by the onomastic category to which it is circumscribed. Thus, the original ‘(element) that has horns’, in the case of anthroponymy, would become a prosopopoeic proper name, probably passing through a stage of byname — referring to a specific physical

⁹The alleged Celtic derivatives, W. *creyryn* ‘fly, insect’ (< $*crās-r-ino-$?) and OIr. *crebar* ‘gadfly’, which Delamarre and Lacroix adduce as arguments in favour of their hypothesis, do not constitute weighty evidence for two reasons: on the one hand, because the veracity of these terms is in question due to the scarce documentation — a fact which they themselves state — and, on the other hand, because the confirmation of those would not be a line against what is argued here, but one more example of certain semantic evolution together with the other cognates, always independent of the onomastic field. In fact, [Nussbaum 1986] does not even mention them in his exhaustive study.

feature or metaphorical. In theonymy, it could also refer to an iconographic characteristic of the deity — as in the case of the Gaulish god [C]ERNNUNOS — or to its function as a protector of horned animals. And in toponymy, ‘horns’ would have been assimilated to rocky or mountainous formations that resemble the appearance of horns, such as hills, mounds or hillocks.

Secondly, the meaning ‘heron’ is only put forward by Lacroix [2010] on the basis of a different root, *(s)Ķor- (*ani!*!), and presumably onomatopoeic (in [IEW: 567–571] also reconstructed with an initial velar consonant *(s)kor-), from which would derive some bird names such as L. *cornīx* and *corvus*, Gk. κόραξ or Skt. *karāṭa*- ‘raven’, among others. It seems therefore not appropriate to follow this theory in the following pages considering the phonetic and semantic disparities.

At this point, it is in our opinion sufficiently proven that the Celtic toponymic formations never had anything to do with bees or hornets — and much less with herons — but with the primordial notion of ‘horns’ shared by the various semantic derivations.

3. Onomastic derivatives of **Ķerh*₂- and **Ķer*-

We will now proceed to the individual analysis of each of the onomastic categories in which derivatives of the roots in question have been identified.

3.1. **Ķerh*₂-

3.1.1. Toponymy

Crarie

This PIN was already documented by Holder [ACS 1: 1155] and identified with the present-day hamlet of Creyers, in the French department of Hautes-Alpes. It is a perfectly suitable name for a PIN located at the top of a hillock. An evolution from PIE **Ķh*₂-s-ro- > **krāsro*- > **krāro*- ‘hillock, mound’) can be posited (cf. the various PINs Sp. *Cabezón de la Sal*, *de Liébana*, *de Cameros*, *de Echauri*, *Cabezo*, and others — ultimately derived from Vulgar Latin *capitium* < L. *caput* ‘head’). The PIN is supposed to be attested in a document of the 8th century, but there is no further evidence for it, so it must be regarded as uncertain. This element **krāro*- can be found in many Celtic onomastic formations, both as part of compounds and as an independent name (see below).

Novencraris/Novemcraris

A name given to a *mutatiō* or Roman rest station mentioned in the *Itinerarium a Burdigala Hierusalem usque* (Anonymous author of Bordeaux, 333 CE) and

located in the modern department of Drôme. At first glance, it seems that it is a hybrid Gallo-Latin compound consisting of the Latin numeral *novem* and Celtic **krāro*-. It is also well attested the tendency in Celtic territory to create onomastic formations by means of numerals (e.g. ENs *Tri-corii*, *Vo-corii*, *Petru-corii*, *Vocontii*, *Suessiones/Suessetani*, etc.), so we could think of a *dvigu-bahuvrīhi* type compound ‘(place) that has nine hillocks’. The substitution of the indigenous numeral ‘nine’ in the first member (hitherto unattested in Gaulish, cf. PCelt. **noṷan* > OIr. *noí*, OW. *nauou*, OBret. *nau*) could have taken place due to the progressive unintelligibility of this Gaulish form to Latin speakers of the place, who, nevertheless, could still tentatively connect it to their own numeral, *novem*.¹⁰

†*Albocrarum* (vel sim.)

A mining town only known thanks to its detoponymic adjectives, *Albucrarensis metallum* (Plin. *Nat.* 33. 80. 3) and METALL(I) ALBOC[RARENSIS] (León) [CIL 2: 2598],¹¹ referring to the metal that was extracted there. In the literary testimony there appears a transition vowel *-u-*, probably due to the influence of the homophonous cognate L. *albus*, since the direction of the analogical process in the transition vowel substitution is exactly the opposite. The translation of this PIN located in the ancient *Callaecia* is transparent: ‘white hillock’, most probably an allusion to its particularly snowy appearance (first proposed by [Prósper 2002: 180–181], partially based on the previous analysis of [Búa Carballo 2000: 112]), *paxe* [Delamarre 2009: 75–79; Lacroix 2010] who, as already announced, interpreted **krāro*- as ‘hornet/bee’ or ‘heron’, accordingly understanding the compound as ‘heavenly heron/hornet’. From the semantic and — partially — structural point of view it is a perfect *comparandum* of the indigenous epithet found in Lusitanian territory, ALBVCELAINCO (Viseu) [AÉ 1990: 502], a Celtic compound **albo-okelo*- ‘white hill’,¹² that can be found in the Vaccean PIN *Albocela*/Αλβόκελλα, displaying a paradigm shift (Zamora, *It. Ant.* 434. 7; in Livy it shows dissimilation of the lateral consonants *Arbocala* (AUC 21.5.6.2); cf. also the Alpine PIN Fr. *Mont Blanc*).¹³

¹⁰ Alternatively, [Prósper 2018: 117] explained a PN gen. sg. NOVENTI (Primorje-Gorski Kotar County) [Kurilić 2006: 137 (1)], found in Celtic territory, by means of an exceptional evolution *-an-* > *-en-* that could have taken place due to contextual reasons starting from this very numeral *(*H*)*neṷn-to-* (cf. the expected result of the vocalic nasal in the PN NOVANTICO(NI) (Sălaj) [CIL 16: 160] and the exact parallel of the former gen. sg. NOVANTI (Somerset; Kosovo) [CIL 7: 47; 3: 1695], thus rejecting an Italic etymology).

¹¹ About two hundred and thirty kilometres to the south, at Vilar de Maçada, located in the neighbouring Portuguese region of Trás-os-Montes, another possible testimony of this ON was found, ALBOC[RARENSIA?] [CIL 2: 2394b], but its reconstruction is subject to criticism.

¹² For the first interpretation of **ok-elo-* as ‘mound, small hill’, see [Prósper 2000: 56–58; 2002: 117–118].

¹³ Still on the margins between Hispania citerior and Lusitania, we have attested an ON ALBOCOLENSI (Salamanca) [CIL 2: 880], and ALBOCO(LENSIBVS) in Oporto [HEp 1994: 1078], that is, an ethnic name

3.1.2. Anthroponymy

CRARVS: L(VCIVS) CVRVIVS / L(VCI) L(IBERTVS) **CRARVS** (Rome) [AÉ 1985: 80].

The indigenous name, CRARVS, consists of the common name **krāro-* itself anthroponymized without any kind of derivational mechanism and may be compared to the series of proper names that originated from PCelt. **okelo-* ‘mount, hill’ (e.g. PNs OCELVS [Tarn, CAG 81: 224 *et al.*], OCELA (Pyrénées-Orientales) [CAG 66: 469 *et al.*], nom. sg. OCELIO (Bas-Rhin) [CIL 13: 4550 *et al.*], DN OCELO (Monmouthshire) [RIB 1: 310 *et al.*], etc.) [Prósper 2002: 117–118]; to the PN Gk. Ὀρος and DN Skt. *Pārvatī* (< *pārvata-* ‘mountain’), the name of Shiva’s wife, as well as partly to the PNs L. MONTIVS (Rome) [CIL 14: 5357 *et al.*] and MONTIAE (Carinthia) [AEA 2008: 40], the latter ones derived via **-io-*.

CRANVS: D(IS) M(ANIBVS) S(ACRVM) / L(VCIVS) **CRANVS** MVS / VIX(IT) ANN(OS) [.] III / VXOR PIA POS(VIT) / H(IC) S(ITVS) E(ST) (Tunisia) [ILAfr: 177, 6].

This PN inscribed in a *titulus sepulcralis* can be easily traced back to the very same structure studied above by modifying the secondary suffix: **Ķh*₂-*s-no-* ‘head’.¹⁴ This protoform, well attested in other Indo-European historical dialects (e.g. Skt. *śīrṣn-* ‘head’, Gk. κῆριον ‘skull’, Du. *hoorn-dol* ‘fool’, Lith. *šīršuo* ‘hornet’) > **krāno-* and presents a perhaps exact theonymic *comparandum*, the epithet of the Roman god Faunus, gen. sg. CRANI (see below for its etymological approach). Moreover, there is another PN, the *nomen* VICRANVS (Rome) [CIL 6: 27838], that can be parsed as a *dvigu-bahuvrīhi* type exocentric compound ‘having two heads, bicephalous’: **krāno-* plus the compositional form of the numeral ‘two’ **dui-*, with the expected simplification of the group #*du-* > #*u-* postulated by [Prósper 2016: 136] for Continental Celtic (vs. Insular Celtic > #*d-*). An interesting common *comparandum* of this structure can be found in the Indic compound *dviśiras*. Cf. also the Gk. PNs Κράνιος, Κρανίων, Κῆριος, Κρανού, Κρανώ, etc. (see below Κάρανος *et al.*).

