

REINTERPRETING SOME DOCUMENTS OF THE CELTIBERIAN AND OTHER PALAEOHISPANIC *CORPORA*

Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel

0. While investigating Continental Celtic word-formation, I have come across some isoglosses which allow a less complicated reconstruction and, last not least, a better comprehension of the Palaeohispanic forms discussed in the present paper.

On the one hand, there is the narrowing of unstressed *yo* and *ya* to *e* by way of *ye* — already discussed in detail in vol. 6 (2006) of this journal —¹ which disguises several *yo*- and *yā*-stems as well as the genitive singular of the *i*-stems (section I in the following).

On the other hand, there is the epenthesis — first pointed out by Ködderitzsch 1985 and Eska 1996 —, which accounts for several onomastic forms, in and outside the Iberian Peninsula,² that also appear somewhat disguised with respect to their otherwise well-known etymologies. In the present study, we are just going to discuss such a possibility for a ceramic graffito originally read **A.Pu.r.a.z** (section II below).

I

1. The monophthongization of unstressed *yo* and *ya* to *e* is well-known for being a characteristic feature of the Goidelic branch, where it is already visible e.g. in the corpus of Ogam inscriptions found in Britain.³

¹ The present article represents just one more link within a long chain of systematic studies seeking to elucidate several aspects of Continental Celtic. It is hence, unfortunately, beyond the possibility of the present author to repeat here accurately — in the limited space available — examples, bibliography and the often complex argumentation referring to what has been amply illustrated in earlier publications.

² More evidence for epenthesis in the Hispanic and the Italian corpora has been discussed by De Bernardo 2001, 321-322. with. n. 20; 2007b, 158, and, respectively, 2009, 163, 179.

³ Cf. *i.a.* De Bernardo 2011c, 184 ff. with references and more examples, also of the types discussed in the following.

As a rather secondary than diatopic isogloss, the narrowing of unstressed *yo* and *ya* to *e* by way of *ye* is widely known from all over the Keltiké: cf. i.a. the narrowing of Celt. *ianto-* ‘zeal’ in (-)iento- in many Continental personal names whenever the first syllable became unstressed in compounds or derivatives, e.g. in *Adiántus* vs. *Adietuános* ‘Very eager or passionate’.⁴ We also know that *Alísiia* turned into *Alixie* and *Turibríga*, the later form of *Turóbriga*, into *Turibrie*.⁵ And we observe the same narrowing in the Celtic genitives of *yā-* and *ā-*stems contained in Roman inscriptions: *Coties*, *Obilies*; *Avites*, *Boudes*; *Luteives*.⁶

In some territories, however, it is already present in the oldest documents, so that it seems to have contributed to mark dialectal boundaries. Accordingly, the narrowing of unstressed *yo* and *ya* to *e* by way of *ye* has been described for the “grande Liguria mediterranea”,⁷ e.g. in *montem Berigiemam* as in the ethnic genitives plural *Nítelium* and *Βαδ/γιεννων*⁸ or even in ethnic nominative plurals like *Maiéli* from **Mágio-li* via **Máyieli* and later **Mayiéli*.⁹ The isogloss in question is also operative in parts of the Narbonnese corpus, cf. the formulaic *δεκαντεμ* ‘the tenth’ < **dek’m-t-yo-m*;¹⁰ and ethnonymic coin legends like **n.e.r.o.n.Ke.n** < **Ner-ón-ik-yo-m* ‘of The manly people’ and **s.e.l.o.n.Ke.n** < **Sel-ón-ik-yo-m* ‘of The land-owners’.¹¹ Some remnants of the ancient Catalonian Celticity¹² also seem to have experienced the narrowing, e.g. the population group of the *Laletáni* or

⁴ NPC, 12; Matasović 2009, 434. Further details in *Sonanten*, 163-164, where, however, the reconstruction of two distinct protoforms is uneconomic and needs correcting.

⁵ Cf. n. 3 above.

⁶ Wedenig *et al.* 2007, 623 ff. — Other examples are more problematic for having been found in areas of linguistic contact, as in Aquitania, where in the local Celtic and Classical onomastics a vowel *e* can be often traced back to an etymological **yo*, as in the case of *Andereni* from **Anderyoni* and perhaps *deo Artahē* (**deo Artā(s)yo?*) and *deo Erriape* beside *deo Erriapo* from **deo Priapyo* vs. *deo Priapo* (De Bernardo 2006, 54 and 2006a, 14-17). On *Bodogenes* in Rome as a possible **Boudogenyos* cf. De Bernardo - Sanz 2009, 230 with n. 9.

⁷ For the term cf. Maras 2004. “A prescindere dall’eventualità di una più ampia presenza ligure in Europa e dal riferimento a tale *ethnos* di alcuni gruppi della Corsica, le fonti documentano per il territorio storico dei Liguri un’estensione su tutto l’ampio tratto della costa mediterranea che va dalla Catalogna a occidente, fino alla Versilia a oriente” (*ibid.*, 21).

⁸ The linguistic evidence is accounted for — together with a discussion of the previous studies — by De Bernardo 2006, 46 and, in more detail, by *ead.* 2009. It may be added that the NW-Hispanic ethnic *Baidioi* (documented in the gen.pl. as *Βαδ/ύων*), as a palatalized form of the original Celtic adjective *badio-* < **b^ha-dyo-*, seems to constitute another parallel for the lectio difficilior *Badienni*; cf. DCCPIN, 61, 68 and De Bernardo 2011c, 177 ff.

⁹ References in Petracco - Caprini 1981, 61-62.

¹⁰ A detailed discussion of the various types of Celtic ordinal numbers offers De Bernardo 2006.

¹¹ Note that, although coin legends of this kind (more exx. in vol. 6 of this journal) are usually assumed to be Iberian also from a linguistic point of view, they find no match in the truly, non monetal Iberian epigraphy.

¹² On the “submerged Celticity” of this area cf. now Arenas *et al.* 2011, 121-125.

Láieski ‘The lowland people’, whose name is preserved in the genitive plural of the coin legend **l.a.i.e.s.Ke.n.**¹³ Forms like the coin legend **s.a.l.Tu.i.e.**, as opposed to the more conservative variants *Salduvia* /*Saldubia*,¹⁴ together with the ethnonymic legend **s.e.Te.i.s.Ke.n.**, continuing the genitive plural **Sede^ysk-yo-m* and thus corresponding to the ethnic of the Sédeiski or *Sedetáni*¹⁵ — and perhaps also Kelse and Lagine in the following § 1.2 —, suggest further that the isogloss reached the inland Sedetan area.¹⁶ Last not least, we find the town of *Sentice* in the Vaccean area (Barr 24: F4), which, for being unanimously considered to be linguistically Celtic, can be easily traced back to **Séntikia* < **Séntu-k-(y)ā* ‘The settlement along the road’.¹⁷

I now propose that the same type of narrowing as that observed in the aforementioned cases also accounts for the names in (Celt)Iberian writing discussed in the following paragraphs of this first section, thereby revealing them to be normal *yā*-stems (§§ 2-4, 8 and 10), *yo*-stems (§§ 6-7, 9-10) and *i*-stems (§§ 5, 9-10).

2. Ὠρία AND o.r.e, Celsa AND Ke.l.s.e, l.a.Ki.n.e

The existence of variants in *-e* for settlement names otherwise ending in *-ia* — as e.g. in the case of *Ore*, written as **o.r.e.** on coins dated to the 2nd c. BC of ‘Localización insegura, probablemente en Cataluña’,¹⁸ and Ὠρία — was already pointed out by Villar 2000, 357 ff., who saw it in the perspective of morpheme substitution in language contact. On the account of the huge number of Celtic instances where a Celtic *e* is shown to go back to an ascending diphthong with semivowel *y*, I suppose now that in those cases where the etymology of the toponyms seems to be Celtic and their location is

¹³ Etymology by García 2005. Further exx. in De Bernardo 2006. — Note that here and in the following a different script has been employed for representing the interpreting transcriptions of the forms transliterated.

