ON THE INDO-EUROPEAN ORIGIN OF TWO LUSITANIAN THEO-NYMS (*LAEBO* AND *REVE*)[1]

KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK
Łódź

Lusitanian, the Pre-Celtic Indo-European language of the Hispanic Peninsula, demonstrates numerous similarities in theonymy to the Celtic areas, e.g. Lusit. *Iccona* (dat. sg.) = Gaul. *Epona* 'the horse-goddess', Lusit. *Lucubo* (dat. pl.) = Gaul. *Lugoves* (nom. pl.) and Celtiber. *Luguei* (dat. sg.). Other religious comparisons relate to an even larger Italo-Celtic geographical area, e.g. OLat. *Pales* (f.) and Lusit. *Trebo-pala*, *Tenco-pala*, Old Roman *suouetaurilia* and the analogical triple animal offerings of Lusitania (i.e. *porcom - oilam - taurom*). The author suggests two new Italo-Lusitanian equations in theonymy (namely: 1. Lusit. *Laebo* = Lat. *Laribus*, 2. *Reve* = Lat. *Ioui*, Osk. *diuvei*). Both comparisons are firmly documented by the Latin-Lusitanian texts, and additionally the latter bears a close resemblance of the formations (the same innovational declension stem **dyeu̯-*, not **diu̯-*) and an interesting exclusiveness of the epithets (e.g. Lusit. *Reve Laraucu* = Lat. *Ioui Ladico* [both dedications from Orense]). The phonological development of IE. **d* to Lusit. *r*, documented by 4 different instances (2 indubitable ones), occurs in some Italic languages, but it is absent from the Celtic language world.

Lusitanian is a scarcely attested Indo-European language from the Iberian Peninsula (see Beekes 1995, p. 27), which – in opposition to all the Celtic languages – preserved IE. **p* both initially and medially, e.g.

1) Lusitanian *porcom* (acc. sg.) 'pig' < IE. **pórk̂os* 'piglet, young pig' (cf. Lat. *porcus*, OHG. *far(a)h*, Pol. *prosię*) vs. MIr. *orc* 'piglet, young animal'.

---

2) Lusitanian *Trebo-pala* (name of a deity) < IE. **trebo-palā* 'protector of the dwelling', cf. Vedic *Viś-pala* (f.), a horse-like goddess or heroine connected with the twin gods Aśvins (see Maggi 1983), Latin *Pales* (dat. pl. *Palibus*), a divine pair of Old Roman deities, the patrons of flocks and herds. Also the Indo-European name of the divine twins **Pal-ikoi* (du. *Paliko*), preserved in the name of the Sicilian twin-gods *Palici* and Celtic *Alci* (cf. Witczak 1995, 1997), contains the same Indo-European root **pal-* 'to protect'.

Both above items (*porcom* and *Trebopala*) are attested in the Lusitanian inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas[2]. Apart from *porcom*, two other animal names are mentioned in the same document. Their equivalents are found in Celtic as well, but they differ in form from the Lusitanian words:

3) Lusit. *taurom* (acc. sg.) < IE. **taṷros* 'bull' (cf. Lat. *taurus*, Gk. *taũroj* 'bull', Lith. *taũras* 'bison', Pol. *tur* 'Auerochs') vs. Gaul. *taruos*, MIr. *tarb*, W. *tarw*, Corn. *tarow*, Bret. *taro* 'bull'. All the Celtic languages show the common metathesis *-ṷr-* > *-rṷ-*, but Lusitanian does not follow the same development.

4) Lusit. *oilam* acc. sg. (from **owi-lā-m*) < IE. **óṷis* 'sheep' (cf. Lat. *ouis*, Skt. *ávih*, Gk. ὄϊς) vs. OIr. *oi* 'ewe', Gaulish PN *Ovio-rix* (from CC. **owis*) and W. *ewig* 'doe', OCorn. *euhig* gl. *cerva* (from Brittonic **oṷikā*). Although the reconstructed archetype **oṷilā-m*, proposed by Tovar (1966-67, p. 244; 1985, p. 234) is convincing from the phonological point of view, there are no attested parallels for such a derivation from IE. **óṷis* 'sheep' in Celtic or any other Indo-European languages. Therefore I agree with K. H. Schmidt's opinion (1985, p. 336) that «the Celtic character of Lusitanian *oilam* cannot be regarded as proven».

