

The textual arrangement of Alise-Sainte-Reine [L-13] *

Zusammenfassung

Es wird der Versuch unternommen zu zeigen, dass die Anlage des Textes und die graphische Ausgestaltung der bekannten gallo-lateinischen Inschrift von Alise-Sainte-Reine [L-13] nicht bloss auf der Prosawortfolge beruht, sondern dass der Anordnung der Elemente ein bewusstes Gliederungsprinzip zugrundeliegt, für das Parallelismus der Silben- und Wortzahl eine Rolle spielt. Die Inschrift nimmt damit eine Mittelstellung zwischen gewöhnlicher Prosa und dichterischem Stil ein.

The aim of this article is to contribute to the understanding of the textual make-up and the epigraphic embellishment of the Gallo-Latin inscription from Alise-Sainte-Reine, Côte-d'Or [L-13]. Despite its being one of the best studied and, indeed, best understood Gaulish texts, uncertainties remain in its analysis. The text of the inscription runs thus:

MARTIALIS · DANNOTALI
I EVRV · VCVETE · SOSIN
CELICNON ꝛ ETIC
GOEBDBI · DVGIIONTIIO
ꝛ VCVETIN · ꝛ
IN []ALISIA

I stands for *I longa* in the inscription, which in view of its distribution I interpret here as a sign for the glide /j/ after the homorganic vowel /i/. Whether this glide is regarded as phonemic /j/, as I do, or as an automatic subphonemic, that is, phonetic [j] after /i/, is actually of no importance for the interpretation of the text. What is important is that I regard the spellings <II> and <IIA> as representing disyllabic sequences. It does not matter that in <MARTIALIS> no <I> is used, because the spelling of the Roman name could follow Roman orthographic practice (see below). STOKES (1886: 131) reads the double <II> in *dugiōntiio* and *Alisiā* as cursive spellings for <E>. But since the letter <E> otherwise appears in its capital form in this inscription, and since the two vertical strokes of cursive <E> are usually of equal length, which is not the case in L-13, Stokes's suggestion can be disregarded. The letters *O* and *T* in *Dannotali*¹ are written in ligature, but can only be sensibly interpreted as representing the sequence

* Work on this paper was undertaken within the FWF-funded project P20755-G03 "Die altkeltischen Sprachreste in Österreich" (The Old Celtic language remains of Austria). I want to thank Stefan Schumacher, Jürgen Uhlich and an anonymous reviewer for valuable input to this article. All errors are mine.

¹ Gaul. **dannos* 'magistrate, dignitary', the first member of the compound name *Dannotalos*, makes a perfect equation with Latin *fānum* 'sanctuary' <PIE **d^hh₁sno-*, from the root √*d^heh₁s-* 'belonging to the religious sphere' (this root is **dhēs-*, *dhəs-* in religiösen Begriffen' in *IEW*

-ot-; cf. the name **TanoTalos** (= *Dannotalos*) in the Gallo-Etruscan inscription from Briona [E-1]. The words are separated either by raised dots or by *hederae*, ivy leaves. The technical term for them is *hederae distinguentes*, mentioned once in an inscription from Cirta in Numidia (CIL VIII 6982). The shape and the fine representation of the *hederae* on L-13 are remarkable even in the wider context of Latin epigraphy. Ivy leaves are absent altogether from inscriptions until the beginning of the Augustan period; even then they occur chiefly in texts from Gaul and other marginal areas of the empire, becoming frequent only in the course of the 1st century A.D. and later (HÜBNER 1885: lxxv f.; HOMMEL 1970: 300–302). The exceptional graphic quality of the *hederae* in L-13 can perhaps be taken as indicating a provenance of the inscription from some time after the Augustan period; LEJEUNE (1988: 147) assigns the inscription to the Flavian period (late 1st century A.D.). The positional role of the third *hedera* is not easy to determine; it is positioned roughly halfway between lines 5 and 6, and it could either, together with the leaf at the beginning of line 5, form a graphic emphasis of *Ucuetin*, or it could mark the very end of the sentence after *Alisiia*. Since *Ucuetin*, unlike any other line-final word on the stone, is already followed by a word divider in the shape of a raised dot,² the likelihood is greater that the third *hedera* closes the sentence, or has simply been placed there out of *horror uacui*, that is to say, in order to occupy otherwise empty space on the face of the stone. The inscription is damaged in line 6 between *in* and *Alisiia*; it is generally agreed that the damaged area probably contained a word divider, perhaps a raised dot or another ivy leaf, but not a letter or a word (ESKA 2003: 101). The inscription can be translated as

Martialis (son) of Dannotalos* offered this edifice to Ucuetis* and to/with the smiths
who worship (?)³ Ucuetis* in Alisia.

One syntactic aspect of the inscription in particular has frequently been commented upon.⁴ The main bone of contention is whether *gobedbi*⁵ is to be interpreted as a dat-

259; NIL 102, 113–114 analyses it as the PIE root **d^heh₂-* ‘stellen, legen, setzen; herstellen, machen’, enlarged by -s). The original meaning of **dannos* may have been ‘religious official’.

² This dot is visible on photographs of the inscription, but it is ignored in the edition in RIG L-13. The position of this dot is a tiny bit lower than that of the other word separators in the inscription, so the possibility cannot be excluded that it is rather an accidental hole in the stone.

³ I take no strong stance as to the semantic interpretation of the relative verbal form *dugiōntiō*. A meaning ‘who worship’ is suggested by the context, but ultimately cannot be proven. The only PIE root that fits formally is *√d^heyǵ^h-* ‘to happen, succeed, achieve’ (‘treffen’, LIV² 148–149), but this is hard to square semantically with the present context. I find the translation ‘façonner’ suggested by LEJEUNE (RIG II 1, 154) less likely because it requires a semantic development for *√d^heyǵ^h-* which has a parallel in Greek τεύχω ‘to manufacture, accomplish, produce’ alone and may be specific to that language. Moreover, it requires the additional assumption that the theonym *Ucuetis** is used metonymically for ‘metal’ in this inscription. Morphologically, the verb has been explained by most scholars as a *īe/o*-present of the root *√d^heyǵ^h-*. In view of what JASANOFF (2004: 155) says about ‘full set[s] of derivatives’ from ‘stative stems’ in -*eh₂-* (<PIE instrumentals), *dugiōntiō* could also be interpreted as the formal continuation of a ‘stative’ present **d^heyǵ^heh₂īe/o-* > PC **dugiīe/o-*. The transitive structure of the clause, however, is an obstacle to this interpretation.

⁴ The most recent contributions to the discussion are MEES 2008c, ESKA & MERCADO 2005: 178–180, ESKA 2003, LAMBERT 2003: 100–103, SCHRIJVER 1997: 181–182, LEJEUNE 1988: 147–155.

