

EMERITA. Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica (EM)  
LXXIV 1, enero-junio de 2006  
pp. 77-88  
ISSN 0013-6662

REMARKS ON THE  
MORPHOLOGY, PHONOLOGY, AND ORTHOGRAPHY OF  
HISP.-CELT. LVGVEI AND RELATED MATTERS

JOSEPH. F. ESKA

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Mientras hay consenso general que la forma hispano-céltica LVGVEI es el singular dativo del nombre divino *Lugus*, no hay consenso alguno sobre su representación fonológica ni morfológica; desde la perspectiva proto-céltica, la forma debe presentarse ortográficamente como \*⟨LVGOVEI⟩. Este trabajo evalúa los estudios anteriores y propone que la forma atestiguada, de hecho, continúa la forma heredada de una manera regular.

*Palabras clave:* ablaut proterocinético; inflexión de los temas en *-u*; ortografía económica; igualar paradigmático.

While there is general consensus that the Hispano-Celtic form LVGVEI is the dative singular of the divine name *Lugus*, there is none at all about what its orthography represents phonologically and morphologically; from the proto-Celtic perspective, the form should appear as orthographic \*⟨LVGOVEI⟩. This paper assesses previous scholarship and argues that the attested form, in fact, continues the inherited form in a regular way.

*Key words:* proterokinetic ablaut; *u*-stem flexion; economic orthography; paradigm leveling.

I. INTRODUCTORY MATTERS \*

1. Though a general consensus exists that the epigraphic form LVGVEI, attested twice in the long Hispano-Celtic inscription from Peñalba de Villastar (*MLH* K.3.3)<sup>1</sup>, is the dative singular of the *u*-stem theonym *Lugus* – cf. Transalp. Celt. nom. sg. λουγους (*RIG* G–159) (see Wodtko 2000, pp. 234–236), the same cannot be said concerning the morphology and phonology of the form.

\* I should like to thank Raimo Anttila, Jay Friedman, Jared Klein, Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine for helpful discussion. All opinions expressed herein are my responsibility alone. — Epigraphic abbreviations: Round brackets ( ) indicate characters left out by the engraver; square brackets [ ] indicate characters which are restored; the underdot ˙ indicates characters which have been damaged or which are no longer clearly legible; angled brackets < > indicate characters which replace those erroneously incised by the engraver; the tie-bar — indicates ligatures; the pipe | indicates line breaks.

<sup>1</sup> Untermann 1997, pp. 624–625 allows that the first token could be read as LVGVEꞑ, though the syntactic analysis of the inscription by Ködderitzsch 1985, pp. 213 leaves no doubt in my mind that it should be read as dat. sg. LVGVEI.

2. The singular flexion of *u*-stems in proto-Indo-European followed a proterokinetic flexional pattern<sup>2</sup>, such that the root bore full-grade and the suffix nil-grade vocalism in the strong cases (Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 208–212)<sup>3</sup>, while the opposite situation obtained in the weak cases. In the *u*- (and *i*-) stems of the Indo-European daughter languages, however, this situation has been simplified. Nil-grade vocalism in the root occurs in all but a vanishingly small number of strong stems, and the accent is fixed on the root or the suffix throughout the paradigm of an etymon; thus the nil-grade vocalism in the root of Transalp. Celt. nom. sg. λουγους /lugus/.

This leads us to expect \*-ouēi as the dative singular desinence in Hispano-Celtic *u*-stems, as attested by Skt. *-ave*, OLat. *-VEI* (later *-uī*), and OChS *-ovi*<sup>4</sup>. A number of scholars have treated the discrepancy between attested LVGVEI and expected \*lugouēi, explaining it via morphological, phonological, and orthographical factors. In this brief reassessment of a problem whose analysis is rendered more difficult by the fragmentary nature of the Hispano-Celtic corpus, I offer some commentary on previous research and introduce some new elements into the discussion.

## II. OTHER RELEVANT FORMS

3. The principal relevant epigraphic comparanda for LVGVEI from ancient continental Europe are as follows (see also Stifter 1997, pp. 216–217)<sup>5</sup>:

<sup>2</sup> It appears that proterokinetic flexion may have been confined to the singular in proto-Indo-European; animate plurals of these nouns may have borne hysterokinetic flexion, in which the root bears nil-grade and the suffix full-grade vocalism in the strong cases (nominative and sometimes accusative in the plural) (Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 212–216), but in which both bear nil-grade vocalism in the weak cases (so McCone 1992, pp. 106–107).