The Lusitanian inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas contains not only a list of sacrificial animals (*porcom - oilam - taurom* = Old Latin *su-oue-taurilia*) in the accusative (sg.), but also a number of theonyms in the dative, among which two names, namely *Trebopala* and *Iccona*, are noteworthy. The former seems to be a semantical equivalent of *Viś-pala* (literally 'a protector of the dwelling'), a Vedic semigoddess of mare shape, thus the element *-pala* (attested also in another Lusitanian deity's name *Tencopala*) is a perfect example for the *p-* retention. The latter form, *Iccona*, may represent a Lusitanian equivalent of the Gaulish horse-goddess *Epona* (cf. Best 1982, pp. 64-65; Maggi 1983, pp. 58-59). If so, then we are able to add a further item to the list of the Lusitanian animal names of Indo-European origin:

---

[2]   The most important studies on this inscription have been written by the prominent Spanish linguist Antonio Tovar (1966-1967 = 1973, pp. 181-205; 1985; cf. also 1968).

5) Lusit. *icco-* < IE. **éḱu̯os* 'horse' (cf. Skt. *áśvah*, Lat. *equus*, Gk. ἵππος, Dor. also ἵκκος) vs. Gaulish *epo-*, OIr. *ech* 'horse' and W. *ebol* 'colt' (Brittonic **epālos*). Note that the Lusitanian equivalent demonstrates two features untypical of Celtic forms: (1) a different initial vocalism (*i-*) and (2) the geminate *-cc-*.

Anderson (1985) and Untermann (1987) have recently tried to prove the Celtic character of Lusitanian on the basis of name-correspondences. However, these attempts appear to be unproductive. I agree with Karl Horst Schmidt (1985, p. 325) that «name-correspondences are not sufficient proof for genetic relationship, as they can result from language contacts».

The retention of **p* is a phonological feature that excludes completely a Celtic origin of Lusitanian. A different opinion is expressed by Untermann 1987, p. 74: «Ich fürchte, eines Tages werden die Keltisten lernen müssen, mit dem *p* zu leben». Schmidt rejects completely these words. He points out that: «As long as Celtic is defined among other things by the loss of IE **p* in anlaut, the Lusitanian ins[cription]s, containing *porcom* 'pig' (with a *p*-!) do not meet this definition. To incorporate them into the Celtic languages family, as Untermann (1987) does, violates the elementary principles of linguistic reconstruction» (Schmidt 1992, pp. 55-56).

As the discussion held at the third and fourth Colloquia on Languages and Peoples of the Hispanic Peninsula clearly demonstrated, most Celtologists and Indo-Europeanists agreed that the retention of IE. **p* is one of the principal arguments for the non-Celtic character of Lusitanian. Karl Horst Schmidt lists two further premises of syntactical nature, which separate Lusitanian from Common Celtic, namely: (1) the basic word order is of the type ODS (= direct object + indirect object + subject), (2) «the position of accusative object preceding dative object» (Schmidt 1985, p. 329). Stipulating that «syntactic criteria are not sufficient in themselves to prove a linguistic relationship», Schmidt discusses a number of additional (phonological, morphological and lexical) features and concludes that the non-Celtic character of Lusitanian may be demonstrated by the following additional facts: (3) preservation of the Indo-European phoneme **p*, which disappeared in Celtic in most contexts; (4) use of the conjunction *indi* 'and', not attested in Celtic at all; (5) development of a present inflection of the root **do-* 'to give', *doenti*[3], unparalleled in Celtic; (6) lexical differences. As

---

[3]   This argument is, in my opinion, of no value. I do not agree with the traditional view

a result, Karl Horst Schmidt (1985, p. 338) "tentatively" defines Lusitanian as «a language that belongs to the southern group of western IE languages and borders on eastern IE».