⁵ SCHAFFNER (2005: 180–184) proposes an IE etymology for Gaul **gobet-* and OIr. *gobae*, gen.

ive plural 'to the smiths' or as a comitative or sociative instrumental 'with the smiths' (see ESKA 2003: 105–112 for a discussion of previous scholarship). If it is the former, it is noteworthy that the complex dative phrase, which consists of the deity *Ucuete* and *etic gobedbi dugiōntiō Ucuetin in Alisiā*, is discontinuous. ESKA (2003: 112–115) makes the valid argument that complex phrases can be split and heavy constituents can be moved rightward for pragmatic reasons. In favour of the instrumental reading of *gobedbi* it can be advanced that the ending *-bi* is inherited from the Indo-European instrumental ending **-b^hi* and that, with our present knowledge of Gaulish, it cannot be proven (nor, indeed, disproven) that it had fallen together functionally with the inherited ending of the dative plural *-bo*.⁶ However, the use of an instrumental together with the conjunction 'and' would be quite extraordinary. In addition to the discussion about *gobedbi*, it has been suggested by KOCH (1982) and SCHRIJVER (1997: 182) that *etic* is not the connector 'and' < **eti-k^he*, but rather the 3sg. of the copula **esti* with enclitic **k^he* 'and'⁷ attached to it. ESKA 2003 discusses the various syntactic problems posed by these hypotheses and ultimately rejects them in favour of the received view that *etic gobedbi* mean 'and to the smiths'.⁸

I want to draw attention to a lesser studied aspect of the inscription, that is, to the question as to whether it can be read as a metrical or poetic text. Such a proposal

gobann 'smith'. The Gaul. word is explained as continuing **g^(h)ob^(h)h₁-et-*, the OIr. word as continuing **gobann-* < **gobasn-*, generalised from a hysterokinetic paradigm Proto-Celtic **gobasu, gobasn-* ← pre-Celtic **g^(h)eb^(h)h₁s-IIon-* (a possessive derivative meaning 'having skill' of the s-stem **g^(h)eb^(h)h₁os, g^(h)eb^(h)h₁es-* 'skill, dexterity'). The root would be the same as in various Lith. words like *gabūs, gebūs* 'able, skilled' etc. However, the syncopated stem OIr. *goibn-* disproves this explanation: it requires the syncopation of a front vowel, i.e. **-enn-*, which cannot go back to pre-Celtic **-asn-* (SCHRIJVER 1995: 455–456 and MCCONE 1996: 46).

⁶ The syncretism evinced by the OIr. dative plural ending *-(a)ib* can be adduced as a parallel for such a development, but this parallel is, first of all, typological, not automatically genetic. However, Gaulish seems to maintain the instrumental case as a separate morphological and syntactic category at least in some stem-classes and numbers (ESKA 2004: 865, 867). This is one piece of evidence to show that Gaulish did not evolve in the same direction as Irish. Consequently, it cannot be taken for granted that the ending *-bi* (later *-be*) in Gaulish stands for the dative, and alternative analyses must be considered as well.

⁷ According to SCHRIJVER (1997: 182), **k^he* is used as a relative marker here; he translates *etic gobedbi* as 'which is by the smiths [i.e. made by the smiths]'.⁸

⁸ ESKA (2003: 105–107) discusses possible cases of dative and instrumental plurals in *-bi* in Gaulish. To the material adduced by him, *dubniqanuaqi* on helmet A from Ženjāk-Negau (Slovenia) may be added (NEIDOMA 2002). If it is not the genitive singular of an *o-* or *iō-* stem (OLSEN 1903: 29–30) or of a compound name ending in **-bijos* 'slayer', the only other viable IE or Celtic interpretation for the morpheme *qi* would be as a dative plural ending, referring to the recipient of the donation. SCHUMACHER (2004b: 330), on the other hand, mentions the inscription as a possible example of Raetic and reads it either as *-uqniqanuaqi* or as *-uqnitⁱanuatⁱ* (= being a letter peculiar to Raetic). On a wall painting in a Roman villa from Meikirch, canton Bern, Switzerland, a possible Gaulish dat. pl. *mapobi* is found (FUCHS et al. 2004: 107–109). Regarding possible Celtic plural datives, attention must also be drawn to the following two forms: not far from Ženjāk-Negau, a Celtic or perhaps Venetic dative plural in *-bos* is attested on two Latin votive inscriptions to deities called *Vibebos* in Warmbad Villach (Carinthia) (*L'année épigraphique* 1975: 660 + 661 = ILLPRON 642 + 643). A further example of a Celtic dative plural in *-bos* has been claimed for an inscription from Tiffen (Carinthia) by DOLENZ & DE BERNARDO STEMPER (2004: 738–740). This, however, is doubtful, since it is exactly the ending *-bos* which has to be conjectured to arrive at the form *Sena[bos]* 'to the old (goddesses)'.

has been made twice before (RHÛS 1906: 276–282; GRAY 1942: 442), but Lejeune, who reports their suggestions in RIG II.1, concludes defiantly ‘s’il n’est pas exclu *a priori* que l’inscription soit en vers, on estimera que toute démonstration est présentement, et risque de demeurer, hors de portée’ (LEJEUNE 1988: 155). ESKA & MERCADO (2005: 180) come to the same conclusion and state that for them ‘there is no reason, as yet, to believe that this inscription is metrical’. Nevertheless, I want to make a new attempt at such a demonstration. Let us review the two earlier suggestions first. For RHÛS (1906: 281), ‘the metre is accentual hexametre’, consisting of two lines of 3+3+3+3+2 syllables, each foot having a single stress. In order to arrive at this pattern, he has to arbitrarily attribute accents to the words, scattering them around as he sees fit, not to speak of other liberties he takes in regard to the reading of the text:

Martjális | Dannóta||i iéuru U|cuéti [sic!] | sósin ce||licnon,
Étic gobedbí dulg’iöntiïo U|cuétin | indū [sic!] Ali|sija.

For him, ‘the characteristic portion of the lines is the last two feet’, that is, ‘sósin ce||licnon’ and ‘indū Ali|sija’. These supposedly exhibit the typical clausula of a *dactylus* followed by a *trochaeus* at the end of hexametres, but only under the unverifiable supposition that these words were accented as RhÛs wants them to be. While there seems to be a certain consistency on RhÛs’s side in trying to attribute penultimate accents to the words, the accent on the ultima in *gobedbí*, in order to save the rhythm, is haphazard. Furthermore, the accent on the preposition *indū* ‘in’, his emendation of attested *in*, defies all likelihood, given that prepositions are typically weakly stressed or unstressed.

GRAY (1942: 442), in trying to establish the quantitative trochaic dimeter as a common Italo-Celtic metre, imposes a trochaic structure upon the text, but in doing so he has to take recourse to a degree of arbitrariness that exceeds even that of RhÛs. With disregard to orthographic conventions, he takes liberal decisions as to the vocalic or consonantal values of letters, without providing explanations for his decisions:

Mártiális Dánnotáli
jéuru Úcuétin [sic!] sósin
célicnón etic gobédbi
dúgijóntiïo Úcuétin
ín Alísija.

In particular, Gray’s unsystematic rendering of <Í> of the inscription, partly as syllabic /i:/, partly as geminate /ii/, a sound for which no evidence otherwise exists in Gaulish, does not help to inspire confidence in his method. The line break between demonstrative *sosin* and its head noun *celicnon*, in order to arrive at neat lines of four feet, runs against natural tendencies of versification, according to which phrasal and clausal breaks often coincide with line breaks. Because of their methodological shortcomings, both RhÛs’s and Gray’s respective attempts can be rejected as failed. It comes as no surprise that in a recent evaluation, ESKA & MERCADO (2005: 178–180) come to the conclusion that the text is not metrical and displays no marked poetic syntax. Nevertheless I think that there is a valid reason to look out anew for features that are indicative of a poem.