<sup>3</sup> The strong cases in the singular flexion are the nominative, accusative, and vocative, and sometimes also the locative (see Meier-Brügger 2002, p. 203).

<sup>4</sup> The Transalpine Celtic *u*-stem dative singular theonym ταρανοου /taranou/ (RIG G–27) either is modelled after the *i*-stem pattern gen. sg. *\*-ejs*, dat. sg. *\*-ei* (← *\*-eiej* by haplology) (cf. the Transalpine Celtic *i*-stem dative singular theonym VCVETE to acc. sg. VCVE-TIN (RIG L–13) and Latinised dat. sg. VCVETI (CIL xiii 11247)), thus *u*-stem gen. sg. *\*-ous*, dat. sg. *-ou* (← *\*-ouēi*) (so Klingenschmitt 1992, p. 119), or has syncretised with inherited loc. sg. *\*-ōu* with shortening of the diphthong (so Thurneysen 1946, p. 194).

<sup>5</sup> These and many other epigraphic tokens of derivatives of the root *l(o)ug-* attested in ancient Hispania, including theonyms, idionyms, and toponyms, are listed by Sagredo & Hernández Guerra 1996. See also Tovar 1981 & 1982.

## (1) Nominative singular:

- a. Transalp. Celt. λουγους (*RIG* G–159)

## Nominative plural:

- b. Transalp. Celt. LVGOVES (*CIL* xiii 5078)

## Dative plural:

- c. Hisp.-Celt. LV $\widehat{\text{CO}}$ VBV (*IRG* 18)<sup>6</sup>  
 d. Transalp. Celt. LV $\widehat{\text{CV}}$ BVS (*CIL* xii 3080)  
 e. Hisp.-Celt. LV $\widehat{\text{CV}}$ BO (*IRG* 19)  
 f. Hisp.-Celt. [L]V $\widehat{\text{CO}}$ BO (*CIL* ii 6338<sup>v</sup> = *ECEDO* 7)<sup>7</sup>  
 g. Hisp.-Celt. LVGOVIBVS (*CIL* ii 2818)  
 h. Hisp.-Celt. LVGOVEBV[S] (*AE* 1912, 12)

There is little doubt that (a) is an inherited Celtic form, and it is possible that (b) is, as well, though a Latinised form would not differ from the inherited nominative plural save in the vowel quantity of the desinence, which is not captured by the orthography. The remaining forms all occur in Latin contexts, however, and have been Latinised in various ways. (c) preserves the inherited vocalism of the suffix, but has adopted Latin vocalism in the desinence<sup>8</sup>. (g) and (h) go further and affix the normal Latin *u*-stem dative plural desinence *-ibus* to the Celtic stem.<sup>9</sup> (e) and (f) reflect the common development of *-us/ > -o/* word finally in the Latin of Hispania (Carnoy 1906, pp. 179–180) and demonstrate the differential treatment of inherited *\*/ou/* as */o:/* or */u:/* attested in this regional Latin, as well (Carnoy 1906, pp. 63–64). It is probable that (d), too, attested in Transalpine Gaul, evinces a Latinised monophthongisation of the inherited stem vowel. Among these

<sup>6</sup> I regard the writing of <C> for /g/ not as an error by the engraver or evidence that we are dealing with a different etymon, but as a token of quasi-phonetic orthography in view of the fact that /g/ is normally realised as [k] phonetically in the modern Celtic languages. I intend to publish on this matter in the future.

<sup>7</sup> The reading is after Untermann 1980, p. 375. *CIL* reads VGINO and *ECEDO* reads VOPO, but the photograph in *ECEDO* clearly supports Untermann's reading.

<sup>8</sup> Loss of final *-s/* in (c) in a highly characterised desinence such as the dative plural is not surprising; Carnoy 1906, pp. 179–199 lists numerous contexts in which it does not appear in the Latin of Hispania.

<sup>9</sup> The lowering of */i/* to */e/* in (h) reflects a common development in the Latin of Hispania post-tonically, as well as in other positions; see Carnoy 1906, esp. p. 23.

forms, (c), (g), and (h) are key in that they demonstrate that the inherited form of the suffix was preserved in the weak stem.

