

ON SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS IN ALISE-SAINTE-REINE
(CÔTE-D'OR), AGAIN

§ 1. *Introductory matters.* Perhaps the best known monument of Gaulish epigraphy, the so-called *Martialis*-inscription (RIG L–13), was discovered on Mont Auxois, c. 50 km. northwest of Dijon, during excavations in 1839. It is engraved in capitals on a limestone block 49 cm. in height, 74 cm. in width and 13 cm. thick. The text appears on the stone¹ as follows:²

(1) MARTIALIS · DANNŌTALI
IEVRV · VCVETE · SOSĪN̄
3 CELICNON ♠ ETIC
GOBEDBI · DVGIJONTIJO
♠ ṼCVETIN ♠
6 IN []ALISIJA

It is clear in l. 6 of the text that the preposition IN is complete, as is the toponym ALISIJA.³ There is room for no more than a single character in the damaged area of the line. Rhÿs 1911–1912: 290 reports that Otto Hirschfeld and Karl Zangemeister, the editors of volume XIII (*Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum Latinae*) of the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*,⁴ suggest that an ivy leaf, as found three times otherwise on the stone, should be restored to the damaged area, and cites as a parallel the prepositional phrase EX ♠ {JU}SSU⁵ found in another inscription (CIL xiii 1190) at the same site. Lejeune 1988: 151 is not sanguine about such a possibility, preferring to imagine that a simple interpunctum was present. We, of course, can never know whether anything, at all, was engraved in the damaged area, but, if there were, it was a word divider of some type.

It is commonly, though not universally, thought that the stone originally belonged to a structure discovered 75 m. to the north of the find-site of the inscription⁶ during excavations in 1908. During those

¹See the fine photograph in Lejeune 1988: 149 fig. 77.

²I employ ⟨j⟩ to transcribe the *i*-longa. The spadesuit ♠ represents an ivy leaf carved in various orientations on the stone. Here and throughout, square brackets [] indicate characters which have been restored or which can no longer be read; round brackets () indicate characters omitted by the engraver; curly brackets { } indicate characters erroneously incised by the engraver; the underdot Ṽ indicates characters which are damaged and/or no longer clearly legible; the pipe | indicates line breaks.

³Attested in classical sources as *Alesia*, Ἀλῆσιᾶ.

⁴The *Martialis*-inscription is CIL xiii 2880.

⁵The form is engraved with the two initial characters orthographically metathesised.

⁶For a map indicating the relative positions of the stone bearing the inscription and the structure, see Lejeune 1988: 148 fig. 76. Why the stone bearing the inscription would have been moved, and when, must remain a mystery.

excavations, a bronze vase bearing the Latin inscription (CIL xiii 11247) in (2) was discovered in the main room of the structure.⁷

- (2) DEO · VCVETI
 ET · BERGVSIAE
 3 REMVS · PRIMI · FIL(ius)
 DONAVIT
 V(otum) S(oluit) L(ibens) M(erito)

‘Remus, son of Primus, gave (this vase) to the god *Ucuetis and to *Bergusia. A vow willingly and properly fulfilled’.

It is now generally thought that the structure was dedicated to the god *Ucuetis; see Martin and Varène 1973 for an archeological study of the structure, and, more recently, Olivier 1992 and Creuzenet and Olivier 1994 on specific aspects of it.

§ 2. The point of departure for all scholarship on the analysis of the *Martialis*-inscription is still Thurneysen 1908: 558, who first recognised that DVGIJONTIJO is a 3. pl. present verb with attached uninflected clitic relativiser and suggested that GOBEDBI is a dative plural⁸ in co-ordination with dat. sg. VCVETE. He translates:

- (3) ‘Martialis, Sohn des Dannotalos, machte für Ucuetis dieses *celicnon* (irgend ein Gebäude) und für die Priester, die den Ucuetis bedienen (*qui colunt Ucuetim*) in Alisia’.

Aside from the precise semantics of 3. sg. pret. IEVRV, which remain in dispute,⁹ the only aspect of Thurneysen’s interpretation which was challenged early on is his translation of GOBEDBI as ‘Priester’. He expressly states that ‘[a]n kymr. *gof* mittelir. *goba* ‘Schmied’ wird man nicht denken dürfen’, but Poisson 1908: 262–3 synchronously argued in favour of a connection with the Insular Celtic forms, citing the well known mention from Pliny, *NH* xxxiv 162, to the effect that Alesia was renowned in the ancient world for metalworking. In view of the fact that excavation at the site of the structure in which the Latin inscription in (2) was discovered has subsequently unearthed numerous bronze and iron votive objects (see Martin and Varène 1973: 157–9), it now seems

⁷See Simon 1908–1909: 376–7 for a description of the vase and the inscription. Le Gall 1980: 204 provides a black-and-white photograph; he provides a colour photograph at 1985: 40 pl. XVI.

⁸Such an analysis, however, goes back at least as far as Pictet 1859: 30, who, at that time, mistakenly divided the form into GO BEDBI. In 1867: 325, he recombined the form into unitary GOBEDBI.

⁹Whatmough 1949: 10 seeks a connection with an unspecified base *uer-* meaning ‘make’; Gray 1953–1954: 64 seeks a connection with **uerh₁-* ‘say’; Wagner 1962 and Isaac 1997: 161–8 seek a connection with **h₂ieh₁-* ‘throw, send’ (→ ‘make’ in Anatolian and Tocharian); Lambert 1979 and 1996, Schmidt 1986 and Lindeman 1991–1992 seek a connection with **perh₃-* ‘provide’. The last proposal is favoured by Lejeune 1980.

clear that Poisson was correct to translate GOBEDBI as ‘forgerons’ and to regard **Ucuetis* as their patron deity;¹⁰ this has become the *communis opinio*.

The traditional interpretation of the *Martialis*-inscription, thus, has been:¹¹

- (4) ‘Martialis, son of *Dannotalos, offered this edifice to *Ucuetis and to the smiths who serve *Ucuetis in Alisia’.

Despite the eminent satisfaction of this translation, issues concerning the meaning of CELICNON and the morphosyntax of the inscription — and hence its overall translation — have recently been raised several times which dispute it. It is the purpose of this paper to address these new arguments in defence of the traditional interpretation of the inscription.