LITAVICRARI: [...] PARET ET POTVI QVOD PROFAN[E]TVR INFRA ANTE CE[L] / LAM MEMORIAE QVAE EST **LITAVICRARI** ET IBI CONSVMANT [.] / MORENTVRQVE [...] (Haute-Marne) [CIL 13: 5708].

In the large Langres inscription — which will not be entirely reproduced here for reasons of space — we find this Gaulish PN in the genitive singular case, already

derived from the PIN *Albocola* (today, Alba de Tormes, Salamanca), which was already recognized by Villar [2000: 272] as a third variant of *Albucela*, this time showing progressive vowel assimilation or some sort of analogy.

¹⁴In the available edition of this inscription, the editors have unjustifiably chosen to introduce an <I>, CRAN(I)VS, but, given that we cannot confirm that reading, CRANVS will be preferred here.

understood in the previous works either as ‘earth heron’, or as ‘earth hornet’ (see respectively [Lacroix 2010; Delamarre 2009]). Indeed, the first member of the compound happens to be perfectly familiar: it is the Celtic outcome of the PIE adjective **p_lth₂u-ih*₂- ‘broad’ via a metonymic shift → ‘the earth’ (cf. Skt. DN *Prthivī*, the divine Vedic personification of the earth, and the PIN Gk. Πλάταια and in Italic *Pultovia*, found in Pannonia — on the latter, see [Repanšek 2016: 198]; see also [Prósper 2019: 18–19]).¹⁵ Therefore, it seems more reasonable to propose a translation ‘(he) of the earth hillock’ or perhaps with a locative sense ‘(he) of the hillock that lies on the earth’. Given that we only possess this testimony, it is impossible for us to know whether its nominative form would appear as †*Litavicrarus* or as †*Litavicrarius*.

CERANIVS: IOVI OPTIMO MAXIMO / DOLICHENO SACRVM / C(AIVS) CERANIVS F(ILIVS) CALLYSTVS / PRAEFECTVS CLASS(IS) RAVENN(ATIS) / PRAEFECTVS COLLEG(II) / DENDR(OPHORVM) / ET CENTONAR(IORVM) IIIVIR / QVINQVEN(ALIS) (Emilia-Romagna) [CIL 11: 6].

Unlike what has been seen in the previous examples, if we started from a full grade form, we could venture a secondary derivative with a nasal suffix that would have caused the vocalization of the laryngeal in the position of the syllabic nucleus, **kerh*₂-*nV*-, giving rise then to a sequence **keranV*-. However, since it is a *hapax legomenon* and considering the inscription’s findspot — especially taking into account that Lex Joseph did not operate here, whereby we would expect a Celtic result CARANIVS, most probably attested (on which see below) — we consider it more plausible to opt for an Italic explanation.

Interestingly, as will be remarked in the concluding section, there seems to have been no apparent derivatives of **kerh*₂- coming from the *o*-grade of the root. Nevertheless, we have a series of PNs attested in all three Mediterranean peninsulas, southern France, and North of Africa so far unanalyzed that could constitute the only exception to that statement: CORANIVS (Rome) [CIL 6: 451 *et al.*], CORANIA (Aude) [CIL 12: 4719 *et al.*], CORANVS and CORANA (Lazio) [CIL 10: 5813 *et al.*].¹⁶ Its recon-

¹⁵This element appears in other Celtic compositional and derivational onomastic formations: PNs *Convictolitavis* (Caes. *Gal.* 7. 32. 4 *et al.*) perhaps ‘broad (sc. rich) in companies, alliances’ (cf. W. *cyweithi* ‘society, company, alliance’), *Litaviccus* (Caes. *Gal.* 7. 38. 3 *et al.*, also attested in epigraphy), the DNs dat. sg. LITAVI (Côte-d’Or) [CIL 13: 5599 *et al.*], a chthonic goddess, and the epithet of Apollo COBLEDVLITAVO (Dordogne) [Ibid.: 939], ‘broad/rich in feasts’ (cf. OIr. *cobled* ‘feast, banquet’), the Latinised PIN *Letavia* (today the Brittany peninsula, OIr. *Letha*, OW. *Litau*, OBret. *Letau*), understood as ‘land, continent’ as opposed to the Celtic insular territory, and its orignonymic derivative W. *Llydewig*, etc.

¹⁶In the district of Setúbal and in Valencia province, coins were found containing what appears to be a PN CORANI [García-Bellido & Blázquez 2001: 149, 151].

struction would be similar to that of CERANIVS but with an *o*-grade, **korh₂-n(i)V-*, and its affiliation, considering that its distribution is mainly limited to Italic territory, could be taken as Italic as well, although there is no linguistic feature that can categorically disprove a Celtic ancestry.¹⁷

CARAVANCAE: [...] // D(IS) M(ANIBVS) / AIAE / C/ARAV/ANC/AE BO/DDI F(ILIAE) / CELTIG(VN) AN(NORVM) / XXXV (Palencia) [CIL 2: 6298].

In a recent work, Prósper [2016: 21–26] analysed this proper name as a family name or as a second name derived from the full grade of the root with a possessive or individualizing suffix **kerh₂-uV-* > **kerauV-* as a result of Lex Joseph **karauV-* ‘having horns, horned’, and she compared it to another Celtic PN, *Καρωνιος* (App. *Hisp.* 94) and with the following Hispanic PINs: *Caravia* (Asturias), *Carabias* (Guadalajara) and *Caravis* (Zaragoza). As far as the semantics of the PINs are concerned, that denomination would clearly allude to the steep nature of the ground on which the settlements were originally founded.

CARANVS, CARANA, CARANIVS, CARANIA:

MOCVS / **CARANIVS** / NEVI F(ILIVS) / POL(LIA) (Piamonte) [CIL 5: 7656 *et al.*];
D(IS) M(ANIBVS) / AV[.]VS / TIBE[RIV]S / FILIV[.]V/XOCNO // D(IS) M(ANIBVS) /
CARANA / C[.]CPLIA (Alsace) [CIL 13: 11652c];

CARANVS (Bas-Rhin) [CAG 67/2: 334 *et al.*];

CARANIAE NOBILIS / FILIAE MONIMENTVM (Côte-d’Or) [CIL 13: 2886 *et al.*].

This is a group of PNs, to our knowledge never studied before, which, as said above, could correspond to a suffixed full grade structure **kerh₂-nV-* > **keranV-* by means of Lex Joseph > **karanV-*/**karaniV-*. It would once again be an appellative understandable as ‘having horns, horned’. Its distribution favours a Celtic ancestry since most of the evidence was found in the different provinces of Gaul or in the Germania Superior.

Furthermore, those PNs may in all likelihood not be the only existing formations derived from **kerh₂-nV-*: gen. sg. *CARANITA*[N]I (Rhineland-Palatinate) [CIL 13: 7551], displaying the widespread suffixal chain of doubtful origin **-it-āno-*, frequent in ethnonymy and oronymy (e.g. *Aquitani*, *Lusitani*, *Aranditani*, etc.); and in Hispano-Celtic with secondary velar suffix *CARANCA* (León) [IRPLéon: 174], *CARANCVS* (Burgos) [AÉ 1998: 774], and *CARANCIN*[I]VS (León) [CIL 2: 2612]. Prósper [2016: 160], however, has offered a different etymology for the latter ones,

¹⁷On the other hand, previous works have argued for an Etruscan origin, although without providing linguistic evidence in this respect [cf. Estarán Tolosa 2019: 399, with references].

starting from the thematic adjective PCelt. **karo*- ‘beloved’ (< PIE **k̑h*₂-*ro*- ‘id.’, with a full grade L. *cārus*, ONr. *hórr*, Latv. *kārs*).¹⁸

On the other hand, in Greek onomastics there is a series of PNs, *Κάρανος* (e.g. first King of Macedonia), *Καράνιος* and *Καρανία*, that, as rightly pointed out by Nussbaum [1986: 166], are to be compared to Gk. *κάρᾱνος* ‘leader, chief’, collected by Hesychius in Aeolian Greek *κάραννος* — cf. *καράρα*-*κεφαλή*. These forms come likewise from **k̑h*₂-*s-no*- > (under the action of *Lex Palma* #*CṘHC*- > #*CáRaC*-) **κάρᾱhvo*- > *κάρᾱνο*-/*κάραννο*-.¹⁹

3.1.3. Theonymy

CRANI: DEI FAVNI CRANI (Norfolk) [AÉ 1982: 670d].