Additional evidence for the non-Celtic character of Lusitanian may be adduced from the indigenous divine names of the Lusitanian-Galician regions. The inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas, which is the most valuable text in Lusitanian, contains names of five different deities (I underline them below, treating the word *loiminna* as a special epithet of *Iccona*, as well as incomplete form *tre[* occurring after *Reve*). It reads the following:

> OILAM . *TREBOPALA* .
> INDI . PORCOM . *LAEBO* .
> COMAIAM . *ICCONA* . *LOIM-*
> *INNA* . OILAM . USSEAM .
> *TREBARUNE* . INDI . TAUROM .
> IFADEM [
> *REUE TRE* [

Following Danielle Maggi (1983), who convincingly indicated a few related Indo-European equivalents for *Trebopala* and *Iccona*, I intend to discuss here two other Lusitanian theonyms: *Laebo* and *Reve*, which also demonstrate some similarities to the Italic, especially Latin, theonymy.

1. *Lusitanian* Laebo = *Latin* Laribus.

Most linguists believe that the above-mentioned Lusitanian text attests «the name of the god *Laebo* in the dative singular» (Anderson 1985, p. 322). Such an interpretation is not theoretically impossible, but I prefer to consider *Laebo* as a theonym in the dative plural[4]. My interpretation is confirmed by a number of observations:

---

that the Lusitanian verb *doenti* derives from the Indo-European root **do-* 'to give'. According to my opinion, the usual analysis the Lusitanian form as non-reduplicated equivalent of Greek δίδουσι (Dor. δίδοντι) 'he gives' is impossible from both the phonological point of view (IE. *d yields regularly Lus. *r*) and the morphological one.

[4]   This theonym appears also in the Latin inscriptions of Lusitania as *Laebo* or *Laepo* (Blázquez. 1991, pp. 140-141).

a) from the declensional point of view *Laebo*, as well as *Lucubo* 'for all the gods named Lugus', may contain the dative plural ending *-bo*;

b) Lusitanian *Laebo* can be hardly dissociated from the Gaulish formations such as *matrebo* (dat. pl. = Lat. *matribus* 'for the mothers') or *atrebo* (= Lat. *patribus* dat. pl. 'for the fathers');

c) The dative plural *Laebo* compares favourably with the Lusitanian god *Laho Paraliomego* (dat. sg.)[5] and also with the Gaulish goddess, whose name *Lahe* (dative form) is attested twice in the department of the Haute Garonna[6]. This equation suggests that *Laebo* derives from **Lahebo*.

d) The dedications for the Roman *Lares* (in dat. pl. *Laribus*, rarely in dat. sg. *Lari*) are frequent in the Latin votive inscriptions of the ancient *Lusitania*[7]. It is acceptable to propose a double equation: Lusit. *Laho* = Lat. *Lari* and Lusit. *Laebo* = Lat. *Laribus*[8]. By analogy, the Gaulish goddess *Laha* may be reminiscent of Roman *Lara*, the mother of *Lares*, and Etruscan *Lasa*.

e) this triple Gaulo-Latin-Lusitanian equivalence appears to be well justified from the etymological point of view. The Latin theonym *Lares* (OLat. *Lases* m. pl.) demonstrates a rhotacism in the root. If so, then the original Indo-European phoneme **-s-* is lenited to *-h-* (and zero) in both Gaulish and Lusitanian.

Summing up, the Lusitanian name *Laebo* appears to have an exact counterpart in *Laribus* of the Latin inscriptions from the north-western part of the Iberian Peninsula. The bundle of theonyms, derived from the same

---

[5]   Untermann (1985, p. 358, no. 5): *Laho Paraliomego* (Lugo); Bermejo Barrera, 1986, p. 148.

[6]   Cf. *CIL* XIII 142: *Lahe nu[mi]ni* (near Martres-Tolosanes) and *CIL* XIII 147: *Lahe deae* (near Le Fousseret), Bermejo Barrera, 1986, p. 148.

