

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.3.031
UDC 811.131'337.231 + 811.15'337.231 +
+ 811.291'337.231 + 811.1/.2

Blanca María Prósper
University of Salamanca
Salamanca, Spain

THE VENETIC NAMES OF ROMAN SISCIA

This work deals with the proper names attested in the lead tags of Siscia in Pannonia, the territory which, in the author's view, reveals an intersection of at least four different branches of Indo-European: Latin, Venetic, Celtic, and Illyrian, and thus holds clues to multiple linguistic discoveries. Documents from Siscia contain names of different filiations. While most names are unmistakably Roman, and others are Greek and even Semitic, they also feature some Celtic instances, occasionally never attested before. The author has selected a number of proper names that can be labeled as Italic or, probably unduly, as Venetic, and that have been paid no attention thus far. The linguistic evidence, however limited, shows that these names may tie up well with an Italic series of names and adjectives whose ultimate morphological origins are sometimes disputed. An in-depth analysis of the etymology of these proprial forms that draws a wide range of Indo-European and other related data presents a most convincing testimony of the degree to which the ancient Pannonia was a linguistic patchwork resulting from language contacts between Celtic and Italic peoples with Illyrians. Such an analysis, although far from being exhaustive as to the areal distribution and linguistic attribution of the onomastic data, however, enables the author not only to suggest plausible interpretations for the names under study but also to clarify some specific problems of Indo-European morphology and morphophonemics, as well as to trace some unmanifested ties both within and beyond the Italic language family.

K e y w o r d s: Italic languages, Celtic languages, Venetic, Gaulish, Illyrian, Italic onomastics, Pannonia, language contacts, Indo-European morphology, morphophonemics.

1. Introduction

Siscia is a Roman settlement in Pannonia, whose name is continued by present-day Sisak in Central Croatia. It was built at close quarters with the Celtic city of *Segestica*,

© Prósper Blanca María, 2018

and over time became a central commercial and strategic node that communicated Italy with the Balkans. In his doctoral dissertation, Radman-Livaja [2010] has conducted a thorough study of the personal names (PNs) written on the hitherto unpublished hundreds of lead tags found in the riverbeds of the area, encountering countless difficulties in their readings and interpretations. These documents are of the utmost importance for the study of the protohistory of the area, but also for the discrimination of the different linguistic layers they reflect, revealing a more interesting picture of the dialectal complexity of the region than previously believed. This is hardly surprising, since these tags were appended to commodities and bear witness to intense trade relations. While the PNs appear on one side of the tag, the other side contains abbreviations referring to the products and services, as well as their respective weights and measures, and their price. Most of them reveal glimpses of the flourishing textile industry of the area, on which the literary sources are silent, however. This leads Radman-Livaja to believe that they mostly covered the internal needs on a local or more probably regional basis.

In all likelihood, given its topical importance for the linguistic side of this research, the vast array of different names (totaling nearly 700), and the fact that hardly any of them occurs more than once, reveals that they are more likely to refer to customers than to the artisans, weavers or fabric dyers [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 517]. In fact, one does not quite see why the names of the artisans and weavers should be consigned to writing, especially when the exact nature of their work remains unspecified. Still, this is sometimes the case, when slaves, potters, tailors or fullers are occasionally mentioned. But it is not excluded that they acted as customers of other professionals, or even that their profession is mentioned in order to distinguish them among namesakes. Inscriptions containing more than one PN may be mentioning both the customer and the professional. In sum, a number of them is certain to have resided in nearby villages of Pannonia, not necessarily in Siscia itself. On the other hand, Radman-Livaja [cf. *Ibid.*, 524 ff.] has identified a large number of different hands, and the texts are invariably Latin.

In spite of their unitary aspect, we have to be very cautious about the varied provenance of these PNs and, what is more, about what the apparent deviations from the spelling norm may reflect, even when the etymology is more or less certain. Additionally, it is next to impossible to date the texts on material or archaeological grounds, and Radman-Livaja's work in this point is mostly based on the palaeography (only capitals and cursive capitals), the currency system and the onomastic structure of each particular item. Apparently, the tags are to be placed in a time span ranging from the 1st to the beginnings of the 3rd C. AD, and most of them between the reigns of Claudius and Hadrian. Siscia is known to have been inhabited by populations originating from the Italian Peninsula. While most names are unmistakably Roman, and others are Greek and even Semitic, many others are certainly Celtic, occasionally never attested before. Radman-Livaja [2010, 555] makes the interesting comment that indigenous names are infrequent in Pannonia by the time of Marc Aurel.

This work tackles an in-depth analysis of the etymology of some of these names and tries to discriminate the Italic from other Indo-European materials that may be rather cautiously labelled as “Celtic” or “Illyrian” (whatever hides behind this exceedingly comprehensive term). It specifically focuses on a number of PNs that have been paid no attention thus far and which tie up well with an Italic series of names and adjectives whose ultimate morphological origins are sometimes disputed. I contend that these PNs are specifically Venetic. On the other hand, the Iggian area, situated in central Slovenia, which originally belonged to Italy according to Šašel-Kos [2003], is often believed to bear witness to a dialect different from Celtic and Venetic, and to show special local morphological features in its onomastic corpus [see Repanšek, 2016; Stifter, 2012b]. In my view, which will be developed in future works, this “melting pot” area simply attests to the intense relations between Gaulish and Venetic populations and a high degree of interference. Finally, the alleged existence of a specifically “Pannonian” dialect will not be taken into account, and cannot be substantiated, since it is mostly based upon phonetic peculiarities which are the emergent product of language contact. It is important to note that this work does not aim at exhaustivity, and that it is not easy to draw general conclusions on the general distribution of onomastic materials in this region, since many of the PNs are isolated and thus especially relevant from the etymological point of view, in that they open the way to a different understanding of appellative forms of the extant Indo-European dialects.

Another, different issue arises from the side of language contact and interference. In fact, these texts are always conducted in the Latin alphabet. This introduces a first layer of distortion, since any phonemic contrasts that do not match those of Latin fail to find a written expression. Some errors can be attributed to “phonetic spelling”, but it is not always feasible to ascertain whether it is Latin or the indigenous language that has undergone a sound shift. For instance, etacism, by which <E> repeatedly replaces the usual reflection <AE> of an IE diphthong, is more likely to be concealing an indigenous monophthongization /aj̥/ > /ae/ > /ɛ:/ than a mere case of hesitation on the part of Latin-speaking scribes, caused by their failure to spell correctly /ae/ once it had been monophthongized in Latin, and is definitely favoured by the absence of a long spelling tradition for certain names.

A different problem can be exemplified by the PN *DRVNSA*, left uninterpreted by [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 266]. It is nothing other than a misspelling of the common cognomen *Drūsa*. But, even if it were indigenous, the sequence <NS> can be explained as a spelling hypercorrection by a scribe who hesitated about whether to employ a nasal symbol or not when a long vowel was followed by a fricative. Here at least, the problem is circumscribed to the standard Roman writing practice, since in the Celtic and Italic dialects spoken in the area, the cluster *-Vns-* had probably evolved into *-V̄s-* before a writing tradition was created for these languages. Accordingly, establishing the chronology of Latin spelling conventions is often instrumental to a correct understanding of scribal errors, without regard to the chronology of similar changes in the western IE dialects.

Occasionally, the phonetic changes at issue, even when they are late enough to find some resistance from the side of the written tradition, are not certain to have been shared by Latin and the neighbouring dialects at the same time and place, and can be put down to Latin interference: for instance, <CI> for <TI> points to incipient palatalization and confusion of the strings /k̄i/ and /t̄i/. Venetic seems to have had an earlier tendency to undergo this change at least as /t̄i/ is concerned, but the extant materials may well be deceptive. Sometimes, however, we find Gaulish PNs which show the wrong spelling, and then only in this area: Take, for instance, the uninterpreted PN PRICIONIS (gen.) [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 401]. It is obviously identical to PRITIONIS (Belgica), PRITIVS (Belgica), PRITILLIVS (Germania Superior), PRITTO (Lugdunensis), PRITVSA (Germania), Ogam. gen. sing. *Qritti* ‘poet,’ OIr. *crithe*, probably a Celtic derivative **k^urit-(i)jo-* from IE **k^ur-tu-* ‘doing,’ attested as OIr. *cruth* ‘form,’ etc. The western parallels, including the Ogamic testimonies, attest to the tendency of a heterosyllabic sequence to resyllabification and absorption, specifically *-t̄.i-* > *-t̄.t̄i-* > *-t̄.t-*. Consequently, PRICIVS is the product of a local, Latinate pronunciation or even transmission of a Celtic name, and suggests that the scribes tended to use <CI> (we will see more instances below) if the name was not Roman and then probably unknown to them. According to this view, this would be only an early, regional instance of the ongoing confusion of the Latin sequences *-ciV-/-tiV-*, which may have proceeded through the following stages: a) a front velar stop shifts to an (alveolo-)palatal stop; b) the resulting realizations [c, ʃ] are interpreted as /t, d/ by listeners.¹ This ongoing confusion may have surfaced in these names only because no precedent spelling tradition existed for them. In other words, indigenous PNs have not been sufficiently valued as a touchstone for the chronology of Latin sound changes in the different regions of the Roman Empire. Since a change [kj] > [tj] is more common than the reverse, the rendition <CI> for expected <TI> can only be put down to hypercorrection. Of course, both renditions may be covering a single affricate sound [tʃ] that presupposes that the merger of [kj] and [tj] had been completed. Note, however, that a considerable number of Romance dialects preserve the difference between these clusters because coarticulation has given rise to two different affricates, respectively [tʃ] and [tʃ̄].