¹⁴ The toponymic coin legend *Salduie* (A.24 in *MLH* I/1, 213f.; *DCPH* II, 71; *CNH*, 228) refers to the antecedent of Caesaraugusta, a town called by Pliny both *Salduvia* (/ *Salduva*) and *Saldubia*. Note that, if the nexus *-ld-* is due to the toponymical attraction of some neighbouring place names, as the geminated *ll* of the corresponding ethnonyms in the Latin transmission (*Salluitanus*; *Salluii*, *Salluienses*) seem to indicate and the traditional explanation goes, the ethnonym underlying the settlement name would have an exact match in the Ligurian ethnic *Sálluvii* < *Sállui* < *Salues* < **Slwes* ‘The own ones’ (De Bernardo 2006, 46).

¹⁵ On its phonetic development cf. now De Bernardo 2011c, 180. We have to stress once more that those scholars who try to analyze the ending *-sk-en* as an Iberian suffix do not have a match for it in Iberian inscriptions, but have to make it up out of different bits and pieces.

¹⁶ This is — although indirectly — shown by the map of Sedetan coins and mints drawn by Burillo 2007, 373, fig. 100, after Villaronga.

¹⁷ The very archaic derivative pattern **Sentikī* — as proposed by Delamarre 2012, 235-236 — would, in fact, be far more problematic, not only from the phonetic, but also from the structural point of view, since it is unparalleled among settlement names. Cf. also *DCCPIN*, 203 and 30 with references.

¹⁸ *DCPH* II, 302-303; cf. also A.31 in *MLH* I and *CNH*, 189.

not altogether incompatible with a however tenuous and/or ancient Celticity,¹⁹ the variants with *-e* may be the results of the monophthongization of a former **-yā*. In the case of the Oretan toponym *Ore*, older *Oria*,²⁰ it seems obvious to reconstruct a *yā*-derivative of the inherited Common Celtic lexeme **(p)oro-* ‘edge, limit’.²¹

In the case of the coin-legend **Ke.l.s.e**, the voiceless velar stop at the beginning of the word is unequivocal, given that the legend appears — from the middle of the 2nd c. BC — on the emissions of the mint *Celsa*, which later became the first Roman colony in the Ebro valley. There is even a dual legend **Ke.l.s.e** /**CEL** in the Pompeyan era.²² Under the new hypothesis, Kelse simply represents a case of the narrowing to *e* of the unstressed *ya* contained in the adjectival variant **Kelsyā*, which, for being regularly derived from and alternating with *Celsa*, was actually the logical option for a coin legend.²³ It is, in fact, well known, that apparently adjectival variants ending in *-yo-* and, respectively, *-ya* were freely available for all settlement names of the *-o-* and *-ā* declensions, cf. *Anaunon* /*Anaunion*, *Mediolanon* /*Mediolanion*, *Cremona* /*Cremonia* etc.²⁴ One may furthermore recall that in the Italian Celticity there is some evidence pointing to an assibilation of the sequence *tyV* and wonder whether the original form might once have been **Keltyā*, with the same development as in the name of *Medussa Cariassi*, an Italian **Medutia* daughter of **Cariatios*.²⁵

Probably not far away from the ancient **Kelsya* > Kelse /*Celsa* was the town which minted — between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st c. BC — the coins with the legend **l.a.Ki.n.e**, whose more important finds point to the Lérida region.²⁶ Due to the similarity of this legend with the name of the Hispanic Λαγυι, a town to which the mint under study does not, however, seem to have been geographically related,²⁷ the legend **l.a.Ki.n.e** had already be interpreted as a possible “**Lagina*” “in lateinischer Überlieferung”.²⁸ I should like to suggest now (1) that **l.a.Ki.n.e** not only reflects *Lagine*, but that it also continues a former **Laginyā*, and (2) that it is

¹⁹ On this question cf. the bibliography quoted in n. 12 above.

²⁰ For the attestations of the name cf. Cruz *et al.* 2007, 439-442. García 2003, 345-346. Villar 2000, 358 n. 19.

²¹ Cf. *MIr. or*; *MW or* (fem.); *Co. or*; *OBret. orion* (gl. *oram*), *MoBret. or*; Matasović 2009, 137 with further evidence and bibliography, to which *W. eirionyn* ‘fringe’ and *DGVB* II, 451 and 533 ought to be added.

²² *DCPH* II, 234-240; *CNH*, 221-225; A. 21 in *MLH* I.

²³ Cf. also the aforementioned **Salduvia* > *Salduie* as opposed to *Salduva* or **Segedia* > *Segeiza* as opposed to the more frequent *Segeda*.

²⁴ Cf. De Bernardo 2001, 106.

²⁵ Cf. De Bernardo 2009, 178.

²⁶ According to *DCPH* II, 264; cf. also *MLH* I on A.22 and *CNH*, 226.

²⁷ So Untermann in *MLH* I, 211, and — more recently — *DCPH* II, 264. Burillo 2007, 234 and 368.

²⁸ *MLH* I, 211.

a further instance of the Celtic toponymic element **la(:)gina* ‘blade; stripe’ which is found *i.a.* in various European river names.²⁹ The same element is contained in the Goidelic name used for both the Leinstermen and their region in the SE of Ireland, i.e. the nominative plural **Lagini* > *Laigin* with gen. *Laigen*,³⁰ also surviving in some significant places in north Wales — such as the *Llyn* Peninsula and *Porth Dinllaen*.³¹ In any case, the connection between Spain and the rest of the Keltiké outlined here seems more promising than the old attempt at linking the mint’s name with toponyms of unclear structure and containing an opaque base with a voiceless velar, such as “*Lacippo, Lacilbula, Lacimurgis*”.³²

3. o.i.l.a.u.n.e AND o.i.l.a.u.n.e.z BESIDE o.i.l.a.u.n.i.ko.s AND o.i.l.a.u.n.u

From the same mint which “en Beronia o Celtiberia, quizás en el Alto Ebro” issued from the middle of the 2nd c. BC coins with the Archaic-Celtiberian nominative plural **o.i.l.a.u.n.i.ko.s**, there are later emissions with the legends **o.i.l.a.u.n.e.z** and **o.i.l.a.u.n.e** on bronze coins, whereas silver coins (*denarii*) show **o.i.l.a.u.n.u**.³³

It appears now that the interpretation of various settlement-names ending in *-e* as former *yā*-stems offers a satisfying solution also for the analysis of **o.i.l.a.u.n.e.z**. Even if we do not know which was the actual etymology of the toponym in question, the form **o.i.l.a.u.n.e.z** is in fact likely to represent the regular development of the genitive **Oilaunyās* of a settlement originally named **Oilaunyā*. The grapheme *-z* of the final syllable represents here the sonorization of the inherited **-s*, triggered by the voiced consonant with which that unstressed syllable begins and noted in several of the less archaic and old-fashioned documents of the Celtiberian corpus.³⁴

Such a reconstruction seems to be confirmed (1) by the use of *-i-* as a presuffixal vowel in the ethnic derivative *Oilaunikos* < **Oilauni-kōs* and (2) by the fact that the derivation morphem **-auno/-ā* — even when proceeding from the older suffix **-Vmno-/Vmnā* — is thematic. There is also no need at all to reconstruct with Villar³⁵ a nasal stem in the ablative singular, a hypoth-

²⁹ Cf. Delamarre 2012, 170 s.v. “*laginā*” and note that the original **Lāganiā* of a settlement name in Galatia was probably just a regional variant of the **Lāgin(i)ā* in question.

³⁰ CC III, 1078ff. Note, however, that the Middle Irish word for ‘spear’ has actually a long *á*: *láigen* < **plāginā*, cf. DIL-L-26. O’Rahilly 1942, 152f.

³¹ CC III, 1079.

³² MLH I, 211. DCPH II, 264.

³³ DCPH II, 295-296. Cf. also CNH, 277-279 and A. 56 in MLH I. On the reasons for retaining the traditional interpretation of the coin legend *Oilaunikos* — with CNH *l.c.* — as a(n archaic) nominative plural, too complex to be expressed here, cf. the De Bernardo 2011a and 2011b with further bibliography. The interpretation tallies, moreover, with the results of an investigation into the typology of Old Celtic coin legends (*ead.* 2012).