This Brittonic DN, found in the well-known treasure hoard of silver *instrumenta* in Thetford, constitutes together with the Roman god Faunus a syntagma in the genitive case expressing the *nomen possessoris* of the offering. In the same way as with LITAVICRARI, CRANI could be a graphic variant of †CRANII, so it is not certain at all if we are dealing with a primary or with a secondary derivative. Be this as it may, it seems possible to affirm that CRANI reflects an indigenous version of the minor Roman god related to geographical elevations, such as mounds and hillocks (< **krān(i)o*- < **k̑h*₂-*s-n(i)o*-). For other, in our opinion, less convincing, etymological proposals see [Nash Briggs 2017: 92–95].

CRARO:

{ME} DIOCRARO / LVC(.) VERVS / [BL]AESIDIA(?) EXTRICATA / D(E) S(VO) D(EDERVNT) (Hérault) [CIL 12: 4217];

AVGO PROP/EDDI(VS) CRARO / VOTVM / S(OLVIT) L(IBENS) M(ERITO) (León) [AÉ 1961: 344].

To begin with, the reading of the first of the attestations that we offer here is not the traditional one, since usually the most favoured one has been MEDIOCRARO, although this reading had already been questioned by Holder [ACS 1: 1155].

¹⁸As for another PN, CARANIVSA (Aisne) [CIL 13: 3449], whose photograph or reproduction is not available, it seems very convincing that it is a misreading by CARANTVSA (cf. the PN CARANTVSARVS (Moselle) [CIL 12: 4363]), perhaps a derivative of the old present participle PCelt. **karant*- ‘friend’. On the other hand, the PINs *Caranusca*, documented in the *Itinerarium Antonini* (today Hettange-Grande, Moselle) and *Caranicum* (Betanzos, La Coruña), could belong to the list of proper names derived from **k̑erh*₂-*nV*-.

¹⁹In Hesychius, there is a word, *καράρα*, glossed as *κεφαλή* ‘head’, which, following Nussbaum’s analysis [Nussbaum 1986: 221, 242–246], can easily be traced back to the same derivative pertaining to the -*s*-stems plus a Caland suffix *-*ro*- < **k̑h*₂-(*e*)*s-ro*- < **k̑h*₂-(*e*)*s*-, an ancient adjective substantivized as a collective feminine (cf. L. *cerebrum*, Gk. -*κῤῥος*) (although Nussbaum also offers the possibility of deriving it from a locative in *-(*e*)*r*-, thus ‘that which is on/at/in the head’). In fact, Greek *κάρᾱνος* could easily be traced back to this same sequence with a different suffix **k̑h*₂-*es-no*-.

On many occasions, several academics have preferred not to eliminate the first syllable so that a convenient comparison with the forms whose first members come from **medjō*- could be established (cf. PINs *Mediolanum* ‘plain in the middle’ or ‘(settlement) in the middle plain’, today Milano).

Second, there is also a third DN, erroneously read as *SALSOCRARO* (Hérault) [AÉ 1979: 395], instead of *MESOCRARO*.²⁰ Although the adscription of the second member of the compound to this series of Celtic DNs is clear, the analysis of the first one is not transparent at all.²¹ Lastly, with respect to the Hispano-Celtic DN *CRARO*, whose identification is key for the rest of the *comparanda*, Prósper [2002: 180–181] analysed it as a god of the mounds that could likewise be traced back to **krāro*-, without secondary derivation. Thus, a situation of homonymy between formations belonging to different onomastic categories (namely, toponymy, anthroponymy, and theonymy) and, furthermore, a vast expansion of the same stem into various areas and dialects of the *Keltiké* can be detected.

Outside of western theonymy, there is also a Luwian horned divinity, *K(u)runtiya* (logogram *CERVUS*₂), parsed by Oreshko [2013: 410] as a nominal stem plus the Anatolian possessive suffix *-want-*, here contracted before *-u-* (< PIE **-uēnt-*²²), so, once again ‘god that has horns’. In addition, Melchert [2012: 5], following a personal suggestion by H. Eichner, traces back the Luwian name of the celestial god of the storm, *Karḫuḫa*, to an identical structure formed with different suffixation. On the other hand, García Trabazo [2017: 210] proposes for the name of the Phrygian priests of the goddess Cybele, the *Κορύβαντες*, a parallel formation, but this time from the *aniṭ* root, thus, **Ķor-u-uent-* ‘having horns’.²³ In fact, both DNs, *K(u)runtiya* and *Κορύβαντες*, could be equally traced back to either root — though *Karḫuḫa* cannot.²⁴ On the Anatolian figure of the horned numen as the protector of hunt

²⁰The only possible formal correspondence for <*SALSO*> would be the *alteuropäisch* hydronymic stem identified by Villar [2000: 291–292], **salso-* ‘salty’ (< past participle **sald-to-*, cf. *L. salsus* and the Dacian place name *Salsovia*). However, from the point of view of both composition and *realia* aspects (Roquebrun is located in the department of Hérault, which indeed has access to the Mediterranean Sea, but this precise locality is far from the coast) a hybrid DN of these characteristics is very unlikely.

²¹*HERMES / VOTVM / LIBE(N)S / SOLVIT / MESOCRA/RO (?) NIMP(H)IS*. To adduce a partial Hellenization of the DN, thus substituting the Celtic stem **medjō*- for the Greek μέσο-, as suggested by Finocchi [1979: 73], seems highly risky and lacks parallels.

²²This formation is structurally comparable with the epithet given to Dionysus by Nonnus of Panopolis (D. VI 1.165), *κερόεν βρέφος* ‘horned child’ < **Ķero-uent-*.

²³This etymology would be supported by the passage dedicated to them in the *De rerum natura* (II 617 ff.), where these wind instruments are characteristic elements of those dancers: *tympana tenta tonant palmis et cymbala circum / concava, raucisonoque minantur cornua cantu*.

²⁴As to the ultimate origin of this acrostic noun, see [Neri 2003: 79–80; Prósper 2016: 21–26], both with additional references.

and wildlife and its roots back in the core Indo-European culture and religion, see [García Trabazo 2023].

The apparent inexistence of these onomastic derivatives in the Indo-Iranian branch seems striking to us. In Indo-Aryan, we find a Rigvedic epithet of the fire god Agni, *śīrāḥ*, that Mayrhofer [1956–1976: 350–351] hesitantly translates as ‘sharp’ on the basis of a syntagm *śīrā-śociṣ-* ‘with a sharper flame’. Perhaps it could be a lengthened grade derivative of Skt. *śīraḥ* ‘horn’, or just a derivative drawn directly from the oblique stem of that word, considering a possible semantic correspondence between the sharp aspect of the flames and the horns. Finally, the epithet of the horned serpent slain by Kərəsāspa in the Avesta, *Aži Sruuara*, belongs here too (< Av. *sruuā-* ‘horn’).

3.2. **ker*-

3.2.1. Топонимы

Given the abundance of PINs derived from this *aniṭ* root, the next section will be structured according to the vocalic grade and the secondary suffixation that each form presents.

a) **cornV*- stem:

The identification of the following PINs as purely Celtic is in many cases compromised due to the situation of homophony between the Italic and the Celtic stems. Amongst them we can mention *Cornus* (today Cornus, located in the homonymous canton, in Aveyron, Southern France), *Corna vicus* (Merovingian coinage) [ACS 1: 1129], *Cornaus* (*Rav.* 98, 18); those with dental suffix *Cornate* (today Cornas, Ardèche; cf. also the Italic PIN *Cornate d’Adda*, in Lombardy, which may owe its name to the shape of the river stream; cf. PN CORNAT(I) in Hispania citerior, Lugo [HEP 1990: 516b]) and acc. sg. *Cornutium vicum* (Ille-et-Vilaine or else Eure); with different velar suffixes *Cornucio* (Lot),²⁵ *Cornacum*/Κορνακόν < **korn-āko*- (today Cornago, La Rioja; cf. also the modern *Cornay* in the French department of Ardennes and Cornac in Lot),²⁶ *villa Corneciaco* (Reims); with a labial phoneme in the suffix *Cornubia* (today the English county of Cornwall

²⁵This PIN could also be traced back to a protoform **kornutiō-*, a derivative of L. *cornūtus* ‘horned’ (< *cornū* plus the adjective-forming suffix *-tus*), showing the result of the usual palatalization of *-tjV-* > *-k̄jV-*.