Alise-Sainte-Reine [L-13]

Any analysis of the Alise-Sainte-Reine inscription that seeks to detect poetic embellishments in the widest sense of the word has to take into consideration both the syntactic structure of the text and the orthographical system behind the inscription. There is a kind of break in the sentence between *celicnon* and *etic*, graphically expressed by the ivy leaf after *celicnon*. Even though ESKA recognises the break (he uses the term ‘discontinuity’; ESKA 2003: 107, 115), he rejects the idea that the ivy leaf has been put there on purpose and thinks of a mere space filler instead, the central positioning of which between the two words of the line is merely incidental. I think that this is underrating the evidence: the ivy leaf splits the text into two halves of approximately matching length (first half: 6 words, 42 letters; second half: 6 words,⁹ 38 letters; the lines are likely to match in syllable count as well, see below). In almost all respects the first ivy leaf takes up the middle position in the inscription. Under the working hypothesis that a deliberate stylistic rationale lies behind this arrangement, I will tentatively speak of two lines.

Words 1–6 constitute a complete sentence, a votive formula with the syntactic structure $SVO_{\text{indir.}}O_{\text{dir.}}$. This structure is a variant of the dominant configuration in Gaulish SVO (ESKA 1994: 23 = 2007a: 84, and ESKA 2007b). It is also found in other dedicatory texts, e.g. Auxey, Côte-d’Or [L-9]:

⁹ Even though diachronically *-io* of *dugiontio* could be regarded as a separate, seventh word, the graphic layout of the inscription reveals that the person who wrote the text did not do so: there is no word-separator, be it dot, ivy-leaf or blank space, between *dugionti* and *io*, like there is between all other words of the text.

ICCAVOS · OP|INICNOS · ĪEV|RV · BRIGINDONI | CANTALON
 'Iccaos Oppianicnos offered to Brigindona a/the cantalon';

or Autun, Saône-et-Loire [L-10]:

LICNOS CON|TEXTOS · IEVRV | ANVALONNACV | CANECOSÉDLON
 'Licnos Contextos offered to Anualonnacos a/the canecosedlon'.

Words 1–6 of L-13 can thus be regarded as the formulaic nucleus of the inscription. They take up a complete line = line 1. The following words 7–12 can be grouped together as a second line = line 2. Line 2 consists of two words (*etic gobedbi*), which – assuming that *etic* = 'and' – syntactically belong to the preceding clause, and of a relative clause of four words dependent on the second word in line 2. The second line as a whole adds information to the formulaic nucleus in line 1. The juncture between the two lines postulated by this hypothesis is explicitly indicated by the epigraphic means of an ivy leaf. Viewed under the hypothesis of a textual arrangement in two lines, a series of structural similarities emerges between them:

- (1) Both lines consist of six words.
- (2) The third word in both lines is a verb (line 1: *ieuru*, line 2: *dugiōntiō*).
- (3) In both lines, the fourth slot is taken up by the deity **Ucuetis* to whom the inscription is dedicated (line 1: dative *Ucuete*, line 2: accusative *Ucuetin*).
- (4) The fact that the subject of the main clause, *Martialis Dannotali*, occupies the first two slots of line 1 may bear on the interpretation of *gobedbi* in the second slot of line 2. If there is parallelism in the layout of the two lines and in the assignment of functional roles, *gobedbi* could be read as a sociative instrumental (co-dedicators), adding a further argument to the corresponding subjectival constituent in line 1. While the use of the opening conjunction *etic* 'and' of line 2 is entirely predictable if *gobedbi* is interpreted as an additional dative argument (co-recipient or benefactive; cf. ESKA 2003: 112–115), it poses a problem if the word is taken to be a sociative instrumental, since in such a construction it would actually be superfluous. Under the hypothesis advocated here, there may be redundancy involved in the choice of the words here, in the sense that an extra word was needed to parallel the two words, referring to the agent, at the beginning of line 1.
- (5) The fifth word of line 2, the preposition *in* 'in', is most certainly unstressed; the fifth word of line 1, the demonstrative *sosin* 'this', may be weakly stressed or unstressed, too. The use of a demonstrative pronoun in a dedicatory formula of this type finds a parallel in the Gallo-Greek inscription from Vaison-la-Romaine, Vaucluse [G-153], which refers to the dedicated sacred site as $\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\mu\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ 'this *nemeton*'; on the other hand, inscriptions L-9 and L-10 cited above display no demonstrative reference to the objects dedicated, *cantalon* and *canecosedlon*, both possibly, like *celicnon*, structures of some kind (ESKA 2003: 104).
- (6) All other words can be regarded as fully stressed; this is also true for the first word of line 2, the conjunction *etic* 'and'. Etymologically, it is composed of connective PIE **(h₂)éti* 'beyond, further' and the enclitic connector **-k^he* 'and'

(ESKA 2003: 108). **(h)éti* was a fully stressed word in PIE, cf. Ved. *áti*, Greek *ἔτι*. The fact that enclitic **-k^he* could be attached to it underlines that **eti* must have been accented in Gaulish or at least in its prehistory, too.

- (7) Before the number of syllables in each line can be determined, a few ambiguous spellings have to be discussed. The Roman letter <I> represents both the vowel /i/ and the glide /j/. Consequently *ieuru* could be di- or trisyllabic. In Gallo-Greek inscriptions, what corresponds to the initial <I> of Gallo-Latin *ieuru* is written with the digraph <EI> – otherwise used for vocalic /i/ – in *ειωρου* (Vaison-la-Romaine, Vaucluse [G-153]) and perhaps []ειωρα[(Nîmes, Gard [G-528]). In Gallo-Greek inscriptions, <I> is used for word-initial /i/, cf. *ιουγιλιακος* (Saint-Chamas, Bouches-du-Rhône [G-28]; from PC **iugom* ‘yoke’) and *Βιτουιστου* [M-73] where the constituent members of *lotobito* are inverted.¹⁰ [I]οουιγοπειξ (Cavaillon, Vaucluse [G-556]) cannot be used as evidence since the beginning of the word is missing. This distribution suggests a vocalic value for the first phoneme of *ειωρου* and *ειωρα*. The use of the digraph <EI> in these spellings does not necessarily prove a long /i/, since <EI> may simply have been employed to avoid orthographic confusion with <I> = consonantal /j/ in word-initial position. Cf. also *Εινδο[υ]τιοπειξ* (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône [G-70]), where <EI>¹¹ most certainly represents /i/. The Gallo-Greek evidence therefore strongly suggests that *ieuru* has to be read as a trisyllabic word.

The divine name *Ucuet-* presents a similar problem: is it disyllabic /ük̥uet-/ or trisyllabic /ük̥üet-/? In the present inscription and in a Latin inscription excavated in its immediate proximity (DEO VCVETI [CIL XIII 11247]), the name is spelt with the sequence <CV>, not with the Latin digraph <QV> for /k^h/. One is reminded of the spellings *cuetic* ‘and’ beside *coetic* < *ko-eti-k^h(e) (with the allomorph **ko* for **kom*) on the Gaulish lead tablet from Larzac, Aveyron [L-98, 1b1], where <cu> most certainly stands for /ku/ or /ko/, not /k^h/.¹² Therefore

¹⁰ From PC **iutu-* ‘mash, soup, broth’? (cf. DLG 194; but differently DELAMARRE 2007: 42 < **bitu-itu-* ‘Nourriture de Vie’ (ou ‘- du Monde’)).