³⁴ See De Bernardo 2005, with earlier bibliography.

³⁵ Cf. the bibliography quoted by MLH v/1 s.vv.

esis which is also forced to postulate (i.) the introduction into the consonant declension of a new ablative singular of the thematic type; (ii.) an unparalleled development of the involved vowel; (iii.) special developments for the alleged dental stop in the final syllable; (iv.) an unusual pattern in a Celtic coin legend.³⁶

In addition, the new reconstruction provides also a possible explanation for the coin legend **o.i.l.a.u.n.e**: it seems unusually long for an alleged shortening of **o.i.l.a.u.n.e.z**, as it has been often interpreted,³⁷ and may hence rather represent the regular nominative of the involved toponym **Oilaunyā*.

Finally, as to the legend **o.i.l.a.u.n.u** characteristic of the silver *denarii*, Untermann was certainly right in tracing it back to “eine<r> Form auf *-ōn-* (latinisiert **Oelaunō*, *-ōnis*)”.³⁸ I think, though, that the derivative with individualizing nasal suffix must have been created in order to name a coin, which — for being of a higher value than the others — deserved a particular denomination. We might perhaps compare the name *florenus*, which was given to a particularly important coin and not to any emission issued by Florence (*Florentia*) in the XIIIth c. AD.³⁹ Also in this case, the word formation of the coin name is not identical to that of the name of the mint-plate: *Florentia* : *florenus* (and not ***florentius*!) = **Oilaunyā* : **oilaunō* (and not ***oilauniō*)? Less plausible is the sometimes favoured assumption that *oilaunu* represented a genitive plural of the name of the inhabitants, because the form not only (1) lacks both the velar suffix used to derive the ethnic *Oilaunikos* and the semivowel *-y-* contained in the toponym **Oilaunyā*, but is also (2) not used on the older emissions.

4. **TERMESTUDIA** AND **Ta.r.m.e.s.Tu.Te.z**

The form **Ta.r.m.e.s.Tu.Te.z** is contained in the text of a tessera found in La Caridad (Caminreal/ Teruel), where it determines the abbreviation **ka.r**, being preceded by a naming formula simply consisting of idionym and family name (the former a nasal stem with Latinate ending *-o*, the latter in the form of the genitive in *-um* characteristic of Classical Celtiberian).⁴⁰

³⁶ Reasons for which it has been variously disproven, *i.a.* by Meid, Schmidt, Isaac and myself: *cf.* now the extensive discussion in De Bernardo 2011a and 2011b, with earlier bibliography.

³⁷ Note that the existence of the variant **O.i.l.a.u.n.e** is not mentioned in *MLH* v/1, 288-290.

³⁸ *MLH* v/1, 272. *Cf.* also Ballester 1999, 217: “OILAUNU es una de esas formas en las que F. Villar ha propuesto reconocer un caso instrumental, pero que entendemos más bien como un nominativo singular, especialmente tanto por la evidencia segura y abundante de nominativos en *-u* [...], cuanto por la improbabilidad de aparición de instrumentales para la denominación de la ceca emisora en leyendas monetarias”.

³⁹ *Cf. i.a.* *DELI* II, 438 s.v. “fíóre”.

⁴⁰ Vicente - Ezquerro 2003. *Celtibérico*, 265 ff. The tessera has been also validated as authentic by Beltrán *et al.* 2009, 653.

Although Occam's razor compels us to reject the frequently favoured analysis of the ending *-ez* as a new and special ablative morpheme,⁴¹ we can nevertheless retain the functional analysis of this form as proposed by Jordán (2003, 123): “amistad (procedente) de T[~] para con Lasuro, del G[rupo]F[amiliar] de los Cósocos”.

Knowing that the morpheme **(y)ās* was normally used for expressing both the genitive and the ablative in the singular of the IE *ā-* and *(y)ā-*declension, we may, in fact, analyse the form **Ta.r.m.e.s.Tu.Te.z** as representing the phonetic development of a former toponymic genitive **Tarmestudyās* ‘Of Tarmestudia’.

The reconstruction of a voiced dental stop at the beginning of the last, unstressed syllable is not only prompted by the presence of a sonorized final **-s*,⁴² but it is also backed up by the existence of a town called *Termestudia*, “que aparece en una de las lecturas de Floro para referirse a *Termes*”.⁴³

At present, we do not know if the *e/a*-alternance observed in *Tarmestudez* as opposed to the toponym *Termestudia* and also in the ethnic *Tarmestini* /*Termestini*⁴⁴ is to be attributed (α) to the widespread secondary assimilation of *a__e* to *e__e* in pretonic position or rather (β) to a lowering of *erβ* to *arβ* like that observed in **Néruōm* > *Νάρβων*, the Celtic name of Narbo, and in the idionym *Δαρκετ[]* at Elne as opposed to the etymological Gaulish *Dercetius*.⁴⁵

5. CARAVIS AND **Ka.r.a.u.e.z**

The coin legend **Ka.r.a.u.e.z** has been identified as belonging to a mint-place located between Turiasu and Caesaraugusta and called *Caravis* (Barr. 25, D4).⁴⁶ The name of the town is attested by Appian in the accusative *Καράουιν* and in the ablative *Carauī* by the Antonine Itinerary,⁴⁷ hence it belongs to the *i*-declension.

We shall recall that the Indo-European *i*-stems could form their genitive/ablative singular also by means of the case ending **-yos*. It is a morpheme “best preserved in Old Indic, but remnants of it are found in Avestan, Greek, and even Germanic”.⁴⁸ Not to forget Goidelic where, in addition to paradigmatic remains in the declension of feminine *i*-stems (*GOI*, 193, 226:

⁴¹ See the bibliography listed in n. 36, where previous work on the subject is discussed.

⁴² See above sub § 1.3 with n. 34.

⁴³ Jordán 2007, 114, with more details in *id.* 2008, 123-124.

⁴⁴ Cf. Jordán 2008, 122-123.

⁴⁵ Cf. De Bernardo 2007b, 153, 157 and *ead.* 2006, 53.

⁴⁶ *DCPH* II, 226 as already *MLH* V/1, 284-285 (A.66); *MLH* V/1, 162-163; *CNH*, 282-283.

⁴⁷ *Bell. Hisp.* 8, 43 (*pace DCCPIN*, 91) and, respectively, *It.Ant.* 443,1 (p. 68 in the reprint of Cuntz 1990).

⁴⁸ Szemerényi 1996, 178 ff. Note that all subfamilies mentioned shared periods of intense proximity with the Old Celtic speakers (*LKA* s.v. “Indogermanisch-Keltisch”).

§§ 303, 357), we find the genitive Οὐινδέριος, used by Ptolemy for the ancient river name *Vinderis*.⁴⁹ In the Iberian Peninsula also the divine name *TOGOTIS*, i.e. **Tog-ot-i-s* ‘The protecting god’ from the IE verbal root (s)*teg-*, known *i.a.* from the Palaeohispanic Roman corpus, forms a genitive and ablative singular in *-yos: cf. **Tog-ot-yos* > **Togo^ytyos* > **Togoityos* > *Togoitos* beside the dative singular **Tog-ot-ei* > **Togo^ytei* > *Togoitei* in the 1st bronze from Botorrita.⁵⁰ Further evidence of the same case-ending is to be found in the bronze plate from Gruissan (s. § 1.9 below).

It is hence possible to account for the coin legend *Karauéz* as representing the regular albeit dialectal development of **Karavyos* ‘of Caravis’, i.e. of the genitive singular of the very name of the involved mint *Caravis*: the assumed monophthongization of the ascending diphthong and the sonorization of the sibilant at the end of an unstressed syllable beginning with a voiced consonant (not indicated in the most archaic or old-fashioned texts) have been both repeatedly observed.