### III. PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

4. There have been a variety of attempts to elucidate the unexpected shape of LVGVEI. The first, with which I am in sympathy in principle, posits that *u*-stem dat. sg. -VEI directly continues inherited *\*-oue̅i*. Though he is not explicit, Lejeune 1955, pp. 9 & 9<sup>8</sup> apparently suggests that *\*-oue̅i* > *\*-uue̅i*. He does not, however, discuss the realisation of the latter as orthographic -⟨VEI⟩. One might presume that he would have agreed with Wodtko's 2000, p. 235 report that there are not any geminates attested in the inscription.<sup>10</sup> Schmidt 1960, p. 183 suggests that *Hispano-Celt. -VEI* evolved in precisely the same way as *OLat. -VEI*, viz., proto-IE *\*-eue̅i* > *\*-oue̅i* > *\*-uue̅i*, written -⟨VEI⟩ (as per Leumann 1977, p. 135)<sup>11</sup>. Villar 1997, p. 923 likewise believes that inherited *\*-oue̅i* underlies orthographic -⟨VEI⟩, but he does not explain the process via which the change would have occurred.

5. Jordán 2004, p. 114 maintains that *u*-stem dat. sg. -VEI is analogical with the dative singular of *i*-stems. I do not understand his statement, for the attested *i*-stem desinence in Hispano-Celtic is -E < proto-Celt. *\*-e̅i* ← proto-IE *\*-e̅e̅i* by haplology, e.g.:

- (2) a. GENTE (*MLH* K.11.1); cf. nom. sg. **CenTiś** (e.g., *MLH* K.1.3 i 39)  
 b. ṢTENIONTE̅ (*MLH* K.11.1); cf. gen. sg. Ṣ**TenioTeś** (*MLH* K.17.1)<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Though I note that it is not certain that there are any phonological geminates that could have been recorded in the inscription. Only the first person plural verb COMEIMV, which has been connected by Ködderitzsch 1985, p. 217 to *\*me̅i*- 'change' and by Meid 1994, p. 389 to *\*h<sub>1</sub>e̅i*- 'go', appears to be at all possible.

<sup>11</sup> My view is very substantially the same as Schmidt's, though with some added details which are presented in §§8–10.

<sup>12</sup> This idionym has often been understood to be a *nt*-stem, but **Ti̅riCanToś** (Bot. IV A3) now guarantees that the genitive singular desinence of this stem class bore *o*-grade vocalism. Other attested forms of this idionym are nom. sg. Ṣ**TenionTeś** (*MLH* K.1.3 iv 2) and Latinised gen. sg. STENIONTIS (*HEp.* 3, 191). All are consistent with classification of the idionym as an *i*-stem. ṢTENIONTE̅ and Ṣ**TenioTeś** represent monophthongisations of dat. sg. *\*-e̅i* and gen. sg. *\*-e̅is*, respectively. For -e- for expected -i- in the final syllable of nom. sg. Ṣ**TenionTeś**, one can compare **ar̅e-** (e.g., *MLH* K.6.1) < *\*ari-*; one might also compare

An analogy with the *i*-stem desinence would have yielded dat. sg. *-ou*, as may have been the case in Translantine Celtic (see n. 5).

6. Wodtko 2000, p. 235, in addition to the view that -VEI continues inherited *\*-oueī*, also suggests that *u*-stems in Hispano-Celtic were remodelled after consonant stems, yielding *lugu-* as the stem for the theonym. The existence of forms such as Latinised LVGOVIBVS and LVCOVBV render such a view extremely unlikely, however, for inherited *\*/ou/* was monophthongised in Latin (cf. §3); the diphthong must, then, be Celtic.

7. Stifter 1997, pp. 218–219 proposes that not only LVGVEI, but also the dative singular verbal abstracts (which function as infinitives) in (3), which likewise bore inherited proterokinetic flexion<sup>13</sup>, reflect a remaking of the proterokinetic flexion in the dative singular of Hispano-Celtic only, such that the inherited full-grade vocalism of the weak stem suffix was replaced by nil-grade *-u-*.

- (3) a. [a]mPiTinCounēi (MLH K.1.1 A6)  
 b. Taunēi (MLH K.1.1 A2)  
 c. Tisaunēi (MLH K.1.1 A2)  
 d. [u]eʳTaunēi (MLH K.1.1 A2)  
 e. ušimounēi (Bot. IV A6)

The motivation for this change, according to Stifter, would be that the proterokinetic flexional paradigm possessed a descriptively hysterokinetic or amphikinetic (see Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 218–220) instrumental singular (Schindler apud Hollifield 1980: 45)<sup>14</sup>, in both of which the suffix bore nil-grade vocalism, and that syncretism between the dative and instrumental singular commonly occurs in later Celtic.

