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Common Ground and Progress on the Celtic of the South-western (SW) Inscriptions

by

John T. Koch

INTRODUCTION

A special importance can be claimed for the 90–100 inscriptions in the South-western Palaeohispanic script.¹ This corpus, the script and language of which are also known as 'Tartessian', date to the earlier Iron Age. The most securely dated example today is the stela from the necropolis of Medellín in Spain's Badajoz province. This belongs to a mature style, rather than the beginning of the series, and is assigned to the period 650–625 BC (Almagro-Gorbea 2004a; 2008). Although intrusive literacy from the eastern Mediterranean had reached Europe's Atlantic façade prior to this, the SW inscriptions represent the oldest written corpus produced by an indigenous culture west of Etruria.

Going back to Wikander in 1966 (cf. Tovar 1969), many researchers have offered Indo-European interpretations for the language of this corpus or elements of it. More recently, the proposed Indo-European features and affinities have mostly been specifically Celtic. The aim of the present work is to provide an up-to-date survey of such proposals, noting instances where more than one researcher has offered the same or similar explanations, analysing an element either as Celtic or, more generally, as Indo-European or Palaeohispanic and not incompatible with an Indo-European or specifically Celtic classification. The primary focus here is on matters of detail rather than the central question of the classification of the principal language (or matrix language) of the corpus. That debate has become sometimes a distraction,

¹ The research for this e-book was carried out as part of the project 'Atlantic Europe in the Metal Ages (AEMA) — Questions of shared language' supported by the United Kingdom's Arts and Humanities Research Council (grant AH/K002600/1). As a member of the AEMA project research team, Dr Fernando Fernández Palacios made the invaluable contribution of compiling most of the Palaeohispanic evidence used as comparanda here. I am very grateful to Dr Carlos Jordán Cólera for detailed comments on the typescript. The interpretations and any remaining shortcomings are my own.
obscuring points of agreement and areas of potential collaborative progress among researchers who recognize Celtic elements but hold different views about the matrix language (Celtic versus non-Celtic probably non-Indo-European) or have expressed no view on the matrix language.2

Recent work has modified the status quaestionis. Notes on the Decipherment of Tartessian as Celtic (2015) by the American linguist Terrence Kaufman could be counted as a sustained argument—at viii + 526 pages—for the classification of the language of SW corpus as Celtic. Regarding this core issue, Kaufman recognizes common ground:

... part of Koch's summing up of his conclusions and accomplishments runs: '[It is not hard to see that the SW corpus contains Celtic names.]3 It is not hard to see that the matrix language contains forms that look like Indo-European verbs and preverbs re, ro, and ar.4 Combined, these categories make up more than half the corpus and are consistent with a particular classification.' [Koch 2014b, 400–1] This is entirely correct and is the reason that Koch needs to be credited for showing that Tartessian is Celtic.5 (Kaufman 2015, 19, cf. 525)

Kaufman (2015, 9) also provides a detailed account of how the distinguished Celticist and Indo-Europeanist, Eric Hamp, reached the conclusion that Tartessian is Celtic in 2010. This view of Hamp's also figured in his updated Indo-European family tree (Hamp 2013).6 Several proposals in Kaufman's book are attributed to personal communication with Hamp. Thus, in effect, we are informed that there now exists a school of thought for whom the Celticity of the SW language has been established.

The seminar of Werner Nahm, 'Is Tartessian Celtic?', given at the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies in October 2015, presented work carried out independently

---

2 Readers interested in the classification controversy as of a few years ago can see the series of articles by Joseph Eska, Blanca Prósper, Miguel Valério, and myself in Journal of Indo-European Studies 42 (2014). The three other writers focus on areas of disagreement with my work. However, Eska allows that there are Celtic elements in the corpus and Prósper writes of its numerous Celtic names. As this series of papers was recent and included my response, it won't be recapitulated here.

3 In Kaufman's quotation from my 2014 article, the first sentence of the original text is restored in brackets above, because otherwise the 'combined categories' would make up less than a half of the corpus.

4 Throughout this e-book, I have, to avoid confusion, rewritten romanizations of SW Celtic and reconstructions of Proto-Celtic and Proto-Indo-European, by Kaufman and the various other researchers, so as to conform to the conventions used here and in my earlier work.

5 Although gratifying to be credited in this way, it is somewhat misleading for the complicated history of this particular question. In stating a case for the Celticity of the SW language, I was reviving and developing a hypothesis first put forward by Correa in the 1980s and early 1990s (which he subsequently modified, though never completely reversed), was allowed as possible by Untermann (1995; MLH IV) with further detail and regarded as more likely than any alternative by Jordán Cólera (2004; 2007) and others, before I began work on the corpus.

6 I first became aware of Hamp's interest in and views on Tartessian in conversations with the late R. Geraint Gruffydd, in spring 2011, at which time I sent a pre-publication typescript for Tartessian 2 to Hamp.
of Kaufman and Hamp and was made public at nearly the same time as Kaufman 2015 appeared. It is therefore significant that this seminar expressed agreements on several matters of detail, as well as the general conclusion, concerning the Indo-European, specifically Celtic, classification.

Notwithstanding the foregoing points, the Celtic classification of the SW language is not the primary focus of Kaufman’s monograph. He sees the matter as already well enough established. So, it is time to move on to a second set of questions: Where can the grammatical and etymological interpretations be improved or confirmed? What is the content of the lexicon and grammar? What do the inscriptions say and what can that tell us about the cultural history of the region? What light does this new evidence throw on the evolution of Proto-Celtic from Proto-Indo-European? In Koch 2011 (§46.2) and speaking only for myself, I wrote that my personal research on the SW corpus had reached a similar stage.

Until the step past, or around, the classification debate can be taken, progress with the corpus will be limited and somewhat superficial. The focus necessarily remains on the most unambiguously Celtic-looking material in the corpus (against the allegedly least Celtic-looking material cited against it) in order to demonstrate the classification, reminding readers of examples recognized years ago. As a result, apart from telling us that there is Celtic material in the SW corpus, the classification debate can tell us little that we did not already know. We see in the corpus what we’ve seen before, but now in a different time, place, and writing system. But, as a school of thought concerning the Celticity of the corpus gathers, it becomes possible to shift

7 I was unable to attend the seminar, but Professor Nahm kindly sent me the file. Though Nahm accepts the Celtic decipherment of the language, he objects (not uniquely or without reason) to applying the term ‘Tartessian’ to the SW language: ‘Conclusion: On the whole, Koch seems to be right ... Town names with suffixes *ipo* (e.g. *Olisipo* = Lisbon) and *uba* (e.g. *Corduba* = Córdoba), with prefix *Ip-*, *Ipo-* (*Iptuci*, *Ipsca*, *Ipocobulcola*), personal and geographical names starting with *Sis-* (e.g. *Sisapo*) are regarded as remainders of a non-Indo-European, non-Iberian language in the Tartessian territory. Perhaps the Espanca “Abekatu” was used for that language. If texts will be discovered, it will be a shame if the name Tartessian is no longer available, but a book with the title *Cunetian* or similar might be less popular. Nevertheless I regard the choice of the name “Tartessian” for the newly discovered Celtic language as the least satisfactory aspect of his impressive work.’ (Contra ‘Tartessian’, cf. also Brandherm 2016.) Let us urge, in any event, that publications on the SW language and script, whatever name for them is preferred by the author, include ‘Tartessian’ as a key word. One of the more avoidable, though real, obstacles to progress on the subject is the difficulty in searching for relevant literature due to the variety of terms in use. It should also be remembered that the probable Celticity of the name of the historical Arqanthonios king of Tartessos (see below s.n. *Ἀργανθωνιος*) does not by itself prove that he, let alone his subjects, spoke a Celtic language; on the other hand, it certainly does not prove they did not.

8 On the other side of the debate, a converse but similarly arrested state is observable. So, recent assertions against Celtic as the SW matrix language—some of them lengthy—concede a substantial Celtic element in the corpus, but without specifying the acceptably Celtic items, let alone considering the affinities and implications of this material. Are they closer to reconstructed Proto-Celtic or one of the attested Celtic languages? Or do they define a unique sub-branch? So long as the focus remains on the matrix-language debate, such significant questions remain offstage.
from the more secure examples and features to the more difficult. And it is only these
that can tell us things we did not already know about Celtic and its evolution from
Proto-Indo-European.

Appearing at about the same time as the overviews of the language by Kaufman
and Nahm, Woudhuizen (2014/15)\(^9\) took an approach that is unusual in three signif-
icant ways. First, he innovates from the standard Correa/Untermann phonetic key
for the romanization of some of the SW signs. Second, he allows breaks in scriptio
continua between the graphemes for the stop consonants (i.e. those romanized \(t^\circ\)
\(t\) \(t\) \(t\) \(t\), &c.) and the following vowel with which they agree (i.e. \(a\) \(e\) \(i\) \(o\) \(u\)). Third,
he regards the SW corpus as including examples written as late as the early Roman
period and thus in some cases incorporating usages borrowed from the Celtiberian
script of those times, as well as references to that later political situation. As a result,
Woudhuizen’s readings and interpretations are frequently unique. Nonetheless, his
article accepts or arrives at several of the same specific Celtic interpretations as well
as the conclusion that the language of the corpus is Celtic overall.

Prior to the outputs of 2015 and my own earlier work, several noted researchers
in Palaeohispanic studies had, over a period of thirty years, recognized the presence
of Celtic-looking forms in the SW corpus. Therefore, it will be useful in the present
account to include also the identifications proposed in this earlier research, where
these have continued to be viewed favourably and have thus contributed to developing
areas of agreement. Much of this earlier published work included lists of Celtic-
looking items. Thus the aim of this study is to take stock of these areas of consensus
so as to provide a useful baseline or checklist for future research by taking note of
specific interpretations that have seemed promising to two or more researchers. It
should be mentioned also that, as well as the work that will be most useful here,
several publications have acknowledged the existence of this Celtic material without
repeating any examples or identifying new ones (e.g. Lorrio & Ruiz Zapatero 2005;
Fortson 2009; Maier 2012).\(^{10}\)

Despite what might now be seen as a sufficiency of published recognition, a
coherent Celtic interpretation of the corpus—as could be integrated into historical
and comparative Celtic and Indo-European studies—has been slow to take shape,
even provisionally. Amongst the approaches favouring Celtic names in a non-Celtic
matrix language, Villar’s (2004) proposal that SW Celtic was early Gaulish would
have important implications for the history of the Celtic languages as a whole and
could be investigated further. Even allowing only the presence of Celtic elements, that
nonetheless entails linguistic evidence comparable to that of the Old Indic words and
names found in documents from the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Mitanni in present-

\(^9\) Cf. also Woudhuizen 1998/1999.

\(^{10}\) Broderick 2010 had also recapitulated many of the proposals in Koch 2009. Although he
evidently thought the interpretation sufficiently worthwhile to merit an extended epitome,
Broderick, unlike Kaufman and Nahm, does not make clear how far he was endorsing the
approach in general or in its particulars.
day northern Syria, which have long been recognized as crucial for the study of Vedic Sanskrit and the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-Iranian.

In the interest of inclusiveness and aware of controversies over the name ‘Tartessian’, the term ‘South-western Celtic (SW Celtic)’ might be preferable for two reasons: it avoids the toxic T-word and can accommodate either the position Celtic is the proven primary language of SW corpus or merely there is a recognized Celtic element in the SW corpus.

Most of those elements of the SW corpus for which there has been some agreement over their identification as Celtic, or at least as Indo-European, are identified and explained in the list of the individual lexemes below. However, there are four general aspects of Kaufman’s approach that affect numerous items and the overall interpretation. So they are better dealt with at this point. The first two are problematical for reasons explained. The third and fourth are acceptable and present significant potential for further progress.

1. Kaufman doubts many of the identifications of forms in the corpus previously recognized as Celtic names, advancing instead new proposals as verbs, nominal compounds, and so on. If correct, this would be ironic, amounting to a rejection of some of the identifications that led in the first place to the breakthrough of Correa’s ‘Posibles antropónimos en las inscripciones en escritura del SO. (o tartesia)’ (1989). But irony avoidance is no part of a scientific methodology.

An overview of the indigenous personal names of the region with briga place-names (i.e. the Indo-European zone of the Iberian Peninsula) during the Roman period is more decisive in this connection. The list of names and name elements that recur many times across this region, or wide areas of it, is limited, a few dozen. For example, there are many repeated instances of Ambatos, Tirtos, Turos, and their variants across the briga zone. Lengthy lists of comparanda from this material have been included below to convey some idea of its nature and extent. This distribution implies a longstanding stable onomastic system. That this name stock shows regional dialectal variation in its phonology and make up, considered along with its overall continuity and density across the briga zone, is certainly consistent with discovering an earlier state of the same system already in place in the Early Iron Age. It is, time and time again, this finite stock of pre-Roman Indo-European Palaeohispanic names for which striking resemblances have been found in the SW corpus. As argued (Koch 2014b; 2014c), it is, as a matter of statistical probability, essentially impossible that the standard Correa/Untermann phonetic key for the SW script could be incorrect in some fundamental way but have so often produced by coincidence forms resembling one particular language. It is likewise incredible for these forms repeatedly to resemble by coincidence the pre-Roman language spoken in the same region 500 to 1,000 years later. It would be still more incredible had a stable system of a few dozen Hispano-Celtic personal names been preceded in the same region by a corpus (of funerary inscriptions!), in which again and again forms resembling the names appeared (e.g. anb’at’ia,
tuirea), but those older forms were not names, the resemblances being coincidental. As is clear from the annotated alphabetical list of SW forms below, the consensus in the published scholarship is particularly broad in the area of Palaeohispanic onomastics with Celtic comparanda. As well as accepting that SW forms that have been recognized as closely resembling Palaeohispanic and/or Ancient Celtic names probably are names, we should also consider as inherently promising etymological explanations that can plausibly link Palaeohispanic and/or Ancient Celtic name stock to regular Indo-European and Celtic vocabulary.

2. Kaufman argues that Proto-Celtic preposition and preverb *u(p)o should invariably be reflected as Tartessian o and *u(p)er as uar ‘no matter what Welsh does’ (2015, 18). It is not just Welsh that implies otherwise. As well as the Brythonic reflex of Proto-Celtic *u(p)er-*tegerno- being written Vertigernus, Guorthigern, Gvarthigern, and Gwrtheyrn, we find one word written both DIVERTOMV and DIVORTOM- on the Gaulish calendar of Coligny, VARCONIS occurs for the reflex of *u(p)er-kunos in Noricum. Taking an overview of the evidence (see Koch 2011,
§70.2, it can be seen that Proto-Celtic *u(p)o- is reflected as both *ua and *uo in Gaulish, and likewise Brythonic, often for the same word or name, and that Proto-Celtic *u(p)er is reflected in both languages variously as *uer, *uor, and *uar. More to the present point, the evidence of Celtiberian VERAMOS (K.3.18; HEP, 9, 557 — Peñalba de Villastar; Teruel) right alongside VORAMOS (K.3.7; HEP, 9, 545 — Peñalba de Villastar; Teruel) (both from Proto-Celtic *u(p)eramo-s) shows that such variations occurred also in Hispano-Celtic. That implies, as comparative evidence, that the multiple reflexes go back to Proto-Celtic, rather than arising in the post-Proto-Celtic dialects. The source of the variations is not purely phonological; rather, the reflexes of *u(p)o ‘under, &c.’ and *u(p)er ‘over, &c.’ and their derivatives have contaminated one another analogically. Most relevant for our purposes, an ancient place-name of the south-western Iberian Peninsula preserves the most archaic way of saying ‘highest’ in Celtic: Οὐαμα Uama and the local group name Latinized as VAMENSI applied to a settlement (Luján 2001, 279; Villar 2004, 259–60; Falileyev et al. 2010, 228 — Salvatierra de los Barros, Badajoz) in the territory of the south-western Celtici are situated high on the massif within the great bend of the Anas/Guadiana; cf. SW uab*an | uamām | (J.16.5), and Lepontic UVAMO- (Prestino), likewise from Proto-Celtic *u(p)m,mo-/ā, with diagnostically Celtic weakening and loss of *p. Thus, when the SW formula word uar(n)b*an | uar,mām is explained as the phonological reflex of Proto-Celtic *u(p)m,er,āmām (feminine accusative singular), this is not the whole story. uar(n)b*an is also the analogical replacement of the obsolete lexeme uamā-. We cannot now be certain whether the first a of uar(n)b*an is the result of sound law or analogy or a combination. In any event, the Celtiberian evidence tells us that the variants VERAMO- and VORAMO- were also in use — either across the entire briga zone or just regionally towards the east. The latter form itself is probably due to the analogical influence of *u(p)o.

3. Largely on the basis of the absence of grapheme for /m/ in the original and more basic form of the SW writing system, Kaufman proposes that this earliest Palaeohispanic script was first devised (from the Phoenician script, as widely held) to write an indigenous non-Indo-European language akin to Basque. Pre-Basque/Aquitanian did apparently lack the phoneme /m/. This absence — found in only a minority of the languages of the world — is also characteristic of the extinct Iberian language of the Mediterranean side of the Peninsula. Iberian was in general phonologically similar to Pre-Basque/Aquitanian.11 In other words,

11 The possibility that Aquitanian/Basque and Iberian were genetically related, i.e. descended from a common proto-language, has yet to be decisively proved or disproved (cf. Ferrer i Jané 2009; Gorrochategui 2013b). That they had a typological similarity, particularly in matters of phonetics and phonology, is superficially apparent (cf. Trask 1997; Egurtzegi 2013). This could be the result of prolonged contact in geographical proximity in later prehistory. Ballester (2001; cf. Jordán 2015, 333–5) proposes this era of contact took place immediately north of the Pyrenees, with both languages subsequently expanding southwards into their historical territories. It is likely that both languages lost ground to Indo-European in later prehistory.
the absence of the phoneme /m/ was characteristic of the indigenous non-
Indo-European languages of south-west Europe (cf. Gorrochategui 2013a, 52).
On the other hand, because words beginning with r- or r̠- were not possible in
the Iberian language, even beginning the second element of compounds, and the
situation was the same for the reconstructed Pre-Basque (*r and *R), the several
SW syntagmata beginning with ro- show that the language of the corpus was not
itself of the 'Vasco-Iberian' type. Cf. also raha, rinoebo̱, and eḵu-řine in the SW
word-list below. It is necessary to recognize and distinguish the characteristics
imposed by the history and nature of the script from the underlying language.

Because the Phoenicians surely landed in Mediterranean Spain before the
major Tyrian presence could be established at Huelva and environs on the
Atlantic by c. 900 BC (González de Canales et al 2004; 2006; 2008; Torres 2008),12
or coming into contact with the core area of the SW inscriptions further west and
further north, it is inherently likely that Palaeohispanic writing was first devised
in the non-Indo-European zone to the east (cf. Koch 2011, §131). Therefore, I'm now
willing to accept this as the stronger hypothesis, rather than a direct transference
of the literacy from the eastern Mediterranean to the Indo-European zone in the
western Peninsula.

If it is then agreed that the SW script in its original form, as reflected in the
epigraphic formula (on which see below), could not represent /m/, this conclusion
has further implications. In writing an Indo-European language that did have
the phoneme /m/, such as Celtic, and without drastically revamping the first
Palaeohispanic signary and its phonetic values, a few strategies were available.
These would be similar to those used a few centuries later when borrowed
Celtic names were written in Iberian script and the same problems arose, e.g.
katubaře (B.1.373, 1 — Ensérune, Hérault, France, c. 3rd century BC) for Gaulish
Katumāro-. It is important, however, to draw a distinction between Celtic names
borrowed into the Iberian language and then written in Iberian script as against
a Celtic language written in a script adapted for a language of Vasco-Iberian type.

As Correa (1994, 269) points out, Celtic o-stems borrowed into Iberian are found
with the ending -e, and jo-stems with -i: for example, asedile (B.1.45) < Gaulish
Adsedilos, eşkinke (B.1.268, MLH II, 47) < Gaulish Excīngus /ɛxskingoς/, likine
< Celtiberian likinos, katulati (to be read katuladi) < Gaulish *Katu-ladi̯os. On
the other hand, SW ṯirṯos (J.1.2) and aḵojoś (J.56.1) retain the Indo-European
endings of masculine o-stem and jo-stem nominatives singular, implying that they
belong to statements in an Indo-European language. If we compare an inscription
from the Roman period like DEIBABO NEMVCELAIČABO FVSCINVS FVSCI F. / V.

12 The Ría de Huelva deposition of the 10th century BC shows that the place was already a
major maritime hub before a permanent Phoenician presence was established there (Ruiz-
Gálvez 1995a; 1995b). Therefore, it is likely that more than one indigenous language had
been lately in use in Huelva at the time the prototype of the SW script was devised. Af-
ter the horizon of the deposition, contacts with the (arguably incipiently Celtic) Atlantic
Bronze Age world fell off precipitously (Burgess 2012).
L. A. S. (AE 1987, 159, 562 g; HEp 2, 839; Búa 1997, 60; Vallejo 2013 — Aguas Frias, Chaves, Vila Real), using Roman letters and combining indigenous gods’ names and case forms with Latin, something different is involved. The native datives plural in -BO stand apart in the syntax, effectively forming a bipartite statement; even so, the blending involves two ancient Western Indo-European languages with clearly cognate declensional systems. The analogy with inscriptions of this type is imprecise for the idea that the SW corpus comprises Indo-European names inflected as Indo-European, showing a variety of case forms, in a non-Indo-European matrix language.

In the SW script, at the beginning or interior of a word, the b-series of signs was used for /m/. These signs required a following vowel, and therefore could not end a word: $b^2a$ $b^e$ $b^i$ $b^o$ $b^u$. In the interior of words, it was also possible to represent phonetic nasalization as well as the labial quality of /m/ by writing $n$ followed by the b-series with the required redundant vowel: $nb^a$ $nb^e$ $nb^i$ $nb^o$ $nb^u$. However, this strategy had the disadvantage of ambiguity, as it also represented the cluster /mb/, as in, for example, $anb^a$t$\check{a}i$ | $Amba(\chi)t\check{a}i$ | ‘daughter of Amba(χ)tos’. There are a few SW inscriptions making use of signs that resemble symbols for /m/ occurring in the less archaic versions of the Phoenician alephat and the Iberian and Celtiberian scripts, $n$ and $\check{n}$, respectively. These two signs are mostly confined to the beginning of words, marginal to the system overall, and never appear in the traditional epigraphic formula (on which see below).

At the end of words, neither of the first two strategies was possible. $b^2a$ $b^e$ $b^i$ $b^o$ $b^u$ and $nb^a$ $nb^e$ $nb^i$ $nb^o$ $nb^u$ had to represent a syllable and could not stand for a non-syllabic sound at the end of a word. The uncommon signs $n$ and $\check{n}$ were not used at the end of words. On the other hand, $n$ was part of the basic system and commonly occurs at the end of a word. In many cases, SW-n corresponds to an etymological Proto-Celtic final */-m/, which would have been preserved as -m in Celtiberian. For example, the SW forms that Untermann recognized as genitive plural kindred names, $liirnest$ $\check{a}kuun$ (J.19.1) and $taarnekuun$ (J.26.1), corresponding to Celtiberian -Vkum; similarly the formula word $uar(n)b^a$an | Celtiberian (masculine) VERAMOM (K.3.11 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel). Such examples have been thought to show that the SW Celtic language had innovated, like Gaulish and in contrast to Celtiberian, with a sound law that changed inherited final */-m/ to */-n/ written -n. That remains possible. However, the SW script originally had no sign for /m/ and the strategy of employing $b^2a$ $b^e$ $b^i$ $b^o$ $b^u$ or $nb^a$ $nb^e$ $nb^i$ $nb^o$ $nb^u$ could not be used at the end of a word. Therefore, it now seems unnecessary to posit a sound law whereby the SW Celtic language had evolved, at an early date, like Gaulish and away from Celtiberian, by turning inherited *-m to *-n. It is more probable that final -n was merely a strategy for representing the *-m reconstructed in this position for Proto-Celtic and found written -m in Celtiberian. Note that preceding another word in close phrases, Proto-Celtic final */-m/ was probably realized phonetically.

---

13 Cf. Iberian kanbul-o-ilereuti (B.7.34, 14 — Pech Mahó, Aude, France, 3rd century BC) probably containing Gaulish Kamulo-.
as *[-n] before dentals and *[-ŋ] before velars. Therefore, ]liirnest*ak*un (J.19.1), ]t*arneku*un (J.26.1), and uar(n)b*an can be understood as probably representing [Liranestākūn], [Taranēkūn], and [uar,nām] in a less innovative than previously thought Ancient Celtic language. To summarize the present proposal, in SW Celtic the phoneme /m/ was represented as follows.

a. in word-initial position, including initially in the second element in compounds—
(originally):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{baa}- & \text{ A} \hspace{1em} \text{b*e}- \text{ O} \hspace{1em} \text{b*i}- \text{ Y} \hspace{1em} \text{b'o}- \text{ a} \hspace{1em} \text{b'u}- \text{ Y} \\
\text{m} & \text{ M} \hspace{1em} \text{m} & \text{ M}
\end{align*}
\]
(subsequently also):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{m} & \text{ M} \hspace{1em} \text{m} & \text{ M}
\end{align*}
\]

b. in word-internal position:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{-baa}- & \text{ A} \hspace{1em} \text{-b*e}- \text{ O} \hspace{1em} \text{-b*i}- \text{ Y} \hspace{1em} \text{-b'o}- \text{ a} \hspace{1em} \text{-b'u}- \text{ Y} \\
\text{-nbaa}- & \text{ A} \hspace{1em} \text{-nb*e}- \text{ O} \hspace{1em} \text{-nb*i}- \text{ Y} \hspace{1em} \text{-nb'o}- \text{ a} \hspace{1em} \text{-nb'u}- \text{ Y}
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{-n} & \text{ Y}
\end{align*}
\]

c. in word-final position:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{-n} & \text{ Y}
\end{align*}
\]

4. In the SW corpus, forms that contained the Proto-Celtic diphthongs *ou (< Proto-Indo-European *ou and *eu) and *ei (< Proto-Indo-European *ei, though this was possibly already *ē in Proto-Celtic or least widely in the Ancient Celtic languages) are written o and e. In Koch 2013a, for example, it was assumed that this usage reflected an actual phonological change, that Proto-Indo-European *ou and *eu had become Tartessian /ō/ and Proto-Indo-European *ei had become */ē/. Kaufman believes that Proto-Celtic */ou/ and */ei/ were retained but conventionally represented as o and e in the SW writing system. This seems likely (especially o for /ou/) and, in line with the previous point, opens a possibility. Although Iberian texts contain forms representing a diphthong ei, the language did not seem to have had a phonemic diphthong /ou/ or, if it did, it was rare. The same observations holds for the less extensive remains of Aquitanian, and the phonemic diphthong /ou/ is wholly absent from reconstructed Pre-Basque (Trask 1997, 166). Therefore, it is possible that Kaufman is correct in this interpretation, especially with regards to Proto-Celtic */ou/ represented by Tartessian o, and furthermore that this would be another example of a feature carried over with the SW script from its earlier history representing a neighbouring non-Indo-European language.

Accepting Kaufman’s proposals 3 and 4 above together implies a major conclusion as follows. The first Palaeohispanic script was devised, largely on the basis of an early West Semitic alephat as used by the Phoenicians, to write an indigenous non-Indo-European language of the eastern, Mediterranean-facing Peninsula. Afterwards,
this primitive Palaeohispanic script was applied to an Indo-European language in
the west (i.e. SW Celtic) without a second major reformation. In other words, new
graphemes were not added, at least not initially, to accommodate phonemes in SW
language that did not exist in Iberian (and Aquitanian/Palaeo-Basque), nor were
surplus signs reassigned to adapt systematically to the new phonemic inventory.
The initial creative impulse behind the invention of the first Palaeohispanic script
was not sustained or reignited. This would not be surprising. It is, rather, the first
major revamp of the alephat to create the primitive Palaeohispanic script that is
remarkable. Individuals who have been taught to write only one language and then
attempt to write a second usually do not create new symbols or change the values of
the signs from what they have learned. The result is usually that the second language
is represented less accurately, until a second innovator with enough imagination,
disdain for tradition, and polyglot learning intervenes.

Taking an overview of the several versions of the Palaeohispanic script, their
comparative characteristics imply that they were not flexibly redesigned to write
the different indigenous languages. The four main versions—SW or Tartessian,
SE or Meridional, NE or Levantine or Iberian, and Celtiberian—fall into two major
subfamilies: the SW and SE signaries differ little, similarly NE and Celtiberian. In
observing this alignment, Ballester (2004a) proposed that the integrity of these
two subsets should be recognized, calling them *el sureño* and *el septentrional*,
respectively. The key point presently is that this subdivision does not follow the
principal linguistic division of the pre-Roman languages. Rather, both *el sureño* and
*el septentrional* cross the Indo-European/non-Indo-European divide, i.e. the line
separating the territories of the *briga* and *ilti* place-names. Furthermore, taken as
a whole, the four Palaeohispanic scripts agree more with one another, in both their
basic structure and the forms of their individual signs, than any of them agree
with the early West Semitic alephat that was the primary basis for their common
prototype. In other words, after the initial adoption and adaptation of the alephat in
the Peninsula, Palaeohispanic writing became traditional, and did not change form
drastically even when applied to wholly unrelated language families. The situation
was, therefore, not unlike that in Cyprus, where Cypriot syllabic writing was applied
to two wholly unrelated languages—Greek and non-Indo-European Eteo-Cypriot—in
contrast to the non-native Phoenician script also in use on the island. In other words,
Palaeohispanic writing in general—like Cypriot Syllabic writing in general—was
emblematic not of linguistic affiliation, but of indigenous identity, diverse languages
native to the country (Sherratt 2003). When this is the paramount consideration, we
must be prepared to decipher corpora for which the phonetic accuracy of the writing
systems was of secondary importance. That is another reason not to assume that,
when our romanizations of Tartessian texts appear to show systematic deviations
from comparanda of the Roman Period and reconstructed Proto-Celtic, this can only
mean that the earlier language in Palaeohispanic script had rapidly innovated then
died out.
If we accept now as the preferred working hypothesis that the immediate prototype from which SW script was derived had been customized to a non-Indo-European Palaeohispanic language, this permits a more minimalist account of the sound laws leading from Proto-Celtic to SW Celtic. In other words, some of the systematic disparities distinguishing reconstructed Proto-Celtic and the romanizations of the inscriptions can be explained as the result of constraints imposed by the script, as opposed to hypothetical sound laws. Thinking along these lines, we should suppose that the practitioners of the SW script were at considerable disadvantage in trying to represent their language with a script that was first invented for one wholly unrelated language (West Semitic) and then underwent a major reform in order to represent a second wholly unrelated language. Recognizing the likelihood of such a situation opens further possibilities for the decipherment of the SW corpus.

If it is possible that the SW writing system was regularly representing /ou/ as o, as per Kaufman, that raises a second possibility concerning the representation of the semi-vowel /yu/ in general, that is, at the beginning of syllables as well as as the second element of a diphthong. Both Kaufman and I proposed that Proto-Celtic */yu/ at the beginning of syllables was widely lost in the SW language. Kaufman defines this change as a simple loss of the segment across-the-board. My position has been—and I still think this possible—that /yu/ assimilated to the articulation of a following /e(:)/, /i(:)/, /o/ and that the resulting /ge(:)/, /gi(:)/, /go/ were then often written with the single graphemes e, i, o, whether or not they had preserved articulation as two segments. However, in instances, where /go/ (mostly from Proto-Celtic *u(p)o ‘under’) had dissimilated as /ya/, the semivowel was preserved and the group was written ua in the corpus.

With either Kaufman’s explanation or my own, the frequent disappearance of Proto-Celtic */yu/ remains one of the more striking innovations distinguishing SW Celtic from the other Ancient Celtic languages and reconstructed Proto-Celtic. However, if we now build on Kaufman’s proposal in accepting as likely that Proto-Celtic */ou/ was preserved, but written o, in Tartessian, that further suggests that the language had /yu/—distributed more-or-less as in the other Ancient Celtic languages and as inherited from Proto-Celtic—but conventionally did not write it. If so, the apparent exceptions with ua < Proto-Celtic *u(p)o can be explained not as representations of /ya/ with the semivowel written—due to an exceptional phonological treatment of this combination—but of disyllabic /u.a/ (dissimilated from */u.o/ < *u(p)o) with two vowels and hiatus. Note that most or all of the examples of ua in the corpus do not reflect Proto-Celtic */yo/, but *u(p)o and *u(p)er. Therefore, the forms do not reflect the Proto-Celtic semivowel */yu/ but the vowel *u. They had gone through a stage as disyllables with hiatus, /u.a/ and /u.ar/, which might still have been the case when SW Celtic became a written language. In other words, much of what we are seeing in the SW corpus with regards the reflexes Proto-Celtic */yu/ could be explained as the

---

14 /w/ is an alternative representation for this sound.
consistent application of a borrowed writing system that had a sign for the vowels /ū/ and /ū/, but had no sign for the semivowel /u̯/. Favouring this explanation is the fact that Iberian and Palaeo-Basque languages evidently lacked /w/, as can be shown by merely going through the corpora of Iberian and Aquitanian inscriptions, as well as Michelena’s ‘Pre-Basque’ phonemic inventory reconstructed for the later pre-Roman Iron Age (cf. Trask 1997, 126; see below).

The phonemes of Pre-Basque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fortis</th>
<th>(p)¹⁶</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>tz</th>
<th>ts</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, in taking over a writing system first devised to represent a language or languages lacking phonemic /u̯/, the epigraphers applying the script to Indo-European in the west had three alternatives:

1. invent a new sign for /u̯/,
2. use the sign u for both /uː/ and /u̯/,
3. or simply not write /u̯/ at all or (at most) sometimes suggest its presence with a copy of the following vowel sound.

The third alternative is consistent with the evidence of the SW corpus.

Anyone who has learned to read Latin or Welsh, for example, might at first pause, thinking it should have been so completely natural as to require virtually no thought to expand the values of the SW sign u, which represented [uː], to include [w], when scribes literate only in a language lacking the latter sound faced the challenge of writing a language with [w]. In other words, we expect SW u to represent both [uː] and [w], like Latin V and Welsh w, as a linguistic quasi-universal. A knowledge of Proto-Indo-European phonology might foster a similar expectation; however, in Proto-Celtic *[u] and *[w] were no longer allophonic realizations of a single phoneme */u/, as had once been the case at an early reconstructable stage of Proto-Indo-European. The experience of Welsh speakers with monoglot English speakers will dispel such assumptions. If the sounds are always distinct phonemes in your language, you must be taught to represent [uː] and [w] with the same grapheme. The idea is not inherently natural and does not arise spontaneously. A road sign to Eglwyswrw must be explained with patience.

¹⁵ However, fairly numerous Iberian forms like Iberian iunstir suggest that a phonemic palatal glide /i/ was present in that language.

¹⁶ /p/ was most probably altogether absent from reconstructed Pre-Basque, as was likewise the case, and directly observable from contemporary evidence, in Iberian.
The evidence allows the possibility that Proto-Celtic */u̯/ was lost by a regular, across-the-board phonological change in the SW language. On the other hand, the possibility that the semivowel was retained but not written offers more for understanding SW Celtic as a less atypical Ancient Celtic language, as well as for the invention of Palaeohispanic script and its application to diverse indigenous languages of the Peninsula.

If this is the preferable explanation concerning the fate of Proto-Celtic */u̯/ in the SW language, it implies similar explanations for two further labial sounds, */k̪/ and */g̪/ undoubtedly existed in Proto-Celtic. The former at least clearly survived in Celtiberian and some of the Western Hispano-Celtic dialects attested in Roman times. These phonemes were absent from Iberian and Aquitanian/Palaeo-Basque, and they were absent from the Palaeohispanic signaries. It is therefore likely that the SW language had not eliminated these Proto-Celtic phonemes by phonological change, but wrote them with the series used for the simple velars (\(k\), \(\mathfrak{k}\), \(q\), \(\mathfrak{q}\), \(g\), \(\mathfrak{g}\)) because the script was taken over without modification for the SW language after last being modified to write a language lacking phonemic labiovelars.

Further problems associated with the SW corpus that could be solved with such a theory of the script's history include the distribution of the two sibilant signs (transliterated \(s\) and \(ś\)) and the two rhotic signs (\(r\) and \(ŕ\)). It is not clear that in either case we are dealing with two different sounds, following an examination of all instances of these signs in the corpus (Koch 2011, 152–6). So, for example, there are two probable examples of the (i̯)o-stem nominative singular ending ak̪̬̬olios̄ (J.56.1) and tirt̪̬̬os̄ (J.1.2). If so, the two sibilant signs could be used interchangeably, although in a few examples the \(ś\) seems to stand for what is historically a geminate or cluster with sibilant, for example k̪̬ašèt̪̬̬ana ~ Gaulish cassidannos, iš̪̬iin̪̬k̪̬olo̪bo̪ ~ Gaulish ESCENCOLATIS. The most common of the SW formula words, nark̪̬ɛnt̪̬i and numerous variants, is once written nańr̪̬k̪̬e:n; implying that \(ń\) and \(r\) had similar or identical sounds; cf. also tv̪̬urea (J.7.8) versus tv̪̬ufeč̪u (J.14.1), ke̪̬ar̪̬ner-ion (J.7.2; §§35, 36, 80, 96, 105) versus enb̪̬r̪̬kar̪̬ne (J.17.4), ek̪̬u̪̬-ř̪̬ine (J.4.1) versus rinoeb̪̬o (J.5.1). Unlike Proto-Celtic, the Iberian language and reconstructed pre-Basque had two clearly distinct phonemic sibilants and two clearly distinct phonemic rhotics, which, at least for the latter language, were opposed fortes and lenes. A script adapted for a non-Indo-European language of this type and then transferred with minimal revision to an Ancient Celtic language could account for both the surplus and inconsistent distribution of the sibilant and rhotic signs.

There follows a partial inventory of phonemes represented in the SW script,17 as

---

17 This is based on the de facto standard of the Correa–Untermann key, followed in almost all the work cited here. The values of most signs, especially the most frequently occurring signs, are not in dispute. The variant proposals have generally followed a fundamentally different methodology, in which the standard key's output of attested Palaeohispanic names has not been accepted as confirmation. In several instances, rejection of elements of the Correa–Untermann key has been advanced as part of an argument against the Indo-European classification of the language. A tentative proposal of Rodríguez-Ramos
implied by the foregoing discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW sign and romanization</th>
<th>Phoneme(s) represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>/ā, ā/ and possibly /a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>/ē, ē/ and possibly /ei/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>/ī, ī, i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>/ō, ō, ou/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>/ǔ, û/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>/s, ss/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>/r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ř</td>
<td>/r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>/n/, /ₐn/ &lt; PIE */n̥/, */m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b, m/, (/ₐm/ &lt; PIE */m̥/) before a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>/b, m/, (/ₐm/ &lt; PIE */m̥/) before e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>/b, m/, (/ₐm/ &lt; PIE */m̥/) before i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ô</td>
<td>/b, m/, (/ₐm/ &lt; PIE */m̥/) before o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b, m/, (/ₐm/ &lt; PIE */m̥/) before u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>/k, g, kʷ, (gʷ)/ before a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>/k, g, kʷ, (gʷ)/ before e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>/k, g, kʷ, (gʷ)/ before i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>/k, g, k², (g²)/ before o; the distinction of k² (g²) vs. k (, g) possibly neutralized in this position in Hispano-Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>/k, g/ before u; the distinction of k² (g²) vs. k (, g) neutralized in this position in PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(2000), recently revived by Ferrer i Jané (2016), would reverse the phonetic values of Correa–Untermann  and  to  and . This revision is not inherently impossible. In some cases its potential results are pointed out here in the notes on interpretations. However, such a revision is on balance unnecessary. It also has some specific drawbacks, including the following. (1) The Palaeohispanic sign  can be explained as having evolved as a simplification of . With the standard key, is b⁵, the phonemic values of which include /m/ before /u, ū/. On the other hand, reading as k⁵ would leave the ancestry of unexplained. (2) It is promising to take  and  as reflecting forms of the same often-occurring SW formula word, but this correspondence would be lost if the last was transliterated  and . (3) Other forms in Correa–Untermann transliteration, such as  and  (1.23.1), would have to be regarded as closely resembling Palaeohispanic names, such as the very common ARQVIVS, by uncanny coincidence.
If the evidence is interpreted in this way, we gain three advances with the Celtic of the SW corpus. First, it reduces the examples showing Tartessian innovating from Proto-Celtic in a unique way so as to differ from the other Ancient Celtic languages. Second, it reinterprets and thus eliminates much of the evidence that would preclude regarding the SW language as the direct ancestor of the source of onomastic stock attested in the western Iberian Peninsula in Roman times. ‘Tartessian’ would no longer be seen as a cul de sac, related to the Western Hispano-Celtic attested in Roman script but having branched off from it through a remarkable series of major and early sound changes. To the contrary, there may be little to preclude applying the label ‘Old Western Hispano-Celtic’ to the SW language. Third, it reconciles features of the SW writing system that have been seen as better suited to a non-Indo-European language in general (e.g. Rodríguez Ramos 2002; 2015) or one of specifically Iberian type (Eska 2014), explaining the representation of /m/, /u/, rhotics, and sibilants as the legacy of such a language.

¶ THEORIES OF A SECOND SOURCE FOR THE PALAEOHISPANIC SCRIPTS’ PROTOTYPE

The present work is intended to draw attention to details of SW Celtic about which two or more researchers have reached similar or identical conclusions. As mentioned above, Kaufman joins a broad consensus in seeing the West Semitic alephat, specifically that of the Phoenicians, as the primary source of the SW script. Untermann’s idea (1997) that an early form of a Western Greek alphabet was an important second source has little resonance in newer work. I have proposed that the influence of Cypriot Syllabic writing might account, not for the formal signs of the Palaeohispanic scripts, but for the scripts’ peculiar hybrid structure (Koch 2011, 168–9; 2016, 452–6). They are semi-syllabaries, that is to say, a combination of the ‘one sign = one phoneme’ principle for the vowels and some consonants, but one sign representing a consonant plus a vowel for the stop consonants. In the case of the SW script, which is the earliest of the attested Palaeohispanic scripts, we should more accurately call it a ‘pseudo-semi-syllabary’.
because in most instances the vowel sign is written ‘redundantly’ after a grapheme for the stop consonant which in itself expresses the following vowel.

As to why the syllabic concept should come from Cyprus in particular rather than, say, from the Linear B syllabary used to write Greek in the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age, this is partly a matter of plausible historical context. Linear B died out not long after the collapse of Mycenae about 1200 BC, which is probably too early for it to have been a factor in the invention of Palaeohispanic writing. On the other hand, syllabic writing continued in Cyprus from about 1500 BC down to the 3rd century BC. There is also considerable archaeological evidence for contact between Cyprus and the Iberian Peninsula at the key period, about 1150–650 BC (Garrido Roiz 1983; Karageorghis & Lo Schiavo 1989; Mederos 1996; Almagro-Gorbea 2001; Blázquez 2011). Secondly, unlike Linear B, Cypriot Syllabic writing (at least in its more fully understood Iron Age forms) uses 15 signs to write the combinations of the stop consonants plus following vowels: \textit{ta te ti to tu, pa pe pi po pu, ka ke ki ko ku}. It has no series to distinguish the voiced from voiceless consonants, or to distinguish other essential features of the Greek consonant system, which it was nonetheless used to represent for at least seven centuries. Palaeohispanic writing similarly used 15 signs to represent the same 15 combinations of consonants and vowels. Palaeohispanic writing also made no distinction of voice—at least not at the beginning—even though this contrast had been phonemic in the Indo-European languages of the Iberian Peninsula. So, in the SW pseudo-semi-syllabary, the corresponding series are \textit{ta te ti to tu, ba be bi bo bu, ka ke ki ko ku}. (For the five signs in the middle, \textit{ba b e b i b o b u} is written, following Untermann, in recognition of the evidence that the SW language probably lacked the phoneme \textit{/p/}, like Iberian, Aquitanian/Palaeo-Basque, and inherited vocabulary in Celtiberian.) Therefore, I’ve argued that this phonetically inaccurate structural feature of Palaeohispanic writing—though not the graphemes themselves—had been carried over from Cypriot Syllabic writing when the new script was first invented to represent an indigenous language or languages in the west.