It goes without saying that this solution is much simpler than to postulate *ad hoc* (1) the introduction into the Celtiberian *i*-declension of a new ablative singular of the thematic type, (2) an unparalleled development of the involved vowel, (3) special developments of the alleged dental stop in the final syllable and (4) an unusual pattern among Celtic coin legends, as required by the ablatival explanation discussed *i.a.* in *MLH* v/1, 162-163.

6. s.e.Ko.Pi.r.i.Ke.z AND THE *SEGOBRIGII*

The population group of the *Segobrigii* is documented — in the form of the Latinized genitive plural *Segobriorum* — in the surroundings of Marseille.⁵¹ It appears to be derived by means of the suffix *-yo-* from the velar-stem settlement name **Sego-brig-s* ‘The strong hillfort’, which turned into *Segobris* in the ancient western Celticity. Also possible, even if somewhat less probable, seems a derivation from the later *ā*-stem *Segobriga*.

A close cognate of this ethnonym seems now to underlie the legend **s.e.Ko.Pi.r.i.Ke.z** that appears on the 2nd c. BC coins of a mint called *Segobris*, first localized in Celtiberia and later displaced — under the name of *Segobriga* — to the proximity of Cuenca.⁵²

The legend has been much debated. The interpretation of the underlying *Segobrigéz*⁵³ as a former nominative plural **Segobrig-es* indicating the

⁴⁹ De Bernardo 2001, 107 and 2007a, 153. On account of all the ‘new’ evidence, the position taken in *NWAI*, 62 will have to be reconsidered.

⁵⁰ Their phonetic development has now been accounted for more precisely by De Bernardo 2011c, 178 ff. On the attestations of the theonym cf. *ead.* 2010, 126, 128 and 140 with more details and bibliography.

⁵¹ *DCCPIN*, 200; Barr. 15, E3.

⁵² *DCPH* II, 338 ff.; cf. also *CNH*, 291; A. 89 in *MLH* I.

⁵³ The first *i* of the written form seems to have been a silent vowel (their rules have been systematically investigated in De Bernardo 1996 and 2001, 319-324).

inhabitants of *Segobris/Segobriga* has been criticized by Villar (*i.a.* 1995, 121 ff.) for assuming a rather rare word-formation pattern: indeed, it would have just been the plural of the same consonant stem represented by the toponym. On the other hand, Villar's own proposal that Segobrigez might represent instead the very settlement-name in the ablative case, namely **'at Segobris', meets with even more problems: as already stated in § I.3, this assumption makes it necessary to postulate (1) the introduction into the consonant declension of a new ablative singular of the thematic type together with (2) an unparalleled development of the involved vowel and (3) special developments for the alleged dental stop in the final syllable; it also requires (4) to assume an unusual pattern in Celtic coinage, so that it has been variously rejected.⁵⁴

All problems are solved, however, if we take Segobrigez to be just one of the many *yo*-stems 'in disguise' and to go back to a former **Segóbrigyōs*, i.e. 'The Segobrigenses'. Accordingly, it would continue the inherited, Indo-European and Celtic nominative plural in *-ōs of the ethnonym **Segobrig-yo-s* derived by means of the suffix -yo- from our settlement name.⁵⁵ The sonorized sibilant -z in an unstressed syllable that begins with a voiced consonant can be traced back — once again — without problems to an inherited voiceless sibilant.⁵⁶

7. THE Roturki AND THE Argeturki

The first ethnic name is contained in the coin-legend **r.o.Tu.r.Ko.n** or else **r.o.Tu.r.Ko.m**, which — although of uncertain provenance — is believed to belong to eastern Celtiberia in the 1st c. BC.⁵⁷ The form of the name contained in the legend is that of the genitive plural, which may be of modernized Hispanoceltic type if its ending is really to be interpreted as -on. If its ending were, on the contrary, -om, it would represent either a genitive plural belonging to the archaic Celtiberian period, i.e. with the inherited morpheme *-ōm still preserved, or else a genitive of Gallo-Goidelic type, i.e. in which the inherited morpheme *-ōm had been substituted by the morpheme *-om in analogy to the consonantal stems. As to the population group involved, the legend RoturkoN obviously refers to 'The big or strong (Celt.(p)ro-) boars (Celt. turko-)'.⁵⁸ We may hence translate it 'of the Big Boars'. The ethnonym appears to be a prefix compound with the noun *turko*- 'boar' for a *determinatum*. The lexeme, which goes back ultimately to IE **twork*'ó-s 'cutter, digger', is continued by practically all Celtic dialects, and

⁵⁴ See n. 36 above.

⁵⁵ With respect to the *yo*-/*yā*-adjective possibly written as **s.e.Ko.Pi.r.i.Ke.a** cf. the recent discussion in Ballester 2009, 34-35.

⁵⁶ See n. 34 above.

⁵⁷ Burillo 2007, 273, 372-373; *DCPH* II, 328 ; *CNH*, 289-290; A.87 in *MLH* V/1, 312.

⁵⁸ So already *LG*, 48.

it has been debated if the Proto-Celtic form was **t(w)orkós* or actually **turkós*.⁵⁹

The same *turko-* ‘boar’ is the *determinatum* of at least one more ethnonym,⁶⁰ namely that contained in the legend **a.r.Ke.Tu.r.Ki**, hitherto uninterpreted and considered *faute de mieux* linguistically Iberian. First documented in the first half of the 2nd c. BC., it is localized in the Catalan region, and it is perhaps not insignificant that it is mostly accompanied by a boar, which appears in particular on the oldest and truly Ausetan emissions.⁶¹

The legend in question evidently contains the newer Celtic nominative plural in *-i* (< **-oi*) of the name of a population group, thus complying with a pattern well known from Gaul, where it was particularly common among the coins inscribed in Latin characters, while the more southern and Greek oriented emissions favoured the genitive plural.⁶² Its first element appears now to be the Celtic adjective *argio-* ‘brilliant, shiny’, known *i.a.* from the Belgian personal name *Argiotalus* ‘(With a) shiny brow’.⁶³ The resulting structure for our ethnonymic compound would then be of {adj + subst}, thus following a widespread pattern for descriptive determinative compounds. We may then trace back the nom.pl. Argeturki underlying the legend **a.r.Ke.Tu.r.Ki**⁶⁴ to **Argyotúrkī* ‘the Brilliant Boars’.

It should be finally added that, since — as we have seen — Argeturki belongs to a language stage more modern than Celtiberian, it is not unlikely that also the legend **r.o.Tu.r.Ko.N** was the product of a Celtic dialect not specifically Celtiberian, possibly with nom.pl. Roturki.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ More details in *NWÄI*, 43-44 with n. 45, where Hamp’s reconstruction of a Proto-Celtic **turko-s* (1989, 193) is also discussed, and Matasović 2009, 395.

⁶⁰ Further exx. of ethnonyms derived from animal names and their motivation are discussed by De Bernardo 2008, 102-103.

⁶¹ *DCPH* II, 31-32. and *CNH*, 182-183. A.28 in *MLH* I.

⁶² As outlined in 2006a and 2006b, the newer nom.pl. morpheme **-oi* was apparently introduced into Celtic already during the so-called 2nd period, namely when the would-be speakers of the Old Italian Celtic, Goidelic, Gaulish and British had still not separated and differentiated from each other. — For a typology of the linguistically Celtic coin legends in Europe cf. De Bernardo 2012.

⁶³ *KGPN*, 134; *LICCPN*, BEG 099; *NPC*, 25, 211. Note that a word beginning with **a.r.Ke.**[is meanwhile documented on a ceramic fragment from Contrebia Belaisca (Estarán *et alii* 2011, 252 ff.).

⁶⁴ It seems worth noting that, while the syllable /ki/ was consequently noted by means of the simple grapheme called by Untermann <ki₁> (*MLH*, *passim*), two different graphemes were used for expressing the syllable /ge/: the complex grapheme <ke₁> in the first three emissions and the simpler grapheme <ke₂> in the later ones. It is specifically the latter which is supposed to indicate the voiced variety in the dual writing system tentatively proposed by Jordán 2005.

⁶⁵ Note that also in the Iberian Peninsula, “As in other geographical areas, it took some time to recognize that there was a distinct group of texts in a previously unknown language” (in the words of Egetmeyer 2009, 69).

