§ 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 stone as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{MARTIALIS - DANNÔTALI} \\
&\text{IEVRV - VCETE - SOSIN} \\
&\text{CELINNON ♠ ETIC} \\
&\text{GOBEDBI - DVGIJONTIJO} \\
&\text{♠ VCETIN ♠} \\
&\text{IN [ ]ALISJA}
\end{align*}
\]

It is clear in l. 6 of the text that the preposition IN is complete, as is the toponym ALISIJA. There is room for no more than a single character in the damaged area of the line. Rhŷs 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, 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 ] SSU 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 inscription during excavations in 1908. During those

---

1See the fine photograph in Lejeune 1988: 149 fig. 77.
2I employ ⟨i⟩ 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 . indicates characters which are damaged and/or no longer clearly legible; the pipe | indicates line breaks.
3Attested in classical sources as Alesia, Αλεσία.
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) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{DEO} & \cdot \text{VCVETI} \\
\text{ET} & \cdot \text{BERGVSAE} \\
3 & \cdot \text{REM\^VS} \cdot \text{PRIMI} \cdot \text{FIL(ius)} \\
\text{DONAVIT} & \cdot \text{V} \cdot \text{(otum)} \cdot \text{S} \cdot \text{(oluit)} \cdot \text{L} \cdot \text{(ibens)} \cdot \text{M} \cdot \text{(erito)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘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 \textit{Martialis}-inscription is still Thurneysen 1908: 558, who first recognised that \textit{DVGIJONTIJO} is a 3. pl. present verb with attached uninflected clitic relativiser and suggested that \textit{GOBEDBI} is a dative plural\(^8\) in co-ordination with dat. sg. \textit{VCVETE}. He translates:

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

Aside from the precise semantics of 3. sg. pret. \textit{IEVRV}, which remain in dispute,\(^9\) the only aspect of Thurneysen’s interpretation which was challenged early on is his translation of \textit{GOBEDBI} as ‘Priester’. He expressly states that ‘[a]n kymr. \textit{gof} mittelir. \textit{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, \textit{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

---

\(^{7}\)See 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.

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

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 ἑσυχασίαν ‘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 SOSIN 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.

\(^{10}\)In 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 states that Mageoghagan’s translation of the Annals of Connacht has a parallel passage which contains the variant Ughdon, but Murphy’s edition of Mageoghagan’s translation has it as Ighdôn (1896: 32).


\(^{13}\)Szemerényi 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. χυλὸς, χυλὸς (dim.) ‘small cup’ (also attested as χυλὸς (g)), and the Gothic form, which he wants to mean ‘dining room’, to be a borrowing from Lat. cēnācum ‘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 ō-stem to thematic flexion, neither of which occur in Osc. CvLChna, CvLFNAM or Etr. CvLIXna, XLIXNA, 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 ieu ro-corp us apparently refer to other types of structures, e.g. CANTALON (RIG L–9) and CANECOSEDLO N (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.\footnote{The Gothic form requires that cēnācum 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. ἔδαφος and Goth. kelkn, 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. πύργος (acc. sg.) and Goth. kelkn. 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. kelkn.

\footnote{Thus, I remain satisfied with the etymology proposed for celicno- in Eska 1990a: 68–9: The base *kelhiₐₐ - ‘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 *keiₐₐ - ‘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. /el/ and Goth. /el/ (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. /el/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [ɛ]) contrasted with both Goth. /el/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [ɛ]) and /il/ (articulated as proximate phonetic [i]), it (i.e. Gaul. /el/) was spelt with (e), which was normally reserved to spell Goth. /el/, because it, while perhaps not as high as Gaul. /el/ \(\approx [ɛ]\), occupied a point in vowel space much closer to it than either /el/ \(\approx [ɛ]\) or /il/ \(\approx [i]\). 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. /el/ and Gaul. /el/.
§ 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)idh ← IE instr. pl. *-bis, and hence that a syncretism has begun (so Schmidt 1974: 403), owing to the attestation of inherited dat. pl. -bo < *-bhos, e.g. µαρηβο (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=kʷe) 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\textsuperscript{d}):

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
 devó & devébhír & ā gamat \\
 god.NOM.SG & god.INSTR.PL & come.3.SG.AOR.SUBJ \\
\end{tabular}

‘May the god come along with the gods’.

b. Greek (Homer, \textit{Il.} viii 289–90):