More recently and based on a completely different approach, Hosszú (2017) has also concluded that Cypriot Syllabic writing is likely to have been a second source—once again recognizing the Phoenician aleph at as the primary source—for the SW script and subsequent Palaeohispanic scripts. Hosszú’s method is ‘computational palaeography [which] investigates the evolution of graphemes’. In any event, the key point is that some of the SW signs that do not have any clear antecedent in the West Semitic alephat are arguably traced to Cypriot Syllabic graphemes. For example, the Paphian syllabary’s sign for \textit{ko} resembles SW \textit{X k} (cf. Olivier 2013). Hosszú’s specific derivations merit careful scrutiny, in terms of the dates when the graphemes were in use, their proposed evolution, variants, and phonetic values. Unless form and sound go together, similar graphemes in two writing systems could occur by chance. Bearing that in mind, if some of the SW signs can be credibly derived in this way, that would have inherent and obvious advantages over the theory that those SW graphemes
lacking clear Phoenician antecedents had all been created without precedent. The case is potentially compelling because, as noted above, other reasons have been found to attribute inspiration from Cypriot Syllabic writing to the Palaeohispanic script’s inventor(s).

INDO-EUROPEAN AND SPECIFICALLY CELTIC FORMS IDENTIFIED IN THE S.W. CORPUS

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS

— precedes a form the segmentation of which is relatively uncertain, such as possibly incomplete forms beginning or ending broken inscribed stones.

[ ] Square brackets indicate a break in the inscribed text, sometimes enclosing restored signs (mostly involving the SW epigraphic formula).

# precedes the intact beginning of an inscribed text and follows the intact ending.

b* Underlined letters indicate uncertain readings.

* indicates the position of a trace of a sign, for which no probable reading can be made out.

... indicates a portion of an inscription omitted in the citation.

〈 〉 Angle brackets enclose signs probably carved in error. Recognizable examples of this are rare.

≡ between nouns indicates that they form a possible co-ordinative (dvandva) compound or, more broadly, closely linked declinable forms in a noun phrase with case syncretism.

GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS. For citing Palaeohispanic comparanda, there has been no attempt to subdivide modern provinces in order to recover more accurately the ancient boundaries of Celtiberia, the briga zone, and so on. The heading ‘Celtiberian region’ comprises evidence from the modern Spanish provinces of Burgos, Cuenca, Guadalajara, La Rioja, Palencia, Soria, Teruel, and Zaragoza. ‘Central region’ comprises Ávila, Madrid, Segovia, Toledo, and Valladolid. ‘Western Peninsula’ comprises all of Portugal and the Spanish Provinces of Asturias, Badajoz, Cantabria, Cáceres, A Coruña, Huelva, Léon, Lugo, Ourense, Pontevedra, Salamanca, and Zamora. ‘Outside the briga zone’ refers to finds from the rest of the modern provinces of Spain.


CONTEXT: aalaein ūebe [naʃ]k´eni [

CENTRAL REGION. OVini(V S) A LA VS (HEp, 7, 660; ERSg, 170–002 — Pedraza, Segovia).

WESTERN PENINSULA. ALAINVS (HAE, 1338 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); ALAISVS ARRENI F. (HAE, 1366; HEp, 11, 426 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); LABOINA ALAISI F. (HAE, 1274; Navascués 1966, 216 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); CILIASA ALAESI F. (ERZamora, 204; CIRPZ, 189 — Sejas de Aliste, Zamora); ALAESI TRITI F. [V/]BON[IC]VM (Albertos 1975a, 2. 212. nº 235 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); Sextio Alavi (EBrag, 45; ERTOM, I — Santulhão, Bragança, Bragança); BANDV ALANOBРИGRE AEMILIVS REBVRRINVS (HAE 1966–9, 38 — San Amaro, Ourense).


CONTEXT. # aarkuuioriou ‹ti ›bea:i :elurea r. More than one segmentation is possible: genitive singular aarkuio ‘(grave stone) of Arkuios (“Archer”)’ or dative singular aarkui ‘for Arkuios’ < *Arku ̯i̯ūī [arku ̯(u ̯ )uːi], in which the palatal glide *i̯ has been assimilated to articulation of the flanking labials, a development generally consistent with the observable phonetic tendencies of Tartessian (see Koch 2011 §96.2), or first element of a compound name aarkuio.-18

INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman: from *argo- ‘champion’.

NOTE. As explained above (N 17), the transliteration aarkuio is preferable to aarbuiio as implied by the transliteration system proposed by Rodríguez-Ramos (2000) and Ferrer (2016).


CENTRAL REGION. ARQVIO (HEp, 4, 103; ERAv, 30 — Ávila); FL[ORIN]A LIBERTA ARQVIOCVM (AE, 1985, 604; Abascal 1994, s.v. — Alcalá de Henares, Madrid).

WESTERN PENINSULA. ARQVIVS CANTABRII (AE, 1973, 307 — Braga); ARQVIVS VIRAII F. ACRIPIAS (CIL II, 2435; HEp, 4, 1011 — Braga); [A]RQVIVS CANTABRI— (AE, 1973, 308; HEp, 1, 664 — Braga); APIL[VS] ARQVII (CIL II, 2433 — Dume, Braga); C. IVLIO CILIO ARQVI (Gimeno & Stylow 1993, nº 48 — Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Cáceres); ARQVIA HELENA (CIL II, 377 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-

18 Photographs of the stone show that the reading aarkuuioris < *Arku ̯io-riχs ‘archer-king’ is not impossible, the signs o ♦ and s ♦ being similar and the upper crossbar of the latter possibly being obscured by the upper framing line carved above the series of signs.
In the absence of a compelling case for a different etymology, the well attested series **ARCVS**, &c., may be considered a delabialized variant of **ARQVI VS**, including the following examples:

**Celtiberian Region.** **ARCEA ALICON ALONEI FILIA** (Abásolo 1974a, 48 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEA [---] AMBATI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 188 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEA [---] AVCA AMBATI TERENTI F.** (EE, VIII 150; Abásolo 1974a, 160 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEAE DESIIAE CADAECI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 95 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEAE DESIIAE PATER[NI] F.** (AE, 1983, 600; HEP, 4, 198 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEA ELANOCA PATERNI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 146 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEAE LONGINAE C. F. (MATRI)** (CIL II, 5799; Abásolo 1974a, 154 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEA PLANDICA MATICLAVA(E) F.** (CIL II, 2860; Abásolo 1974a, 176 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos). **Note also the Hispano-Celtic place-name Arcobriga, probably 'bow-shaped hill' (Koch 2016, 438–42).**

**Western Peninsula.** **ARCIAE MO[---]** (HEP, 4, 1023; ERRBragança, 22; HEP, 12, 599 — Meixedo, Bragança); **ARCVS EPEICI F. BRACARVS** (HEE, 992; HEP, 11, 647; HEP, 13, 647 — Vila da Feira, Aveiro); **TAVRVS ARCI F. AMMICIVS** (AE, 1971, 146; HEP, 7, 168 — Villar del Rey, Badajoz); **ANIVS ARCI** (ILER, 974 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **ARCVS** (AE, 1967, 157 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **[CAE]NIVS ARCI** (Almeida 1956, 154, no. 20 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **L. SVLLA ARCI F.** (AE, 1967, 157 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **TERTVLA ARCI F.** (HEE, 1172; Almeida 1956, 133 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **TOVTONI ARCI F.** (AE, 1967, 144; HEP, 2, 770; HEP, 5, 989 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **ARCVS** (HEE, 5, 1055 — Ponte da Barca, Viana do Castelo); **ARCISSVS ARENIER(I) F.** (CIL II, 733; CPILC, 116 — Cáceres); **MEDAMVS ARCISI F. CASTE[L]LO MEIDVNIO** (CIL II, 2520; IRG IV, 130 — Cadoves, Celanova, Ourense).

**CONTEXT.** # aibˈuris[ ]a kˈinbˈaibˈi ro-laʔa uarbˈan ubˈan ub[ui] #

**COMPARANDA.** WESTERN PENINSULA. AEBVRA R EBVRR INI F[I]LIA (HEp, 3, 217 — Riotinto, Huelva); COSO DOMINO AEB(VRVS) ATI CIL(ENVS) EXS VOTO P(OSVIT) (CIRG I, 22; HEP, 4, 333; HE 1994, 133f; Búa 2000 — Logrosa, Negreira, A Coruña); CALPVRA ABANA AEBOSO (CIL II, 2527; IRG IV, 74 — Ourense); CRISVS TALABVRI F. AEBOSOCELLEN S T[R]EBARONI V.S.L.M. (HAE, 342 = HAE, 945 = HAE, 1504; CPILC, 217; AE, 1958, 17; AE, 1952, 130; AE 1952, 42f; Búa 2000 — Coria, Cáceres); C. SEMPRONIVS AEBARVS VISCVNOSNI F. CVLNIES. (AE, 1950, 221; AE, 1984, 470* — Belver, Gaviao, Portalegre; this individual was a Celtiberian); CILEA AEBICI F. (HAE, 1108 r; HEP, 13, 941 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); AQVILVS AEBICI F. / AEBICVS (AE, 1988, 691; FE, 108; HEP, 2, 777; HEP, 3, 474 — Soure, Coimbra, Coimbra); BVAN(AE?) AEBVTI LIB. (CIL II, 2500; ERRBragança, 36 — Bragança); AEBVTIAE ATTE AEBVTI (CIL II, 2672; ERPL, 97 — León); AEBVTIAE ATTVAE AEBVTI FIL. (CIL II, 2673; ERPL, 98 — León).

**INTERPRETATIONS.** Villar (2004, 263–4) also considers connections with the Aipora and similar Palaeohispanic place-names.

**NOTE.** Although the transliteration system proposed by Rodríguez-Ramos (2000) and Ferrer (2016) is not followed here (N 17), the resulting transliteration aikˈuris[ ] would be compatible with an etymology proposed by Correa (1992) < *aikˈo-rēg-s- ‘justice king’ without requiring a sound change */k/ > */p/.

**akˈolioś** or **akˈosioś** (J.56.1) Hispano-Celtic personal name (Correa 1992, 98; MLH IV; Ballester 2004b, 119; 2012, 15; Almagro-Gorbea et al. 2008, 1050; Jordán 2015, 309), masculine o-stem, nominative singular (Villar 2004, 264; Koch 2013a, 142).

**CONTEXT.** # akˈolioś naʔkˈeTI # As recognized by Villar (2004) the complete text clearly appears to be a nominative singular subject followed by its 3rd person singular present-tense verb. akˈo(l)ioś is therefore a nominative singular masculine o-stem.

**INTERPRETATION.** If akˈolioś is the correct reading, a cognate of Latin accola ‘dweller by or near, neighbour’ < *ad-kˈolo- ‘turn towards’ is possible.

**COMPARANDA.** Divine names: IOVI ACCIOINCI (CIL III, 3428; Jufer & Luginbühl 2001 — Pest, Hungary); GENI ACEOLI (Jufer & Luginbühl 2001 — Rognac, France).

**CELTIBERIAN REGION.** ACCA (CIL II, 2808; Palol & Vetella 1987, 97 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos); AEMILIA ACCA MEDVITICORVM BARBARI MATER (AE, 1925, 22 — Barcebalejo, Soria); MAG[IAE] ACCAE PVPELLI F. (AE, 1985, — Quintanarraya, Burgos); DVSQVENA ACCIA (HEp, 17, 63 — Saelices, Cuenca); ACCONI (AE,
1988, 779; Palol & Vilella 1987, 39; HEp, 2, 104 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos); **GAIVS CAVTENICO ACCONIS F.** (HEp, 6, 182 — Valdeande, Burgos); **MADICENVSV ACCONIS F. VAILICO(N)** (CIL II, 2771 — Gumiel de Hizán, Burgos); **VALERIVS ATTO SAIGLENIQ(VM)** ACCONIS F. (HEp, 9 — San Leonardo de Yagüe, Soria); **LVCIVS NISSIC(VM)** ACCVT(I) F. (CIL II, 6294; AE, 1987, 623; Abascal 1983, 3 — Almadrones, Guadalajara).

¶ **CENTRAL REGION.** ACCA (AE, 1914, 17; ERAv, 16 — Ávila); ANAE ET ACCAE F(LIIABVS) (HEp, 4, 98; ERAv, 25 — Ávila); ACCE(S) CAVCA (AE, 1914, 22; HEp, 4, 86; ERAv, 15 — Ávila); ANAE ET ACCAE F(LIIABVS) (HEp, 4, 98; ERAv, 25 — Ávila); **ACCAE DEOCENAE QVORONICVM CADANI F.** (ERSg, 6; HEp, 13, 576; AE, 2003, 963 — San Miguel de Bernuy, Segovia); **ACCETI CARAQO AMBATI F.** (HEp, 2, 618; ERSg, 5 — Coca, Segovia); **ACCONI MATTICVM** (CIL II, 2734; HEp, 6, 860; ERSg, 81 — Segovia); P(VBLICIO?) ACCI(QVM)? (CIL II, 5784; ERSg, 73 — Segovia); **ACCANNIV[S]** (AE 1976, 300 — Berrueces, Valladolid); **ACILIA ANNEZA** (CIL II, 3069 — Titulcia, Madrid).

¶ **WESTERN PENINSULA.** ACCAE METELLI SERVAE (HEp, 7, 1164; ERBRagança, 14 — Castrelos, Bragança); [...] A ACCA (ERCan, 7; HEp, 6, 551 — Luriezo, Cantabria); **ACCA** (IRG IV, 78; HEp, 10, 388 — San Miguel de Canedo, Maside, Ourense); **ACCAE CELERIS STATVLCI VXORI** (FE, 8; AE, 1982, — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **QINTV[S]** ACC F. (Beltrán 1975–6, 31; AE, 1977, 393 — Trujillo, Cáceres); L. ACCIVS CAENO (HAE, 1284 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); **LVCIVS ACCIVS REBVRRVS** (CIL II, 871 — Salamanca); ACC[---]VS ACC F. (CIL II, 869 — Ciudad Rodrigo, Salamanca); **ACCA** (HEp, 6, 819 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); **APER MAVRI F. ACCEICVM** (CIL II, 865; HAE, 1261 — Fuenteguinaldo, Salamanca); **ACCO** (HEp, 7, 1078 — Rábano de Aliste, Zamora); **ACINI CILONIS F.** (ILER, 2326; ERZamora, 187; CIRPZ, 84 — Moral de Sayago, Zamora); **ACINICI** (Navascués 1963, 213, n. 63; Martín Valls 1979, 507, nº 10 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **ATTANO ANFLOV ACCONIS F(LIVS) CLVNIENISS** (CPILC, 652; HEp, 15, 104 — Villar de Plasencia, Cáceres); CLVN[IENISS(?)] FRONTONIS ACCONIO FILI(O) (HEp, 15, 103 — Villar de Plasencia, Cáceres); **ACINVS** (Encarnación 1975, 257, foto 60 — Vouzelu, Viseu); **SAMACIA M. ACIL(I) FRONTONIS LIB.** (CIL II, 844; CPILC, 649 — Villar de Plasencia, Cáceres); CABVRIVS MA[GI]O ACILIS (HEp, 7, 1298; HEp, 13, 1039 — Pinho, São Pedro do Sul, Viseu); IVDEVS ACOLI C. S. (HAE, 752; CPILC, 775 — Villamáesias, Cáceres).

¶ **OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE.** C[---] COLINECVS ACCONIS F. VXAME(N)SIS (AE, 1915, 12; HEp, 3, 165 — Córdoba); ACCINIPIVS (?) (CILII, 3238 — Valdepeñas, Ciudad Real); **ACILIA ANTVCA** (AE, 1920, 79; IRCád, 361 — Cádiz); **LVCIA AVIRCA ACILIANA P. F.** (EE, VIII 306 — Montellano, Sevilla).


¶ **ETYMOLOGY.** Probably with the root Proto-Celtic *albo/-ā- < Proto-Indo-European *H₂elbho- ‘white’.
The inscription is fragmentary and its layout confusing. This is the clearest form in it. So we must go on etymology alone without clues from syntax. Of the 30 readable signs of the inscription there are no examples of ū; therefore, albooroi should possibly be read as dative singular | Albūrū| ‘for Alburos’ or a nominative plural group name ‘the Alburoi’.

**Western Peninsula.** ALBVRA MATER (CIL II, 73 — Beja); IVLIA ALBVRA T. F. (Encarnação 1984, 306 — Neves, Beja); ALBVRA CATVRONIS F. (AE, 1973, 303 — Braga); ALBVRA CARISI F. (EE, VIII 118 — Braga); ALBVRA (CIL II, 73 — Vila Nova de Ourém, Santarem); ALBVRA (Dias 1985–6, 196 — Almacave, Lamego, Viseu); ALBVRA (AE, 1977, 378; HEp, 12, 674 — Beijós, Carregal do Sal, Viseu); ALBVRAE TANCINI (CIL II, 853; CPILC, 392 — Plasencia, Cáceres); ALBVRAE TITI F. (CIL II, 341; Brandão 1972, nº 30 — Leiria); POM(PEIA) ALBVRA (HAE, 2124 — Varzea do Douro, Marco de Canaveses, Porto); ALBVRS (CPILC, 412 — Robledillo de Trujillo, Cáceres).

**Biblography.** Included in the Ancient Celtic toponymic elements of Isaac (2004) and Falileyev (2010).

**ališne** ηημην (J.11.4) derived from Proto-Indo-European *H₂éliso- ‘alder’ (Koch 2013a, 142; Kaufman 2015, 19, 63, 70–1, 123, 298, 486; cf. Nahm 2015).

**Interpretations.** Proto-Celtic *alisanoi possibly locative singular ‘in the place of alder (...), ‘alder grove’ possibly with secondary sense of ‘sacred grove, sanctuary, burial ground’. Kaufman reconstructs Proto-Celtic *alisini̯-essibis instrumental plural ‘with alder-catkin-eaters’.

**Context.** # aioforainn b’aanon**[ | ea ro-n-b’aren nařk’enii ališne # Thus ališne follows ea ro-n-b’aren nařk’enii on a single line at the end of the text, therefore, arguably to be construed as amplification of the basic epigraphic statement comprising name(s) of deceased + formula. The formula word uar(n)b’an ‘highest destination’ is absent. Therefore, I argue that ališne possibly fills a logical gap of the expressed destination, as a locative singular place-name, [Alis,nē] ‘in Alis,n-, Alis,nā’, from *Alis,noi or *Alis,nāi with simplification of the diphthong (on which see Koch 2011, §94). ališne would mean ‘in the alder wood’, or similar, perhaps in a transferred sense of sacred grove as necropolis.

**Comparanda & Etymology.** Cf. Latin alnus ‘alder’ < *alisnos, Celtiberian alizos (K.0.2), and the family name alizokum (K.0.1, genitive plural) (for a different interpretation of these Celtiberian forms, see Jordán 2009), Northern Hispano-Celtic ALISSIEGINI (genitive, Latinized?) (Untermann 1980b, 376), Gaulish place-names Alesia, IN ALISIIA, IN ALIXIE, Alisicum, also ALISANV ‘to the god of Alesia’. On Gaulish an corresponding to Tartessian n, written as non-syllabic, see Koch 2011 §69.

**alk’u** ʞʞ1 (J.12.1) Celtic man’s name, possibly meaning ‘Elk’ (Kaufman 2015, 124, 306, 309, 486), alternative possible meanings are ‘Hawk’ (Koch 2009; Kaufman 2015, 124, 306, 309, 486) or ‘Wolf’.

CONTEXT. # iru alk'uu sie; nafk'ent'i mub'a t'e-ro-b'are hat'aneat'e #

INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman interprets the inflexion as ‘associative/instrumental sg.’ However, the parallelism of the opening of this complete text with # iru alk'uu ... and that of MdC # 'tilek'urk'u ark'ast'amu ... is best explained as coordinative compounds inflected in the nominative/accusative dual (cf. Nahm 2015), so iru alk'uu [(y)irū≡Alkū], literally ‘the man/heroe ›› Alkos’. In Celtiberian, n-stems are a well-attested and productive category for men’s personal names. Therefore, an alternative possibility is to understand two nominative singular names here: Ŭirū (genitive Ŭironos) and Alkū (genitive Alkonos).

NOTE. With the transliteration system proposed by Rodríguez-Ramos (2000) and Ferrer (2016), the resulting transliteration alb'u would be compatible with an etymology from Proto-Indo-European *H₂elbhos ‘white’.

COMPARANDA. Lepontic or Cisalpine Gaulish alko-uinos (end of the 2nd century BC), Gaulish Alco-undos, Alcus, Alcius, and the place-names Alcena, Alciacum, ‘Ἀλκιμόνις, Hispano-Celtic Alce (Delamarre 2003, 38). Tacitus (Germania 43) mentions central-European divine twins called Alci, worshipped by the Naharvali, a subtribe of the extensive Lugii (whose name is probably related to lok'ob'os (J.1.1).


CONTEXT. ( ) omuŕikā[ ] anb'at'ia≡iob'a[ ]e b'a-[na]řk'e k'ee-ion[ ]

INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman (2015, 487) adopts the etymology proposed here, but takes the form as a common noun, designating a social function, as found for the cognates in Gaulish and Welsh. However, in the ancient Iberian Peninsula Ambatos and its derivatives are so common as personal names that this remains the preferred explanation, as also suits the structure of the epigraphic text, where the opening survives as ( ) omurikā[ έ ]anb'at'ia≡iob'a[, which appears to comprise three feminine forms in case agreement. This naming phrase probably identifying the deceased and is to be provisionally analysed and translated |(U)omurikā Amba(χ)ṭjā jou,ma| ‘woman of the kindred of Ūomuri-, youngest daughter of Amba(χ)tos’, cf. |liirnest=ak'un b'ane=oo'oire ‘woman of the kindred of Lir(a)nestos and wife of Oo'oir’ (J.19.1).
Non-Hispanic Comparanda. Gaulish AMBACTOS, ambactus ‘a man sent in service of a chief’ (e.g. Caesar; De Bello Gallico 6.15), ambaxtus ‘servant of high rank, envoy, representative’ (De Hoz 2007, 191). Note also Gaulish ambascia ‘embassy’ < *ambi-auxtia (De Hoz 2007, 191). AMBACTIVS and AMBAXIVS occur as names in Latin inscriptions of the Roman Period from the Netherlands and Germany respectively, and AMBACTVS is found as a name in Germany and Serbia (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 34); Old Breton ambaith, Middle Welsh amaeth ‘ploughman, farmer’ (cf. the mythological ploughman Amaethon < *Ambaxtonos in Culhwch ac Olwen and other Early Welsh sources); Old High German ambah ‘servant’, Modern German Amt ‘post, position, office’ is a Celtic loanword.


Celtiberian Region. AMBATA (Abásole 1974a, 99; Albertos 1975a, — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); AMBATAE [---] SEGEI F. (Abásole 1974a, 194 — Quintanilla de las Viñas, Burgos); AMBATAE AIONCAE TI[---]TI F. (Abásole 1974a, 155 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); AMBATAE AIONCAE LOVGHEI F. (Abásole 1974a, 185 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); AMBATA ALBEAVCA? SEGOVETIS F. (CIL II, 2855; Abásole 1974a, 18 — Iglesia Pinta, Burgos); AMBATA BETVCA AMBATI F. (Abásole
1974a, 60 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **AMBATA CAELICA CAI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 24 — Iglesia Pinta, Burgos); **AMBATAE [D]ESSIC[A]E RVFI [F.] (SOCERAE)** (AE, 1983, 600; HEp, 4, 198 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **AMBATAE MEDICAE VERATI F.** (HEp, 10, 81 — Belorado, Burgos); **AMBATAE MEDICAE PLACIDI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 81; HEp, 4, 199 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **AMBATAE PAESICA ARGAMONICA AMBATI VXOR** (CIL II, 2856; Abásolo 1974a, 177 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **AMBATAE PEDITAGE AMBATI** (Reyes 2000, 24; HEP, 10, 87 — Belorado, Burgos); **AMBATAE PLANDIDAE** (EE, VIII 172; Abásolo 1974b, 83 — Pancorbo, Burgos); **AMBATAE[TAE VENIAENAE VALERI CRECENTI[S] F.** (CIL II, 2878 = CIL II, 2882; Abásolo 1974a, 214; HEP, 5, 153; HEP, 6, 172 — San Pedro de Arlanza, Hortigüela, Burgos); **[CA]LPVRNIAE AMBATAE LOVGEI F.** (AE, 1980, 587 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **SEMPRONIAE AMBATAE CELTIBERI** (Abásolo 1974a, 209 — San Millán de Lara, Burgos); **AMBATAE TERENTIAE SEVERI F.** (CIL II, 2857; Abásolo 1974a, 212 — San Pedro de Arlanza, Hortigüela; Burgos); **VALERIA AMBADA** (CIL II, 2909; Abásolo 1974b, 30 — Villafranca, Montes de Oca, Burgos); **[---] AMBATI L.** (CIL II, 2884; Abásolo 1974a, 141 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **[A]MBATVS (CIL II, 2790; Palol & Vilella 1987, 219 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos);** **[A]MBATO ALEBBIO [B]ODANI F.** (Reyes 2000, 5 — Belorado, Burgos); **AMBATO BVRGAE SEGILI F.** (HEp, 10, 84 — Belorado, Burgos); **AMBATVS VEMENVUS ATI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 55 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **AMBATO VIROVARCO** (HEp, 9, 246 — Ubierna, Burgos); **ARCEA [---] AMBATI F.** (Abásolo 1974a, 188 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); **ARCEA [---] AMBATI CORVM HiRni F.** (HEp, 10, 8; ERAv, 142 — Candeleda, Ávila); **VER NFCVLVS AMBATI C(VM) M ODESTI F. [---]** (HEp, 1, 79; HEP, 9, 83; ERAv, 143 — Candeleda, Ávila); **ACCETI CARAQO AMBATI F.** (HEp, 2, 618; ERSg, 5 — Coca, Segovia); **AMBAT(A) (CIL II, 94*/5320 — Talavera de la Reina, Toledo).**

**CENTRAL REGION.** **AMBATO** (HEp, 4, 103; ERAv, 30 — Ávila); **AMBATO** (HEp, 4, 72; ERAv, 11 — Ávila); **ATA AMBATICORVM HIRNI F.** (HEp, 10, 8; ERAv, 142 — Candeleda, Ávila); **VERNACULVS AMBATIC(VM) MODESTI F. [---]** (HEp, 1, 79; HEP, 9, 83; ERAv, 143 — Candeleda, Ávila); **ACCETI CARAQO AMBATI F.** (HEp, 2, 618; ERSg, 5 — Coca, Segovia); **AMBAT(A) (CIL II, 94*/5320 — Talavera de la Reina, Toledo).**

**WESTERN PENINSULA.** **FVSCI CABELDI AMBATI F. VADINIENSIS** (CIL II, 2709; ERAsturias, 51 — Corao, Cangas de Onís, Asturias); **MACER AMBATI F. OBISOQ(VM** (Roso de Luna 1904, 127 — Casas de Don Pedro, Badajoz); **[---] AMBATI F.** (HEp, 1, 668; ERRBragança, 95; HEP, 12, 587 — Donai, Bragança); **AMBATVS (CIL II, 738, 739; CILCC, 44 = CILCC, 45; HEP, 9, 248 — Arroyo de la Luz, Cáceres); **AMBATVS (CILCC, 50; CILCC I, 75 — Arroyo de la Luz, Cáceres);** **AMBATVS PE[L]LI (CIL II, 853; CILCC, 392 — Plasencia, Cáceres);** **[A[N]DERCIA AMBATI F.** (AE, 1978, 393; AE, 2006, 625; HEP, 15, 92 — Monroy, Cáceres); **ARC(O)NI AMBATI F. CAMALICVM** (CILCC, 660 = CILCC, 803 — Villar del Pedroso, Cáceres); **CAMIRA AMBATI** (CIL II, 623; CILCC, 527 — Trujillo, Cáceres); **CORIA AMBATI F.** (CILCC, 146 — Cáceres); **IRINEVS AMBATI F.** (CILCC, 367 — Pedroso de Acim, Cáceres); **AMBATVS (ERCan, 8 — Luriezo,
Cantabria); AMBATI PENTOVIECI AMBATIQ. PENTOVI F. (ERCan, 8 — Luriezo, Cantabria); TILLEGVS AMBATI F. SVSARRVS C AIIOBAIGIAECO (IRLugo, 8, 1367 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); AMBATVS DIV(1)LI F. (HEp, 4, 962 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); CAVRNVIS AMBATI CAVRNVICVM (Albertos 1975a, 8 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); [AMBATVS (AE, 1972, 287 — Salamanca); AMBATVS PINTOVI (HAE, 1327 — Saldeana, Salamanca); AMBATVS TANCINILI F. (HEp, 2, 617; HEp, 5, 677 — San Martín del Castañar, Salamanca); CLOVTi[A] AMBATI FILiA (HAE, 1265 — Navascués 1966, 212 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca; IANVA AMBATI (HAE, 1972, 287 — Villalcampo, Zamora); MENTINA AMBATI F. (CIL II, 5036; HEp, 10, 513 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); AMBATI ARQViC (HEp, 11, 361 — Barruecopardo; Salamanca); AMBATI ARQVi F. (ERZamora, 114; CIRPZ, 241 — Villalcampo, Zamora); AVELCO AMBATI F. (HAE, 920; CIRPZ, 246; ERZamora, 29 — Villalcampo, Zamora); PINTOVI AMBATI (ILER, 2333; ERZamora, 210; CIRPZ, 271 — Villalcampo, Zamora; AMBATO (HEp, 18, 486 — Villardiegua de la Ribera, Zamora); AMBATA (HEp, 18, 488 — Villardiegua de la Ribera, Zamora).

OUTSIDE THE BRIGA-ZONE. AMBATA APPAE F. (CIL II, 2950 — Contrastra, Álava); AMBATO (HAE, 2522 — Angostina, Álava); AMBATVS SERME F (CIL II, 2951 — Contrastra, Álava); AMBAT[Vi]S PLENDI F. (CIL II, 2948 — Egüilaz, Álava); [AMBATV [ARAV F. (HAE, 2571; HEp, 4, 11 — Uraibín, Álava); […] CVS AMBATI F (HAE, 2563; HEp, 4, 11 — San Román de San Millán, Álava); ELANVS TVRAESAMiCO AMBATI F (ILIVS) (CIL II, 5819; Albertos 1975a, 13. nº 74 — Irún, Álava); SEGONTIviS AMBATI VECTI F. (CIL II, 2956 — Contrastra, Álava); AMBATA (Castillo et al. 1981, 48 — Gatián, Navarra); DOITena AMBATI CELTI F. (EE, VIII 167; Castillo et al. 1981, 53 — Marañón, Navarra); DOITERV[S [[]] AMBATI F. (Castillo et al. 1981, 55; HEp, 5, 623 — Marañón, Navarra); IVNIA AMBATA VIRO[Ni] F. (CIL II, 5827; Castillo et al. 1981, 45 — Gatián, Navarra); PORCIA AMBATA SEGONTI FILIA (CIL II, 5829; Fita 1913, 565, nº — Gatián, Navarra); AMBATi[S] (HAE, 185; Alföldy 1975, 337 — Tarragona); L. POSTVMiVS AMBATVS (CIL II, 4024 — Villar del Arzobispo, Valencia).

¶BIBLIOGRAPHY. GPC s.n. amaeth; Delamarre 2003; Matasović 2009 s.n. *ambaxtos.

ane OYA (J.1.1) |an(d)e| ‘inside, below, great’ preverb, preposition, (in Kaufman’s terminology) adposition (as a possibility Koch 2013a, 146; with more certainty Kaufman 2015, 486).

¶CONTEXT. ... kalt* lok’on ane nańk* k*ak’išiink*olob’o ... With the sequence lok’on ane nańk*, one might consider the Gaulish compound preserved in the 9th-century Andelagum monasterium (De Hoz 2007, 195), implies the basic sense of the collocation ande + √leg- as ‘lying down inside’; if so, the burial/urn lies down within’ as a gloss on |logon an(d)e narkêt|, or |... narkêt|, plausible in a necropolis.

¶ETYMOLOGY. Proto-Celtic *ande < Proto-Indo-European *H₁ndhi ~ *H₁éndo- ‘inside’.
COMPARANDA. Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic preposition ande; Old Irish and ‘there’; Ancient Brythonic Anderitum for Pevensey, meaning ‘between fords’ or ‘great ford’; Gaulish andogna [‘indigenous’, feminine accusative singular andognam, negatived anandognam (all from the Larzac inscription); Middle Welsh annyan ‘nature, inborn quality’ < *andoganā; Latin indigēna ‘native, &c.’ < Proto-Indo-European *H₁(e)ndo-ĝenH₁ ‘born inside’ (Delamarre 2003, 48); Hittite anda ‘inwards, into’; Greek ἔνδον ‘within, at home’; Old Latin endo ‘in, on to’. An intensive force is often attributed to Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic compounds with initial ande-, e.g. Ande-roudos ‘very red’ (= Ir. ann-ruadh), similarly Welsh annwyl ‘dear’ ~ gŵyl ‘meek’ *ande-wēlo-; cf. Sanskrit adhi-deva- ‘greatest god’, adhi-rāj-a- ‘over-king’ (Búa 2005, 119–20).

WESTERN PENINSULA. ANDERENV(S) (CPILC, 146 — Cáceres); ANDERENV(S) TRITI F. (HEp, 4, 955 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); AMMINS ANDAITIAE F. BANDI ARBARRAICO VOTVM L.M.S. (cf. CIL II 454; HEp, 11, 661 — Capinha, Fundão, Castelo Branco); TONCIVS ANDAI[--- F.] (EE, VIII 10; Encarnação 1984, 574 — Elvas, Portalegre); ANDOTI FLAVI ARENI F. (CIL II, 2696 = CIL II, 5675; ERPL, 356 — Puebla de Lillo, León); ANDOTO VVALACINO VADONIS F. VAD(INIENSI) (HEp, 1, 396; ERPL, 357 — Liegos, León); ARENVNS ANDOTI (ERPL, 364 — Riaño, León). ¶ Andamos can be interpreted as Celtic meaning ‘inner-most’ or ‘greatest’, a formation parallel to Celtiberian VERAMOS, accusative VERAMOM ‘supreme’ < *u(p)eramо:- ANDAMV[S] ARCONIS (HEp, 4, 1082; HEp, 5, 1048; HEp, 9 — Ferreira do Zézere, Santarem); MEIDVENVS ANDAMI (AE, 1977, 409; CPILC, 4 = CPILC, 11; CILCC II, 428 — Abertura, Cáceres); NOBBIVS ANDAMI (HEp, 1, 458; HEp, 3, 247; HEp, 4, 505; HEp, 7, 402 — Lugo). ¶ DIVINE NAME. […] MAR[…] EX CON[S|VLT]| ANDAI[.] P|IVS) P(OSVIT) (HEp, 6, 1064 — Santiago Maior, Castelo de Vide, Portalegre).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW, 181ff; LEIA A-75, de Vaan 2008, 189; Matasović 2009 s.n. *andom ‘inside, there’.

ANTONBO[-] [J.8.1] A fragmentary form possibly preserving the case ending of a dative/ablative plural |-anton-bó|. However, the orthography could also represent |-antombo(-)| or |-antomo(-)|, the last sign is not clear, and a vowel would be expected before the dative/ablative plural ending -bó|. However, bó as the second-to-last sign is clear (Koch 2013a, 146), which precludes the reading antonbí (instrumental-locative plural) of Kaufman (2015, 487). Nonetheless, his identification of anton- ‘forehead’ as the root (cf. *anto- ‘border limit’) < Proto-Indo-European H₁ento- ‘border’ ~ *H₁ent- ‘forehead’ cannot be immediately ruled out. A name beginning |Anto-| is also thinkable: cf. e.g. NO_RBANAVA ANTA Q. F. (CPILC, 311 — Ibahernando, Cáceres). However, as the text breaks before |antonbó| becomes unreadable afterwards, and there are numerous Palaeohispanic formations containing -ant-, only the discovery of a fuller text repeating this sequence could ever resolve the matter.

COMPARANDA. Celtiberian antos, possibly to be read andos (K.23.2 — Osma, Soria), Gaulish ANATOM or ANOTOS ‘fines’ (Vercelli), Antobroges (variant Antebroges, Pliny IV, 109), Old Irish étan ‘forehead’; Skt. ánta-, án- ‘in front of’, Gothic andēis ‘end’; Latin ante ‘in front of’, Hittite ḫant-, Tocharian B ante ‘surface, forehead’.

†CONTEXT. See ar·bārie.

†COMPARANDA. Old Irish ar-, Middle Welsh ar-, er-, Middle Breton er-, ar-; Gaulish group name Aremorici; Celtiberian place-name arekorata (A 52); Latin per ‘over’, Greek περί ‘all around, about’. The same phonological development (ar- < *(p)are < *peri) is found in a Western Hispano-Celtic name ABRVNVS ARCELTI F. (Vallejo 2005, 183 — Coria, Cáceres) explained as *(p)ar(i)+Celtius ~ Conceltius by Prósper (2002, 422): BOVDELVS CONCELTI F. (AE, 1984, 471 — Belver, Gavião, Portalegre), similarly Gaulish Armorica alongside Aremorica suggests that the tendency to lose this syllable was old, occurring in more than one Ancient Celtic language.

†BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW, 810–12; LEIA, A–37; GOI 497f; Delamarre 2003, 52; MLH V.l, 36f; Matasović 2009 s.n. *fare.

aŕaiai ΑΑΑΑΑΑ|araíai| or, less probably, aŕaiui ΑΑΑΑΑΑ|araíül| (J.1.1) Celtic, dative singular, possibly ‘noble, free’ (Koch 2013a, 147; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 318; Kaufman 2015, 68, 70, 486) < Proto-Indo-European *H₄er(i)i̯ós ‘member of one’s own group’.

†CONTEXT. # lok⁷b⁷o niirab⁷o te⁷o aŕaiai k₄alt‘e lok⁷on ...

†INTERPRETATION. Kaufman translates aŕaiui ‘freeman-related’, which is possible, but other explanations may be considered, such as an etymology connecting aŕaiai, along with Celtiberian ARAIANOM, to ‘ploughland’ (Schwerteck 1979; cf. MLH V.1, 29–30; Jordán 2006); cf. Middle Irish airim ‘I plough’; Middle Welsh arδaf; Middle Breton arat ‘ploughing’; Cornish aras; Latin arō; Gothic arjan. Alternatively, aŕaiai could be a dative singular personal name ‘(to) Aŕaia (or Aŕaius, Aŕaios)’, corresponding exactly to the Celtiberian genitive plural family name araithkum ‘of the kindred of Araios’. Note also the possibly distinct Western Hispano-Celtic personal name and family name occurring in an inscription from Ávila ARAV(VS)| ARAV|IAQ(VM) TVRANIF(ILIVS) (Sánchez Moreno 1996, 121) and the theonym ARABO COROBE|LICOBOTALVSICO BO (Arroyomolinas de la Vera, Cáceres, Spain [Búa 2000, 526]).

ar·bārie ⁶⁸⁸⁸|ar·bārie (J.10.1)  perfect tense |ar·bāire| of a compound verb, Proto-Celtic *(p)ari+√ber-. (Koch 2013a, 147–8; Kaufman 2015, 123, 188, 284–5, 490).

†CONTEXT. # ariariše : oni?ak‘at‘i-še : o?er-b‘eři : leoine ar·bārie (?n)?i?ensere (?t)au # The only word in the text that comes at all close to resembling an element
of the epigraphic formula is \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arie}, so discerning a syntactic structure as a basis for interpretation is difficult. If there is an \textit{n} following \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arie}, that sign could go with the preceding, allowing an interpretation as a 3rd person plural \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arien} (see \textbf{b\textsuperscript{a}aren} and \textbf{t\textsuperscript{e}e-b\textsuperscript{a}arenti} below).

\textit{COMPARANDA.} Old Irish \textit{ar·beir} ‘use, employ, practice’; Old Welsh \textit{arber} ‘use’, Latin \textit{perferō} ‘carry through’, Greek \textit{περιφέρω} ‘carry around’. The comparanda and their similar meanings imply the likelihood of a commonly inherited compound verb from Late Proto-Indo-European : \textit{*peri+\textsqrt{bher}-}.

\textit{INTERPRETATION.} Kaufman glosses \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arie} as ‘has reproached’. This is an extended meaning of Old Irish \textit{ar·beir} and requires in that language the preposition \textit{fri} before its object, a point favouring the more basic meaning ‘carry around, forward’ > ‘use’. The use of \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arie} here instead of one of the compounds of the same verb found more commonly in the SW epigraphic formula (\textbf{t\textsuperscript{e}e-b\textsuperscript{a}are}, \textbf{ro·b\textsuperscript{a}are}, \textbf{t\textsuperscript{e}ro-b\textsuperscript{a}are}) may have been influenced by the contents of the text, such as the opening sequence \textit{ariariś}, which is probably the name of the deceased. In other words, \textit{ariariś} may have attracted the variant \textbf{ar·b\textsuperscript{a}arie} due to alliteration and was possibly also felt to be a \textit{figura etymologica}, i.e. ‘leader forward’ and ‘has carried forward’. The \textit{i} in \textit{b\textsuperscript{a}are} may be merely a graphic variant of the formulaic \textit{b\textsuperscript{a}are}, reflecting the epigrapher’s recognition of the phonetically palatalized [\textcircled{r}]. Alternatively, \textbf{b\textsuperscript{a}arie} could have been influenced purely graphically by the inscription’s opening sequence (and keynote?) \textit{ariariś} and/or the preceding form \textit{b\textsuperscript{e}efi}, which is, in my view, possibly a different tense stem of the same verb, likewise \textbf{ar\textsuperscript{b}ie\textsuperscript{f}it\textsuperscript{u} \textit{ΔΥΚΟΥΑ}} or \textbf{ar\textsuperscript{b}ie\textsuperscript{f}i \textit{ΜΟΥΑ}} (J.12.3).
†arkant- (Vanséveren 2012); Latin argentum, Sanskrit rajat-, Avestan ērēzata, Old Persian rdata.

¶BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 64; LEIA A-88; EIEC 548, 641.; DGV 72; GPC s.n. arian; LHEB 467f.; Lambert 1994, 76f; Delamarre 2003, 53; McCon 1994, 80; MLH V.1, 41f.; 2003 §2; de Vaan 2008 s.n. argentum; Matasović 2009 s.n. *arganto-; Koch & Fernández 2017.


¶CENTRAL REGION. LVCRETIA ARGANSA (HAE, 2462; HAE, 17–20, 21 — 39Valdenebro de los Valles, Valladolid).

¶WESTERN PENINSULA. FLACCVS ARGANTON(I) MAGILANCVM MIROBRIGENSIS (CPILC, 34; HEP, 13, 232; CILCC I, 200 — Garrovillas, Cáceres); divine epithet of the
LVGGONI ARGANTICAENI (Búa 2000, 274 — Villavicosa, Asturias) the exact equivalent of the Early Breton woman’s name Argant-ken ‘beautiful in silver’ (Evans 1988, 549 — Cartulary of Quimperlé, AD 1126).

ariariś-e ὨΜoleon (J.10.1) Celtic name (MLH IV, 257), cf. Gaulish ARIO- and RIX (Koch 2013a, 150; Nahm 2015).

†CONTEXT. # ariariś : oni?aқat’i-še : oweathermapa ar-b-әrie (?n)?ensere (?t)au # There is apparent congruence in the endings: # ariariś : oni?aқat’i-še ...

†INTERPRETATION. The second element is explained as -riś from Celtic -rīχs < Indo-European *H3rēg-s showing characteristically Celtic ī < ē; see Koch 2011, §81. On a from the composition vowel *o, see Koch 2011, §73.1.

†COMPARANDA. Gaulish Ario-manus (attested five times in Roman inscriptions from Austria [Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 37]), Ario-ustus, Ario-gaisus, simplex Ariós (St-Germaine-Source-Seine), Arius, Ariola, the coin legend ARIVOS SANTONOS, the central-European Harii named as a subgroup of the Lugii (Tacitus, Germania §43), Old Irish nom. sg. aire ‘lord, freeman, noble’, genitive airech < *arik-s, -os (De Hoz 2007, 192); the Indo-Iranian self-designation ā́rya-, Avestan airya- ‘Aryan, &c.’


†WESTERN PENINSULA. C. ARIVS APILOCVS EBVRI F. (AE, 1977, 358 — Fundão, Castelo Branco); possibly LATINO ARI ‘for Latinus son of Ar(i)us’ (IRLugo, 55; HEP, 8, 334 — Esperante, Folgoso do Courel, Lugo). ARIOVNIS MINCOSEGAEGIS C. ARCISIVS RVFVS V.S.L.M. (AE 1990, 159; Búa 2000, 303–4 — A Porqueira, Ourense) possibly belongs here, but more probably with ‘ploughing, &c.’

aš?a (?= ašʔa) ΑϟMΑ (J.7,1, twice).

†CONTEXT. # ašʔa bәbәbir naфкেnai | ašʔa na-bәolon # The stone was found in a necropolis of the Early Iron Age. The inscription, which survives complete, is arranged as two discontinuous, parallel right-to-left lines. Both lines commence with the same segmentable form ašʔa. The upper line ends in naфkεnai, one of the less common variations of the most common of the formula words naфkεnti/naфkεnii. This is the only recognizable element of the formula in the text.

