APPENDIX C

Versions of this talk were given at the Department of Irish and Celtic Studies, Queen's University Belfast, in May 2011 and at the XIV Congress of Celtic Studies at Maynooth in August 2011.

A Celtic Verbal Complex in Tartessian?

1. INTRODUCTION

§ 0. If we were just discovering Gaulish now, many of the names would fit Proto-Brittonic-Goidelic as previously reconstructed. But we could not have foreseen the most prevalent sentence type or verb forms—*ieuru, aunuote, ΔΕΔΕ, and KARNITU*. Despite impressive advances, our understanding of the Proto-Celtic verb remains incomplete, and ideas will have to be revised as new evidence continues to appear.

§ 1. As the South-western (SW) or Tartessian inscriptions of south Portugal and south-west Spain became more reliably decoded, commentators noted sequences of signs resembling Indo-European verbs with primary endings: for example, *nařk'ent'i, nařk'ent'i, lak'ent'i* (e.g. Untermann 1997). With the last two, compare Lusitanian *DOENTI* ‘they give’. There are also recurrent prefixes found with these Tartessian forms: for example, *t'ee-baarent'i* and *t'e-baant'i*. I suggest that the last, from the recently unearthed Mesas do Castelinho stone, be understood as *de∙b
ti* | 'they pass away', i.e. 'they die'.

That long text allows a breakthrough, significantly increasing the corpus and confirming previously proposed word divisions by recombining attested stems, endings, and prefixes. At present, the prefix *ro* is found eight times with the same stem syllables as those occurring with Indo-European primary endings, though *ro* never occurs together with those inflexions: for example, *ro-la[kʷ]a, ro-n-b'aren, ro-n-b'are*, possibly *ro-b'ae*, and the frequent *t'e(e)-ro-b'are*. My working hypothesis is that the last means *de-ro-bare* | 'has carried away', understood as '[this grave/death] has carried away'. The minority of SW inscriptions found in documented archaeological contexts come from burial grounds of the Early Iron Age.

§ 2. It was the occurrence of *ro* together with stems found inflected as verbs that convinced me that the principal language of the SW corpus was Celtic. What I
want to talk about today is this pattern of verbs and preverbs and what light that might throw on the persistent uncertainties in deriving the early Neo-Celtic verbal complex.

But first, as the idea that Tartessian is Celtic is still fairly new, I will supply more evidence favouring the Celticity of the corpus, particularly names, naming formulas, and their inflexions. Relevant examples include:

1. nominative singular masculine o-stem tūrtos (J.1.2) well-attested in Hispano-Celtic;

2. dative singular tuūrtekui (J.14.1), which can be understood as ‘for a male of the kindred of Turos’, a name, formation, and case ending all known in Celtiberian;

3. the typical Hispano-Celtic genitive plural family name taarnekuun (J.26.1), probably ‘of the kindred of Taranus’;

4. the dative plural (with preposition) k'o b'elib'o (J.1.2).

5. Compare tīlek'urk'u opening the Mesas do Castelinho text with a heavily Celtic inscription dating to AD 28 from Caurel, Galicia: TILLEGVS AMBATI F SVSARRVS | AIOB[R] IGIAECO, also the Gaulish genitive TILLICI. Note that the adjectival suffix -iko- is found lowered to -eko- in both Western Hispano-Celtic and Tartessian.

6. I suggest taking anb'at'ia iob'a[ and t'urea iub'a as | amb(χ)tiā iō, mā | ‘youngest daughter of Amba(χ)tos’ and | Tureā ju,mā | ‘youngest daughter of Turos’. Both fathers’ names are common in Hispano-Celtic. The latter shows two sound shifts paralleled elsewhere in the corpus: i lowered to e before a and o from the diphthong ou raised to u.

7. A similar formula is b'o't'ieana k'ert'o rob'a, which I understand as | Bō'deanā kerdo ro,mā | ‘Bōdeanā the craftsman’s first-born daughter’, | kerdo | being an o-stem genitive, formed as in Celtiberian. Names in both Boudi- and Boui- were very common in the western Peninsula during the earlier Roman period. The diphthong simplified to o occurs in these. With rob'a for | ro,mā |, compare Middle Irish rom ‘early, too soon’ < Indo-European *pro-mo-, Homeric πρόμος ‘foremost man’. Note also that the distinctive SW signs for [m] are rare; more commonly the series for b+vowel was used. rob'a, or its accusative rob'an, recurs in the recently discovered graffito from Castelo de Moura.