§ 3. *The semantics of CELICNON*. The interpretation of CELICNON as ‘edifice’ or something similar was originally based upon the inference that Goth. *kelikn*, attested three times to translate Gk. πύργος ‘tower’ (Luke 14.28 and Mark 12.1) and ἀνάγαιον ‘elevated dining room’ (Mark 14.15), is a loan word from Gaulish. It certainly seemed clear that the stone on which the *Martialis*-inscription is engraved must have been part of the CELICNON owing to the presence of the demonstrative SOSIÑ and this still holds. Nevertheless, the discovery of a Gaulish inscription upon a drinking vessel in Banassac (Lozère) containing the form *celicnu* caused Fleuriot 1975: 449–50 to translate it as ‘vase’ while maintaining ‘tower’ for CELICNON.¹² Koch 1983: 182, Szemerényi 1995: 309–14 and Schrijver 1997: 181 (only tentatively) have extended the meaning ‘vase’, or something similar, to CELICNON, as well.¹³ But clearly the fact that the stone bears an inscription with a demonstrative, while the drinking vessel does not, establishes that Gaul.

¹⁰In a paper published in 1912, Poisson calls attention to a passage in *Annála ríoghachta Éireann* s.a. 3657 in which a figure called *Uchadan* is said to have been the first to smelt gold in Ireland. The etymological equation with **Ucuetis* is not exact, ‘mais il ... semble qu’il y a là autre chose qu’une simple coïncidence fortuite’. Poisson notes that O’Donovan 1854: 42^w states that Mageoghagan’s translation of the *Annals of Connacht* has a parallel passage which contains the variant *Ugden*, but Murphy’s edition of Mageoghagan’s translation has it as *Ighdonn* (1896: 32).

¹¹So, e.g., Schmidt 1980: 181 and Meid 1986: 40 and 1992: 29.

¹²The entire text reads: *lubi rutenica onobjja | tiedi ulano celicnu*. Fleuriot 1975 translates: ‘Aime les liquides de vie Rutènes! A toi est la satisfaction par (ce) vase!’; Koch 1983: 201–2 translates: ‘Enjoy *rutenica*! And by (its) waters thou hast satisfaction from the chalice!’ I make some brief comments on this difficult text in Eska 1992: 17–18.

¹³Szemerényi denies any relationship between *celicno*- and *kelikn*. He would have the Gaulish form, which he wants to mean ‘vase’, to be a borrowing from Gk. κολύχνη, κολύχνηον (dim.) ‘small cup’ (also attested as κολύχνης), and the Gothic form, which he wants to mean ‘dining room’, to be a borrowing from Lat. *cēnāculum* ‘dining room’. He is not concerned that to get from the Greek to the Gaulish form requires a distortion of the base vowel from *u* to *e* and a shift from *ā*-stem to thematic flexion, neither of which occur in Osc. CVLCHNA, CVLCFNAM or Etr. CVLIXNA, XVLIXNA, CVLCNA, forms he cites as being borrowed from the Greek. Nor is he concerned that to get from the Latin to

celicno- does not (specifically) mean ‘drinking vessel’, but refers to a structure of some type, as astutely stated by Lejeune 1979: 260 and 1996.

§ 4. In defence of the analysis of CELICNON as ‘edifice’, we may note, following Lejeune 1996: 127, that other inscriptions in the *ieuru*-corpus apparently refer to other types of structures, e.g. CANTALON (RIG L–9) and CANECOSDLON (RIG L–10), and that there is no indication that the CELICNON-stone has ever been re-used.

Lejeune 1996: 128–9 is clearly correct to state that, given the extant evidence, we are not in a position to make an adequate attempt at establishing the precise semantics of CELICNON and *celicnu* (or Goth. *kelikn*, for that matter) in their discourse contexts. At present, ‘edifice’ or ‘structure’, in the broadest terms, seems to be the best to which we can aspire.¹⁴

the Gothic form requires that *cēnāculum* undergo metathesis and distortion of the suffixal vowel to yield unattested Lat. **cēlicunum* (which still requires a syncopation), the putative immediate source of Szemerényi’s borrowing.

Despite Szemerényi’s 1995: 312 notation that the Latin *Vulgate* has *cēnāculum* at Mark 14.15 parallel to Gk. ἀναγῶν and Goth. *kelikn*, it is important to recognise that his comparison of the semantics of these forms is probably illusory, for the *Vulgate* has acc. sg. *turrem* ‘tower’ at Luke 14.28 and Mark 12.1 parallel to Gk. πύργον (acc. sg.) and Goth. *kelikn*. Since ‘dining room’ is obviously not what Lat. *turris* and Gk. πύργος mean in these passages, we are obligated to seek a more general meaning for Goth. *kelikn*.

¹⁴Thus, I remain satisfied with the etymology proposed for *celicno-* in Eska 1990a: 68–9: The base **kelh_x-* ‘rise up; tower (upwards)’ + adjectival **-iko-* + adjectival abstract **-no-* > **kelikono-* > *celicno-* by syncope; thus, literally, ‘that which is raised, i.e. erected, i.e. a building’. The syncope required for this analysis is perhaps unexpected (though syncope is hardly unattested in Gaulish), but gets us around the difficulty of seeking a suitable analysis for a suffix *-ikno-*, which, as Lejeune 1996: 128 remarks, is only known to form patronymics in Gaulish. De Bernardo Stempel 1998: 610 proposes that, in fact, patronymic *-ikno-* is the suffix present in *celicno-*, but with a secondary function which expresses ‘einfache Zugehörigkeit’, as in Goidelic; what *celicno-* would mean under her analysis, with the suffix attached directly to a verbal base, is not clear to me. Motta 2001 now argues that the base of CELICNON is **kei-* ‘lie; beloved’ as in O. Ir. *céile* ‘companion’ and that it refers to ‘la sala del convivio (o ... l’edificio in cui questa si trova)’.