\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
 ἑν & ἔν & χερ & 2.POSS.PRON.DAT.SG & in & hand.DAT.SG \\
 to & / & ὑμῖν & ἑν & ἔν & χερ & 2.POSS.PRON.INSTR.PL & chariot.INSTR.PL \\
 \end{tabular}

‘I will place in your hand two horses along with their chariots’.

c. Latin (Caesar, \textit{BG} v 49.1):

\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
 Gallí & ... & ad & Caesarem & omnibus \\
 Gaul.NOM.PL & towards & Caesar.ACC.PL & all.ABL.PL \\
 copíis & contendunt \\
 troop.ABL.PL & hasten.3.PL.PRES \\
\end{tabular}

‘The Gauls hastened to meet Caesar with all their troops’.

The syntax of the \textit{Martialis}-inscription itself, then, provides good evidence against the analysis of \textit{GOBEDBI} as a comitative instrumental. Furthermore, the existence of both \textit{-bo} and \textit{-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. \textit{-bo} is always functionally dative plural, but this is not so for \textit{-bi} (and its late variant \textit{-be}).\textsuperscript{19} It is highly

\textsuperscript{16}See further Delbrück 1888: 123–5.

\textsuperscript{17}See further Schwyzer 1988: 159–65 and 172.

\textsuperscript{18}See further Hofmann and Szantyr 1972: 114–16.

\textsuperscript{19}The inherited instrumental plural desinence \textit{-bi} (later \textit{-be}) is, at present, attested six times aside from \textit{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 \textit{eiabi} (\textsuperscript{19}) 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. \textit{gandobe} (2) and \textit{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 \equiv 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);\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{align*}
(8) & \text{ MARTIALIS DANNÔTALI | IEVRV VCVETE SOSÎN | CELICNON} \\
(9) & \text{ ETIC | GOBEDBI DVGJIONTIJO | VÇVETIN | IN ALISIJA}
\end{align*}

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

\begin{align*}
(10) & \text{ ‘et aussi, en second lieu, avec la participation de . . . ’.}
\end{align*}

In support of this analysis, Lejeune 1996: 126 suggests that ‘l’heidera 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 to the latter as dative-instrumental plural. Koch 1983: 206 treats SVIORBE (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. ammanbe (5) in quasi-phonetic orthography) in the recently discovered inscription from Châteaubleau remains very uncertain.\textsuperscript{20} It 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.\textsuperscript{21} Thus 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 ♦ {IU}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 \( *h_1eti=k^w_e \), but as a copula with attached clitic connective, i.e. 3. sg. pres. \( *h_1esti + \) an apocopated form of \( =k^w_e \). 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\(^b\)1), and, in augmented form, as \( coetic \) (1\(^b\)3), beside which \( cuet[ic] \) (1\(^b\)3) 23 occurs in quasi-phonetic orthography. 24 This is not to say that ETIC \( \langle *h_1eti=k^w_e \rangle \) and putative ETIC \( \langle *h_1esti=k^w_e \rangle \) 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 22

---

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 l. 1\(^b\)3 perhaps should be restored as \( c[otic] \).

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 35.18ª)

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. 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. 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:

(13)  [\[CP [NP \text{RAT} \text{TI} \text{N} BRI \text{VATIO} \text{M}]_j \mid \text{IP [NP FRONTV \cdot TARBE} \text{TIS} [\text{O}] \text{nI} \text{OS}^{28}]_i \mid \text{VP t}_i \text{ IE} \{1\} \text{VRV} t_j]]

‘F. T. offered the *latin 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] Ucuetis 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 Ucuetis, is incongruous to say the least’.

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

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

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

27 It should be clear that under no circumstances could this inscription be treated as a cleft sentence with null copula: *RBRI VATIO* 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.

28 This form could possibly also be restored as *TARBE} \text{TIS} [\text{ČO}] \text{nI} \text{OS}.

29 As is clear from the Latin inscription in (2), the sex of *Ucuetis* is male.
‘M. D. has offered to Ucuetis the celicnon, which is by the smiths [i.e. made by the smiths] who worship Ucetis in Alisia’.