¹¹ Unless one has to read <ΣI>, cf. RIG I, 92.

¹² SCHMIDT (1986: 2–3) explains *Ucuetis* as **uk^h-eti-*, a verbal abstract ‘*Ansprechung, Anrufung*’ derived from the PIE root **uek^h-* ‘to speak’. This etymology is (1) morphologically (‘Ersatz von [DS: expected] -ti- durch -eti-: why?’), (2) phonologically (*k^h* could be expected to have become delabialised after *u*, cf. KÜMMEL 2007: 321 and WEISS 1994: 137–139; and even if this rule no longer applied in Gaulish, *k^h* would be expected to have become *p* in this language), (3) epigraphically (<CV> more likely stands for /ku/ than for /k^h/) and (4) semantically (the apparent connection of the god with smiths is not addressed) dubious. In this context I want to state explicitly that I regard the theory that a number of words with apparent or actual /k^h/ in Gaulish are due to phonological archaism in religious terminology (as in SCHMIDT 1986: 2) as implausible. Phonological archaisms in the religious sphere are – to my knowledge – conceivable and observable only in traditions with written corpora of sacred texts. If credence can be attached to what Caesar (*Bell. Gall.* 6, 14, 3–4) says about the druids’ refusal to accept writing in religious affairs, the opposite of such a situation prevailed in Gaul. In particular, I do not see what greater religious significance a month’s name *Equos*, a rivername *Sēquanā*, or an ethnic name *Quariatēs* should have over the name of the goddess *Eponā*. The only unambiguously religious term in this group is *Eponā*, which actually shows the expected treatment of the labiovelar. On a more methodological note, admitting arbitrariness to phonological developments seriously undermines one of the fundamental pillars of the

it may be concluded that *Ucuet-* consists of three syllables. It could now be assumed that the <I> in the name of the dedicator *Martialis* should have syllabic value as well. But noting that the sequence /i/ + back vowel is otherwise spelt with an intervening *I longa* in this inscription (here transcribed with <i> in *dugiōntiō* and *Alisiā*), it is at least conceivable that <I> represents a glide in *Martialis* and that the word is trisyllabic.¹³ In Latin vulgar speech, prevocalic *i* and *e* had turned into the glide /j/ by the 1st century A.D., as evidenced by the inscriptions from Pompeii (VÄÄNÄNEN 1963: 47 §77). This could be the state of affairs represented by the spelling *Martialis*. Or the name – a loan from Latin – could simply have retained its Roman spelling, without providing any clue as to its pronunciation. Putting all things together, we arrive at two lines of equal or nearly equal syllabic count (19 syllables each or 20/19 syllables, depending on how *Martialis* is read).

- (8) Provided the trisyllabic analysis of *Martialis* holds true, both lines can furthermore be broken into two half-lines a and b, the first of which consists of ten syllables with three stresses, the second one of nine syllables with two main stresses. I will not speculate as to where the stress may have been in these words; to me, the present knowledge about Gaulish accentuation is too limited to warrant the drawing of any conclusions for a particular text (*pace* LAMBERT 2003: 48; DE BERNARDO STEMPPEL 1994). Consequently, I will not attempt to impose a rhythmical pattern upon L-13, as RHŶS (1906) and GRAY (1942) have done.
- (9) Half-lines 1b and 2b both begin with the deity *Ucuetis**, the main recipient of the dedication. Possibly, graphic emphasis was laid on *Ucuetin* in line 2b by surrounding it with two ivy leaves, but this is very uncertain (see the remarks above).

historical-comparative method and must therefore be avoided. When words with apparent labiovelars are found in Gaulish, alternative explanatory strategies have to be sought (see Lambert 2003: 113 for basically the same opinion): (1) Such words could be loans from other languages (e.g. *Equos* from Latin, for *aequos* 'equal', signifying the month of the (spring?) equinox (?) or from other, lesser known Continental Celtic dialects, which did not share in the development *k^h > p (e.g. *Sequana* from a marginal dialect of Gaulish?). (2) These spellings could reflect other phonemic sequences (e.g. /ku/). (3) A new phoneme /k^h/ or a cluster /k^h/ could have developed secondarily after the sound change PIE *k^h > *p had removed all inherited labiovelars from Gaulish, thereby rendering impossible etymological comparisons which involve PIE *k^h (STIFTER 2004: 240–241).

¹³ The two sequences <eo> and <io> side by side in Gallo-Greek texts (for instance on the inscription from Vaison-la-Romaine, Vaucluse [G-153], i.e. οὐλλωνεος and τοουτιουε) could be regarded as mere graphic variants of a single morpheme, one phonemic, the other one quasi-phonetically reflecting 'lowering' of *i* before a back vowel. But in view of the fact that Celtic had inherited two suffixes *-iō- and *-iō- from PIE, one can also ask the question if the two spellings stand for the two suffixes respectively, for example in G-153 eo = /iō/ and iou = /ju/ or /jo/? Due to the constraints of the transmission, the behaviour of Gaulish in this respect must necessarily remain largely unclear, in contrast to the Insular Celtic languages. In Goidelic the two suffixes merged and underwent a unitary treatment, i.e. largely resulting in Old Irish reflexes of *-iō-, but of *-iō- in a few cases (see BALLE 1999 for a revision of UHLICH 1993, who had assumed separate treatments of the two suffixes in Goidelic). But in the British languages /jo/ and /iō/ were kept apart phonologically, the former resulting in *i*-affection within the word, the latter giving e.g. W -ydd, -edd. BALLE (1999) comprehensively traces the developments from IE to the British languages.

dugióntiú in 2a. The inscription on a spindle-whorl from Saint-Révérien, Nièvre [L-119], however, displays more of these features:¹⁶

moni gnatha · gabi · | buddutton imon
'go,¹⁷ girl, take¹⁸ this¹⁹ *buddutton* (= take this as a *b.* = kiss^{20?})'

¹⁶ MEES (2008b: 202) offers a slightly different analysis of the text.

¹⁷ For the translation 'go!' cf. SCHMIDT (1983: 336–337).

¹⁸ Pace DE BERNARDO STEMPEL (2005), I remain convinced of the traditional interpretation of Celt. *gab-* as possessing the inherited meaning 'take' (see LIV² 195) in Celtic. The only instance where the context supports strongly the meaning 'give' for the root *gab-* in a Celtic environment is that of the deities called *Ollogabiae* 'the all-giving' (CIL 13, 6751 and 7280, in and near Mainz; see DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2005: 190–191). But these may be due to a superficial Gallicisation of originally Germanic *Alagabiae* (CIL 13, 8529, Burgel). A linguistic ascription of the related *Gabiae* (CIL 13, 7937–7940, Rāvenich) is not possible.