²⁶The PIN *Cocurnaco*, the modern locality of Congourmac (Tarn-et-Garonne), could unproblematically be derived from this same root, supposing a graphic omission of the nasal in the first syllable of the old PIN — unless the nasal of the modern PIN is the product of an analogy to other formally similar PINs — and that the radical vowel underwent some sort of backing, **ko(m)-korn-āko-*, whose meaning would allude to the accumulation of several mounds in the same area.

and the homonymous traditional region of France²⁷), *Cornobis* (or *Carnabis*, Huesca); plus the numeral *tri*- ‘three’ *Tricornium*/Τρικόνιον ‘having three hill-ocks’, also in the *castra Tricornia* (province of Vojvodina, Serbia) and its ON *Tricorn(i)enses*, whose linguistic adscription is doubtful, since we know that the original population were Romanized Celts and Thracians, but *Tricornium* could be understood both as an Italic and a Celtic formation; *Corniaspa* (province of Yozgat, ancient region of Pontus), perhaps a compound with an obscure second member; a fort in Wiltshire, *Durocornovium*; in the Romanian province of Banat the diminutive PIN *Cornuțel*, the modern village of *Puycornet* (Tarn-et-Garonne, France), probably a tautological place name or tautonym (OFr. *puy* ‘mountain, hill’ < L. *podium*), tentatively a Celtic compound or alternatively a hybrid one in the Cyrenaica, *Corniclanum* (Ajdabiya), if finally its second member can be related to the PIN *Glanum*, the modern *Corny* in Eure, *Cornillé* in Ille-et-Vilaine, etc. On the PINs formed from this stem and the plausibility of their Celticity, see [Sims-Williams 2006: 65–66].

b) *cernV*- stem:

The variant with an *e*-grade of the root shows fewer derivatives: doubtfully *Cernusson* (Maine-et-Loire), *Cernadus villa* (6th c. CE), (*de*) *Cernone* (Marne, 12th c.), *Cerniacum* (present-day Cergnago, Lombardy), the river name (*super*) *fluvio Cernune* (today Sânon, tributary of the Moselle, in the Meurthe-et-Moselle department), the latter structurally comparable to the DN [C]ERNVNOS [cf. ACS 1: 993].²⁸

²⁷The PIN Co. *Kernow* (from which obviously is also derived the current Cornish glottonym, Co. *Kernewek*), comes from the EN *Cornovii/Cornavii*, ‘those (who live) on the promontory’ with the expected proto-Brittonic vowel affection before *-i* in the first two vowels. However, the relationship between these ENs and the PIN *Cornubia* remains controversial. Villar [2000: 66, 144, 166–167 *et al.*] (also in [Villar & Prósper 2005: 81]), who considered them to be grapho-phonemic variants of the same form, preferred to see not a derivational but a compositional process, thus inserting them in the long list of derivatives of the **uba* series, one of the many *Wasserwörter* proposed by the former author. In this case, the PIN would originally refer to a stream and its passage near or over the promontory in question. However, in view of the betacist variants and the vowel alternation *-a/-o-* in the ENs, in our view, we could maintain the derivational hypothesis, whereby **korn-* would have been enlarged by means of a suffix **-āuo-/*-ouo-*, both well attested in Celtic onomastics. Thus, in *Cornubia* it could be considered that the presence of /u/ is due to an analogy to the numerous forms created from *cornu-*, being therefore absent in the slightly more conservative variant *Cornobis*. Nevertheless, Schrijver [1995: 297–298] runs against this analysis and opts for parsing these PINs as mere derivatives and not as compounds involving older Indo-European layers.

²⁸However, we are fully aware of the difficulties that a medieval PIN can entail. This specific hydronym is documented at least twice in private correspondence dating from the end of the 7th c. onwards [see Lepage 1862: 46, 185].

с) **carnV*- stem:

The toponymic derivatives from the zero grade of the root are quantitatively fewer compared to those built from the full grade, but they are equally distributed all over the Celtic territory, with the exception of Britannia: *Carnuntum*/Καρνούς, the well-known capital of Pannonia (Lower Austria)²⁹, *Iulium Carnicum* (Udine) and *Alpes Carnicae*, both names given after the Celtic tribe settled there, the *Carnii*, *Carni*/Κάρνοι (Carinthia, ancient Noric), *Carniola* (today Upper Carniola, Slovenia) whose name comes from the PIN *Carnium* (later *Carnioburgum*), *Carnota* (La Coruña), *Civitas Carnotum* (today Chartres, Eure-et-Loir), *Carnonam castellum* (Maine-et-Loire), *Carnias* (Rav. 98. 2, Asia Minor), *Carnsore Point* (Wexford, Ireland³⁰), etc.³¹

On the other hand, those PINs that are formally similar, but attested outside the *Keltiké* (e.g. the island Κάρνος, today Kalamos, *Carna*, *Carnus* in the Arabian Peninsula, etc.), do not constitute certain parallels and, therefore, will not be treated here (on this see [Villar & Prósper 2005: 84–85; Sims-Williams 2006: 59–60]). Nevertheless, there is a truly interesting case study which, to our knowledge, has not yet been related to this stem **carnV*-: the well-known PIN Ἀλικαρνῶσσις, always analysed as a pre-Greek PIN due to the characteristic suffix -σις/-τις, widely spread along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean [cf. García Alonso 2023, with references]. This minorasiatic PIN has been traced back by [Yakubovich 2015: 44] (based on the first reading and interpretation of [Adiego 1990: 135–136; 2007: 68, 161, 228], *alos-δ k̑arnos-δ*) to a Luwian *karmadhāraya* compound

²⁹This PIN *Carnuntum*, together with other place names of the *Keltiké*, e.g. *Aguntum* (Tyrol), *Turguntum* (today Turgon, Charente), *Pituntium* (Split-Dalmatia), *Diluntium* (Herzegovina-Neretva Canton), present an anomalous vowel /u/ in the suffix which, to our knowledge, has not been explained to date. This vowel alteration could be explained in line with another similar phenomenon, the well-known passage of /e/ > /i/ in a #CeRC- sequence (described since the pioneering work of [Ellis Evans 1967: 392]) (e.g. in the onomastic stems CENT-/CINT- ‘first’, SENT-/SINT- ‘path’, VENT-/VINT- ‘wind’, etc.). Thus, we could postulate that a sequence consisting of a short closed-mid vowel plus a resonant followed by a stop would undergo this change for purely contextual reasons. Alternatively, Szemerényi [1954: 210] had suggested a structure with the possessive suffix *-*uent*- with a zero grade. Thus, the PIN *Carnuntum*, starting from **karno*- ‘heap of rocks’ (if it finally has a different origin from **karno*- ‘horn’, see below for the discussion) ought to be understood as **karn(o)-unt*- ‘place rich in stones, stony place’ (although the loss of the thematic vowel is not fully explained).

³⁰It has been estimated that there are around three hundred Goidelic PINs that come from this stem **carnV*-. For reasons of space, see [Hogan 1910: 617–639], where a good number of them can be found with bibliographical and geographical details.

³¹However, Falileyev [2010: 64] collects earlier views to the effect that these PINs would derive from the root featured by Pokorny as **kar*-/**karkar*- ‘hard’ [IEW: 531–532] (cf. also [Villar 2000: 304–306]). Besides the fact that most of the presumed derivatives of this anomalous root have already been lodged in other sets of cognates, the Celtic words W. *carreg*, Co. *carrag* and Bret. *karreg* (> OIr. *carrac*) ‘rock’, given their phonetic structures, are unlikely to have a purely Indo-European origin (< **karreko*-ā-, [cf. Stifter 2023: 32–33]).

**alV-xarnasa*- ‘high/remote fortress’, adducing a later folk etymology with Gk. ἄλς to justify the lack of aspiration in the Luwian forms. Thus, the second member of this descriptive compound could be tentatively linked to this same stem, either with a full grade or with a zero grade, with a clear semantic evolution ‘upper part (of the terrain)’ → ‘promontory’ → ‘fortress’, given the usually elevated location of these defensive constructions, as occurs in many western PINs already mentioned (cf. too PIN Καρνάσιον/Καρνασός in Messenia and see Kaczyńska’s precise survey on the Cretan compound PIN Καρνησσόπολις [2015]).