8. THE IDIONYM **a.n.Ke**

The traditional reading for the now unfortunately lost funerary stele of Torrellas in the province of Zaragoza (K.8.1) suggests the presence of two naming formulae at the beginning of the inscription, each consisting of a female idionym immediately followed by the corresponding family name in the genitive.⁶⁶ Under this hypothesis, the first naming formula would be Mata Abilikom, leaving Anke Saulein[-]kum for the second.⁶⁷

The only tentative identification of the segment **a.n.Ke**, possibly indicating Anke, as the latter of the two female idionyms may now be supported by its plausible reconstruction as a former **Ankyā*, consequently matching Continental Celtic personal-names such as *Anco*, *Anconius*, the Hispanic *Ancetus/Angetus*, *Angeta* and also the name of the potter *Angius* at La Graufesenque.⁶⁸

On account of similar derivatives in Insular Celtic, the onomastic type *Ancetus/Angetus* seems to indicate something like ‘the fisher’ or else ‘the paw, grasp’. On the other hand, in the case of **Ankyā*, which seems to have turned later into **Angya*,⁶⁹ the semantics seems to indicate ‘The bent’ or ‘Crooked, hooked (woman)’.⁷⁰

9. **s.Te.n.i.o.n.Te.s** AT BOTORRITA, **s.Te.n.i.o.Te.s** AT GRUISSAN AND **STENIONTE** AT TIERMES

The first form, **s.Te.n.i.o.n.Te.s**, has been read in the 4th column (line 2) of the third Botorrita bronze, in a position “que por la situación en el texto debería ser un N.sg.”.⁷¹ And, indeed, *Steniontes* may simply continue the nominative singular **Stenyóntyos*, a derivative of the *i*-stem *Steniontis* attested in the Palaeohispanic Roman corpus in the genitive *Steniontis*.⁷²

Different is the function of the form **s.Te.n.i.o.Te.s** found on a bronze plate at Gruissan in the proximity of Narbonne (K.17.1), where it expresses the name of the dedicant’s father and is followed by the shortened form of the Celtiberian word for ‘child, son’. The full text of the inscription is **ji.Ku.m: s.Te.n.i.o.Te.s: Ke: ri.Ta**, which means ‘offered [by **Gaius*] of

⁶⁶ One must, however, acknowledge that *Celtibérico*, 229-230, offers a different analysis.

⁶⁷ On the usage of *ā*-stem idionyms for women cf. the studies by Stüber (*i.a.* 2006, 131-132 on Clb. Mata) and also De Bernardo *et al.* 2012; on female onomastic formulae *ead.* 2010-11.

⁶⁸ Cf. *NPC*, 20, 22 and 211, where also the augmentative compounds *Adangus*, *Adangianus* are listed. Vallejo 2005, 150 ff. and *AALR*, 87f. *NTSIndex* I, 198f.

⁶⁹ So that the supposed **a.n.Ke** might even have to be interpreted as Ange.

⁷⁰ Cf. *DLG*, 45 and Matasović 2009, 37 with further references.

⁷¹ *Celtibérico*, 136.

⁷² The suggestions proposed in De Bernardo 2007, 155 are *ad hoc* and to be considered obsolete.

the [*Sempron]ikos, son of *Steniontis*'.⁷³ The underlying form *Stenio(n)tes* was already supposed to be the genitive of an *i*-stem personal name *Stenio(n)tis* on account of the aforementioned gen.sing. *Steniontis*, attested in the Hispanoceltic corpus. However, the old reconstruction of a genitive ***Stenionteis* monophthongized into *Stenio(n)tes*⁷⁴ was *ad hoc*, given that *ei*-endings were usually preserved in Celtiberia, even in the inscriptions written in Latin alphabet: cf. e.g. *eni-Orosei* and *to-Luguei* at Peñalba.⁷⁵ Since we now know that there are many parallels for the narrowing of *yo* and *ya*, last not least in the very same geographic area(s) where the plate was found and/or written,⁷⁶ it is preferable to assume that the underlying *Stenio(n)tes* continues the archaic *yos*-genitive singular **Stenyóntyos* of the otherwise attested *i*-stem *Steniontis*.⁷⁷ The meaning would, of course, be the same: 'of *Stenio(n)tis*'.

Slightly more ambiguous is the dative singular *STENIONTE* on a silver patera from Tiermes in the province of Soria (K.11.1), where it precedes *DOCILICO AN GENTE MONIMAM*. The interpretation of the involved inscription as "memoriae *Stenyonti*, *Docilici An(?nidii) filiō*" has meanwhile been backed up — even if with a slightly different word order — by the naming formula *Bodogenus, Abani Saibodaeci f(i)lius*, found on a Vaccean funerary stele near Peñafiel (Valladolid).⁷⁸ As regards, in particular, the interpretation of *STENIONTE* and *GENTE*, they are usually taken as datives showing a hitherto unparalleled monophthongization of *-ei* in final syllables. Their respective nominatives are restituted as *Steniontis* and *gentis*.⁷⁹ However, since — as we have just seen — *ei*-endings were otherwise preserved in the Palaeohispanic corpora, it would be easier to explain the attested *STENIONTE* as a former **Stenióntyō*, i.e. as the dative of the idionym **Stenyóntyos* restituted for *Botorríta III* at the beginning of this paragraph. On the other hand, this reconstruction would imply the symmetric restitution of a thematic appellative **gentios* — a derivative of the well-known *Cib. Ke.n.ti.s* 'child' — in order to account for *GENTE* as continuing a dative singular **gentyō*. Note that a thematic derivative (*-*)*Gentius* is indeed attested in Continental Celtic onomastics.⁸⁰

⁷³ My analysis of *rita* as **(p)ritā* 'ofrecida' and consequent translation (2000, 186) has been accepted in *Celtibérico*, 223.

⁷⁴ *I.a.* in De Bernardo 2007, 155 with n. 76.

⁷⁵ A fresh discussion of all inscriptions in De Bernardo 2008, 182 ff.

⁷⁶ *Celtibérico*, 222, speaks in favour of a discrepancy between the two places.

⁷⁷ For this archaic type of *i*-stem genitive singular see § 1.5 above.

⁷⁸ Cf. De Bernardo 2000, 184 (in the wake of Jordán 1998, 200) and, respectively, De Bernardo - Sanz 2009.

⁷⁹ Gorrochategui 1990, 310-311.

⁸⁰ *MLH* v/1, 130-131 and De Bernardo 2010-11, part one, 100.

10. FURTHER POSSIBLE INSTANCES OF THE YO/YA-NARROWING

It goes without saying that I do not propose to trace every hitherto unexplained *e* back to a former unaccented *yo* or *ya*. Proof of this is, among others, the case of the Navarrese coin legends **Pa.r.s.Ku.n.e.z** / **Pas.Ku.n.e.z**, whose second element I have recently identified as the normal Celtic nominative plural of the inherited nasal-stem word for ‘dog’: the ethnic name Braskunez would hence probably continue **bras(so-)kunes* ‘the Big, mighty (*brasso-*) wolfhounds (*kunes*)’.⁸¹

Nevertheless, there may be some more instances of the monophthongization at study than those discussed up to now. A possible case is that of the hitherto unexplained legend **o.n.ti.Ke.z**, found on coins first issued in the second half of the 2nd c. BC and attributed to a mint-place situated either in Navarra or in the northern part of Aragón.⁸² If the legend indicated the name of the mint, it is just possible that its derivational base was *ond-*, to be traced back to the Celtic lexeme **(p)ondos-* ‘stone’, a cognate of Lat. *pondus*: preserved also in Old Irish *ond* ‘stone, rock’⁸³ and perhaps in the name of the Gaulish *Onobrisates* as ‘Stonebreakers’,⁸⁴ it is suitable for deriving a settlement name; a semantic parallel would be e.g. *Pedrosa* in Spain. On account of the other epigraphic evidence discussed in this contribution, it would then be possible to trace back the form *Ondigez*, probably underlying the coin legend in question, to the genitive singular **Ondigyās* of a settlement named **Ondigyā*. Alternatively, though perhaps less likely, one might think of the genitive in *-yos* of a toponym **Ondigis*. The ultimate structure of the toponym would, in any case, have been that of a velar suffix derivative, perhaps an original **Óndo-k-yā* ‘The stony place’. This means that the lenition which sonorized voiceless stops had already taken place at the time the legend was written,⁸⁵ since a voiceless *-k-* would hardly have triggered the voicing of the originally voiceless final sibilant.