¹⁹ Following a suggestion by Stefan Schumacher, I translate *imon* as 'this', taking it as a parallel to or as an exact cognate of Ved. *imām*, i.e. demonstrative stem **i-* + accusative ending **-m* + additional deictic element **-om*, or + thematic acc. sg. ending. A frequently proposed alternative interpretation is to equate *imon* plus a few possible further, albeit ambiguous instances of the word (see DLG 189–190) with the Greek possessive pronoun ἐμός 'my'. While there is nothing *a priori* to exclude this possibility, a couple of objections must be addressed: (1) The unexpected raising of initial **e > i* vis à vis the putative preform **emós* finds a superficial phonological parallel in the Gaul. 1sg. of the copula *imi* [G-13] and perhaps *imi* [L-120] < Proto-Celtic **emmi* 'I am' (contrast OIr. *am* without raising) – unless the latter forms are themselves instances of the putative possessive pronoun – and in the preposition *in* < **eni* 'in', unless it is due to interference from Latin. But the phonetic environments are not equivalent: whereas those two words were unstressed (at least judging by their behaviour in related languages), putative Pre-Celtic **emós* is built on the pronominal stem **em-*, which is thought to represent the stressed allomorph of the PIE 1sg. pronominal stem **m-* and which therefore *a priori* should be expected to be stressed in Gaulish, too. But in stressed wordforms the raising **e > i* in open syllables did not take place in Gaulish before nasals, cf. compound names with *eni-* as first member (DLG 163). Furthermore, the raising in *immi* < **emmi* and *in* < **eni* may have been supported by the *i* of the second syllables. So **imos* < **emós* would, at best, be an example of an exceptional, irregular raising of **e > i* in a stressed or half-stressed word. (2) The status of the putative stressed pronominal stem allomorph **em-* in Indo-European is in itself disputed. Reflexes of it are only found in Anatolian (Hitt. *ammuk* 'I'), Greek (ἐγὲ 'me', ἐμός 'my') and Armenian (*im* 'my'), but not in Albanian *im* 'my', which is rather made up of article + inherited possessive pronoun (see MATZINGER 1998: 191–192). While it is basically possible that those three branches alone continue inherited stressed forms of the oblique 1sg. pronoun, the opposite is also conceivable, namely that we are looking at independent *nachgrundsprachlich* contaminations of the PIE oblique stem **m-* with the **e-* of the 1sg. subject pronoun **egōh₂* (cf. KATZ 1998: 92). Since Greek and Armenian are known to have many innovations in common, they do not count as separate witnesses in this process, but they more likely shared in an areal phenomenon. As to the position of Celtic in this regard, it must be also noted that – to my knowledge – apart from the possible case of Gaul. **imos*, the putative pronominal stem **em-* is not reflected elsewhere in Celtic pronominal systems. If the 1sg. subject pronoun was *mi* / *mī* in Gaulish (e.g. LAMBERT 2003: 69), this must continue the PIE accusative pronoun **mé* or **me* with secondarily lengthened vowel, the use of which, rather than putative **emé*, would in itself speak against the latter's presence in Celtic.

²⁰ For phonological reasons, *buddutton* cannot be connected with Early Ir. *bot* 'tail; penis' < **g^hozdo-* (as suggested, for example, by WATKINS 1999: 542). Such a preform ought to yield Gaul. **botto-*, cf. Gallo-Latin **pettia* 'piece' < **k^hezdīā* (MW *peth*, OIr. *cuit*; s. DLG 249 f.). Instead, a comparison with the rare MidIr. *bus* 'lip' (ModIr. *pus*, Sc.-Gael. *bus*) < **bur^u-* is formally more satisfying.

This may be analysed as a short poetic composition consisting of two lines; one raised dot separates the two clauses which I analyse as two lines; another raised dot corresponds to the change of lines on the inscribed object. If some speculation is allowed, the poetic core can be taken to be:

moni gnatha
gabi ... imon

These four words are linked by numerous devices: syllabic equality (2+2 : 2+2), possibly equal or nearly equal syllabic weight,²¹ alliteration (*gnatha* : *gabi*), phonological ‘mirroring’, i.e. reverse phonological ring composition (*moni* : *imon*), consonantal and vocalic assonance (*moni* : *gabi*; *gnatha* : *gabi*; *moni* : *gnatha*). The only word in the short poem that falls out of the quasi-metrical framework is *buddutton* (with internal ‘assonance’ -*udd-* : -*utt-*, WATKINS 1999: 541), which by its very isolation is awarded special prominence and is thus rendered the focus of attention of the text. In addition to these features, WATKINS (1999: 541) has drawn attention to the fact that the text can also be read as a ‘11 syllable verse line with caesura after the fourth syllable, thus a 4 | 7 pattern that is characteristic both of Vedic and Iranian metric texts’.

Another old Celtic inscription that can with some certainty be claimed to contain a metrical text is the late Lepontic inscription from Ornavasso [*LexLep* VB.3.1]. It can be analysed as a trochaic tetrameter (LEJEUNE 1987: 499), but, like L-13, it does not contain any further poetic embellishments. Considering its late date for a Lepontic inscription (end of the 2nd, beginning of the 1st cent. B.C., see *LexLep* at VB.3.1), the use of a quantitative metre will best be attributed to Latin or Greek influence. Like in L-13, however, the word divisions play a central role in the graphic expression of the metrical units. The strongest break – the caesura – is felt between the two constituent phrases (indirect object – subject) of the text; consequently that break is expressed by four dots. Each part of the sentence is in turn made up of two constituents, two coordinated recipients in the case of the indirect object, noun and attributive adjective in the case of the subject. In order to indicate that the break is slighter than that between the parts of the sentence, three dots are used. Finally, the connector -*Pe* ‘and’ < **k^he* is attached to the second constituent of the indirect object, but separated from that preceding stressed word by merely two dots which mark the enclitic nature of the element:

laTumarui : saPsuTai : Pe · uinom : našom²² ◡ ◡ - - : - ◡ - : ◡ · - ◡ : ◡ ◡

²¹ In order to arrive at such an analysis, *gnatha* has to be read as /gnātā/ (allowance being made for a lenited pronunciation of /t/). The final short *a* could be due to shortening in the vocative, i.e. loss of the PIE laryngeal in pausa; the short *a* in the first syllable follows Schumacher’s account of the development of PIE laryngeals in Celtic (SCHUMACHER 2004a: 136–138; 349–350). It is needless to say that this is a mere hypothesis for which neither positive nor negative evidence can be adduced. The -*i* < **eje* of *moni* will have to be measured long, however, against the probably short -*i* < **-je* of *gabi*.

²² Helmut BIRKHAN (2005) has proposed a new interpretation of *našom*, not as /naksjom/ (*uel sim.*) ‘Naxian (wine)’, the widely preferred analysis, but as /natsom/ (*uel sim.*) < **n_hd-tom* or **n_hd-som*, a past participle of the root **ned-* ‘to bind, tie’ (*recte* /natsom/ < **ηHd-tom*, past participle of the root **neHd-* found in OIr. *nascaid*, MBret. *nasca*; cf. SCHUMACHER 2004a: 489; vs. **Hned^h*, LIV² 227). For Birkhan, the delicacy contained in the vessel for the buried

Returning to L-13, the following can be said in conclusion. Although the text of the Alise-Sainte-Reine inscription is not metrical (there is no detectable pattern of syllable length or stress), and although there is nothing in its syntax that looks overtly artificial or contrived as could be expected of poetry, the measured, even distribution of syllables and words and the graphic prominence in the shape of an ivy leaf placed at the main discontinuity speak for a deliberate stylistic design behind the layout of the text. In that sense it is possible to speak perhaps of measured prose or of a poetic arrangement in a wider sense of the word. It is true that the discontinuous syntax can be explained by grammatical exigencies as has been done by ESKA (2003: 112–115), but I want to draw attention to the possibility that a conscious stylistic design may have played a role as well.