In addition, James [2020: 28, 85] informs of a Welsh river name *Abercarf* (West Sussex) whose second member he relates to PCelt. **karu*- ‘stag’ and which, if a late formation, could perhaps be understood as ‘confluence of the stag’ (cf. OIr. *abar*, OCo./OBret./OW. *aber* ‘river’ < PCelt. **abū*), alluding to the shape of its antlers; and a second PIN *Vanncarw* (later known as *Bannawg*) which he parses as a compound containing **band-no*- ‘tip’ (OIr. *benn*, MW. *bann*, MBret. *ban*), thus ‘top/peak of the stag’. However, this is definitely not the expected order we would find in an original and archaic Celtic compound, in which the *determinans* occupies the first position.

d) **caruV*- stem:

As we have previously noted, the possessive structure **Ķ_g-uV-*, ‘having horns’, constitutes the second derivative we find in Celtic for the *aniġ* root. The PINs that can be traced back from this stem are the oronym *Carvanca mons*/Καρουάγκας ὄρος (Ptol. *Geog.* II, 13, 1. 14, 1 *et al.*, today the *Karavanke* mountains, between Austria and Slovenia; on these PINs and other cognates see [Repaňsek 2016: 179, 262]), the river name *Ceirw* ‘river of the deer’ (North Wales), the Roman fort *Carvoran* (Northumberland) and abl. sg. CARVIO (Gelderland) [AÉ 1939: 130], a possible *castellum* known only from this inscription. For more modern derivatives see [Hubschmid 1938: 69; Delamarre 2019: 188–189]. Also, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (5. 61) bears witness to a city in Latium, *Carventum*/Καροῦέντων, next to Mount Algidus, which could constitute an Italic example of this same derivation.

3.2.2. Theonymy

The theonymic attestations of this *aniġ* root are equally scarce.

[C]ERNVNOS: TIB(ERIO) CAESARE / AVG(VSTO) IOVI OPTVM[O] / MAXSVMO / NAVTAE PARISIACI / PVBLICE POSIERVNT // EVRISIS // SENAN[T] V[S]E[T]LO[N] [-] // IOVIS // TARVOS TRIGARANVS // VOLCANVS // ESVS // [C]ERNVNOS // CASTOR // [.] // SMER[.] // FORT[VNA] // [.]TVS[.] // D[.] (Paris) [CIL 13: 3026].

Starting from a full *e*-grade we find the Gaulish theonym [C]ERNVNOS carved in the well-known Pillar of the Boatmen erected in the old Lutetia, now Paris

(1st c. CE), which can go back to a noun **cernu-* plus a Hoffmann suffix [Prósper 2016: 96]. The geminate *-n-* could be explained by means of the action of the *flamma* rule by which *-ŴC-* > *-ŴCC-*. Somewhat paradoxically, although there is just this single attestation of the DN and, furthermore, we do not even conserve it in its entirety, [C]ERNVNOS has attracted the attention of countless scholars since the past century. Due to the transparency of its etymology, many studies on Celtic mythology and culture have regarded this DN as a unique linguistic testimony of the original Indo-European horned god and compared it with several horned divinities in various Indo-European religions and languages (e.g. the horned figure in the Gundestrup cauldron, 3rd–4th c. C.E., cf. [Ross 1961]).

Καρνονου: Ἀλλετεινο **Καρνονου** Ἀλισοντεας (Hérault) [RIG 1: 224].

There are different readings of this Gaulish DN documented in the Greek alphabet, which in turn affects its attribution to a paradigm or an onomastic category — either a thematic DN in the dative singular as the receiver of the offering, *Καρνονου* or *Καρνομου*, or the father's name *Καρνονος* in the genitive singular as a noun complement. It is in any case a cognate of [C]ERNVNOS.

CARNEO:

CARNEO / CALANTICE(N)SI CAECILIA / Q(VINTI) F(ILIA) NI CVIS [.] / R C V(OTVM) L(IBENS) S(OLVIT) (Alentejo) [CIL 2: 125];

[DEO?] / **CARNEO** CA/LANTICE[NSI] / HERME[S] / L(IBENS) A(NIMO) V(OTVM) S(OLVIT) (Alentejo) [CIL 2: 126].

In addition, it is possible to posit another cognate found in Lusitanian territory, although phonetically it might not belong to the Lusitanian language because of the theorized outcome of the vocalized resonant, for which we would expect /u/ [Prósper 2002: 430]. In this regard, the same scholar [Ibid.: 173–175] asserts that its linguistic classification will remain unsolved since it could unproblematically be posited either as a Celtic DN (but **CARNEO** displays no exclusively Celtic feature that allows us to undoubtedly classify it as such) or as a DN belonging to an undetermined Indo-European substrate dialect in which there was no phonemic difference between /a/ and /o/. In the first of the two scenarios, **CARNEO** could be interpreted as another god of the hillocks and the small elevations, **k̑₂-n(V)-jo-*, while in the second one, the grade of the root would remain uncertain, just like its ultimate meaning. In both attestations **CARNEO** is complemented by a detoponymic epithet, CALANTICE(N)SI.³²

³²The possibility suggested by [De Bernardo Stempel 2017: 194] that this is a conscious transposition of the Greek epithet of Apollo, *Καρνεῖος/Καρνήιος/Κάρνειος* or the full grade gen. sg. *Κερεάτα* in Arcadia (Paus. 8. 34. 5), and that, therefore, behind this syntagm hides the omitted DN of the Graeco-Roman god

CERNENI: DESCRIPTVM ET RECOGNITVM FACTVM EX LIBELLO QVI PROPOSITVS / ERAT ALB(VRNO) MAIORI AD STATIONE(M) RESCVLI IN QVO SCRIPTVM ERAT / ID QVOD I(NFRA) S(CRIPTVM) EST / ARTEMIDORVS APOLLINI MAGISTER COLLEGI(I) IOVIS CERNENI ET / VALERIVS NICONIS [...] (Alba) [CIL 3: 924, 1].

In the laws inscribed in some wooden *tabellae* found in the mining town of Roşia Montană (*Alburnus Maior*, in ancient Dacia), there is a carving referring to a minor cult of Jupiter, unknown elsewhere. A divine name IOVIS CERNENI is mentioned, whose *collegium* is led by ARTEMIDORVS APOLLINI. The epithet †*Cernenus* is easily recognizable as another derivative with a full grade of the root, **Ķer-n(V)-eno*.³³ As for the derivational means, the already studied primary nasal suffix received a secondary one, *-*eno*- that usually contains appurtenance or locative nuances.³⁴ On the other hand, the details of this Dacian cult to a horned Jupiter are totally foreign to us,³⁵ although it might not be the only example of a cultural conception of this Roman god as having horns (see below the Latin epithet CORN(.)), plus the Roman-Egyptian epiclesis Jupiter-Ammon, depicted in a *clipeus* with ram horns (Tarragona, Spain, now in the Archaeological Museum of Tarragona).³⁶

seems, at the very least, risky. Nevertheless, we see no problem in deriving Gk. (ὄ/τὸ?) *κάρνος* ‘ram’ (← ‘horned animal’, glossed by Hesychius as βόσκημα, πρόβατον) from this root, so that it could ultimately be considered a cognate of CARNEO [cf. Nussbaum 1986: 6; Van Beek 2022: 413]; although Beekes [2010: 646–647] expresses some doubts about an Indo-European etymology. On the Carneia festival, its origin, and onomastic parallels, see [Robert 1967].

³³Note that we do not consider the option of classifying it as linguistically Dacian DN for two reasons: first, because of that specific geographical area where different Indo-European peoples converged, and second, because of the general assumption that Dacian would have at least partially undergone the process of satemization, in which case it is likely that the result of **Ķ* would have been different. In any case, Dacian is an extremely fragmentary language, and its phonological description is currently insufficient, so we prefer not to offer it as a possibility.

³⁴This is not to be confused with the unproductive deverbative suffix *-*ěno*-. However, a second suffix could be envisaged, *-*ēno*-, which is well represented in various detoponymic epithets, some of minorasiatic origin, but very rarely in Celtic (e.g. DOLICHENO (Rome) [AÉ 1971: 28 *et al.*], TADENO (Pernik; Sarajevo) [AÉ 1911: 17; CIL 3: 13858], PIRVNENO (Alba) [AÉ 2003: 1502], CIMISTENO (Alba) [AÉ 1964: 185 *et al.*], etc.). Thus, we could also propose a Celtic toponymic base **kernV-* derived by means of this Hellenizing suffix *-*ēno*-.

³⁵For a Galatian origin of this epiclesis, see [Nemeti 2021: 142–143], with previous bibliography.

³⁶In two texts of the prosaic Edda (*Gylfaginning* and *Nafnþulur*) a proper name, *Hörn*, appears, in the first case applied to the goddess Freyja and in the second to a female troll. A connection with OI. *horr* ‘flax’ < PGerm. **harzwa-* ‘id.’ has been sought because of the relation between the Norse goddess and the activity of spinning. However, we see no impediment to deriving it from PGerm. **hurna-* ‘horn’ and thus to consider it the first theonymic cognate in Germanic.