I also note that Szemerényi’s 1995: 313 claim, to the effect that those who endorse a connection between CELICNON and *kelikn* usually ignore the difference between Gaul. /e/ and Goth. /e:/ (I note that the existence of phonemic vowel quantity in Gothic remains an open question) in the base syllable, is unfounded. More than a half-century before Szemerényi wrote his article, Dillon 1943: 496 hinted that there might have been some disturbance during the borrowing process owing to differences in the precise point of articulation within the vowel space of the respective languages. And in Eska 1990a: 67, I suggested that since Gaul. /e/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [e̞]) contrasted with both Goth. /e/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [e]) and /i/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [i]), it (i.e. Gaul. /e/) was spelt with ⟨e⟩, which was normally reserved to spell Goth. /e:/, because it, while perhaps not as high as Gaul. /e/ ≈ [e̞], occupied a point in vowel space much closer to it than either /e/ ≈ [e] or /i/ ≈ [i]. Cf. Vennemann’s 1971: 120, 129, 130 proposal that Gothic lexical items which are included in the category [+foreign] may contain phonemes which are not otherwise included in the native phonemic stock. Note, furthermore, that experimental phonetic evidence indicates that second language learners often have difficulty precisely producing phones of the new language which are similar to those in their native language, i.e. they articulate them much like the phones in their native language (Flege 1987); this is precisely the relationship between Goth. /e:/ and Gaul. /e/.

§ 5. *The morphosyntax of the inscription.* In approaching the syntax of the inscription, many scholars have noted that VCVETE and GOBEDBI are discontinuous in the text and that the former, as a deity, and the latter, as human beings, do not share the same status. This has led them to propose, in diverse ways, that the two NPs are not conjoined by ETIC and do not bear the same semantic rôle.

§ 6. Lejeune 1979: 256–7 ≡ 1988: 153–4, followed by Lambert 1994: 98–101 *passim*, doubts that the desinence of GOBEDBI is functionally dative plural, like OIr. dat. pl. *-(a)ib* ← IE instr. pl. **-h₁is*, and hence that a syncretism has begun (so Schmidt 1974: 403), owing to the attestation of inherited dat. pl. *-bo* < **-h₁os*, e.g. *ματρεβο* (RIG G–64 and 203) and *ATREBO* (RIG L–15). He suggests, therefore, that GOBEDBI be translated as a comitative (or sociative) instrumental, thus:

- (5) ‘M. a fait dédicace . . . , et (il l’a fait) en association avec les forgerons qui . . . ’.

However, as I have previously commented in Eska 1991–1992: 24 (so also now Schrijver 1997: 181), the analysis of GOBEDBI as a comitative instrumental is awkward in view of the fact that it immediately follows the etymologically pleonastic connective ETIC (< **h₁eti=k^we*) in the text. Lejeune’s analysis yields:

- (6) ‘M. D. offered this edifice to U. and with the smiths . . . ’.

Such syntax, however, does not occur with the comitative instrumental in any other Indo-European language, e.g.:¹⁵

¹⁵See Delbrück 1893: 234–8 for more examples from these and other languages.

(7) a. Sanskrit (*RV* i 1.5^d):¹⁶

devó *devébhīr* *á gamat*
 god.NOM.SG god.INSTR.PL come.3.SG.AOR.SUBJ
 ‘May the god come along with the gods’.

b. Greek (Homer, *Il.* viii 289–90):¹⁷

τοῖ ... *ἐν χερῖ*
 2.POSS.PRON.DAT.SG in hand.DAT.SG
θήσω / ... *δύω ἵππους*
 place.1.SG.FUT two horse.ACC.PL
αὐτοῖσιν *ὄχεσφιν*
 3.POSS.PRON.INSTR.PL chariot.INSTR.PL
 ‘I will place in your hand two horses along with their chariots’.

c. Latin (Caesar, *BG* v 49.1):¹⁸

Gallī ... *ad Caesarem omnibus*
 Gaul.NOM.PL towards Caesar.ACC.SG all.ABL.PL
copiās *contendunt*
 troop.ABL.PL hasten.3.PL.PRES
 ‘The Gauls hastened to meet Caesar with all their troops’.

The syntax of the *Martialis*-inscription itself, then, provides good evidence against the analysis of GOBEDBI as a comitative instrumental. Furthermore, the existence of both *-bo* and *-bi* in Gaulish flexional morphology by no means demonstrates that the dative and instrumental plurals were (always) marked by different exponents. To establish that this were the case, we would need to have a well understood text in which both desinences occur with clearly differentiated functions; but, as I have noted in Eska 1991–1992: 24–5, no known Gaulish text attests both desinences. It is clear that Gaul. *-bo* is always functionally dative plural, but this is not so for *-bi* (and its late variant *-be*).¹⁹ It is highly

¹⁶See further Delbrück 1888: 123–5.

¹⁷See further Schwyzer 1988: 159–65 and 172.

¹⁸See further Hofmann and Szantyr 1972: 114–16.

¹⁹The inherited instrumental plural desinence *-bi* (later *-be*) is, at present, attested six times aside from GOBEDBI, but always in passages about which a consensus in analysis has not yet been reached. Fleuriot (in Lejeune et al. 1985: 143) is agnostic as to whether Larzac *eiabi* (1^b9) is dative or instrumental plural in function, while Lejeune 1985b: 91 and Lambert (in Lejeune et al. 1985: 170) assume that it is instrumental. The well known plate inscription from Lezoux contains two relevant forms, viz. *gandobe* (2) and *mesamobi* (4); Fleuriot 1980: 129 and 131, respectively, takes the former to function as a dative plural and the latter as an instrumental plural; Lambert 1994: 147 and 146, respectively, is agnostic about the former, but understands the latter to function as an instrumental plural; Meid 1986: 47 ≡ 1992: 49 does not address the former, but analyses the latter as instrumental plural in function; McCone 1996: 111 labels the former as dative plural and

probable that a syncretism was in progress in Gaulish whereby inherited instr. pl. *-bi* had begun to assume the function of inherited dat. pl. *-bo* (as it manifestly did in Irish);²⁰ cf. the case of the non-neuter *n*-stem dative singular in Lepontic, in which there exist three examples of inherited *-ei* beside three examples of inherited loc. sg. *-i* in dative singular function, all of the latter attested in early texts (Eska and Wallace 2001).²¹ Language change of all kinds, including the replacement of morphological exponents, does not occur overnight, but is a gradual process (see Kroch 1989 and 1994).