[7]   Untermann, 1985, p. 361, quotes six attestations of the name of *Lares* in the inscriptions of Lusitania and Galicia, namely: *Laribus Cairiesibus* (near Idanha-a-Nova, Beira Baixa), *Laribus Cerenaicis* (S. Salvador de truyas, Marco de Canaveses, Douro Litoral), *Lari Circeiebaeco Proeineitaeco* (S. Marta de Moreiras, Orense), *Lares Lubanc. Dovilonicor(um)* (Conimbriga), *Lari Pemaneieco* (S. Pedro de Readegos, Villamarín, Orense), *Laribus Inmucenbaecis Ceceaecis* (Graginha, Chaves, Tras-os-Montes). We may supplement this evidence, e.g. *Larib(us) Ormonufis* (Pitoes das Junias, Montalegre), *L(aribus) Gegeiqis* (freguesia Arcossó, Chaves), *L(aribus) Varigis* (Oimbra, Orense), see Rodríguez Colmenero, 1987, p. 330-331, 333-334, 338-341. Also Blázquez, 1991, p. 113; 1992, p. 197, cites a number of new attestations.

[8]   The Lusitanian (and Roman) cult of Lares is thoroughly discussed by Bermejo Barrera, 1986, pp. 193-230), who quotes 18 votive inscriptions, dedicated to *Lares Viales* (pp. 199-200). All these texts derive from the Ancient Galicia or Lusitania (Lugo, Pontevedra, La Coruña, Braga, Orense).

root *Las-*, is well attested in all west dialects of Indo-European, i.e. Celtic, Italic and Lusitanian.

2. *Lusitanian* Reve *(*Laraucu*) =* Latin *Ioui (*Ladico*).*

In his article on the principal god of the Lusitanians, whose name is attested nine times as *Reve* (in dat. sg. only), Francisco Villar 1996 discusses different opinions as to the origin of this god, trying to explain the etymological association not only of the divine name, but also numerous epithets of the deity. Unfortunately, his suggestions and results are highly subjective[9]. He does not take into account two essential aspects:

> a) the god in question was both the principal (*deus maximus*)[10] and most popular in the Lusitanian pantheon.

> b) the dative singular *Reve* indicates the declensional stem *Rev-*, which is worth mentioning by reason of its exceptionality and rarity.

These two premises induce us to compare the Lusitanian god with the Indo-European principal god *Dyeu̯s* (dat. sg. *diu̯-ei*, also *dyeu̯-ei*), attested in the mythological imagination of most Indo-European nations (for lexical evidence, see Witczak-Kaczor 1995, pp. 269-270)[11]. The formal aspects of the suggested comparison are perfect, but the phonological

---

[9]   It is worth noticing that *Reve*, as well as *deo Salamati*, was mistakenly classified as a god of waters. However, both deities are securely connected with the high mountains: the former god (*Reve Larauco = Ioui Ladico*) was celebrated in the mountains, which are named "los Codos de Larouco" (see Bermejo Barrera 1986, pp.126-127), the latter was «la deidad de la montaña de Sálama» (Albertos 1985, p. 470; cf. Melena 1985).

[10]   Compare two parallel votive texts: *Reve Larauco* and *Larauco D(eo) Max(umo)*, cf. Bermejo Barrera (1986, p. 127, nn. 73 and 74), Albertos (1985, p. 470). It is clear that the epithet *Deus Maximus* (typical of Iupiter) refers to *Reve* as the principal god of the Lusitanians.

[11]   The Indo-European god *Dyews (päter)* is not immediately attested in the Celtic tradition. However, Caesar informs that all the Gauls originate from Dis pater (Lat. *a Dite patre*). In my opinion, the Roman commander tried to render here Gaulish *Dis atir* ('Dis the father') partially by its Latin phonological equivalent (Gaul. *Dis* = Lat. *Dis*), partially by the semantic one (Gaul. *atir* = Lat. *pater*). Note that the Vedic religion, as well as the Gaulish one, knew the god *Dyaus pita* only as 'the father of gods and men', but all the different Indo-Iranian nations, like the other Celtic tribes, lost this deity in general.

remains partially obscure. The question is: may Lusitanian *r-* reflect Indo-European **d(y)-*?