3.2.3. Anthroponymy

The anthroponymic derivatives of **k̑er*- are profuse as well, although once again a purely Celtic adscription cannot be fully proven in many cases: from the zero grade stem **k̑ȓnV*- we can mention the PNs CARNEOLVS (Charente-Maritime) [CIL 13: 119] (see above DN CARNEO), with Celtic base and Latin suffixation, CARNARVS (Nord) [Ibid.: 10010, 3038f], CAR[NV]TENVS (Somerset) [RIB 1: 149 *et al.*], CARNVNTINA (Burgenland) [AÉ 1956: 81 *et al.*], CARNVS (Nord) [CIL 13: 10027, 206], CARNIVS (Veneto) [CIL 5: 2522 *et al.*], CARNIA (Rome) [CIL 6: 14412 *et al.*], CARNVTVS (Burgos) [HEp 1990: 182f2 *et al.*], CARNVCI (Cumbria) [RIB 2/7: 2501, 129], CARNVTILLA (Rome) [CIL 6: 37271], CARNENVS (Rome) [AÉ 1976: 19], CARNELA (Daraa) [AÉ 1931: 110 *et al.*]. Logically, the synchronic equation of these Celtic PNs within the Latin-speaking societies with the oblique stems of L. *carō* ‘meat’ could have taken place, to the point of not being possible for the Celtic and Latin speakers to actually discern one stem from another.

Second, those PNs that can be considered derivatives of **k̑ernV*- are CERNVS (Puy-de-Dôme) [CAG 63/1: 184 *et al.*] and †*Cernius* (if the gen. sg. CERNI (Tipasa) [CIL 8: 22645, 93] had a phonetic realization [kern̑i:]), gen. sg. CERNANI (Somme) [CAG 80/1: 123], CERN(.) (Somme) [Ibid.: 155 *et al.*], and CERNIA (Lazio) [CIL 10: 5695].

Third, there is a second series of derivatives with different suffixation that was particularly productive in anthroponymic formations: this is the zero grade suffixed through **-uV*-, as already mentioned, the second and last derivational mechanism in Celtic for this root. Thus, the derivatives of the possessive structure **k̑ȓ-uV*- ‘having horns’ (cf. W. *carw*, Co. *carow*, and Bret. *karo* ‘deer’, see [Nussbaum 1986: 8, 10] and section 2 in this very work) are CARVIL(L)IVS (Lazio) [CIL 10: 8071, 33 *et al.*], CARVILIA (Rome) [CIL 6: 7594 *et al.*], and CARVILIENAE (Lombardy) [CIL 5: 5336] with secondary Latin suffixation *-il(l)iV-*; [CA]RVONIAE (Styria) [CIL 3: 5115], CARVEICIONIVS (Fejér) [AÉ 1906: 114], gen. sg. CARVICI (Segovia) [HEp 2008: 133], gen. sg. CARVI (Yonne) [CAG 89/2: 703 *et al.*], unless it reflects a sequence [kaȓi:]), as seen in CARVIVS (Livno) [ILJug 3: 1807 *et al.*], [C]ARVI(A)E (Salamanca) [CIRPSalamanca: 65], the NE CARVETANVS (Rome) [CIL 6: 37390, 34787], abl. sg. CARVANIO (Zlatibor) [CIL 3: 8308], CARVINVS (Puy-de-Dôme) [CAG 63/1: 252 *et al.*], the Celtiberian gen. sg. *Karuo* [MLH 4: K.6.1, Bronze of Luzaga, Guadalajara], and the Hispano-Celtic nasal stem nom. sg. CARVO (Palencia) [IRPPalencia: 194, 17].

3.2.4. Names of origin

Similarly, proper names indicating origin (i.e. ethnonyms for tribes and human groups and oronymy for cities and settlements in general) are plentiful for this

root, although they seem to be completely absent in the *set* root. First, regarding the subcategory of ethnonyms, we find ENs derived with the primary nasal suffix **Ķe/ornV-/ĶnV-*: the Brittonic *Cornovii* or *Cornavii*/Κορνα(ο)ύιοι (west-central England), together with two other homonymous tribes, one in the far north of Scotland (Caithness) and another one in Cornwall, meaning ‘those who inhabit the headland/promontory’; and the also northern *Carnonacae*/Καρνονακαι (Ross and Cromarty). In the continent, we encounter the variants *Carnutes/Carnotes/Carnotas*/Καρνοῦται and the Plinian variant *Carnuteni* ‘those who live in hillocks/those of the stony mounds’, given to the well-known tribe settled in the territory between the Seine and Loire rivers. In the eastern Alps a Gaulish tribe, the *Carni*/Καρνίοι, settled down between the ancient provinces of Noricum and Venetia. Second, we can name the Brittonic †*Carvetii* (Cumbria, north of Lancashire), exclusively known from epigraphic sources and formed by this secondary suffix **Ķt-ūV-* plus what looks like a *nomen agentis* suffix *-et- built to an anomalous zero grade, or alternatively a suffix of possibility *-eto-, whose presence would also be difficult to justify given the non-verbal nature of the derivational stem.³⁷

On the other hand, on the subcategory of oronyms, we can mention the *Cornacates*, probably ‘those who live in *Cornacum*’, a spread PIN repeated at least four times over the *Keltiké* (here in Pannonia, Plin. *Nat.* 3.147.1). Variants of the latter could be considered the ONs *Corniacenses/Cornacenses* (cf. the ancient Croatian region *Cornacensis-Sirmiensis*); in central Sardinia were located the *Corneses*, also called *Aechilenses*, inhabitants of the ancient city of *Cornos*, both names probably of Italic origin; in ablative case the (*pago*) *Carnonensi* (Maine-et-Loire) and, finally, the names with allomorphic oronymic suffixes referring to the ancient capital of Pannonia, *Carnuntum*, CARNVNTIENSI (Alexandria) [CIL 3: 6593 *et al.*] and *Carnuntas*.

4. An unsolvable situation of homonymy? Celtic **kornV-* ‘horn’, Gaulish κόρνα ‘prickly poppy’, and other Indo-European dendronyms

Last, we would like to tackle the relationship between the *aniġ* root **Ķer-* and a group of dendronyms and phytonyms spread throughout some Indo-European branches, such as the Gaulish term κόρνα, glossed by Pseudo-Dioscorides (II, 208) as ‘ἀργεμώνη’, a species of flowering plant of the poppy family (*Papaver argemone*; cf. also [DAG: 560]). Since Pokorny’s *opus magnum*, this word and others that will

³⁷All the inscriptions involved (always in Cumbria [RIB 3: 3525, 3526; 1: 933]) contain the EN of this ethnic entity in the genitive plural complementing the common noun C(IVITAS), CARVETIOR(VM).

be listed below have been repeatedly treated as borrowings from a centum language like Greek, Thraco-Phrygian, or from one in the Anatolian branch, or alternatively from an undefined Mediterranean language (cf. [IEW: 572–573], where they are traced back to a root **(s)ker-* ‘to cut’, [Beekes 2010: 677, 771; De Vaan 2008: 137] *inter al.*).

The alleged cognates are Greek κράνον and Homeric Greek κράνεια ‘cornelian cherry, *Cornus mas*’ (and a third variant, κράνία, in the Hippocratic corpus) and κέρασος ‘bird cherry, *Prunus padus*’ (already documented in Mycenaean Greek as a PN *ke-ra-so* /*Kerasō*³⁸ [cf. MT 3: 65]; probably transmitted as a loanword into Armenian, *k^hran* ‘id.’), Gaul. *kópvā*, and L. *cornum/cornus* ‘cornelian cherry’ (> e.g. Fr. *cornouille*, Eng. *cornel* (< MFr. *corneille*), Sp. *corno*, *cornejo*, etc.), and its derivatives *corneus* and *cornētum* ‘plantation of cornelian cherries’ (and perhaps Albanian *thanë* ‘cornel’, but its etymology remains controversial).

On the other hand, the presumed Balto-Slavic *comparanda* will not be considered here because of their semantics and the absence of the *satem* treatment of the voiceless palatal consonant in *Anlaut*: Lith. *kirna* ‘set of bushes’, *kirnis* ‘swamp’, Opr. *kirno*, Cz. *keř*, and Latv. *ceřs* ‘bush’, OCS. *korenь* ‘root’, etc. [cf. IEW: 572–573]. However, separate mention deserves the DN Lith. *Kirnis* ‘*deus cerasorum*’, the divine protector of cherries, whose attestation has caused positions against accepting it as valid for the reconstruction of the dendronym, but which has also received wide acceptance within the Indo-European studies because of its exceptional character as a theonym. Its first appearance dates back to the 16th c. (in Jan Łasicki’s *De Diis Samagitarum*, 1582) and Balticists are not convinced either about its existence or its belonging to this group of dendronyms [see Friedrich 1970: 116–121]. In this regard, more recently Kregždys [2014], recovering a subtle suggestion previously made by Jēgbrs [1966: 20], has argued for a different etymological proposal: this author prefers to advocate for a deverbative origin starting from the root **(s)kerH-* ‘to cut off, to sever’ (OIr. *-scara*, Lith. *skiriù*, U. *kartu*) (itself purportedly derived from the synonymous *aniņ* root **(s)ker-* [LIV: 558]).³⁹ Thus, the DN *Kirnis* would come from the dialectal Lithuanian *nomen agentis kirtinys* ‘woodcutter’ — via absorption of the middle syllable — and finally from a *nomen acti kirtinỹs* ‘act of cutting

³⁸For a Semitic etymology of κέρασος, see [Blažek 2014: 44–45]. Indeed, the preservation of intervocalic /s/ makes a purely Greek origin impossible, at least for the suffix, but this does not preclude postulating a name formed from a Greek base later derived by means of a non-Greek suffix < **k^her-aC-* or alternatively from **k^her₂-C-*.