2. FASANA and the Italic fate of Indo-European **d^heh₁-es-* ‘ritual’

The isolated PN FASANA in a lead tag from Siscia is compared with FASENAE by [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 277], which ascribes FASANA and FASENAE to Illyrian on distributional grounds and refers the reader to Mayer [1, 143]. Alföldy [1969, 200] related FASENAE to the Greek PNs *Phaseus* and *Phason*, which is unconvincing. However, the text PVBLICIAE FASENAE (Dalmatia [CIL, 3, *Suppl.* 2, 13285], 2nd–3rd C. AD) is not trustworthy, and is now read as FAVSTINAE (Brigitte Gräf in [EDH, 061149]). In point

¹ Phonetic interpretation by Recasens [2014, 131].

of fact, FASANA is exclusively paralleled by the cognomen in the formula L(VCI) CAL(I) FAS/ANI (Rome [CIL, 6, 14049]). Another lost inscription from Teba (Málaga, Baetica, Hispania, 2nd C. AD) reads AVRELIAE FESENAE, etc. [CIL, 2, 1426; EDH, 030680].

The Italic languages abound with testimonies of this stem: a derivative $*d^h h_1 s-nó-$ is attested in Latin *fānum* ‘shrine’ and Skt. (RV.) *dhiṣnya-* (an epithet of the Aśvinas); a feminine full grade variant $*d^h e h_1 s-neh_2$ is traditionally believed to account for Pael. *fesn(am)*, acc. sing. ‘shrine’ and O. *fīsnu*, nom. sing., U. *fesnafe*, acc. pl. According to Schrijver [1991, 92], these words originally belonged to the same paradigm, and the second would be its collective form, which is not very cogent if $*d^h h_1 s-nó-$ is a thematic adjective. Lat. *fērālis* ‘funerary,’ *fēriae* ‘religious festival,’ O. *fīsiais* (dat.-abl. pl.) ‘religious holidays’ and Lat. *fēstus* ‘holiday(-)’ belong here, too, and are unanimously traced to a stem $*d^h e h_1 s-$. Recently, Cartlidge [2013] has called attention to the onomastic formula *t(rebis) .fisanis* [.] *ú*, attested once in Pompeii, which matches the gen. pl. *fis[anium]* in a *Iuvila Capuana*. In his view, *fisanis* goes back to a derivative in $*-ān-i_1o-$ from the thematic form $*d^h e h_1 s-ó-$, attested in Arm. *dik* and indirectly in Lat. *fēriae*, *fēstus*. In the following lines I shall argue that the PN FASANA is closely related to these forms, but some words are in order before clarifying the exact nature of their relatedness.

The reconstruction of an amphikinetic $*d^h e h_1 s-$, $*d^h h_1 s-és$ [cf. NIL, 102] is unsatisfactory, and that of a root noun $*d^h e h_1 s-$, as in [IEW, 259], are both unwarranted and uneconomic.² An alternating paradigm of either structure would never be expected to give rise to the attested derivatives, unless all the forms containing /e:/ are built from the stem of the strong cases. On the other hand, I believe Meier-Brügger [2006] to be right in reconstructing a typical *-s*-stem neuter meaning ‘ritual act,’ *vel sim.*, which must have had the oblique stem $*d^h e h_1 s-es-$, but his views on the matter are to my mind contradictory: he apparently takes all the forms containing a long vowel from $*d^h e h_1 s-$, which is at variance with what we know about *-s*- stems, and regards $*d^h h_1 s-$ as a compositional variant and the base of Gk. θεός. Finally, an original proterokinetic inflection of the type nom.-acc. $*R(é)-S(ø)-D(-s)$, oblique $*R(ø)-S(é)-D(-s)$ is poorly attested, and its oblique stem would be $*d^h h_1 s-es- > *d^h es-$, which remains unattested.³

In my view, a different path may be envisaged: the oblique stem, from which all the forms containing /e:/ are derived, is $*d^h e h_1 s-es-$, at least in post-Anatolian IE, where the originally proterokinetic paradigm had been leveled and the full grade of the root had spread to all the cases, as in Gk. γένος, γένους, Lat. *genus*, *generis*, etc., from $*gēnh_1 o/es-$. Accordingly, a completely consistent account demands that all the adjectival derivatives synchronically containing /e:/ be traced back to $*d^h e h_1 s-es-$.

² I deem it very implausible that the Latin infinitives *-dere* and *dare*, respectively (as if) from $*d^h h_1 s-i$ and $*d^h s-i$, are the original locatives of such a paradigm, an idea for which there is no support at all in the second case.

³ Cf. on the original structure and early regularization of this type [Schindler, 1975; Stüber, 2002, 199 ff.; Meißner, 2006, 56–60].

In the string **-eh₁e-*, an intervocalic laryngeal would have been lost without a trace early in Indo-European, with the subsequent contraction of the two identical vowels into /e:/. The original stem **d^heh₁-es-* is possibly preserved in Av. *dāh-* ‘gift.’ This noun can be traced back to Iir. **d^(h)aH-as-* on the grounds that the scansion is disyllabic, which eliminates the possibility of postulating an original **d^(h)eH-s-*. The possessive adjective *hu-dāh-* ‘beneficent’ preserves an original **h₁su-d^(h)eH-és-*. Other adjectives of the same type, like its antonym *duž-dāh-* ‘wrongdoer’ (that is to say, not ‘giving bad things’ or ‘giving bad gifts’) and *yauž-dāh-* ‘making healthy,’ as opposed to Skt. *su-dās-* ‘generous’ suggest that two Iir. preforms **daHas-* and **d^haHas-* have fallen together in Iranian somewhere down the line. In the same vein, if the Armenian form *dik’* goes back to a plural form **dhēs-es*, nothing prevents us from reconstructing a form which is decompositional to an ancient adjectival, possessive **X-d^heh₁-es-* ‘having/receiving a <...> ritual act’ (as in the Indo-Iranian forms in the preceding paragraph) instead of **d^heh₁s-es* (as per Olsen [1999, 172], Meier-Brügger [2006] or Martirosyan [2008, 239]).

The Italic forms containing **fēs-* are regularly built according to the same pattern. Lat. *fēriae* ‘religious festivals,’ like O. *fīsiais*, belongs to the unproductive type of *temperius*, *venerius*, etc.⁴ While both these forms are conceivably delocalival from **d^heh₁-es-i*, an alternative derivation by means of **-i̯jo-* from the noun stem **d^heh₁-es-* would tie up well with the structure of the gentilics *FESIDIVS* (Rome) and *FESEDIVS* (Todi, Umbria). Lat. *fēstus* may be traced back to a typical possessive formation **d^heh₁-es-to-*, and in this way becomes neatly integrated in the type of Lat. *honestus*, *modestus*, *scelestus*, *fūnestus*, etc. Lat. *fērālis* ‘funerary’ is comparable to *temporālis*, *generālis*, *munerālis*, *laterālis*, and accordingly does not require a thematic base. Italic **fēs_{nā}* goes back to **d^heh₁-es-neh₂*, the collective of an adjective **d^heh₁-es-no-*. It belongs to the type exemplified by Lat. *ahēnus* (< **h₂ej₂-es-no-*), *verbēna* ‘twig,’ *egēnus* ‘lacking.’ Additionally, Lith. *duosnūs* (from **deh₃-es-no-*) provides a near cognate.⁵

On the other hand, Gk. *θεσ-* in *θεσ-πέσιος*, *θέσ-κελος*, *θέσ-φατος* has never existed as an independent form. Its immediate ancestor **d^hh₁s-* is the regular zero-grade

⁴ And possibly *Leucesie* (*Carmen Saliare*) and the Etruscan loanword *Lauxusies* (PN); both examples are too early to show rhotacism. Poccetti [2009, 236–239] traces both forms to **leuketjo-* in Lat. *Lucetius*, under the assumption that there has been a very early “Sabine” palatalization and assibilation. This is attractive, but the coincidence in the rendition <si> in two different traditions is intriguing, since the evolution is presumably *-tj- > -t- > -f- > -s-* (with coalescence, not assibilation of a dental sound preceding a palatal vowel), and the rendition of the affricate or fricative outcome in this case usually hesitates between <ts>, <ss> or <s>.