I am inclined to give a positive answer, and the reason is that such a development is not only phonetically possible, but also it may be detected in Lusitanian vocabulary and onomastics. It is necesary to indicate the following three arguments:

> c) The process of IE. **d > r* is not phonologically unfounded, as it occurs in some Italic languages (e.g. in Umbrian), but not in Latin. The Celtic languages do not attest such development.
>
> d) Untermann 1985, p. 355, lists two epithets *Laraucu* and *Ladico* (both found in the inscriptions from Orense) to exemplify a *-r/d-* alternation in Lusitanian. He does not inform that the equivalence is in fact twofold (Lusit. *Reve Laraucu* = Lat. *Ioui Ladico*) or even fourfold (*Laraucu d<eo> max<imo> = Ioui Optimo Maximo*). Thus two pairs of cognate epithets document firmly the equation of *Reve = Ioui*[12].
>
> e) Apart from Lusit. *Reve* = Lat. *Ioui*, Osc. *diuvei* (all from IE. **dyeu̯-ei*) and Lusit. *Laraucu* = Lat. *Ladico*, two supplementary Lusitanian-Latin pairs *Reo*[13] = *deo* (dat. sg. 'for the god') and *Reae*[14] = *deae* (dat. sg. 'for the goddess') are noteworthy. In my opinion, this onomastical material is the most convincing evidence for the development of IE. **d* in Lusitanian.

The Lusitanian documentation is not plentiful, but informative. The verb *doenti* (3 pers. pl. active), attested in the Lusitanian inscription of Lamas de Moledo, seems to be the unique counterexample. However, the usual analysis of *doenti* as a non-reduplicated form with the meaning '(they) give' (cf. Greek δίδουσι, Dor. δίδοντι) is far from being certain. I prefer to see in it a compound verb containing IE. **H₁senti* (> Gr. Myc. *e-e-si*, Att. εἰσί, Skt. *sánti*, G. *sind* vs. **H₁sónti* > Lat. *sunt*, PSl. **sǫtъ*).

We may conclude with certainty that the principal god of the Lusitanians was **Revs* (attested only in dat. sg as *Reve*), a formal and etymological cousin of the Roman Iupiter and the Greek Zeus.

---

[12]   Bermejo Barrera, reviewing «los exvotos dedicados a Júpiter Ladi[c]o y a Júpiter Laraouco» (1986, p.138), also interprets *Reve* as Iupiter, the Roman chief of the gods (ibid. pp. 126-127). His equation is based on a combination of formal similarities.

[13]   Cf. *Reo Paramaeco* (Lugo), according to Untermann, 1985, p. 359, no. 16.4. It is a simple possibility, not a firm evidence. The same refers to the next suggestion.

[14]   *Reae* (Lugo), see Untermann, 1985, p. 359, no. 16.7. Does it derive from REΛE (a scribal error in place of REVE)?

Conclusions

The Lusitanian (inscriptional) documentation, much of it in the form of votive offerings, refers in large degree to the names of indigenous deities. This theonymic evidence is sometimes highly useful not only in researching the native religions of the Iberian Peninsula, but also in reconstructing the historical development of Lusitanian phonology.

Lusitanian belongs, in my opinion, to the western subgroup of the Indo-European languages, but it differs from the Celtic speech by some phonological phenomena (e.g. in Lusitanian IE. *p* is preserved, but IE *d* is changed into *r*; Common Celtic, in contrary, retains IE. *d* and loses *p*).

REFERENCES

Albertos, L. 1985. «A propósito de algunas divinidades lusitanas», in: J. L. Melena (ed.), *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae*, Pars prior, Vitoria-Gasteiz 1985, pp. 469-474.

Anderson, J. M. 1985. «Pre-Roman Indo-European languages of the Hispanic Peninsula», *Revue des Études Anciennes* 87, 1985, pp. 319-326.

Beekes, R. S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.

Bermejo Barrera, J. C. 1986. *Mitología y mitos de la Hispania Prerromana*, vol. 2, Madrid.

Best, J. G. P. 1982. «Zur frühindoeuropäischen Sprache in Lusitanien», *TALANTA. Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society*, vol. 13, 1981: *Supplementum epigraphicum mediterraneum*, Middelie 1982, pp. 63-68.