†INTERPRETATION. What must be stressed is that there is no sound basis for transliterating the hapax sign $ as t. Redundancy appears to be regularly observed in this inscription. Therefore, $ cannot be a variant form of the somewhat similar looking signs $t or $k, which must precede e and u respectively. $ does not resemble X the usual sign for t. $ does look somewhat like $v, which does often precede a, and the phonetic value of which is probably h (the phonetic value of the Phoenician letter that was its source) or possibly φ. Therefore, there would have to be compelling reasons for transliterating ΑϟMΑ as ašʔa, such as etymology and syntactic structures in cognate languages, or a form like ašʔa used similarly in
the SW corpus itself. In this light, those proposals depending on the transliteration asṭa are at most slim possibilities. ¶ Focussing on the syntax of the complete text rather than relying on the doubtful representation asṭa, the statement can be construed as two parallel clauses, the second negatived with na prefixed to a 3rd person plural thematic verb b'olon in statement-final position. The function of the repeated asṭa at the head of both clauses might then be as a conjunction, linking or contrasting them, something like '(or) either', 'and so', 'moreover', or 'but even' (cf. Namh 2015; see na-b'olon below). ¶ A possibility based on the reading asṭa is to see a connection with Palaeohispanic names, including the major group name Astures in the north-west (from which the personal names Astur, Astur, Asturius, and Asturia are derived). Note also the place-names Astapa, Astigi, Asta, Astia/Hastia, all south of the -brigā line. This apparent series is likely to be of multiple origin (Vallejo 2005, 188). ¶ Kaufman (2015, 455, 463, 488) proposes derivation from Proto-Indo-European *H₂óst 'bone' (whence Proto-Celtic *astn(ii)o- 'rib'), suiting thematically an inscribed stone from a necropolis.

COMPARANDA. ¶ 'bone': Old Irish asna, esna 'rib'; Middle Welsh asen 'rib', collective eis; Old Cornish asen gl. 'costa'; Hittite ḥastā-, Luvian hās-, Sanskrit āsthi-, Homeric ὀστέον, Latin os, ossis, Albanian asht, Armenian oskr. Cf. also Middle Welsh ascwn, ascwn, Old Cornish ascorn, Middle Cornish ascorn, ascourn 'bone' < *ast-kornu- 'bone+horn'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 783; GPC s.n. eisen; Mallory & Adams 2006, 97; Matasović 2009 s.n. *astn(iy)o-.


CONTEXT. # ?ib'oi ion asune uarb'an ek'urine ob'ar b'ara oret'o # In the sequence asune= uarb'an =ek'urine with apparent case agreement with ek'urine and the formula word uarb'an 'highest, uppermost' intervening.

INTERPRETATION. To suggest a general meaning for the broader context on the basis of etymology, asune= uarb'an =ek'urine ... b'ara ... oret'o 'As(s)un(an)ā and Ekurīganī (“Horse Queen”) ... I [this burial] have carried in deliverance (< running under) to the highest destination'. If the text does indeed contain words meaning ‘Horse-Queen’ and ‘running under’ (< *u(p)o-reto-) as proposed, an obvious suggestion is that asune means ‘divine mare’ or ‘she-ass’, as the byname or partner of the Tartessian equivalent of the Gaulish Epona Regina. A difficulty or, at any rate, complication with this explanation is that linguists have not usually grouped Gaulish Assuna with Old Irish asan, Old Cornish asen 'ass', &c. These medieval Celtic forms tend to be explained as borrowed from Latin asinus. Asinus, Greek ὀνος, and Luvian tarkasna-, all meaning ‘ass’ (cf. Mallory & Adams 2006, 139) are often regarded as borrowed vocabulary from the east ~ Sumerian anšu 'ass' (LEIA A–93). It is, however,
not unlikely that this word spread widely in later prehistory with knowledge of the equine breeding and vehicle technology. Basque asto ‘ass’ was probably borrowed from Latin or Romance, but could derive from Celtic. ¶ On the suffix of asune, cf. the formation of the Hittite theonym *Tarḫunnas and Gaulish Cernunnos pointing to an inherited Indo-European divine suffix (Watkins 1999, 12–20). If so, the text invokes the divine she-ass in conjunction with the divine horse-queen.

—baaanon (J.11.4) genitive plural ‘of women/wives’ | banon| < Proto-Celtic *banom ~ Old Irish ban; Gaulish bnanom (Larzac) (Koch 2013a, 152; Kaufman 2015, 301–2).

¶ CONTEXT. These signs are clear enough in the extant 18th-century drawing, but the context aioforainn b’aanon[ is not helpful and contains doubtful readings as well as a break.

¶ INTERPRETATION. Falling back on etymology, b’aanon corresponds precisely to the paradigmatic form implied by the identification of the recurrent b’ane (J.11.1, J.19.1, J.20.1, J.26.1) as |b,ne| < *b,nai ‘woman, female, wife’ nominative/accusative dual or dative singular, see below. It is possible that the epigrapher has written the vowel double in b’aanon to make it clear that this means |banon| with a full syllable before the first nasal, thus contrasting with monosyllabic b’ane |b,ne|.


¶ COMPARANDA. Gaulish beni (Châteaubeau) ?accusative singular, genitive plural bnanom (Larzac), accusative plural mnas (Larzac) < Celtic *bnam-s (see further Delamarre 2003, 72), personal names Seno-bena, Uitu-bena, Old Irish nominative singular ben ‘woman, wife’ < Proto-Celtic *bena < Proto-Indo-European *g*énH2 (also archaic and literary bé), dative singular archaic bein < Proto-Celtic *bene, later Old Irish mnáí, nominative-accusative dual mnái, genitive plural ban < Proto-Celtic *banom, compositional form ban- < Proto-Celtic *bano-, Old Breton ban-leu gl. ‘lène’, ban-doisuis gl. ‘musa’ < ‘goddess’, OC benen gl. ‘ sponsa”; Sanskrit jáni, gnā, Greek γυνῆ, OE cwen, Old Prussian genno, Tocharian B šana, Old Church Slavonic žena.

¶ CONTEXTS. # kielaoe: oisāa b’ane rob’ae n(a)rk’enii # (J.11.1); # liirnest’ak’un b’ane oofoir b’a[re nař]rk’enii # (J.19.1); ]t’arnek’(k)un b’ane [ro-]b’are nařk’[e (J.26.1).

¶ INTERPRETATION. Kaufman sees b’ane as dative singular throughout (cf. Old Irish mnái < *bnáí). ¶ I think that b’ane is probably a monosyllable |b,ne| or |bnê| < *bnáí, with the first graphic syllable either representing a phonetic whisper between consonants or merely a device to show a consonant cluster that could not be represented otherwise. My provisional interpretations of the examples above are as follows |... b,nê romael ‘Oiśaha, most senior wife of Kielaos’,
Lir(a)nestākūm b, nē Qorqirē (< *U(p)erīrījāi) ‘woman of the “Near the Sea” kin group wife of “Over-man”, | Taranekūm b, nē| ‘woman of the kingroup claiming descent from Taranos’. ¶ Although Kaufman interprets ba’aenae in J.15.1 differently, I think it is probably a further example with variant orthography (as influenced by the nominative singular *bena): haitura melesae≡≡b’aenae | Haiturā mele’sae≡b,nae| ‘Haitura, sweet-woman and wife’. In three of these four examples, there is an overt congruence of endings in -e (or, in the last, -ae as a more archaic graphic variant of -e), which can be interpreted as forming feminine co-ordinative compounds in the nominative-accusative dual. In two of the examples, there are typical Hispano-Celtic genitive plural kindred names immediately preceding b’aane, thus jliire ak’ un ‘of the kindred of Lir(a)nestos’ and jt’arnek’un ‘of the kindred of Tar(a)nus’. Two of the phrases include forms resembling feminine ā-stem nominatives singular: oīśa Ha and haitura. These may be taken as nominatives singular in apposition to the co-ordinative duals. In J.19.1, jliire ak’ un b’aane≡oofoire appears to be identified with an attributive form derived from the name oofoir (J.19.2) borne by an individual commemorated in the same necropolis.


| CONTEXTS. | # ?iboi ion asune uarb-an ek-urine ob-ar b’ara******t-a oret-o # (J.4.1); # b’aasteb’ufúi onunaoi t’e […]i*reiар*nio eb’u alak’iumb’o? a nařk’e b’ær | ean b’ara | b’? # (São Martinho) |

| INTERPRETATION. | In S. Martinho, the sequence ean b’aara comes near the end of the complete text and stands apart from, and inside, the main circle of signs, around which most of the text is arranged. Here ean can be understood as a feminine singular accusative relative | eām| < *jām, so we read ean b’aara as | eām bāra| ‘she whom I have carried’ or ‘that I have borne’ with feminine antecedent (Koch 2013a 122; Kaufman 2015, 440), which I take to refer back to the deceased with the burial structure receiving the interment and its inscribed stone being understood as speaking in the 1st person. This convention is likely also the case with J.4.1. |

| See further ar-b’arie, b’are, b’arei, b’aren, ro-b’are, t’e-b’are, t’e-b’arenti, t’e-ro-b’are. |

\[36\]  \textbf{b³are} \quad \textbf{b³areii}

\textit{Contexts}. -\textit{b³are} is an essential element in the SW epigraphic formula (on which see below). \textit{b³are} occurs as a simplex in J.27.1 (which is known only from an 18th-century drawing): \textbf{Juk'e šæn b³are nařk'e* [ ] b³eš**n*[} \text{Probably also in (J.1.5): \# mut'uiare b³ar[e n]ařk'ent'i a(a/m)musok'eiionii \# b³are more commonly follows recurring prefixes that can be construed as preverbs with well-attested Celtic cognates: see the entries \textit{ar-b³arie}, \textit{b³aren}, \textit{ro-b³are}, \textit{t'e-b³are}, \textit{t'ee-b³arent'i}, \textit{t'ee-ro-b³are}, also \textit{b³areii}. In J.17.2 \textbf{b³are nařk'ent'i it could be compound or simplex, as there is room for several signs in the preceding gap.}

\textit{Derivation}. A perfect of Proto-Indo-European *\textit{bher}- cannot be reconstructed from comparative Indo-European evidence (e.g. LIV 77; cf. Wodtko et al. 2008, 15–30), arguably none existed. Though probably generated independently by analogy, similar perfect forms came about early in some of the branches of Indo-European: e.g., Vedic \textit{jabhāra} 'has brought', \textit{babhāra} 'has carried' (the long vowel in these is not original), Gothic strong preterite 1st singular and 3rd singular -\textit{bar} 'carried' (cf. New English \textit{bore}). Old Irish and Early Welsh do not derive their preterites of this verb from the Indo-European perfect, but rather have \textit{t}-preterites: e.g. Old Irish -\textit{ru-bart} \textless *\textit{ro-bīrt} \textless *(p)\textit{ro-bīrt} \textless *\textit{bērt}, Middle Welsh \textit{kymmyrth} \textless *\textit{kom-bīrt}. \textit{ro-b³are}, &c., therefore implies either that the Indo-European perfect and aorist had not yet merged in the SW language (and therefore had not yet merged in its Proto-Celtic ancestor) or that the merger had taken place, but the process had once given more scope to formations derived from the perfect, a tendency that prevailed fully in Germanic (cf. Schumacher 2004). In the surviving Goidelic and Brythonic material, there are no examples of verbs with the root shape \textit{Cer-} forming an \textit{ā}-preterite. However, these patterns could be due either to an innovation in SW Celtic or one in the Insular languages, or a mere accident of survival, as the category is not extensive.

\textit{See further} \textit{ar-b³arie}, \textit{b³ara}, \textit{b³areii}, \textit{b³aren}, \textit{ro-b³are}, \textit{t'e-b³are}, \textit{t'ee-b³arent'i}, \textit{t'ee-ro-b³are}.

\textbf{b³areii} \textit{\ṣṿdíпа} (J.5.1) \textit{b³are} |\textit{bāre}| 'has borne, has carried'; 3rd sg. perfect of Proto-Celtic \textit{\ṣṿdíпа} \textless \textit{ber}- < Proto-Indo-European \textit{\ṣṿdíпа}-, + affix (Koch 2013a, 157; Kaufman 2015, 244–5; cf. MLH IV, 165).

\textit{Context}. \# \textit{sab'oi} : \textit{ist'æjib'o \textit{rinoeb'o|anak'enak'æe|ib'o iiɓan b³areii} \# The final double vowel -\textit{ii} is surely meant to represent a syllable rather than a non-syllabic glide [-\textit{i}].

\textit{Interpretations}. Kaufman identifies -\textit{ii} as a pronoun object accusative plural \textless *\textit{ins}, so 'it has borne them'. On the other hand, it could be nominative-accusative neuter singular, Proto-Indo-European *\textit{H1id} 'this one' (Latin \textit{id}), referring either to the grave as the subject of \textit{b³are} or the interment as its object. With either, the final *-\textit{d}, had it survived, could not have been represented in the SW writing system. My earlier proposal that -\textit{ii} was possibly an analogical transference of present-tense marking (i.e. the *-\textit{i} of the Proto-Indo-European primary endings) to convey a present perfect
meaning (‘[this grave] has now carried’) entails an unconfirmed analogical innovation, but it remains suggestive that in the position, where simplex bəreii occurs in J.5.1, many of the epigraphic statements end with nařk'entii or nařk'enii, forms which probably preserve the Proto-Indo-European primary ending written -ii.

¶ See further ar·b'arie, b'ara, bəar(e)n, ro-b'are, t'e-b'are, t'ee-b'arentii, t'e-ro-b'are.

bəar(e)n ŋəaʔ (J.20.1), ro-n·b'aren ʔɔŋəʔŋ (J.11.4) | bārent| ‘they have carried’ 3rd plural perfect, √ber- < Proto-Indo-European √bher- ‘bear, carry' (Koch 2013a, 157–8; Kaufman 2015, 301, 381, 489).

¶CONTEXTS. Juńi b'elišon uarn|b'an e* bəar(e)n nařk'en[ (J.20.1) There is enough space on the stone for another sign in the gap of bəar n, but nothing is visible there today. § aiqpɔrirain b'aanon**[ | ea ro-n-b'aren nařk'enii ališne # (J.11.4) This inscription survives only as an 18th-century drawing. However, most of the signs are recognizable in their usual forms. Although one stroke of the r of ro-n-b'aren is missing, the drawing does not, to my view, support Kaufman’s reading eaon b'aren (with r apparently disregarded), which gives him the translation ‘of whom they have borne’ with eaon | eaom | < *i̯ām as feminine relative genitive plural.

¶ See further ar·b'arie, b'ara, bəreii, ro-b'are, t'e-b'are, t'ee-b'arentii, t'e-ro-b'are.

b'arentii ʔɔŋəʔŋ (J.23.1), see t'ee-b'arentii.

b'ast'eb'uvoi ʔɔŋəʔŋ (S. Martinho) compound, the second element of which is the plant name Celtic ebur/o-eburā, common in place-, personal, group names, (Koch 2013a 166–7; Kaufman 2015, 70, 436, 441, 489; Nahm 2015).

¶CONTEXT. b'ast'eb'uvoi opens a long and complete inscription: # b'ast'eb'uvoi onunao t'ʔe [...][...]o*reiar*nio eb'au ...

¶INTERPRETATIONS. Per Koch, Kaufman, and Nahm, eb'uvoi goes with the Celtic comparanda below. Kaufman understands b'ast'eb'uvoi as nominative plural group name ‘the death ivy-ish ones’. Although Kaufman’s gloss sounds awkward, it is not impossible, especially in light of the Gaulish group name Eburones. The yew is poisonous, so |basteburo-| ‘death-yew’ would not have been an unintelligible qualification of the basic name, perhaps distinguishing the ‘yew’ from some of the other plants called by the same Celtic name. On the other hand, the comparanda and meaning of ebur/o- suggests alternatively that b'ast'eb'uvoi could have been a place-name, formally locative, so ‘in the yew wood’ or ‘in the death-yew wood’, possibly referring to the necropolis where the stone was placed. ¶ The element Bast(i)- is however widespread in the ancient place-names of the Iberian Peninsula, including the Iberian-speaking zone, and these names surely did not all contain Celtic ‘death’. In
the south in Roman times, there was a territory known as *Bastetania*. On its western edge was a town named *Basti*. About 100km to the west of that in Turdetania lay town *Ebura*. Therefore, it is probably easiest to understand *basteebuńoi* as the locative of a compound place-name.

**COMPARANDA.** (A) *baste-Tsab* Celtiberian *baston/iam* (lead tablet from La Manchuela, Albecete), Old Irish *bás* ‘death’ < *bàsto-m* < *g*gost- ‘extinguish’ (LEIA B–21). Alternatively, as a Palaeohispanic onomastic element: *Bastetani* near Granada, *Bastiuli* near Gibraltar, and *Mastia* near Cartagena. The geographic distribution suggests that this is a non-Indo-European element. The fluctuation of *b*– and *m*– also fits Iberian phonology.

(B) *ebuńoi* ioRuPe. Galatian personal names Ἐβουρηνα, Ἐβουρηνος, possibly Ἐβουριανος (Freeman 2001, 53); Gaulish place-names *Eburobriga*, *Eburodunum*, *Eburomagus*, *Eburovicum*; group names *Eburones*, *Eburouices*; Gallo-Roman divinities *MATRIS AVG* (*STIS*) *EBVRICIS* (Jufer & Luginbühl 2001, 38); Old Irish *ibar* ‘yew’; Ancient Brythonic *Eburācum* ‘York’ (= Old Welsh *Cair Ebrauc*); Old Welsh *Ebur*, Middle Welsh *eïwr* ‘cow parsnip, hog-weed’; Middle Breton *euor*, ModB *evor*, cf. German *Eberesche* ‘mountain ash’.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** IdgEW 334; EIEC 654; Delamarre 2003 159f; MLH V.l, 103; Matasović 2009 s.n. *eburo*; Falilleyev et al. 2010, 117–18.

**CELTIBERIAN REGION.** *ebursunos mailikinokum* (K.13, III–52 — Botorríta, Zaragoza); *SECONTIO EBVREN[I](Q)VM AMBATI F*. (Reyes 2000, 18 — Belorado, Burgos); [*T*]RAVIRS EBREWIVIS CALA[E]TI F. (AE, 1976, 293 — Barcina de los Montes, Burgos); *ANT[ONIVS] ADDIO EBVR(A)NCO A(E)M(II) F*. (ERsoria, 59; HEp, 9, 529 — Dombellas, Soria); *L. TERENTIO PATERNO EBVRANCO(N) TITI F. QVIRINALI* (CIL II, 2828; ERsoria, 94 — San Esteban de Gormaz, Soria).

**NOTE.** De Bernardo Stempel (2013, 642) interprets *ebursunos* as “‘hijo del dios EBUROS’ del gal*o *Ebrero-sú-in-o-s*’. With so much Palaeohispanic comparanda, the connection with Gaulish is probably unnecessary.

**CENTRAL REGION.** *EBVRIANVS* (CIL II, 2764 a; ERsg, 165 — Duratón, Segovia); [A]TTA LVGVA CARAECICVM EBVRENI VXOR (FE, 340; ERAv, 134; HEp, 13, 71 — Narros del Puerto, Ávila); *EBREWIVIS CVRVNDI F. CARAECIQ(VM)* (ERAv, 164 — Candeleda, Ávila).

**WESTERN PENINSULA.** place-names *Eبدأ* (Ptolemy 2, 56) = *Ebara* (Pliny 4, 117 — Évora), *Ebuorittium* (Pliny 4, 113); possibly *Ebara* (Mela 3,11) in Callaecia; personal names *LVCILA EBVRA* (HAE, 1691; CIRG I, 37 — Ciudadela, Sobrado dos Monxes, A Coruña); *EBVRVS AVRIF* (Beltrán 1975–6, 24; AE, 1977, 387 — Cañamero, Cáceres); *AMANA EBVRI F.* (HAE, 744; CPILC, 611 = CPILC, 778 — Villamesías, Cáceres); *APANA EBVRI F.* (CPILC, 407; Beltrán 1975–6, 62 — Puerto de Santa Cruz, Cáceres); *C. ARIVS AIPLOCVS EBVRF* (AE, 1977, 358 — Fundão, Fundão, Castelo Branco); *CASIA EBVRI* (CIRpz, 32 — Escuadro, Zamora); [L]IVLIVSVS EBVRA[N]CVS GAL. C. F. (CIL II/7, 873; AE, 1977, 422 — Siruela, Badajoz); *CAENOBIVS EBREVIFI N* (AE, 1967, 206; CPILC, 85 — Berzocana, Cáceres); *EBVRF* (CIRpz, 33 — Escuadro, Zamora); R[---] *EBVRNI F.* (HEp, 6, 838 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); [A]EBV[RI][NA] (Cangas de Morrazo, Pontevedra); MANTAIS / EBVRIAE (Fabião & Guerra 2010, 343–4, figs. 11-13; Guerra & Fabião 2010, 482–3 — Mesas do Castelinho, Freguesia de Santa Clara-a-Nova, Almodôvar, Beja).

**OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE.** Place-names *Ebara* (Pliny 3,10 — Cádiz); *Ebura* (Córdoba).
three paradigmatic variants of the same Celtic lexeme with a proposed translation ‘bright (one)’ (Koch 2013a, 160–1; Kaufman 2015, 125, 203–7, 361–4, 380–1, 489) < Proto-Indo-European √bhel- ‘shine’, although there are other possible roots and meanings.

¶ INTERPRETATIONS. kεo- in kεobεelibο o{O 9 could be either a preposition or part of a compound name, segmented as the latter by Untermann (MLH IV, 167) and Villar (2004); for the latter, possibly compare Q. CVMELIVS Q. [F]AB. CELER BRAC(ARENSIS) (CIL II, 2639; EE, IX, 111; ERPL, 148 — Astorga, León); CVMELIVS MEIDVENI F. (AE, 1983, 479 — Región de Lamego, Viseu). ¶ I interpret bεeli- as onomastic and the case forms respectively as dative/ablative plural, accusative singular, and genitive plural. ¶ Kaufman segments bεeliσon as bεeli, analysing this as nominative-accusative plural.

¶ COMPARANDA. Gaulish divine name in the text CΕΓΟΜΑ ρΟC ΟυΙλλΟνΕΟC ΤΟΟυΤΙΟυC ΝΑΜΑυCΑΤΙC ΕΙωρΟυ Βηλη|CΑΜΙ CΟCΙν CΟΣ ΝΕμηΤΟν ‘Segomâros son of Uillonos, citizen of Nîmes, dedicated this holy thing/place to Belesama’ (RIG I, G-153 — Vaison), MINERVAE BELISAMAE (Jufer & Lugibühl 2001, 29 — St-Lizier), also numerous attestations of Gaulish divine names Belenos and Belinos (Jufer & Lugibühl 2001, 28–9); Ancient Brythonic place-name Beleirion, divine name BELISAMA. Cf. Old Irish Bel(-tene) ‘bright-fire’, name of the festival of 1 May, ScG bealtuinn ‘May-day’.

¶ CELTIBERIAN REGION. tirtanos abulokum letontunos ke belikios (MLH IV, K.16.1 — Ibiza (Baleares); belaiokum (MLH IV, K.6.1; HEp, 11, 267 — Luzaga, Guadalajara); possibly include with these CAENIVES VEMENICVS BELVICON (Abásolo 1974a, 49 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); DEDDO / BELAI[N]OGVN C. F. (Abascal 1983, 1; HEp, 2, 414 — Ablanque, Guadalajara). ¶ place-name belaiskom (A.80), belaiskaz (K.0.2), CONTREBIA BELAISCA.


bεetisai ιΑΦO9 (J.23.1) proposed to be segmented as bεeti sai | bedi sāi ‘of a grave for her...’ (Kaufman 2015, 390–1, 489).

¶ CONTEXT. bεetisai t’ee-baarenti iru(u)arb’u iel nařrk’e:n: | uʃne

¶ INTERPRETATIONS. A Celtic word for ‘grave’ at the beginning of a funerary inscription is inherently plausible, but there are two problems with that. First, the Celtic o-stem genitive singular in -i, as in Gaulish and Ogam Irish, is an innovation, and there is no clear evidence that the form occurred in the pre-Roman languages of the Iberian Peninsula. Celtiberian had -o. Secondly, the inscription survives complete, and
beetiisai opens the text, the most usual position for the naming phrase in the SW corpus. With the reading beeti sai ‘of a grave for her’, the personal name of the deceased may not be merely absent from its usual place, but altogether. Therefore, an alternative interpretation with beetiisai as the dative singular of a woman’s name remains preferable: |Betisai de·bārenti (y)irū≡(y)ar, mū iel narkent Uχs, mē|, tentatively translated ‘[a grave] for Betisa: the supreme lord (? and Iel) have carried away, they lie down in Uxama (the highest place)’. A weakness for this second interpretation is that the onomastic comparanda are neither numerous nor especially close to beetiisai. ¶ This form, though it could represent |Met-| or |Med-|, is unlikely to have any connection with MEDAMVS (‘one counted in the middle of a series’ = ‘Middle son/child’) and related forms common as indigenous personal names in the western Peninsula. ¶ baïtes /baides/ of uncertain meaning occurs in Iberian inscriptions. However, we lack probable examples of SW e < *ai in an initial syllable, and the correspondence of the vowel in the second syllable is also inexact. ¶ Owing to the limitations of the SW writing system, beetiisai could stand for |bletisāi|; however, if this was actually the superlative adjective ‘broadest’, or a name based on it, we would expect *beetiisbaai from Proto-Celtic dative-locative *(p)letis, māi.

|COMPARANDA. (A) ‘grave, excavation’: Possibly in Celtiberian arkatobezom / arganto-beδou/ ‘silver mine’ (K.0.7), the Gaulish pn. Beda now Bitburg (Falileyev et al. 2010, 69); Middle Welsh beδ ‘grave’; Middle Breton bez; Middle Cornish beth; Latin fodiō ‘dig’, fossa ‘ditch’; Hittite padda-, pidda-; Tocharian A pāt- ‘plough’; Gothic badi ‘bed’ < Proto-Indo-European *bdēh- ‘dig’ (Mallory & Adams 2006, 372, 375, 382–3).
(B) as a personal name: Celtiberian family name betikum, the family name BEDAQ[VM] from Soria, also BETACI from the Évora region (Vallejo 2005, 210, with further examples).

|BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW s.n. bdēh-; GPC s.n. bedd; L&P 36; LIV 66; Lambert 1994, 188; Villar 1997, 906; Delamarre 2003, 70; de Vaan 2008 s.n. fodiō; Matasović 2009 s.n. *bedo-.

b°olon ♣♣♣♣♣ (J.7.1), see na·b°olon.


|CONTEXT. # b°ot'ieana≡ k'ert'o ≡robaa t'e-b'are b°a-nařk'ent'i #

|INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman analyses the name as a compound Boudi-iānā ‘booty-noble’, cf. Middle Welsh buδ+iawn. My proposed interpretation for the statement-initial naming phrase remains |Bout'ieanā kerdo romā| ‘B. first-born daughter of the artisan’.
COMPARANDA. (A) Proto-Celtic *boudi-. Gaulish feminine personal names *Boudilatis, Boudicca, *Boudicca with similar, but not identical, nasal suffix *Boudina, (Delamarre 2007, 46–7), and feminine divine names BOVDINAE, MATRONIS BOVDVNNEIHS (Jufer & Luginbühl 2001, 30); Old Irish *buaid ‘victory, gain, profit’; Ancient Brythonic *boudica; Old Welsh *budicaʋl ‘victorious’; Middle Welsh *budic ‘victorious’; Old Breton *budicɔl. Old Irish *būadach ‘triumphant, &c.’ probably reflects *boudāko- rather than *boudi(:)ko-. Modern English booty and cognate words in the other Germanic languages possibly derive from an early loanword from Celtic.

WESTERN PENINSULA. BOVDICA SEMPRONI (HAE, 1090 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); BOVDICAЕ TONGI F. MΑTRI (AE, 1967, 170; Albertos 1983, 872 — Telhado, Fundão, Castelo Branco). The examples BODIVS (AE, 1975, 514 & 515 — Coria, Cáceres), BOVDENNA CAMALI F. (CIL II, 625 / 5274; CPILC, 521 — Trujillo, Cáceres), and BOVDINNA CA[R]AI F. HSE (AE, 1993, 924 — Trujillo, Cáceres) could alternatively belong with BOVTIA, BOVTIVS, but it is not necessary to assume that these reflect a lenited t.

(B) Proto-Celtic *bouti-. A well attested name type, the distribution is predominately in the western Peninsula, but extends eastwards to Navarre. Generally rare elsewhere in Celtic territory, one BOVTIVS is attested in Gallia Belgica (OPEL I, 317) and another in Britain (CIL VII 1336, 174). Various etymologies have been proposed. Those reviewed by Vallejo (2005, 221–2) are consistent with classification as Celtic. There is no sound law that would regularly have produced BOVTIA, &c., from Proto-Celtic *boudi- ‘victory’. And it is unlikely that all the attestations can be explained as hypercorrections for BOVDI-, though this may explain a few of them. Unlike BOVTIA, &c., Old Irish both, Middle Welsh bot ‘dwelling’ derives from zero-grade Proto-Indo-European *bhu(H)-tō-. Therefore, it is more likely a form of Proto-Indo-European *gguo- ‘cow’ with a dental suffix; cf. Greek βουτης ‘cowherd’, βοτόν ‘head of cattle’, βοτάνη, βωτόρ ‘pasture’, Lithuanian gūotas ‘herd’. If so, these names are examples of the characteristically Proto-Indo-European > Proto-Celtic sound law *g> *b.

CELTIBERIAN REGION. ATTVAE BOVTIAE BOVTI F. INTERCATIENSI (CIL II, 2786; AE, 1956, 27; Palol & Vilella 1987, 36; HEP, 2, 101 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos); AVSCVS BOVTIVS VIRONI F. (Abásolo 1974a, 14 — Hontoria de la Cantera, Burgos); BOVTIA VQVLANCA SEGILI F. (HEP, 10, 79 — Belorado, Burgos); VAL(ERIA) DONATA BOTIA (CIL II, 5812; AE, 1946, 120 — Sasamón, Burgos).

CENTRAL REGION. [---]OCANCVM BOVTI (ERSg, 38 — Duratón, Segovia); BOVTI (Jiménez de Gregorio 1969, 211–12; Albertos 1972b, 22 — Talavera de la Reina, Toledo); PROCVLVA BOVTI F. PENTANIQ(VM) (AE, 1969–70, 252; Albertos 1972b, 6 — Talavera de la Reina, Toledo).

WESTERN PENINSULA. BOVTIAE SAEGLI F. (HEP, 5, 53 — Badajoz); BOVTIA ALVCCI F. (CIL II 2/7, 956; HEP, 7, 149 — Monterrubio de la Serena, Badajoz); BOVTIA CADARI F. (HEP, 2, 42 — Monterrubio de la Serena, Badajoz); BOVTIA CABRJNI F. (EE, IX 157 — Nogales, Badajoz); BOVTIAE TVCI F. (EBrag, 26; ERRBragança, 24 — Meixedo, Bragança); BOVTIA (CPILC, 50; CILCC I, 75 — Arroyo de la Luz, Cáceres); BOVTIA LATRONI F. HISTINII[S] (CPILC, 147 — Cáceres); BOVTIA BOVTI (CPILC, 197 — Carrascalego, Cáceres); BOVTIA TANGINI F. (CIL II, 798; CPILC, 200; Melena 1985, 498 — Casillas de Coria, Cáceres); BOVTIA APER F. (Albertos 1983, 871; HEP, 8, 65 — Coria, Cáceres); BOVTIA AI[BA]RI (CPILC, 208; Sánchez &
Vinagre 1998, nº 23. p. 37 — Coria, Cáceres); **BOVTIA TANGINI** (CIL II, 626; CPILC, 578 — Trujillo, Cáceres); **BOVTIAE MANTAI F.** (AE, 1983, 473 — Vale Formoso, Covilha, Castelo Branco); **BOVTIAE** (HEp, 6, 1033 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); **BOVTIAE FILIAE SVAE** (CIL II, 2380 [891, 1039]; AE, 1956, 157 — Pombeiro da Beira, Arganil, Coimbra); **FELIX BOVTIAE LIB.** (CIL II, 375 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); **BAEBA BOVTIA** (AE, 1969–70, 232 — Bencatel, Vila Viçosa, Évora); **LVRIAE T. F. BOVTIAE** (CIL II, 123 — Nossa Senhora do Bispo, Montemor o Novo, Évora); **BAEB IAE B OVT I F.** (AE, 1969–70, 232 — Bencatel, Vila Viçosa, Évora); **LVR IAE T.** (CIL II, 375 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); **BOVT IAE M ANDi F.** (CILA Huelva, 53 — El Cerro de Andévalo, Huelva); **BOVT IAE CLOVT I F.** (HEp, 6, 1033 — Salamanca); **BOVT IAE MEV** (HEp, 1, 676 — Meimoa, Penamacor, Castelo Branco); **AMOE B OVT I F.** (HAE, 1345; HEp, 11, 427 Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **BOVT IAE TRIT I ** (HEp, 6, 1033 — Salamanca); **BOVT IAE** (HEp, 5, 945 — Aguada de Cima, Águeda, Aveiro); **ACCVS BOVT I F.** (HEp, 6, 1033 — Salamanca); **BOVT IAE An TVBEL (i)** (HAE, 1345; HEp, 11, 427 Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **BOVT IAE L OVC ini F.** (CIL II, 5305; CPILC, 343 — Moraleja, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE** (Albertos 1993, 871; HEp, 6, 1033 — Coria, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE ANTVBEl(I)** (CIL II, 756; CPILC, 24; Búa 2000, 519; CILCC I, 24 — Alcântara, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE** (CPILC, 737 — Barrado, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE [---]PANFIVS** (HAE, 736; HEp, 8, 46 — Compolugar, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE LOVCIN I F.** (CIL II, 5305; CPILC, 343 — Moraleja, Cáceres); **BOVT IAE [---]** (HEp, 11, 419 — San Morales, Salamanca); **APAN BOVT I F.** (HEp, 1294; Maluquer 1956, 136, nº 69 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca) **BOVT IAE [---]** (HEp, 1294; Maluquer 1956, 136, nº 69 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca) **BOVT IAE [AM]BATI** (HAE, 1345; HEp, 11, 427 Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **AB[--]JIVO BOVT I F.** (HAE, 1345; HEp, 11, 427 Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **APAN BOVT I F.** (HAE, 1294; Maluquer 1956, 136, nº 69 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca) **BOVT IAE [---]** (HEp, 1294; Maluquer 1956, 136, nº 69 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca) **BOVT IAE [AM]BATI** (HAE, 1310 — Agallas, Salamanca); **BOVT IAE TRIT I** (HAE, 1239 — Barruecopardo, Salamanca); **BOVT IAE [---]** (Albertos 1977b, 37; Búa 2000, 468; HEp, 10, 456 — Béjar, Salamanca); **BOVT IAE TANCINI F.** (HAE, 1317 — Salamanca); **BOVT IAE** (HAE, 1909; HEp, 10, 492 — Saldeana, Salamanca); **ERGVEA BOVT I F. AMMARICVM** (HAE, 1370 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRIT I VS BOVT I AE (HAE, 1364 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca): BOVT IAE+++ (HEp, 11, 419 — San Morales, Salamanca); **DOMITEVS BVAC[---] BOVT I F.** (HAE, 1369 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **VICANVS BOVT I F.** (CIL II, 5182 — Alcácer do Sal, Setúbal); **T[---] BOVT IAE SEGONT I F. CL.** (HAE, 517; Aquae Flaviae 2, 329 — Três Minas, Vila Pouca de Aguiar, Vila Real); **APINNAE BOVT I F.** (HEp, 3, 492 — Lamas de Moledo, Castro Daire, Viseu); **BOVT IAE CIL I** (CIL II, 5252 — Lamego, Lamego, Viseu); **MAELO BOVT I F.** (CIL II, 408 — Viseu); **BOVT IAE [---]** (ERZamora, 141 — Villalarazán, Zamora); **BOVT I AE [---]** (HEp, 5, 892; CIRPZ, 215 — Villalarazán, Zamora); **CAMALA BOVT I AE [---]** (HEp, 5, 892; CIRPZ, 215 — Villalarazán, Zamora).
F. (ERZamora, 17 — Villalazán, Zamora); TALAVS TONCETAMI F. BOVTIE(CVM) (Albertos 1975a, 2. 212. nº 234 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); AMMAIA BOVTILA (AE, 1915, 8; CPILC, 471; Albertos 1977b, 35; CILCC I, 340 — Talaván, Cáceres); BOTILLA AMI F. (CPILC, 367 — Pedroso de Acim, Cáceres).

OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE. [A] VRELIAE BOVTIAE FLACCI ATTESVCLO(N) F. (CIL II, 5814; Elorza 1967, 14 — Laguardia, Álava); OPPIA BOVTIA PATRVINI F. (Castillo et al. 1981, 35 — Aguilar de Codés, Navarra); FLAVOS BOVTI F. LVCE(NSIVM), MIL. COH. I (CIL III, 9834 — Tepljút, Dalmatia; the man named was from Callaecia).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. LEIA B–107; GPC s.n. budd; DGVB 91; Lambert 1994, 59; Delamarre 2003, 83f; Meid 2005, 188; Matasović 2009 s.n. *bowdi.

bˈotˈi:Xana bˈotˈo:har[ ]†A ¥Å+Å+å# (J.7.2) Celtic compound personal name (Koch 2013a, 164; Kaufman 2015, 65, 123, 178, 188, 256–9, 491).

CONTEXT. # bˈotˈo:har[*]aa kˈarner-ion ire # The positioning at the undamaged beginning of the epigraphic text favours interpreting bˈotˈo:har[ as the name of the deceased.

INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman glosses the elements of the compound ‘warning’ |boudo-| (cf. Old Irish robud ‘notice beforehand (generally of something unexpected or dangerous), a warning’, Middle Welsh rybuð ‘warning, admonishment; advice, notice’) and ‘bestowal’ |haro-|, cf. Old Irish ernaid ‘bestows’ < Proto-Celtic *(p)ar-na-, Sanskrit prpāṭi ‘gives’, Latin parō ‘furnish, provide’ < Proto-Indo-European √perH₃ ‘bestow, give’. However, these words are rare, if not wholly absent, in Celtic onomastics. The comparanda suggests |Bodo-| as the more probable first element, perhaps from *Bodu- with neutralization of /u/ before the round vowel, or /u/ not written as proposed above. Note that since etymological *ō as a composition vowel tends to be reflected as a in the SW corpus, bˈotˈo:- is more easily explained as the reflex of Proto-Celtic *Bodu- rather than *Bodo-, with composition vowel coloured by the preceding labial glide. The second element breaks off at the end. For -har- one looks for a source with Proto-Celtic *(p)ar- or *(p)aCr-, as the SW writing system could not accurately represent a stop at the beginning of a consonant cluster: Hispano-Celtic BODOGENVS ‘born of, child of *Bodu-’ suggests the possibility that bˈotˈo:har[ represents |Bodu:o-hatr|- ‘father of *Bodu-’ or ‘having *Bodu- as father’. The Proto-Celtic stem *(p)ar-tr- < Proto-Indo-European *(p)H₃tr- : *(p)H₃tēr ‘father’ is the base of the Old Irish men’s names Aithrine and Aithre, cf. Old Irish aithre ‘paternal kindred’, Middle Welsh edryð ‘property, inheritance’ < *(p)a триo-.

ea ean eert\textsuperscript{a}une eert\textsuperscript{a}au

ea AO, ean YAO  pronoun, feminine nominative singular or nominative-accusative neuter and feminine accusative singular |eā| and |eām eām|, relative (Koch 2013a, 165–6, cf. 176–7; broadly in agreement with Kaufman 2015, 119, as follows), or possibly anaphoric, cf. Celtiberian ibos (Torrijo del Campo, Teruel).

\textbf{INTERPRETATION.} Like Celtiberian, Tartessian has an inflected clause-introductory relative pronoun (i̯o-, i̯ā-) that marks gender, number, and case. Gallo-Brittonic and Goidelic have an invariant postposed relativizer *i̯o. The former situation is Proto-Celtic, the latter innovative. Because the segments in question are short (also singular masculine accusative and nominative-accusative neuter ion [i̯om]), there are relatively numerous possible examples in the scriptio continua that are difficult to confirm as the only or best explanation: e.g. ea ro-n\textsuperscript{b}aren nafk\textsuperscript{e}nii (J.11.4) and ea nira-k\textsuperscript{a}alt\textsuperscript{e}... (Mesas do Castelinho).

\textbf{NOTE.} ea and ean < *i̯ā and *i̯ām show regular SW e from Proto-Celtic *i̯ before *ā, a sound change that probably involves both vocalization of the semi-vowel and lowering. The same phonologized change occurred in Goidelic, 1,000 or more years later; however, an inherited phonetic tendency—common or widely occurring across dialectal varieties of Proto-Celtic—is possible.

If ea ro-n\textsuperscript{b}aren nafk\textsuperscript{e}nii (J.11.4) is introduced by a subject relative, ea is probably neuter plural, as the following verbs both show plural marking, so something like ‘[these stones] that have carried him ...’ (?), cf. Kaufman (2015, 297) ‘whom they have borne’. In the last three lines of the long MdC text lii*eianiit\textsuperscript{a} | eanirak\textsuperscript{a}alt\textsuperscript{e}t\textsuperscript{a}ao | b\textsuperscript{e}esaru[?n]an, the third to last line remains opaque, but the segmentation of the last two lines as ea nira-k\textsuperscript{a}alt\textsuperscript{e} t\textsuperscript{a}ao-b\textsuperscript{e} saru[?n]an is more straightforward, revealing another probable example of a segment ea, though difficult to construe without an interpretation of the preceding line. Kaufman (2015, 460) also segments ea here and allows as the first possibility that it is the relative pronoun.

eert\textsuperscript{a}une ūHAX100 (J.55.1), possibly recurring in the fragmentary eert\textsuperscript{a}au[

\textbf{CONTEXTS.} J.55.1 is the better preserved text, with relatively clear-cut word divisions: # ro- k\textsuperscript{olion eert\textsuperscript{a}une t\textsuperscript{arielnon li\textsuperscript{ni}ene nafk\textsuperscript{e}nai #. As well as a form of the formula word nafk\textsuperscript{e}nai in its usual closing position, there is recurrent prefix ro- (J.54.1) with ]*ik\textsuperscript{e}i*[][ ]*uosor eert\textsuperscript{a}u[, from Capote, Badajoz, is more difficult and damaged, a reused Late Bronze Age warrior stela with prominent images of a chariot and an oversize lyre, which are upside-down from the perspective of inscription.

\textbf{COMPARANDA.} Celtiberian nekue uertau\textsuperscript{e}nei litom nekue taun\textsuperscript{e}i litom nekue masnai tizaun\textsuperscript{e}i litom soz auku (K.1.1, A2 — Botorrita; cf. Jordán 2007, 796).
**eert*aune eert*aau**  
**ek*uúrîne**

**INTERPRETATIONS.** eert*aune is significant evidence for the classification question, because Celtiberian uertaunei is almost surely not a name, but generally interpreted as the dative singular of an infinitive verb (cf. MLH IV, 529), thus implying that the matrix language of the SW corpus, and not just the language of its name stock, is closely related to Celtiberian. ¶ My earlier proposal, followed by Kaufman, derives eert*aune from Proto-Celtic √uert- ‘turn, exchange’ (Welsh gwerthu ‘sell’; Rix 2001, 691–2), which is possible, thus [uertaunel] or [uertaunê]. However, the Celtiberian context above suggests a simplex taunei and two compounds of the same verb, so possibly the well attested Proto-Indo-European primary verbs √deH3- ‘give’ or √dheH1- ‘place’ (cf. Fortson 2009, 71), thus parallel infinitives of Proto-Celtic *u(p)er-dā-, *dā-, and *di-dā- ‘to give over/up ... to give away’ or similar, so that eert*aune = [uer-dāunei] (cf. Woudhuizen 2014/15, 325). ¶ In Nahm’s interpretation, naŕkenai is an infinitive. If eert*aune is likewise, t'arielnon is possibly the name of the deceased and the logical subject, in the accusative, of both infinitives, so that #_ro-k’oliu eert*aune t’arielnon lińiene naŕkenai # would mean something like ‘they have announced (< made heard) that *Tariel(a)nos has given over [=?died] ... [and] lain down [here]’, cf. Cisalpine TARIOLENSVS (CIL V no. 1395 — Aquileia).

**ek*uúrîne ोण्यहे (J.4.1)** ‘Horse-Queen’ |Eku-rîg,nei|, cf. numerous Gallo-Roman dedications to EPONA REGINA (Koch 2013a, 168–9; Kaufman 2015, 60, 67, 70–1, 188, 229, 232–4, 492; Nahm 2015).