8. lok'ob'o niirab'o opening the long inscription of Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1) is strikingly similar to early Roman-period dedications from Galicia: LVCVBO ARQVIENOB (Sober, Lugo), LVCOVBV[S] ARQVIENI[S], DIBVS M[.]; LVCVOB, and LVCBOBO AROVSA[-] (Lugo). I take the Tartessian as co-ordinated datives plural, meaning ‘for the divine Lugoues and for the chief men’.
9 With raṣa kāṣēṭana | kas(s)edannā | (J.53.1, Alcalá del Río), I think the dead woman’s name (≈ Hispanic-Celtic Rapa) is co-ordinated with the feminine equivalent of the Gaulish title cas(s)idan(n)os ‘tin or bronze minister’ (Graufesenque). Note again i lowered to e before a.

10 That shift happens again in meleśae, a feminine case form equivalent to the Gaulish man’s name Meliððus, meaning ‘sweet’.

II. PATTERNS IN THE TARTESSIAN VERBAL COMPLEX

§ 3. Romanized transcriptions of the longer and more complete SW inscriptions—those for which syntax can be considered—are gathered in Tartessian 2, 93–8 and can be found individually in the catalogue above (pp. 29–134).

The forms with ro never show the primary endings. Where there are two or more instances of the various recurrent verbs on one stone, the pattern is that ro never occurs twice and that the primary endings never occur twice. It is also possible for verbs to have neither feature. The other preverbs—tē(e) being the most frequent of these—never occur twice in one text either.

§ 4. The verbal expressions thus appear to avoid marked agreement. By contrast, the forms that are recognizable as names by their Celtic and/or Palaeohispanic analogues often occur with another element in exact formal agreement: dative ablative plural pairs in -bōo + -bōo, masculine pairs ending in -u + -u, and feminine in -a + -a or -e + -e. I take these doublets as co-ordinative or dvandva compounds to be translated with ‘and’. The masculine and feminine forms are inflected as nominative/accusative duals and can be the subjects of plural verbs.

§ 5. The most common of the forms resembling Indo-European verbs is naṝk‘etṭi, naṝk‘entṭi, and numerous other endings. This stem never occurs with a prefix resembling a Celtic or Indo-European preposition, but naṝk‘entṭi can be preceded by the segment bɔa.

The complete minimal text ak‘ōlrios naṝk‘etṭi resembles a masculine name, o-stem nominative singular, followed by a present-tense active verb, 3rd person singular. In the light of the probably funerary function of the corpus, naṝk‘etṭi would mean, or at least function, as ‘rests, remains, lies’ or the like.

bɔa before naṝk‘entṭi could stand phonetically for | ma | and thus be equivalent to Old Irish ma ‘if’. Etymologically, this has been related to the Vedic enclitic sma and Greek μήν used in oaths. Both forms added affirmative force to a statement. The recurrent bɔa naṝk‘entṭi could thus mean something like ‘so they now rest [here]’.
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§ 6. In the longer inscriptions, there are variations on a recurrent formula (cf. De Hoz 2010, 400). The most common elements and sequence of this are as follows:

1. name of deceased (often including two substantives in concord),
2. \( \text{uar}(n)\text{baan} \) (once \( \text{uabaan} \)),
3. \( \text{t\text{e}(e)}\cdot\text{ro-b\text{are}} \),
4. \( (\text{b\text{a}})\text{na\text{rkeentii}} \).

My working interpretation of this formula is: 

'[This grave or death (understood)] has carried away \((\text{de\text{ro-b\text{are}}})\) the deceased X=and=Y to the highest destination \((\text{\text{uar.man}} < *u(p)\text{er.m\text{am}}); (\text{so})\) they now rest [here]. \na\text{rkeentii} or one of its variants frequently ends the statement as a formulaic closing, although this is not always the case, and in some of the longer inscriptions there can be an 'amplification' after \na\text{rkeentii}.