⁵ On the other hand, **fēs_{nā}* could conceivably be taken from the collective of a possessive adjective **d^heh₁s-no-*, as in **leuk-os- > *leuk-s-n-eh₂ > lūna* ‘moon,’ OPr. *lauxnos* ‘stars,’ Av. *raoxšna-* ‘light’ (if these forms are not derivatives of the athematic **leuk-s-mj* in Lat. *lūmen*, which is less likely). But in this case, we would probably expect to find an adjectival derivative **d^heh₁s-o-* of the type **uejd-os > *uejd-s-o-* (cf. Eng. *wise*) which is not directly attested (as opposed to **leuk-os-* in Skt. *rocas-* → **leuk-s-o-* in the Venetic ps.-gentilic *LEVXSIVS*, ON. *ljóss* ‘bright’ and the base of W. *lluched* ‘lightning’). The collective form of a substantival *-no-* derivative is usually based on the root, as in **deh₃-no-*, which is hardly the case here.

variant of **d^heh₁-es-* in the first member of a synthetic compound: take for instance **m₁s-d^heh₁-* (Av. *mazdā-*, Skt. *su-medhā-* ‘wise,’ etc. [cf. NIL, 493]), whose first member goes back to **men-es-* ‘mind, thinking’ but can only be the product of reduction. Consequently, there has never been a member of the *-s*-stem paradigm showing this Ablaut (as Stüber [2002, 28] reasonably contends). And **d^hh₁s-ó-* cannot derive from it by thematicization. The thematic zero-grade forms going back to **d^hh₁s-ó-*, namely Gk. θεός, Phrygian δεός (dat. pl. [cf. Lubotsky, 1988, 15]), the Skt. adverb *dhiṣā* ‘with religious zeal,’ and perhaps the Anatolian forms CLuv. *tasa(n)-za*, Lydian *taśēv*, Lycian θθē ‘slab, altar, tomb’ [see Eichner, 1983; NIL, 102],⁶ are the descendants of an original adjective, which belongs to the oldest layer of derivation of exocentric thematic adjectives from neuter *-es*-stems, and is identical in structure to Lat. *russus* (< **h₁rud^h-s-ó-*), etc., as contended by Höfler [2015].⁷

In other words, these “zero forms” presumably go back to a time when the oblique stem of the proterokinetic *-s*-stems had a structure **R(θ)-S(é)-D-(s)*, still preserved in Hittite and reconstructable from scattered instances of paradigm split (see above), and the addition of the thematic vowel caused the zero-grade of the suffix, yielding adjectives of the form **R(θ)-S(θ)-D-(-ó-s)*. Gk. θεῖος ‘divine’ goes back to **d^hh₁s-iió-*, like, possibly, OIc. *dasi* ‘lazy fellow.’ This can be explained by assuming a tendency to the substantivization of the underlying **d^hh₁s-ós*, either in IE or in the particular languages, which is visible in Greek. The name *DASIVS*, well attested in Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia, could have the same origin, and in any event is likely to belong to the Illyrian stock.

The adjective **d^hh₁s-no-* attested in Latin and Sanskrit is the derivative of the secondarily substantivized **d^hh₁s-ó-* ‘divine,’ and then not standing in a paradigmatic relation of any sort to the Sabellic form **fēs-nā*. It would be comparable, for instance, to Gk. λύχνος ‘lamp’ (< **lúk-s-no-*) with respect to Skt. *rocas-* (< **leuk-o/es-*). There is also a Sanskrit derivative *rukṣá-* ‘bright’ that is crucially identical to **luk-s-ó-*, in turn, in my view, indirectly attested in the gentilics *LVXSIVS* (Etruria), *LVXSILIVS* (Bruttium

⁶ Schür [2016] has challenged this etymology on the grounds that the Lycian form actually means simply ‘building’; Lydian *taśēv* is an outdated reading for *taiēv* ‘column.’ If they belong here, the feminine DN *dhiṣ-anā* and *dhiṣ-anyant-* ‘pious’ may belong to productive deverbative formations and then would presuppose a hypostasis of the *-s*-stem. In that case they are not directly equatable to any of the nasal adjectives we are dealing with. Byrd [2011] enlarges the Anatolian list by reconstructing the following chain: *-o*-stem **d^hh₁s-ó-* ‘possessing/characterized by the divine’ → fem. abstract **d^hh₁s-éh₂* ‘the divine (abstract)’ → *-o*-stem **d^h(h₁)sh₂-ó-* ‘possessing, characterized by the divine’ → **d^héh₁sh₂o-* ‘act or thing characterized by the divine’ > Hitt. *tesha-* ‘dream’ → **d^h(h₁)sh₂i-* ‘act/thing characterized by the divine’ > Hitt. *tsh(a)i-* ‘dream’.

⁷ In fact, there are more relevant forms in Italic: the Ven. PN *vhu.k.s.siiāi*, *vhu.g.sia.i*. (Este) looks like the derivative of **b^heug-os* ‘enjoyment.’ Most recently, Vine [2016, 135] has made an interesting case for Lat. *crassus* going back to a “zeroed-out” form **k₁rH-s-ó-*, which smoothly aligns this form with others belonging to the above schema, like the DN *Cerēs* < possessive **X-ker-ēs*, Pael. *Cerria* < **ker-es-iió-*, *Cer(r)us Manus* ‘bonus creator’ < **ker-es-o-* (the last one obviously representing the youngest layer of derivation). On the etymology of Umbrian DN *Çerfo-* cf. now a different opinion in [Weiss, 2017].

and Lucania), *LVXSONIVS* (Germania Superior), etc., from which **lúk-s-no-* may be, in turn, derived. In this line, **d^hh₁s-no-* would be a noun derived from **d^hh₁s-ó-*, which instantiates a very archaic layer of substantivization by suffixation and accent retraction.

The Venetic PN *FASANA* in Pannonia and *FASANI* in Rome continue a transparent derivative of IE **d^hh₁s-ós* ‘sacred, divine,’ have probably arisen after the substantivization of this form (a process comparable, for instance, to the one conducive to the late derivative Gk. *θεϊκός*), and constitute the only direct continuants of this stem in Italic. It is a secondary formation, and probably a denominative adjective (ultimately **-eh₂-no-*). O. *Físanis* is a similar derivative in which **-eh₂-no-* is enlarging the full grade Italic stem **fēs-* going back to **d^heh₁-es-*, and therefore is descriptively comparable to the type *veterānus*.

To recap, none of the formations that *could* contain a sequence **-eh₁s-* (putatively **d^heh₁s-no-* and **d^heh₁s-o-*) must be derived from an anomalous noun with a nom.-acc. **d^heh₁s-*. As remarked above, the same considerations apply to the double zero grade forms **d^hh₁s-no-* and **d^hh₁s-o-*, which do not go back to a substantival oblique stem **d^hh₁s-ós*. It should be clear by now that all the extant forms are compatible with a regularly formed *-s*-stem **d^heh₁-es-* or its adjectival derivatives.