³⁹See [Derksen 2015: 238, 246] for the Baltic and Slavic derivatives.

down trees'.⁴⁰ Therefore, this god would be the tutelary divinity of the lumberjacks and of the profession itself.⁴¹

However, leaving aside the hypotheses that explain *obscura per obscuriora* and retrieving a tentative suggestion made by André in the last century [André 1985: 187], we do not find any formal or semantic inconvenience in relating *kópva* and the rest of the Latin and Greek cognates to the root **Ķer*-. Indeed, the lexicon belonging to semantic spheres such as fauna and flora tends to be traced back to substrate or adstrate languages because of its high transmissibility in the form of *Wanderwörter*, and we cannot radically reject this option. On the other hand, it does not seem logical either to reject out of hand a perfectly plausible etymology from the point of view of semantics –‘upper part of a flower/tree’— referring thus to the fruit or flower, easily be extended by metonymy to the plant itself as a whole (cf. Eng. *ear of corn* or *head of grain*, Sp. *oreja de trigo* ‘ear of wheat’, etc.)— and of phonetics, since there is no presumed derivative whose phonetic form is incompatible with the structure **ĶornV*-/**ĶrnV*-. In point of fact, the technical term in botany for the grain-bearing spike of cereals like maize and wheat is *ear*, which perpetuates the semantic relationship between the upper part of the flora and the upper parts of the human body.

5. Conclusions

In the above sections, we have assumed that the ultimate origin of those forms was **Ķer*- ‘upper part of the body, horn’, later through the hypostasis of the collective suffix *-(*e*)*h*₂-, giving thus rise to a secondary root as productive as the former one most of the times meaning ‘head’ (except for the already mentioned Hitt. *karā(uar)* and Gk. *κέρας*). It therefore seems possible to draw the following conclusions.

With respect to the semantic aspects, a return by means of morphological derivation or composition to the original meaning is observed in several forms as in the Greek adjective *ὀρθόκραυρα* ‘having straight horn(s)’ and the derivatives from the secondary noun **Ķrh*₂-*s-r(o)*- ‘horn’: Lith. *širšuo*, OPr. *sirsilis*, Serb. *šr̄sljén*, L. *crābrō*, OHG. *hurnūz*, etc., ‘(animal) with horns’ → ‘wasp, hornet’. Also, as Nussbaum first pointed out, the notions of ‘head’ and ‘horn’ are cognitively very

⁴⁰ Similarly, Kaczyńska [2015: 36] argues for a connection either with Gk. *κάρπος* ‘ram’, with Apollo’s epithet *Καρπέιος*, or with the dendronyms aforementioned, although she implies a different etymology for each group of words. However, as we have contended earlier, all the Greek terms could be ascribed to the same etymology, applying the respective required semantic evolutions.

⁴¹ Returning to the Celtic sphere, it is worth mentioning in this respect the Celtic god Esus or Aesus, also considered a divine woodman on the basis of two iconographic appearances. One of these is the well-known pillar of the *Nautae Parisiaci* (Paris) [CIL 13: 3026], where the god’s name is revealed, and the second one is a similar votive monument found in Trier. In both cases, Esus is depicted as a bearded man chopping down trees with his axe, so we could be dealing here with a mythological *topos* common to Celtic and Baltic mythologies.

close. This is why in some cases the common referent to which the proper names once alluded is no longer accessible.

Likewise, this pair ‘head’/‘horn’ was semantically enriched by the creation of phytonyms and dendronyms traditionally considered Mediterranean *Wanderwörter* through a metonymy ‘upper part of the vegetable’ → ‘ear, spike *vel sim.*’.

With regard to its morphological behaviour, the *set* root was also distinguished from the original *aniť* in that it did not receive in common names the same primary suffixes *-*no*- and *-*uo*- (although it seems that it did in PNs such as CERANIVS, CARANIVS *et al.*), but opted for others which, in turn, are not found in **ker*- either: -*s*-stems (**k(e)rh*₂-*es* > Skt. *śirāḥ*, Av. *sarah*-), the Caland suffix *-*r(o)*- (not as primary suffix), these two consecutive *-*s-r(o)*- (**kḡh*₂-*s-r(o)*- > see above, and with a full grade of the root > L. *cerebrum*) or the nasal stem *-*s-n*- (also not as primary, **kḡh*₂-*s-n*- > Gk. κρανίον, Lith. *širšuo*, Skt. *śīrṣṇ*-), the latter two originally coming from an ancient heteroclite neuter with an alternating pattern *-*sr*/-*sn*- which would later have generated parallel derivatives from the straight and the oblique cases stem independently. It is also worth mentioning the total absence of the *o*-grade in **kerh*₂- both in common and proper derivatives — omitting the already referred PNs CORANIVS *et al.* Thus, we see that, although the productive capacity of **ker*- was greater, it was augmented with a smaller inventory of suffixes, here in the three possible vocalic grades.

In numerical terms, it is evident that both outside the Celtic group and within it, the root *aniť* was the most productive with a considerable quantitative difference concerning the *set* one **kerh*₂- (90 and 20 in Celtic, and 30+ and 16 in the rest of the languages surveyed above). Apart from the differing ages of attestation, the wider semantic potential of **ker*- has also contributed to the active creation of proper and common nouns. The vast majority of all onomastic derivatives belong to the categories of anthroponymy (*aniť* 36 / *set* 14 in Celtic, 45.4% of the total number of onomastic derivatives; 10+/11 in the rest of the languages, 45.6%) and toponymy (40/3 in Celtic, 39%; 14+/0 in the rest of the languages, 32.6%).

Finally, as previously mentioned, the presence of proper names is more noticeable in the *centum* languages of Western Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean, with a special distributional focus on Celtic, Greek, and Italic branches. Conversely, we come across a virtually total absence or at least no preservation of toponymic formations in the *satem* and/or Eastern languages, namely in Tocharian, Albanian, Armenian, Indo-Iranian (besides the Avestan epithet *Sruuara* and if not accepted as a cognate Skt. *śirāḥ*-), and Balto-Slavic. It is therefore possible to conclude that a clearly more pronounced isogloss can be detected in Western *centum* Indo-European dialects, even leading on several occasions to situations of homonymy between discrete languages.

Abbreviations

Languages

A/BToch.	Tocharian	MW.	Middle Welsh
Av.	Avestan	OBret.	Old Breton
Bas.	Basque	OCo.	Old Cornish
Bret.	Breton	OCS.	Old Church Slavic
Co.	Cornish	OE.	Old English
Cz.	Czech	OFr.	Old French
Du.	Dutch	OHG.	Old High German
Eng.	English	Olr.	Old Irish
Fr.	French	OlS.	Old Icelandic
Gal.	Galatian	ONr.	Old Norse
Gaul.	Gaulish	OPr.	Old Prussian
Ger.	German	OW.	Old Welsh
Gk.	Greek	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Hitt.	Hittite	PGerm.	Proto-Germanic
L.	Latin	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Latv.	Latvian	Serb.	Serbian
Lith.	Lithuanian	Skt.	Sanskrit
MBret.	Middle Breton	Sp.	Spanish
MFr.	Middle French	U.	Umbrian
MIr.	Middle Irish	W.	Welsh

Categories of proper names

DN	name of a deity, theonym	PIN	place name
EN	ethnic name, ethnonym	PN	personal name, anthroponym
ON	origonym, demonym		

Other abbreviations

abl.	ablative	nom.	nominative
acc.	accusative	pl.	plural
dat.	dative	sg.	singular
gen.	genitive		

References

- ACS — Holder, A. (1896–1922). *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* (Vols. 1–3). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Adiego, I.-X. (1990). Deux notes sur l'écriture et la langue cariennes. *Kadmos*, 29(2), 133–137. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kadm.1990.29.2.133>
- Adiego, I.-X. (2007). *The Carian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- AE — Cagnat, R. et al. (Eds.). (1888–). *L'Année Épigraphique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- AEA — Taeuber, H. (Ed.). (1979–). *Annona Epigraphica Austriaca*. Vienna: Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik der Universität Wien.
- André, J. (1985). Noms de plantes gaulois ou prétendus gaulois dans les textes grecs et latins. *Études Celtiques*, 22, 179–198.
- Beek Van, L. (2022). *The Reflexes of Syllabic Liquids in Ancient Greek. Linguistic Prehistory of the Greek Dialects and Homeric Kunstsprache*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beekes, R. S. P. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