An analysis along the same lines may account also for several other idionyomic nominatives in *-es*, to be added to the **Stenyóntyos* > *Steniontes* discussed above in § I.9. One of those might be the *Tures* identified in a Latin inscription by Comes - Velaza 2004, which would surface as **Tu.r.e.s** in the more archaic or orthographically old-fashioned documents of the Celtiberian corpus. One of these appears to be, among others, the so-called

⁸¹ De Bernardo 2012, section III sub a,a with further bibliography. *CNH*, 249 ff.; *DCPH* II, 55 ff.

⁸² *DCPH* II, 300, points out that a weapon typical of the Hispanic Celts is represented on the coins. *CNH* 261; A.42 in *MLH* I.

⁸³ Cf. Matasović 2009, 137; *NWÄI*, 143.

⁸⁴ A semantically less satisfying interpretation is mentioned in *DCCPIN*, 175 s.v.

⁸⁵ We shall recall that the sonorization of voiceless stops, corresponding to the second Celtic lenition-wave and in particular to the so-called ‘British’ lenition, is comparatively frequent in the Continental Celtic corpus of Gaulish type.

Cortono mining transaction K.0.7,⁸⁶ where the signature of the magistrate reads: Tures, bundalos Kortonei ‘Tures, the soil officer at Kortonom or Gortonom’.⁸⁷ Variants like *Turius*⁸⁸ suggest, indeed, that the protoform was **Turyos* ‘The strong one’ rather than ***Turis*, unless it was an instance of already Celtiberian **ri > re*.

Finally, if the authenticity of the 4th tessera of the Pellicer collection (CP-4: **e.l.i.a : Ka.r : Ka.r.Ti.l.i.Ke**)⁸⁹ were not otherwise to be doubted,⁹⁰ its third element might be analysed either as a former adjective **kartilikyā* or — more probably on account of the context — as the genitive plural of a family name, originally **kartilikyōm*, proceeding from a different dialectal area than that to which the first element of the inscription belongs.

II

THE *DOLIUM* K.1.22

According to Untermann (*MLH* IV, ad K.1.22) and Wodtko (v/1 *s.v.*), the only word engraved before the firing or drying on the *dolium* K.1.22 found at Botorrita is to be read **a.Pu.r.a.z**. The referent of the graffito has not yet been identified, and both scholars only suggest that it may represent the name of a town.

The aforesaid transcription admits an interpretation *Aburaz*, which — as we shall see — probably goes back to **Áb(u)rās* and means ‘from *Abra*’. Under this opinion, the *dolium* would be evidence of a commercial relationship between the Celtiberian town of Contrebia Belaisca and the Turdetan locality of *Abra*, not far from Obulco (Barr. 27, A4).

It is evident that, in order to transcribe a name like *Abra* by means of the (Celt)Iberian semisyllabary, one must at least insert a so-called silent vowel between the labial stop and the vibrant. If this were the case, however, the silent vowel should be a replica of the vowel of either the preceding or the following syllable. Accordingly, for the nominative [abra] we ought to expect in either case ****a.Pa.r.a.**, i.e. ****Ab^ara** with the internal *-a-* as a silent or dead vowel. Instead, the colour *-u-* of the vowel separating the stop from the continuant, together with the many instances of epenthesis in the ancient Celtic corpora, lead us to assume that it is a real *svarabhakti*-vowel.⁹¹ In

⁸⁶ On its treatment of the sibilants and other graphic peculiarities *cf.* De Bernardo 2005, 548-550.

⁸⁷ For this interpretation *cf.* De Bernardo 2004, 139-140, and 2010-11, part one, 96. It is hence no longer plausible to analyse the element **Tu.r.e.s** in this text as a verbal form, as it is still done by some scholars.

⁸⁸ *OPEL* IV, 134; *NPC*, 186; *AALR*, 327.

⁸⁹ Edited by M. Almagro in *EpPr*, 385.

⁹⁰ Rather sceptical Beltrán *et al.* 2009, 647, 652.

⁹¹ *Cf.* the bibliography in § 0 and n. 2 above, which partly modifies the results of my systematic studies on silent vowels (1996, 229-233, and 2001, 319-324).

particular, the labial quality of our epenthetic vowel seems to have been required, as very often in the Hispanic and Italian Celticity,⁹² by the preceding labial stop.

The sonorization of the final *-s may have been triggered, as it is to be seen in the less archaic or at least less old-fashioned documents of the Celtiberian corpus, by the sonorant *r* which introduces here the last and unstressed syllable. Hence, the form *Aburaz* can represent the genitive/ablative singular **Áburās* — here used for indicating provenance —⁹³ of our toponym.

Also possible, but much less probable seems to be an interpretation of the graffito as representing the genitive of an idionym, even if personal-names of the type of *Abra* and — with epenthesis — *Aburea* are well attested,⁹⁴ and even if there is some evidence for merchant women in the Keltiké, including Celtiberia.⁹⁵

The underlying lexeme seems to be, in either case, an adjective for ‘strong’ common to Germanic and Celtic and usually traced back to an IE protoform **áb^hro-*.⁹⁶ The Common Celtic form *abro-* ‘strong’ is also continued by personal names such as the possible dative Αβρω on a capital at Uzès near Nîmes (*RIG-G-219*).⁹⁷ Accordingly, the name of the town *Abra* and probably *Ábura* on the *dolium* at Botorrita would designate ‘The strong settlement’.

Note that the same type of labial epenthetic vowel accounts for the divine names *ABURNOS* /*ABURNA* found in Northern Italy: *ábro-* > **áburo-* → **ABÚRO-NO-S* > *ABÚRNOS* ‘The strong or mighty god’.⁹⁸

There seems to be no need for postulating a *lectio facilior* ***e.Pu.r.a.z*, implying *Eburaz*, as has been occasionally done.

⁹² Cf. De Bernardo 2009, 162 and *passim*.

⁹³ See § 1.4 above.

⁹⁴ Cf. *i.a.* Abascal 1994, 259.

⁹⁵ As argued by De Bernardo *et al.* 2012.

⁹⁶ *IEW*, 2 *s.v.* *abhro-* ‘strong, heftig’; *AEW*, 2f. *s.v.* *afar-* ‘besonders, sehr’; *GED*, A3f. *s.v.* *abrs* ‘ἰσχυρός’.

⁹⁷ Degavre I, 22; *LEIA-A-6f*. More names of the same type are listed by *NPC* and *OPEL I*. Strangely, the lemma is neither contained in *DLG* nor in Matasović 2009.

⁹⁸ Cf. De Bernardo *i.p.*, § 3.1.