§ 7. More recently, Lejeune 1996: 125–6 has proposed a binary analysis of the inscription which, one could argue, disposes of the syntactic objections to the analysis of GOBEDBI as a comitative instrumental raised in § 6, while addressing the difference in status between the deity and the human smiths. He would now understand the sequence in (8) as the main text of the inscription, after which the sequence in (9) is attached as an appendix:

(8) MARTIALIS DANNŌTALI | IEVRV VCVETE SOSÎN̄ | CELICNON

(9) ETIC | GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO | V̄CVETIN | IN AĻISIJA

The latter sequence he would now translate (loosely) as:

(10) ‘et aussi, en second lieu, avec la participation de ...’.

In support of this analysis, Lejeune 1996: 126 suggests that ‘l’hedera insérée avant *etic* fait fonction de ponctuation et marque l’articulation du texte’, but I am sceptical on at least two grounds:

1. Since it is obvious that the inscription is carefully worked out, it seems improbable that the second part of the text under Lejeune’s binary interpretation would have been added as an appendix affixed to the main text by the connective ETIC. More probably, a coherent sentence, without the ellipsis necessary to Lejeune’s interpretation, would have been formulated by the dedicator and/or engraver for so monumental an inscription.
2. That the ivy leaf between CELICNON and ETIC functions as a punctuation mark of sorts is entirely without precedent. A glance

the latter as dative-instrumental plural. Koch 1983: 206 treats SVIOREBE (RIG L–6) as dative plural in function, while Lambert 1994: 106 takes it to be instrumental plural. The function of twice-attested *anmanbe* (2) (var. *anmambe* (5) in quasi-phonetic orthography) in the recently discovered inscription from Châteaubleau remains very uncertain.

²⁰It may not be coincidental, then, that only one example of *-bo* is attested relatively late, viz. ATREBO (RIG L–15), while there are no pre-Caesarian attestations of *-bi* to date.

²¹Thus Schrijver’s 1997: 181–2 suggestion that one could save the dative plural functional analysis of GOBEDBI by proposing that *-bo* and *-bi* syncretised, but in different directions depending upon geographic locale, is unnecessary.

at the photograph of the inscription reveals that the space between these forms is larger than that between any other two contiguous forms on the stone. In all likelihood, this ivy leaf, like those others on the stone, is merely meant to fill significant empty surface space; cf., furthermore, the purely decorative function of the ivy leaf in EX ♠ {JU}SSU, mentioned in § 1, which is embedded within a preposition phrase.

§ 8. Koch 1982: 94–100 ≡ 1985: 6–9 likewise understands GOBEDBI as an instrumental plural, and makes a proposal which hinges on the analysis of ETIC not as a pleonastic connective continuing $*h_1eti=k^we$, but as a copula with attached clitic connective, i.e. 3. sg. pres. $*h_1esti$ + an apocopated form of $=*k^we$. While it is certainly true that the tau Gallicum phoneme, which, inter alia, continues the group $*st$, could be spelt with ⟨t⟩ (see Eska 1998 most recently), there are numerous factors which conspire against Koch's analysis, viz. that ETIC introduces a clefted clause with gapping (1985: 8). He would translate the inscription as one of the following:

- (11) a. 'M. D. bestowed this chalice on U.; and it is by means of the smiths ... (that he did so)'.
 b. '(TOPIC) M. D. bestowed this chalice on U.; (COMMENT) (and) it is by means of the smiths ...'.²²

We should note, first of all, that /etik/ is attested as a co-ordinating connective twice in the inscription of Chamalières, as *etic* (7), and, in quasi-phonetic orthography (Eska 1997), as *eddic* (3) (Eska 1991–1992: 26–30). It is likewise attested in the inscription of Larzac as *etic* (1^b1), and, in augmented form, as *coetic* (1^b3), beside which *cuetic[ic]* (1^b1)²³ occurs in quasi-phonetic orthography.²⁴ This is not to say that ETIC < $*h_1eti=k^we$ and putative ETIC < $*h_1esti=k^we$ could not exist as homographs, but the existence of the former ought to give pause before one posits the existence of the latter.

Allowing for the possibility that ETIC could continue the 3. sg. present copula with attached clitic connective, Koch's analysis depends upon the existence of cleft sentences in Gaulish which branch rightward, rather than leftward, as in other Indo-European languages

²²That CELICNON does not mean 'chalice' or something similar, but 'edifice' or something similar, has been addressed in §§ 3–4. When we replace 'chalice' with 'edifice' in Koch's translations, another matter arises which militates against his analysis: it would suggest that the edifice was constructed by the smiths; but smiths work with metal. They do not construct temples; masons do.

²³Lejeune (in Lejeune et al. 1985: 130) suggests that the end of 1. 1^b3 perhaps should be restored as *c[coetic]*.

²⁴It is worth noting that all of the examples from the Chamalières and Larzac inscriptions are employed sub-clausally, just as a connective analysis of ETIC would be in the *Martialis*-inscription.

which have the cleft construction. He suggests that such configurations exist in Middle Welsh, but it is clear that the examples he cites, e.g.:

(12) *stauell gyndylan ys tywyll heno* (e.g. CLIH 35.18^a)

are more cogently analysed otherwise (Eska 1991–1992: 23–4), the example in (12), for instance, as a left dislocation to an entirely average copular clause.²⁵ Moreover, contrary to Koch's 1982: 97 = 1985: 7 statement that there is no *a priori* reason why a cleft sentence in Gaulish could not have the copular clause branch to the right, a cross-linguistic survey of languages with true cleft constructions reveals that right-branching cleft sentences simply do not exist.²⁶ Even more importantly, it is probable that Gaulish, like other languages with rich flexional morphology, did not possess a cleft construction at all, but simply raised constituents for emphasis, focus and other discourse purposes. Cf. the inscription from Naintré (Vieux-Poitiers) (RIG L–3), in which an accusative argument has been raised for a discourse effect without the aid of clefting:²⁷

(13) [CP [NP RATĪN BRIVĀTIOM]_j | [IP [NP
FRONTV · TARBETIS[O]NĪŌS²⁸]_i | [VP t_i IE{I}VRV t_j]]]
'F. T. offered the *ratin brivatiom*'.