Appendix: verb-initial relative clauses in Gaulish?

SCHUMACHER (2004a: 98 fn. 100) has argued that in Gaulish the relative particle **io* < **iod* had become enclitic and thus occupied Wackernagel's position after the first word in the clause. The implication is that the clause-initial slot could have been filled by word classes other than verbs and that Gaulish probably did not have relative verbal forms of the Old Irish type (SCHUMACHER 2004a: 743 fn. 34). Schumacher argues that in order to develop fully grammaticalised relative verbal forms, it is prerequisite that a language belong to the VSO-type. Since the unmarked word order in Gaulish probably was SVO (as in the first part of L-13; see ESKA 1994: 23 = 2007a: 84; ESKA

couple Latumaros and Sapsuta is not 'wine from Naxos', but 'wine (from vines) tied up (in contrast to vines spreading on the ground)'. While Birkhan's analysis is unimpeachable on morphological, phonological and factual grounds, it is possible to defend the wide-spread translation 'Naxian' on palaeographic grounds. Birkhan assails the phonetic interpretation of the letter *ś* 'san' as /ks/ [sic] and demands that it be strictly considered as representing a Proto-Celtic combination of dentals and/or sibilants, i.e. *tau Gallicum* (like in *anareuiseos* < **ande-are-uid-tijos* [San Bernardino di Briona, E-1/ *LexLep* NO:21] and *išos* < **is-tos* [Vergiate, *LexLep* VA:6]; both are my own examples). But he overlooks the fact that the letter rendered as *ś* in the transcription is actually a variant that is found merely in two or three inscriptions (see LEJEUNE 1971: 374 and *LexLep* s. v. *Ś*). This particular variant consists of a body shaped like an X, the two lower ends of which are connected by an understroke. A very uncertain example is VA-1.2, which is very likely to be read as Tu; the understroke which would turn it into šu looks very much accidental. In the only other inscription purported to contain it [Nosate, *LexLep* MI-1], traditionally read as Pešu, the photograph reveals that the understroke has been added accidentally and does not belong to the letter (see *Studi Etruschi* 60 (1995), tavv. LXVII b and LXIX a; cf. MORANDI 2004: 610). The name in *LexLep* MI-1 has rather to be read as Pešū (thus also MORANDI 2004: 610), perhaps a short name based on the numeral **petuores* '4'. Consequently, *LexLep* VB-3.1 remains the sole instance for this particular shape of the letter. This raises the question if the letter should be read as 'san' at all, whereas in other inscriptions from the late Lepontic period for 'san' the so-called 'butterfly-sign' is used [San Pietro di Stabio, *LexLep* TI-41; Miasino, *LexLep* NO-18; Stresa, *LexLep* VB-127]. So it is best to follow the suggestion by RIIYS (1913: 86) that the letter in the inscription from Ornavasso is not 'san', but a loan grapheme from Latin X = /ks/, to which has been added an understroke as a diacritic in order to distinguish it from isomorphous native Lepontic X = /t, d/. The letter m in *LexLep* VB-3.1, which does not show the inherited flag-like shape, betrays Latin graphematic influence, too (LEJEUNE 1987: 504 f., 506). The word could thus be read overtly as /naksom/. The /i/ of the supposedly underlying *io*-adjective /naksjom/ must be assumed to have been 'absorbed' into the preceding /ks/, or could the diacritic understroke actually represent the i?

2007b), it is not impossible that constructions may have existed where the relative particle **iō* was attached to other word classes, but primarily to nominal subjects. In conscious contrast to Vendryes' restriction, he thinks that it is only due to the chances of transmission that in the few relative clauses that we find attested in Gaulish, the particle always comes after a verb. The syntactic, not the formal correspondence, between Gaulish 3pl. relatives in *-ont(i)ō* and their Old Irish counterparts in *-te* would thus be rendered a little bit less close than hitherto assumed. Two possible examples of verbs with attached relative particle **iō* in Gaulish (*dugiōntiō* [L-13] and *toncsiōntiō* [L-100]) will be discussed below. Other alleged instances of relative verbs (*sagitiontias*, *scrisumio*) are of dubious transmission or uncertain interpretation or amenable to other analyses and will be ignored here.²³

In L-13 we have a case of a relative clause with subject antecedent. The word order of the relative clause is unmarked SVO. Since the subject is expressed in the matrix clause (*gobedbi*), the relative particle **iō* stands in as the overt subject in the dependent clause: $\rightarrow *S_{[-iō]} V_{[abgionti]} O_{[iōverin]}$. The relative particle, however, being clitic, must be attached to the next available host, which is the verb, and in consequence the slot before the verb becomes phonologically empty: $\rightarrow *SV-iōO \rightarrow V-iōO$. The verb is thus superficially promoted to the first position of the clause by syntactic rules and as a consequence of the underlying constituent order SVO. At the same time, the position of the verb *dugiōnti-īō* in the third slot of line 2 also fulfils a stylistic purpose by corresponding to the position of the verb in the first line. Two different factors therefore conspire to place the verbal form at exactly that position of the text, namely a syntactic factor which is specific to relative clauses with subject antecedents, and a stylistic factor. It would therefore be rash to adduce this particular verbal form as good evidence for verb-initial syntax in Gaulish relative clauses.

In line 9 of the lead tablet from Chamalières [L-100], another possible example of a relative verb in Gaulish is attested, viz. *tonc siōntiō*. If this is a single word and a verb, which is far from certain,²⁴ it is 3pl. (*-ont(i)*), it is furthermore likely to be a future formation (*-siō-* < **-sīe/o-*), it is relative (*-iō*), and it may stand in a *figura etymologica* relationship to the preceding phrase *se couitoncnaman*.²⁵ The second part of the latter has been surmised to contain the verbal abstract (verbal noun) *toncnaman* of the verb *toncsiōntiō* and thus its internal object. In one possible analysis of the construction, *toncnaman* could belong to the matrix clause²⁶ and provide the object antecedent of the relative verb, which on its own would constitute the relative clause: '... the *toncnaman* which they will *tonc-* ...'. Here the relative particle **iō* represents

²³ Larzac's *sagitiontias* [L-98] could be a present participle (LAMBERT 2002: 266); regarding *scrisumio* from Marcellus of Bordeaux's *De medicamentis liber*: the genre of magical formulae, to which the presumed Gaulish charms in Marcellus' treatise belong, and the specific textual conditions which obtain in that genre disqualify those texts as a source of Gaulish altogether (BLOM 2007: 58–126).

²⁴ Cf. the various suggestions reported in LAMBERT (2002: 278–279) and SCHUMACHER (2004a: 651–652), but note the arguments advanced by LINDEMAN (2007) against taking *tonc siōntiō* (which has a clear word break in the middle) as a single form.

²⁵ The sequence *coui* finds a parallel in the sequence [...] *coui* of a hitherto unrecognised text, which does not seem to be Latin and may perhaps be regarded as Gaulish (STIFTER forthcoming). The function of [...] *coui* within that text, however, remains totally unclear.