§ 7. For formula words 2 and 3, preceding \((\text{b\text{a}})\text{na\text{rkeentii}}\), an Early Welsh analogue is worth noting. In the canon of poems generally classed as the earlier or historical content of the 14th-century manuscript known as the 'Book of Taliesin' ('Llyfr Taliesin', National Library of Wales, Peniarth 2), 'Dadolwch Vryen' is addressed to the 6th-century ruler Urien Rheged. Anticipating his patron's death, this 'historical Taliesin' declaims:

\[ \text{namyn y} \text{D\text{uw vchaf} | ny-s dioferaf} \] ‘except to the highest God I will not give (< carry) him away’. The key words and concepts in these lines are \( \text{vchaf} < *u(p)\text{amo-} \)'highest' (= Hispano-Celtic Uxama) and \( \text{dioferaf} < *d\text{i-}u(p)\text{o-ber-} \)'carry away'. So the Welsh Cynfardd (earliest poet), like the Tartessian epigraphers, articulates the wish for his patron to be carried off at death to the highest destination. And they use cognate vocabulary to express these ideas. I would see the parallel as a shared inheritance with the following reconstructable starting point:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{vchaf} &< *u(p)\text{amo-} \quad \text{highest} \quad (=\text{Hispano-Celtic Uxama}) \\
\text{dioferaf} &< *d\text{i-}u(p)\text{o-ber-} \quad \text{carry away} \\
\text{uar}(n)\text{baan} &/\text{uabaan} \\
\text{y}\text{D\text{uw vchaf}} &< *u(p)\text{er.m\text{am}} \quad \text{highest} \quad (=\text{Hispano-Celtic Uxama}) \\
\end{align*} \]

The chief poetic elaboration in the Welsh is the double negation. The underlying, and no doubt earlier, formulation would be the straightforward 'to the highest (deity) carry him off'.

§ 8. When one or more of the formula words are missing in an SW inscription, their place sometimes appears to be taken by forms that have a similar grammatical...
cal form or arguably have a similar sense, or both: such as, a different accusative of destination or some other expression of a sublime afterlife, a different verb expressing conveyance or deliverance of the deceased grammatically marked as completed action, or a different present-tense verb expressing the current repose of the deceased. Thus, the essential logical content is preserved. For example, in the long and complete, but now lost, inscription from Alcalá del Río near Seville (J.53.1), uar\(n\)b\(a\)n 'highest destination' is absent, but we find orb\(a\) set\(a\), possibly meaning ‘inherited resting place’ or ‘highest resting place’, compare Old Welsh gworsed. te(e)·ro·b\(a\)re ‘has taken away’ is absent; k\(e\)·t\(e\)·ua·rat\(e\) ‘has delivered to’ < ‘has run under (with) towards’ (compare Old Irish furráith, Old Welsh guo·raut < *u(p)o·r\(t\)e) arguably expresses the same notion in the same tense and person. There is no nařk\(e\)nt\(i\), but instead lak\(e\)nt\(i\) (possibly ‘they lie down’ or ‘they are now lain down’) precedes the co-ordinative compound naming the deceased rařa=k\(a\)še\(t\)ana ‘Rařa (and) the bronze minister’.

§ 9. Why are these verbs (most often in the second clause and) with present marking nařk\(e\)nt\(i\), &c., usually 3rd person plural? I see more than one possibility. First, the name of the deceased is often expressed with two, or sometimes three, names in agreement, often inflected like nominative/accusative duals. Whether these naming phrases referred to one or more persons, they were probably not singular grammatically. Secondly, the idea of the formula is, I think, that the deceased has been carried away by the memorialized grave to the highest place, state, or deity: so ‘they’ (the mortal and the immortal grave and/or the sublime) now rest together.

§ 10. The recurrent uar\(n\)b\(a\)n | uar\(a\)n, which I take as an accusative of destination, could refer to an ideal or actual place. The variant uab\(a\)n | uaman is the exact cognate of Ōuāμa, the ancient name of a settlement below the highest summit of the south-western Celtici. But in some of the variants of the formula in which uar\(n\)b\(a\)n is absent, there may be a feminine personage instead. For example, my interpretation of the text with warrior relief of Abóboda 1 (J.12.1) is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iru}=\text{alk\(u\)} & \quad \text{sie}: \text{nařk\(e\)nt\(i\)} & \quad \text{mub\(a\)} & \quad \text{t\(e\)·ro·b\(a\)re} & \quad \text{pat\(a\)neat\(e\)} \\
\text{\(\bar{\text{i}}\)}\text{ir\(\bar{\text{u}}\)=Al\(\text{k}\(\bar{\text{u}}\)} & \quad \text{sie} \text{ nark\(e\)nt\(i\)} & \quad \text{Mum\(\alpha\) de·ro\(\bar{\text{b}}\)\(\text{a\)re} & \quad \text{pat\(a\)neat\(e\)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘She who is nurturer to the winged one (i.e. she who feeds the [battle-field] bird and the armed warrior [as pictured]) has carried the hero and Alkos away, these men (who) now rest [here].’