REFERENCES

- AALR: M. Navarro, J. L. Rámirez (coords.), *Atlas antroponímico de la Lusitania romana*, Bordeaux 2003.
- Abascal 1994: J. M. Abascal, *Los nombres personales en las inscripciones latinas de Hispania*, Murcia 1994.
- Arenas *et al.* 2011: J. A. Arenas, P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Celtic Dialects and Cultural Contacts in Protohistory: the Italian and Iberian Peninsulas”, *ÉC* 37, 2011, 119-139.
- Ballester 1999: X. Ballester, “Tres notas celtibéricas: *OILAUNICA CaR, *ARGAILICA CAR y CAAR *SALMANTICA”, *Veleia* 16, 1999, 217-220.
- Ballester 2009: X. Ballester, “Filología arqueoibérica: cuestión de método”, *Acta Palaeohispanica X = PalHisp* 9, 2009, 23-38.
- Barr.: R. J. A. Talbert (ed.), *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, Princeton 2000.
- Beltrán *et al.* 2009: F. Beltrán, C. Jordán, I. Simón, “Revisión y balance del *corpus* de téseras celtibéricas”, *Acta Palaeohispanica X = PalHisp* 9, 2009, 625-668.
- Burillo 2007: F. Burillo, *Los Celtíberos: etnias y estados*, Barcelona 2007².
- CC: J. T. Koch (ed.), *Celtic culture. A historical encyclopedia*, vols. I-V, Santa Barbara 2006.
- Celtibérico*: C. Jordán, *Celtibérico*, Zaragoza 2004.
- CNH: L. Villaronga, *Corpus nummum Hispaniae ante Augusti aetatem*, Madrid 2002².
- Comes - Velaza 2004: R. Comes, J. Velaza, “Nota onomástica hispanodalmática: sobre AE 2000, 1178 y MLH IV, K.0.7,4 (y K.1.3, II-37)”, in: L. Ruscu, C. Ciongradi, R. Ardevan, C. Roman, C. Găzduc (eds), *Orbis antiquus (Studia in honorem I. Pisonis)*, Cluj-Napoca 2004, 46-47.
- Cruz *et al.* 2007: Estrabón, *Geografía de Iberia*, transl. by J. Gómez Espelesín; introduction, notes and commentary by G. Cruz, M. V. García, J. Gómez, Madrid 2007.
- Cuntz 1990: O. Cuntz (ed.), *Itineraria Romana, vol. 1. Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*, Stuttgart 1990 (reprint of the original edition of 1929 with a *Conspectus librorum recentiorum* by G. Wirth).
- DCCPIN: A. Falileyev, with A.E. Gohil, N. Ward, *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names*, Aberystwyth 2010.
- DCPH: M.P. García-Bellido, C. Blázquez, *Diccionario de cecas y pueblos hispánicos*, vols I-II, Madrid 2001.
- De Bernardo 1996: P. de Bernardo, “Die Stummvokale: eine Bilanz für das Keltiberische”, in: W. Meid & P. Anreiter (eds), *Die größeren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler (Akten des Kolloquiums Innsbruck, April/Mai 1993)*, Innsbruck 1996, 212-256.
- De Bernardo 2000: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Celtib. *karvo gortika* ‘favor amicitiae’, *rita* ‘ofrecida’, *monima* ‘recuerdo’ y los formularios de las inscripciones celtibéricas”, *Veleia* 17, 2000, 183-189.

- De Bernardo 2001: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Grafemica e fonologia del celtiberico”, in: F. Villar, M. P. Fernández (eds.), *Religión, lengua y cultura prerromanas de Hispania (VIII CLPH, Salamanca 1999)*, Salamanca 2001, 319-334.
- De Bernardo 2002: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Centro y áreas laterales: la formación del celtibérico sobre el fondo del celta peninsular hispano”, *PalHisp* 2, 2002, 89-132.
- De Bernardo 2004: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Cib. *oboi* ‘sea eso’ ... *alaboi* ‘o bien sea’ ... : Morfosintaxis céltica en el Bronce de Córtono (K.0.7, Ll. 1-2)”, *PalHisp* 4, 2004, 135-151.
- De Bernardo 2005: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Tratamiento y notación de las silbantes en celtibérico: cronología relativa del desarrollo paulatino visible en inscripciones y monedas”, in: *Acta Palaeohispanica IX = PalHisp* 5, 2005, 539-563.
- De Bernardo 2006: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “From Liguria to Spain: Unaccented *yo > (y)e in Narbonensic Votives (‘Gaulish’ δεκαντεμ), Hispanic coins (‘Iberian’ -(sk)en) and some Theonyms”, *PalHisp* 6, 2006, 45-58.
- De Bernardo 2006a: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Las lenguas célticas en la investigación: cuatro observaciones metodológicas”, *CFC (g)* 16, 2006, 5-21.
- De Bernardo 2006b: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Language and the Historiography of Celtic-Speaking Peoples” S. Rieckhoff (ed.), *Celtes et Gaulois dans l’histoire, l’historiographie et l’idéologie moderne (Leipzig, juin 2005)*, Glux-en-Glenne 2006, 33-56 = Vol. I de V. Guichard *et alii*, *Celtes et Gaulois: L’Archéologie face à l’histoire*, 5 vols. (Bibracte 12/1-5).
- De Bernardo 2007: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Le declinazioni nel celtico continentale: innovazioni comuni al gallico e al goidelico?”, in: P.-Y. Lambert, G.-J. Pinault (eds), *Gaulois et celtique continental* (Colloque Clermont-Ferrand 1998), Geneva 2007, 145-179.
- De Bernardo 2007a: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Pre-Celtic, Old Celtic Layers, Brittonic and Goidelic in Ancient Ireland”, P. Cavill, G. Broderick (eds.), *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland*, Nottingham 2007, 137-163.
- De Bernardo 2007b: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Varietäten des Keltischen auf der Iberischen Halbinsel: Neue Evidenzen”, in H. Birkhan (ed., with H. Tauber), *Kelten-Einfälle an der Donau*, Vienna 2007, 149-162.
- De Bernardo 2008: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Linguistically Celtic ethnonyms: towards a classification”, in J. L. García Alonso (ed.), *Celtic and Other Languages in Ancient Europe*, Salamanca 2008, 101-118.

- De Bernardo 2008a: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Cib. *TO LVGVEI* ‘hacia Lugus’ vs. *LVGVEI* ‘para Lugus’: sintaxis y divinidades en Peñalba de Villastar”, *Emerita* vol. 76.2, 2008, 181-196.
- De Bernardo 2009: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “La ricostruzione del celtico d’Italia sulla base dell’onomastica antica”, in: P. Poccetti (ed.), *L’onomastica dell’Italia antica. Aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori*, Rome 2009, 153-192.
- De Bernardo 2010: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “La ley del 1^{er} Bronce de Botorrita: Uso agropecuario de un encinar sagrado”, in F. Burillo (ed.), *VI Simposio sobre Celtíberos: Ritos y Mitos*, Zaragoza 2010, 123-145 (versión digital 2008).
- De Bernardo 2010-11: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Zur Interpretation keltischer Inschriften im Lichte indogermanischer Namenformen”, *Incontri Linguistici* 33, 2010, 87-123 (part one) and *Incontri Linguistici* 34, 2011 (part two).
- De Bernardo 2011a: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “El genitivo-ablativo singular del indoeuropeo arcaico: viejas y nuevas continuaciones célticas”, *CFC (g)* 21, 2011, 19-43.
- De Bernardo 2011b: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Celtic and Beyond: Genitives and Ablatives in Celtiberian, Lepontic, Goidelic, Gaulish and Indo-European”, in E. R. Luján, J. L. García (eds), *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street. Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of J. de Hoz*, Innsbruck 2011, 149-168.
- De Bernardo 2011c: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “*Callaeci, Anabaraecus, Abienus, Tritecum, Berobriaecus* and the new velar suffixes of the types *-ViK-* and *-(y)eK-*”, in M. J. García, M. T. Amado, M. J. Martín, A. Pereiro, M. E. Vázquez (eds), *Ἀντίδωρον: Homenaje a J. J. Moralejo*, Santiago de Compostela 2011, 175-193.
- De Bernardo 2012: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Tipología de las leyendas monetales célticas. La Península Ibérica y las demás áreas de la Celtica antigua”, in F. Burillo (ed.), *VII Simposio sobre Celtíberos: Nuevos datos, nuevas interpretaciones (Daroca, Marzo 2012)*, Zaragoza, in print.
- De Bernardo i.p.: P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Celtic and Other Indigenous Divine Names Found in the Italian Peninsula”, in: A. Hofeneder and P. de Bernardo Stempel (eds. with M. Hainzmann and N. Mathieu), *Théonymie celtique, cultes, interpretatio / Keltische Theonymie, Kulte, interpretatio (X Workshop FERCAN Paris, Mai 2010)*, Vienna, in print.
- De Bernardo et al. 2012: P. de Bernardo Stempel, F. Burillo, M. E. Saiz, R. Wedenig, “Women Potters — and Their Names — in Celtic-Speaking Areas”, in: W. Meid, E. Bánffy, L. Bartosiewicz, C. Metzner-Nebelsick, P. Anreiter (eds.), *Archaeological, Cultural and Linguistic Heritage. Festschrift für Erzsébet Jerem, In Honour of her 70th Birthday*, Budapest 2012, 115-133.