---

**Cañaves** (MLH A.66), which appears to be identical with the toponym attested as Κάραουον (Appian, *Hisp.* 43; acc. sg.) and *Caravi* (*It. Ant.* 443.1), though the identification of the desinence remains under discussion.

<sup>13</sup> Whether they continue the nil-grade of the formans *\*-uer/n-* or *\*-men-*, which remains uncertain.

<sup>14</sup> To which Stifter 1997, p. 219 adds the directional case of proto-Indo-European after the teaching of Martin Peters.

But syncretism between cases normally involves not the suffix of a noun, but the desinence, e.g., cf. inherited *n*-stem dat. sg. **-on-ei**, e.g., **Piuonei** (*CI* 26), with innovatory **-on-i**, e.g., **Kuaṣoni** (*CI* 20), ← locative singular in early Cisalpine Celtic (Eska & Wallace 2001). We do not have hard evidence for syncretism elsewhere in Hispano-Celtic, but we can look to Old Irish. To be sure, proto-IE instr. pl. *\*-bʰis* replaced dat. pl. *\*-bʰos* in all stem classes in Old Irish as evidenced by *-(a)ib*. But it is the instrumental desinence that took over the function of the dative case. It is also far from clear that the dative and instrumental cases syncretised in any stem class in Old Irish, as demonstrated in (4).

- (4) a. Thematic dative singulars, e.g., *fiur* «man», presuppose a desinence with *u*-quality, which could continue proto-Celt. instr. sg. *\*-ū* < proto-IE *\*-oh<sub>1</sub>*, but could equally well represent an apocope of proto-Celt. dat. sg. *\*-ūi* < proto-IE *\*-ōi* < *\*-o-ej*. Compare earlier Transalp. Celt. dat. sg. -ουι = /u:i/, e.g., in the idionym ἀδγεν|νουι (*RIG* G–208), with later -v = /u:/, e.g., in the idionym ELVONTIV (*RIG* \*L-4). Such an apocope lies behind Latin thematic dat. sg. *-ō* < *\*-ōi* (Leumann 1977: 425–426).
- b. *ā*-stem dative singulars, e.g., *túaith* «tribe», presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably *\*-ī*, which likely represents a contraction of inherited dat. sg. *\*/ai/* < *\*-āi*. Cf. earlier Transalpine Celtic *-ai*, e.g., in the idionym εσκεγγαι (*RIG* G–146) with later *-i* = *\*/i:/*, e.g., in the theonym βηλη|σαμυ (*RIG* G–153).
- c. *i*-stem dative singulars, e.g., *cnáim* ‘bone’, presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably *\*-ē*, which continues inherited proto-Celt. dat. sg. *\*-ei* ← proto-IE *\*-eiej*. Cf. the Transalpine Celtic theonym VCVETE (*RIG* L–13) and see n. 5.
- d. *u*-stem dative singulars, e.g., *mug* ‘slave’, presuppose a desinence with *u*-quality; it is not consistent with the *\*/ou/* attested to by Transalp. Celt. dat. sg. *u*-stem ταρανοου (*RIG* G–27), but one can compare *-ou* = *\*/u:/* in Transalp. Celt. βρατου ‘with gratitude’ (e.g., *RIG* G–28), if it is to be identified as a *u*-stem instrumental singular (though note that identification as a thematic instr. sg. *-ū* < *\*-oh<sub>1</sub>* is also possible; cf. Oscan thematic neut. acc. sg. βρατωμ ‘(willing) gift’ (*ST* Lu 39.6), gen. sg. *brateis* (*ST* Lu 1.6) and see Thurneysen 1946, p. 196).
- e. Consonant stem long dative singulars, e.g., *ríg* ‘king’, presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably *-i*, syncretised from the

inherited locative singular. Cf. Transalp. Celt. EPADATEXTO|RICI (*RIG* L-6), though it could have been \*-ē, which continues inherited proto-Celt. dat. sg. \*-eī, as attested by earlier Cisalpine Celt. **-ei**, e.g., **aTilonei** (*CI* 12).