A host of evidence, then, conspires to render a cleft analysis wholly unlikely.

§ 9. Schrijver 1997: 182 does not believe that a dative interpretation of GOBEDBI fits the context of the inscription:

'[T]he dedication of an object to the goddess [sic]²⁹ Ucuētis and, as if they were on the same level as she [sic], also to the smiths, who as we know worked in Alisia and worshipped Ucuētis, is incongruous to say the least'.

Instead, he follows Koch in understanding ETIC to continue **h₁esti=k^we*; but rather than analyse **=k^we* as a connective, he would treat it as a relativiser; cf. OIr. *nach-mbeir* 'who does not carry him' < **ne=k^we=en bereti*, and MBr. *an nep nac eu discret* (Mir 1200) 'ceux qui ne sont pas modérés', with *nac* < **ne=k^we*. He, thus, translates the inscription as:

²⁵In fact, since the sequence *stauell gyndylan* does not contain a verb, it cannot be a root clause, as a cleft analysis would require.

²⁶I should like to thank Orin Gensler for discussion on this matter.

²⁷It should be clear that under no circumstances could this inscription be treated as a cleft sentence with null copula: RATĪN BRIVĀTIOM is inflected for the accusative case, not the nominative, as a cleft construction would require, and there is no relativising complementiser following it, as one would expect in a cleft sentence. The syntax of the verb is also diagnostic, for Vendryes' Restriction would require the verb to be raised to initial position in the root clause to host any such complementiser.

²⁸This form could possibly also be restored as TARBETIS[Ā]NĪŌS.

²⁹As is clear from the Latin inscription in (2), the sex of **Ucuētis* is male.

- (14) ‘M. D. has offered to Ucuētis the celicnon, which is by the smiths [i.e. made by the smiths] who worship Ucuētis in Alisia’.

We must note, however, that the relativising character of $*=k^we$ is clearly secondary in Insular Celtic, and that it was employed only in negative clauses (cf. Thurneysen 1946: 539 and Hemon 1975: 282); in pre-Irish, it, furthermore, was restricted to instances in which clitic pronominals were attached to $*ne=k^we$. Since ETIC in this inscription occurs in a clause which is not negative, and which does not have a clitic pronominal attached to it, Schrijver’s Insular Celtic comparanda for his relativising analysis are, at best, a very distant stretch. Moreover, let us also note that the translation in which his analysis results has the smiths constructing the *celicnon*, an event which, as suggested in § 8, is altogether unlikely.

§ 10. Finally, Szemerényi 1995: 305–6 offers a new, but non-instrumental, analysis of GOBEDBI, which, in turn, forces him to reinterpret DVGIJONTIJO. He first posits that were the traditional translation of the inscription to render the intended meaning, the attested syntax is ‘rather awkward’. He would, instead, expect the following configuration:

- (15) *MARTIALIS DANNOTALI IEVRV SOSIN CELICNON VCVETE
ETIC GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO VCVETIN IN ALISIJA

i.e. with both dative arguments following the accusative argument. However, in fact, in other inscriptions of the *ieuru*-corpus which contain both dative and accusative arguments, it is the dative argument which precedes in the syntax,³⁰ viz.:³¹

- (16) a. σεγομαρος | ουιλλονεος | τουουτιο{υ}ς | ναμαυσατις |
ειωρου βηλη| σαμι σοσιν | νεμητον (RIG G–153)
‘S. V., tribesman of Nîmes, offered this holy thing/place to B.’.
- b. ICCAVOS · ÔP|PIANICNOS · JEV|RV · BRIGINDONĒ³² |
CANTALON (RIG L–9)
‘I. O. offered the *cantalón* to B.’.
- c. LICNOS CON|TEXTOS³³ · IEVRV | ANVALONNACV |
CANECOSDLON (RIG L–10)
‘L. C. offered the *canecosedlon* to A.’.

³⁰In the corpus of inscriptions bearing the syntagm δεδε βρατου δεκαντεμ/-ν, there are eight which contain both dative and accusative arguments; in seven (RIG G–27, 64, 65, 148, 183, 203, 214), the dative argument precedes the accusative argument, while in one (RIG G–206), the order is reversed. In the last, it is probable that the dative argument has been postposed for a discourse purpose. At any rate, it is clear that the more common configuration is for the dative argument to precede the accusative argument.

³¹While it may be possible that an inscription from Nîmes (Gard) (RIG G–528) (Lejeune 1994: 183–9), which contains the form [–]ειωραι[?], contained both dative and accusative arguments, its state of preservation is too fragmentary to be certain.

³²This form could possibly also be read as BRIGINDONĪ.

³³This form could possibly also be read as CONĪ|TEXTOS.

The question which Szemerényi ought to have asked, then, is why, under the dative analysis of GOBEDBI, the configuration of the inscription is not as in (17), with both dative arguments preceding the accusative argument, a matter which I will address in § 13.

- (17) *MARTIALIS DANNOTALI IEVRV VCVETE ETIC GOBEDBI
DVGIJONTIJO VCVETIN IN ALISIJA SOSIN CELICNON

Like others, Szemerényi also thinks it strange that, under the dative analysis of GOBEDBI, the deity **Ucuetis* and the human smiths should both be recipients of the offering. He, thus, dismisses that analysis, but he does not adopt the instrumental analysis. Instead, he notices that ETIC, which he accepts is a connective, is located between CELICNON and GOBEDBI. This leads him to believe that it is CELICNON and GOBEDBI that are co-ordinated in the inscription and that, if this is the case, GOBEDBI must be a noun inflected for the accusative singular, like CELICNON (since only like constituents are normally co-ordinated). Szemerényi is, thus, forced to assume that GOBEDBI is a nominal abstract in *-bi*. A further consequence of this theory is that the compelling analysis of DVGIJONTIJO as a 3. plural present verb with attached clitic subordinator is not suitable, a difficulty from which he escapes by positing that it is a genitive plural participle in *-nt-*. This results in his translation of the sequence CELICNON ETIC | GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO | VCVETIN as:

- (18) ‘celicum et fabricam colentium Ucuetim’.