¶CONTEXT. The form occurs on a stone now lost, but for which the text is clear from a surviving photograph: # ?ib ooi ion asune uarb aan ek uuŕine ob aar b aara ta oretwö#. The same site produced a carved stone of the same thickness and geological fabric (J.4.2) with a fragmentary line of SW signs accompanied by the relief image of a woman, viewed from the back, wearing what appears to be an archaic Greek helmet and riding a large horse side-saddle.

¶INTERPRETATION. See asune above.

¶NOTE. The transcription system proposed by Rodríguez-Ramos (2000) and Ferrer (2016) would yield ebuúrine, which would resemble a Celtic personal name, see comparanda at b’ašt’eb’ufo above.

¶COMPARANDA. (A) *ek’o- ‘horse’ < Proto-Indo-European *H1ek̂u-. Galatian men’s names Ἐπορηδοριξ (cf. Middle Welsh ebrwyδ ‘swift’) Ἐποσογνατος, Ἐπαδοριξ, woman’s name Ἐπονη (Freeman 2001, 54–5); Gaulish coin legend EIQUITIVICO (Allen & Nash 1980, 196) ‘horseback fighter’, month name EQVOS (Coligny Calendar), divine name Epona (many attestations); Ogam EQODD[− (CIIC no. 186 — Cill Fhionntain / Kilfountain, Co. Kerry); VEQOANAI MAQI EQOD[− (CIIC no. 129; McManus 1991, 128 — Cooldorragha, Co. Cork); Old Irish ech; Ancient Brythonic coin legends EPATI[ for Epaticos (Van Arsdell 1989, 179–82), COMM.F.EPILLV. ‘Epillos son of Commios’ (Van Arsdell 1989, 144); Middle Welsh ebawl ‘foal’; Old Breton eb ‘horse’, ebol ‘foal’, Middle Breton ebeul; OC ebol gl. ‘pullus’; Luvian assu-; Sanskrit āśva-; Latin equus; Venetic
acc. sg. EKVON, EKVOPETARIS ‘of a horse-rider’; Greek ἵππος; OE eoh; Lithuanian asvá ‘mare’; Tocharian B yakwe.

**Celtiberian Region.** Coin legends ekualakos, ekualaku, ekualakom (A.63; Jordán 2004 nos. SP.M.32, SP.M.54, SP.M.45) show an otherwise unknown group name, an adjectival formation with the same suffixed base as Middle Welsh ebawl < *ek̂ūala-, similarly western EQVALES and EQVALiVS below, possible divine name EQVEiSViQVi (K.3.3 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel).

**Central Region.** DOBITERVS CABVRONI(Q)VM EQVAESi F. (AE, 1914, 13; ERAv, 40 — Ávila).

**Western Peninsula.** EQVALES LADRONI F. (FE, 368 — Vilar de Perdizes, Montalegre, Vila Real); EQVALiVS PECEVi (HEp, 3, 134 — Robledillo de Trujillo, Cáceres); SEXSTO EQVAESi (HAE, 899; ERZamora, 50; CIRPZ, 277 — Villalcampo, Zamora); ARCIVS EPEICI F. BRACARVS (HAE, 992; HEp, 11, 647; HEp, 13, 647 — Vila da Feira, Aveiro). It is noteworthy that the last example shows two divergent treatments of Proto-Celtic *k̂e* in the reflexes of *arki̯os* and *ek̂ikos*. It is possible that the names reflect more than one indigenous Indo-European language, which differ on this point. However, in both examples *k̂e* has been eliminated, which implies a common sound system lacking this phoneme. It is therefore possible that the dual reflexes have a historical basis within a single dialect. Such possibilities include the following two. (1) Proto-Indo-European *k̂e* (as in ‘bow and/or arrow’) and *kũ* (as in ‘horse’) did not fall together in this dialect and that the first gave /k/ and the second /p/. (2) More probably, */(-)k̂e̯j/- became */(-)k̂j/-, by assimilation of the (labio)velar to the following palatal glide, before the operation of *k̂e* > *p* in other environments.

**Outside the Briga Zone.** CALAETVS EQVESi F. (CIL II, 2968 — Oteiza, Navarra).

**Bibliography.** IdgEW 301; GPC s.n. ebol; DGVB 154; EIEC 98, 274; Delamarre 2003, 163ff; MLH VI, 104f, Wodtko et al. 2008, 230–3; Matasović 2009 s.n. *ek̂o-*.  

**Comparanda.** (B) *rīganī‘queen’. *H3rēĝniH > Sanskrit rājñī ‘queen’, Gaulish rigani, Cisalpine genitive rikanas, Old Irish rígain. Welsh Rhiannon and PIFANTIK on Gaulish coin legends point to the existence of a form *rīgant- in both Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic.

**Interpretation.** Nominative-accusative dual or dative singular (Koch), locative singular (Kaufman). Hamp (apud Kaufman 2015) proposes SW ekũ- as an inherited composition form, Proto-Indo-European *H*ekũ-, rather than *H*ekyo-s with a subsequent sound change. -fine ‘queen’ does not necessarily imply that Proto-Celtic *giene* had been lost by phonetic change in this context. Rather, the overall orthographic pattern of the corpus implies that the reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *giene* were written as SW n rather than an, where this remained possible within phonotactic constraints. Therefore, [,n] was represented as a single segment n and [r̃i̯g,nei] was not represented as a trisyllable **fikane;** the velar stop could not be shown before [,n] written n and therefore was simply not written. The Rhiannon of the Welsh Mabinogi has often been seen as the functional equivalent of Epona in the light of her numerous equine associations. The accompanying image on stone J.4.2 is comparable to representations of Epona of the Roman Period. In the Roman
dedications, the recurrent collocation EPONAE REGINAE ‘to queen Epona [Horse Goddess]’ (Jufer & Luginbühl 2001, 39–40) suggests that Eponā and the equestrian Rhiannon < *Rīgantonā might both continue the function and myth of an earlier *Eku-rīganī.


¶CONTEXT. There is little basis for suggesting word divisions in this portion of the inscription: :elurea r[...], which is worn and fragmentary.

¶COMPARANDA. Celtiberian elu (K.1.3, II–5, III–39), family name elokum (K.1.3, III–28; see MLH V.1, 112), but these don’t necessarily show -u- as part of the stem; Gaulish personal names Eluontiu, Eluadius, Eluo-rix, group names Elu-sates, Helvetii, Helve-cones (a subtribe of the Lugii in central Europe), Old Irish il- ‘many, poly-’, Welsh elw- ‘profit, gain’.

¶INTERPRETATION. If this etymology is correct, SW elu- would show characteristically Celtic loss of Proto-Indo-European *p-.

¶BIBLIOGRAPHY. GPC s.n. elw; Delamarre 2003, 162.

**Gargoris** ‘Savage king’, the fitting name of the primeval and murderous ruler of the saltus Tartessiorum in the myth of cultural origins preserved in Justin’s epitome of the Philippic Histories of Trogus Pompeius (44.4; for a full text and translation of the tale, see Freeman 2010, 316–18) < Proto-Celtic *gargo- ‘rough, savage’ + rīχs ‘king’ (Villar 2004, 265; Koch 2013a, 173–4; Kaufman 2015, 64, 68–9, 175, 178, 494).

¶COMPARANDA. ¶ First element, cf. Old Irish garg ‘fierce, savage’ and the Gallo-Roman place-name Gargarius (Delamarre 2003, 175–6), also the woman’s name Gargenna/ Gergenna from Abertura, Cáceres (Luján 2007, 256), Greek γοργός ‘terrible, frightful’ Proto-Indo-European *garĝos ‘frightening, threatening’. ¶ Second element, note in the SW corpus: aïbūris[...](J.3.1) and ariariše (J.10.1) = ariaris-se can be interpreted as Celtic rīχs names. -RIX sometimes spelled -RIXS was common in Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic personal names with plural occurring in Gaulish group names in -rīges, e.g. Catu-rīges, Bitu-rīges; cf. Old Irish rí, Latin rēx, Sanskrit ṛāj- < Proto-Indo-European *H3rḗg-s ‘ruler, king’.

[48] hat*aneate e iib*an (?)ib'o-jion or (?)ib'onion

†CONTEXT. # iru alk*u sie; nařk.cent'i mub*a t'e-ro-b*are hat*aneate e # With an accompanying image of a warrior as part of the same composition and showing all signs of being carved at the same time. He is shown with short throwing spears in each hand, extending outward from his body. If hat*aneate e relates to this image, the meaning ‘winged’ makes sense, but ‘feather’ or ‘bird’ would not. Thus, this example arguably shows the semantic development found in Brythonic, where the reflexes of Proto-Celtic *(p)atan- mean specifically ‘wing’, rather than the more general ‘wing, feather, bird’ found in other Indo-European cognates.

†COMPARANDA. Old Breton attanǫc ‘winged creature’, plural atanǫcion, Old Welsh hataned ‘wings’, Early Welsh edein, plural adaneδ ‘wings’, atar ‘birds’, singular etermn; Old Irish én ‘bird’; the reading of the second word of Celtiberian VORAMOS EDNOVM ‘highest of birds’ is doubtful (K.3.7 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); Latin penna ‘feather’; OHG fedara ‘feather’, English feather; Greek πτερόν ‘wing’; Hittite pattar, pitter ‘wing’; Sanskrit pátra- ‘wing (of a bird), feather’, Avestan patarə-ta- ‘winged’.


iib*an γΆζΜΜ or iib*au γΆζΜΜ (J.5.1).

†CONTEXT. # sab*oi : ist'alb'o results in anakte n'enke|e|ib'o iib*an b'areii #

†INTERPRETATIONS. Preferring the reading iib*an, Kaufman (2015, 75, 90, 121, 203–5, 240–5, 493) interprets this form as ‘they (may) drink’, 3rd plural subjunctive. This is possible. Although Kaufman’s overall interpretation of this text is different, his proposal for this word would suit the proposal in Koch 2013a (48–50), assuming that the function concerns a ritual that is non-funerary, at least not directly: |samoi istVbo rig,nVbo an(d)agenākVbo ibā̆nt bāre-i̯i ‘in the summer, may they drink to these indwelling queens [i.e. goddesses]’.

†COMPARANDA. Old Irish ibid, ‘ib ‘drinks’, Middle Welsh yf ‘drinks’, Old Welsh 1st pl. iben, Middle Breton eu ‘drinks’, Gaulish 2nd plural IBETIS, possibly also the Gaulish theonym IBOSVS (CIL XIII 1370), Sanskrit pibati ‘drinks’, Old Church Slavonic piti, Latin bibō ‘I drink’ < Proto-Indo-European *peH3(i)- ‘drink’.

†BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 839f; GPC s.n. yf; LIV 462f; L&P 373, RIG II.2, 349f; Delamarre 2003, 187; Mallory & Adams 2006, 256; Matasović 2009 s.n. *fibo-.

——(?)ib'o-jion γuyVnYMM or (?)ib'oonion (J.4.1) personal pronoun dative/ablative plural + relative |ibo-jom| (Koch 2013a, 44, 175, 176–7; Kaufman 2015, 55, 146, 229, 495, 504).

†CONTEXT. # ?ib'oι ion asune uarb*an ek*ufinge ob'ar b'ara*****t'a oret'o #

The sign of uncertain value at the beginning could alternatively belong to the end of the text, which forms a complete circuit. It is possible that that unusual sign merely
marks the beginning and ending of the text and has no phonetic value, though this
would be a unique example for such a practice. A further uncertainty in the reading
is whether the fifth sign is \( i \) or \( n \). A range of segmentations and grammatical
analyses are possible, including (?)ib\(^{o}\)ion with the first element resembling a
dative/ablative plural.

\[ \text{\textit{Interpretation.}} \]

ib\( \) < Proto-Celtic \(^{i}i\)i\(bos\) per Kaufman. He glosses -\(i\)ion 'when',
but formally it suits the accusative singular masculine form of the relative pronoun,
Proto-Celtic \(^{i}\)om. In the present example -\(i\)ion would be functioning as an enclitic,
like the Gaulish uninflected \(jo\), e.g. \(D\text{V}\)GI\(O\)NT\(i\)O 'who serve' (3rd plural). Other
possible examples in the SW corpus are b\(\text{arua}\)-\(i\)ion \(\{\text{A}\text{R}\text{A}\text{N}\text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree}\}\) (J.7.9) and
k\(\text{arner}\)-\(i\)ion (J.7.2), possibly recurring in k\(\text{a}[\text{r}n]\)-\(i\)r-\(i\)on (J.1.3).

\[ \text{\textit{Comparanda.}} \]

Cf. Celtiberian ibos (Torrijo del Campo, Teruel), relative iom, and the
Gaulish personal pronouns of the Larzac inscription: 3rd feminine genitive plural
\(\text{eianom}\), 3rd singular nominative feminine \(\text{eia}\), 3rd plural feminine instrumental
plural \(\text{eiabi}\), possibly genitive singular \(\text{es\(\text{i}\)as}\) (Delamarre 2003, 161).

\( i\)on This sequence of three signs occurs in contexts where it might stand for the
relative pronoun accusative singular \(|i\)om| 'that, which, whom'. See \(ib^{o}\)ion (J.4.1)
above.

-\(i\)r \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.11.3). -\(i\)ir \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.22.1) and probable case forms of the same \(i\)ru \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\)
(J.7.9, J.12.1, J.23.1) and \(i\)re \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.7.2, J.52.1) and as the second element of the compoundsoor\(\text{oi}\)r \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.19.2) and case form of the preceding oo\(\text{oir}\)e\(\text{ri}\)r \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.19.1), soloi\(r\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.11.3). uar\(b^{o}\)oir \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.22.1), and
linb\(^{o}\)oir \(\text{\textdegree}\) (J.11.2) in which the second element is a case form, < Proto-Celtic \(^{u}\)i\(ros\)
'man hero' (nom. sg.) < Proto-Indo-European \(^{u}\)i\(H\)\(r\)\(\text{o}\)\(s\) (Koch 2013a, 177–80; Kaufman

\[ \text{\textit{Note 1}}. \] The signs \(i\)re also occur on a fragment of a vessel of the 5th or 4th century BC from
Córdoba (De Hoz 1989, 555), which may be coincidental.

\[ \text{\textit{Interpretation.}} \]

Kaufman and I agree that the forms represented as -(i)ir with
no case ending are to be understood as the nominative singular with loss of final
*-\(os\), as occurred, independently, in Latin. As in Latin, this was not a general sound
law, but a special development in this high-frequency word. The analogy of the near
synonym \(r\)-stem \(^{nir}\) ( < Proto-Indo-European nom. sg. \(^{H}\)\(n\)\(\text{\textdegree}\) \(\text{\textdegree}\)\(\text{\textdegree}\) 'man, chief man, hero,
&c.') was a possible factor, and Celtiberian kar 'friendship agreement' may show a
similar development. As we do not have examples from the indigenous languages of
the western Peninsula of reflexes of nominative singular \(^{u}\)i\(ros\) as a common noun
or as the second element of a compound, we do not know if this sound change was
limited to SW Celtic of had spread more generally across the region.
I interpret the form **iru** as probably nominative-accusative dual (i.e. in a co-ordinative or *dvandva* compound, thus **iru**) would be literally ‘the hero and Alkos’, cf. Vedic mitrə́-varuṇa ‘Mitra and Varuna’, a being in two aspects, though logically and factually singular ‘the hero Alkos’), less probably dative singular (from earlier *u̯iřūi* or representing an unchanged |u̯iřūi|). However, as mentioned above (s.n. **alkuu**), these could be represent two nominative singular n-stem names: iffies (genitive iffies) and Alkū (genitive Alkonos). Kaufman proposes that **iru** is accusative singular or vocative plural. I propose that (i)ire represents nominative plural |u̯iřē| < *u̯iroi* with simplification of the diphthong (see Koch 2011, §94). Kaufman interprets ire as vocative (*u̯iře*), instrumental, or locative (*u̯iřeI*) singular.

In Kaufman’s view Proto-Celtic *u̯-* was simply lost in initial position in Tartessian, in keeping with a general view that the language had undergone extensive phonological change in its evolution from Proto-Celtic. As explained above, this conclusion may be unnecessary if we accept (with Kaufman) that SW Celtic had taken over a writing system from a language similar phonologically to Iberian and Palaeo-Basque/Aquitanian, i.e. a language lacking the phoneme /u̯/ and thus any sign for [w]. Therefore, the spellings (i)ir(-) could represent |u̯iř-| with /u̯-/ not written or, alternatively, |i̯iř-| or |u̯ir|, in which the glide was palatalized before a front vowel (cf. Koch 2011, §§97.1–3).

**Comparanda.** Gaulish personal names Uirocantus, Uirodu, Uirolo, Uirmoraros, Uironicui, Uironus, Uironotus, Uirotutta, Uirotutta, UoretoUiriuis, divine names Uirodactis, Uirodis, Uirotuti, Uirotutis, place-names Uirodunum, Uiroloicium, Uiromagus, Uirouicuos, group name Uironandui; Old Irish fer, personal names Fergnnae ~ Feradach, Ferchar, Fergal, and the extremely common Fergus (~ Pictish Uurgusth); Scottish Gaelic fear; Early Medieval Brythonic Uirgnow, Old Welsh gour, gur, personal names Gurcant, Gurgustil, Gurhaual, Guronu, Gurgust (~ Fergus), Middle Welsh gwr, Old Breton personal names Catwur < *Katu-üiros, Uurgost (~ Fergus), Gurwuoret, Middle Breton gour; OC gur gl. ‘uir’, personal names Worlowen, Worgestel, Worcant, Guryaret, MC gour; Sanskrit virá- ‘man, hero’; Avestan vira-; Latin uir; Umbrian uiro; Lithuanian výras ‘man, husband’; Gothic wair ‘man’, Tocharian A wir ‘youthful, young, fresh’.

**Celtiberian region.** TVROS CAROQVM VIROS VERAMOS (MLH IV, K.3.18; HEp, 9, 557 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); AIA ORIGENA VIRONI F. (CIL II, 6298 — Olleros de Pisuerga, Palencia; the Old Welsh personal names as spelled Guruan and Guorganu [gUr-wo’n-ı:] imply that these reflect the Proto-Indo-European compound *u̯iH-ro-gHon- ‘man-slaying’ > ‘hero’ ~ Avestan vira-gan-, rather than the suffixed Proto-Celtic *u̯irono- [see Koch 1992b]). ¶ The divine name VVROVIO (AE, 1976, 294 — Barcina de los Montes, Burgos) possibly belongs here, in which case it shows a development of [wir-] > [wur-] as in Brythonic, cf. Welsh gwryw ‘male’. ¶ A kindred name that occurs several times in the name list of Botorrita III is possibly based on *u̯irom- ‘man’: ultinos amakue uiriaskum (K.1.3, III-55 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); antiokos uiriaskum melm (K.1.3, III-9 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); anu uiriaskum (K.1.3, IV-15 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); aureiaku tuate+reskue uiriaskum (K.1.3, II-39–40 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); basuku uiriaskum (K.1.3, II-32 — Botorrita, Zaragoza);
belsu uiriaskum (K.1.3, I-21 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); bubilibor uiriaskum (K.1.3, IV-22 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); elku suolakue tirtanikum uiriaskum mel (K.1.3, III-2-3 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); elku zurekua launtikum mel (K.1.3, II-27-8 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); iunstí+[-] uiriaskum (K.1.3, I-49 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); kari uiriaskum (K.1.3, III-59 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); melmanios uiriaskum (K.1.3, I-27 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); ulitinos amakue uiriaskum (K.1.3, I-55 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); usizu uiriaskum (K.1.3, IV-23 — Botorrita, Zaragoza).

WESTERN PENINSULA. AMAENIA VIRONI F. TRITECV(M) (HAE, 1340 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); TRITIANVS VIRONI SERV. (AE, 1983, 512 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); VIRONVS TOVTONI F. (HAE, 1344 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); VIRON(VS) (HEp, 13, 544 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); BLOENAE VIRONI (CIL II, 5654; ERRBragança, 32 — Castro de Avelãs, Bragança, Bragança); CASIA VIRONI F. (HAE, 784; CPILC, 800 — Valdelacasa del Tajo, Cáceres); VIRONO CAELENI F. (AE, 1987, 564 a; ERRBragança, 86 — Nogueira, Bragança, Bragança).

COMPARANDA. Old Irish personal name Ferchú; Old Welsh Gwyrchi, Gurci, and Gurcon (from an oblique case); Old Breton Gurki; OC Wurci and Wurcon (from an oblique case). As a transparent compound of two common words, Gaelic Ferchú and Brythonic Wwrchi resisted the apocope that affected both Insular Neo-Celtic languages. It is possible that the Ancient Brythonic name for the Roman town of Wroxeter, Shropshire, is derived from this personal or divine name: Οὐιροκονιον (Ptolemy II, 3.11), spellings in Roman letters include Uiroconiorum and Uiriconio (Rivet & Smith 1979, 505).

Celtiberian region. turus retukenos statulu mezukenos koitina tueizu uiroku munika koitu koitina (K.1.3, I-2-6 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); uiroku turumokum (K.1.3, I-51 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); uiroku konikum statulos (K.1.3, III-26 — Botorrita, Zaragoza).


Interpretations. Although agreeing on the Celtic words involved, Kaufman and I construe the case inflexion and syntax differently. For both, I favour co-ordinative (dvandva) compounds, with both members as o-stems, inflected in nominative-accusative dual (with -ū < Later Proto-Indo-European < *-ō): iru≡alk'u ‘the man/hero (and) Alkos’, iru≡{u}arbui i- |yirū≡u.ar,rmū | ‘the man/hero (and) the highest one’. To judge from the comparative Celtic evidence, this construction would already have been archaic in Proto-Celtic. I think this usage was favoured by the elevated style of the funerary statements and also as a device of verbal art for the epigraphers in that its grammatical ambiguity allowed that the deceased when named in the nominative-accusative dual along with the SW epigraphic formula could be construed as either the object of t'eo-ro-bare ‘[this grave] has carried away’ and/or the subject of (b'a-)nark'ent'i ‘so they now lie below here’. Kaufman takes iru alk'u as two accusatives-instrumentals singular in case agreement, translating ‘with the man Alkos’. He segments the second as ir uarb'oiir ‘man for the uppermost’ (nominative singular + dative singular).

See also the entries for alk'u,-ir,-iir, uar(n)b'an, uarb'oiir.

iśiink'olob'o (J.1.1), see —kʾak'iśiink'olob'o.


Comparanda. Celtiberian stam, also iste (for which there are various inter-
pretations, see MLH IV, 506), Lepontic IŚOS, Latin iste, ista, istud.

¶INTERPRETATIONS. Woudhuizen segments the first as endingless feminine ista. I propose that it is the first of three datives/ablatives plural in the sequence ista|ib'o rinoeb'o|anak'ena|e|ib'o|istVbo rig,nVbo an(d)agenākVbo| ‘to these indwelling queens’.

—k'ak'išíink'olob'o +l+U X ∆ Σ + [J.1.1] ‘every, everyone’ < Proto-Celtic *k'ēk'o- < * k'ōk'o- + dative-ablative plural noun (Koch 2013a, 181; Kaufman 2015, 198–9, 496; Nahm 2015) ‘heroic one’ < ‘one who strides out’ Proto-Celtic *eχs-kingo-lo- (Koch 2013a, 181; Nahm 2015).

¶CONTEXT. # lok'ob'o niirab'o t'oafaiāk'alt'elok'onanafek'ak'išíink'olob'o ii t'e-ro-b'are (b')e t'asiionii #

¶INTERPRETATION. As a dative-ablative plural k'ak'išíink'olob'o can be seen as referring back to, or is at least as being parallel to, the first two words lok'ob'o niirab'o. The basic sense of PC *eχskings is ‘hero, champion’, thus a plausible amplification to a list commencing with gods and chief men, a probable meaning of lok'ob'o niirab'o; cf. Nahm k'ak'išíink'olob'o ‘for all warriors’. ¶ An alternative segmentation as k'ak'išíin k'olob'o may be considered as per Kaufman (2015, 197). With such a word division, the first part would have some inexact Iberian parallels. The latter, again a dative/ablative plural, might be related to k'olion (J.55.1) and/or ] k'ololion (Monte Novo do Castelinho).

¶COMPARANDA. (A) k'ak'i-: Gaulish inflected forms papon, papi, pape, papu, Old Irish cách, proclitic cach, Old Welsh paup, proclitic pop, Old Breton pop. (B) išíink'olob'o: Gaulish personal name ΞΣΚΕΓΓΟΛΑΤΙ (genitive, Les Pennes-Mirabeau), also ESCENCOLATIS in Roman script (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 59 — Aubagne) for EXCINCOLATIS /eχskingolatis/, Iberianized Gaulish eškinke (B.1.268, MLH II, 47) < /eksingsos/, EXCINGOMARVS (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 59), feminine dative ΞΣΚΕΓΓΑΙ /e(χ)skiŋgái/ (Gargas). The evidence of the Hispano-Celtic languages suggests that there was a deep-seated tendency to lose χ.

k'alt'e ΟΓIA (J.1.1), nira-k'alt'e ΟΓIAΛΆΠΗ (MdC).

¶INTERPRETATIONS. Woudhuizen (2014/15, 314) adopts one of the proposals allowed by Koch (2010, 188; 2013a, 182): SW k'alt'e as a group name related to Κελτοί, Γαλάται, &c. In favour of this possibility, it should be remembered that Herodotus did say that the Κελτοί, implicitly in his own time, the mid 5th century BC, lived in this area, i.e. ‘beyond the Pillars of Hercules and neighbouring the Κοννητες, the westernmost people of Europe’; the latter known from other sources to have been located in what is now the Algarve. Writers of the Roman Period name peoples in the south-western and north-western Iberian Peninsula as belonging to the Κελτικοί Celtici. For k'alt'e to be the equivalent of both Κελτοί and Γαλάται would
be at least possible if the latter two were variant forms of single name (Ballester 2002; cf. Sims-Williams 1998, 22). However, their equivalence is not proven (see, e.g., Mccone 2006, who, however, suggests that another Latin synonym Gallus comes immediately from Etruscan *Kalde < Proto-Celtic *galatis, meaning essentially ‘fighter’). During the Roman Period, Celtius occurred frequently as a personal name in the western Iberian Peninsula and mostly in context with other Hispano-Celtic names, making the possibility of a learned borrowing from Latin less likely. Strabo (4.1.14) considered Κέλται, rather than Herodotus’s Κέλτοι, to be the oldest form of the name, agreeing with the Latin Celtae and possibly SW k*alt*e (if dative singular); he used the form θαλάται himself.

†COMPARANDA. †CENTRAL REGION. CELT[i] (ERAv, 128; HEp, 10, 51; HEp, 13, 79 — Niharra, Ávila).

†WESTERN PENINSULA. CELTIO / CATVR/ONIS ´F(ILIO) / FILI(I) F(ACIENDVM) C(VRAVERVNT) (FE, 625 — São Pedro do Sul, Viseu); ALEBA CELTI F. (CIL II, 755; CPILC, 27 — Alcântara, Cáceres); COMMERTO CELTI F. (Téllez et al. 1982, 16; Búa 2000, 551; HEp, 16, 106; CILCC I, 238 — Montánchez, Cáceres); GAVIS CELTI (Sayans 1964, 265; Búa 2000, 553 — Navaconcejo, Cáceres); SVNVA CELTI F. (AE, 1987, 488; HEP, 2, 213 — Madrigalejo, Cáceres); [TAN]CINO CELTI F. ENTERANIES. (Melen 1985, 499–501; CPILC, 736 — Zarza la Mayor, Cáceres); CLOV[T]IVS CELTI FIL[IVS] (HEp, 18, 81 — Ibahernando, Cáceres); ANCEITVS CELTI (AE, 1967, 146 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); [A]NIVS [C]ELTI [T]AORVS (Almeida 1956, 178, n° 59 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CELTI ARANTONI F. (AE, 1967, 144; HEP, 2, 770; HEP, 5, 989 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CESSEA CELTI F. (AE, 1977, 362 — Fundão, Fundão, Castelo Branco); P. VALERIO CLEMENTI QVI. CELTI F. (AE, 1967, 182 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); [S(E)R(E)NVS CELTI F(ILIVS] (HEp, 10, 445 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); CESSEA CELTI (Vaz 1983, 577–81 — Meiñinhos, Lamego, Viseu); DOCVIRVS CELTI (HEp, 2, 899 — Carvalhal Redondo, Nelas, Viseu); DOCQVIRVS CELTI (HEp, 2, 900 — Carvalhal Redondo, Nelas, Viseu); DOQVIRVS CELTI (HEp, 2, 897 — Canas de Senhorim, Nelas, Viseu); TANGINVS CELTI F. (HEp, 7, 1276 — Castelo de Penalva, Penalva do Castelo, Viseu); L. LVCRETI CELTI (HEp, 8, 612a — Benfica do Ribatejo, Almeirim, Santarem); CELTIO ANDERCI F. (HEp, 13, 231 — Casas del Monte, Cáceres); CELTIVS CILINI F. (CIL II, 5310; CPILC, 269 — Hoyos, Cáceres); CELTIVS (CPILC, 617 — Villamesías, Cáceres); CELTIVS [IVS] TONGI (FE, 382; HEP, 11, 141 — Zarza de Granadilla, Cáceres); CELTIVS (Albertos & Bento 1977, 1206 — Meimoa, Penamacor, Castelo Branco); CELTIVS TONGI F. (AE, 1934, 22; Encarnação 1984, 638 — Montalvão, Nisa, Portalegre); CELTIVS CLOVTI F. (HEP, 4, 979 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); CELTIVS MÆLONIVS (CIL II, 5257 — Lamego, Viseu); CELTIVS MEID(VBRIGENSIS) (Vaz 1982, 505 — Lambe, Viseu); CELTIVS ET BOVTIA MEID(VBRIGENES) (CIL II, 5250 — Lamego, Viseu); APANA AMBOLI F. CELTICA SVPERTAMARICA) [Ω] MAIOBRI (HEP, 7, 397; HEP, 13, 436 — Lugo); Q. CAECI[LIO] CELTI[CO] (CPILC, 291 = CPILC, 320 — Ibahernando / La Cumbre, Cáceres); CELTIENVS CANAPI F. (HAE, 1208 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CELTIATVS VENIATI F. (CPILC, 30 — Alcollarín, Cáceres); LATRONIVS CELTIATI F. (AE, 1990, 541; HEP, 3, 280 — Verín, Ourense); DVCRIAE CELTIATIS (HEP, 2, 882; HEP, 7, 1250 — Bouçoães, Valpaços, Vila
k^alta^e nira-k^alta^e  \text{[55]}

Real); **AVNIAE ARANTONI CELTIACTICI F. LANC(IENSI) OPPIDANAE** (HAE, 1088 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); **ABRVNVS ARCELTI F.** (Beltrán 1975–76, 51; AE, 1977, 406; CPILC, 218 — Coria, Cáceres); **[P]EIDVRTA CONCELTI F.** (HEp, 5, 194 — Conquista de la Sierra, Cáceres); **BOVDELVS CONCELTI F.** (AE, 1984, 471 — Belver, Gavião, Portalegre).


¶ INTERPRETATIONS (2). There are other possible interpretations for k^alta^e, such as locatives singular |kaldē| ‘in the grove, i.e. in the necropolis’ and |nira-kaldē| ‘in the grove of men/leaders’ < *-kaldei ~ Old Irish caill ‘wood, forest’, Old Welsh celli, Old Cornish kelli, Gaulish place-names Cädís, Caldeniacum (LEIA s.n. caill), Old English and Old Norse holt ‘wood’. The Palaeohispanic group name Callaec(i)i may also belong here, as ‘forest(-country) people’, suiting Galicia, as suggested to me by Juan Luis García Alonso. That etymology is supported by the Callaecian personal name **CALDAECVS**, if that form is recognized as an archaic variant of the ethnynymic Callaecus (cf. Prósper 2011, 227), in which the original ld cluster has not yet been simplified. If we now read Celtiberian kaltaiikticos on a tessera from Osma, Soria (González Rodríguez 1986, 126) as kaldaikikos (Jordán 2005; Prósper 2011), that might also belong here.

¶ kaanan γAγΑ(Λ[ or ]aanan γAγΑ(Λ[ (J.9.1).

¶ CONTEXT. ]aanan uarb^an eb^e nař[k^e ... 

¶ INTERPRETATIONS. As the inscription is fragmentary and the word under consideration very possibly incomplete and its first surviving sign in doubt, we can only note possibilities, if and until the same wording surfaces in a better preserved text. Based on the reading ]kaanan, Kaufman (2015, 61, 281, 495) interprets this as |kanänt| or |kanänt|, a 3rd person plural subjunctive verb ‘they may sing’, cf. Old Irish canaid ‘sings’, Old Welsh canam ‘I sing’, Latin canō, Gothic hana ‘cock’ (Matasović 2009 s.n. *kan-o-). This explanation can be acknowledged as possible. ¶ Alternative possibilities include a feminine ā-stem accusative singular, possibly co-ordinated with the formula word with this ending uarb^an. If the correct reading is ]kaanan, this could be a name ending with the common Ancient Celtic element -ganām ‘born of’ < Proto-Indo-European √gēnH₁-r ‘beget a child, be born’ (Wodtko et al. 2008, 136–9). ¶ For the reading ]aanan, a connection with the name Anas (now Guadiana), the principal river of the region, is possible. The feminine name Anna and masculine n-stem Anno are common in Hispano-Celtic contexts: for example, Celtiberian ana uerzaizokum atu(nos) (K.1.3, I–34 — Botorrira, Zaragoza), **ANNA MADVGENA F.**, **ANNAE CALEDIGE, VALERIO ANNONI LVGVADICI F. VXAMENSIS** (Vallejo 2005, 141–9).
**k’aśetaana** (J.53.1) ‘overseer of tin/bronze’ [kassedannā], cf. Gaulish cassidanno(-), genitive casidani (Graufesenque) (Koch 2009, 101–2; Koch 2013a, 184; Guerra 2010b; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 300, 310; Kaufman 2015, 64–5, 189, 497; Nahm 2015), feminine ā-stem (Koch; Kaufman; Nahm).

**CONTEXT.** # k’t-ua-ratee t’nblit’sb’an orb’a set’a lak’ent’i raha k’aśetaana # Where the form under consideration is the last word of longer first line of the text, which is oriented clockwise, left-to-right in a nearly complete circle.

**INTERPRETATIONS.** Concerning the last three words, lak’ent’i raha k’aśetaana, Kaufman agrees with Koch (2013a, 114) that these are, respectively, a verb 3rd plural present ‘they (now) lie down (here)’, a woman’s name, and her office. k’aśetaana can be construed as agreeing in number and case with raha. I think it likely that raha k’aśetaana identifies the deceased and is the subject of lak’ent’i. Kaufman proposes that orb’a set’a, which he translates as ‘heirloom seats’, is the subject of lak’ent’i.

k’aśetaana [kassedannā] shows the regular phonological development in which Proto-Celtic short *i* was lowered to Tartessian ẽ/ē when preceding an ā or ā either immediately or in the following syllable after a consonant (Koch 2011, §78).

**COMPARANDA.** Gaulish ARGANTODANNOS ‘moneyer’ (< ‘silver minister’) occurring on Gaulish coinage (Delamarre 2003, 108, citing De Bernardo Stempel 1998; cf. Gorrochategui 1984, 182), also platiōdanni ‘overseers of metal’ or ‘overseers of streets’ (De Hoz 2007, 193, 196). Compare also the personal names Celtiberian Kasilos, Gaulish Cassi-talos, Ancient Brythonic Cassi-uellaunos (‘Excelling in [feats of] bronze’), &c.; it is possible that more than one homophonous root is involved in these names. Greek κασσίτερος ‘tin’ is of uncertain origin and probably a trade word going back to the Bronze Age. The name Κασσίτερίδες ‘tin islands’, mentioned repeatedly in the Greek sources (e.g. Herodotus 3.115), is of course related. Modern writers have located these islands variously in Galicia, Armorica, Scilly, and Cornwall, perhaps all of these.


**CONTEXTS.** # k’ielaoe: ośaua b’a re n(a)lk’eni # (J.11.1); loko’on k’eloia nafk[e . . | li[ | b’a[re (J.57.1); k’iu [---] k’eilau k’e iśa n[a]lk’eni # (Cabeza del Buey IV) In the contexts of the complete J.11.1 and intact ending of Cabeza del Buey IV the usual formulaic closing — n(a)lk’eni and n[a]lk’eni — appears in its most common location with no amplification. It may be significant that the latter two inscriptions were recovered from sites in Spain, the basin of the upper Guadiana, about 200 kilometres to the north-east of the main concentration of the SW corpus in south Portugal.

**INTERPRETATIONS.** The three are similar enough to be interpreted as the same form with different case endings, possibly different genders (Koch 2013a, 185–6; Nahm...
K'ielaoe: k'eloia k'elau

2015). ¶ Kaufman interprets k'eloia as the nominative singular of a woman’s name (unobjectionably), which he etymologizes as Proto-Celtic *k'eillo-giija ‘Mind-bending’. This derivation of the first element is not impossible, but apart from the protagonist of the First Branch of the Mabinogi Pwyll, Proto-Celtic *k'eillo- ‘sense, mind’ is not a common in personal names.

¶ COMPARANDA. Possibly Gaulish cele (Chateaubleau); Old Irish c'ehile ‘fellow, companion’; Middle Welsh cilid, kilid; Middle Breton e-gile ‘other’; Middle Cornish y-gyla, e-gile. The variation in the vowel of the first syllable of what are clearly cognates possibly reflects a Proto-Celtic paradigm with ablaut. Old Breton kiled and Middle Welsh kilydo show a different vowel, which cannot be fully explained by assuming a Pre-Celtic form with a movable accent, *kéliio- and *kiliio-, as the Brythonic forms imply an earlier long *i (see LEIA C–52–3). If this is the correct comparandum, k'ielaoe: ...

¶ BIBLIOGRAPHY. GPC s.n. cilydd; LEIA C–52f; Delamarre 2003, 112; Matasović 2009 s.n. *kāλýo- / *kiýo-.

¶ CELTIBERIAN REGION. [E L] Ani O Ci Li + (HEp, 5, 738 — Burgue de Osma, Soria); possibly the hospitality tessera CIΛICICOS ... CARO (CP-17).

¶ WESTERN PENINSULA. As well as the group name Cileno in the north-west of the Peninsula, there are numerous comparable Hispano-Celtic (and/or Lusitanian) personal names, most heavily in the west (Albertos 1985, 278; Vallejo 2005, 278ff; cf. Búa 2000, 530–6): CILIVS CAENONIS F. (CIL II, 741; CIPILC, 519; CILCC I, 95; HEp, 3, 121 — Brozas, Cáceres); CILIVS CAMALI F. with divine name BANDI ISIBRAIEGVI (AE, 1967, 133; Búa 2000, 508; HEp, 11, 666 — Bemposta do Campo, Penamacor, Castelo Branco); CILIVS CAMALI F. (AE, 1969–70, 216 — Ferro, Covilha, Castelo Branco); CILEVS CAENONI with divine name APVLVSEAECO (Búa 2000, 635–6 — Solana de los Barros, Badajoz); CILVS · PISI/RI · F(ILIVS) · H(IC) · S(ITVS) · E(ST) (FE, 626 — Trujillo, Cáceres); MAGILO CILI F. (CIL II, 5655; HEp, 7, 1166; ERRBragança, 65; HEp, 12, 574 — Bragança); BOETELA CILI F. (CIPILC, 259; Salas & González 1991–2, 186–7 — Granadilla, Cáceres); CILEAE CILI F. VXORI (AE, 1967, 170; Albertos 1983, 872 — Telhado, Fundão, Castelo Branco); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon, 375 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon, 392 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon, 394 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon, 361 b-c — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon,395 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon,396 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (ERCon,397 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (CIL II, 372 — Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); CILEA CILI F. (CIL II, 443 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CILEA CILI F. (CIL II, 444 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CILEA CILI F. (CIL II, 445 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); [L]ERVVS CILI F. (CIL II, 446 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); MÆLØ CILI F. (HEp, 1, 676 — Meimoa, Penamacor, Castelo Branco); ALBINVS CILI F. with divine name ILVRBEDAE (FE, 377; HEp, 10, 425 — La Alberca, Salamanca); ANTISTIVS PLACIDVS CILI FILIVS with divine name CRVGIA? MVNNIAEGO (CIL II, 2523; IRG IV, 90; Prósper 2002, 183–4 — Viana do Boio, Viana do Boio, Ourense); LANCIVS CILI
[Note: The Callaecian group name Cileni/Cilini (Pliny NH IV 111; Ptol. II, 6.24; It.Ant. 423.7, 430.3, Rav 308.2, 321.8) could belong to this root. Luján (2006, 724) lists this name as possibly Celtic.]

NOTE. The Callaecian group name Cileni/Cilini (Pliny NH IV 111; Ptol. II, 6.24; It.Ant. 423.7, 430.3, Rav 308.2, 321.8) could belong to this root. Luján (2006, 724) lists this name as possibly Celtic.

NOTE. The Callaecian group name Cileni/Cilini (Pliny NH IV 111; Ptol. II, 6.24; It.Ant. 423.7, 430.3, Rav 308.2, 321.8) could belong to this root. Luján (2006, 724) lists this name as possibly Celtic.
k’ielaoe: k’eloia k’eilau k’enila(∗)rin

**CELTIVS CILINI F.** (CIL II, 5310; CPILC, 269 — Hoyos, Cáceres); **ALBIN[VS] ALBVR[I]**

**CILINV[S]** (EE, VIII 132; ERPL, 108 — Santa Colomba de Somoza, León); **CAELEO CADROIOOLONIS F. CILENVS Ć BERISAMO** (HAE, 1695; CIRG I, 52 — Cicere, Santa Comba, A Coruña).

**OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE.** TI. **CLAVDIVS CILVS Q. F.** (CIL II, 1319 — Medina Sidonia, Cádiz); **ARANTONIVS CILI F. [T]APORVS** (CIL II2/7, 766; HEP, 1, 296 — Santa Eufemia, Córdoba); **CI LA** (HAE, 61* — Cartagena, Murcia).

¶

**k’enila(∗)rin** (J.17.4) Celtic compound personal name, accusative singular, with first element *geni- < √ĝenH₁- 'beget a child, be born' (Koch 2013a, 185; Kaufman 2015, 60, 63, 70, 187, 359–63, 494).

¶**CONTEXT.** # : **k’enila(∗)rin** | b’eilin enbe·kaarne : #  The reading from the surviving 18th-century drawing is not trustworthy. The first two words possibly show overt case agreement.

¶**INTERPRETATIONS.** Kaufman thinks **k’enila(∗)rin** is possibly woman’s name and derives the second element from Proto-Celtic *(p)lāri- 'mare'.

¶**COMPARANDA.** Deritives of the Proto-Indo-European root √ĝenH₁- are abundantly attested in Ancient Celtic and Early Medieval Celtic personal names as the second element of bithematic compounds, as shown below. Therefore, comparison with these is inexact. A smaller group of Celtic names beginning with Geni- or Gene- followed by a suffix are more probably relevant: Gaulish genetli m(anu) (Lezoux); D.M. GALLIAE SECVNDAE BAEBILIVS GENETHILVS IVL(IVS) ZMARAGDV S HERED(ES) B.M. (CIL III no. 2342 — Salona, Dalmatia); Primitive Irish NAVALLO AVVI GENITTAC[... (CIIC no. 30 — Dunbell Big, Co. Kilkenny); GENDILIO ogam and Roman script (CIIC no. 456 — Steynton, Radnorshire, Wales).  ¶ A second root may be considered: Proto-Indo-European √ken- 'begin, new, young, fresh', cf. Lat. re-cens, Gk. καινός 'young, new', Skt. kanīna 'do.'; Proto-Celtic *kenetlom 'race, kind' > OIr. cenél, Old Welsh cenetl 'kindred', Chad 2, Old Breton chenedtl, Old Cornish kinethel gl. 'generatio'.  ¶**NOTE.** Owing to the limitations of the SW writing system, the consonant clusters of the type /tl/ could not be represented accurately. Therefore, it is possible that **k’enila...** represents /genitla(ː)-/ or /kenitla(ː)-/.