In only the thematic and the *u*-stems, then, is it possible that the dative singular continues the instrumental singular form. But even were one to grant that such a merger is what occurred, we should note that the proto-Indo-European suffix – \*-o- or \*-u-, respectively – and desinence \*-h<sub>1</sub> had long since merged in the distant prehistory of Celtic and that, in synchronic terms, it is the desinence, not the suffix, that syncretised in Old Irish.

#### IV. A NEW APPROACH. CELTIC TEXT AND LATIN ORTHOGRAPHIC PRACTICE

8. The view of Lejeune, Schmidt, and Wodtko that inherited *\*lugouēi* > *\*luguuēi* appears to me to have substantial merit. It is well known that there is a tendency in Hispano-Celtic for /o/ to be labialised to /u/ when adjacent to a non-final labial (Eska 1995: 9–13). Thus proto-IE thematic dat. pl. *\*-ob<sup>h</sup>os* is usually attested as **-uPoś**, e.g., **louCaiTeiTuPoś** (*MLH* K.0.7), but may appear with unaltered stem vowel in OILOBOS (*MLH* K.3.11)<sup>15</sup>. Cf. also COMEIMV (*MLH* K.3.3) and **rusimus** (*MLH* K.1.1 A11), which, in my view, continue 1. pl. *\*-mos*.

9. Should we adopt the view that *\*lugouēi* > *\*luguuēi*, I would suggest that the engraving of <v> for /uw/ may not be either merely a random failure to note an orthographic geminate (as hinted at by Wodtko)<sup>16</sup> or a regular orthographic practice of Hispano-Celtic when engraved in Roman characters (as per Schmidt, who sees an identity with Latin orthographic practice)<sup>17</sup>. The fact that the inscription is engraved in Roman characters may be pivotal to our analysis, however. As an alternative explanation, then, I would propose that the orthographic representation of -/uw/- by -<v>- is a token of «econo-

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the fact that in Old Latin, all unstressed vowels were rounded to proximate phonetic [Y], spelt both as <u> and <i>, before labial consonants; see Leumann 1977, pp. 87–90, Sommer & Pfister 1977, pp. 82–85, and Meiser 1998, p. 68.

<sup>16</sup> Though let us note TVRROS (*MLH* K.3.8) beside TVROS (*MLH* K.3.9) in the graffiti from Peñalba de Villastar.

<sup>17</sup> For which, to the best of my knowledge, there is no evidence either for or against.

mic orthography», a feature of Latin orthography attested throughout the Roman world, e.g.g.:

- (5) a. FLVIA /fluwia/ (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup> 584.9)  
 b. IVENT(us) /juwentus/ (*CIL* ii 3479)  
 c. OINVORSEI /oinuworsi:/ (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup> 581.19)

Under such an analysis, Schmidt's view is substantially correct, though the economic orthography would not be native to Hispano-Celtic practice, but an artifact of the inscription being engraved in Roman characters.

For a typological parallel, compare the situation in the Sabellic languages, in which /i/ and /j/ in combination and /u/ and /w/ in combination are normally both written in the native script, while economic orthography is employed to an overwhelming degree in inscriptions engraved in Roman characters (Buck 1904, pp. 28–29), e.g.g.:

- (6) a. Osc. **eítiuam** (*ST* Po 3.1) : *etuam* (*ST* Lu 1.19)  
 b. Umb. **tria** (*ST* Um 1 iv 2) : *trio* (*ST* Um 1 vii<sup>a</sup> 51)  
 c. Umb. **prinuatus** (e.g., *ST* Um 1 i<sup>b</sup> 19) : *prinuatur* (e.g., *ST* Um 1 vi<sup>b</sup> 50)

That such a literate Roman practice should be employed in a Hispano-Celtic inscription should not be surprising. There were a number of Latin inscriptions engraved at Peñalba de Villastar; one, located amongst the Celtic inscriptions and engraved in the same type of hand, even is so erudite as to record a sentence from the second book of Vergil's *Aeneid* (II 268–269) (see further de Hoz 1979, pp. 245–246):

- (7) tempus erat quo prima quies mortalibus aegris inc[ipit]  
 “It was the time when, for weary mortals, their first rest begins”.

10. The orthography of LVGVEI, then, is likely not to be essentially aberrant in any way. While it is possible that it represents a common sound change and a random failure to engrave an orthographic geminate, it is at least as likely to represent a token of a Latin orthographic practice solely because the inscription is engraved in Roman characters<sup>18</sup>. As so often in the Conti-

<sup>18</sup> It is possible that the forms LVCVBVS and LVCVBO, discussed in §3, are susceptible to a similar analysis.



mental Celtic linguistic record, whereas LVGVEI has often been thought to be the product of engraver error or, at least, linguistically problematic, in the end, it is not so.