As a reply to Szemerényi’s ideas, I can do no better than to follow Lejeune’s 1996: 126 critique:

1. It is unfortunate that Szemerényi does not cite any comparanda for nominal abstracts in *-bi* (< **-bi?*), but this must be because none exist; the formans is his invention.
2. Szemerényi’s analysis of DVGIJONTIJO as a genitive plural *nt*-participle requires that the final nasal of the genitive plural exponent *-on* < **-om* be lost, but as the forms SOSIN, CELICNON and VCVETIN demonstrate, final nasals are retained in the language of the inscription.³⁴

To these, I would add a further point:

3. Under Szemerényi’s interpretation of DVGIJONTIJO as a genitive plural *nt*-participle, even were we to grant the aberrant loss of the

³⁴Even were one to propose that the loss of final nasals was in progress in the language of the inscription, the environment in which DVGIJONTIJO occurs, before a form with an initial vowel, viz. VCVETIN, would be the last one to manifest the loss.

final nasal, we are required to understand his participle as a feminine containing the formans \bar{v} - < $*-ih_2$ -, as attested in *tigontias* (1^a4), *sagitiont|ias* (2^a8–9 and 2^b10), and *ictontias* (2^b13) from the inscription of Larzac. Surely, under any interpretation of the inscription, we would expect a masculine participle to refer to the smiths.

There can be no question but that Szemerényi's innovatory treatment of the *Martialis*-inscription is untenable.

§ 11. Now that the failings of the recently proposed alternatives to the traditional analysis of the morphosyntax of the *Martialis*-inscription have been revealed, I turn to a defence of that analysis. There are two issues with which we must be concerned:

1. Can it be explained why the two recipients of the offering, the deity **Ucuetis* and the human smiths, are conjoined, despite the fact that they are of very different status?
2. Why are the two dative arguments discontinuous in the text if they are to be understood as conjoined?

§ 12. I would argue that, in fact, the offering of the *celicnon* at the same time to the deity and to the humans who serve that deity is entirely unremarkable. The offering has a single intention which has two facets: (1) it is made for the honour of the deity **Ucuetis*; (2) it is made for the use of the human smiths who serve that deity.

A probable comparandum for a text with both a divine and human recipients is the large Hispano-Celtic inscription from Peñalba de Villastar (MLH K.3.3). In this inscription, which comprises two complex, gapped sentences, it appears that there are human recipients and a divine recipient, all governed by the same verb in each sentence, respectively. Under the syntactic analysis of Ködderitzsch 1985 and 1996, the first sentence contains the dative arguments ENIOROSEI and TIGINO TIATV[N]EI, which are conjoined by the connective VTA, as well as the divine name LVGVEI, while the second sentence contains the dative arguments ENIOROSEI and EQVQISVI,³⁵ which are conjoined by the connective =QVE,³⁶ as well as the divine name LVGVEI. Ködderitzsch interprets ENIOROSEI (2×), TIGINO TIATV[N]EI and EQVQISVI as anthroponyms, a reasonable, though still somewhat uncertain, conclusion.³⁷

³⁵This form is also often read as EQVEISVI.

³⁶See Eska 1990b: 105–6 on the alternation between the connectives.

³⁷Villar 1991 prefers to segment the two examples of ENIOROSEI into a preposition ENI and a governed nominal on the basis of comparison with the ablative singular coin legend *orois* (MLH A.86.2), which he takes to be a toponym. He, therefore, takes OROSEI to be a locative singular toponym, and concludes that TIGINO TIATV[N]EI and EQVQISVI ought to be locatives, too, despite their inherited dative morphology. Meid 1994: 389–93 prefers

It is also worth noting that the divine and human realms are conjoined in the Gaulish inscription from Vercelli (RIG *E-2), which contains the remarkable genitive plural dvandva compound **Teuox|Tonion** within the accusative argument **aTom**³⁸ **Teuox|Tonion** ‘field of gods and men’. There seems to be little reason, then, to think that the deity **Ucuetis* and the human smiths cannot be co-recipients in the *Martialis*-inscription.

§ 13. It is very common cross-linguistically for so-called ‘heavy’ constituents to shift rightward to final position in the sentence (Grosu and Thompson 1977, Dryer 1980, Hawkins 1994, Harris and Campbell 1995: 235).³⁹ Cf. the following examples from languages in which accusative arguments typically precede dative arguments (cited after Primus 1998: 443 with minor additions):

(19) a. English:

She gave t_i (to) *John* [_{NP} *the book I bought yesterday*]_{*i*}.

b. Italian:

Ho scritto t_i *a Carlo* [_{NP} *una lettera di*
AUX.1.SG written to C. a letter of
cinque pagine]_{*i*}.
five pages
‘I wrote (to) Carlo a five-page letter’.

c. Catalan:

Han venut t_i *a les teves germanes* [_{NP} *els*
AUX.3.PL sold to the your sisters the
ous que hem donat]_{*i*}.
eggs REL AUX.1.PL given
‘They sold (to) your sisters the eggs that we gave’.

d. Welsh:

Rhoddodd yr athro t_i *iddi hi* [_{NP} *lyfr*
gave.3.SG the teacher to.3.SG.FEM her book
a oedd ar y bwrdd yn y gegin]_{*i*}.
REL was.3.SG on the table in the kitchen
‘The teacher gave (to) her a book which was on the table in the kitchen’.

to treat ENIOROSEI, TIGINO TIATV[N]EI and EQVQISVI as preposed, discontinuous epithets in concord with dat. sg. LVGVEI. At this time, I find Ködderitzsch’s proposal about the forms under discussion to be the only one which may be tenable (I intend to take up this matter in the future.)

³⁸The form has also been read as **aToš**; I argue that diagnostic means exist to prefer the reading **aTom** in Eska 1994: 26⁵³.

³⁹It is often claimed that this mechanism is effected in the interest of processing by the hearer, but Wasow 1997 and Arnold, Wasow, Losongco and Ginstrom 2000 convincingly demonstrate that the trigger for the phenomenon is multi-faceted.

e. Irish:

Thug sé t_i dom [NP *gluaisteán mór bán a*
gave he to.1.SG car big white REL
fuair sé i Meiriceá]_i.
got he in America
'He gave (to) me a big white car that he got in America'.