¶**CELTIC COMPOUND NAMES IN -genos, -genā, &c.** Gaulish personal names Cintu-genus, Litugenus, Suadugenus, Satigenus, Nitrogenus; Primitive Irish in ogam script BRANOGENI, IVAGENI (cf. Old Irish Éogan), in Roman script CVNOCENNI FILIVS CVNOGENI (CIIC no. 342); INIGENA CVNIIGNI AVITTORGES ‘(the stone) of Cunignos’s daughter, Avittoriga’ (CIIC no. 147 — Eglwys Gymyn 2, Carmarthen-shire); cf. Old Irish gainithir ‘is born’; Old Welsh Abrgen, Anaugen, Gyvregen, Gyvidgen, Haerngen, Milugen, Morgen, Urbgen < *Orbo-genos, cf. Middle Welsh ganet ‘was born’; Old Breton gen gl. ‘ethnicus’, personal names Budien, Houarnen, Morgen-munoc, Ridgen/Ridien, Torithgen/ Torithien, Uvregen/ Uvrien, Uurmgen/ Uvormen, Uvoren/ Uvoriem; ModB genel ‘generate’; Sanskrit jānas-, Greek γένος, Latin genus.  ¶ Proto-Celtic *Matu-genos, *Mati-genos: Gaulish MATVGENVS (CIL XIII, 570 — Boudeaux); DM MATVGENO MONTANI F. (CIL XII, 2865 — Narbonensis); Old Irish mad-génatar ‘blessed are they’ lit. ‘auspiciously are they born’ (GOI 347), Mathgen (the name of a
sorcerer of the Túath Dé in *Cath Maige Tuired*; Ancient Brythonic or possibly Gaulish *matugenus* (on a potsherd from the Verulamium region); Old Welsh personal name *Matganoj*, cf. *mat-y-th-anet* ‘you were born auspiciously’, *ny mat-anet* ‘was not born auspiciously’ in *Y Gododdin*, Middle Welsh personal name *Madyein*; Old Breton personal names *Matganeo*, *Matganet* / *Matggenet*. ¶ Proto-Celtic *Medu-genos, -genā*: Latinized Ancient Brythonic DEI FAV DEI FAVNI MEDVGENI, DEI FAVNI MEDVGEN (Nash Briggs 2012 — inscribed silver spoons, Thetford treasure, Norfolk); Ogamic Pr.Ir. (genitive) MEDDOGENI, Old Irish *Midgen*; Old Welsh place-name containing personal name *Porth Medgen*.

¶ BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 373ff; DGVB 174; GPN 204; Delamarre 2003, 177f; Matasović 2011 s.n. *geno-.


WESTERN PENINSULA. TRI[TIO / -TIAE] COROGENI F. (ERRBragança, 85; HEp, 12, 586 — Donai, Bragança, Bragança); EDIGENIO DOMINO CO(...) TROPHIMVS V.S. (Mérida, Badajoz); [ID(EO)] EDIGENIO AVL(...) AŚCANI SAC(RVM) (Mérida, Badajoz), explained as ‘edi-gen-(i)yo- < *Heti- + genH- ‘renacido’ o más bien *eti-genā/ā «estirpe’ (Prósper 2002, 308). ¶ Proto-Celtic *Katu-genos: IVLIA CATVEN[A] B[--- F.] (Encarnação 1984, 452 — Bencalet, Vila Viçosa, Évora); CATVENVS TONGI F. (CPLIC, 221; HEp, 8, 77 — Coria, Cáceres); CATVENVS AVELI (with dedication to BANDI VORTIAECI; CIL II, 855; CPLIC, 333; HEp, 4, 238; HEp, 11, 122; AE, 1999, 882 — Malpartida de Plasencia, Cáceres); CATVENVS ÄECANDI F. (CPLIC, 730; M. Beltrán 1975–1976, 43; AE, 1977, 402; HEp, 14, 100 — Trujillo, Cáceres); APANA CATVENI MATER (CPLIC, 228 — Coria, Cáceres); CASINAE CATVENI (HEA, 1107 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); DOCQVIRUS CATVENI LIB. (AE, 1983, 471; FE, 19 — Orjais, Covilha, Castelo Branco); PAULVS CATVENI (AE, 1981, 544; ERZamora, 87; CIRPZ, 71 — Madridanos, Zamora); CATVENO (CIL II, 780; CPLIC, 246 — Coria, Cáceres); CATVENO TANCINI F. (CPLIC, 228 — Coria, Cáceres). ¶ Proto-Celtic *Matu-genos: BOVTIO MATVGENI F. (ERRBragança, 34; HEp, 12, 581 — Vila Nova, Donai, Bragança, Bragança); MATVGENI FA (CIRPZ, 178 = CIRPZ, 208 — Santa Cristina de la Polvorosa, Zamora); TANCINVS MATVGENI F. (EE, IX 166 — Badajoz); TRITIA MAGILONIS MATV[E]NIQ(VM) (HAE, 1356 — Yeltes de Yeltes, Salamanca); CAPITO MATVGENI F. (HAE, 784; CPLIC, 800 — Valdelacasa del Tajo, Cáceres); TOVTONO MATVGENI F. (HAE, 927; ERZamora, 54; CIRPZ, 282 — Villalcampo, Zamora). ¶ Proto-Celtic *Medu-genos, -genā: MEDVGENA TERE[NTI] FIL. (HEP, 11, 385 — Salamanca); MEDVGENA CAI F. (HEP, 11, 387 — Salamanca); MEDVGENAE ARRONIS F. (AE, 1981, 542; ERZamora, 86; CIRPZ, 36 — Fariza, Zamora); MEDVGENVS CESARONIS EX GENTE CILVRNIGORVM (HEP, 4, 66 — Gijón, Asturias); MEDVG[ENVS] (EE, VIII — Jerez de los Caballeros, Badajoz); C. LABERIVS MEDVGENVS (HEP, 5, 946 — Messejana, Aljustrel, Beja); C. LICINIVS VERVS MEDVGENI F. C[L]VN. (CIL II, 162 — São Salvador de Aramenha, Marvão, Portalegre); CAVNVS MEDVNI (HEP, 1, 181 — Plasenzuela, Cáceres); MEDVCEA MEDVNI F. (HEP, 5, 1055 — Ponte da Barca, Ponte da Barca, Viana do Castelo); MEIDVENA (HAE, 291 = HAE, 2395; IRG IV, 128 — San Cristovo de Cea, Ourense); MEARVS MEIDVENI F. (CPLIC, 743; HEp, 3, 127 — Malpartida de Plasencia, Cáceres); MEIDVENVS ANDAMI (AE, 1977, 409; CPLIC, 4 = CPLIC, 11; CILCC II, 428 — Abertura, Cáceres); TALTICO MEIDVENI F. LANCIONI OPPITANO (Beltrán 1975–6, 20 — Nuñomoral, Cáceres); RVFVS MEIDVENI (HEP, 15, 101 — Valdeobispo, Cáceres); TANGINVS MEIDVENI F. (AE, 1967, 178 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); CVMELIVS MEIDVENI F. (AE, 1983, 479 — Región de Lamego, Viseu); [M]EDIGENVS (EE, IX 72 — Mérida, Badajoz; if the M- has been incorrectly restored, this could be ‘reborn’ < *Ati-genos); probably SEX. IVLIVS LVPSVS GAL. MEDVC[--- F.] (EE, VIII 304 — Jerez de los Caballeros, Badajoz).

k‘ert‘o +A9O (J.18.1) ‘artisan’: Proto-Celtic *kerdā ‘art, skill’ ~ o-stem *kerdo-s ‘artisan, craftsman’ (Koch 2013a, 185; Kaufman 2015, 20, 188, 368, 497).

CONTEXT. # b‘ot‘ieana k‘ert‘o rob‘a t‘e-b‘are b‘a-na-fk‘ent‘i #
INTERPRETATIONS. I think it most probable that keertō is a genitive singular, identical to the o-stem ending in Celtiberian and probably a shared Hispano-Celtic innovation, thus Boutieana kerdo romā ‘Boutieana most senior female relative (probably eldest daughter) of the artisan.’ Kaufman sees keertō reflecting Proto-Celtic nominative singular *kerdos, thus being one member of a co-ordinated subject ‘Boutieana (and) Kerdos (“Craft”).

COMPARANDA. Gaulish personal name Cerdo, Old Irish cerd ‘artisan’ or specifically ‘bronze smith’, Early Welsh kerδawr ‘artisan’ or specifically ‘musician, poet, artisan’, kerδ ‘song, poem, craft’. If common origin with Greek κέρδος ‘gain, advantage; tricks’ is accepted, this supports Proto-Indo-European *kérdos ‘craft’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. GPC s.n. cerdd; LEIA C–71f; DGVB 103; L&P 37; EIEC 139, 143; Matasović 2009 s.n. *kerdā.

k'olon γιηγη[ ] (J.55.1), see ro-k'olon

[ ](Monte Novo do Castelinho)

CONTEXT. ]k'oloion : k'oloar[ ]r[.s][?k'e]nt'i,

INTERPRETATION. ]k'oloion is possibly related to, or even the same word as ro-k'olon (which see) and likewise possibly a 3rd plural form of |klo-y-| ‘hear’ as per Nahm’s explanation. As the opening of the text has broken away, the original reading could have been [ro-]koloion. Kaufman (2015, 496) derives ]k'oloion from Proto-Celtic *k'olo-yiwm ‘wheel-bending’ going with k'oloar derived from *k'olo-yarrā ‘wheel-prop’.

k'ořb'o +b+ (J.53.1) Celtic man’s name, cf. Ogamic Primitive Irish (genitives) CORBBI, CORBAGNI, Old Irish Corb, Cormac < older Corb-macc, and Coirpre (Koch 2013a, 189; Nahm 2015).

CONTEXT. //bb k'ořb'o b'arletc # This portion of this lost inscription is detached from the rest, reads in the opposite orientation (right-to-left), and is generally difficult to read. k'ořb'o is the clearest segmentable series of signs within this portion of the text. Note that there are six further violations of the principle of redundancy within the main text. Therefore, an edited transliteration |korbeo| is indicated.

COMPARANDA. Note also the Old Irish glossary word corb.i. carput ‘chariot’.

k'utuarate ∆HAPAHO (J.53.1) 3rd singular perfect verb, compound of rāte ‘has run’ √ret- ‘run’ with the preverb tu from the widely reflected Proto-Celtic preverb *to, alternatively reconstructed as *tu (Koch 2013a, 189–90; Kaufman 2015, 17, 126, 410, 416, 500).

CONTEXT. # k'tuarate t'nb'it'sb' an orb'a≡set'a ...
COMPARANDA. Old Irish fu·rráith = Old Welsh gʋo-raʋt ‘he saved, helped, delivered’ < ‘has run under’ < Celtic *u(p)o-rāte (on the derivation of the Insular Celtic ā-preterites from the Indo-European perfect, see Schumacher 2004, 75–6; cf. 2005). Note that these Insular Celtic ā-preterites agree exactly with the attested Tartessian perfect as proposed here. Early Welsh also has a related compound with two preverbs dywaret < *to-u(p)o-ret- ‘rescue, save’. SW oreto (J.4.1; see below) probably reflects the Proto-Celtic compound verb *u(p)o-ret-.

INTERPRETATIONS. *ko(m)+to-u(p)o-rāte ‘has delivered to’, expressing the action of the funerary rite with regards the deceased (Koch 2013a, 114–15, 189–90); *ko(m) tu-u(p)er-rāte ‘when s/he ran over hither’ (Kaufman 2015, 17, 126, 410, 416, 500). Kaufman’s gloss is more compatible with Old Irish co ‘up to, until’, than the reconstruction *ko(m) ‘with’, and it is not impossible that the cognate of Old Irish co ‘until, up to’ is what we have here, going back to Proto-Celtic *k̯o- (Middle Welsh py ‘up to, until’). If so, the sense would anticipate the accusative destination, ‘has run ... to/up to’. Kaufman thinks that k'tuuarat'e must contain *u(p)er not *u(p)o, because the latter otherwise is the source of Tartessian o rather than ua. However, this objection should be discounted in the light of examples such as the Gaulish byforms uoθθos alongside uassus ‘servant’ < *u(p)ostos. *u(p)o-ret- ‘help, deliver’ < ‘run under’, perfect *u(p)o-rāte can be safely reconstructed from abundant comparative evidence as a Proto-Celtic compound verb with a suitable meaning for a funerary context (although Kaufman takes this lost inscription to be non-funerary). On the other hand, there is insufficient evidence for Proto-Celtic **u(p)er-ret-, as there are no certain examples of Old Irish for-reith, preterite for-ráith, and Welsh gor-redeg first appears in the mid 19th century.

Kυνήτες Kunētes, Κυνησιοι Kunēsioi, Κονιοι Conii Celtic group name ‘the tribe of the hound’ implying a society of warriors (De Bernardo Stempel 2008b, 103; Koch 2013a, 190–2; Koch 2014a), cf. Old Welsh Cɪnʋɪt and from it the warband name Kyn(n)wydyon (Koch 2013a; Kaufman 2015, 176, 495) < Proto-Indo-European: *k̯(u)ōn ‘dog’.

INTERPRETATION. The Kunētes lived in the present-day Algarve and upper Guadiana. Speaking of his own time (the mid 5th century BC), Herodotus (4.48) calls the Kυνητες Kunētes—as likewise when he writes their name Κυνησιοι Kunēsioi (2.34)—the westernmost people of Europe (i.e. in what is now southern Portugal, which is the area of densest concentration of SW inscriptions) with the Κελτοι as their immediate neighbours to the east.

Conii occurs for a people in the south-west in sources of the Roman period (e.g. Polybius 10.7.5: Κονιοι Konioi). Strabo (3.2.2) says that Κωνιστόργις Konistorgis, a place-name which probably means ‘Town of the Konioi’, was the most famous city of the south-western Keltikoi. As now shown convincingly by Almagro-Gorbea et al.
the location of Konisturgis was Medellín on the upper Guadiana, site of the important Early Iron Age necropolis of the orientalizing Tartessian culture, findspot of J.57.1, &c. The cultural background of the Κονιοι Konioi is seen as an archaic «protocelta atlántica», which means not derived from Celtiberia or central European Urnfield, by Almagro-Gorbea et al. (2008, 1041).

COMPARANDA. Romano-British place-name Cunētio and the Old Welsh place-name arx Cynut in Asser’s Life of Alfred, also Old Welsh man’s name Cmunt, the eponym of the north British dynasty/warband the Kynwydyon (in the 12th-century Welsh genealogical source Bonedd Gŵy r Gogoledd ‘Pedigree of the Men of the North’) < Brythonic *Cunetjones, probably a recharacterized plural from older Kunētes (cf. Charles-Edwards 1978, 66–8). These names are based on Celtic *kūno- ‘hound, wolf’, forms of which were commonly used in the metaphoric extension ‘warrior, hero’: Proto-Indo-European: *k(y)ōn ‘dog’ (Wodtko et al. 2008, 436–40).

Konioi is probably also based on Celtic ‘dog’, meaning ‘hound-like men’ or ‘descendants of the [mythic] hound’. The pre-Roman place-name Conimbrigā, modern Coimbra on the central Portuguese coast north of Lisbon, can be understood as standing for a Celtic noun phrase, rather than a close compound of the more usual type, i.e. *Konijūm brigā ‘hillfort of the Konioi’. The group name Κονισκοι Koniskoi occurs in an area of thick Ancient Celtic place-names in the north-central Peninsula and probably represents another ‘Hound Tribe’ or even an offshoot of the south-western Kunētes/Konioi (as per De Bernardo Stempel 2008b, 113). That the SW inscriptions are most heavily concentrated where this group name is found indicates that the shared name is meaningful, and that the same cultural practices and language were vigorously in use in these areas.

INDO-EUROPEAN 3RD PLURAL ACTIVE VERB (MLH IV, 159, 166; Guerra 2009, 327), specifically Celtic, present-tense ‘they lie down’ < Proto-Indo-European √legh- ‘lie down’ (Koch 2013a, 192–3; Kaufman 2015, 88, 458, 497).

CONTEXT. # koe-tua-ratee tunbitesbaan orba≡setaa lakentii rhaha≡kasetana (...) NOTE. Other possible examples of this verb in the SW corpus include lakinbii ywaćkɪrɨ ⚫ (J.12.4), possibly a 1st singular present [la(:)gimil], in which case either the deceased or burial and inscribed stone are understood as the speakers. The noun loko̯n ậr̥ (J.1.1, J.57.1), probably ‘interment, burial, funerary urn’, would also belong to this IE root.

COMPARANDA. Old Irish 3rd sg. present laigid ‘lies down’, Gaulish verbs LEGASIT (Bourges) and probably causative ‘is laid down’? LOGITOE (Néris-les-Bains); Gothic ligan, Old Church Slavonic lešti, Faliscan lecet ‘lies’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 658ff; LIV 398ff; L&P 375; Matasović 2009 s.n. *leg-o-.
**CONTEXT.** There is evidence for a Hispano-Celtic kindred name, typically characterized by an adjectival *k-* suffix and the genitive plural case ending *SW-un* < Proto-Indo-European *-ōm* (MLH IV, 166; Ballester 2004b, 120; 2012, 16), ‘of the kindred living near the sea’ |Liranestākūm| < Proto-Celtic *(p)liro- ‘sea’ + *nesto- ‘near, next to’ (Koch 2013a, 195–7; Kaufman 2015, 64, 125, 145–6, 348, 374, 497, 499; Nahm 2015).

**INTERPRETATION.** The crux is the relationship of this text to that of J.19.2, a stone found nearby in the same necropolis: # ooŕoir naŕkeenbii #. As summed up by Nahm (2015): ‘Obviously two persons, one related to the other.’ To take this pair as a case study could also supply a straightforward insight into the frequent occurrence of verbs with plural inflexion in the corpus (e.g. naŕkeentii, naŕkeenii, lak'entii, &c.). With the briefer inflexion, ooŕoir is the primary figure, and his relative called |liirnest aakuun b'ane≡ooŕoire b'aa[re nař]k'eniib| identified with reference to him, not vice versa. For ooŕoir the following formula word has what can be construed as 1st singular present-tense inflexion |narke(ː)mi|, so translate as something like ‘[I] Ooŕ oir (U ̯ oru ̯ iros) now lie down [here]’. As the more central person in the society (whose name, I think, means ‘Over-man’ < *u(p)er-u ̯ iros), he can act as spokesman in the 1st singular. There is no question that he belongs, and he has his own status. Interpreting J.19.1 |liirnest aakuun b'ane≡ooŕoire b'aa[re nař]k'eniib| as |Liranestākūm b,ne=Qorgirē bāre narkenji| ‘[this grave] has carried O.’s wife of the kindred living next to the sea; they now lie below [here]’, the plural verb contrasting with the first singular can be understood as appropriate for a person of less central social importance. Her value is enhanced because with her ‘they lie down here’, including most significantly her husband Qorgir, but also the rest of the community in the necropolis, with which she is included despite originating in a kindred which has been identified, presumably because it differs from that of the people among whom she is buried. It would not make much sense to identify a woman as belonging to the kindred of the Li(a)nestākoi, if everyone she lived with and was buried with also belonged to that group. But if we assume an exogamous social order of the most common Indo-European type in which the wives were moving, liirnestaakuun not only effectively identified the woman, but also advertised the value of a marriage alliance for her husband’s kindred, in whose territory the burial and inscribed stone were probably located. In other words, part of the motivation for the recurrent use of present-tense plural verbs in the epitaphs of individuals may be to emphasize belonging to the group, by making a statement which could allude to everyone buried in the necropolis or in an immediate family cluster.
NOTE. Brandherm’s (2016) study of the necropolises in the Algarve and Baixo Alentejo shows that the burial rite of the Early Iron Age rite that has been found as the context of SW inscriptions is a precise revival of a rite Middle Bronze Age (c. 1800–c. 1300 BC) in exactly the same region. The widely separated chronological horizons are not easily distinguished without excavation: both sets characteristically include single burials in stone-lined cists and stelae reused as cap stones, all overlain by surface structures of circular or sub-circular pavements delimited by kerb stones, sometimes overlapping in clusters. Leaving aside the words on the Iron Age inscriptions, it can be seen that the message of their burial context involved a claim of ancestry and continuity with an indigenous community over centuries.

COMPARANDA. For Hispano-Celtic kindred names of this type, cf. tērnēkūn bāne in the SW corpus (J.26.1), Celtiberian alizokum ‘of the descendants of Alizos’, tīrтанikum ‘of the descendants of Tīrтанos’, tūrikim ‘of the descendants of Tūros’ (Wodtko 2003, 26), and from Cantabria AVITA [E]CON (Untermann 1980b). In inscriptions of the Roman Period, endings with -velar+ -on, -um, and -un are attested: ALONGVN, AVLGIGVN, BALATVSCV, BODDEGVN ‘of the clan of Bōdios’, CA [DECVN, CANTABREQVN, CELTGVN ‘of the clan of Celtius’, VIR[ONI]CVN (González Rodríguez 1986, 145–6). ¶ For liir- compare Old Irish ler, Middle Welsh llyr ‘sea’ perhaps related to Latin plērus < *pleiro- ‘very many’ (Indo-European *pelh₁ - ‘fill’), if so, Proto-Celtic *(p)līro- showing characteristically Celtic loss of Indo-European p. Cf. also the kindred name LER[AN][I]QV|M on a funerary inscription of the Roman Period from Segovia (González Rodríguez 1994, 172). ¶ For -nest-, compare Gaulish nēddāmōn ‘of the nearest ones’, Old Irish nessam, Middle Welsh nes ‘nearer’, nessaí ‘nearest’. ¶ As Wodtko notes (2003, 26), the -ako- suffix in Celtiberian is best attested in expressing a relationship to a place: e.g. kontebakom ‘pertaining to Contrebia’, sekaizakom ‘pertaining to Segeda’. That might also hold for SW liiirnestaakuun. The Celtiberian family name kounesikum (K.1.1) has a double relevance here: first, as showing the cognate adjectival velar suffix and genitive plural case ending in the same functions and, second, by possibly identifying a group by an eponymous ancestor *Kom-ne’ sos ‘neighbour, man living nearby’.


CONTEXT. lokōbōo=niirabōo tō aɾaiai ... begins a long, well-carved, and complete inscription. These dative/ablatives plural are closely co-ordinated with each other and more loosely with a third: lokōbōo=niirabōo ... kʰakʰišiin[kolobōo]. Cf. J.5.1: istəqibōo rinoebōo | anak’enakʰʰ-e|ibōo.

INTERPRETATION. If lokōbōo does not represent /lugubo/ as has been proposed (Correa 1992, 100 N 62; Villar 2004, 263), it might reflect the full grade Proto-Celtic *Loug- of a full-grade ablaut variant (Jordán 2006) or an archaic ablauting paradigm.
Woudhuizen, (2014/2015, 316) sees lokoobō niirabo as collocated Celtic datives-ablatives plural, meaning ‘over the Lugii (and) Nerii’. Nahm (2015) translates lokoobō niirabo as ‘for gods and men’. The desinence of lokoobō corresponds the dative-ablative plural -BO attested in ‘Lusitanian-Callaecian’ (Ballester 2004b, 120; 2012, 16). However, -BO is also the usual ending Gaulish, as in the comparable dedicatory formulas: ΜΑΤΕΒΟ ΓΛΑΝΕΙΚΑΒΟ ‘for the mothers of Glanum’ (Saint-Rémy G-64), ΡΟΚΛΟΙΣΙΑΒΟ ‘for the listeners’ (Saint-Rémy G-65), AΤΕΡΕΒΟ ‘for the fathers/ancestors’ (Plumergad, Morbihan). By contrast, the Celtiberian ending is -bos (Untermann 1985, 358). Furthermore, the Viseu inscription DEiBABOR IGO DEIOBOR VISSAEIGOBOR ‘Deabus diisque Vissaieicis’ (Fernandes et al. 2009: 146; cf. AE 2008, 643; HEp 17, 2008, 255) implies that -bo might better be interpreted as diagnostically the Western Hispano-Celtic form agreeing with Gaulish, whereas the corresponding Lusitanian dative-ablative plural ending is -bor; cf. Villar (2004, 261–2) who emphasizes that -bo (without -s) in this ending is otherwise known only in Celtic, i.e. Gaulish: ‘It would therefore seem to me more correct from the
methodological point of view to attribute \textit{-bo} to the Celts of the west rather than to the Lusitanians.’ ¶ Kaufman (2015, 121, 196, 199, 497) interprets \textit{lok\textsuperscript{o}bob\textsuperscript{o}} as the dative-ablative plural of the same noun attested as accusative singular \textit{lok\textsuperscript{o}on} (J.1.1, J.57.1), for which the translation is plausibly ‘grave, resting place’ (see below).

\textbf{COMPARANDA.} \textit{LVgBO ARQVIEONBO C. IVLIVS HISPANVS V. S. L. M.} (IRLugo, 67 — Liñarán, Sober, Lugo); \textit{LVGOBV[S] ARQVIENI[S] SILOIVS SILO EX VOTO} (IRLugo, 68; IRG II, 18 — Sinoga, Rábade, Otero del Rey, Lugo); \textit{DIBVS M[.] LVVCBO} (Peña Amaya, north of Burgos — Búa 2003, 153–4; Marco 2005, 301), and \textit{LVCBOBO AROVSA[-]} (Lugo). Cf. \textit{LVGOVIBVS} (CIL II, 2818 — Osma, Soria); \textit{LVGVNIS DEABVS} (HEp, 6, 167 — Atapuerca, Burgos); \textit{BANDE LVGVNO} (HEp, 17, 230 — Vale de Prazeres, Castelo Branco, where the first divine name is definitely Lusitanian); \textit{LVGGONI ARGANTICAENI} in Asturias, northern Spain (Búa 2000, 274 — Villaviciosa, Oviedo); that collocation is interesting in the light of the Welsh tradition of \textit{Llew fab Ar(y)anrot}.

¶ For further examples of this dative-ablative plural ending used similarly in dedications, compare \textit{DEIBABO NEMVCELAIAGABO} (Vila Real, north Portugal), \textit{ARABO COROBE|LICOOBO TALVSICOBO} (Arroyomolinas de la Vera, Cáceres, Spain [Búa 2000, 526]). ¶For the divine name, note Celtiberian dative singular \textit{LVGVEI} ‘to [the god] Lugus’ (MLH IV, K.3.3; HEP, 6, 921; HEP, 9, 541; HEP, 12, 429 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel). A Latin inscription from Uxama in Celtiberia records a dedication to \textit{LVGOVIBVS} ‘to the divine Lugoues’ by a guild of shoemakers, which is intriguing in view of the shoemaking episode in the story of Lleu (< Celtic \textit{Lugus}) in the Mabinogi. Cf. Gaulish \textit{LVGOVES} (nominative plural) from Avenches, Switzerland, Old Irish \textit{Lug}, Welsh \textit{Lieu}.

¶ Personal names: Gaulish \textit{ΛΟΥΓΟΥΣ}, \textit{LVGVSELV A} (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 65); Ogamic Primitive Irish \textit{LUQUQUIT}, \textit{LUGUVECCA}, \textit{LUGUDECCAS}, &c.; Brythonic \textit{Louocatus}, Old Breton and Old Welsh \textit{Loumarch} > \textit{Llywarch} (cf. the simplex group name \textit{Avy} of north Britain, the extensive \textit{Lugii} of central Europe); Hispano-Celtic [A\textit{TTA} \textit{LVgVA CARAECVM EBVRENI VXOR} (FE, 340; ERA, 134; HEP, 13, 71 — Narros del Puerto, Ávila); \textit{VALERIO ANNONI LVGVADICI F. VXAMENIS AVR(ELIVS) CEL(ER)} (CIL II 2732 142 — Segovia); \textit{sekanos kolukokum lukinos} (K.1.3, II-1 — Botorrita, Zaragoza). ¶ Note also the Place-name \textit{Lugisonis} (Rav.321.1) in Callaecia. ¶ The following Palaeohispanic personal names may contain the full-grade of the same root: \textit{AMBATAE AIONCABE} \textit{LOVGEI F.} (Abásolo 1974a, 185 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); \textit{[CA]LPVRNIAE AMBATE LEVGEI F.} (AE, 1980, 587 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); \textit{ELAESVS PETOLVS LOVGEI PETRAIOCI F.} (Abásolo 1974a, 70 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); \textit{AEMILIA LOVGO C. F. CLVNIENSIS} (AE, 1973, 298 — Braga); \textit{BRVTTIA FESTA LOVGEDOCVM} (CIL II, 3121; González Rodríguez 1986, nº 133 — Uclés, Cuenca).


\textbf{lok\textsuperscript{o}on} \(\alpha\xi\chi\tau\iota\) (J.1.1), \textbf{lok\textsuperscript{o}on} \(\alpha\xi\chi\psi\tau\iota\) (J.57.1) Celtic (Villar 2004, 264) accusative singular (MLH IV, 167; Jordán 2006, 60–1) or nominative-accusative neuter; ‘burial, interment, bed, resting place, grave, funerary urn’, \textit{o}-stem \textit{logom} < Proto-
Indo-European √\textit{legh} ‘lie down’ (Koch 2009, 102; 2013a, 198; Guerra 2010b; Kaufman 2015, 121, 196, 199, 497).

\textit{Contexts.} # \textit{lok}⁴\textit{ob}⁴\textit{o}≡\textit{niirab}⁴\textit{o} t\textit{o} a\textit{r}⁴\textit{ái} k\textit{a}³\textit{alt}⁴\textit{e} \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} ane \textit{nafk}⁴\textit{e} ... (J.1.1); \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} k\textit{e}³\textit{loia} \textit{nafk}⁴\textit{e} .. | \textit{li}[( ] b\textit{a}³\textit{re} (J.57.1)

\textit{Interpretations.} Apart from Jordán and myself, the writers cited above favour the possibility \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} is a case form of the same noun opening J.1.1 as dative-ablative plural \textit{lok}⁴\textit{ob}⁴\textit{o}. Thus, Villar (2004, 264) sees \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} as a genitive plural divine name; however, \textit{liirnest}⁴\textit{a}³\textit{k}⁴\textit{e} (J.19.1) and \textit{j}⁴\textit{arne}³\textit{k}⁴\textit{e} (J.26.1) imply that the corresponding SW genitive plural ending was -\textit{un} [-\textit{üm}]. Although plausible on the face of it, equating \textit{lok}⁴\textit{ob}⁴\textit{o} and \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} requires abandoning either the hard-to-deny comparison with Callaecian \textit{LVGBO ARQVIENOBO}, &c., or the similarity of Cisalpine Gaulish \textit{LOKAN} (RIG E–5 — Todi bilingual inscription) = Latin \textit{VRNVM}, more recently read \textit{SEPVLCRVM} (Estarán 2016, 238–243). This comparison is also compelling as it occurs likewise in funerary context. It therefore might be necessary to allow that the similarity of \textit{lok}⁴\textit{ob}⁴\textit{o} and \textit{lok}⁴\textit{on} is apparent only.

\textit{Comparanda.} Cisalpine \textit{LOKAN} /\textit{logan}/ ‘burial, funerary urn’, Early Welsh \textit{golo} ‘burial’ < *\textit{u(p)}\textit{to-log}–.

\textbf{meleśae} O\textit{AMOLOW} (J.15.1) woman’s name or epithet from the Proto-Celtic adjective *\textit{melits}³\textit{so}–, *\textit{melitsë}– ‘sweet’ < ‘tasting like honey’, dative singular (Koch 2013a, 198–9; Kaufman 2015, 60, 65, 124, 178, 328–9, 498) or nominative-accusative dual (Koch).

\textit{Context.} # \textit{haitura meleśae}: b³\textit{aenae} (*\textit{n} #


\textit{Interpretations.} Kaufman derives the name from the Proto-Celtic abstract noun ‘sweetness’ *\textit{melis}³\textit{ijë}, as implied by Middle Irish \textit{milsse}, Welsh \textit{melysedd}. The corresponding masculine formation is attested as a Gaulish name: D M MELIDDVIS (CIL XIII, no. 5439 — Luxeuil). However, as the Gaulish feminine ā-stem MELISSAE is well and directly attested and more closely resembles SW \textit{meleśae}, derivation from abstract *\textit{melis}³\textit{ijë} is unnecessary and requires one or more sound law to delete the segments [-ii-] from Proto-Celtic [melis]i[s]:i so as to leave no trace of their former presence. On the other hand, the lowering of Proto-Celtic *\textit{t} and *\textit{f} preceding *\textit{ā} or *\textit{à} to SW e, as in \textit{meleśae} < *\textit{Melis}i[s]ë, is found in further examples in the corpus and can
be accepted as a regular sound law: for example, hatāneate (J.12.1) < *(p)atani̯atei
‘for the winged one’, feminine accusative singular superlative tānb̥itśb̥an (J.53.1)
with |es,ma(f)m| < *-is,mām; tūrea |tūra| ‘daughter of Turos’ (J.7.8) < *Turjā (see
Koch 2011, §78).

—mut̥uirea AΩ|Ψ|Δ|Ψ|M or —šut̥uirea AΩ|Ψ|Δ|Ψ|M
(J.1.5) possible Hispano-Celtic name (Ballester 2004b; 2012; Koch 2013a, 199;

†CONTEXT. # mut̥uirea b̥ar[e n]ak̥eent̥i a(a)mušokeon̥i # The segmentation
mut̥ui or šut̥ui is also possible.

†COMPARANDA. Celtiberian genitive plural kindred name muturiskum ‘of the
descendants of *Muturos’, personal names Muturae, mutorke.

†INTERPRETATIONS. mut̥uirea can be understood as ‘female relative of *Muturos’,
feminine ī̯ā-stem, nominative singular. mut̥ui or šut̥ui would resemble the
dative singular of an o- or a u-stem; the former could be related to Celtiberian
muturiskum. ¶ Kaufman segments mut̥uire, interpreting that as the locative
singular derived from Proto-Celtic *muto-üro-s ‘penis-man’, possibly a personal
name.

na·bolon əˈbɔlɔn (J.7.1) negated 3rd plural active verb derived from
Proto-Celtic *bal-n-, √belA ‘die’ < Proto-Indo-European √g˙el-h- ‘strike, stab’ (Koch
2013a, 162; Kaufman 2015, 80, 85, 88, 107, 121–2, 252–3, 489).

†CONTEXT. # aʃa b·obir nafk̥eni | aʃa na·bolon #

†INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman labels the form as 3rd plural perfect, but formally it
resembles the active thematic inflection in the present-imperfect system, with
imperfect *-ont or present *-onti with early apocope.

†COMPARANDA. Old Irish at·baill ‘dies’, Early Welsh aballaf’aI (shall) perish’ (Marwnad
Cunedda), Sanskrit galati ‘drops, disappears’, Old English cwelan ‘to die’ (Lewis &
Pedersen §502), Lithuanian gãlas ‘end, death’: Indo- European *g˙el-h- (LIV 207–8). If
this is the relevant root, Tartessian b·olon shows diagnostically Celtic b from Indo-
European g˙.

nafk̥e O̱k̥aj (J.27.1), nafk̥e O̱k̥aj (S. Martinho), naf[k̥e]
O̱k̥aj (J.1.1), nafk̥e [O̱k̥aj (J.26.1, J.57.1, MdC), nafk̥etu [O̱k̥aj (J.16.2),
nafk̥eti [WΩk̥aj (J.56.1), nafk̥en [WΩk̥aj (J.7.8),
nafk̥enbi [WΩk̥aj (J.19.2), nafk̥eni (J.1.2, J.1.3), nafk̥enii
WΩk̥aj (J.2.1, J.21.1), nafk̥enii [WΩk̥aj (J.12.1, J.16.1, J.17.2, J.18.1), [n]afk̥entii (J.1.5), nafk̥ent[i [J.4.3),
(na)fk̥enii [WΩk̥aj (J.11.1), nafk̥enii [ADk̥omV (J.11.3), nafk̥en [R]A[k̥omV (Corte Pinheiro), naf[k̥enii (J.19.1),
nařkēn


CONTEXTS. nařkēnti, &c., never occurs at the beginning of a complete epigraphic text, but often at, or nearer to, the end:

... k‘alt‘e lok‘on ane nařkē k‘ak‘išiink‘olobo o ii t‘e-ro-b‘are ... (J.1.1);
... uarb‘an t‘irt‘os ne-b‘a-nařkēnii # (J.1.2);
[frak‘urš t‘e-b‘are nařkēnii ak‘a**ir-ion a] (J.1.3);
# mut‘uirea b‘a[e n]ařkēnti a(a/m)musok‘eoni # (J.1.5);
]b‘oara nařkēnii # (J.2.1);
]*r t‘eaion(k‘a)a ... nařkēnti[ (J.4.3);
]*reonuu[ ]u[a]rb‘a[an ... nařkēnii[ (J.4.4);
]ea-b‘are n[ařk‘]enii # (J.6.1);
aš?a b‘o(t‘)ir nařkēnai aš?a na-b‘olon (J.7.1);
]uarb‘on i[ ]nařkēn[ (J.7.5);
]eb‘o t‘e-b‘ere nařkēn emun t‘urea=lub‘a # (J.7.8);
]***nařk‘enii rašen b‘are # (J.7.10);
]aanan uarb‘an eb‘e nařk‘e (J.9.1);
# k‘ielaoo:= oisuaa :=b‘ane= rob‘ae n(a)řk‘enii # (J.11.1);
# soloir uarb‘an[ ]ina o*[ n]ařk‘enii (J.11.3);
... ea ro-n-b‘aren nařkēnii ališne (J.11.4);
# iru=alk‘u sie:= nařk‘enti mub‘a t‘e-ro-b‘are hat‘aneate # (J.12.1);
]noś t‘ae-b‘are nařk‘en # (J.14.1);
# aalaein ře[ nařk‘]enii # (J.15.3);
# uursaau*_arb‘an t‘e-bar[e] b‘a-nařk‘enti # (J.16.1);
( ]omúřk‘a[ ]anb‘at‘ia=ioob‘a[ ]e b‘a-[na]řk‘e k‘eo-ion[ (J.16.2);
... ro-b‘are b‘a-nařk‘enii# (J.16.3);
# k‘ui k‘aos a nařk‘en( ) (J.17.1);
# k‘ui arairb‘u | lb‘are nařk‘enti # (J.17.2);
INTERPRETATIONS. Given the limitations of the SW writing system, \( \text{nařk}^{e} \) (J.1.1., São Martinho, &c.) could represent |narke(ː)t| and \( \text{nařkeen} \) (J.14.1, J.7.8, &c.) |narke(ː)nt|, in other words, the Indo-European secondary endings corresponding to primary \( \text{nařk}^{e} \) (J.56.1) and \( \text{nařkeent}^{i} \) (J.1.5, J.4.3, J.12.1, J.16.1, J.16.3, J.17.2), probably the past tenses (imperfect) correspond to the present with -(n)ti. ¶ It would be an unremarkable phonological development for the forms \( \text{nařkeenii} \) and \( \text{nařkeeni} \) to represent a later pronunciation of \( \text{nařkeent}^{i} \) rather than a distinct paradigmatic form. The relative frequency of \( \text{nařkeenii} \) (with final -ii) as opposed to \( \text{nařkeeni} \) suggests that change was not a matter of [-nti] simply becoming [-ni], but that [-t-] had shifted to palatal segment, with a result such as [-nji] or [-nʧi]. ¶ The variant orthography \( \text{nařrkee:n}^{:} \) |n|eKrRan (J.23.1) implies that the signs \( R \) and \( r \) had similar or (sometimes, at least) identical sounds. ¶ Nahm (2015) proposes that \( \text{nařkeenai} \) (J.7.1, J.55.1) is an infinitive in the dative case.

As to the source and meaning of the verb itself, it remains possible that \( \text{nařk}^{e} \) is the cognate of Greek ναρκᾶω ‘grow stiff, numb, dead’ < Proto-Indo-European \( √(s)mer- \) ‘bind, fasten with thread or cord’ (cf. Koch 2013a, 202). ¶ Kaufman’s proposal relates to this same semantic field, deriving the base the base /nazg-e-/ ‘from the Celtic preverb + verb string *en=ad=rig-E-, also meaning ‘to bind in’ or from *en=ad=seg-E- meaning “to plant in”’ (2015, 14–15). ¶ Nahm (2015)
translates nařkε- as ‘lies buried’ or ‘put up’, which is inherently likely for a formulaic verb recurring in a corpus of funerary inscriptions.

The idea of Wikander (1966), subsequently adopted by Tovar (1969), and more recently revived by myself (Koch 2014b), is that nařkεnti, &c., continues Proto-Indo-European √k̂ei- ‘lie down’ (cf. κεῖται Πάτροκλος ‘[here] lies Patroklos’, Iliad 23.210). This derivation requires a shift from an Indo-European medio-passive to active inflexion. Such a development seems well motivated in light of the evidence of Vedic 3rd singular śáye ‘lies’, which lacks the synchronically regular personal marker -t- and so must have been archaic and at least somewhat anomalous already in Late Proto-Indo-European. In other words, the inherited form was ripe for reformation. nařkenbi [narke(:)mi] (J.19.2) is thus consistent with nařkεnti as IE athematic present-tense forms, 1st singular and 3rd plural respectively. Villar (2004) is therefore probably mistaken in interpreting nařkεti (J.56.1) as a thematic 3rd person singular form. The evidence is however consistent with Wikander’s theory, in which case active athematic endings (-mi, -ti, -nti) have been added to the base -kε- < Proto-Indo-European √k̂ei-. If so, the isolated fragment [n]ařkεeuu[ (Corte do Freixo 2) should probably not be interpreted as a thematic 1st person singular synonymous with nařkenbi, but segmented [n]ařkε uu].

¶NOTE. PLURAL VERBS IN THE S.W. CORPUS. As emphasized by Jordán (2015, 308–9), the resemblance nařkεnti and the other forms in forms in -(e)ntii to Indo-European primary 3rd person active verbal endings is a key pointer towards the Indo-European classification of the SW (matrix) language. As to why forms of this type occur at a high frequency, mostly in the formula, there is, in my view, more than one possibility. (1) Nahm and Kaufman have seen this as an honorific usage in keeping with the elevated genre. There may be simply a stylistic bias for 3rd plural active forms. (2) It may also be an effect of basic grammatical structure, that is, that the naming phrases, which most often contain more than one name form, are not grammatically singular, even if they refer to one person logically. Where the naming phrase shows apparent case agreement of two masculine forms in -u or two feminine forms in -e or -a, these can be understood as co-ordinate compounds, grammatically nominative-accusative duals, which governed plural verbs after the dual verbal inflexion had died out in Proto-Celtic. An advantage of retaining the dual number for the names of the deceased in funerary inscriptions was the grammatical ambiguity of subject and object. Thus, in connection with an epigraphic formula with two verbs (b̲a̲re ‘has carried’ and nařkε- ‘lie down’ or similar) the deceased named in the dual case could be construed as the object of the first verb and/or the subject of the second. (3) It is possible that the variants of (b̲a̲-) nařkεnti, coming at or near the end of so many of the epitaphs were understood as something like ‘so they now lie down [here]’, referring to the community’s necropolis as whole, and stressing that the individual named on the stone was united with the larger social and religious group venerated in the place. The usual layout of the necropolises of south Portugal in the Early Iron Age was one of clusters of cist burials with overlapping circular pavements at the surface level (see Brandherm 2016). Presumably related individuals have been meaningfully arranged in these groups. So it is hardly farfetched to suppose that the plural (b̲a̲-) nařkεnti had a logical plural subject, referring to individuals buried in primary and subsidiary interments in the immediate vicinity of the inscribed stone. The pair of stones from Pêgo (J.19.1 and J.19.2 — Ourique, Beja) support and illuminate this third possibility, as discussed above in the Interpretation of liirnest’ak’un.°
Hellenized Celtic divine name, dative singular (Almagro-Gorbea 2004b; Marco 2005, 292; Koch 2013a, 203-4; Kaufman 2015, 175, 499).

**CONTEXT.** ΝΙΘΩΙ occurs as a graffito in archaic Ionic Greek script on a Greek bowl (probably Milesian) found at Huelva and dated by Almagro-Gorbea to 590–560 BC.

**INTERPRETATION.** Almagro-Gorbea identifies this linguistic form with the name of the Hispano-Celtic divinity Nētos (accusative Nēton), who is described by Macrobius (Saturnalia I.19.5) as a solar, ray-adorned manifestation of the war god, i.e. Mars: *simulacrum Martiis radiis ornatum*. Note also the probable etymological connection with Old Irish *níam* ‘radiance, beauty’ (LEIA N-16). For the name, Marco (2005, 292) compares Nēton with Celtiberian Neito (Botorrita), though it is now doubtful that neito could be a theonym, but there are also Palaeohispanic divine epithets of the Roman period—*Cassoe Nedoletto, Nidanlua-, Reva Nitaecus*, and the *Netaci Veilebricae* named on an altar from Padrón. Cf. also *NETONI DEO* on an altar, now lost, from Trujillo, Cáceres (Búa 2000, 571–2). F. Beltrán (2002) has registered doubts about this reading, as well as some of the other evidence which has been adduced in support of a Hispano-Celtic god Neito-/Nēto-.

**COMPARANDA.** Almagro-Gorbea also compares Irish forms such as Old Irish *nia*, genitive *niath*, ogam NETTA, NETA ‘champion, hero’: e.g. NETTASLOGI, NETASEGAMONAS, NET(T)ACUNAS. That word could also be related to Old Irish *niath* (genitive), ogam NIOTA ‘nephew, sister’s son’ < Indo-European *nepot-s*, genitive *nepotos* (McManus 1991, 109-10). ΝΙΘΩΙ and Neton would imply a Hispano-Celtic o-stem, dative and accusative respectively.