²⁶ Note, however, that under this analysis the further syntactic position of *toncnaman* in the matrix clause remains quite unclear.

the object in the dependent clause. The subject is not overtly expressed because it is inherent in the verb; in consequence, the slot before the verb becomes phonologically empty: $\rightarrow *SV_{[toncsionti]}O_{[-i\theta]} \rightarrow *VO_{[-i\theta]}$. Again, in observance of Wackernagel's Rule, the relative particle attaches itself to the first stressed element of the clause, which this time – since there is only one element present – means no visible movement at all; the object slot as such is deleted because it is empty now: $\rightarrow *V-i\theta\Theta \rightarrow V-i\theta$.

ESKA (1994: 27–28 = 2007a: 86–87), on the other hand, regards the whole phrase *secoui toncnaman toncsiionti* as the relative clause, the head of which is phonologically null and in which 'topicalisation of *secoui toncnaman* has occurred following verb-fronting and clitic placement'. He translates 'those who will swear the oath of Segovos', i.e. a relative clause with covert subject antecedent. Although under his analysis the construction seems to disprove Schumacher's claim (*a priori* one might have expected something like ***secoui-i\theta toncnaman toncsiionti*), this is only so on the surface. If, as ESKA suggests, topicalisation of *secoui toncnaman* within the clause occurred after the cliticisation of **i\theta*, the following path of events is conceivable:

$$\begin{aligned} & *S_{[-i\theta]}V_{[toncsionti]}O_{[secoui toncnaman]} \\ & \rightarrow *SV_{[toncsionti]}-i\theta O_{[secoui toncnaman]} \text{ (cliticisation)} \\ & \rightarrow O_{[secoui toncnaman]}V_{[toncsionti]}-i\theta \text{ (topicalisation)} \end{aligned}$$

Again neither this verbal form nor the construction in which it appears (be it surface configuration or underlying structure) provide unequivocal evidence for a rule of clause-initial verbs in Gaulish relative clauses. It would only be fatal to Schumacher's above-cited claim if there turned up in the Gaulish corpus an instance of a relative clause with non-subject antecedent, in which despite the presence of an overt nominal subject within the relative clause the verb were promoted to the first slot. According to Schumacher's claim, for such a case a surface configuration $S-i\theta V(O) \leftarrow *XS-i\theta V(O) \leftarrow *X_{[-i\theta]}SV(O)$ would be expected. X represents the slot for the non-subject constituent (which could also represent O), for which the relative particle stands in, and which is being deleted after the clitic has been moved to the position after the first stressed word. If, however, an input structure $*X_{[-i\theta]}SV(O)$ would be represented by a surface configuration $V-i\theta S(O)$, i.e. with promotion of the verb to the initial slot in order to host the relative clitic, Schumacher's claim would have to be regarded as positively falsified.

References

- BALLES, Irene 1999: 'Zu den britannischen **i\theta*-Stämmen und ihren idg. Quellen'. In: Stefan ZIMMER, Rolf KÖDDERITZSCH & Arndt WIGGER (Hrsg.), *Akten des Zweiten deutschen Keltologen-Symposium (Bonn, 2.–4. April 1997)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 4–22.
- BIRKHAN, Helmut 2005: 'UINOM NAŠOM'. In: Franziska BEUTLER & Wolfgang HAMETER (Hrsg.), 'Eine ganz normale Inschrift' ... Vnd ähnliches zVm GebVrtstag von Ekkehard Weber. *Festschrift zum 30. April 2005* (Althistorisch-Epigraphische Studien 5). Wien: Eigenverlag der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Archäologie, 223–228.
- BLOM, Alderik H. 2007: *Lingua Gallica: Studies in the languages of late antique Gaul*. PhD-thesis, Cambridge 2007.