Blázquez, J. M. 1991. *Religiones en la España antigua*, Madrid.

Blázquez, J. M. 1992. «Recientes aportaciones a las religiones prerromanas de Hispania. II», *Gerión* 10, 1992, pp. 193-203.

Maggi, D. 1983. «Sui teonimi *Trebopala* e *Iccona* nell'iscrizione lusitana del Cabeço das Fráguas», in: E. Campanile (ed.), *Problemi di lingua e di cultura nel campo indoeuropeo*. Pisa, 1983, pp. 53-60.

Melena, J. L. 1985. «Salama, Jálama y la epigrafía latina del antiguo corregimiento», in: J. L. Melena (ed.), *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae*, Pars prior, Vitoria-Gasteiz 1985, pp. 475-530.

Rodríguez Colmenero, A. 1987. «Un importante grupo de nuevos teónimos Galaicos», in: J. Gorrochategui, J. L. Melena & J. Santos (eds.), *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Colo quio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas (Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985)* (= *Veleia* 2-3, 1985-1986). Vitoria ,1987, pp. 327-354.

Schmidt, K. H. 1985. «A Contribution to the Identification of Lusitanian», in: J. de Hoz (ed.), *Actas del III Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas (Lisboa, 5-8 no viembre 1980)*. Salamanca, 1985, pp. 319-341.

Schmidt, K. H. 1992. «The Celtic Problem. Ethnogenesis (location, date?)», *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 45, 1992, pp. 38-65.

Tovar, A. 1966-67. «L'inscription du Cabeço das Fráguas et la langue des Lusitaniens», *Études Celtiques* 11.2, 1966-1967, pp. 237-268 (= Tovar 1973, p. 181-205).

Tovar, A. 1968. «La lengua lusitana y los sostratos hispánicos», in: *Actas del XI Congreso Internacional de Linguistica y Filologia Románicas, Madrid 1965*. Madrid, 1968, pp. 491-497.

Tovar, A. 1973. *Sprachen und Inschriften. Studien zum Mykenischen, Lateinischen und His panokeltischen*. Amsterdam.

Tovar, A. 1985. «La inscripción de Cabeço das Fráguas y la lengua de los Lusitanos», in: J. de Hoz (ed.), *Actas del III Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas (Lis boa, 5-8 noviembre 1980)*. Salamanca, 1985, pp. 227-253.

Untermann, J. 1985. «Los teónimos de la región lusitano-gallega como fuente de las lenguas indígenas», in: J. de Hoz (ed.), *Actas del III Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Pale ohispánicas (Lisboa, 5-8 noviembre 1980)*. Salamanca, 1985, pp. 343-363.

Untermann, J. 1987. «Lusitanisch, Keltiberisch, Keltisch», in: J. Gorrochategui, J. L. Melena & J. Santos (eds.), *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas (Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985)*. (= *Veleia* 2-3, 1985-1986), Vitoria-Gasteiz ,1987, pp. 57-76.

Villar, F. 1996. «El teónimo lusitano *Reve* y sas epítetos», in: W. Meid, P. Anreiter (eds.), *Die grösseren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler: Akten des Kolloquiums Innsbruck*, *29. April - 3. Mai 1993*, Innsbruck, pp. 160-211.

Witczak, K. T. 1995. «Mit o boskich bliźniętach w nowym oświetleniu, część I: Palikowie», *Meander* 50, No. 9-10, 1995, pp. 401-410. (in Polish; Latin summ.)

Witczak, K. T. 1997. «Śląsk w epoce antycznej: kult Alków (Tacyt, *Germania* 43) i jego cel tycka geneza», in: *Tradycje kultury antycznej na Śląsku*, Opole 1997, pp. 43-56. (in Polish; German summ.: *Schlesien in der Zeit der Antike: Der Kult der Alken [*Tacitus*, Germania* 43*] und sein keltischer Ursprung*)

Witczak, K. T. and Kaczor, I. 1995. «Linguistic Evidence for the Indo-European Pantheon», in: J. Rybowska, K. T. Witczak (eds.), *Collectanea Philologica II in honorem An nae Mariae Komornicka*, Łódź, 1995, pp. 265-278.