As stated in Eska 1991–1992: 25, there can be no doubt but that GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO | VÇVETIN | IN ALISIJA is a heavy constituent. It bears a much more complex structure (20) than does the dative argument to which it is conjoined, viz. VCVETE (21):

(20) [NP [NP GOBEDBI] [CP DVGIJONTI_j =JO_i [IP t'_i t'_j [VP t_i t_j VÇVETIN IN ALISIJA]]]]

(21) [NP [N VCVETE]]

The immediate trigger for the shift of GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO | VÇVETIN | IN ALISIJA from its base-generated position before the accusative argument SOSÎN | CELICNON to the end of the sentence is clearly its complex structure, thus yielding the following s-structure:

(22) [IP [NP MARTIALIS DANNŌTALI]_i IEVRV_j [VP [VP t_i t_j VCVETE t_k SOSÎN CELICNON] [ETIC [NP GOBEDBI DVGIJONTI=JO VÇVETIN IN ALISIJA]_k]]]]

One may, of course, ask why the two dative arguments did not shift rightwards to the end of the sentence as a unit, yielding:

(23) *MARTIALIS DANNOTALI IEVRV SOSIN CELICNON VCVETE
ETIC GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO VCVETIN IN ALISIA

We will never be in a position to answer this question definitively, but there are a variety of possibilities. The reason could be a purely grammatical one: since VCVETE is not a heavy constituent, there was no trigger for it to shift to the end of the sentence; or it may have remained in its base-generated position for stylistic or discourse reasons: e.g. the discontinuity between it and GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO VÇVETIN IN ALISIJA may be a feature of a formal register, or perhaps the relative leftward position of VCVETE in its base-generated position as opposed to rightward-shifted GOBEDBI DVGIJONTIJO VÇVETIN IN ALISIJA may have served to endow the former with a higher discourse prominence.

Whatever the reason may have been, there can be no doubt that the discontinuous configuration of the discrete portions of a compound argument is possible. Cf. the following Latin inscription (CIL i² 1834 = ix 4875), in which two accusative arguments, viz. COLOMNAS III and CREPIDINEM | ANTE COLOMNAS | EX LAPIDE, are discontinuous:⁴⁰

⁴⁰I should like to thank Brent Vine for providing me with this example.

- 1893. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* iii, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* i. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Dillon, Myles. 1943. 'Germanic and Celtic', *Journal of English and Germanic philology* 42, 492–8.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1980. 'The positional tendencies of sentential noun phrases in universal grammar', *Canadian journal of linguistics* 25, 123–195.
- Ernault, Emile (ed. and tr.). 1914. *Le miroir de la mort, poème breton du XVI^e siècle*. Paris: H. Champion.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1990a. 'Another look at Gaul. *celicno-* and Goth. *kelikn*', *North-western European language evolution* 16, 63–72.
- 1990b. 'Syntactic notes on the great inscription of Peñalba de Villastar', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 37, 104–7.
- 1991–1992. 'Syntactic ways to etymology. The case of Gaulish *etic* and *eddic*', *Studia Celtica* 26–7: 21–33.
- 1992. 'Miscellanea Gallica', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 39, 16–23.
- 1994. 'Rethinking the evolution of Celtic constituent configuration', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55, 7–39.
- 1997. 'Allophony, Chamalières *eddic*, and related matters', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 49–50, 170–178.
- 1998. '*Tau Gallicum*', *Studia Celtica* 32, 115–27.
- and Rex E. Wallace. 2001. 'A syncretism in *fieri* in early Celtic', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 106, 229–40.
- Flege, James Emil. 1987. 'The production of "new" and "similar" phones in a foreign language. Evidence for the effect of equivalence classification', *Journal of phonetics* 15, 47–65.
- Fleuriot, Léon. 1975. 'Un graffite gaulois sur céramique de Banassac', *Etudes celtiques* 14, 443–50.
- 1980. 'Inscriptions gauloises sur céramique et l'exemple d'une inscription de la Graufesenque et d'une autre de Lezoux', *Etudes celtiques* 17, 111–44.
- Gray, Louis H. 1953–1954. 'Notules étymologiques sur des inscriptions gauloises', *Etudes celtiques* 6, 62–70.
- Grosu, Alexander and Sandra A. Thompson. 1977. 'Constraints on the distribution of NP clauses', *Language* 53, 104–51.
- Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, John A. 1994. *A performance theory of order and constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hemon, Roparz. 1975 (repr. 1984). *A historical morphology and syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Hofmann, J. B. and Anton Szantyr. 1972. *Lateinische Grammatik* ii, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*². München: C. H. Beck.

- Isaac, Graham R. 1997. 'Two Continental Celtic verbs', *Studia Celtica* 31, 161–71.
- Koch, John T. 1982. 'Gaulish *etic*, *eθθic* < IE. **esti-k^we*?'', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 2, 89–114.
- 1983. 'The sentence in Gaulish', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 3, 169–215.
- 1985. 'Movement and emphasis in the Gaulish sentence', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic studies* 32, 1–37.
- Ködderitzsch, 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*, ed. Hermann M. Ölberg and Gernot Schmidt unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bothien, 211–22. Innsbruck: AMÖ.
- 1996. 'Noch einmal zur großen Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar', in Meid and Anreiter 1996, 149–55.
- Kroch, Anthony S. 1989. 'Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change', *Language variation and change* 1, 199–244.
- 1994. 'Morphosyntactic variation', in *Papers from the 30th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ii, *The parasession on variation in linguistic theory*, ed. Katharine Beals, Jeannette Denton, Robert Knippen, Lynette Melnar, Hisami Suzuki and Erica Zeinfeld, 180–201. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1979. 'Gaulois IEVRV : irlandais (ro)-ír "dicauit"', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 37, 207–13.
- 1994. *La langue gauloise. Description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*. Paris: Errance.
- 1996. 'Notes gauloises. III. L'étymologie de ειωρου/*ieuru*', in Meid and Anreiter 1996, 96–8.
- Le Gall, Joël. 1980. *Alésia. Archéologie et histoire*². Paris: Arthème Fayard.
- 1985. *Alésia. Le siège de la forteresse gauloise par César. La ville gallo-romaine. Le culte de sainte Reine*. Paris: Ministère de la Culture.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1979. 'La dédicace de Martial à Alise', *Revue des études anciennes* 81, 251–60.
- 1980. 'Le dossier gaulois *ieuru*', in *Recherches de linguistique. Hommages à Maurice Leroy*, ed. Jean Bingen, André Coupez and Francine Marvet, 110–118. Bruxelles: Université de Bruxelles.
- 1985a. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises* i, *Textes gallo-grecs*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- 1985b. 'Notes d'étymologie gauloise. x. La première déclinaison celtique', *Etudes celtiques* 22, 88–94.