On | Mum\(\alpha\) pataneat\(e\) | ‘foster-mother to the winged one’, compare Sanas Cormaic’s
Búanann Mume na Fian ‘B. Foster-mother of the warband’. On the warrior armed with short spears as wingèd, Welsh aer-edeinauc ‘winged in slaughter’ expresses this idea in Y Gododdin.

§ 11. In the inscription from Monte Nova do Visconde—beetisai tée•baarentii iru≡{u}arb•u i el nařrk•en: ušnee — the stem b•ar- occurs with the primary ending -entii. From this example, it appears that this usage excludes ro with b•arentii. The other verb has the form nařrk•en:, rather than the frequent nařk•entii. There is thus a reversal in forms, though the usual sequence remains. t•ee (probably | d¢ | ‘away from’, possibly with an enclitic infix here) is compatible with primary b•arentii.

§ 12. Proto-Indo-European *pro was high frequency and had many non-temporal meanings. This situation continued with both the Goidelic and Brittonic reflexes of *pro. Therefore, as Celtic *(p)ro had functions other than tense, its close contrastive relationship with the primary endings might have provided an analogical basis for extending the opposition outside the tense system.

The ‘Mealha Nova 1’ inscription (J.18.1) has ro in a nominal compound, in concord with the name of the deceased. This excludes ro from the usual formula t•e-ro-b•are:

b•ot•ieana= k•ert•o =ro•b•a t•e-b•are b•a nařk•entii

| Bōd•eana= kerdo ≡ro,mā de-bāre; ma narkenti |

‘[this grave] has carried away Bōd•eana ⟨and⟩ the first-born daughter of the artisan; so “they” now rest [here].’

§ 13. The inscription of Barradas (J.5.1) has no ro and only one verb, to which -ii is added:

sab•oi : ist•a|ib•o rino|b•o| anak•enak•e|ib•o iib•an b•areii

My tentative interpretation is

| samoi istzbo ri(g)anbo an(d)ogenákebo ippan bāre-i |

‘In summer, for these indwelling queens [this altar stone] has now carried offerings to ṭippā (the important place/town).’

So the usual ro and nařk•entii are absent, but the final -(i)i turns up on b•are-, as though the ending is gravitating to the only available slot.
§ 14. The contrastive pattern of ro and the primary endings possibly signifies a sequence of actions and states. ro with verbs that mostly resemble Indo-European perfects marks completed actions. Primary endings without ro, but with or without other preverbs, mark actions or states continuing through the present.

nark\textsuperscript{en} as well as nark\textsuperscript{ent}i in variants of the same Tartessian formula suggest that the *-i of the Indo-European primary endings was sometimes being lost. Note also the form ar\textsuperscript{b}ie\textsuperscript{rit}u, probably a compound verb with ar < Indo-European *peri; compare South-west Hispano-Celtic ARBRVNS ARCELTI F.

A system like that seen in the SW corpus—contrasting present-tense verbs with final -i and completed action marked by *(p)ro—was thus vulnerable at two points to a non-temporal reanalysis, producing a pattern similar to that in Old Irish:

1 the survival of lexical *(p)ro with the present tense and
2 the emergence of present-tense verb endings with apocopated 3rd person singular -t and 3rd person plural -nt.

III. TARTESSIAN AND ABSOLUTE AND CONJUNCT THEORIES

§ 15. Do the patterns in Tartessian favour or disprove any of the accounts tracing the Old Irish and early Brittonic verbal complex to their Indo-European sources? Those explanations diverge widely at two points:

1 the origins of the opposition of absolute and conjunct verb forms (a system not found in any other branch of Indo-European);
2 the non-lenition of verbs, object pronouns, and second preverbs after main-clause-initial preverbs that originally ended in a vowel.

§ 16. The explanations can be subdivided into four broad categories. Comparing these with Tartessian potentially illuminates not only what happened between Indo-European and the attested Celtic languages, but also when it happened—at the Proto-Celtic stage or later in a sub-branch nearer Old Irish.