#### V. CODA. THE FORMANS **-UN-** IN VERBAL ABSTRACTS

11. The fact that LVGVEI and the dative singular verbal abstracts in **-un-** listed in (3) both appear to bear nil-grade vocalism in their suffixes when full-grade is expected does not mean that both must be explained in the same way. The verbal abstracts, for which we expect proterokinetic *\*-uenej* or *\*-menej*, are not susceptible to the phonological and orthographic explanation that I have advanced for LVGVEI. Their unexpectedly vocalism can only be explained as analogical.

12. Whether the verbal abstracts continue the formans *\*-uer/n-* or *\*-men-*, I propose that the nil-grade vocalism in **-un-** is simply modeled after the strong stem, where it is regular. It is well known that the Celtic languages have a pronounced tendency to level paradigmatic ablaut. An example is found even in the fragmentary Hispano-Celtic corpus, in which hysterokinetic non-neuter *n*-stems have leveled the vocalism of the suffix throughout the paradigm after that inherited in the nominative singular, viz.:

- (8) nom. sg. **melmu** (*MLH* K.1.1 B2)  
 gen. sg. **mel|munos** (*MLH* K.0.11)  
 dat. sg. TIATV<N>EI (*MLH* K.3.3)<sup>19</sup>

A precise parallel exists in Luwian, which forms its verbal abstract (= infinitive) by affixing *-un-a* (with allative singular desinence), instead of expected full-grade *\*-uan-a*, directly to the verbal root (Starke 1990, pp. 531–535), just as appears to be the norm in Hispano-Celtic.

#### VI. RECAPITULATION

13. I conclude by rehearsing the findings of this paper:

<sup>19</sup> The sixth character of this form is clearly engraved as <M>, but it is mostly likely to be analysed as a *n*-stem idionym.

- a. The most straightforward way to get to the unexpected orthography of LVGVEI is to propose that \*/o/ in inherited \**lugouei* was labialised yielding \*/luguwei/.
- b. Rather than assuming that /uw/ was normally spelt <v> in Hispano-Celtic epigraphy, as is common in Roman practice, it is probable that this token of economic orthography represents a Roman spelling rule applied to a Celtic text engraved in Roman characters. A strong typological parallel is attested in the Sabellic languages.
- c. There is no reason to assume that the unexpected suffixal vocalism of LVGVEI and the Hispano-Celtic verbal abstracts in **-un-** are manifestations of the same linguistic phenomenon.
- d. Whether the verbal abstracts in **-un-** are *uer/n-* or *men-* stems, it seems most straightforward to think that the unexpected nil-grade vocalism of the formans is modelled after the strong stem, in which it would be regular, especially in view of the fact that the Celtic languages are known for commonly levelling paradigmatic ablaut. A precise parallel exists in Luwian, which forms its verbal abstract (= infinitive) by affixing nil-grade *-una* directly to the verbal root, just as Hispano-Celtic does.

		ABBREVIATIONS
<i>AE</i>	=	<i>L'année épigraphique</i>
Bot IV	=	Villar, Díaz, Medrano, & Jordán 2001
<i>CI</i>	=	Solinas 1995
<i>CIL</i>	=	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>ECEDO</i>	=	Iglesias Gil 1976
<i>HEp.</i>	=	<i>Hispania epigraphica</i>
<i>It. Ant.</i>	=	Cuntz 1929: 1–85
<i>IRG</i>	=	Vázquez Saco & Vázquez Seijas 1954
<i>MLH A</i>	=	Untermann 1975
<i>MLH K</i>	=	Untermann 1997, pp. 349–722
<i>RIG G</i>	=	Lejeune 1985
<i>RIG L</i>	=	Lejeune 1988, pp. 55–194
<i>ST</i>	=	Rix 2002