- 1988. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises ii/1, Textes gallo-étrusques, textes gallo-latins sur pierre*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- 1994. 'Compléments gallo-grecs', *Etudes celtiques* 30, 181–9.
- 1996. 'Notes d'étymologie gauloise. XIII. Autour de CELICNON', *Etudes celtiques* 32, 125–9.
- with Léon Fleuriot, Pierre-Yves Lambert, Robert Marichal and Alain Vernhet. 1985. 'Textes gaulois et gallo-romains en cursive latine. 3. Le plomb du Larzac', *Etudes celtiques* 22, 95–177.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto. 1991–1992. 'Gaulish *ieuru* and Old Irish *-ír*', *Studia Celtica* 26–7, 7–8.
- Martin, Roland and Pierre Varène. 1973. *Le monument d'Ucuétis à Alésia*. Paris: Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique.
- McCone, Kim. 1996. 'Der Teller von Lezoux', in Meid and Anreiter 1996, 107–17.
- Meid, Wolfgang. 1986. 'Die Interpretation gallischer Inschriften', *Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 123, 36–55.
- 1992. *Gaulish inscriptions. Their interpretation in the light of archaeological evidence and their value as a source of linguistic and sociological information*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- 1994. 'Die "große" Felsinschrift von Peñalba de Villastar', in *Indogermanica et Caucasia. Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Roland Bielmeier and Reinhard Stempel unter Mitarbeit von René Lanszweert, 385–94. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. [Abbreviated Spanish translation in *Kalathos* 13–14 (1993–1995) 348–53; abbreviated English translation in Wolfgang Meid, *Celtiberian inscriptions*, Budapest: Archaeolingua (1994) 31–7.]
- and Peter Anreiter (ed.). 1996. *Die grösseren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler* (Akten des Kolloquiums Innsbruck 29. April – 3. Mai 1993). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Mir*: Ernault 1914.
- MLH A*: Untermann 1975.
- MLH K*: Untermann 1997: 349–722.
- Motta, Filippo. 2001. 'La sala del convivio dei fabbri gallici. Per l'etimologia di gall. CELICNON', in *Studi e ricerche di terminologia alimentare*, a cura di Carlo Consani, 21–6. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Murphy, Denis (ed.). 1896. *The annals of Clonmacnoise*. Dublin: Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland.
- O'Donovan, John (ed. and tr.). 1854. *Annála ríoghachta Éireann. Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*. Dublin: Hodges, Smith and Co.

- Olivier, Albéric. 1992. 'Les chapiteaux à consoles du "celicnon" d'Ucuetis à Alesia', *Revue archéologique de l'est et du centre-est* 43, 307–27.
- Pictet, Adolphe. 1859. *Essai sur quelques inscriptions en langue gauloise*. Genève and Paris: Joël Cherbuliez.
- 1867. 'Nouvel essai sur les inscriptions gauloises', *Revue archéologique* 15, 276–89, 313–29, 385–405; 16, 1–20, 123–40.
- Poisson, G. 1908. 'Note sur une inscription gauloise d'Alesia', *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie de Rochefort* 30, 259–64.
- 1912. 'A propos de l'inscription d'Alise', *Revue celtique* 33, 101–3.
- Primus, Beatrice. 1998. 'The relative order of recipient and patient in the languages of Europe', in *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, ed. Anna Siewierska, 421–73. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rhÿs, John. 1905–1906. 'The Celtic inscriptions of France and Italy', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 2, 273–373.
- 1911–1912. 'The Celtic inscriptions of Gaul. Additions and corrections', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 5, 261–360.
- RIG E*: Lejeune 1988: 1–54.
- RIG G*: Lejeune 1985a.
- RIG L*: Lejeune 1988: 57–194.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1974. 'Zur Vorgeschichte des keltischen Kasussystems', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 25, 402–7.
- 1980. 'Continental Celtic as an aid to the reconstruction of proto-Celtic', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94, 172–97.
- 1986. 'Zur Rekonstruktion des Keltischen. Festlandkeltisches und inselkeltisches Verbum', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 41, 159–79.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1997. *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles*. Maynooth: The Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- Schwyzer, Eduard. 1988. *Griechische Grammatik* ii, *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*⁵. München: C. H. Beck.
- Simon, Adrien. 1908–1909. 'Rapport sur les fouilles exécutées en 1908 par la Société des Sciences Historiques et Naturelles de Semur', *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences Historiques et Naturelles de Semur-en-Auxois* 36, 353–84.
- Szemerënyi, Oswald. 1995. 'Loan relations between Gaulish, Gothic, Latin, and Greek', in *Verba et structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm and Norbert Oettinger, 303–17. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1908. Review of Rhÿs 1905–1906. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 6, 557–8.
- 1946, repr. 1998. *A grammar of Old Irish*, rev. ed. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

- Untermann, Jürgen. 1975. *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum i, Die Münzlegenden*, zwei Tle. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- (unter Mitwirkung von Dagmar Wodtko). 1997. *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum iv, Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Vennemann, Theo. 1971. 'The phonology of Gothic vowels', *Language* 47, 90–132.
- Villar, Francisco. 1991. 'Le locatif celtibérique tardif de la langue celtique dans l'inscription de Peñalba de Villastar', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 44, 56–66.
- Wagner, Heinrich. 1962. 'Gaulish *ieuru* "fecit"', *Ériu* 19, 87–8.
- Wasow, Thomas. 1997. 'Remarks on grammatical weight', *Language variation and change* 9, 81–105.
- Whatmough, Joshua. 1949. 'Gaulish *tuθθos, auot, ieuru*', *Journal of Celtic studies* 1, 7–10.
- Williams, Ifor (ed.). 1935. *Canu Llywarch Hen*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

JOSEPH F. ESKA

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University