1 Absolute and conjunct from Indo-European primary and secondary. It has long been recognized that the Old Irish pattern (absolute beir\textit{d}, conjunct ·beir; 3rd plural absolute berait, conjunct ·bera\textit{t}) can be reconstructed like Sanskrit present bharati ‘carries’ < Indo-European *b\textvar{\textit{e}}\textit{ri}ti, bharanti ‘they carry’ < *b\textvar{\textit{e}}\textit{ronti}, and á-bhara\textit{t} ‘used to carry’ < *b\textvar{\textit{e}}\textit{ret}, plural á-bhara\textit{nt} < *b\textvar{\textit{e}}\textit{ront}. In the theories of Watkins and Meid, both published in 1963, Old Irish absolute and conjunct had not lost tense as the original significance of the contrast, rather Celtic alone
reflected an early stage of Proto-Indo-European before the final *-i had become a fixed feature of present-tense endings. The Tartessian contrast of primary endings versus ro prefixed to perfects is easier to understand as a development from Indo-European as usually reconstructed than by the Watkins/Meid theories.

2 Particle theories go back to Thurneysen (1907). The most influential was Cowgill’s (1975). In these, an enclitic particle in Wackernagel’s position—i.e. second in its clause—became obligatory in most sentences in a proto-language ancestral to both Goidelic and Brittonic. Its presence produced the absolute endings for simplex verbs at the head of their sentences and non-lenition after sentence-initial preverbs. Forms and etymologies of the particle vary. As in Celtiberian and Gaulish, no ‘Cowgill’ particle announces itself in Tartessian. But the particle theories often claim relevance only for Insular Celtic and in this require a special shape for the Celtic family tree. A common thread unites particle theories with types 3 and 4 coming up. They derive the conjunct endings from the Indo-European primary endings with an apocope of final short *-i in the common ancestor of Goidelic and Brittonic. Such an apocope has possibly occurred in Tartessian naŕk*en versus naŕk*ent*i, and ro-n-b*aren versus t*ee-b*arent*i.

3 ‘Enclitic-deletion’ theories. In these (notably McCone 1979; 2006; Sims-Williams 1984) there is no particular Wackernagel’s enclitic. However, various enclitics in second position are pivotal as the proto-language or languages of Goidelic and Brittonic shift from verb-final to verb-initial order. So, an infrequent inherited type # *bereti-E . . . #, in which the enclitic has shielded the primary *-i from apocope, gives rise to the unmarked absolute-verb-initial # beirid . . . # by analogical suffix deletion. And inherited # *to-E . . . beret(i)# gives # do*bbeir . . . # by infix deletion. The changes are thus bound up with both the emergence of verb-initial syntax and the beginning of morphophonemic mutations. The key changes are explicitly late—Late Iron Age or Roman Period—and limited to Insular Celtic. But do we have something like the final stage already in Tartessian, e.g. lak*ent*i ra≡a≡kaśet*ana? However clearly not t*ee-b*arent*i or ak*olios naŕk*ent*i.

4 The prosodic theory is based on the premise that the Proto-Indo-European verb—as reflected in Vedic—was unaccented in main clauses, except in the less common type where the verb began the sentence. In Celtic the result was that the verb shows features otherwise characteristic of enclitics: early apocope of final *-i (giving rise to the conjunct verb forms in non-initial position) and doubling of initial consonants. So unlenited do*bbeir < *tό beret(i) has the same enclitic gemination as do-t ‘to thy’ and do-m(m) ‘to my’. Since I published this
idea in 1987, developments include De Hoz’s (1997) conclusion that it accounted better for the Continental Celtic evidence than the alternatives. Hock (2005) argues that the unaccented verb of Vedic and the apocope creating the conjunct series are both results of universal tendencies for sentential intonation to cause sentence-final words to lose their word accent and for unaccented words to lose final sounds. So, the Vedic enclitic verb and Old Irish conjunct series are both consequences of Proto-Indo-European verb-final basic order.

§ 17. As I see it now, the Tartessian evidence is most compatible with the ‘enclitic-deletion’ or ‘prosodic’ explanations, but doesn’t conclusively prove either or exclude all alternatives. Though suggesting the Indo-European primary endings as the source of the absolute series, the relevant forms seem to mark the Tartessian present tense, ruling out the similar approaches of Watkins and Meid. *nařk’ent'i* and *nařk’en*, *tee-b’arent’i* and *ro-n-b’aren* suggest apocope of final *-i* as a factor. But there is no obvious ‘Cowgill’ particle.

In very broad outline, it might now be possible to glimpse a succession of stages: (1) the primary-secondary opposition marking present and past tenses as usually reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, (2) an opposition of marked present-tense non-*ro*-forms contrasting with marked perfect *ro*-forms as found in the SW corpus, possibly reflecting the Proto-Celtic situation, (3) the absolute and conjunct opposition observable in Old Irish, which still has some relation to the tense-aspect system, particularly in the matter of the *ro*-forms.