3. The Venetic deadverbial derivatives of Indo-European **pro-* and **prō-*

The PN *SEPTIMA PROMA* [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 447] is paralleled by a number of identical names from Italy: *ANNAEA PROMA* [CIL, 10, 5602] (Fabrateria Nova, Latium et Campania), *PROMVS* [CIL, 5, 387] (Heraclea, Venetia et Histria), *PRIMVS PROMVS* [CIL, 6, 9839] (Rome), *PROMO COSSVTI* [Ibid., 25086] (Rome), *PROMVS* [Ibid., 33901] (Rome), *PROMO* [CIL, 11, 6709] (Aemilia). It goes back to IE **pro-m(H)o-* ‘first’, continued by U. *PROMOM*, *promum* adv. ‘at first,’ Oscan *PROMVS FELLATOR* [CIL, 4, 10022] (Pompeii, where it is an obvious appellative meaning ‘masterly, first class’), Gk. *πρόμος* ‘protagonist, commander,’ possibly Mlr. *rom* ‘early,’ Germ. *fram* ‘further, forward,’ adjective **framaz* ‘excellent.’ The variant forms Goth. *fruma* ‘first of two,’ *frumists* ‘first,’ albeit too often equated with the above ones, can only go back to a superlative **pr-ṛHō-* and are consequently identical to Gk. *πράμος* ‘leader, prince’ [see Müller, 2007, 243]. A further variant with a full grade of the root is probably preserved down to the present day in Sp. *páramo* ‘moorland, high isolated waste land,’ directly related to the DN *DEO PEREMVSTAE* (Navarra) and Skt. *paramá-* ‘foremost.’ All of them can be traced to a superlative **per(H)-ṛHō-*, on which see [Prósper, 2016a, 109]. At least two peripheral Hispano-Celtic cities bore a second name *Paramica*. Hesitations in the attested vocalism may be caused by Hispano-Celtic dialects (which had no sequence *-eRa-* due to Joseph’s Law) mediating between an unknown IE dialect preserving /p/ and Hispano-Latin.

A further variant **p_ḡh₂-mo-* has been reconstructed to account for Lith. *pirmas* ‘first’ and Germ. **furmaz* ‘first’ [Müller, 2007, 245], as well as Faliscan *pramo* and Lat. *prandium* from **prāmo-ed-* ‘early lunch,’ to which we may now add the (Celtic) potter’s name *RAMVS*, attested in Southern Gaul, on which see [Gavrielatos, 2012, 171]. It is tempting to relate this last form to the base of a twice attested nasal stem PN: *PRAMION* (nom. sing. [CIL, 5, 7641], Verzuolo, Liguria, 1–30 AD according to [EDR]) and its derivative *PRAMIANIVS* (*DISIVS PRAMIANIVS MOMI F*, Cavour, Liguria). Apart from preserving PIE /p/ as expected, these PNs probably show the Ligurian outcome of the IE sequence **-R̥H-*, which would team up with that of Italic and Celtic, and additionally suggest that nasal stems had analogically restored the final nasal in the nominative, so that **-ō* was redone into *-ōn*.

The PN *PROVIA* [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 407–408] is matched by a masculine PN *FIRMO PROVIO* (dat. sing. [CIL, 3, 3797], Ig/Emona). The editor is non-committal about the Celticity of this name. Still, both PNs are obviously derived from **prō-uo-*, an inherited deadverbial adjective meaning ‘first, foremost, going forward’ or the like, and accordingly cannot possibly be Celtic, and an Italic attribution is conceivable. Their close cognates are: Skt. *pravaṇā-* ‘willing, inclined,’ n. ‘slope, heap, mound,’ a suffixed form identical to *PROVIA* and *PROVIO* can be found in OHG. *frō*, OS. *frao*, OEng. *frēa* ‘master, mister’ (**frawan-*), Goth. *frauja* ‘master, lord,’ OS. *frōio*, OIc. *freyja* ‘mistress, lady; name of a goddess.’ In turn, **prō-uo-* is attested as such in OHG. *frouwa* ‘wife, woman;’ cf. also OS. *frūa*, MLG. *frūwe* ‘wife, woman’ from PGerm. **frōwōn*, perhaps also in Attic *πρῶρα* ‘prow’ (< **prōu-r-iǎ*) and in OCS. *pravъ* ‘right.’ Therefore, the Pannonian PN *PROVIA* must have meant ‘the lady’ and an Italic filiation is in principle favoured by the fact that the only other instance of this PN is attested in Emona/Ig, especially since Šašel-Kos [2003] has plausibly contended that this nucleus actually belonged to Italy.

A related zero-grade variant form **p_ḡh₂-uo-* is attested in Skt. *pūrva-* ‘foremost, earlier,’ Av. *pauruua*, ^BToch. *parwe* ‘first,’ OEng. *forwost/forwest*, OCS. *prǐvŭ* ‘first,’ Arm. *haraw* ‘South (wind)’ according to Olsen [1999, 26], and hypothetically also in such (Gaulish?) PNs as *RAVONIVS* (Dalmatia, Pannonia, Moesia) and *RAVIVS*, *RAVIA*, attested as pseudo-gentilics in Pannonia, Moesia Superior, Venetia et Histria, Umbria, Latium and Rome (they could alternatively be derived from Lat. *ravus*).

4. A neglected participle and a “predicted” present stem **stVne/o-*

STANONCIA CRESCENTIS [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 463] is again a hapax. It is of special interest, since it has an obviously verbal origin.

A small number of OLat. 3rd pl. present forms contain the ending *-nunt* (or *-nont*), once in the passive form *-nuntur*. The most frequent form and the only one attested more than once is Lat. *danunt* ‘they give.’ *Obstināre* ‘to set one’s mind on something,’ and *praestināre* ‘to bargain for, buy,’ are deverbal *ā*-presents. As De Vaan [2012]

observes, they have transitive but atelic semantics and can all be understood as instantiations of a meaning ‘to place, set.’ Hence, according to this scholar, they presuppose the existence of a derivational basis **stVne/o-* ‘to take position’ or ‘place.’ In his view, a PIE nasal present **st-n(é)-h₂-* [see LIV, 590–592, s.v. **steh₂-*], if thematicized into **st-ŋ-h₂-e/o-* ‘to stand, arrange,’ should evolve into **sten-*, which may easily have given **stan-* by analogy. The resulting present **stan-e/o-* had a 3rd person pl. **stanonti* ‘they stand, place,’ and this form provided the direct model for a 3rd person pl. **danonti* ‘they give.’ This may now be indirectly confirmed by the existence of this PN. STANONCIA is unlikely to be Celtic, and since, as we have just seen, there is likely to have been an Italic present form **stano-*, we can provisionally hypothesize that STANONCIA is a Venetic form. The root-vocalism is arguably original and the form presupposed by *danunt* is attested for the first time in an Italic dialect. Accordingly, I contend that STANONCIA continues a feminine present thematic participle **stanontiā*, itself (as if) from **stŋh₂-o-nt-ih₂*. It was probably intransitive, meaning something like ‘standing, staying firm.’

5. The ordinal ‘ninth’ and the Venetic continuant of IE **g^hos(ti)-pot(i)-* ‘host’

The otherwise unattested PN NONCIVS [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 375] is similar to an equally uninterpreted Dalmatian PN in an inscription which reads: D(IS) M(ANIBVS) / VLP(IO) NONN/TIONI AN(NORVM) XL / CAMP(ANIVS) MARCIA/NVS V(IVVS) S(IBI) ET / IVL(IA) MARCIAN[A] / PAREN(TES) (Bosanski Novi — Japra i Blagaj Rijeka, Dalmatia, 2nd C. AD) [cf. ILJug, 1479A]. The double <NN> is unexpected but not unparalleled, and there is no room on the right hand in which a vowel could have been written.

This PN goes back to an IE ordinal **(H)neun-to-* ‘ninth,’ enlarged by means of a suffix *-ijo-*. The same numeral forms the base of the PN in the gen. sing. NEVNTHI in an inscription reading SATVRN(A)E / NEVNTHI / LIB(ERTAE) O(BITAE) AN(NORVM) L / POSVIT / HOSTILA ET VERI(VS) FIL(II) (Ig/Emona, Pannonia Superior) [CIL, 3, 10776; see Hamp, 1976; Stifter, 2012b, 257]. In view of the other examples, it hardly comes as a surprise that NEVNTHI does not look Celtic at all. The Celtic numeral ‘ninth’ should be attested as †NOVANTIVS [see Repanšek, 2016, 330]. In fact, if these three names represent spelling variants of the same name, they must probably be ascribed to a non-Celtic, western Indo-European dialect, characterized either by a vocalization [ŋ] > [un] or by a slight shift from the expected IE phonotactics, which actually predict *-unC-* and not *-un-*. In the first case we would expect an outcome [noŋuntijos], while in the second, which is *prima facie* the likelier of the two, an evolution [no.ŋŋ.ti.ios] > [no.un.ti.ios] > [no.ŋun.ti.ios] or [noŋun.ti.ios] would be more probable. Incidentally, this is close to the solution advocated by Hamp [1976], who reconstructs an IE ordinal **neuno-*, later enlarged by *-to-*. This phonotactic shift has a parallel in Italic that belongs both to the ordinal numeral system and to the realm of onomastics: both the PN PETVRTIVS (in Central Italy) and its Lusitanian cognates PERVRDA, PEDVRTIA

[see Prósper, 2016b] reflect an immediate Italic preform **k^uetur-tó-*, but ultimately stemming from an ordinal **k^uetur-t(H)ó-*.⁸

Still, the only Italic surviving word for ‘ninth,’ Lat. *nōnus*, can only stem from **(H)neun̄-(H)o-* (its only Italic cognate being the U. fem. gen. sing. *NONIAR*). The Venetic word for ‘tenth’ is now attested as *dekomei* ‘decimus’ (loc. sing.) in the Tavola d’Este [cf. Marinetti, 1998], and O. *δεκμος* (Pozzuoli), as well as the Siculan PN *Δεκομο*, as opposed to the equally Oscan derivative *degetasis* < **dekant-āsijō-*. This points to the Italic branch not having introduced the innovative *-to-* variant form for ‘ninth,’ and additionally suggests that Proto-Italic created **dekVmo-* in analogy of ‘ninth’ and ‘seventh’ at the expense of PIE **dek̑nt-(H)o-* or **dek̑n-t(H)o-*. Additionally, this explains why this latter form only survived in forms no longer belonging to the numeral system. Consequently, the forms *NONNTIONI*, *NEVNTII* are not in principle likely to be Italic.