**niirabºo** (J.1.1) dative-ablative plural, from Proto-Indo-European *H₂nḗr* ‘man, leader, hero, warrior’, related to the Callaecian group name Νεριοι (Correa 1981, 208; 1992, 99–100; Untermann 1995, 255; MLH IV; Villar 2004; Guerra 2010b; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 317; Jordán 2015, 309, 318), [niirabo] in which the long i reflects the ablaut spreading analogically from the Proto-Indo-European nominative singular *H₂nér* with diagnostically Celtic *i* < *ē* (Koch 2013a, 204–5; Kaufman 2015, 196, 498).

**nira-** is generally interpreted as a form of the same word as *niirabºo*, thus a Celtic word meaning ‘(chief) man’ or ‘manly’ or the derived group name Νεριοι also from Proto-Indo-European *H₂nér*. A close syntactic association with the following word kālte ỌBJYA (see entry) is also recognized (Koch 2013a, 204–5; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 314; Kaufman 2015, 196, 498).

**CONTEXTS.** The second word in this unusual and high-quality inscription, ‘Fonte Velha VI’, where it is also the second of three datives/ablatives plural in agreement: # lokºobºo niirabºo ... kakoılıiin|kºolobºo |o ... The first and surely the most important in this series is lokºobºo ‘for the [divine] Lugoues’. In the MdC text, nira-
follows a series of signs that is difficult to analyse and segment, ending with *eiā: ... lii*eiianīt*ā ea nira-k*alt*e t*ao b*e saru[ʔ]an[.

¶ INTERPRETATIONS. The comparanda indicates, in the first instance, an important Indo-European noun meaning ‘man, leader, chief, hero’. Hence, Nahm’s interpretation of lok*ob*onniirab*o as ‘to gods and men’, reminiscent of the Cisalpine Gaulish TEUOXTONI[ON (RIG II.1, E-2 — Vercelli), although the attested meanings of the reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *H₂nér indicate that the common noun had a sense more towards ‘noblemen, chiefs’, even a specifically defined rank or office, rather than simply ‘male human being’. In the Iberian Peninsula, the group name of the north-west is the best attested cognate for SW ni(i)ra-. Thus, Woudhuizen sees as two parallel Celtic group names ‘over the Lugii (and) Nerii’. However, given the difference in the vowel grade, it is not so likely that niirab*o and nira-kaalte refer to the group inhabiting Galicia some centuries later. Kaufman proposes an adjectival meaning ‘male, masculine, manly’ (cf. Vedic nárya- ‘masculine, virile, heroic’ < Proto-Indo-European *H₂néri̯o-, though this is not a perfect match formally with ni(i)ra-, unless i̯-epenthesis is involved). There is more than one possible explanation for the -a- in niirab*o and nira-kaalte. It had possibly spread from the inherited accusative forms *neram(s) < Indo-European *H₂nr̥m: replacing the problematical reflex of Indo-European *H₂nr̥bo(s). The Ogam genitive -NIRRAS (see below) could equally go back to Proto-Celtic *-níros or *-niras.

¶ COMPARANDA. The Indo-European paradigm had ablaut: *H₂nér, *H₂nér-, *H₂nr̥-: e.g. Homeric nominative singular ἄνήρ, dative ἄνδρι, accusative ἄνδρα (Homeric and Attic ἄνδρα), nominative plural ἄνδρες, dative ἄνδράσι, accusative ἄνδρας; Avestan nominative singular nā (< Indo-European *H₂nḗr), genitive nāraš, dative nārōi, accusative naram, nominative plural nāro; Oscan nominative singular niir ‘leader, magistrate’, Umbrian nîr < Italic *nēr (Wodtko et al. 2008, 332–8). Ogamic Primitive Irish DUBONIRRAS MAQQI TÉNAC[1] (McManus 1991, 65) probably shows that this Indo-European ablaut grade (i < Proto-Indo-European *ē spreading from the inherited nominative singular) survived in Proto-Celtic. Welsh nēr ‘lord, chief (frequently of God)’ and the closely synonymous nâr ‘lord, chief, leader’ likewise imply that Proto-Celtic had an inherited paradigm with vowel grades in the root. Strabo (3.3.5) and Pliny (Naturalis Historia 4.111) classed the Nērioi Neri of Galicia (cf. promontorium Nerium) as Κελτωκοὶ Celtici, an over-arching group name also occurring in south-west Hispania in the Late Iron Age and Roman times, pointing towards a general shared ‘Celtic’ identity across the western Peninsula (cf. Villar 2004, 247). In a Roman-period inscription from Briteiros, north Portugal CORONERI CAMALI DOMVS ‘a casa de Coronerus Camali’ (Búa 2004, 382; 2007, 28), NERO- could signify either ‘of the (Callaecian group) Ner(i)i’ or ‘leader (of the warband)’ or both.

omuříkª(a*)[ 76 ]

†CONTEXT. The text is carved in four lines, the most probable order being: ( )omuříkª(a*)[ ]anbªatªia≡iobªa[ ]*e bªa [na]řkªe kªe¬ion[ ♀ Kaufman’s arrangement of the lines differs (2015, 340–3): ]anbªatªi aiobªa [na]řkªekªe) o¬ion[ ( )omuříkªa[*] ]*e bªa #

†INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman (2015, 68, 343, 498) approaches this text, as he does with the SW corpus generally, as commemorating a wide range of themes and events, and less often limited to stereotypical identifications of the deceased together with (usually followed by) versions of the epigraphic formula (on which see below). This question of basic attitude to the material is significant and cannot be simply resolved as a matter of subjective preference or common sense. For Kaufman, ( )omuříkªa refers to an ‘under-sea’ creature somehow involved in the death of deceased, who bore the hapax name aiobªa. He supplies a final -s to Proto-Celtic *u(p)o-moríkãs (there is room for the sign on the stone) to restore the form in the inscription as genitive singular.

My interpretation begins with the long-standing recognition of SW ]anbªatªia as the attested Hispano-Celtic name AMBATIA, which is derived from the most common Hispano-Celtic man’s name Ambatos < Proto-Celtic *ambaχtos ‘subordinate representing a superior’ < ‘one sent around’. ]anbªatªia can be seen in case agreement with two further forms forming the naming phrase ( )omuříkªa ([ ] anbªatªia iobªa[ ], which I propose as |Qomurijkã Amba(χ)tiμ jou„mā| ‘woman of the Ūomurikoi kindred, youngest daughter of Amba(χ)tos’. Ūomurios (or the like), meaning ‘Undersea being’, would be the namesake ancestor of the kindred, possibly a mythological founder, cf. below the SW kindred name ]tªarnekuun |Tar(a)nekūm| ‘of the kindred descended from Taranos’ (J.26.1). Like ]tªarnekuun and ]liirnestªakªun (1.19.1), Celtiberian and other Hispano-Celtic kindred names are mostly attested in the genitive plural, e.g. mailikum, teiuantikum, toutinikum (all K.1.3; see Wodtko 2003, §56 — Botorrita, Zaragoza). This evidence raises the question of the significance of the contrasting syntax of ( )omuříkªa ([ ] anbªatªia iobªa[ versus ]liirnestªakªun bªane oořoire and ]tªarnekuun bªane. If these three are examples of kindred names as used in a single system of identification of individuals within a single tradition of funerary inscriptions, why is the case form sometimes genitive plural and sometimes in concord with the name of the deceased? There is a significant difference in these examples. The woman of the Lir(a)nestākoi kindred and that of Tar(a)nekoi kindred are both identified as bªane ‘woman, wife’. In other words, they are identified with reference to their husbands. In J.19.1, where the inscription has survived fully enough, we can see that the woman of Lirnestākoi is the wife of oořoire, whose own inscribed stone is J.19.2. She is ‘Mrs. oořoire’. As we seem to have an exogamous patrilocal system, as common in the early Indo-European-speaking world, oořoire was not of the Lirnestākoi himself. Had the text read *liirnestªake bªane oořoire, the case agreement might have wrongly (even transgressively) implied that oořoire was of that same kin group. It might merely have been confusing: was that who she was
before or after she married? On the other hand, ( )omurík(a*)[ ]anba'itia iob'a[ identifies a woman with her father's name and, I think also, her position within her father's family. In a patrilocal exogamous system, both the father and his dependent daughter were of the same Ūomuríkoī kindred. Any syntactic ambiguity resulting from the case agreement of the three items of the naming phrase could not lead to a misunderstanding. There is no second kindred implied, although there are two individuals are involved, as in the epitaph for the married woman ]liirnest'ak'un b'ane≡ooŕoire. Although the simplest interpretation would be to assume that 'the daughter of Amba(χ)tos' was unmarried and had perhaps died under age, the social system might have included male outsiders who had married local women, but had no hereditary legal standing or social status and were thus under the protection of their fathers-in-law; cf. the class of recognized married outsider called cú glas in the Old Irish laws (Kelly 1988, 6). Another possibility is that ( )omurík(a*)< *u(p) o-moríkā does not mean that the deceased woman is of an ancestral kindred claiming 'under-sea' as their founder, but that her spouse was a foreign mariner, castaway, or shipwreck survivor with no legal status.

¶COMPARANDA. Gaulish personal name AGEDOVIRVS MORICI FIL (CIL XIII, no. 3101 — Nantes), personal epithet MORITEX 'sea-farer' (CIL XIII, no. 8164a — Cologne), region name Aremoreica / Armorica, group name Morini, divine name DEO APOLLIN[I] MORITASGO and DEO MORITASGO (cf. Prósper 2002, 203); with the phonetic development found in ( )omurík(a), ABVDIA MVRINILLA VXOR (feminine diminutive from Morinos; AE 1905 no. 240 — Carnuntum, now Austria); Ancient Brythonic personal names Mori-uassus (Bath), Moricamulus (near Verulamium), place-names Moryκαμβη, Moridunum 'sea-fort' = ModW Caer-fyrrdin, Anglicized Carmarthen; Old Irish muir 'sea'; Scottish Gaelic muir; Old Welsh mor, ModW mór 'sea, ocean, the deep, also figuratively plenty, abundance, copiousness', also merin < *morīn- 'sea, tidal estuary'; Cornish mor 'sea', Old Breton mor; Latin mare, Old High German mari, meri 'sea, lake', Old Church Slavonic morje 'sea'.

¶BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 748; LEIA M-73, GPC s.n. mór; EIEC 503; DGVB 259; Delamarre 2003, 229; 2007, 136–7; Matasović 2009 s.n. mori-.

¶WESTERN PENINSULA. MORINIS (Diego Santos 1986, no. 220 — Cacabelos, León); MORILAE TOVTONI F. (HAE, 923; CIRPZ, 278; ERZamora, 42 — Villalcampo, Zamora); divine name MORICILIO (AE 1977, 108 — Casas de Millán, Cáceres); possibly MVRE PECE PARAMECO CADABREI (HEp, 1, 77; ERAsturias, 11 a — El Collado, Riosa, Asturias).

On the phonetic conditioning of Proto-Celtic *morī- to SW -muři-, see Koch 2011, §91.

ονι-(*b')aka'ti-še ομυρίκ ο-μυρίκ (J.10.1) 3rd person singular verb with preverbs o < *u(p)o 'under' and ni 'down(wards)' (Koch 2013a, 211; Kaufman 2015, 285, 499).

¶CONTEXT. # ariariśe : oni(*b')aka'ti-še : o(*b')er-b'efi : leoine ar-b'arie(ʔn) i(*b')ensere (?t̪̄a)u # The reading is problematical. There are many examples in
the corpus for which the sign \( \uparrow \) can be transliterated as \( b' \), as \( \uparrow \) stands for \( bi \) in the closely related SE or ‘Meridional’ script. However, in the inscription of ‘Mestras’ (J.10.1), the sign \( \uparrow \) occurs three times, never preceding \( i \), therefore, an apparent violation of the principal of redundancy in each instance, though redundancy is observed otherwise in that text. The phonetic value of \( \uparrow (b') \) is therefore uncertain.

\[ \text{COMPARANDA. -ni- : Proto-Indo-European } *ni \ (\text{Mallory & Adams 2006, 289, 292}) > \text{Vedic } ni, ny- 'downwards', \text{Old Welsh } ni-tanam 'down under me [this memorial stone]' (\text{Tywyn inscription}). \]

\[ \text{INTERPRETATION. Kaufman, ignoring } \uparrow, \text{ takes the verb to be subjunctive } ak^\text{at'iše} 'may drive' < ^*agāti, cf. Old Irish } agaid.\text{He sees the final two signs as the future ending } ^*-sjet, \text{which seems unlikely involving a second occurrence of a 3rd singular personal ending, following the tense marker. Therefore, it remains preferable to understand } -sé \text{as a demonstrative ‘this one, here’}.\]

\[ \text{oófoir } \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \text{ (J.19.2), ooófoire } \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \text{ (J.19.1) western Palaeohispanic name (MLH IV, 168), Celtic compound man’s name with second element } -\text{oir(-)} < \text{Proto-Indo-European } ^*yuiH_rós ‘man, hero’, both forms from the Pêgo necropolis and referring to the same man (Koch 2013a, 211–12; Kaufman 2015, 61, 63, 66–8, 125, 177, 375–8, 504; Nahm 2015). \]

\[ \text{CONTEXTS. } \# \text{oófoir } nařk’eñbi # \text{ and } ( )\text{lirnestaakuun } baa=[\text{re nař}]k’eñil # \]

\[ \text{INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman derives the compound from notional Proto-Celtic } ^*yosu-\text{iros ‘goodness-man’. He agrees that oófoir is nominative singular, and considers ooófoire to be locative singular; therefore, not in case agreement with b’ane ‘woman, wife’, which he treats as dative singular.} \]

My interpretation remains that oófoir and ooófoire reflect the positive grade of the traditional honorific epithet Proto-Celtic *u(p)er-\text{iros, for which the superlative is attested as Celtiberian VIROS VERAMOS ‘supreme man’ (K.3.18; MLH V.1, 444; De Hoz 2007, 202 — Peñalba de Villastar), also the SW compound uarb\text{ooir (J.22.1) |uar,mo-y’ir| ‘supreme man/hero’ < Proto-Celtic *u(p)er,mo- + *\text{iro-s. Thus the first element goes back to Proto-Indo-European } ^*(s)H_upér ‘over’ and shows characteristically Celtic loss of Proto-Indo-European *p. The vowel of the first element of ooófoir and ooófoire shows the phonological development found also in Celtiberian VORAMOS, cf. the second preverb of the Gaulish compound verb de-uor-buet-id (Lezoux).}

Therefore, the two texts are provisionally interpreted: [Oófoir nařkëmi] ‘I Ŭorù ir am now lying down below [here]’ (with ooófoir < *u(p)er-\text{iros) and [Liranesñakùm b,ñë=Oóoirë bàre narkënji] ‘[this grave] has carried Ŭorù ir’s wife (and) a woman of the Lirnestakoi group; they now lie down below [here]’ (with ooófoire < a feminine jà-stem form *u(p)er-\text{irjài} with regular simplification of diphthongs; see Koch 2011, §94).
COMPARANDA. For Proto-Celtic *u̯ir-o- ‘man, hero’ < Proto-Indo-European *yīH,ró- ‘man, young man, warrior’: see the entry above for -ir, -iir, iru ꞏ Ya ꞏ, and ire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 1177; GPC s.n. gŵr; DGVB 201; EIEC 355, 548; LHEB 337; Delamarre 2003 32If; MLH VI, 45zf; de Vaan 2008 s.n. vir; Matasović 2009 s.n. *wiro.

orbaa ꞏ A (J.53:1)

CONTEXT. # k̩-t̩-ua-rā-te t̩n̩b̩i̯t̩s̩b̩a̯n orbaa seta̯ i̯ raha k̩a̯s̩e̯t̩a̯na (...)  

INTERPRETATIONS. Koch (2013a, 212–13; 2016, 463–8) and Kaufman (2015, 188, 499) see orbaa ≡ seta̯ forming a close phrase with case agreement and the second word reflect Proto-Celtic *sedo̯- ‘seat’, both probably feminine singular or dual in my view, or nominative accusative neuter plural for Kaufman. It is possible that orbaa means ‘heiress, inheritance, inherited’, cf. the Hispano-Celtic family name [O]RBIENIC[V]M (González Rodríguez 1986, 132 — León), Old Irish orbæ, orb(b) ‘heir, inheritance’, Early Welsh (Gododdin) wr̪wyδ < Celtic *orbjom, Gaulish personal names Orḅus, Orḅia, &c. (Delamarre 2003, 243), the Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic compound name ORBIOTALVS (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 69) < Proto-Celtic *orbjom < Proto-Indo-European *H₂/₃ orbhos ‘orphan’ (De Hoz 2007, 197). This interpretation is favoured by Kaufman, thus orbaa ≡ seta̯ ‘heirloom seats’.

In light of the prevailing themes and vocabulary of the SW corpus, I now think it more likely that orbaa is a phonological variant (showing development parallel to that of Celtiberian VORAMOS) and different case of the SW formula word uar(n)b̩a̯n (which see) in the feminine nominative singular. Thus read k̩-t̩-ua-rā-te t̩n̩b̩i̯t̩s̩b̩a̯n orbaa ≡ seta̯ ... raha ≡ k̩a̯s̩e̯t̩a̯na | ko(m) tu-ua-rā-te tumetis, mām (y) or, má ≡ sedā ... Raha ≡ kassetanā| ‘the highest seat (=enthroned supreme deity) has safely delivered Raha the bronze officer to the greatest tumulus’. In other words, orbaa ≡ seta̯ would have the same two elements as Old Welsh gʋorsed ‘tumulus, ceremonial mound, throne, &c.’ with a superlative form of the first element for a poetic meaning something like ‘gorsedd, sedd oruchaf’.


CONTEXT. The interpretation is supported by the forms asune ≡ uarb̩a̯n ≡ ek̩u̯r̩ine ꞏ ‘divine she-ass(?) ... Horse-queen’ in the same text, as well as the relief carving of a helmeted horsewoman from the same site (Benaciate, inscription J.4.2). To deliver to safety by running under (Proto-Celtic *u̯(p)o-reto-) would be the principal virtue of the horse deity.

INTERPRETATIONS. If ak̩olio̯š (J.56.1) and t̩i̯r̩t̩os (J.1.2) are most probably o-stem nominative singulars, Kaufman’s interpretation of oret̩o as a masculine o-stem
nominative singular (Proto-Celtic *u(p)o-reto-s) with loss of final -s raises questions. The problem is avoided by retaining the interpretation that the form is genitive singular in -o as well attested in Celtiberian.

†COMPARANDA. Gaulish VORETO- occurs in names; Old Irish fo·reith, Old Welsh gworet, Middle Welsh gwaret, dwyaret, &c. The older meaning of the compound is reflected in Old Irish fod·rethat ‘that run under him’ referring to chariot wheels in Audacht Morainn, Early Welsh (Gododdin) eðystrawr pasc a-e gwaredei ‘it was well-nourished steeds that were wont to run under him [i.e. the hero]’. Probably a form of the same verb is the perfect 3rd singular k·e·ṭ-u-a·raṭe ‘has delivered’ (J.53.1); see entry.

—otørkaa Aŋ9ol† or otørkaař*[ ]’Aŋ9ol† (J.1.4) ‘grave, burial, tomb’ < Proto-Celtic *u(p)o-derk- < Proto-Indo-European *derk̂- ‘glance at, see’ (Koch 2013a, 214; Kaufman 2015, 214, 217, 492)

†CONTEXT. ]sekũ uurk’e otørkaa ř*[ ]aēhaeōleala[ Because of the fragmentary state of the stone and text—half or less survives—and absence of any of the formula words, interpretation is difficult. However, the meaning can be proposed due to the fact that the stone was found in the Fonte Velha Early Iron Age necropolis taken together with the form’s close resemblance to a Gaulish word, the meaning of which would be appropriate in an epigraphic text commemorating a burial.

†INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman labels otørkaa a nominative-accusative neuter plural ‘tombs’, which is possible.

†COMPARANDA. Gaulish uoderco, uoderce ‘tomb, burial’ (Delamarre 2003, 326, citing Fleuriot — Larzac) < ‘under-cavity’, personal names INDERCILLVS, INDERCINIUS, INDERCVS (Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 63); Old Irish derc, also deirc, ‘cavity’ as well as ‘eye, face’, and the verb a-t-chondarc ‘saw’, drech ‘face’ < *drikā < *dṛkā; Welsh drych ‘appearance, mirror’ must belong to this root; Sanskrit dars-; Gk δέρκομαι; OE torht ‘bright, clear’; Albanian dritë ‘light’.

†BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW, 213; GPN 344f; LEIA D-55f; LIV 122; EIEC 505; Lambert 1994, 167; MLHV.l, 378f; Matasović 2009 s.n. derk-.

†CELTIBERIAN REGION. terkininei (Torrio del Campo, Teruel); bartiltun ekarbilos munika elkuakue koitinas terkinos toutinikum leton (K.1.3, II 50–52 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); terkinos austikum eskutino (K.1.3, II — Botorrita, Zaragoza); terkinos telazokum (K.1.3, II–19 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); terkinos atokum launikue (K.1.3, III–40 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); terkinos turanikum (K.1.3, IV–38 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); AEMILIA DERCINIO (CIL II, 6338 ee — Saelices, Cuenca); DERCETIO (CIL II, 5809; Espinosa 1986, 40 — Estollo, La Rioja).

†NOTE. The Palaeohispanic forms A[N]DERCIA, &c., are probably intensives *Ande·erk̂jä with syncope. As all of the examples have ANDERĆ-, it is most likely that -C- is part of the root, rather than a suffix attached to *ander- ‘young woman’ or ‘below, infernal’, cf. Gaulish anderon ‘of the underworld beings’ (Chamalières).

†WESTERN PENINSULA. A[N]DERCIA AMBATI F. (AE, 1978, 393; AE, 2006, 625; HEp, 15, 92 — Monroy, Cáceres); CANCILVS (or CAINOLVS) ANDERCI F. with the divine
name MORICILÓ (Beltrán 1975–6, 78; AE, 1977, 424 — Casas de Millán, Cáceres); CELTIO ANDERCI F. (HEp, 13, 231 — Casas del Monte, Cáceres); AVELIUS ANDERCI (HEp, 18, 77 — Cerezo, Cáceres); ANDERCIVS ALLVCQVI F. with divine name ERBINE IAEDI CANTIBEDONE (HEp, 4, 1042; HEp, 5, 992 — Segura, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); ANDERCIO (ERCon, 99 — Spot: Condeixa-a-Velha, Condeixa-a-Nova, Coimbra); ANDERCA CATVRONI F. (AE, 1904, 156 — Arcos de Valdevez, Viana do Castelo).

raha=k’asét’ana PAEΛÂAMOXÂA (J.53.1) a Semitic woman’s name in close combination with a Celtic occupational title, see k’asét’ana above (Nahm 2015; Koch 2016, 464–5; cf. Kaufman 2015, 74, 126, 172, 178, 413, 416–18, 500)

_ctxt. # k’-t’-ua-ratee tunbîtesbaan orbaa set’a lak’ent’i raha k’asét’ana (…)

_interp. Koch 2016 follows Nahm. That the name raha is probably Semitic is indicated by the Palaeohispanic examples of the Roman Period, RAPPA in the territory of the south-western Celtici and RAPETIGVS Medicvs Civis Hispanis in Rome. West Semitic rapa means ‘heal, healer, healing’ and is attested in Aramaic, Phoenician, and Hebrew, including numerous examples in the Hebrew Bible (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995 s.n. rapa). That Semitic [p] is reflected in raha with the SW sign derived from the Phoenician/Canaanite letter with the phonetic value [h] indicates that the SW language either lacked the phoneme /p/ at the time the name was borrowed or subsequently underwent the change of /p/ > /h/ in this phonetic context. RAPPA and RAPETIGVS date from a period when the Palaeohispanic languages had acquired [p]. Factors favouring the (re-)acquisition of this phoneme included the presence of [p] in Latin, Lusitanian, and the language that was the source of the ip(p)o place-names in the southern Peninsula. Kaufman also doubts that raha is Celtic (cf. also Luján 2001, 473), but Nahm’s interpretation is preferable to Kaufman’s ‘rope’.

rinoeb’o PRIY+ŒB (J.5.1) or rino- PRIY+ stem identified as ‘queen’ Proto-Celtic nominative singular *rīg’nī < Proto-Indo-European *H1rēṃiH2 (Koch 2013a, 215; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 323)

_ctxt. # sab’oi : ist’aib’o rinoeb’o anak’enak’eib’o iib’an b’arei #

_interp. Woudhuizen sees a reference to the Tartessian goddess called ‘Horse Queen’ (cf. Gaulish Epona) in the sequence ist’a ib’o rino, with the first word interpreted as a demonstrative followed by a p-Celtic form of ‘horse’ < Proto-Celtic *ek’o- < Proto-Indo-European *H1ekyo-. Then rino is a composition form from Proto-Celtic *rīg’nī. I do not see this as an advance over my explanation of ist’aib’o rinoeb’o as datives-ablatives plural of demonstrative + ‘queen’ in case agreement, ‘for these queens (i.e. goddesses)’: rinoeb’o and ek’uřine (J.4.1) are not to be
taken as evidence that */g/ had been lost in the reflex of Proto-Celtic *rīganī < Proto-Indo-European *H3rḗĝniH₂. Rather, the reflexes of syllabic *ṇ was usually written as n rather than an in the SW corpus, wherever phonotactic constraints did not require the vowel. As the SW pseudo-semisyllabary could not represent /gn/ without an intervening vowel, the velar was simply omitted. In other words, the cluster /gn/ was permissible phonologically, but not orthographically.

COMPARANDA. See ekūrine above.

ro preverb < Proto-Celtic *(p)ro < Proto-Indo-European *pro ‘in front of, before, &c.;’ used as part of the tense-aspect system and possibly other functions (Koch 2013a, 215–16; Kaufman 2015, 12–13).

CONTEXT. Examples of ro in complete texts show that the form never appears independently or at the end of a statement or the end of a plausibly segmented phrase, but always prefixed to another, longer word, most or all of which can be interpreted as verbs. The occurrences are listed below as the compounds or close phrases that begin with ro.

INTERPRETATIONS. In my view, the contextualized examples of ro in the SW corpus, notably in the epigraphic formula, are especially strong evidence in favour of the Celtic classification of the matrix language. The loss of Proto-Indo-European *p is diagnostically Celtic, as is the use of ro with verbs appearing to have perfect form and meaning and the preverb’s avoidance of verbs marked for the present tense (Koch 2011, 101–12; 2013a, 295–303).

According to Kaufman:

In Tartessian, the preverb shape ro occurs in two positions. My take on this is that when absolutely initial it can be interpreted as encoding ‘perfect’, as suggested by Koch, and noted by students of OIr.; but when it is preceded by other preverbs it should be interpreted as ‘forth’, and NOT as ‘perfect’. (2015, 12–13)

No such distinction operated in Old Irish. It is not clear; in variants of the SW epigraphic formula, why ro should be understood as having one function in ro·baare (MdC; J.16.3) and another in tēro-baare (J.1.1, J.12.1). For both, the verb is understood, by both Kaufman and myself, as a perfect of √ber- ‘carry’. What evidence in Indo-European, the Celtic languages, or the SW corpus leads us to expect that the preceding preverb tē rendered the perfectivizing force of ro superfluous and activated its lexical meaning?

COMPARANDA. Celtiberian (in ro-biseti), Gaulish, Old Irish, Old Breton ro, Old Welsh rr; Latin prō, pro- ‘before’, Oscan pru, Umbrian pru-, pro-; Greek πρό ‘before’, Sanskrit pra ‘before, forward’, Avestan fra- ‘for, before’, Lithuanian pra- ‘by, through’, Old Church Slavonic pro- ‘through’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW, 813–16; GPC s.n. rhy; LEIA, B-35–6; de Vaan 2008 s.n. prō; Matasović 2009, 141–2.
**rob**a  АЯFY (J.18.1)  form based on Proto-Celtic *(p)ro* from the Proto-Indo-European preposition and preverb *pró*, thus showing the diagnostically Celtic weakening, and regular loss in this position, of Proto-Indo-European *(p)* (Koch 2009, 109; 2013a, 216; Kaufman 2015, 107, 366–7, 488).

**CONTEXT.** # b*ot’ieana k*ert’o rob’a t’e-b’aare b*a-nafk’ent’i #

**INTERPRETATIONS.** Acknowledging Koch 2009, Kaufman proposes a 3rd singular perfect of the verb ‘to be, ‘has been’ |ro-bā| < Proto-Celtic *(p)ro-bāye. This is not impossible and would anticipate Old Irish ro-ba ‘has been’. Expecting that Proto-Celtic *(p)* would be lost or not written, this proposal still requires a special explanation for the absence of the inherited Proto-Indo-European desinence *(e)*, which seems to survive in rat’e ‘has run’ (see k*t”uarat’e above) and b’aare ‘has carried’. I more recently favour the alternative possibility that rob’a here be read |romā| < Proto-Celtic *(p)*romā < Proto-Indo-European *pro-meH₂ ‘first, most senior woman’, in context probably ‘eldest daughter’, showing case agreement with the name of the deceased b*ot’ieana: cf. Middle Irish rom ‘early, too soon’, Homeric Greek πρόμος ‘foremost man, champion’. A similar Western Hispano-Celtic formation is attested during the Roman Period as a man’s name: C(AIVS) ROTAMVS · TRITEI (HEp, 1, 709; HEp, 5, 1066 — São Martinho de Mouros, Resende, Viseu), cf. Vedic prathamā ‘1st’ and the closely related pratamá ‘foremost’.

**ro-b’aare** ⊳APO (MdC), possibly also ... P+APO ... ro-b’aare (J.16.3) |ro-bāre|  ‘has carried, has borne’ perfect 3rd sg. < *(p)ro+√ber- ‘carry’ (Koch 2013a, 217; Kaufman 2015, 346, 418, 457, 490).

**CONTEXTS.** ... t’e-b’ant’i lebooiire ro-b’aare nafk[e ... (MdC)  itiab*reb* anak’a [---] ro-b’aare b*a-nafk[e]nt’i (J.16.3)  In the second example, a long gap with space for several signs precedes ro-b’aare, so this is possibly another example of t’e-ro-b’aare (see below). Therefore, the MdC text is the only certain example of ro-b’aare without t’e presently known in the corpus. Note that 1.16.3 could be read ... P+AKO ... ro-b’ak[e]. It is therefore possibly significant that in MdC ro-b’aare is preceded by t’e-b’ant’i, which also appears to be a compound verb. The omission of t’e in its usual place in the formula may be merely stylistic avoidance of repetition. On the other hand, as the semantic force of the preverb is likely to have been as an adverbial of direction, its repetition might have been barred grammatically and/or logically, unnecessarily and incorrectly reversing the direction of the first t’e, for example.

**COMPARANDA.** Although Greek προ-φέρω and Latin prōferō ‘bring before one, bring forward’ comprise the same two elements, ro-b’aare is more probably a perfective of √ber- than an inherited IE compound verb. Furthermore, the sense of the Greek and Latin are not particularly apt for a funerary inscription.

†See further t’e-ro-b’aare below.
The inscription is complete, and the reading is mostly unproblematical:

\[ ro\text{-}k\text{-}olion \text{ eert\text{-}aune | t\text{-}arielnon : li\text{-}niene na\text{-}f\text{-}k\text{-}enai } \]

However, it is an unusual text without obvious syntactic parallels within the corpus, apart from closing with a form of na\text{-}rk\text{-}ee\text{-}, which does not however occur here with that verb's most common ending. For an epigraphic statement to begin with ro is unparalleled, although that reading is not completely certain. I have recently re-examined the stone in Badajoz, which supports, as does the photograph in MLH IV, the reading ro..., rather than ao...

**INTERPRETATIONS.** Kaufman and Nahm differ completely. Kaufman (2015, 61, 64–6, 71, 121, 178, 187–9, 197–9, 421, 424–7, 448–50, 496) etymologizes \(*\text{(p)ro-}k\text{-}ol\text{-}i\text{on} \text{ as 'forewheel-related', which could be the basis for a compound word or name meaning 'chariot driver, chariot warrior (> hero), captain, leader'}. Cf. Celtiberian k\text{ueliolos} (probably an adjective derived from a proper name). k\text{-}olion could be construed as showing overt agreement with t\text{-}arielnon, possibly two masculine names in the accusative singular. As I suggested (Koch 2013a, 188) Koli\text{-}os | Koli\text{-}os | could mean 'chariot-' or 'cart-driver, -warrior', as a jo\text{-}stem agent noun corresponding to Old Irish cu\text{-}l̓ 'chariot' < Proto-Celtic *k\text{-}ol\~{i}̈: Proto-Indo-European √k\text{-}el\~{i}̈ 'turn'. Note also Old Irish \text{búachail}, Old Welsh \text{bu\text{-}cel} 'cowherd' < Proto-Indo-European *g\text{-}ou\text{-}k\text{-}el\text{-}ios, hence Kolios 'leader, guide, protector' (also Proto-Indo-European √k\text{-}el\~{i}̈ 'turn'). The proposed root is therefore the source of Proto-Indo-European *k\text{-}ek\text{-}lóm 'wheel'. The orthography k\text{-}olion could represent the reflex of *k\text{-}ek\text{-}lóm, as the SW writing system could not accurately represent the cluster -kl-.

Consideration of the possible consequences of this deficiency leads Nahm to what in my current view is a better explanation: that \textbf{ro-k\text{-}olion} is a form of the Celtic verb *k\text{-}loy\text{-} 'hear' < Proto-Indo-European √k\text{-}ley\text{-} with the preverb *(p)ro, specifically causative |ro\text{-}klou\text{-}i\text{ont} | *(p)ro-k\text{-}klou\text{-}e\text{jont} 'they caused to hear', i.e. 'they made known, they announced'. As it is likely that the form t\text{irit\text{-}os} (J.1.2) is a name meaning 'Third' |Tritos\text{, we have further reason to think that SW orthography's strategy for writing the clusters tr\text{-}, kl\text{-}, &c., was to write the vowel sign between those for the stop and the resonant, hence k\text{-}olion could stand for | k\text{-}lou\text{-}i\text{ont} |. Although not otherwise attested in Celtic, a causative of √k\text{-}ley\text{-} formed in this way is found in Vedic and can be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (LIV 334–5): Vedic śr\text{-}vā\text{-}vati\text{-}, also śr\text{-}av\text{-}vati 'causes to hear', Avestan s\text{râu}u\text{uei\text{-}e}\text{iti} 'causes to hear, recites'. The function of SW |ro\text{-}klou\text{-}i\text{ont} would not be far from that of the past passive ro-cloth 'was heard' in the Irish sagas. The Old Irish verb meaning 'hears', ro-cluin\text{-}e\text{thar}, is formed with an inherent lexical ro, rather than ro limited to forming the perfect tense and similar functions. That the compound verb *(p)ro-k\text{-}loy\text{-} 'hear, listen' is reconstructable for Proto-Celtic is implied also by a Gaulish inscription from Glanum (RIG I, G–65) for a dedicant with a Roman name: \textit{KOP\text{-}N\text{-}L\text{-}IA \textit{POK\text{-}LO\text{-}ICABO \textit{BPAT\text{-}OY \textit{DEK\text{-}ANT[EM] \text{'Cornelia (gave) a tithe in gratitude to the Ro-klouisas (goddesses who hear)'.}}}}
POKΛΟΙCΑΒΟ is understandable as equivalent to a Latin dedication, also from Glanum, inscribed Auribus ‘to the ears’, accompanied by a prominent relief image of two ears set in a medallion (cf. Delamarre 2003, 262).

However, as an alternative to taking ro- in ro-k'olion as belonging to a Proto-Celtic compound *(p)ro-klo̱y-, the example is consistent with all others in the corpus in maintaining the rule that ro- is mutually exclusive with the verbal endings with present marking (-tii, -ntii, &c.), i.e. from Proto-Indo-European primary endings. Therefore, ro-k'olion | ro-klo̱yont might be another example of SW ro marking a past tense expressing a prior action or state, this time used with an imperfect form to mean ‘they made heard, i.e. they have announced, made it known’, a completed action. In keeping with Nahm’s interpretation, in which nařk’enai is an infinitive, taarielnon might thus be its logical subject in the accusative singular. The statement could then be construed, in part, as something like ‘they have made it known ... that Tariel(a)nos lies buried [here] ...’, cf. Cisalpine TARIOLENVS (CIL V no. 1395 — Aquileia).

The ending of k'olion, without the present-marked -ontii or -onii, may be seen as contrasting with Proto-Indo-European *dōsjonti ‘they will give’ > Proto-Celtic *dāsjonti > SW t'asiioonii (J.1.1; see below). If these derivations are accepted, the examples k'olion and t'asiioonii imply that the Proto-Indo-European 3rd plural thematic ending *-ont(i) was preserved in SW Celtic. Therefore, 3rd plural nařk’entii alongside 3rd singular nařk’eti (probably similarly nařk’en and nařk’e as the corresponding secondary endings |-ent and |-etl) cannot be explained as the general replacement of thematic *-ont(i) by athematic *-ent(i) (as in the Sabellian languages). It must be something else, such as the unvarying -e- continuing the vowel of the root of Proto-Indo-European *k̂eī- ‘lie down’ as in the explanation of Wikander (1966) and Tovar (1969).

ro-n·baaren  See b'ar(e)n.

sab'oī EntityManager (J.5.1)  The ending -oi resembles that of an Indo-European o-stem locative singular (MLH IV, 167). The written form could represent |samoi| corresponding to the Proto-Celtic locative form meaning ‘in (the) summer’ (Koch 2013a, 216), cf. Middle Irish sam ‘summer’, OWB ham, OC haf; Gaulish personal names SAMOCENI, SAMOCNA, SAMOGENI, SAMOGNATIVS, SAMORIX, SAMOTALI (Delamarre 2007, 159); Sanskrit sámā- ‘season, year’, OE sumor ‘summer’ < Proto-Indo-European *sem- ‘summer’.

CONTEXT. # sab'oī : ist'aib'o rinoeb'o anak'ekenak:eib'o iib'an b'areii #

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW, 905; DGVB 206; GPC s.n. haf; LEIA S-19; Matasović 2009 s.n. *samo-. 
—sarune əʊəɬə # (J.22.1, J.22.2) less probably to be segmented saruneea
Aoəɬə # Hispano-Celtic name (Correa 1992, 98; MLH IV, 168; Ballester 2004b; 2012; Almagro-Gorbea et al. 2008, 1050; Koch 2013a, 218–20), resembling saru[?]an
#Apəɬə # (MdC, see Guerra 2010a, 71–3).

†CONTEXTS. # uarb'oii sarune ea ɓ'are nař'eenii # (J.22.1), ]sarune ea oar[ (J.22.2), ... nira-k'aːlte t'ao ɓ'e saruɬəan # (MdC)
†COMPARANDA. [P]R(IMVS) AXONIVS SARON(IS) (HEp, 12, 633; Vallejo 2005, 394 — Borba, Borba, Évora)

setəa ʃɔkə # (J.53.1) |sedə| ‘seat’ < Proto-Celtic *sedə- or *sedo- < Proto-Indo-European *sēd-s, genitive *sed-os ~ ṣed- ‘sit down, set’ (Koch 2013a, 220–1; Kaufman 2015, 500).

†CONTEXT. # kə-tə-ua-ratə t'nb'it'sbə an orbə setəa lak'ent'i raha kəaɬətəana (…)
†INTERPRETATIONS. Koch 2013a proposes that setəa is feminine singular (like Welsh sedd) in the noun phrase orbə setəa, which is the subject of the singular verb t'ə-ua-ratə ‘has delivered safely to’ < ‘has run under towards’. If one encountered in Welsh elegy the words dywaredawdd yr orsedd ‘the throne (has) delivered [the deceased]’, gorsedd (< yr-sedə) would be understood as a metaphor for God. † Kaufman also takes orbə setəa to be a noun phrase, but nominative-accusative neuter plural, translating ‘heirloom seats’.
†BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 885; GPC snn. sedd, gorsedd; DIL s.n. forad; Wodtko et al. 2008 s.n. *sed-.

†CONTEXT. # soloir uarb'əən[ ]ina o* [ | n]ař'eenii # The text does not survive complete, but we clearly have the beginning and end. The signs are enclosed within
an inscribed line, and a vertical rule precedes soloir. As the clearly legible formula word uarb*an[ follows, there is no doubt about this form’s segmentation.

†INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman derives from Proto-Celtic *sollo-+uiron ‘entire-man’.
† An alternative possibility is that the first element is ‘sun’, Old Welsh houl ‘sun’< Proto-Indo-European *saH2yel/n.

†COMPARANDA. Celtiberian elku suolakue tirtanikum uiriaskum mel (K.1.3 III 2–3 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); ‘family name’ suoli*kum (K.1.3 III–37 — Botorrita, Zaragoza) and another Hispano-Celtic family name SOLICVM on a funerary inscription (González Rodríguez 1994, 172 — Navas de Estena, Ciudad Real), Cis-alpine SOLA (Cureggio), Gaulish SOLÍBODVVS, SOLICVRVS (2 attestations in Latin inscriptions), SOLIMARIVS (4 attestations), SOLIMARIVS (12 attestations), SOLIRIX (2 attestations), SOLISETIVS, SOLORIX (Delamarre 2003, 287; Raybould & Sims-Williams 2007, 74–6), SVOLICCVN, Gaulish divine name SOLIMARA (Jufer & Lugnínübühl 2001, 63); Galatian ΣΥΩΛΙΒΡΟΓΗΝΟΞ (Delamarre 2007, 174–5).
† (A) ‘sun’: Middle Welsh heul also huan, OC heual, Middle Breton heaul, Old Irish suíl ‘eye’< Proto-Indo-European *suH2l-i-; Latin sól; Vedic súvar, cf. Mitanni Indic personal name Šugar-data, Gothic sunno (Wodtko et al. 2008, 606–11).
† (B) ‘man’: see -ir, -iir, iru, -ire above.

t*ao ⌫ AX (MdC) possibly also (?t*)au ⌫ AX (J.10.1) ‘I stand’, hence ‘I am’, 1st singular present, < Proto-Indo-European 〈(s)teH2- (Koch 2013a, 222; Kaufman 2015, 287, 461, 502).

†CONTEXTS. Both examples come near to or at the end of long, complex, and atypical inscriptions: ... nira-k*alt’e t*ao b’e saru[?n]an # (MdC); ... leoine ar-b*arie(?n) i?ensere (?t*)au # (J.10.1)

†COMPARANDA. Old Irish ·táu ‘I am’ < Proto-Celtic *tä(i̯)ū < Proto-Indo-European *(s)teH2-(i̯ )oH ‘I stand’, cf. Welsh taw ‘that it is’ (probably attested as Old Welsh taw in the Juvenec glosses), Latin stò, Oscan stahu ‘I stand’ (McCone 1994, 149; LIV, 590; Schumacher 2004, 623). Oscan stahù and 3rd plural stahînt were used on stelae to describe the state of the monument itself, and its inscription, standing. The meaning ‘I stand’, in which the inscribed stone is the speaker, would make sense also for the SW examples.


†CONTEXT. # t*alainon t*ürek*ui or[ | ] i | ] Noś t*ae-b*are nařk*en #

†INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman (2015, 322–5, 449, 593) proposes a Celtic noun phrase |dālā yinom| ‘gifts [and] wine’, cf. possibly Lepontic UINOM. ¶ It nonetheless
remains likely that the element t*ala*- is the same as that so commonly found in Celtic onomastics as in the examples below. With the SW writing system -inon could stand for the reflex of Proto-Celtic *u̯indom, masculine accusative singular or nominative-accusative neuter, meaning ‘white, fair, blessed’, and extensively attested in names: cf. Gaulish vind-, -Lepontic -UINO-, Old Irish finn, Old Welsh gwnn < Proto-Indo-European √yeid- ‘see’ (Wodtko et al. 2008, 717–22). I stand by the suggestion that SW | Tala(u̯)-u̯indom | might have something to do with the place known as sacrum promontorium to the Romans and Sagres today.

†COMPARANDA. Old Irish tul, taul, and Welsh tal < Celtic *talu-, *talay- ‘front, brow, headland, protuberance, shield boss’, Ogam TALAGNI, Old Welsh Talhaern, Old Breton Talhoiarn ‘Iron-brow’; Cisalpine compound name TANOTALIKNOI (Briona, late 2nd century BC), talu on pottery from Verdello, Gaulish personal names DANNOTALI, Argio-talus, Dubno-talus, Cassi-talos, Orbio-talus, &c. (Delamarre 2003, 288–9).