- COLBERT DE BEAULIEU, Jean-Baptiste & Brigitte FISCHER 1998: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises (R.I.G.)*. Vol. IV. *Les légendes monétaires*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- DE BERNARDO STEMPPEL, Patrizia 1994: ‚Zum gallischen Akzent: eine sprachinterne Betrachtung‘, *ZcP* 46, 14–35.
- DE BERNARDO STEMPPEL, Patrizia 2005: ‚Indogermanisch und keltisch „geben“: Kontinentalkelt. *Gabiae, gabi/gabas*, keltib. *gabizeti*, altir. *ro-(n)-gab* und Zugehöriges‘, *HS* 118, 185–200.
- [E-x]: s. LEJEUNE 1988.
- DELAMARRE, Xavier 2007: *Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique*. Paris: Errance.
- DLG: Xavier DELAMARRE, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. Préface de Pierre-Yves LAMBERT. 2^e édition revue et augmentée. Paris: Errance, 2003.
- DOLENZ, Heimo & Patrizia DE BERNARDO STEMPPEL 2004: ‚Sena[*bos*]. Eine norische Gottheit aus Tiffen‘. In: Herbert HEFTNER & Kurt TOMASCHITZ (Hrsg.), *Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004 dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden*. Unter der Ägide der Wiener Humanistischen Gesellschaft. Wien: [Eigenverlag], 737–745.
- ESKA, Joseph F. 1994: ‚Rethinking the evolution of Celtic constituent configuration‘, *MSS* 55 (1994 [1995]), 7–39; reprinted in: Raimund KARL & David STIFTER (eds), *The Celtic world. Critical concepts in historical studies. Volume IV. Celtic linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge, 74–100.
- ESKA, Joseph F. 2003: ‚On syntax and semantics in Alise-Sainte-Reine (Côte-D'Or), again‘, *Celtica* 24, 101–120.
- ESKA, Joseph F. 2004: ‚Chapter 35. Continental Celtic‘. In: Roger D. WOODARD (ed.), *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 857–880.
- ESKA 2007a: s. ESKA 1994.
- ESKA, Joseph F. 2007b: ‚On basic configuration and movement within the Gaulish clause‘. In: Pierre-Yves LAMBERT & Georges-Jean PINAULT (eds), *Gaulois et celtique continental*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 215–229.
- ESKA, Joseph F. & Angelo O. MERCADO 2005: ‚Observations on verbal art in ancient Vergiate‘, *IIS* 118, 160–184.
- FUCHS *et al.* 2004: Michel FUCHS, Sophie BUJARD & Evelyne BROILLET-RAMJOUÉ, ‚5. Villa romana: Wandmalereien‘ [übersetzt von Silvia IIRSCHE & Marianne RAMSTEIN]. In: Peter J. SUTER *et al.*, *Meikirch. Villa romana, Gräber und Kirche*. Bern: Archäologischer Dienst des Kantons Bern, 85–150.
- [G-x]: s. LEJEUNE 1985.
- [G-528]: s. LEJEUNE 1994.
- [G-556]: s. LEJEUNE & LAMBERT 1996.
- GRAY, Louis H. 1942: ‚Possible trochaic dimeters in non-Latin Italic and in Gaulish inscriptions‘, *American Journal of Philology* 63, 433–443.
- HOMMEL, Hildebrecht 1970: ‚Das Datum der Munatier-Grabstätte in Portus Traiani und die hederæ distinguentes‘, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5, 293–303.
- HÜBNER, Aemilius 1885: *Exempla scripturæ epigraphicæ Latinæ a Caesaris dictatoris morte ad aetatem Iustiniani*. Berlin: Reimer.
- IEW: Julius POKORNY, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern & München: Francke 1959, 1969.
- ILLPRON: Manfred HAINZMANN & Peter SCHUBERT, *Inscriptionum lapidarium Latinarum provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum*. Indices, 3 vols. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1986–7.
- JASANOFF, Jay 2004: ‚“Stative” *-ē- revisited‘, *Die Sprache* 43/2, 127–170.
- KATZ, Joshua 1998: *Topics in Indo-European personal pronouns*. PhD-thesis, Harvard University.
- KOCH, John 1982: ‚Gaulish *etic*, *eθθic* < IE. **eti-kʰe?*‘, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 2, 89–114.
- KÜMMEL, Martin Joachim 2007: *Konsonantenwandel. Bausteine zu einer Typologie des Lautwandels und ihre Konsequenzen für die vergleichende Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- [L-(1-17)]: s. LEJEUNE 1988.
 [L-(18-139)]: s. LAMBERT 2002.
 LAMBERT, Pierre-Yves 2002: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises (R.I.G.)*. Vol. II, fasc. 2. *Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
 LAMBERT, Pierre-Yves 2003: *La langue gauloise. Description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*. Édition revue et augmentée. Paris: Errance.
 LEJEUNE, Michel 1971: *Lepontica*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971 [= *ÉC* 12 (1968-71), 357-500].
 LEJEUNE, Michel 1985: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises (R.I.G.)*. Vol. I. *Textes gallo-grecs*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.
 LEJEUNE, Michel 1987: 'Le vase de Latumaros', *Latomus* 46, 493-509.
 LEJEUNE, Michel 1988: *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises (R.I.G.)*. Vol. II, fasc. 1. *Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.
 LEJEUNE, Michel 1994: 'Compléments gallo-grecs', *ÉC* 30, 181-189.
 LEJEUNE, Michel & Pierre-Yves LAMBERT 1996: 'Compléments gallo-grecs', *ÉC* 32, 131-137.
LexLep: Lexicon Leponticum. By David STIFTER & Martin BRAUN. With the assistance of and contributions by Chiara DEZI, Eva LETTNER, Marcel SCHWARZ & Michela VIGNOLI, Wien 2009-. Online at: http://www.univie.ac.at/lexlep/wiki/Main_Page. For sigla see <http://www.univie.ac.at/lexlep/wiki/Objects>.
 LINDEMANN, Fredrik Otto 2007: 'toncnaman toncsiontio: remarques critiques sur quelques formes verbales du gaulois'. In: Pierre-Yves LAMBERT & Georges-Jean PINAULT (eds), *Gaulois et celtique continental*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 231-243.
LIV²: LIV. Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Unter der Leitung von Helmut RIX und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer, bearbeitet von Martin KÜMMEL, Thomas ZEHNDER, Reiner LIPP, Brigitte SCHIRMER. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin KÜMMEL & Helmut RIX. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
 [M-x]: s. COLBERT DE BEAULIEU & FISCHER 1998.
 MATZINGER, Joachim 1998: 'Albanisch unë „ich“ im System der albanischen Personalpronomina', *If* 103, 185-201.
 MCCONE, Kim 1996: *Towards a relative chronology of ancient and medieval Celtic sound change*. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
 MCCONE, Kim 2006: *The origins and development of the Insular Celtic verbal complex*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
 MEES, Bernard 2008a: 'The women of Larzac', *Keltische Forschungen* 3, 169-188.
 MEES, Bernard 2008b: 'Early Celtic metre at Vergiate and Prestino', *HS* 121, 188-208.
 MEES, Bernard 2008c: 'Case and genre in Gaulish. From Mont Auxois to the Pont d'Ancy', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 12, 121-138.
 MORANDI, Alessandro 2004: *Celti d'Italia. A cura di Paola PIANA AGOSTINETTI. Tomo II. Epigrafia e lingua*. Roma: Spazio Tre.
 NEDOMA, Robert 2002: 'Negauer Helm. § 4. Inschriften'. In: Heinrich BECK et al. (Hrsg.), *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde. Von Johannes Hoops. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage. Einundzwanzigster Band. Naulia - Østfold*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 56-61.
 NIL, Dagmar S. WOLTKO, Britta IRLINGER & Carolin SCHNEIDER, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter 2008.
 OLSEN, Magnus 1903: 'Über eine in Steiermark gefundene gallische Inschrift in nordetruskischem Alphabet', *ZcP* 4, 23-30.
 RHYS, Sir John 1906: 'The Celtic inscriptions of France and Italy', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 2, 273-373; reprinted in John RHYS, *Celtic inscriptions*. Osnabrück: Biblio, 1977, 1-109.
 RHYS, John 1913: 'The Celtic inscriptions of Cisalpine Gaul', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 6, 23-112 (+ plates); reprinted in John RHYS, *Celtic inscriptions*. Osnabrück: Biblio, 1977, 231-322.
 SCHAFFNER, Stefan 2005: *Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Problemen der nominalen Morphologie und der Etymologie der altindogermanischen Sprachen*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Regensburg.

- SCHMIDT, Karl Horst 1983: ‚Review of Wolfgang MEID, *Gallisch oder Lateinisch? Soziolinguistische und andere Bemerkungen zu populären gallo-lateinischen Inschriften*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1980‘, *IF* 88, 335–337.
- SCHMIDT, Karl Horst 1986: ‚Keltiberisch *Tocoitos/Tocoitei* und gallisch *Ucuete/Ucuetin*‘, *ZcP* 41, 1–4.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter 1995: *Studies in British Celtic historical phonology*. Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter 1997: *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- SCHUMACHER, Stefan 2004a: *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Unter Mitarbeit von Britta SCHULZE-THULIN & Caroline AAN DE WIEL. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- SCHUMACHER, Stefan 2004b: *Die rätischen Inschriften. Geschichte und heutiger Stand der Forschung*. 2., erweiterte Auflage. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- SOLINAS, Patrizia 1995: ‚Il celtico in Italia‘, *Studi etruschi* 60, 311–408.
- STIFTER, David 2004: ‚Review of Helmut BIRKMAN, *Kelten. Bilder ihrer Kultur*. Wien 1999‘, *Die Sprache* 43/2, 237–243.
- STIFTER, David, forthcoming: ‚New early second-century Gaulish texts from La Graufesenque‘, *Keltische Forschungen* 5.
- STOKES, Whitley 1886: ‚Celtic declension. 18. Inscription of Alise‘, *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 11, 1886, 131–132.
- UHLICIL, Jürgen 1993: ‚Die Reflexe der keltischen Suffixvarianten *-jo- vs. *-ijo- im Altirischen‘. In: Martin ROCKEL & Stefan ZIMMER (Hrsg.), *Akten des Ersten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologen (Gosen bei Berlin, 8.–10. April 1992)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 353–370.
- VÄÄNÄNEN, Veikko 1963: *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- WATKINS, Calvert 1999: ‚Two Celtic notes‘. In: Peter ANREITER & Erzsébet JEREM (Hrsg.), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Budapest: Archaeolingua, 539–543.
- WEISS, Michael 1994: ‚Life everlasting: Latin *iugis* “everflowing”, Greek *ὑγιής* “healthy”, Gothic *ajukdūþs* “eternity” and Avestan *yauuaēji-* “living forever”‘, *MSS* 55, 131–156.

David STIFTER
 Dept. of Old Irish
 National University of Ireland Maynooth
 david.stifter@nuim.ie

Copyright of Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie is the property of De Gruyter and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.