Finally, the PN *NOVANTICO* is attested in a military diploma found in Porolissum (Dacia), and an incomplete *NOVANT(-)* is attested in Moesia [CIL, 3, 8180]. As observed by Falileyev [2007, 113], its Celticity is beyond doubt but, in my opinion, this is a numeral form rather than a derivative of the verbal stem **neuā-* ‘to renew’ or, as he proposes on the authority of former works, a derivative in *-ant-* from **nou(ij)o-* ‘new.’

A new inscription reading *TVRVV LIVIVV / HOSPOTIS F. ET VO/LSES OPLINOCVV NOVENTI F.* (Krk/Curictae, Dalmatia, end of the 1st C. BC) has been edited by Kurilić [2006, 137]. The father’s name *NOVENTI* in the gen. sing. shows visibly divergent phonotactics but goes equally back to **(H)neun̄-to-*. In sum, *NOVENTI* does not seem to be Italic, and could be provisionally classified as a Celtic form with a context bound shift *-an- > -en-*.

But there is another interesting thing about this text. While *OPLINOCVV* looks Illyrian, the intriguing PN *HOSPOTIS* may be an indigenous Venetic form for Lat. *hospitis*, that is to say the gen. sing. of **ǵ^hos(ti)-poti-*, which is possible in view of Pael. *hospus*, could more likely point to a Latin PN, consciously or inadvertently glossed over as Venetic.

In fact, it has passed unnoticed that there is yet another instance of *HOSPOTIS*: *HOSPOLIS* in the indigenous formula *LAEVICVV HOSPOLIS FILIVV LVCIVV* (Roc/Piquentum, Venetia et Histria, present day Istria, Croatia) [CIL, 5, 449] is a misreading for *HOSPOTIS*, as transpires from the identical <T> in *PLETORIS* four lines below, which is perfectly discernible on the photograph.⁹ In all likelihood, *HOSPOTIS* is also the way in which the abbreviated form *HOSP* in *VENETVV LASTIMEIVV HOSP(OLIS) F(ILIVV)* (52–48 BC, Krk, Dalmatia, reading by [CIL, 3, 13295]) should be written out. Accordingly, we may now have an exact Venetic match of Lat. *hospes*. Note that the unsyncopated Venetic PN *Ho.s.tihavo.s.* is an older form, although this may raise again the question of the unexpected syncope

⁸ For Latin, the problem is more complex: a number of archaic inscriptions dating to the 3rd C. BC (close to Rome) attest a DN *NEVNA* (*NEVNA DONO* [CIL, 1², 2845]; *NEVNA FATA* [Ibid., 2846], *NEVEN DEIVO* [Ibid., 455]) for which several explanations have been put forward: see a good state of the art in Bakum [2009, 61–63]. It does not belong here at all and contains an original /e:/ according to Lipp [2016].

⁹ Checked on the website of [EDCS, 24900124]. At the time of the present consultation, the PN *HOSPOTIS* published by Kurilić has been corrected into *HOSPITIS* by [EDCS, 57200001].

of *-ti-* in *all* the dialects, which opens up the alternative of a very ancient compound **ǵ^hos-poti-* or a very primitive haplological process caused by the fourth syllable (on which cf. [Neri, 2013]). Unfortunately, both cases of *HOSPOTIS* are inflected for the genitive case, and accordingly leave as in the dark as regards the nominative form.

This additionally confirms that the Proto-Italic stem is **hos(ti)-pot(i)-*, a match of OCS. **gospodь* ‘lord,’ which may be a Germanic loanword in view of the voiced segment /d/. Given the closeness of the genetic relatedness of Latin and Venetic, we have to conclude that either Proto-Italic still maintained an acrostatic structure **pot-i-*, **pet-i-*, or the Latin nominative *hospes* has been refashioned somewhere down the line and its original form should have been **hospos*, like *compos*, *potis*, etc. Note that all the verbal derivatives in Sabellic and Latin presuppose **poti-* and not **peti-* (Lat. *potior*, O. *pútiad*, etc.), and this is also the case with the Continental Celtic forms (cf. the Pannonian PN *OTIOVNA* in [Prósper, 2016a, 32–33]). The comparatively late attestation of *HOSPOTIS* would seem to speak against the reconstruction of an original **ǵ^hosti-* ‘guest, foreigner’ for the Venetic PNs *.o.s.t.s.*, *OSTIALAE.*, etc.¹⁰ This idea, however, is not pacific, since Venetic /h/ had disappeared long before Venetia gave up the indigenous alphabet (on which see now [Prósper, 2018b]). Accordingly, *HOSPOTIS* may be an indigenous form that, at the same time, imitates its Latin synonym at a time in which Latin itself was dropping the Anlaut /h/.

6. Filling the gaps: New Italic and Celtic forms meaning ‘favourable’

The much debated Italic forms U. *fons* (nom. sing. masc.), *foner* (gen. sing. fem. and nom. pl. masc.), go back to **b^hou(H)-ni-* ‘merciful, favourable,’¹¹ and not to a syn-copated form **fo^ueni-*, as suggested by [e.g. IEW, 453]. A related Venetic GN *FONIONI* [cf. Prósper, 2017] probably has the same origin. Several Venetic PNs are conceivably related: C(AI) *VINDEI FONIANI* (gen. sing., Verona) and *FONNIAE L(VCI) L(IBERTAE) / [VE] NVSTAE* (dat. sing., Este [CIL, 5, 2630]).

¹⁰ Cf. also the prudent approach by Solinas [2007, 557]. The idea that *ho.s.tihavo.s.* has “a hyper-correct *h-* (perhaps under the influence of Lat. *Hostilius* and the like) and is derived from the Venetic *osti-*” (cf. [Polomé, 1966, 73]), who additionally reads *hostiavos*) is simply untenable and consequently powerless to undermine the Italic classification of Venetic. Another recent attestation of a name beginning by Italic *h-* is the dative *Horaio.i.* [see Marinetti & Prosdociami, 1994, 176], which could be seamlessly traced back to an agent noun **ǵ^horó-* ‘wishing, aspiring’ or the corresponding object noun **ǵ^horo-*, which, in turn, is reminiscent of Av. *zara-* (masc.) ‘goal,’ Lat. *Horātius*, and presupposes a verb attested in Lat. *horitur* ‘urges’ (Ennius), U. *heriest* ‘will want,’ Skt. *harya-*, and of course the Venetic participle *horeionte*. Disregarding this set of forms, Marinetti & Prosdociami [1994, 189] favour a connection with the Latin divinity *Hora*, wife of *Quirinus*, which, in fact, is very likely to have the same origin.

¹¹ In turn, originally an abstract noun; cf. [Hackstein, 2010] for the general schema, which, however, reunites nouns from disparate origins, and with regard to this particular form see [Garnier, 2010, 442–443].

This etymology is further supported by many Gaulish PNs in which the *-ni*-stem is preserved as such (or has been secondarily transferred to the thematic inflection), like the feminine PNs nom. BOVNIS, dat. BOVNI (Transpadana, Pannonia, Noricum), the thematicized forms BOVNAE, BONIA, BONIVS, BONIO, BONIONI (Pannonia, Noricum, Dacia, etc.),¹² as well as the possessive adjectives in *-ā-to-* like BONIATVS, BONIATA (Noricum), and also compounds like ATEBONIVS ‘very favourable’ (Pavia, Transpadana).