†CELTIBERIAN REGION. anieskor talukokum (K.13 — Botorrata, Zaragoza); TALAVS CAESARIVS AMBATI F. (Abásolo 1974a, 13 — Hontoria de la Cantera, Burgos); SEMPRONIVS TALAVS SEMPRONI [---] (Palol & Vilella 1987, 85; HEP, 2, 145 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos); L. TALANIO REBVRRINO (HAE, 2595 — Olleros de Pisuerga, Palencia).

†CENTRAL REGION. TALAVS NIMIVS ARVS T. LICINI N. (SERVI) (HEp, 7, 730; ERSG, 170–072 — Pedraza, Segovia).

†WESTERN PENINSULA. SEGVMARVS TALABARI F. (HEp, 3, 201 — Aroche, Huelva); CAMALA ARQVI F. TALABRIGENSIS (AE, 1952, 65 — Estoraoos, Ponte de Lima, Viana do Castelo); ARQVIO TALAI F. (AE, 1941, 20; ERZamora, 103; CIRPZ, 164 — San Pedro de la Nave, Zamora); ARABO COROBELICOBO TALVSCIBO M. T B(...) D.M.L.A. (AE, 1977, 423; HEP, 13, 215; Búa 2000, 526; Prósper 2002, 365 — Arroyomolinos de la Vera, Cáceres); TALAVS TONCENTAMI F. BOVTIE(CVM) (Albertos 1975a, 2. 212. nº 234 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); ANCEITVS VACECI F. C TALABRIC(A) (CILA Huelva, 24 — El Repilado, Huelva); TALAO DOCI F. (ERZamora, 219; CIRPZ, 315— Villardiegua de la Ribera, Zamora); DOVITENA TALAVI F. (HAE, 1906; Albertos 1964, 245 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); CAMALO TALONTI ENTARAMICO (HAE, 1102; HEP, 13, 901 — Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); TALAVVS CLOVTIVS CLOVTAI F. (LIMICVS) (CILA Huelva, 24 — El Repilado, Huelva); PINTONI TALAVI (HEp, 2, 762; ERBragança, 69; HEP, 12, 582 — Donai, Bragança, Bragança); CRISIVS TALABRVI F. AEBOSOCLENSIS (HAE, 342 = HAE, 945 = HAE, 1504; CPILC, 217; AE, 1958, 17; AE, 1952, 130 — Coria, Cáceres); SEGONTIVS TALAVI F. TALABONICVM (HAE, 1351; Albertos 1975a, 18. nº 200 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); […] JAE TALAVI F. (CIL II, 5750; ERAsturias, 18 — Castiello, Salas, Asturias); HELENVS TALAVI SER. (CIL II, 2442 — Braga); AVRILIO TALAVI F. (ERBragança, 29; HEP, 12, 610 — Santa Maria, Bragança, Bragança); IEMVRiae TALAVI F. (HEp, 4, 1019; HEP, 7, 1170; ERBragança, 59; HEP, 12, 600 — Meixedo, Bragança, Bragança); ANVLA TALAVI F. (Gimeno & Stylow 1993, nº 56 — Logrosán, Cáceres); [L]VCIVS TAL[AB]I F. (AE, 1975, 516 — Coria, Cáceres); PAVGENDE TALABI F. (CIL II, 776; CPILC, 741; Albertos 1977b, 35 — Coria, Cáceres); TALAVVS LAVNGI? F. (CPI, 749 — Pozuelo de Zarzón, Cáceres); TOGETA TALABA (CPI, 179 — Campolugar, Cáceres); TALAVVS TANGINI (FE, 384; HEP, 11, 142 — Zarza de Granadilla, Cáceres);
\text{\textit{t\textsuperscript{ā}la-inon\textsuperscript{u}}} \textit{Jt\textsuperscript{ā}rne\textsuperscript{k\textsuperscript{u}}un} \quad \underline{\text{\textit{H\textsuperscript{ā}w\textsuperscript{a}yah\textsuperscript{a}}}} \quad \text{\textit{J.26.1}} \text{for} \textit{t\textsuperscript{ā}rne\textsuperscript{k\textsuperscript{u}}un} \text{ (the seventh sign is an incomplete repetition of the sixth, looking like an error realized during carving)} \text{ genitive plural Hispano-Celtic kindred name (MLH IV, 166; Koch 2013a, 224; Kaufman 2015, 399, 492).}

\textit{\underline{\textit{Jt\textsuperscript{ā}rne\textsuperscript{k\textsuperscript{u}}un\textsuperscript{b\textsuperscript{ā}ne}}|[\wedge]\textit{b\textsuperscript{ā}re nařk\textsuperscript{c}e}}}

\textit{\underline{\textit{Context. Jt\textsuperscript{ā}rne\textsuperscript{k\textsuperscript{u}}un\textit{b\textsuperscript{ā}ne}} |[\wedge]\textit{b\textsuperscript{ā}re nařk\textsuperscript{c}e}}}

\textit{\underline{\textit{Interpretations.} Kaufman agrees that \textit{Jt\textsuperscript{ā}rne\textsuperscript{k\textsuperscript{u}}un}} is genitive plural and the following word \textit{b\textsuperscript{ā}ne} means ‘woman, wife’ (2015, 489). But he proposes a compound name or epithet |\textit{Dar-neiko-} ‘oak-like hero’, as opposed to seeing a velar suffix characteristic of Hispano-Celtic kindred names. However, especially when compared with the text J.19.1 (below), the syntactic structure is clear. In both epitaphs, the genitive plural in \textit{-kuun} immediately precedes ‘woman, wife’, as can be readily explained on the assumption that the society producing the SW corpus were of the typical early Indo-European sort—patrilineal, patrilocal, and exogamous. Therefore, the wives commemorated in J.26.1 and J.19.1 were, unlike their husbands, not buried amongst the kindred of the necropolises and thus required further identification. Where it was possible in the SW writing system, the vowel ā was often not written before a nasal. This practice can be seen as a throwback reflecting the fact that in most cases Ancient Celtic ām and ān derived from what had been single phonemes in}
Proto-Indo-European /m/ and /n/ realized as syllabic nasals [m̥ , n̥ , ŋ̥ ], for example, the formula word uar(n)bān | u.ar,mām | < *u(pr)er,mām. (See further Koch 2011, §73.2.) Therefore, the kindred name ṭe′arnekʷun can be read as Tar.nekūm, a form based on the Ancient Celtic tarano-, best known as the name of the well attested ‘thunder’ god < Proto-Indo-European *(s)tenH.r-/(s)tn̥ Hxr-os ‘thundering’: √(s)tenHr- ‘groan, thunder’ (Liv 597; Mallory & Adams 2006, 128). ṭe′arnekʷun may thus be an example of kin group claiming descent from a mythological ancestor. If this is the correct derivation, the Indo-European syllabic η either never developed as an in Tartessian | Tar.nekūm | or that development was not yet (consistently) recognized in SW orthography. ṭe′arnekʷun | Tar.nekūm | would go back to Proto-Celtic *Toranikūm, where the lowering of *ĭ > e might reflect an older *Tor.nikōm, or a levelling through the paradigm of a sound change that had begun in another case form, where there had been a low vowel in the final syllable (see Koch 2011, §78).

†comparanda. Within the SW corpus liirnestakʷun ḅạnẹñọrọire ḅạrẹnạfkʷenii # (J.19.1) is most closely comparable. For the form ṭe′arnekʷun, cf. the Celtiberian genitive plural family name mezukenos turanikum (K.1.3, II-4 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); terkinos turanikum (K.1.3, IV-38 — Botorrita, Zaragoza) ~ Old Irish torann ‘thunder’ (MLH V.1, 422), Old Breton tan ‘thunder’, the Gaulish dative divine name TAPANOYY (Matasović 2009, 384), also TARANVOS and suffixed TARANVCNO. Ancient Brythonic TANARO (Latinized dative epithet of Jupiter) probably preserves the older form without metathesis (< Proto-Indo-European *(s)tn̥ Hxr-os), rather than reflecting a second metathesis reversing the first.

— ṭe′asiioonii ṭe′asiioonii # (J.1.1) Indo-European verb, active, thematic 3rd plural (Correa 1992, 99), reflecting Proto-Celtic *dāsjonti (Koch 2013a, 226), the cognate of Vedic dāsyānti ‘they will give’ < Late Proto-Indo-European *dōsjointi: √deH3- ‘give’ (on which see Liv 105–6).

†context. The final word of this long and complete inscription: ... k̯ak̯išiink̯olobọọ ii ṭe′ro-ḅare (ḅ)e ṭe′asiioonii #

ṭe′ḅanṭi (MdC) Indo-European 3rd person plural, present-tense verb (Guerra 2009, 327; 2010, 74), specifically Celtic meaning ‘pass away, die out’ (Koch 2013a, 227; Kaufman 2015, 109, 341–2, 488).

†context. Ṭe′ḅanṭi lebọịire ...

The document provides a detailed analysis of the Proto-Celtic verb *te·baare* (Celtic compound verb, 3rd person singular perfect -bāre 'has carried') and its probable Proto-Indo-European origin *bher- 'carry'. It notes that all attestations of *te·baare* precede a form of *nařk'ent'i*, which is always final, at least in the texts as they survive. In the two examples where *uarb'an* is present, *uarb'an* immediately precedes *te·baare*.

**Context.** All attestations of *te·baare* precede a form of *nařk'ent'i*, which is always final, at least in the texts as they survive. In the two examples where *uarb'an* is present, *uarb'an* immediately precedes *te·baare*.

**Note:** In J.21.1, the reading should possibly be *...uarbaan te[(e)·ro-b]are nařk'eni* #.

**Interpretations.** Kaufman reconstructs a notional Proto-Celtic *tu-e(p)i-bāre*, translating 'has borne back hither'. A compound verb *de(:)-ber-* cognate with Latin dēferō 'carry down, away' would suit a funerary formula. Welsh *difer-u*, Middle Cornish *devera* 'drip, run down, flow out (of liquids)' belongs to a different semantic field, but taken together with Middle Welsh *kymmer* 'confluence' and *aber* 'river mouth', the group can be understood as showing transferred sense of 'carry', meaning 'flow' when applied to liquids: 'carry water out, carry water together, carry water to'. As argued elsewhere, the line of early Welsh poetry, *namyn y·ðuʋ vchaf nys dioferaf* 'except to the highest God I shall not relinquish [my patron]' can be understood as containing words related to *uar(n)baan* and *te·baare* to express an idea about the afterlife of the patron which would not be implausible underlying the SW epigraphic formula (Koch 2013b).

**Context.** **kee uuakee*[ | ]eb*o te·baere nařk'en emun t'urea iub*a #

**Interpretation.** Writing *te·b'ere* for the usual *te·baare* is a significant discrepancy. A sign has not merely been omitted, repeated, carved badly, or replaced by another sign more or less randomly. This variant supports—indeed could be said to confirm—the derivation from √ber- 'carry'. The present/imperfect system and the imperative, all of which had √ber- but bāre were no doubt of higher frequency. It is also relevant that *|beret* 'carried' was an inherited form from Proto-Indo-European, whereas |bāre 'has carried' was probably an analogical innovation, filling an inherited gap in the verbal system. 3rd singular imperfect |de-beret| would have an overlapping functional range with perfect |de-bāre|. If *te·b'ere* continued the
ending of the Proto-Celtic imperfect *-et, the final *-t could not be represented in the SW writing system. So the final -e is inconclusive as to whether the *-t was present or not. Hispano-Celtic 3rd singular imperfect *|beret| is confirmed by Celtiberian terberez on the 'Res' Bronze, which can be understood as the same verb as tʻe·bʻere with a different preverb: thus Proto-Celtic *tre-beret or *trei-beret 'carried through, carried over' (Jordán 2014, 308–9). It is not impossible that Celtiberian terberez and SW tʻe·bʻere, tʻe·bʻare, &c., represent the same preverb and verb following different principles for writing *tre- or *trei- in Palaeohispanic semisyllabic script. However, the examples tʻiir|tos (J.1.2) probably = |Tritos| and possibly ro·kʻol|ion (J.55.1) = |ro·klouiont| point instead to a system in which TRV sequences were written tvv, along the lines of Celtiberian, rather than omitting the liquid, to write tʻvv, more like Linear B.

**tʻee·bʻarenti** (J.23.1) 3rd person plural Indo-European verb and not other than Celtic (MLH IV, 165; Guerra 2009, 327), with preverb(s) (MLH IV, 166), specifically Celtic and a compound of √ber- < Proto-Indo-European √bher- 'carry' (Koch 2013a, 228; Kaufman 2015, 389–91, 489–90).

**Context.** # bʻetʻisai tʻe(-)bʻarenti iru arbʻu i el nařkʻe:n: ušne # There is a long gap between iru arbʻu where the course of the text turns 180° at the top of the stone. But there is no clear trace of a missing sign. The text is remarkable in that main the formula words are present (uar(n)b an, tʻe-(ro-)bʻare, nařkʻenti), but not in this most usual order and each one is inflected in a unique way. As well as having an unusual and longer than average inscription, the stone is exceptionally large 95 x 34 x 22cm.

**Interpretations.** Bʻarenti clearly inflected as a verb (with 3rd plural active present marking) confirms that the less unambiguous form bʻare is also correctly identified as a verb; see tʻe·bʻare above. I interpret tʻee·bʻarenti |dē-{e(n)}-barenti| 3rd plural, possibly present perfect sense 'they have now carried (him) away, carried (him) down' < a notional Proto-Celtic compound *dē+√ber-, cf. Latin dēferō, Welsh diferaf. The double vowel of tʻee could represent an enclitic object pronoun, but an orthographic variant of tʻe is also possible.

Kaufman proposes |t(u)-ei-bārent-i| 'they have borne back hither' < Proto-Celtic *tu+e(p)i+√ber-. He construes the final -i as an enclitic 3rd person plural pronoun, evidently in agreement with the personal ending of the verb, which is therefore not seen as a reflex of the Indo-European primary (present-marked) -ent, but secondary -ent. This explanation for -i is possible. However, this example is strongly consistent with overall pattern observable in the corpus: ro < Proto-Indo-European *pro never occurs more than once in any inscription and never occurs with forms with the endings -(n)t|i and -nb|i |-mil|, i.e. the reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European primary ending, which also occur at most once in any inscription (see Koch 2011, 101–12; 2013a,
The clear implication of this pattern that ro marks a previous state or action and -(n)ti and -nbti mark subsequent and or present state or action. In the present context (where the formulaic tee·bɑrɛ- lacks ro but has a primary ending and nɑr̥kɛ-e- lacks the primary ending), the temporal sequence would be something like ‘... now they have carried away ... [previously] they did lie down ...’ (probably not the same actors). Another thing that is unusual about this text is that nɑr̥kɛ:n: does not end the statement, but is followed by the form uşnbe (see entry). If this last word is locative |u(χ)s, mɛl| ‘in the highest place’ (if not the proper name ‘in Uxama’), it is virtually identical semantically with the basic meaning of the formula word uar(n)ba^n |uar, mām| < *u(p)eramām, a form of which also appears in the text in sequence iru (u)jɛrɛ u i el. In this unique repetition of synonymous words, the epigrapher was possibly striving to elaborate on two aspects of the formulaic theme ‘highest’: the heavenly afterlife where the departed lay in rest (nɑr̥kɛ:n:) and the highest god or gods who have (now) carried the deceased away (t̥e-e·bɑrɛnti).

### CONTEXTS

... nɑr̥kɛ kɑkişĭn tolo b-o ii t̥e·ro-baare (b-e) e tɑsiianoii # (J.1.1); ... nɑr̥kɛnti—mub a t̥e·ro-baare hɑt’aneate # (J.12.1); uarba’jan t̥e(-)e·ro-baare nɑr̥kɛ(… ) (J.18.2) ¶ In the extant examples, t̥e·ro-baare occurs in a medial position. J.1.1 and J.12.1 are both long, well executed, and generally remarkable inscriptions. And they both have unusual syntax in that nɑr̥kɛ and nɑr̥kɛnti, forms of which often mark the close of the statement, precede t̥e·ro-baare. Cf. ro·n-baare (Monte Gordo).

### INTERPETATIONS.

Kaufman derives t̥e(e)·ro-baare < Proto-Celtic *tu+eks+(p)ro+ √ber-. He takes ro < *(p)ro in this combination to have lexical force rather than marking perfective aspect. He translates ‘has received’. ¶ I think it more likely, as previously proposed, that these items represent |dɛ·ro-báre| ‘has carried away’, in which ro < *(p)ro specially marks a prior state or action with the ‘Italo-Celtic’ compound verb *dɛ+√ber-. ¶ See further t̥e·b-aare above.

### CONTEXT.

# t̥ilek’urk’u≡arkastamu t̥e-baanti leboxoiire ro-baare nɑrk[...

Opening this long inscription, it is likely that t̥ilek’urk’u is part of the naming phrase identifying the deceased.
INTERPRETATIONS. A completely different interpretation, apart from being Celtic, by Kaufman (2015, 87, 115, 454, 458, 463, 497), seeing *tilekur* as a 1st singular deponent verb *di-legūr 'I lay down', which is at least attractive semantically.

COMPARANDA. TiLLE gVS AMBATIC F SVSARRVS C AIOB[R]IGIAECO (Caurel, Lugo, Galicia; AD 28 — Búa 2004, 387) with Tillegus probably reflecting an earlier *Tillikos, showing the regular lowering of Celtic -iko- > -eko- in both Tartessian and the North-west Hispano-Celtic of the Roman Period; see Koch 2011, §80. The voicing of TILLEGVS < *Tillikos is a common feature in the Western Hispano-Celtic names found in inscriptions of the Roman Period. The same Celtic man’s name without the lowering or voicing occurs as the Gaulish genitive TILLIC1 (CIL XII, no. 5575 — Les Poussots, Dijon).


NOTE. Because of the principles of the SW writing system, as similarly with Celtiberian written in Palaeohispanic script, t’irt’os could stand for either |Tirtos| or |Tritos|.

CONTEXT. # koo-beeliboo na-kii-buu oira uarbaan t’irt’os ne-baa naŕkeeni #

INTERPRETATIONS. The basic sense of this common Hispano-Celtic name is the ordinal number. So t’irt’os possibly names the third son, if not commemorating an earlier t’irt’os. The form is unproblematically a masculine o-stem, nominative singular. Its position in the statement is not the most usual for the name of the deceased, i.e. it is not at the very beginning of the inscription. It does, however, begin the second of the complete inscription’s two lines, which display a clear form of the most usual formulaic closing: t’irt’os ne-b’a nařk’eni, probably a negation of the basic formula. Kaufman (2015, 122, 187, 204, 502) offers a completely different interpretation with tir < Proto-Celtic *tiros ‘land’.

COMPARANDA. Gaulish tritos and personal names Trito[s], Tritus, Triti; Old Welsh trtitd, trtti; ModB trede; Latin tertius < Proto-Italic *tritio-; Vedic tṛtya-, older tṛtā-. Old Irish tris, tres reflects a different formation. The existence of the forms *triti(i)jos and *triti(i)jā in Proto-Celtic is indicated by the exact correspondence of Middle Welsh trydyð and feminine singular trydeð with the Hispano-Celtic personal names TRITIVS and TRITIA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. IdgEW 1090–1; MLH VI.1, 297; de Vaan 2008 s.n. trēs; Matasović 2009 s.n. *tris.

CELTIBERIAN REGION. tirtouios turumokum (K.1.3, II–16 — Botorrta, Zaragoza); elku suolakue tirtanikum uiriaskum mel (K.1.3, III 2–3 — Botorrta, Zaragoza); mizuku : retukenos : tirtanos munikakue : uiriaskum (K.1.3, I–52–53 — Botorrta, Zaragoza); tirtanos kentiskue loukaniko uiriaskum (K.1.3, II–2–3 — Botorrta, Zaragoza); arkanta teiuantikum tirtunos (K.1.3, III–21— Botorrta, Zaragoza); [...] loukanikum tirtunos (K.1.3, II–43 — Botorrta, Zaragoza); tirtokum (Torrijo
del Campo, Teruel; HEp, 11, 547); **tarkunbiur bibalos atokum tirtano** (K.1.3, II 45–46 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **burzu tirtobolokum** (K.1.3 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **mezukenos elazunos tirtukue ailkiskum** (K.1.3, II 21–22 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **kainu tirtobolokum** (K.1.3, IV-1 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **koitu kuizunos tirtukue ailokiskum** (K.1.3, II 21–22 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **kainu tirtobolokum** (K.1.3, IV–1 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **koitu kuinikum tirtunos** (K.1.3, II–4 2 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **mezukenos tirtobolokum** (K.1.3, III–29 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **mizuku tirtobolokum** (K.1.3, III–22 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **stena muturiskum tirtu+** (K.1.3, I–16 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **tirtanos statulikum lesunos bintis** (MLH IV, K.1.1 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **tirtu aiankum abulos bintis** (MLH IV, K.1.1 — Botorrita, Zaragoza); **tirtotulu baston** (-?) (Castillejo de Iniesta, Cuenca); **tirtanos abulokum letontunos ke belikios** (MLH IV, K.16.1 — Ibiza, Baleares); **M(ANII) TIRTAIILQVM HILARVS ET FVSCVS LAXTENSES** (CIL II, 6338 ff; HEp, 2, 377 — Saelices, Cuenca); **TRI DOR ni ECV . CARACA  D ESSVAEO nA nEMA iOSQ** (MLH IV, K.14.2; HEp, 1, 93 — Jerez de los Caballeros, Badajoz); **pAV gEnDA  T RiT[ ]i** (CIL II, 2445 — Braga); **Anni A L EVC ipp( E) T RiTi( A)E SERV (A)E** (AE, 1971, 161 — Jerez de los Caballeros, Badajoz); **AVni AE  T RiTi** (ERRBragança, 27; HEp, 12, 604 — Quintela de Lampaças, Bragança); **DOCINIAE TRITI** (HEp, 2, 766; ERRBragança, 48 — Donai, Bragança); **GALACTI trITI F.** (AE, 1985, 546; HEp, 1, 167 — Jarandilla de la Vera, Cáceres); **TRITENE L[IC]INI F.** (CIL II, 639 / 5275; CPILC, 257 = CPILC, 539 — Garrovillas, Cáceres); **TRITIVS TANGINI** (HEp, 1, 93 — Herrera del Duque, Badajoz); **TRITIVS CLOVTI F.** (CPILC, 726; AE, 1971, 149 — Robledillo de Gata, Cáceres); **TRITIVS ALLQVIF.** (CPILC, 762; AE, 1985, 546; HEp, 1, 167 — Jarandilla de la Vera, Cáceres); **TRITIVS MANTAIF.** (San Martín de Trevejo, Cáceres); **TRITIVS CLOVTIF.** (CPILC, 169 — Campolugar, Cáceres); **TRITIVS CASAB( I) F.** (Coria, Cáceres); **TRITIVS LVIIF.** (CIL II, 5304; CPILC, 496 — Torre de don Miguel, Cáceres); **IVLIA BOVANA TRITIF.** (CIL II, 666; CPILC, 636 — Villamesías, Cáceres); **BINERAE TRITI F. AVITAE** (HEp, 2, 377 — Guarda); **PROCVLVS TRITALICVM L. F.** (CIL II, 5077; ERPL, 224 — Astorga, León); **AR[O] TRITE** (ERPL, 118 — Astorga, León); **ALAESI TRITI F. [ ] BON[I]CV** (Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **AMAENIA VIRONI F. TRITECV(M)** (HAE, 1340 —...
Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **ANDEREN(VS) TRITI F.** (HEp, 4, 955 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); **APANA TRITI** (AE, 1983, 503 — Villar de la Yegua, Salamanca); **BOVTI TRITI** (HAE, 1239 — Barruecopardo, Salamanca); **CAERVS TRITI F.** (HEp, 6, 818 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); **MENTINA TRITI F. CAMBARICVM** (Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRITIA MAGILONIS MATVE[NIQ](VM)** (HAE, 1356 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRITIANVS VIRONI SERV.** (AE, 1983, 512 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRITIVS BOVTI** (HAE, 1364 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRITIVS AMBINI F.** (Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); **TRITIVS TVRAOS PEICAI** (FE, 318 — São Facundo, Abrantes, Santarem); **C(AI)VS ROTAMVS · TRITI** (HEp, 1, 709; HEP, 5, 1066 — São Martinho de Muros, Resende, Viseu); **CAINO TRITI** (AE, 1985, 520 — São João da Fresta, Manguade, Viseu); [---] **TRITI VS TRITI F.** (AE, 1985, 520 — São João da Fresta, Manguade, Viseu); **ASTVRIO TRITI F.** (ERZamora, 115; HEP, 5, 905 — Villalcampo, Zamora); **CLOVTIO TRITI F.** (ULER, 2343*; ERZamora, 92 — Rabanales, Zamora); **EMVRIA TRITI F.** (CIL II, 2619; ERZamora, 189 — Moral de Sayago, Zamora); **MVSTARO TRITI F.** (HAE, 892; ERZamora, 45 — Villalcampo, Zamora); [---] **PIPIO TRITI F.** (ERZamora, 211 — Villalcampo, Zamora); **SALAIVS TRITI** (AE, 1965, 105; ERZamora, 13 — Villalazaín, Zamora); **TRITI A PINTONIS F.** (HAE, 894; HAE, 914; ERZamora, 55; HEP, 5, 902 — Villalcampo, Zamora); **VELVA TRITI** (ERZamora, 218 — Villardiegua de la Ribera, Zamora); **CABVRENA TRITI F(LIA)** (HEP, 18, 489 — Villardiegua de la Ribera, Zamora); **TRIDIVS [---]NI F.** (HEP, 6, 839 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); **GENTILITAS TRIDIVARVM EX GENTI IDEM ZOELARVM** (ERPL, 303; CIL II, 2633 — Astorga, León); [---] **D[ER]O PENT[I]OCVM TRIDI FIL(IO) VAD(INI)ESI** (ERPL, 364 — Riaño, León).

**OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE.** **[CAL]AETVS TRITI** (HEP, 1, 14 — Ocáriz, Álava); **CANTABRI TRITI F.** (CIL II, 2953 — Contrasta, Álava); **TRITAVS** (HEP, 5, 628 — Olazagutia, Navarra).

**t°o Δ** (J.1.1) preposition ‘to, for, towards’ (Koch 2013a, 230; Kaufman 2015, 492).

**t°o ** preposition ‘to, for, towards’ (Koch 2013a, 230; Kaufman 2015, 492).

**t°u Δ** (J.53.1) preverb from Proto-Celtic *to or *tu in k°uuarate (see above; Koch 2013a, 231; Kaufman 2015, 502).
COMPARANDA. Cisalpine Gaulish TOŠOKOTE (Vercelli) = to-śo(s)-ko(n)-de ‘has given these’ (Koch 1983, 187–8), Old Irish do, Archaic Old Irish tu, Old Breton do, Old Welsh di.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Cf. Matasović 2009 s.n. *to-.

t\textsuperscript{u}nb\textsuperscript{it\textsuperscript{s}b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} ΔΤ\textsuperscript{u}ŋ\textsuperscript{t}ι\textsuperscript{t}s\textsuperscript{b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} (J.53.1) Celtic feminine accusative singular superlative substantive (Koch 2013a, 231; Kaufman 2015, 69, 126, 492).

CONTEXT. # k\textsuperscript{e}t\textsuperscript{a}-ua-r\textsuperscript{a}te t\textsuperscript{u}nb\textsuperscript{it\textsuperscript{s}b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} orb\textsuperscript{a} set\textsuperscript{a} lak\textsuperscript{e}nt\textsuperscript{i} raha k\textsuperscript{a}as\textsuperscript{t}e\textsuperscript{a}na ...

INTERPRETATIONS. Kaufman derives t\textsuperscript{u}nb\textsuperscript{it\textsuperscript{s}b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} < Proto-Celtic *tu-ambi\textsuperscript{d}exs,\textsubscript{m}ām ‘hither-around-rightmostly, southmostly’. ¶ Also segmenting the word as t\textsuperscript{u}nb\textsuperscript{it\textsuperscript{s}b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n}, I retain my earlier proposal: [tumites,\textsubscript{m}ām] < notional Proto-Celtic *tumetis,\textsubscript{m}ā- ‘greatest tumulus, cairn’ < ‘most swollen’, taking the syntactic and logical place of the formula word uar\textsuperscript{n}\textsuperscript{b\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} [uar,\textsubscript{m}ām] ‘highest one/place’ as an accusative of destination, similarly feminine singular; possibly alternative poetic expressions for heaven, the happy afterlife.

COMPARANDA. Old Irish t\text併\textsubscript{u}aim ‘tumulus’ in place-names, Middle Welsh tyfu ‘grow’, cf. ModW tyfediq ‘grown’; Latin tumulus ‘knoll, burial-mound’ ~ tumeō ‘swell, be swollen’; Greek τ\textsubscript{υ}μβος ‘a mound of earth or cairn heaped over cremated remains’; Sanskrit t\textsubscript{u}m\textsubscript{r}a- ‘strong, thick’; Lithuanian tum\textsubscript{ė}ti ‘become thick’, Old Norse þumal-fingr ‘thumb’ (i.e. ‘the swollen finger’) < Proto-Indo-European √tum- ‘swell’ (LEIA s.n. t\textsuperscript{u}aim; de Vaan 2008 s.n. tumeō) ~ √teu\textsubscript{H}a- ‘swell (with power), grow fat’ (Mallory & Adams 2006, 385).

t\textsuperscript{u}rea AΟogenous \(J.7.8\), cf. t\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{ufek\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{ui} Σ\textsuperscript{u}Ρ\textsuperscript{f\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{n} (J.14.1).

CONTEXTS. Jē\textsuperscript{e}bo t\textsuperscript{e-b\textsuperscript{e}}\textsuperscript{ere naf\textsuperscript{e}k\textsuperscript{e}n emun t\textsuperscript{u}rea iub\textsuperscript{a} # (J.7.8); # t\textsuperscript{a}lalinon t\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{ufek\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{ui or[]} [ ] [ ] n\textsubscript{o}ś t\textsuperscript{a}e-b\textsuperscript{e}are naf\textsuperscript{e}k\textsuperscript{e}n # (J.14.1)

INTERPRETATIONS. It is remarkable—and perhaps must be counted a quirk of intellectual history—that these two SW forms that so clearly resemble one of the most frequently recurring personal name types of the briga zone have not figured from the beginning in the published lists of probable Celtic names in the corpus. t\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{ufek\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{ui}, which I think means ‘for a man of the kindred of Turos’ < *Turikūi, figures recently in t\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{ufek\textsuperscript{a}}\textsuperscript{ui} as one of the three examples cited by Herrera (2016, 76) of Indo-European onomastics with Celtic parallels in the SW corpus. ¶ The interpretations of t\textsuperscript{u}rea by Kaufman and myself share only slight common ground. We both see the form as Celtic. Kaufman (2015, 273–4, 502) analyses t\textsuperscript{u}re as the locative singular of a Celtic word *turi- meaning ‘stronghold’ (not in Matasović 2009). As ‘strong’ is one possible meaning for the Hispano-Celtic man’s name Turos (cf. Vedic turā- ‘strong’), we may be proposing the same Proto-Indo-European root. Against Kaufman’s segmentation and translation (nel\textsuperscript{e}mn t\textsuperscript{u}r\textsuperscript{e}a iub\textsuperscript{a} ‘in the stronghold of the heavens, o Yuba’),
it must again be emphasized that the phrase \textit{Janba\(a\)t\(a\)ia\(\equiv\)iob\(a\)a} (I.16.2) is formed in exactly the same way from a second extremely common Hispano-Celtic man’s name, i.e. \textit{Amba(\(x\)tos}. Therefore, these two are most plausibly understood as \textit{Ture\(a\) iou,\(m\)\(a\)} ‘the youngest daughter of Tu\(r\)os’ and (the phonologically more archaic) \textit{Amba(\(x\)t\(j\)\(a\) iou,\(m\)\(a\)} ‘the youngest daughter of Amba(\(\chi\))tos’ (Koch 2013a, 231–2). Despite the objection of Prósper (2014), the variant spellings \textit{iob\(a\)a} and \textit{iub\(a\)a} are well within the range of what we should expect for an Ancient Celtic language in the light of attested outcomes of Proto-Celtic */ou/ in Gaulish and Ancient Brythonic, e.g. names with \textit{Tout-}, \textit{Tot-}, and \textit{Tut-}. Furthermore, in the phonetic context after the palatal glide /i\(\j\)/, the close high articulation of the following round vowel would be phonetically natural. In both cases, the absence of a kindred name in -V\(k\)\(a\)un or a husband’s name, probably means that these youngest daughters were unmarried and buried with their paternal kin, although it is alternatively possible that \textit{Ture\(a\)} and/or \textit{Amba(\(x\)t\(j\)\(a\)} were identified by the father’s name because they had married a man of low social standing, from outside the community, for example. ¶ The high frequency of the Palaeohispanic names based on \textit{Trito-} ‘3rd’ and \textit{Pento-}/Pinto- ‘5th’ suggests that at least some of the many \textit{Turo-} names mean ‘4th’, cf. Vedic ‘4th’ t\(u\)ri\(y\)a-, t\(u\)r\(y\)a (Avestan t\(u\)i\(r\)ya) < Proto-Indo-European zero-grade *k\(e\)tur\(ó\)-. As recently shown by Vallejo (2017), the closely corresponding geographical distributions of the \textit{trito-}, t\(u\)ro-, and \textit{pento-}/pinto- names also supports the interpretation ‘3rd, 4th, 5th’. As the Hispanic \textit{Turo-} names are numerous and show varied formations, it is not unlikely that they are of more than one origin. The names below of the type TVRESAM\([\text{OS}]\), &c., look like superlative adjectives, rather than ordinal numbers; cf. Prósper (2013, 183) deriving Celtic *t\(u\)r\(\&\)ro-’strong’ < Proto-Indo-European *tu\(H\)-ro-’swelling, inflating’ \(~\sqrt{\text{teuH}}\)’, ‘swell (with power), grow fat’ (Mallory & Adams 2006, 385).

¶\textit{COMPARANDA.} Cisalpine TUROKOS on pottery from Oleggio, early 1st century BC.

¶\textit{Celtiberian Region.} turo\(s\) retukenos (K.1.3, I–2–60 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); letontu ubokum turo bint\(i\)s (Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza; MLH IV, K.1.1 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); mezuzkenos\(s\) abokum turo (K.1.3, I–60 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); barnai\(s\) turumokum tirs (K.1.3, I–59); bulibos turumokum ult\(u\) (K.1.3, I–24 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); likinos\(s\) turumokum ti (K.1.3, III–49 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); elazuna ensikum turo (K.1.3, II–57); akuia stat\(u\) turaku tueizunos tetoku[m]? (K.1.3, II–20 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); karbelos turumokum ulta (K.1.3, I–28) — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); sekontios turumokum ultatun (K.1.3, II–48 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); testios turumokum (K.1.3, III–1); tiritouios turumokum (K.1.3, II–16 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); kibinia kentiskue turikum (K.1.3, III–4 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); mezuzkenos turanikum (K.1.3, II–4 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); terkinos turanikum (K.1.3, IV–38 — Botorr\(i\)ta, Zaragoza); \textit{ATIAE TVRELIAE G(AI) TVRELI F. / G(AIVS) TVRELIVS} (Palol & Villela 1987, 42; HEP, 2, 107 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos); \textit{TVROS} (MLH IV, K.3.1–11; HEP, 9, 549; HEP, 12, 428 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); \textit{TVROV} (MLH IV, K.3.12; HEP, 9, 550 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); \textit{TVROS CAROQVM VIROS VERAMOS} (MLH IV, K.3.18; HEP, 9, 557 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); \textit{TVROS} (MLH IV, K.3.9; HEP, 9, 547 — Peñalba de Villastar, Teruel); \textit{APOLINIVS TVRAINVS AIPONI F.} (CIL II, 2859 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); \textit{ATTA TVROCO(M) GAI VXSOR} (HEP, 7, 343; HEP, 2, 107 — Peñalba de Castro, Burgos);
— Cifuentes, Guadalajara); GAIVS TVROCO (M) PACATI F. (HEp, 7, 343 — Cifuentes, Guadalajara); TVRANI (HEp, 10, 171 — Saélices, Cuenca); C. VALERIVS TVRANCIVS (CIL II, 2866 — Lara de los Infantes, Burgos); TVRAEIVS LETONDICVM MARSI F. (HEp, 2, 415 — Cifuentes, Guadalajara).

CENTRAL REGION. CACO TVRI F. (CIL II, 947 = CIL II, 5344; HEp, 3, 377 — Torralba de Oropesa, Toledo); ARAV(VS) ARAVIAQ(VM) TVRANI F. (ERAv, 28 — Ávila); MATVGENO TVRAEDOVQ(M) CADANI F(ILIO) (HEp, 18, 24 — Ávila); TVRA SEQ (HEp, 7, 736 — Pedraza, Segovia); TVRAS[---] (HEp, 7, 709 — Pedraza, Segovia).

WESTERN PENINSULA. BOVTIVS TVRAIANI (HEp, 1, 657; HEp, 4, 986; HEp, 5, 945 — Aguada de Cima, Águeda, Aveiro); CATVRO TVRENDI (AE, 1984, 478; FE, 26 — Penamacor, Castelo Branco); CILEAE TVRI (AE, 1967, 176 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); DVTIA TVRANI F. (FE, 311 [69, 2002]; HEp, 12, 621 — Capinha, Fundão, Castelo Branco); TVRACIA SAEGLI F. (AE, 1977, 382 — Lousa, Castelo Branco, Castelo Branco); TVRANVTIS LO[V]ESI F. (AE, 1967, 156 — Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); TVROLI (Idanha-a-Velha, Idanha-a-Nova, Castelo Branco); FLA(VIVS) TVRIVS FELIX (AE, 1985, 531; HEp, 3, 473 [+ HEp, 11, 665] — Penamacor, Castelo Branco); TVRANVS (HEp, 5, 962 — Montemor-o-Novo, Évora); TVRAIVS CLOVTI (CIL II, 2633; ERPL, 303 — Astorga, León); TVRANIO BODECCVN (ERPL, 373 — Velilla de Valdoré, León); [T]VVRANO PE[NTIOCVM [--- / CAE]VIVI F(ILIO) (CIL II, 5721; HEp, 1, 402; ERPL, 392 — Riaño, León); [T]VRENNO [B]ODDEGVN [B]ODDI F. VAD(IN)SEI (ERPL, 393 — Argovejo, León); ADIO FLAC[CO] TVREN[N]I F. (CIL II, 2671; ERPL, 96 — León); REBVRRVS COROTVRETIS F(ILIVS) MIL(ES) C(O)HO(RTIS) I LVCENSIV(M) HISPA[NORVM (CIL XIII, 7045 — Zalbaco, Maguntia, Germany; man of origin in the western Peninsula); TVRANVS ALVQVI (AE, 1984, 472 — Belver, Gavião, Portalegre); AMBATI BVRILI TVROLI F. (HAE, 1367 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); LVPERC[---] TVRAI F. (HAE, 1280 — Hinojosa de Duero, Salamanca); TVROVIAMS AMBINI (HEp, 9, 498 — Salamanca); BALAESVS TVRAI F. (HEp, 18, 288 — Yecla de Yeltes, Salamanca); TRITEVS TVRAOS PEICAI (FE, 318 — São Facundo, Abrantes, Santarem); CALAVIS TVROBI F. (EE, IX 273; Tranoy 1981, 62. n, 195; HEp, 7, 1237 — Tronco, Chaves, Vila Real); DOQIRVS TVREI F. (AE, 1983, 483 — Almacave, Lagame, Viseu); CELOTIVS GI TVREIVS (HEp, 5, 1068 — Viseu; HAE, 2328); TVREVS[---] (Carvalho 1989, 79 — Granja, Penedono, Viseu); TVROS BANIE(N)SV(M) (Carvalho 1989, 78 — Penela da Beira, Penedono, Viseu); AVNIAE TVRAI F. (HAE, 1336; HEA, 1823; ERZamora, 90 — Rabanales, Zamora); [---]RIAIE TVRAI F. (HAE, 909; ERZamora, 32 — Villalcampo, Zamora); TVRENIO ARCONIS (HAE, 900; ERZamora, 40 — Villalcampo, Zamora); VENICIAE TVRAI F. (HAE, 907; ERZamora, 58 — Villalcampo, Zamora). place-names TVRORIGA (north of Huelva), TVRVRIGA (attested also in Beja and Faro, south Portugal), TVRVRBRIGA in the region of Badajoz, Spain (Búa 2000, 90–1, 641, 645).

OUTSIDE THE BRIGA ZONE. ELANVS TVRAESAMICIO AMBATI F(ILIVS) (CIL II, 5819 — Iruña, Álava); [T]VRAEAMSVS CANTABRI F. (CIL II, 2957 — Contrastra, Álava); TVRESHA TVRESAMIS F. (HEp, 1, 1 — Alaiza, Álava).

--- It"urk’aiο [ uarb’a an uarnb’ a n


† CONTEXT & READING. The segmentation is uncertain for this fragmentary text. It"urk’aiο is the more probable reading than It"uraaiο.

† INTERPRETATIONS. Untermann (MLH IV, 168) and Almagro-Gorbea et al. (2008, 1050) connect It"urk’aiο with the place-name element occurring in Conistorgis and Illiturgi. Kaufman proposes a Celtic adjective derived from Proto-Celtic *turko- ‘boar’ (2015, 82, 187, 405, 502; cf. Matasović 2009 s.n. *tworko-). It"urk’aiο could be related to the forms t’urea (J.7.8) and t’uňek’tui (J.14.1), such as taking It"urk’aiο as a syncopated feminine form of t’uňek’tui, i.e. Proto-Celtic *Turikāi ‘for a woman of the kindred of Turos’, dative singular; note also MAXSVMA TEIA ARCONI TVRCALE (NSIS) (CIL II, 5307; CPILC, 469 — Sierra de Fuentes, Cáceres) and Cisalpine TUROKOS cited above.


† CONTEXTS. uar(n)b’a an is one of the recurrent words of the SW epigraphic formula (on which see below): # k’o-b’elib’o na-k’i-b’u oira uarb’a an t’irt’os ne-b’a-na fark’eni # (J.1.2); ... k’i’inb’aiib’i ro-la?a uarb’a an ub[u]i # (J.3.1); ... asune≡ uarb’a an ≡ek’u’ufine ... (J.4.1); *reouu[u] [u][a]rb’a an ... nařk’eni[i] (J.4.4); ]aanan uarb’a an eb’e nař[k’e] (J.9.1); # soloiu uarb’a an [ i]na o*[ | n]ařk’eni[i] # (J.11.3); # uuruuau *arban *t’e-b’ar[e] b’a-nařk’ent’i # (J.16.1); ]uññi b’elihu uarnb’ a n e* b’ar(e)n nařk’eni[ (J.20.1); ]uaru b’a n tu’e[(e)-ro-b’a]re nařk’en# (J.21.1); # uuferk’ar uar[br’a]n k’iik’e≡ark’are ... (Monte Gordo).

† INTERPRETATION. As interpreted by Correa followed by Koch and Kaufman, Proto-Celtic *u(p)er regularly gives SW uar, representing /u.ar/ as in Brythonic, e.g. Breton war ‘on, over’ (see Koch 2011, §§70.1–2), alternatively or earlier disyllabic *u.ar/. My view remains that uar(n)b’a an is an accusative of destination as the object of a verb of motion ‘to the highest place/one’. Although agreeing on identification of the case form, Kaufman understands the meaning as adverbial, glossing ‘uppermost’.

† NOTE 1. A possible example of the corresponding accusative singular masculine form, or nominative/accusative neuter, is [uarb’o on if i ] | nařk’en[i] (J.7.5). If the intended referent of the better attested uarb’a an ‘highest (one)’ is a goddess uarb’o on [u.ar,mom] < *u(p)er,mom may refer to a male deity fulfilling the same function.
NOTE 2. It is likely that *u(p)er,mām in the SW formula provides significant insight into the belief system of the people of stelae, including the cult of high places and ideas connected with the Hispano-Celtic place-name Uxama ‘highest’ and those incorporating brigā ‘elevated place, hill(fort)’. At the same time, the formulaic uar(n)b’an t’ero-b’are, meaning something like ‘[this grave] has carried X away to the highest place/being’, euphemistically avoided direct reference to death, as one today might say, ‘so-and-so has gone to heaven’ merely to avoid the words ‘died, dead, death’.