## REFERENCES

- Buck, Carl Darling 1904, *A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, Boston.
- Carnoy, A. 1906, *Le latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions. Etude linguistique*, Bruxelles.
- Cuntz, Otto (ed.) 1929, *Itineraria Romana i, Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*, Leipzig.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1995, «Two notes on phonology in Continental Celtic», *Studia Celtica Japonica* 7, pp. 9–19.
- , & Rex E. Wallace 2001, «A syncretism in fieri in early Celtic», *Indogermanische Forschungen* 106, pp. 229–240.
- Hollifield, Patrick Henry 1980, «The phonological development of final syllables in Germanic», *Die Sprache* 26, pp. 19–53.
- de Hoz, Javier 1979, «Escritura e influencia clásica en los pueblos prerromanos de la Península», *Archivo español de arqueología* 52, pp. 227–250.
- Iglesias Gil, José Manuel 1976, *Epigrafía cántabra. Estereometría, decoración y onomástica*, Santander.
- Jordán Cólera, Carlos 2004, *Celtibérico*, Zaragoza.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert 1992, «Die lateinische Nominalflexion», in *Latein und Indogermanisch* (Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.–26. September 1986), hrsg. Oswald Panagl & Thomas Krisch, Innsbruck, pp. 89–135.
- Köderitzsch, Rolf 1985, «Die große Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar», in *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen*, hrsg. Hermann M. Ölberg & Gernot Schmidt unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bothien, Innsbruck, pp. 211–222.
- Lejeune, Michel 1955, *Celtiberica*, Salamanca.
- , 1985, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises i, Textes gallo-grecs*, Paris.
- , 1988, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises ii/1, Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre*, Paris.
- Leumann, Manu 1977, *Lateinische Grammatik i, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München.
- McCone, Kim 1992, «OIr. *aub* ‘river’ and *amnair* ‘maternal uncle’», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 53, pp. 101–111.
- Meid, Wolfgang 1994, «Die ‘große’ Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar», in *Indogermanica et Caucasia. Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. Roland Bielmeier & Reinhard Stempel unter Mitarbeit von René Lanzweert, Berlin, pp. 385–394.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael 2002, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*<sup>8</sup>, Berlin.
- Meiser, Gerhard 1998, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt.
- Rix, Helmut 2002, *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*, Heidelberg.
- Sagredo, L., & L. Hernández Guerra 1996, «Los testimonios epigraficos de LVG en Hispania», *Memorias de historia antigua* 17, pp. 179–201.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst 1960, «Review of Schmoll 1959», *Kratylos* 5, pp. 181–186.

- Schmoll, Ulrich 1959, *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische*, Wiesbaden.
- Solinas, Patrizia 1995, «Il celtico in Italia», *Studi etruschi* 60, pp. 311–408.
- Sommer, Ferdinand, & Raimund Pfister 1977, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre i, Einleitung und Lautlehre*<sup>4</sup>, Heidelberg.
- Starke, Frank 1990, *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden.
- Stifter, David 1997, «Celtiberian *-unei, Luguē*», *Die Sprache* 39, pp. 213–223.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf 1946, *A grammar of Old Irish*, rev. ed., Dublin.
- Tovar, Antonio 1981, «El dios céltico *Lugu* en Hispania», in *La religión romana en Hispania* (Simposio organizado por el Instituto de Arqueología «Rodrigo Caro» del CSIC del 17 al 19 de diciembre de 1979), Madrid, pp. 277–282.
- , 1982, «The god *Lugus* in Spain», *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 29, pp. 591–599.
- Untermann, Jürgen, 1975, *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum i, Die Münzlegenden*, Wiesbaden.
- , 1980, «Namenkundliche Anmerkungen zu lateinischen Inschriften aus Kantabrien», *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* NF 15, pp. 367–392.
- (unter Mitwirkung von Dagmar Wodtko), 1997, *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum iv, Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.
- Vázquez Saco, Francisco, & Manuel Vázquez Seijas (ed.), 1954, *Inscripciones romanas de Galicia ii, Provincia de Lugo*, Santiago.
- Villar, Francisco, 1997, «The Celtiberian language», *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 49–50, pp. 898–949.
- , M.<sup>a</sup> Antonia Díaz, Manuel M.<sup>a</sup> Medrano, & Carlos Jordán, 2001, *El IV bronce de Botorrita (Contrebia Belaisca). Arqueología y lingüística*, Salamanca.
- Wodtko, Dagmar S., 2000, *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum v, Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.

Con arreglo a las normas editoriales vigentes para las publicaciones periódicas del CSIC, se hace constar que el original definitivo de este artículo se recibió en la redacción de EMERITA en el segundo semestre de 2005, siendo aprobada su publicación en ese mismo periodo (8.11.05 - 11.12.05).