The Sabellic forms have mostly been traced back to **b^huh₂-* ‘become,’ but also to a root **b^huh₁-* ‘pousser, croître’ [Garnier, 2010, 442–443] and to **g^{uh}eu-* ‘to worship’ [Schrijver, 1991, 442], by which he also seeks to explain Lat. *faveō* < **g^{uh}ou₁-eie-*). In a number of works, Nussbaum [notably 1999] has refined the idea that there holds a derivational relationship between thematic adjectives and acrostic abstract nouns in *-i-*, e.g. **h₁ro/eud^h-o-* → **h₁ro/eud^h-i-*, or **h₂o/ek^h-ri-* vs. **h₂ek^h-ro-* (as in Lat. *ocris* vs. Gk. ἄκρος). The thematic adjective often shows the same alternating vocalism. The abstract noun **b^ho/eu(H)-ni-* probably belongs here, and accordingly we would expect the corresponding thematic adjective to be attested in Italic and/or Celtic. Garnier [2010, 442–443] has identified **b^hou(H)-no-* as the base of the Gaulish PN BONONIVS and the PIN *Bononia*¹³ and their appellative counterpart OIr. *búan* ‘enduring, lasting.’ This adjective is also reflected in the Irish DN *Búanann*, from **bou₁nonā* [cf. De Bernardo Stempel, 1995].¹⁴

Since there is no trace of a laryngeal in most of these forms (albeit the Umbrian adjective could conceivably be the product of syncopation of a medial vowel), it is safer to posit a noun **b^hou(H)-ni-* and a corresponding adjective **b^hou(H)-no-* with early laryngeal loss, due to the so-called Saussure effect. But, if the above schema as presented by Nussbaum is right, we would reasonably expect to find some trace of **b^heu₁H-no-* with preservation of the laryngeal reflex. In fact, this is what we find in a hitherto overlooked PN: BAVANVS [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 447], BAVANA (Bliesbruck/Mediomatrici, Gallia Belgica), BAVNI O(FFICINA) (Nizy-le-Comte/Remi, Gallia Belgica). It presupposes the existence of a laryngeal and the action of Joseph’s Law.¹⁵ Additionally, it is probably compatible with the phonetics of OIr. *búan*.

¹² I presently believe the by no means so usual Venetic assimilation and monophthongization /eu/ > /ou/ > /o:/ to be restricted to cases in which there was an original *o*-grade and, crucially, a labial sound preceded: e.g. **fo₁-*, **uo₁-* [see Prósper, 2018a].

¹³ Note, however, the unexpected vocalism, which casts some doubts on the correctness of this ascription: Βονονία (Strabo, Geogr., 5; Ptolemy, Geogr., 3, 1, 42); Βόνωνία (Silius Italicus, 8, 599); Βόνωνιά (Martialis 6, 85), etc. It may be consequently advisable to relate these forms to other PINs like *Vindo-bona*, etc.

¹⁴ According to [Olsen, 2009, 28], Arm. *boyn* ‘nest, den, chamber’ goes back to a preform **b^hou₁-no-* identical to OIr. *búan*. In turn, this would be a secondary derivative **b^hou(H)-mno-* of the **-men-* stem reflected in Skt. *bhūman-* ‘earth, world, being,’ Gk. φῦμα ‘growth, tumour’; and Skt. *bhavanam* ‘residence, abode’ would be a descendant of the thematicized form **b^heu₁-ηno-* [sic]. This falls short of explaining the *o*-grade of the root, however. On the other hand, it is a matter of discussion whether the full grade of the root ‘to be, become’ was **b^heu₁-* or **b^hueh₂-* and whether it constitutes the base of these PNs.

¹⁵ From **b^heu₁-* or **b^hueh₂-*, according to [LIV, 98] ‘to be, become’ or a related root. On balance, an alternative structure **b^heh₂-eh₂-no-* is both more complex and less compelling.

7. Ancient Indo-European compounds in Pannonian onomastics

The PN MARIDORPA [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 343] continues extremely archaic patterns of Indo-European composition. Leaving aside the possibility that the differences in the colour of the original compound vowels have been progressively blurred in Continental Celtic, which often cannot be proven (see a critical account in [Sims-Williams, 2015]), the first member <MARI>- is likely to go back to **mo/eh₂-ri-*. This would be a hitherto unattested acrostatic verbal abstract which alternates with an adjective **mo/eh₂-ro-*. In turn, **mo/eh₂-ro-* (in OIr. *már* ‘big, great,’ etc.) usually occurs as the second member of Celtic compounds in *-māro-*, meaning ‘great in X,’ and is attested in Gk. ἐγγεσί-μωρος ‘great by his spear,’ from **moh₂-ro-*.¹⁶

The underlying schema is the same as in **h₂ék-ri-* vs. **h₂ék-ro-* (cf. Gk. ἄκρις vs. ἄκρος). Nussbaum [2003] has convincingly shown that Lat. *benignus* is reflective of an ancient alternation, by which the adjective **dueno-* is replaced in compounds by an abstract noun **dueni-* ‘goodness,’ so that *benignus* would mean ‘born with goodness.’ Accordingly, the hitherto overlooked substantival **mo/eh₂-ri-* is, at least descriptively, the compositional form of the well-known adjective **mo/eh₂-ro-*, and would mean ‘big amount’ (but we might also consider ‘fame,’ or ‘greatness’). Interestingly, the Gaulish DN in the dat. sing. MARIMOGIO, attested twice in Pannonia (of which one instance reading MAROMOGIO in Noricum might be the trivialized version) is formationally identical.

The second member of this compound, namely *-dorpa*, conceivably goes back to an agent noun **dork^h-ó-* or a neuter object noun **dórk^h-o-*, but this leaves final *-ā* unaccounted for. This root is only attested in Gk. δόρπον ‘evening meal’ and in Alb. *darkë* ‘evening meal’ [cf. Mann, 1950]. The Dacian patronymic Δορπαναῖς, the PN Δορπαναῖς and their latinized variants are not certain to be related. Again, we have to take into account that we cannot really gather the exact meaning of the original verb from its only derivative: it could have been ‘to eat,’ ‘to nourish, feed’ or the like.

The precise syntactic structure underlying this compound merits some discussion. Is MARIDORPA a feminine PN? In that case, it could inherit the same compositional type as the governing Gk. πολύ-φορβος ‘bountiful’ (< ‘much feeding’) and possibly Gaul. *mari-mogius* ‘able to do great things’ > ‘most powerful.’ On the other hand, MARIDORPA stands a good chance of being a masculine PN of the debated type, exemplified by Lat. *indi-gena*, *silvi-cola*, OCS. *voje-voda* ‘army commander-in-chief,’ Gk. βακτρο-φόρῶς ‘stick-bearer.’ While this type constitutes a remarkable archaism that has been variously explained, it is mostly unproductive except in Italic and Greek.¹⁷ There are scattered

¹⁶ As remarked by Nikolaev [2014, 130–131], it is both uneconomic and unwarranted to posit a different, synonymous root **meh₁-* to account for Germ. **mēra-* ‘famous’ in such forms as OHG. *Volkmar*, etc. His own solution consists in the reconstruction of a long grade **mēh₂-ro-* (obeying Eichner’s Law). But the Germanic form might be unrelated in spite of appearances.

¹⁷ Where it often alternates with or is replaced by *-os*, as in Gk. πεζο-μάχος vs. ἰππό-μαχος, and the second member displays all the possible root grades and is synchronically related to a simplex.

examples in Armenian [see Olsen, 1999, 61, 71–72] and Slavic, but only one conceivable Celtic example, namely **eni-genā*, continued by OIr. *ingen*, Ogam. *inigena*, Gaul. ENIGENA.¹⁸ Interestingly, the examples which may lay claim to great antiquity often have an *o*-grade of the root in the second member.¹⁹

Schindler [1997] proposed that this type originally had an *o*-grade second member and was the product of a reinterpretation of original possessive compounds as deverbal: Lat. *agricola* is based on **agro-k^uolā*, in which the second member goes back to an abstract formation **k^uolh₁-eh₂* ‘tilling.’ This, however, may have proceeded by mere “personalization of verbal abstracts” as per [Weiss, 2009, 300–301]. In other words, we have to start from a compound which can be paraphrased as *agri cultura*, reinterpreted as *agri cultor / agrum colens*. Under the provisional assumption the abstract **dork^u-eh₂* may have meant ‘act of feeding’ and not ‘eating,’ we may start from a basic meaning ‘nutrition of abundance’ (ultimately possessive or determinative) → ‘feeding abundantly’ (governing: **dork^u-eh₂* becomes agentive) → ‘bountiful.’