- Blažek, V. (2014). Etymologizing ‘unetymologizable’ Greek dendronyms. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 19(1), 41–50.
- Búa Carballo, J. C. (2000). *Estudio lingüístico de la teonimia lusitano-gallega* (doctoral dissertation). University of Salamanca, Salamanca.
- CAG — Provost, M. (1988–). *Carte archéologique de la Gaule*. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.
- CIL — Mommsen, T. et al. (1893–1986). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- CIRPSalamanca — Alonso Ávila, Á. & Crespo Ortiz de Zárate, S. (1999). *Corpus de inscripciones romanas de la provincia de Salamanca*. Valladolid: A. A. Ávila.
- DAG — Whatmough, J. (1970). *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- De Bernardo Stempel, P. (2017). Matres endeiterae, deus sanctus Endovelecos, dea Nave, and Other Indigenous and Classical Deities in the Iberian Peninsula. In R. Häussler, & A. King (Eds.), *Celtic Religions in the Roman Period. Personal, Local, and Global* (pp. 177–206). Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications.
- De Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Delamarre, X. (2003). *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental* (2nd ed.). Paris: Errance.
- Delamarre, X. (2009). Quatre toponymes celtiques d’Espagne: Albocrarum, Dercinoasseda, Ercoriobriga, Iera Briga. *Nouvelle revue d’onomastique*, 51, 75–87.
- Delamarre, X. (2017). *Les noms des Gaulois*. Paris: Les Cent Chemins.
- Delamarre, X. (2019). *Dictionnaire des thèmes nominaux du Gaulois. Vol. 1: Ab-/Ixs(o)-*. Paris: Les Cents Chemins.
- Derksen, R. (2015). *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ellis Evans, D. (1967). *Gaulish Personal Names. A Study of Some Continental Celtic Formations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Estarán Tolosa, M. J. (2019). ¿Habla de lenguas itálicas en Hispania? Un análisis onomástico y sociolingüístico de la epigrafía latina hispana del siglo II a.C. *Athenaeum*, 107(2), 388–423.
- Falileyev, A. (2010). *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names. A Celtic Companion to the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.
- Finocchi, P. (1979). A proposito di una divinità indigena della Gallia meridionale. *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Antiquité*, 91(1), 71–84.
- Friedrich, P. (1970). *Proto-Indo-European Trees. The Arboreal System of a Prehistoric People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- García-Bellido, M. P., & Blázquez, C. (2001). *Diccionario de cecas y pueblos hispánicos* (Vol. 1). Madrid: CSIC.
- García Alonso, J. L. (2023). Mount Parnassos and the Labyrinth: from Korinthos to Knossos, from Zakynthos to Halicarnassus. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 20(2), 9–40. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2023.20.2.014
- García Trabazo, J. V. (2017). Artemis, Kybele und die gehörnten Gottheiten Anatoliens. In I. Hajnal, D. Kölligan, & K. Zipser (Eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag* (pp. 207–218). Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- García Trabazo, J. V. (2023). La figura numinosa del ciervo en Anatolia y en otras tradiciones indoeuropeas y no indoeuropeas. Comparación, prehistoria, interpretación. *Revista de poética medieval*, 37, 79–116. <https://doi.org/10.37536/RPM.2023.37.1.97459>
- HEP — *Hispania Epigraphica. Revista del Archivo Epigráfico de Hispania*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Retrieved from <http://eda-bea.es/>

- Hogan, E. (1910). *Onomasticon goedelicum locorum et tribuum Hiberniae et Scotiae: an index, with identifications, to the Gaelic names of places and tribes*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.
- Hubschmid, J. U. (1938). Sprachliche Zeugen für das späte Aussterben des Gallischen. *Vox Romanica*, 8, 48–155.
- IEW — Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- IL Afr — Cagnat, R., Merlin, A., & Chatelain, L. (1923). *Inscriptions latines d'Afrique (Tripolitaine, Tunisie, Maroc)*. Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- IL Jug — Šašel, A., & Šašel, J. (1963–1986). *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt*. Ljubljana: Situla.
- IRPLEon — Diego Santos, F. (1986). *Inscripciones Romanas de la Provincia de León*. León: Institución Fray Bernardino de Sahagún.
- IRPPalencia — Hernández Guerra, L. (1994). *Inscripciones romanas en la provincia de Palencia*. Valladolid: Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid.
- James, A. G. (2020). *The Brittonic Language in the Old North. A Guide to the Place-name Evidence*. Glasgow: Scottish Place-Name Society.
- Jēgbrs, B. (1966). Verkannte Bedeutungsverwandtschaften baltischer Wörter. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, 80, 6–162.
- Kaczyńska, E. (2015). Hesychius on Καρνησσόπολις and Τρίτ[τ]α. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 20(2), 33–43.
- Kregždys, R. (2014). Lietuvių kalbos leksemų morfologinio ir semasiologinio lygmenų interferencinio ryšio kvintesencija: *Kirnis*. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, 70, 105–123.
- Kurilić, A. (2006). Recent Epigraphic Finds from the Roman Province of Dalmatia. In D. Davison, V. Gaffney, & E. Marin (Eds.), *Dalmatia. Research in the Roman Province 1970–2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes* (pp. 133–147). Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Lacroix, J. (2010). Celtique *craro*-: quand l'abeille devient héron. *Nouvelle revue d'onomastique*, 52, 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.3406/onoma.2010.1536>
- Lepage, H. (1862). *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Meurthe* (No. 6, Vol. 14). Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.
- LIV — Rix, H. et al. (2001). *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Matasović, R. (2009). *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1956–1976). *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Melchert, H. C. (2012). Luvo-Lycian Dorsal Stops Revisited. In R. Sukač et al. (Eds.), *The Sound of Indo-European 2* (pp. 206–218). Munich: LINCOM.
- MLH 4 — Untermann, J. (1997). *Monumenta Linguarum hispanicarum. IV: Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- MT 3 — Chadwick, J. (1962). *The Mycenae Tablets III*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- Nash Briggs, D. (2017). Something Old, Something New: The Names of Faunus in Late Roman Thetford (Norfolk) and Their Iron-Age Background'. *Proceedings of the 13th F.E.R.C.A.N. Colloquium* (pp. 79–102). Lampeter: University of Wales.
- Nemeti, S. (2021). Celtica (I–II). *Acta Musei Porolissensis*, 43, 139–150.
- Neri, S. (2003). *I sostantivi in -u del gotico. Morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Nikolaev, A. (2010). Indo-European **dem*(*h*₂)- 'to build' and its derivatives. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 123, 56–96. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2010.123.1.56>
- Nussbaum, A. J. (1986). *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Oreshko, R. (2013). Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)? In A. Mouton et al. (Eds.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean* (pp. 345–420). Leiden: Brill.
- Prósper, B. M. (2000). Ein Beitrag zur Vergöttlichung der Flüsse in der Antike: *Arentiā, Arantiā. Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, 35(1), 42–65.
- Prósper, B. M. (2002). *Lenguas y religiones prerromanas del occidente de la Península Ibérica*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016). *The Indo-European Names of Central Hispania. A Study in Continental Celtic and Latin Word Formation*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Prósper, B. M. (2018). The Venetic names of Roman Siscia. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 15(3), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.031
- Prósper, B. M. (2019). Celtic and Venetic in Contact: The Dialectal Attribution of the Personal Names in the Venetic Record. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 66, 7–52. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ZCPH-2019-0006>
- Repanšek, L. (2016). *Keltska dediščina v toponimiji jugovzhodnega alpskega prostora*. Ljubljana: ZRC.
- RIB — Collingwood, R. G., Wright, R. P. et al. (1965–2009). *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain* (Vols. 1–3). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RIG — Lejeune, M. (1985–1998). *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* (Vols. 1–4). Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique.
- Robert, L. (1967). Sur le nom d'un proxène d'Épidaure en Cyrénaïque. *Revue des Études Grecques*, 80, 31–39.
- Ross, A. (1961). The Horned God of the Brigantes. *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 39, 63–85.
- Schrijver, P. (1995). *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Sims-Williams, P. (2006). *Ancient Celtic Place-Names in Europe and Asia Minor*. Oxford: The Philological Society.
- Stifter, D. (2023). The Rise of Gemination in Celtic. *Open Research Europe*, 3(24), 1–58. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.15400.1>
- Szemerényi, O. (1954). Illyrica. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, 71(3–4), 199–217.
- Tovar, A. (1986). Tradición e innovación en el Léxico Céltico: Algunas etimologías. In A. Etter (Ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (pp. 684–689). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Villar, F. (2000). *Indoeuropeos y no indoeuropeos en la Hispania prerromana*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Villar, F., & Prósper, B. M. (2005). *Vascos, celtas e indoeuropeos. Genes y Lenguas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Yakubovich, I. (2015). Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia. *Anatolian Studies*, 65, 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154615000010>
- Zair, N. (2012). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.