COMPARANDA. In Celtic, there were several ways of saying ‘highest’, most of which are formed from the related prepositional bases *u(p)- and *u(p)er-. For example, Gaulish uertamo- and Old Welsh guartham < *u(p)er,tam-. Hispano-Celtic shows three related formations. *u(p)er,mo- gives Óuμα Uama and the Latinized group name VAMENSI for a Roman-period settlement (Salvatierri da los Barros, Badajoz; Falileyev et al. 2010, 228) in the territory of the south-western Celtici, situated high on the massif within the great bend of the Anas/Guadiana; cf. SW uab’an [u.amām] (J.16.5), and Lepontic UVAMO- < *u(p)er,mo-/ā. Óuμα probably originally designated the nearby conspicuous landmark, the highest summit of the region, Peña Utrea, at 813 metres. *u(p)er,mo- gives the recurrent Hispano-Celtic place-name Uxama; see uśnbe below. It is noteworthy that the superlative place-names Óuμα and Uxama are feminine singular, like the much more common place-name element -brigā ‘high (> important) place, elevated settlement, hillfort’. In the conceptual hierarchy of toponyms, a place called Uxama would be claiming superiority over its region’s places with -brigā names. *u(p)er,mo- gives Celtiberian masculine nominative singular VERAMOS, VORAMOS, accusative (?) VERAMOM (MLH V.1, 444–5, 459–60), possibly also VRAMVS in Roman Lusitania (Vallejo 2005, 695).

uarb’oii r ̃ uarbooiir sarune ea b’are nař’enii #

u( )arb’u u[ ] (J.23.1) ‘highest’ < Proto-Celtic *u(p)er,mo-, nominative- accusative dual [uar,mū] (Koch 2013a, 179–80) or dative singular masculine or neuter [uar,mūl] (Koch; Kaufman 2015, 12, 63–6, 121, 124–6, 178, 188, 204–5, 227–9, 232, 238–9, 263–4, 281–2, 293–4, 336–8, 350, 380–6, 390–1, 503).

CONTEXT. # betisai t’ee-b’arenti iru( )arb’u i el nař’ken: uśnbe # The segmentation into words in this section of the text is complicated by three factors. Although the inscription appears complete with nothing broken away, the series of signs runs up the right-hand side of the stone to the top to the sequence ... iru, then recommences on the left going down, beginning with arb’u... It is possible, then, that the final u of iru, a form that occurs elsewhere in the SW corpus (J.12.1), is doing ‘double duty’ as the final of iru and the initial of uarb’u. Whether the correct reading should be (u)arb’u or (u)arb’ui is then uncertain due to the hapax iel or -iel, which follows.
(])uult'ina       uśnbe

(])uult'ina  Acriptions: Palaeohispanic woman’s name, corresponding exactly to the Celtiberian masculine o-stem ultinos (K.1.3), inflected as a Celtic feminine a-stem nominative singular (Koch 2013a, 237) or vocative singular (Kaufman 2015, 178, 315–16).

†CONTEXT: The extant text is fragmentary: (])uult'ina ar-b eieŕituu lα[.

†INTERPRETATIONS. The stemulti- (Uldi-) is found amongst Iberian personal names (Moncunill Martí 2007, 195, 322–3), and this element is possibly of Iberian origin, as favoured by Kaufman. On the other hand, what looks like the same onomastic element occurs in Lepontic dative/ablative plural UVLTIAUIPOS (Prestino), in which case a Celtic origin would be more likely and Iberian totally unexpected; therefore, the borrowing was more probably in the opposite direction. In either case, the element is found fully adapted to Hispano-Celtic onomastic word formation amongst the personal names form Botorrita (K.1.3): ultinos, ultia, ultu, ultatunos, and ulta. If ultimately Celtic,ulti- is possibly a zero-grade variant of the element found as Gaulish uolti-, cf. Uolto-dagae, which probably means ‘long-haired’ (De Hoz 2005, 81) ~ Old Irish folt, Old Breton guolt, OC gols gl. ‘cesaries’, Welsh gwalt ‘human hair of the head’.

†BIBLIOGRAPHY. GPC s.n. gwalt; MLH V.1, 457–8; Matasović 2009 s.n. *wolto-.

uśnbe  OΩMY (J.23.1)  Celtic ‘high(est) place’ (Koch 2013a, 236; Woudhuizen 2014/15, 325)

†CONTEXT. # betisai tsee-barenti i ru≡( )arbu i el nařkê:e:n: uśnbe #  The text is unusual in the way the formula words are used, so that the 3rd person plural present case marking appears on tsee-bare rather than nařkênti, and there seems to be a different case form of the formula word uarbaan. Thus, uśnbe appears in the syntax, as well as the word’s position on the stone, to be an amplification, following a form of the word nařkê: which often closes the epigraph.

†See further tsee-barenti.

†INTERPRETATIONS. The previously published reading ușnee OΩMY is not confirmed by closer examination, which rather favours uśnbe OΩMY, as there is a more pronounced tail on the first of the two circular signs at the end of the inscription, thus agreeing in form with the first sign of the text, which is to be read (see above). In fact, the sign ( in uśnbe closely resembles that opening the text in # betisai ... Therefore the second proposed reading of Koch 21013a (236) is preferable: uśnbe [uks,me] < *u(p)s,māi ‘in the highest place’, locative singular; either as a common noun or as the well-attested Hispano-Celtic place-name, i.e. ‘in Uxama’. This reading reveals an ideologically significant word reconstructable in this form for Proto-Celtic and consistent with the logical content of uar(n)b̥an [uar,mam] < *u(p)er,mām ‘highest (one, place)’. Based on the reading ușnee, Kaufman (2015, 503) interprets as a locative-instrumental singular derived from Proto-Celtic *udsinjo- ‘small water, pool’, with the same base as Old Irish uisce ‘water’.
**COMPARANDA.** Hispano-Celtic Οὐξαμα Uxama (e.g. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 3.27, Ptolemy 2.6.55 Οὐξαμα Ἀργαλα, 2.6.52 Οὐξαμα Βαρκα), Celtiberian usama, Old Breton Ossam ‘Ouessant’, probably a borrowing from Gaulish Οὔξασμη ‘Ouessant’ (Strabo 1.4.5) into Brythonic (as indicated by O- [ǫ-] rather than U- [ʊ-], the usual reflex of Proto-Celtic *ou*, and ss rather than ch), Middle Welsh uchaf.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** IdgEW, 1106–7; LEIA U- 4f; GPC s.n. uchaf; MLH V.1, 463–5; Matasović s.n. *owxs*.

—uursaa that is comparable to indigenous names in Roman script from present-day Portugal (MLH IV, 168; Koch 2013a, 238). However, it is possible that VRSIVS and VRSIAICVS are derived from Latin Ursus/Ursa ‘bear/she-bear’, which occurred as personal names in the Peninsula in Roman times and, therefore, would have nothing to do with SW uursaa.

**CONTEXT.** Within the complete text # uursaa [u]arb*an ṭe-bar[e] b*an nařk*ent*ī #, which adheres closely to the norms of the SW epigraphic formula. Therefore uursaa is very probably the name of the deceased. The only possible uncertainty in segmentation is whether the formula word might uniquely have been written here uuarb*an with an initial double uu-, preceded by uursaa.
SUMMARY ON THE ‘TARTESSIAN EPIGRAPHIC FORMULA’

# NAMING PHRASE uar(n)b^an t^e(e)-ro-b^are (b^a) nakhirent^i (+AMPLIFICATION) #

is the underlying shape of many of the epigraphic statements in the SW corpus, although the variations and exceptions are numerous and wide ranging (Koch 2013b). In most examples, we get something shorter than the ‘full’ formula as set out above. In a recent survey of the 72 most readable inscriptions of the SW corpus (Koch 2014a; 2016, 462–3), this sample totalled 1752 signs. The sequences of signs that could be segmented and then yielded forms resembling attested Palaeohispanic and/or Ancient Celtic names comprised 590 signs or 33.7% of the corpus. Variants of the formula comprised another 581 signs or 33.2% of the corpus and 50.3% of the matrix language, i.e. the total excluding forms resembling names. In other words, the question of the linguistic classification of the matrix language of the SW corpus is largely the question of the language of the formula.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT. My working hypothesis is that this formula is to be analysed [... uar,man de-ro-bāre, ma narkenti (...)], meaning approximately ‘[this grave/death] has carried the deceased away to the highest destination, so they now rest/remain/lie down [here] ...’ (Koch 2013b). ‘The highest’ could refer to heaven or a specific female deity, though merely an elevated euphemism for death as ‘the ultimate’ is another possibility. The derivation uar(n)b^an < Proto-Celtic superlative *u(p)eramo- ‘highest’ goes back to Correa (1992; cf. Untermann 1995, 251 N 30). Like myself, Kaufman accepts this etymology and interprets the case form of uarbaan as feminine accusative singular, Proto-Celtic *u(p)eramām. Like myself he interprets ro as a preverb < Proto-Celtic *(p)ro < Proto-Indo-European *pro compounded with b^are, a 3rd singular perfect of Proto-Celtic √ber- < Proto-Indo-European √bher- ‘carry’. We agree in analysing t^e(e) as preverbal, but differ concerning the more probable derivation of the segment. Kaufman also agrees in interpreting nakhirent^i as a 3rd plural active present-tense verb expressing the act of interment and present state of deceased. It follows, from these specifics, that the approaches of Kaufman and myself also concur concerning the basic tripartite syntactic structure: uar(n)b^an — t^e(e)-ro-b^are — (b^a) nakhirent^i.

ALTERNATIVE SEGMENTATION OF THE EPIGRAPHIC FORMULA? Because the formulaic elements occur most usually in the sequence set out above, it can be considered whether b^are should be interpreted as a prefix on nakhir- rather than belonging to a separate phrase or clause (cf. the lecture presented by Eugenio Luján to the workshop on ‘Indo-European migrations and Celtic origins: aDNA and linguistic evidence’ in Heidelberg, September 2016). Such an alternative might lend itself to an interpretation of the SW formula, and hence the SW matrix language, as non-Indo-European. However, looking across the corpus as a whole, there are clearly examples in which
the sequence of the formula words precludes the segmentation $b^*$arena$^*$k'e-, most clearly the following three (with the formula words printed in upper-case letters):

$# \text{lokoob}^*\text{o} \equiv \text{niirab}^*\text{o} \text{t}^*\text{o} \text{a}^*\text{faai}^*\text{i} \text{k}^*\text{alt}^*\text{e} \text{lok}^*\text{on} \text{ane} \text{NA}^*\text{RK}^*\text{E} \text{k}^*\text{ak'i}^*\text{shi}^*\text{link}^*\text{olob}^*\text{o} \text{ii} \text{T}^*\text{E-RO-B}^*\text{ARE} (b^*e) \text{t}^*\text{asiiooni}^*\text{ #} \text{ (J.1.1)}; \ # \text{iru}^*\equiv \text{alk}^*\text{u} \text{sie}^*; \text{NA}^*\text{RK}^*\text{ENT'I} \text{mub}^*\text{a} \text{T}^*\text{E-RO-B}^*\text{ARE} \text{hata'a}^*\text{a}^*\text{e} \text{ #} \text{ (J.12.1); and} \ # \text{b}^*\text{et'isai} \text{T}^*\text{EE-B}^*\text{ARENT'I} \text{iru}^*\equiv \text{(U)ARB}^*\text{U} \text{i el} \text{NA}^*\text{RK}^*\text{E:N} \text{ u}^*\text{snb}^*\text{e} \text{ #} \text{ (J.23.1). In the last example, the inflexion of} b^*\text{arent'i} \text{shows that it belongs to the same grammatical category as} \text{na}^*\text{rk'ent'i}, \text{which obviously looks like an Indo-European active 3rd person plural present-tense verb. Note also} \ # \text{b}^*\text{ast'eb'uroi onunaio t}^*\text{e} \text{[...]i[...]o*reiar*nio eb'u alak'imurfb}^*\equiv \text{a} \text{NA}^*\text{RK}^*\text{E} \text{b}^*\text{a}^*\text{| ean B}^*\text{ARA} | \text{b}^*? \text{(São Martinho), if} b^*\text{ara} \text{here can be taken as a variant (such as the corresponding 1st person form) of the usual formula word} b^*\text{are}. \text{As well as the above examples there are those in which the segment} b^*\text{a} \text{intervenes between} b^*\text{are} \text{and} \text{na}^*\text{rk'ent'i}, \text{such as} \ # \text{b}^*\text{ot'ieana k}^*\text{ert'oo rob}^*\text{a} \text{T}^*\text{E-B}^*\text{ARE} \text{b}^*\text{a-NA}^*\text{RK}^*\text{ENT'I} \text{ #} \text{ (J.18.1), but these are less decisive for the present question, as they do not by themselves exclude the possibility that} b^*\text{areb}^*\text{ana}^*\text{rk'ent'i} \text{might be analysed as} \text{na}^*\text{rk'ent'i} \text{preceded by chained prefixes} b^*\text{are+b}^*\text{a}. \text{Gorrochategui (2013a) writes that, though he does not believe the SW language is Iberian, it can nevertheless be analysed as though it were, at least regarding the syntax of some segments comprising one or two phonemes and usually written with a single sign in Iberian script. Using inscription J.12.1 as a demonstration, he breaks up} t^*\text{e-ro-b}^*\text{are} \text{to make} t^*\text{e} \text{a suffix on the previous sequence} mub^*\text{a}, \text{as would favour this analysis in his view:} \text{irualk'usi-e: na}^*\text{rk'ent'i mub'a-t}^*\text{e ro-b}^*\text{are} \text{ *atanea-t}^*\text{e}. \text{In Iberian inscriptions, a morpheme} t\text{e} \text{is sometimes found affixed to personal names, where it has been analysed as marking the agent. However, with any survey of the whole SW corpus, one must conclude that} t^*\text{e(e)-ro-b}^*\text{are} \text{forms a syntactic unit (likewise} t^*\text{e-b}^*\text{are, t}^*\text{ee-b}^*\text{arent'i, t}^*\text{e-b}^*\text{ant'i);} t^*\text{e(e)} \text{is regularly prefixed to forms that look like Indo-European verbs rather than suffixed to recognizable names. These alternative segmentations can be ruled out as based on selective and inaccurate descriptions of the evidence. However, such efforts have value. With a corpus written without word divisions, scepticism can linger that it could easily be segmented to resemble a completely different language, such as Iberian, and that the potential for ingenious manipulation of the scriptio continua required no demonstration.} \text{THE 'TARTESSIAN EPGRAPHIC FORMULA' [ 105 ]}
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Abbreviated Language Names Used in the Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Ancient Brythonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av</td>
<td>Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cornish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celt</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis</td>
<td>Cisalpine Gaulish/Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctb</td>
<td>Celtiberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumb</td>
<td>Cumbric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
<td>Early Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galat</td>
<td>Galatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul</td>
<td>Gaulish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goth</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitt</td>
<td>Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Iberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lith</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lpt</td>
<td>Lepontic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lus</td>
<td>Lusitanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Middle Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Middle Cornish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIr</td>
<td>Middle Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModB</td>
<td>Modern Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModW</td>
<td>Modern Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Middle Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numidian (Old Berber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Old Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Old Cornish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Og</td>
<td>Ogamic Primitive Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr</td>
<td>Old Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>Old Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW</td>
<td>Old Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWB</td>
<td>Old Welsh and Old Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Proto-Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoen</td>
<td>Phoenician/Punic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pict</td>
<td>Pictish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr.Ir.</td>
<td>Primitive Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScG</td>
<td>Scottish Gaelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toch</td>
<td>Tocharaian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt</td>
<td>Sanskrit (incl. Vedic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>South-Western / Tartessian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†NOTE: INDO-EUROPEAN PALAEOHISPANIC NAMES. Material from the Celtiberian region as approximated geographically here (i.e. the modern Spanish provinces of Burgos, Cuenca, Guadalajara, La Rioja, Palencia, Soria, Teruel, and Zaragoza) is labelled ‘Celtiberian (Ctb)’. The bulk of the linguistic comparanda cited in this book is treated as a default category, and these forms are not given a language label in the Index. These are Indo-European Palaeohispanic names from sources of the Roman Period and from outside the Celtiberian region. In most cases these show diagnostically Celtic features or features at least consistent with a classification as Celtic. However, these short forms often contain neither conclusively Celtic nor non-Celtic features, such as might lead to classification as Lusitanian or possibly some even less well known non-Celtic indigenous Indo-European language.
INDEX
Aquitanian language 10–11, 14, 17
Aquitanian/Basque and Iberian related? 7 N11
ar (SW) 2, 29
ar-, er- (MW) 29
arat ‘ploughing’ (MB) 29
ar'b'arie (SW) 29–30
ar'b'ieri (SW) 30
ar'beit'tu (SW) 30
ar'beit 'use, employ, practice’ (OIr) 30
ARABQ 29
arae ‘charioteer’ (OIr) 86
aβaig (SW) 29
ARAİANOM (Ctb) 29
araiokum (Ctb) 29
ARAV(VS) | ARAV'IAR'IAQ(VM) 29
arber ‘use’ (OW) 30
arbu ‘use’ (OW) 29
Arcobriga (Ctb) 20
Arcobriga (Ctb) 20
Arcobriga (Ctb) 20
ArCeiTi 29, 55
archant (MB) 30
ARCi 20
ARCI 20
ARCl 20
ARClSvS 20
ARClVS 20
Arcobriga (Ctb) 20
Arcobriga (Ctb) 20
Aremorica / Armorica (Gaul) 77
Aremorici (Gaul) 29
Arganbri (OC) 30
Arganhel (OW) 30
argans (OC) 30
ARGANSA 32
argant (OB) 30
argant (OW) 30
ARGANTA (Ctb) 31
Argant (OB) 30
Argantelin (OC) 30
Arganthael (OB) 30
Arganoθ (OC) 30
ARGANTICAENI 32
ARGANTIQ(VM) (Ctb) 31
Argant-ken (OB) 32
Argantlon (OB) 30
Argantlouwen (OB) 30
Argantmoet (OC) 30
Argantmonoc (OB) 30
ARGANTO (Ctb) 31
ARGANTODNANS ‘officer of silver’ (Gaul) 30, 56
*argantom ‘silver’ (PC) 30
Arganto-magus (Gaul) 30
ARGANTONI(I) 31
argat, aircet (OIr) 30
argentum (Lat) 31
Argio-talus (Gaul) 88
arian, aryant (MW) 30
arie Δ (SW) 30
arie Δe (SW) 32, 47
Ariolais (Gaul) 32
Ariolais (Gaul) 32
Ariola (Gaul) 32
Ariolo-manus (Gaul) 32
Ari-o-usitus (Gaul) 32
ARIOVNIS 32
AriuS (Gaul) 32
ARIVOS 32
arjan (Goth) 29
arkanta (Ctb) 31
arkato-bezom (Ctb) 31
ARKATOKO 31
arkanta (Ctb) 31
ARKIO-TALUS 31
argentum (Lat) 31
argentum (OIr) 30
arkanta (Ctb) 31
ARKANTO 32
ARKANTO-N 32
ARKANTO-N MARETOKOS / ARGANTOCOMATERECVS (Cis) 30
*arkio- ‘archer’ (PC) 19
arlo (Lat) 29
ARQV[VI]C[II] 20
ARQV[II] 19
ARQV[II] (Ctb) 19
ARQV[II] 19–20
ARQV[VI]S 20
ARQVIA 19
ARQVIACVS 20
ARQVICI 20
ARQVIEN[S] 20
ARQVIENOBO 20
ARQVIO 19–20
ARQVIOCVM 19
ARQVM 20
(ARQVVS 15 FN 17, 19–20
ARQVIVS (Ctb) 19
ARQVOCS (Ctb) 19
āriva- (Skt) 32
asan 'ass' (OIr) 33
ascorn (OC) 33
ascorn, ascourn 'bone' (MC) 33
ascorn, ascwrn (MW) 33
ASEDĐIAGO 86
asedile (Ib) 8
asen ‘ass’ (OC) 33
ash (Albanian) 33
asinos 'ass' (Lat) 33
asna, esna 'rib' (OIr) 33
assedon 'war chariot' (Gaul) 86
assen 'rib' (MW) 33
asu (Luvian) 45
Assuna (Gaul) 45
Asuna (Gaul) 33
Asta 33
Asta 33
Astapa 33
Asti (Skt) 33
Astia/hastia 33
Astigali 33
asto 'ass' (Basque) 34
Astures 33
Asturias 33
asune (SW) 33–4
Asunna, Assuna, Assonius (Gaul) 33
ásva- (Skt) 45
asvain (SW) 32–3
atar 'birds' (OW) 48
at-baill 'dies' (OIr) 70
a-t-chondarc 'saw' (OIr) 80
AΓERBO (Gaul) 67
AΘΘEDOMAROS (AB) 86
ATTATVROC(m) (Ctb) 99
attanoc 'winged creature' (OB) 48
AVITA[E]CON 66
AVLIGGVN 66
baan (SW) 34
baaen (SW) 35
(ba-)nař+kent (SW) 52, 73
b'ane (SW) 34, 89
b'ar(e)n (SW) 37
b'ara (SW) 35
b'are (SW) 30, 35–6, 73, 92
b'arej (SW) 36–7
b'arenti (SW) 92
b'arie (SW) 30
b'arua-ion (SW) 49
b'ast'- (SW) 38
b'aste'b'urui (SW) 37–8
babbhāra 'has carried' (Skt) 36
badb 'crow, war goddess' (Mlr) 43
badh 'bed' (Goth) 40
BAEBIA BOV'TIA 42
baites (Ib) 40
BALATVSCVN 66
ban (OIr) 34
ban-douis gl. 'musa' (OB) 34
ban-leu (OB) 34
*bar 'carried' (Goth) 36
bās 'death' (OIr) 38
Bastetani 38
Bastetania 38
Basti 38
Bastuli 38
be (OIr) 34
beal'tuin 'May-day' (ScG) 39
beb 'grave' (MW) 40
Bed (Gaul) 40
BEDAQ(VM) (Ctb) 40
b'el'in (SW) 39
b'elib'o (SW) 39
b'elison (SW) 39
b'eri (SW) 30
b'etisai (SW) 39–40
bein (OIr) 34
Bel-'tene' (OIr) 39
BELAE/C I/S 39
BELAI[N]O GV N (Ctb) 39
belaiokum (Ctb) 39
BELAISC A (Ctb) 39
belaiskaz (Ctb) 39
belaiskon (Ctb) 39
Belenos, Belinos (Gaul) 39
CORACILAE 58
Corb (OIr) 62
corb ‘chariot’ (OIr) 62
CORBAGNI (Og) 62
CORBNI (Og) 62
Cormac (OIr) 62
COROBELICBO 39
COROGENI 61
CORONERI 75
COROTVRETIS 99
Cossus Nedoleado 74
cul ‘chariot’ (OIr) 84
Canetio (AB) 64
CVMEIVS 39
CVNOGENI (Og) 59
cwelan ‘to die’ (OE) 70
Cwen (OE) 34
Cypriot Syllabic writing 11, 16–18
Cyprus 17

DANNOTALI (Gaul) 88
dor-s’ (Skto) 89
dásyánti ‘they will give’ (Skto) 90
data (Old Persian) 31
datives plural in -BO 9
défer (Lat) 91
♀ deHr, ‘give’ (PIE) 90
DEIBABO NEMVCELAICABO
DEIBABOR IGO DEIBBOR
VISSIAIEGOB 67
derc, deirc (OIr) 80
DERCETIO (Ctb) 80
DERCINIO (Ctb) 80
bêróna (Gk) 80
de-uor-buet-id (Gaul) 78
devera (MC) 91
dibad ‘destruction, extinction’ 90
- dibatur ‘they became extinct’ 90
difer-u (W) 91
DIVERTOMV (Gaul) 6
DIVORTOM- (Gaul) 6
DOVITIANA TALAVI 88
drech ‘face’ (OIr) 80
drité ‘light’ (Albanian) 80
drych ‘appearance, mirror’ (W) 80
Dubno-talus (Gaul) 88
DUBONIRRA (Og) 75
DVGIIONTIO ‘who serve’ (Gaul) 49
dywared (MW) 63, 80
ea (SW) 44
ean (SW) 44
eb ‘horse’ (OB) 45
ebcall ‘foal’ (MW) 45–6
Eberesch ‘mountain ash’ (German) 38
ebeul (MB) 45
ebpl ‘foal’ (OB) 45
ebpl ‘bull’ (OC) 45
Ebroa 38
ΕΒΟΠΑ 38
ΕΒΟΠΝΥ (Galat) 38
ΕΒΟΠΗΝΥ (Galat) 38
ΕΒΟΠΠΗΝΥ (Galat) 38
Ebur (OW) 38
Ebura 38
Eburacum ‘York’ (AB) 38
Eburbriga (Gaul) 38
Eburophuna (Gaul) 38
Eburonamun (Gaul) 38
Eburomagus (Gaul) 38
Eburones (Gaul) 37–8
Eburuvices (Gaul) 38
Eburovicum (Gaul) 38
ebu ‘uro’ (SW) 38
ebursunos (Ctb) 38
EBVR(AN)CO (Ctb) 38
EBVR. 38
EBVRA 38
EBVRA[N]CVS 38
EBVRANCO (N) (Ctb) 38
EBVRENI 38
EBVRENIVS 38
EBVRENI 38
EBVRENIVS (Ctb) 38
EBVRI 38
EBVRIAE 38
EBVRIANVS 38
EBVRICIS (Gaul) 38
EBVRNI 38
EBVRVS 38
ech (OIr) 45
EDIGGNI 61
ΕΝΟΒΜ (Ctb) 48
edyrē ‘property, inheritance’ (MW) 43
eer’tuine (SW) 44–5
efwr ‘cow pasture, hog-weed’ (MW) 38
e-gile ‘other’ (MB) 57
EIQUITIVICO (Gaul) 45
ekualakos, ekualaku, ekualakon (Ctb) 46
ekuurstine (SW) 8, 14, 45
EKVON, EKVPETARIS ‘of a horse-rider’ (Venetic) 46
elokum (Ctb) 47
elu (Ctb) 47
Eliudius (Gaul) 47
Eliuentiu (Gaul) 47
Eliu-ris (Gaul) 47
Eliu-sates (Gaul) 47
ein ‘bird’ (OIr) 48
enb ‘learn’ (SW) 14
endo ‘in, on to’ (Lat) 28
ënswov within, at home’ (Gk) 28
en (OE) 46
Enadobpi (Galat) 45
EPATI[(AB) 45
Epaticcos (AB) 45
EPETICI 46
EPILLV (AB) 45
Epona (Gaul) 45–7, 81
EPONA REGINA (Gaul) 45, 47
Erovn (Galat) 45
Erodnobpi (Galat) 45
Eroonuveron (Galat) 45
EQOD(--) (Og) 45
EQODD(--) (Og) 45
equis (Lat) 45
EQVAESI 46
EQVALES (OIr) 46
EQVALIUS 46
EQVEISQVI (Ctb) 46
EQVESI 46
EQVO (Gaul) 45
er-, ar- (MB) 29
arazata (AV) 31
ermaid ‘bestows’ (OIr) 43
er’tuau (SW) 44
ESCENCOLATIS (Gaul) 14, 53
EZEKEIFTAI (Gaul) 53
EZEKEIIOAATI (Gaul) 53
eskenium (Ctb) 60
eskinke (ib) 8, 53
etan ‘forehead’ (OIr) 28
Eteo-Cypriot language 11
terinn (OW) 48
eu ‘drinks’ (MB) 48
euor (MB) 38
EXCINGOLATIS (Gaul) 53
EXCINGOMARVS (Gaul) 53

fear (ScG) 50
fedara ‘feather’ (OHG) 48
fer (OIr) 50
Feradach (OIr) 50
Ferchar (OIr) 50
Ferchu (OIr) 52
Fergal (OIr) 50
Fergnae (OIr) 50
Fergus (OIr) 50
finnr (OIr) 88
for-reith (OIr) 80
fod-reith (OIr) 80
fodridi ‘dig’ (Lat) 40
folt (OIr) 102
for-reith (OIr) 63
for-ráith (OIr) 63
forad (OIr) 86
fossa ‘ditch’ (Lat) 40
fra ‘for, before’ (AV) 82

gainithir ‘is born’ (OIr) 59
gislas ‘end, death’ (Lith) 70
galóta 53–4
galati ‘drops, disappears’ (Skto) 70
Gallus (Lat) 54
ganet ‘was born’ (MW) 59
κονιστοργίς
kooŕbeo
koobeelıbo
*pertaining to
kontebakom
Konioi
64
Lakeentii
*lies down*
(OIr) 64
LM
63–4
Kynwydon
kymmyrth
*confluence* (MW) 91
kymmer
*k̂(u ̯ )ōn
κυνητες
κυνησιοι
Kunēsioi
Kunētes 63
kueliokos
(Ctb)
kounesikum

/lokooboo niiraboo
[kooloar
liirnest aakuun baane
ko(m)
κονιοι
likinos
likine
(Ib) 8
linbooire
√
[124]

Lugus, ΛΟΥΓΟΥΣ, pl. Lugoues
66, 68
LUGUVECCA (Og) 68
Lukinos (Ctb) 68
LVCOBO 68
LVCBO 68
LVGGONI 68
Λυσιόν (AB) 68
LVGOVBVS 68
LVGOVES (Gaul) 68
LVGOVBVS 'to the divine
Lugoues' 68
LVGVA 68
LVGVA 68
LVGVADICI 68
LVGVBO ARQUIENÓBO 69
LVGEI 'to [the god] Lugus'
(Ctb) 68
LVGUVNIS 68
LVGVNO 68
LVGVSELVA (Gaul) 68

/m/ phonne 7–9
Macrobius 74
mad·génatar ‘auspiciously are
they born’ (OIr) 59
Madyein (MW) 60
mailikum (Ctb) 76
MALVGNIQ. 60
mare (Lat) 77
mari, meri ‘sea, lake’ (OHG) 77
Maro-boduus (Gaul) 43
Mastia 38
Matgano, Matgantet /Matganten (OB) 60
Matganoj (OW) 60
Mathgen (OIr) 59
MATIENI (Ctb) 60
MATIGENI (Ctb) 60
MATIGENVS (Ctb) 60
MATREBO ΒΑΛΑΝΕΙΚΑΒΟ
‘for the mothers of Glanum’
(Gaul) 67
matugenus (AB) 60
MATV[ENIQ][VM] 60–1
MATVCENI 61
MATVENI 61
MATVGENI 61
MATVGENO 60
MATVGENO (Gaul) 59
MATVGENO MATVGEN[I]
Q(VM) 60
MATVGENVS (Gaul) 59
mat-yth-anet ‘you were born
auspiciously’ (W) 60
MEDAMVS 40
MEDDOGENI (Og) 60
Medellin necropolis 1
MEDIGENI (AB) 60
[MJ]EDIGENVS 61
MEDVC[ ] 61
MEDVENI 61
MEDVGENVS 61
MEDVGENA 61
MEDVGENAI 61
MEDVGENI 61
MEDVGENI (AB) 60
*Medu-genos, -genē (PC) 61
MEDVGENVS 61
MEDVGENVS (Ctb) 60
MEDVGENVNS (Ctb) 60
MEIDVNA 61
MEIDVNI 61
MEIDVNI 61
MEDVGENVS 61
melēas (SW) 69
MELIDIVS (Gaul) 69
MELIS[S]AE (Gaul) 69
MELISSAE (Gaul) 69
*melit-ti- (PIE) 69
MELISSI (Gaul) 69
melys ‘sweet’ (W) 69
melysedd (W) 69
mezukens (Ctb) 60
mezukenskue (Ctb) 60
Middle Bronze Age stela 66
Midgen (OIr) 60
Milgen (OW) 59
milis (OIr) 69
millse (Mfr) 69
mitrā=varunā (Skt) 50
mnāi (OIr) 34
mnas (Gaul) 34
mor (OB) 77
mor (OW) 77
mor ‘sea’ (C) 77
Morgen (OW) 59
Morgen-mvnuc (OB) 59
Moricamulus (AB) 77
MORICI (Gaul) 77
MORICOLO 77
Moridunum ‘sea-fort’ (AB) 77
Moriebkamab (AB) 77
MORILAE 77
Morini (Gaul) 77
MORINIS (SW) 77
Morinos (Gaul) 77
MORITASGO (Gaul) 77
MORITEX ‘sea-farer’ (Gaul) 77
Mor·iassa·s (AB) 77
mor ‘sea’ (OCS) 77
mub’a (SW) 105
muir (ScG) 77
muir ‘sea’ (OIr) 77
mutorko (Ctb) 70
muturiskum (Ctb) 70
Muturrae (Ctb) 70
mut‘ui or sut‘ui (SW) 77
mut‘uirea (SW) 70
MVRE 77
MVRINILLA (Gaul) 77
Mycenae 17

nā (Av) 75
nār ‘lord, chief, leader’ (W) 75
omurika'[a] = ]anb'at'ia=io'b'a[ (SW) 24
oni(?b'jak'ati-še (SW) 77
ōvo' (Gk) 33
oofoire (SW) 35,49,65,78
oofoire (SW) 49,78
orb'a (SW) 79
orb'aṣe'ta (SW) 56,79
[O]BRIENIC[VM] 79
Orbio-talus (Gaul) 88
oret'e (SW) 63,79
os, oassis (Lat) 33
oksr (Armenian) 33
Ossam (OB) 103
'orečov (Gk) 33
ot'erka (SW) 80
Oúama Uama 7,101
Οὐφροκοουν (AB) 52
Οὐφάμα 103
Οὐοςαμ 'Ouessant' 103

/p/ phoneme 17
/p/ in Iberian 13 N16
/p/ in Pre-Basque 13 N16
padda-, pidda- (Hitt) 40
Palaeo-Basque language 12
Palaeoiberian script(s) 10–11, 16
Palaeoiberian sginaries 14
Palaeoiberian writing 8,11,17
papon
pape, papi, pape, papu (Gaul) 53
parō 'furnish, provide' (Lat) 43
pāt- 'plough' (Toch A) 40
'ō(p)atan- 'wing' (PC) 48
patara-ta-'winged' (Av) 48
pātra- 'wing (of a bird), feather' (Skt) 48
pauv (OW) 53
Pēgo necropolis 78
*pēH(i)- 'drink' (PIE) 48
*pēH,us 'much' (PIE) 47
penna 'feather' (Lat) 48
pento-/pinto- names 98
per'over' (Lat) 29
perferō'carry through' (Lat) 30
pery'carry, give' (PIE) 43
περί 'all around, about' (Gk) 29
περφέρω 'carry around' (Gk) 30
Phoenician script 11
Phoenicians 8
*pHtr: - 'father' (PIE) 43
pibati 'drinks' (Skt) 48
Pillars of Hercules 53
pittar, pittar 'wing' (Hitt) 48
platiodanni (Gaul) 56
plērus (Lat) 66
pop (OB) 53
Porth Medgen (OW) 60

pra- (Lith) 82
pre 'before, forward' (Skt) 82
pratamad 'foremost' (Skt) 83
prathma'd 'first' (Skt) 83
Pre-Basque *r and *R 8
Pre-Basque/Aquitani language 7,10,12–13
prōtē 'gives' (Skt) 43
*prō (PIE) 82–3
*p(p)ro (PC) 104
prō- (OCS) 82
prō̆, prō- 'before' (Lat) 82
πνο 'before' (Gk) 82
προ- 'wing' (Gk) 83
prōferō (Lat) 83
promontorium Nerium 75
πρόμος 'foremost man, champion' (Gk) 83
pru (Oscan) 82
pru- , pru- (Umbrian) 82
πτερόν 'wing' (Gk) 48
*pτvţ : *pet(e)r- 'wing, feather' (PIE) 47

raha (SW) 8,56,81
raha kā'setana (SW) 56,81
ref- (Skt) 47
rajātā- (Skt) 31
rajīji (Skt) 46
rapa (Sem) 81
RAPETIGVS 81
RAPPA 81
rat'e (SW) 83
re-cens (Lat) 59
redundancy 17
√ret- 'run' (PIE) 62
retukeno (Ctb) 60
retukenos (Ctb) 60
Reva Nitaeceus 74
rēx (Lat) 47
Rhiannon < *Rīgantonā 46–7
rhotic signs in SW script 14
rī (OIr) 47
rī (OW) 82
Ría de Huelva deposition 8
Ridgen/Ridien (OB) 59
rigain (OIr) 46
rigani (Gaul) 46
*rigi- (PC) 81–2
rikanas (Cis) 46
ΡΙΦΑΝΤΙΚ (Gaul) 46
rinoeb-o (SW) 8,14,81
-riš (SW) 32
-RIX (Gaul) 47
-RIXS (Gaul) 47
ro (Gaul) 82
ro (OIr) 82
ro < *p(pro) (SW) 2,8,82,93
ro'bāre (SW) 30,36,83
ro-cluineθar (OIr) 84
ro'b[a] (SW) 83
ro·b·a·læ·e (SW) 83
ro·bis·et·i (Ctb) 82
ro·bud (Olr) 43
ro·cloath (Olr) 84
RO·KLO·ZIA·BO, RO·KLO·ZABO 'for the listeners' (Gaul) 67, 84–5
ro·k·o·l·ion (SW) 84, 92
rom ‘early, too soon’ (Mlr) 83
ro·n·b·a·re·n (SW) 37
RO·TA·MVS 83
-ru·bart (Olr) 36
rybu‘ ‘warning, admonishment; advice, notice’ (MW) 43

sab‘oi (SW) 85
sacrum promontorium 88
*sa·H₂u el/n (Toch B) 34
SAMOTA·LIS (Gaul)
SAMO·GNI·TIS (Gaul)
SAMOGENI·TI·VS (Gaul)
SAMORI·X (Gaul)
SAMOTALI (Gaul)
ša·na (Toch B) 34
SARO·NI·S (Gaul) 86
saru·u·n (SW) 86
Satijenus (Gaul) 59
sá·y‘lies‘ (Skt) 73
*šéd- (PIE) 86
se·ð (MW) 86
*se·des-, *sed·‘seat’ (PIE) 86
*sedo· ‘seat’ (PC) 79
sekaiazkom ‘pertaining to Segeda’ (Ctb) 66
*sem·‘summer’ (PIE) 85
Seno·bena (Gaul) 34
se·ta· (SW) 86
shoemaking episode 68
*(s)H₂u·pér‘over’ (PIE) 78
*(s)H₂u·përno‘over-most, highest’ 100
sibilant signs in SW script 14
síd (Olr) 86
shed (W) 86
Sisapo 3 N7
Six-place-names 3 N7
SITGES (Lpt) 86
sol (Lat) 87
SOLA (Gs) 87
SOLIBODVS (Gaul) 87
SOLICVM 87
SOLICVRS (Gaul) 87
SOLIMARA (Gaul) 87
SOLIMARIVS (Gaul) 87
SOLIMARVS (Gaul) 87
SOLIRIX (Gaul) 87
SOLISETIVS (Gaul) 87
soloir (SW) 49, 86–7
SOLORIX (Gaul) 87
srāuvei‘eti ‘causes to hear, recites’ (AV) 84
srāvya·tati, srāvya·tati ‘causes to hear’ (Skt) 84
stahint (Oscar) 87
stahu (Oscar) 87
stam (Ctb) 52
*(s)teh₂-, (s)joh‘i stand‘ 87
stó (Lat) 87
*(s)tonH₂r, (s)teH₂r-os ‘thundering’ (PIE) 90
Suadugenius (Gaul) 59
*Su·H₂i·– (PIE) 87
súil (Olr) 87
sumor ‘summer’ (OE) 85
sunno (Goth) 87
suolakue (Ctb) 87
suoli·*kum (Ctb) 87
SVO·LIC·ENI·TI·VS (Gaul) 87
SW matrix language 104
SW script 14–16

TAL·AV·I (SW) 89
ta·alain·on (SW) 87
ta·ao (SW) 89
ta·riel·on (SW) 45, 84–5
*ta·rn·k‘un (SW) 9–10, 35, 66, 89–90
*ta·rn·k‘un· b·a·n·e (SW) 76
*ta·rn·k‘un·(k)‘un (SW) 69
(tª)jau (SW) 87
tal (W) 88
TALA·BI·I (SW) 88–9
TALAB·AR·I (SW) 89
TALABAR·A (SW) 89
TALABAR·I (SW) 88–9
TALABARIVS (SW) 89
TALABI (SW) 88–9
TALABRIC·A (SW) 88
TALABRIGENS·IS (SW) 88
TALABRI·V (SW) 88
TALABVS (SW) 88–9
TALAGNI (Og) 88
TALAGONIO (SW) 89
TALAI (SW) 88–9
TALANIO (Ctb) 88
TALAO (SW) 88
TALAV (SW) 89
TALAVI (SW) 88–9
TALAVIAE (SW) 89
TALAVIVS (SW) 88–9
TALAVS (SW) 88
TALAVS (Ctb) 88
TALENV[S] 89
TALEVO (SW) 89
Talhaem (OW) 88
Talhoïarn (OB) 88

TALOTIS 89
TALOTIVS 89
talu (Cis) 88
talukokum (Ctb) 88
TALVSICOBO 88
TANARO (AB) 90
TANOTALIKNOI (Cis) 88
tar·an ‘thunder’ (OB) 90
TAPANOY (Gaul) 90
TARANVS (Gaul) 90
TARANVCNO (Gaul) 90
*Tår·hunna (Hit) 34
TARIOLENVS (Cis) 45, 85
tarkas‘–as‘ (Luvian) 33
Tartesian epigraphic formula 104–5
Táptas–as‘ 30
-táu (Olr) 87
taunei (Ctb) 44–5
tow (W) 87
t’s·as·ioonii (SW) 85, 90
t‘e (SW) 2, 82–3
t’e·e (SW) 105
t’e·e·ro·b·are (SW) 93
t’e·e·ro·b·are·e (SW) 105
t’e·b·ant·i (SW) 83, 90
t’e·b·are (SW) 30, 91, 102, 105
t’e·b·ere (SW) 91
*t’e·e·re·e (SW) 92
*t’e·e·re·t·e·b·are (SW) 92
*t’e·ro·b·are (SW) 30, 52, 82–3, 93
*t’e·b·ant·i·k (SW) 105
t’e·ee·b·a·ret·t·i (SW) 92–3, 105
teiuantikum (Ctb) 76
terberez (Ctb) 92
terkininei (Ctb) 80
terkinos (Ctb) 80
terti·us (Lat) 94
*teuH₂r·‘swell (with power), grow fat’ (PIE) 97
TEUOXTONION (Cis) 75
pumal·fingr‘thumb’ (ON) 97
*te·ile·k‘uk‘u or *te·ile·k‘uk‘u
(SW) 93–4
t‘irt‘os (SW) 6, 8, 14, 79, 92, 94
TILLEGVS 94
TILILCI (Gaul) 94
*t’é·os ‘land’ 94
tiritanium ‘of the descendants of Tirtauos’ (Ctb) 66, 94–5
tirtnao (Ctb) 95
tirtnaos (Ctb) 94–5
tirtoboloukom (Ctb) 95
tirtoolum (Ctb) 95
Tiritos 5
tirtotulu (Ctb) 95
tirtouis (Ctb) 94
tirtu (Ctb) 95
*tirtnou (Ctb) 95
*tirtnu (Ctb) 95
THE CELTIC OF THE SW INSCRIPTIONS

uursaa (SW) 103
UVAMO- (Lpt) 101
UVLTIAUIOPOS (Lpt) 102
Uxama 68, 101, 103

VAMENSI 7, 101
VARCONIS (Gaul) 6
VERAMO- (Ctb) 7
VERAMOM (Ctb) 9, 101
VERAMOS (Ctb) 28, 101
VERAMOS, VORAMOS (Ctb) 100
vindo- (Gaul) 88
VIR[ONI]CVN 66
vīra- (Av) 50
vīrā- ’man, hero’ (Skt) 50
vīra-gan- (Av) 50
VIRANI 51
Virgnou (Early Medieval Brythonic) 50
VIRIACIVS 51
VIRO[N]I 51

VIROMENIGORVM 51
VIRON 51
VIRON(VS) 51
VIRONI 51
VIRONI (Ctb) 50
VIRONIGII 51
VIRONIVS 51
VIRONO 51
VIRONVS 51
VIROS VERAMOS ’supreme man’ (Ctb) 50, 52, 78, 101
VIRIOTI 51
Volcae (Gaul) 24
VORAMOS (Ctb) 7, 78–9, 101
VORETO- (Gaul) 80
VRAMVS 101
Vurgen (OW) 59
VRSIACIVS (SW) 103
VRSIVS (SW) 103
Uvorgen/ Uvorien (OB) 59
Uurgen/ Uurien (OB) 59
Uurgost (OB) 50
Uvorgen/Uvormien (OB) 59
VVROVIO (Ctb) 50
vyras ’man, husband’ (Lith) 50
wair ’man’ (Goth) 50
West Semitic alphabet 10–11, 16
Western Greek alphabet 16
Western Hispano-Celtic dialects 14
wir’ ’youthful, young, fresh’ (Toch A) 50
Worcant (OC) 50
Worci (OC) 52
Wurcon (OC) 52
Worgüstel (OC) 50
Wurlowen (OC) 50
yakwe (Toch B) 46
yf’drinks’ (MW) 48
y-gyla, e-gele (MC) 57
žena (OCS) 34