On balance, the connection with Albanian and the labial outcome of the labiovelar indicate that this may be an Illyrian PN. But this is unfortunately not easy to accept: Illyrian has long been suspected of being a *satem* language, which demands a different treatment of the labiovelar. On the other hand, it remains uncertain whether MARIDORPA is a Venetic form, but at such a late stage some unstable sequences containing labiovelars may have evolved in this direction. For instance, if the actual realization of /r/ in this context were a labialized rhotic, this could have triggered assimilation of the following labiovelar and neutralization.²⁰ A Celtic attribution remains possible.

8. Conclusions on the Italic names of Sicilia

Pannonia forms part of a vast linguistic continuum in which an indeterminate number of Indo-European dialects was once spoken. To what degree our onomastic

¹⁸ Cf. [Lejeune, 1985] and further comments in [Uhlich, 2002, 420–422]. Note that, in view of Lat. *indigena*, this is the only conceivably archaic example containing an *e*-grade; but it may go back to **h₁eni-ġenġ₁-* ‘born inside’ if one accepts that Saussure’s theory [Saussure, 1909], according to which this type has root nouns functioning as second members of governing compounds, in which the final laryngeal has been vocalized, may apply to at least a small number of cases.

¹⁹ It is not certain that such a compound forms the base of Ven. *.ekvopetari.s.* ‘monument, tomb’ and its variants, usually held to derive from a name for ‘knight, horse-rider.’ Recently, Marinetti & Prosdocimi [2004] have brought to light an inscription from the area of Padua dating from the 6th–5th C. BC and reading *.ekupetabo.s.* which confirms the existence of an underlying noun **ek^uo-petā*, which could conceivably be a compound of this kind (cf. Lat. *agri-peta* ‘getting an allotment of land’) and mean something like ‘striving for horses’ or ‘having flying horses’ and even stand for an older **ek^uo-potā*. See a well-informed critic of this possibility and a number of morphological alternatives in [Pinault, 2016].

²⁰ There is another PN from Sicilia underpinning this idea: VALERIA CORPI [Radman-Livaja, 2010, 233], probably identical to CORPIO (Dalmatia), CORPENNI (Etruria). This is the equivalent of the Latin adjective *querceus* ‘made of oak’ and the reconstructable path may look like IE **perk^u-* → (Italo-Celtic derivative) **k^uerk^u-iġo-* > **k^uork^u-iġo-* > **kork^u-iġo-* > **korp-iġo-*.

materials preserve the remainders of the languages spoken by the populations originally inhabiting the region and then spreading southwards is unknown, although it could explain several forms which we may somewhat imprecisely label as Italic or, perhaps unduly, as Venetic. On a different, more conservative assumption, what we have is a threefold patchwork resulting from 1) the pooling of Gaulish populations which may have reached Pannonia mostly from Noricum, 2) Venetic peoples establishing colonies which occasionally are certain to stem from westernmost Venetia, 3) and Illyrians, whose onomastics are identified partly on geographic grounds and partly by exclusion, when they show phonetic traits incompatible with Celtic and Italic (e.g. fricativization and assibilation of the IE palatal sounds). This picture, as usual, lacks a temporal dimension. This work has additionally focused on a number of usually neglected issues. First, it has pleaded for the convenience of using onomastics to assess the linguistic classification of some geographic areas. This is also crucially relevant for a correct evaluation of the accepted etymologies of the appellative vocabulary of these dialects. In some cases, thanks to proper names, we even find some morphological or morphophonemic “missing links” that contribute to sketch the history of an insufficiently explained set of forms, as in the case of *FASANA*, *BAVANVS*, *STANONCIA*. To sum up, this work has contended that names often complete our fragmentary information on a particular issue affecting a whole linguistic family. The obtained regularities not only pave the way for new particular etymologies but help to disclose some general aspects of the Italic language family.

-
- Alföldy, G. (1969). *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.
- Bakkum, G. (2009). *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus. 150 Years of Scholarship*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Byrd, A. M. (2011). Deriving Dreams from the Divine. Hittite *tesha-/zash(a)i-*. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 124, 96–105.
- Cartlidge, B. (2013). Lexikon und Onomastik: Osk. *fisanis* und Idg. **d^heh₂s-*. *Linguarum Varietas*, 2, 45–51. CIL — Mommsen, T. et al. (Eds.). (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- De Bernardo Stempel, P. (1995). Gaulish Accentuation. Results and Outlook. In J. F. Eska et al. (Eds.), *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica. Essays in Honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (pp. 16–32). Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- EDCS — *Epigraphik Datenbank Clauss-Slaby*. Retrieved from <http://www.manfredclaus.de>.
- EDH — *Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg*. Retrieved from <http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/home/>.
- EDR — *Epigraphic Database Roma*. Retrieved from <http://www.edr-edr.it/>.
- Eichner, H. (1983). Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Lethoon bei Xanthos. *Orientalia*, 52, 48–66.
- Falileyev, A. (2007). *Celtic Dacia. Personal Names, Place-Names and Ethnic Names of Celtic Origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.

- Garnier, R. (2010). *Le vocalisme du verbe latin. Étude synchronique et diachronique*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Gavrielatos, A. (2012). *Names on Gallo-Roman Terra Sigillata (1–3rd c. AD.)* (unpublished dissertation). Leeds.
- Hackstein, O. (2010). Lateinisch *omnis*. In R. Kim et al. (Eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (pp. 75–84). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Hamp, E. P. (1976). Illyrian *Neunt(i)us*. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 81, 43–44.
- Höfler, S. (2015). *Denominale Sekundärderivation im Indogermanischen: Eine Ochsentour* (Teil 2). Talk at the Indogermanistisches Forschungskolloquium, Erlangen, 26.–27. March.
- IEW — Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- ILJug — Šašel, A. (Ed.). (1963–1986). *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia... repertae et editae sunt*. Ljubljana: Situla.
- Kurilić, A. (2006). Recent Epigraphic Finds from the Roman Province of Dalmatia. In D. Davison, V. Gaffney, & E. Marin (Eds.), *Dalmatia. Research in the Roman Province 1970–2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes* (pp. 133–147). Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Lejeune, M. (1985). La première déclinaison celtique. *Études Celtiques*, 22, 88–94.
- Lipp, R. (2016). La filatrice del destino caduta in oblio. In A. Ancillotti et al. (Eds.), *Forme e strutture della religione nell'Italia mediana antica* [Forms and Structures of Religion in Ancient Middle Italy] (pp. 429–444). Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- LIV — Rix, H. (Ed.). (2001). *Lexicon der Indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzel und ihre Primärstamm-bildungen* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Lubotsky, A. (1988). The Old Phrygian Areyastis-Inscription. *Kadmos*, 27, 9–26.
- Mann, S. A. (1950). The Indo-European Vowels in Albanian. *Language*, 26, 379–388.
- Marinetti, A. (1998). Il venetico: bilancio e prospettive [Venetic: Results and Perspectives]. In A. Marinetti et al. (Eds.), *Varietà e continuità nella storia linguistica del Veneto* [Variation and Continuity in the Linguistic History of Veneto] (pp. 49–99). Torino: Il Calamo.
- Marinetti, A., & Prosdocimi, A. L. (1994). Nuovi ciottoloni venetici iscritti da Padova paleoveneta [New Inscribed Venetic Boulders from Venetic Padua]. In B. M. Scarfi (Ed.), *Studi di archeologia della X regio in ricordo di Michele Tombolani* [Studies of Archeology of the X Regio in Memory of Michele Tombolani] (pp. 171–192). Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Marinetti, A., & Prosdocimi, A. L. (2004). Iscrizione venetica su lebete bronzeo da Cervarese S. Croce (Padova) [A Venetic Inscription on a Bronze Lebes from Cervarese (Padua)]. *Studi Etruschi*, 70, 363–368.
- Martirosyan, H. K. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayer, A. (1957–1959). *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier* (Vols. 1–2). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (2006). Zur Bildung von Griechisch θεός. *Incontri Linguistici*, 29, 119–124.
- Meißner, T. (2006). *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A Study in Diachronic Word-Formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Müller, S. (2007). *Zum Germanischen aus Laryngaltheoretischer Sicht*. Berlin; New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Neri, S. (2013). Zum urindogermanischen Wort für 'Hand'. In A. I. Cooper, J. Rau, & M. Weiss (Eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Greek and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (pp. 185–205). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Nikolaev, A. (2014). Greek ἀμυρός and Indo-European **meh*₂- 'Great, Large'. In S. W. Jamison et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (pp. 121–136). Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- NIL — Wodtko, D. S., Irslinger, B., & Schneider, C. (2008). *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.