- De Bernardo - Sanz 2009: P. de Bernardo Stempel, C. Sanz, “Nueva estela funeraria romana, con onomástica céltica, de Padilla de Duero (Peñañiel, Valladolid)”, *BSEAA* 75, 2009, 223-242.
- DELI*: M. Cortelazzo, P. Zolli, *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana*, 5 vols., Bologna 1979-88.
- DIL*: (*Contributions to a*) *Dictionary of the Irish Language*, Dublin 1913-76.
- Degavre: J. Degavre, *Lexique gaulois: recueil de mots attestés, transmis ou restitués et de leurs interprétations*, vols. I-III, Bruxelles and Libramont 1998-04.
- DGVB*: L. Fleuriot, C. Evans, *A Dictionary of Old Breton / Dictionnaire du vieux breton. Historical and Comparative: I. Dictionnaire des Gloses en Vieux Breton* (reprint of the 1964 Paris edition); II. *A Supplement to ~*, Toronto 1985.
- Delamarre 2012: X. Delamarre, *Noms de lieux celtiques de l'Europe ancienne*, Paris 2012.
- DLG*: X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris 2003².
- Egetmeyer 2009: M. Egetmeyer, “The Recent Debate on Eteocypriote People and Language”, *Pasiphae. Rivista di filologia e antichità greche* 3, 2009 [2010], 69-90.
- EpPr*: M. Almagro *et alii* (ed.), *Epigrafía Prerromana (Catálogo del Gabinete de Antigüedades de la Real Academia de la Historia)*, Madrid 2003.
- Eska 1996: J. F. Eska, “Resyllabification and Epenthesis in Hispano-Celtic”, *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 5, 1996, 71-89.
- Estarán *et alii* 2011: M^a José Estarán, G. Sopena, F.J. Gutiérrez, J.A. Hernández, “Nuevos esgrafiados precedentes de Contrebia Belaisca”, *Palhisp* 11, 2011, 249-263.
- García 2003: J. L. García, *La Península Ibérica en la Geografía de Claudio Ptolomeo*, Vitoria-Gasteiz 2003.
- García 2005: J. L. García, “Indoeuropeos en el noroeste”, *Acta Palaeohispanica IX = PalHisp* 5, 2005, 235-258.
- GOI*: R. Thurneysen, *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin 1946 (reprint 1975).
- Gorrochategui 1990: J. Gorrochategui, “Consideraciones sobre la fórmula onomástica y la expresión del origen en algunos textos celtibéricos menores”, en: F. Villar (ed.), *Studia Indogermanica et Palaeohispanica in honorem A. Tovar et L. Michelena*, Salamanca 1990, 291-312.
- Hamp 1989: E. P. Hamp, “North European Pigs and Phonology”, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 43, 1989, 192-193.
- IEW*: J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols, Bern 1959-69.
- Jordán 1998: C. Jordán, *Inroducción al celtibérico*, Zaragoza 1998 [see also under *Celtibérico*]

- Jordán 2003: C. Jordán, “Acerca del ablativo que aparece en las téseras de hospitalidad celtibéricas”, *PalHisp* 3, 2003, 113-127.
- Jordán 2005: C. Jordán, “¿Sistema dual de escritura en celtibérico?”, *Acta Palaeohispanica IX = PalHisp* 5, 2005, 1013-1030.
- Jordán 2008: C. Jordán, “Toponimia y etnonimia en leyendas monetales celtibéricas y vasconas”, in J. L. García (ed.), *Celtic and Other Languages in Ancient Europe*, Salamanca 2008, 119-132.
- Jordán 2007: C. Jordán, “Estudios sobre el sistema dual de escritura en epigrafía no monetar celtibérica”, *PalHisp* 7, 2007, 101-142.
- KGPN: K. H. Schmidt, *Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen*, Tübingen 1957 (= *ZcPh* 26, fasc. 1-4).
- Ködderitzsch 1985: R. Ködderitzsch, “Die große Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar”, in H.M. Ölberg, G. Schmidt (eds, with E. Bothien), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen (Festschrift J. Knobloch)*, Innsbruck 1985, 211-222.
- LG: P.-Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise: Description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*, Édition revue et augmentée, Paris 2003.
- LKA: S. Sievers, O.H. Urban, P.C. Ramsel (eds.), *Lexikon zur keltischen Archäologie*, Vienna, in print.
- LICCPN: M. E. Raybould, P. Sims-Williams, *A Corpus of Latin Inscriptions of the Roman Empire containing Celtic Personal Names. With Introduction and Supplement to ~*, Aberystwyth 2007-2009.
- Maras 2004: D. F. Maras, “Dalla grande Liguria mediterranea alla regio IX”, in R.C. De Marinis, G. Spadea, *I Liguri: Un antico popolo europeo tra Alpi e Mediterraneo*, Geneva - Milan 2004, 20-25.
- Matasović 2009: R. Matasović, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden - Boston 2009.
- MLH: J. Untermann, *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*, Wiesbaden 1975-00: vols I-III; IV (with D. Wodtko); v/1: D. S. Wodtko, *Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*.
- NPC: X. Delamarre, *Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique*, Paris 2007.
- NTSIndex: B. R. Hartley, B.M. Dickinson, *Names on Terra sigillata. An index of makers' stamps & signatures on Gallo-Roman Terra sigillata (Samian ware)*, vols. I-ff., London 2008-.
- NWÄI: P. de Bernardo Stempel, *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen: Stammbildung und Derivation*, Tübingen 1999.
- OPEL: B. Lőrincz et F. Redő (eds.), *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, vols. I-IV, Budapest 1994 and Vienna 1999-02.
- O'Rahilly 1942: T. F. O'Rahilly, “Notes, mainly etymological: 6. Mid. Ir. *lága, láige. lágan, láigen*”, *Ériu* 13, 1942, 152-153.
- Petracco - Caprini 1981: G. Petracco, R. Caprini, *Toponomastica storica della Liguria*, Genova 1981.
- Sonanten: P. de Bernardo Stempel, *Die Vertretung der indogermanischen liquiden und nasalen Sonanten im Keltischen*, Innsbruck 1987.

- Stüber 2006: K. Stüber, “Frauennamen auf keltiberischen Inschriften: eine Bestandesaufnahme”, *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* N.F., vol. 41, fasc. 2, 2006, 115-139.
- Szemerényi 1996: O. Szemerényi, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, Oxford 1996 (transl. of *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, Darmstadt 1990⁴, with additional notes and references).
- Vallejo 2005: J. M. Vallejo, *Antroponimia indígena de la Lusitania romana*, Vitoria-Gasteiz 2005.
- Vicente - Ezquerro 2003: J. D. Vicente, B. Ezquerro, “La tésera de Lazuro: Un nuevo documento celtibérico en ‘La Caridad’ (Caminreal, Teruel)”, *PalHisp* 3, 2003, 251-269.
- Villar 1995: F. Villar, *Estudios de celtibérico y de toponimia prerromana*, Salamanca 1995.
- Villar 2000: F. Villar, *Indoeuropeos y no indoeuropeos en la Hispania prerromana*, Salamanca 2000.
- Wedenig *et al.* 2007: R. Wedenig, P. de Bernardo Stempel, “Keltisches in norischen Personennamen: Namengraffiti aus der Provinz Noricum”, in H. Birkhan (ed., with H. Tauber), *Kelten-Einfälle an der Donau: Akten des 4. Symposium deutschsprachiger Keltologinnen und Keltologen (Linz/Donau, Juli 2005)*, Vienna 2007, 619-630.

Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel
UPV/EHU, UFI 11/14
correo-e: patrizia.debernardo@ehu.es

Fecha de recepción del artículo: 11/07/2011 Fecha de aceptación del artículo: 02/05/2012