- Nussbaum, A. J. (1999). **Jocidus*: An Account of the Latin Adjectives in *-idus*. In H. Eichner et al. (Eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae. In Memoriam Jochem Schindler* (pp. 377–419). Prague: Enigma Corporation.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2003). *A Benign Interpretation: Latin benignus and the bonus-Rule*. Talk held at the 23rd East Coast Indo-European Conference. Harvard, June 2003.
- Olsen, B. A. (1999). *The Noun in Biblical Armenian*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pinault, G.-J. (2016). Venetic *ekvopetaris* and its Indo-European background. *Wek^{os}*, 2, 179–193.
- Pocchetti, P. (2009). Problemi antichi e dati nuovi: coincidenze di teonimi e di antroponimi nell'Italia antica [Old Problems and New Evidence: Coincidence of Divine Names and Personal Names in Ancient Italy]. In P. Pocchetti (Ed.), *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica: Aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori* [Onomastics of Ancient Italy: Linguistic, Historic, Cultural, Typological and Classificatory Aspects] (pp. 219–248). Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Polomé, E. (1966). The Position of Illyrian and Venetic. In H. Birnbaum, & J. Puhvel (Eds.), *Ancient Indo-European Dialects* (pp. 59–76). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016a). *The Indo-European Names of Central Hispania. A Study in Continental Celtic and Latin Word Formation*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Prósper, B. M. (2016b). The Indo-European Ordinal Numerals 'Fourth' and 'Fifth' and the Reconstruction of the Celtic and Italic Numeral Systems. *Die Sprache*, 51, 1–50.
- Prósper, B. M. (2017). The Irreducible Gauls Used to Swear by Belenos. Or Did they? Celtic Religion, Henbane and Historical Misapprehensions. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 64(1), 255–298. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zcph-2017-0007>
- Prósper, B. M. (2018a). The Venetic Inscription from Monte Manicola and three *termini publici* from Padua: A Reappraisal. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 46, 1/2.
- Prósper, B. M. (2018b). The Venetic Agent Nouns in *-tōr-* Revisited (in print).
- Recasens, D. (2014). *Coarticulation and Sound Change in Romance*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Repanšek, L. (2016). *Quiemonis* and the Epichoric Anthroponymy of Ig. *Arheološki vestnik*, 67, 321–357.
- RLSiscia — Radman-Livaja, I. (2010). *Les plombs inscrits de Siscia* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Paris: EPHE.
- Šašel-Kos, M. (2003). Emona Was in Italy, not in Pannonia. In M. Šašel-Kos, & P. Scherrer (Eds.), *The Autonomous Towns of Noricum and Pannonia* (pp. 11–19). Ljubljana: Institute of Archaeology.
- Saussure, F. (1909). Sur les composés latins du type *agricola*. In *Philologie et linguistique. Mélanges offerts à Louis Havet par ses anciens élèves et ses amis* (pp. 459–471). Paris: Hachette.
- Schindler, J. (1975). Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In H. Rix (Ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (pp. 259–267). Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schindler, J. (1997). Zur internen Syntax der indogermanischen Nominalkomposita. In E. Crespo, & J. L. García Ramón (Eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft* [Berthold Delbrück and the Indo-European Syntax Today. Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft] (pp. 537–540). Madrid; Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schrijver, P. (1991). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Schürr, D. (2016). Zu Lykisch θθē und seiner etymologischen Interpretation. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 121(1), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1515/if-2016-0007>
- Sims-Williams, P. (2015). The Celtic Composition Vowels *-i-* and *-u-*. In G. Oudaer, G. Hily, & H. Le Bihan (Eds.), *Mélanges en l'honneur de Pierre-Yves Lambert* (pp. 313–331). Rennes: Éditions Tir.
- Solinas, P. (2007). Annotazioni sulla forma **g^hosti-* nel celtico d'Italia [Notes on the Form **g^hosti-* in Italian Celtic]. In G. Cresci Marrone, & A. Pistellato (Eds.), *Studi in ricordo di Fulviamario Broilo* [Studies in Memory of Fulviamario Broilo] (pp. 549–568). Venice: Sargon.
- Stifter, D. (2012b). On the Linguistic Situation of Roman Igg. In T. Meißner (Ed.), *Personal Names in the Western Roman World. Proceedings of a Workshop Convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis*

García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, Held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16–18 September 2011 (pp. 247–265). Berlin: Cúra Bhan.

- Stüber, K. (2002). *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Uhlich, J. (2002). Verbal Governing Compounds (Synthetics) in Early Irish and Other Celtic Languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 100, 403–433.
- Vaan, M. De (2012). Latin *danunt*. In A. I. Cooper et al. (Eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (pp. 21–25). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Vine, B. (2016). Latin *crassus, grossus, classis*. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 121, 131–158.
- Weiss, M. (2009). *An Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Weiss, M. (2017) An Italo-Celtic Divinity and a Common Sabellic Sound Change. *Classical Antiquity*, 36, 370–389.

Received 28 June 2018

ABBREVIATIONS

Categories of name

DN — Divine name

PIN — Place name

PN — Personal name

Languages

Alb.	Albanian	Lat.	Latin	OPr.	Old Prussian
Arm.	Armenian	Lith.	Lithuanian	OS.	Old Saxon
Av.	Avestan	MIr.	Middle Irish	Pael.	Paelignian
^B Toch.	Tocharian B	MLG.	Middle Low German	PGerm.	Proto-Germanic
CLuv.	Cuneiform Luvian	O.	Oscan	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Eng.	English	OCS.	Old Church Slavic	Skt.	Sanskrit
Gaul.	Gaulish	OEng.	Old English	Sp.	Spanish
Germ.	Germanic	Ogam.	Ogamic	SP.	South-Picene
Gk.	Greek	OHG.	Old High German	U.	Umbrian
Goth.	Gothic	OIc.	Old Icelandic	Ven.	Venetic
Hitt.	Hittite	OIr.	Old Irish	W.	Welsh
IE	Indo-European	OLat.	Old Latin		
Ir.	Indo-Iranian	ON.	Old Norse		

Prósper, Blanca María

PhD, Professor
Department of Indo-European
and Classical Philology
University of Salamanca
Plaza de Anaya S/N
37008 Salamanca, Spain
E-mail: indoling@usal.es

Проспер, Бланка Мария

PhD, профессор
кафедра индоевропейской
и классической филологии
Университет Саламанки
Plaza de Anaya S/N
37008 Salamanca, España
E-mail: indoling@usal.es

Бланка Мария Проспер

Университет Саламанки
Саламанка, Испания

ВЕНЕТСКИЕ ИМЕНА РИМСКОЙ СИСЦИИ

Статья посвящена анализу имен собственных, зафиксированных на свинцовых бирках из римской Сисции в Паннонии (ныне Сисак, Хорватия), на территории, где, согласно представлениям автора, имеются свидетельства сосуществования языков, принадлежащих по меньшей мере четырем ветвям индоевропейского праязыка: латинского, венетского, а также кельтских и иллирийских языков. Документы из Сисции содержат имена разного происхождения. Большинство из них, несомненно, римские, кроме того, присутствуют имена греческого и семитского происхождения, а также несколько кельтских имен, по всей видимости, нигде более не засвидетельствованных. Из этого корпуса ономастических данных автором отобрано некоторое количество имен, которые могут быть атрибутированы как итальянские или венетские и которым до сего момента не было уделено достаточно внимания со стороны лингвистов. Эти единицы, несмотря на свою немногочисленность, находят соответствия в итальянских именах и прилагательных с не всегда ясной морфологической структурой. Их анализ, выполненный с привлечением широкого круга как индоевропейских, так и неиндоевропейских данных, позволяет представить, насколько пестрым был языковой ландшафт древней Паннонии, где кельтские и итальянские племена контактировали с иллирийцами. Несмотря на то, что требуется дальнейшее уточнение ареальной и языковой атрибуции рассматриваемых имен, представленный анализ позволяет предложить их убедительные этимологические интерпретации, а также пролить свет на отдельные проблемы индоевропейской морфологии и морфонологии и выявить ряд неочевидных языковых связей как внутри, так и за пределами итальянской группы языков.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: итальянские языки, кельтские языки, венетский язык, галльский язык, иллирийские языки, итальянская ономастика, языковые контакты, индоевропейская морфология, морфонология.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 28.06.2018