We must note, however, that the relativising character of $\neq_k w e$ 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 pronouns were attached to $n e=k w e$. Since ETIC in this inscription occurs in a clause which is not negative, and which does not have a clitic pronoun 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 DVGJONTIJO. 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) $\ast$MARTIALIS DANNOTALI IEVRV SOSIN CELICNON VCVETE ETIC GOBEDBI DVGJONTIJO 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 | ουλλονο εισ ιου τοιου τουτους | ναμασατις | εμφρου βηλτι | σαμι σοσων | γεμητων (RIG G–153)
‘S. V., tribesman of Nîmes, offered this holy thing/place to B.’.

b. ICCAVOS · OP|ΠΙΑΝΙCNOS · JEV|RV · BRIGINDONE$^{32}$ | CANTALON (RIG L–9)
‘I. O. offered the cantalon to B.’.

c. LICNOS CON|TEXTOS$^{33}$ · IEVRV | ANVALONNACV | CANECOSDELON (RIG L–10)
‘L. C. offered the canecosedlon to A.’.

$^{30}$In the corpus of inscriptions bearing the syntagm δε δε βρατον δεπτοτεμν-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.

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

$^{32}$This form could possibly also be read as BRIGINDONI.

$^{33}$This form could possibly also be read as COŚI|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 DVGJONTIJO 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 DVGJONTIJO 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 DVGJONTIJO VCVETIN as:

(18) ‘celicnum et fabricam co lentium 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 DVGJONTIJO as a genitive plural nt-participle requires that the final nasal of the genitive plural exponent -on < *-¯om be lost, but as the forms SOSÑ, 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 DVGJONTIJO as a genitive plural nt-participle, even were we to grant the aberrant loss of the

34 Even were one to propose that the loss of final nasals was in progress in the language of the inscription, the environment in which DVGJONTIJO 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 -ʰ- < *-ih-, as attested in *tigontias (1ᵃ4), sagitiontias (2ᵃ8–9 and 2ᵇ10), and *lictontias (2ᵇ13) 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 EQVOISVI, which are conjoined by the connective =QVE, as well as the divine name LVGVEI. Ködderitzsch interprets ENIOROSEI into a preposition ENI and a governed nominal on the basis of comparison with the ablative singular coin legend ofosis (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 EQVOISVI ought to be locatives, too, despite their inherited dative morphology. Meid 1994: 389–93 prefers

---

35 This form is also often read as EQVEISVI.
36 See Eska 1990b: 105–6 on the alternation between the connectives.
37 Villar 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 ofosis (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 EQVOISVI 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 Teuo[Tonio] within the accusative argument a.Tom38 Teuo[Tonio] ‘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.


(19) a. English:
She gave t₁ (to) John [NP the book I bought yesterday].

b. Italian:
Ho scritto t₁ a Carlo [NP una lettera di]
AUX.1.SG written to C. a letter of
cinque pagine; five pages
‘I wrote (to) Carlo a five-page letter’.

c. Catalan:
Han venut t₁ a les teves germanes [NP els]
AUX.3.PL sold to the your sisters the
ous que hem donat; eggs REL AUX.1.PL given
‘They sold (to) your sisters the eggs that we gave’.

d. Welsh:
Rhoddodd yr athro t₁ iddi hi [NP lyfr
gave.3.SG the teacher to.3.SG.FEM her book
a oedd ar y bwrdd yn y gegin];
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’.

38The form has also been read as a.Toš; I argue that diagnostic means exist to prefer the reading a.Tom 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 gluai steán mór bán a
gave he to.1.SG car big white REL
fuair sé i Meiriceá].
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 DVG IJON TIO | YÇVETIN | 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. YÇVETE (21):

(20) [NP [NP GOBEDBI] [CP DVG IJON TIO_j =JO_i [IP t_i t_j [VP t_i t_j YÇVETIN IN ALISIJA]]]]

(21) [NP [N YÇVETE]]

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

(22) [IP [NP MARTIALIS DANNÔTALI_j IEVRV_j [VP [VP t_i t_j YÇVETE t_k SOSIN CELICNON] [ETIC [NP GOBEDBI DVG IJON TIO=JO YÇVETIN IN ALISIJA_i]]]]

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 DANNÔTALI IEVRV SOSIN CELICNON YÇVETE ETIC GOBEDBI DVG IJON TIO YÇVETIN 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 YÇVETE 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 DVG IJON TIO YÇVETIN IN ALISIJA may be a feature of a formal register, or perhaps the relative leftward position of YÇVETE in its base-generated position as opposed to rightward-shifted GOBEDBI DVG IJON TIO YÇVETIN 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

40 I should like to thank Brent Vine for providing me with this example.
(24) Q(uintus) · PESCENN[IVS ... F(ilius)]
    COLOMNAS · III
    3
    DE SVO DAT
    FERONEAE
    ET CREPIDINEM
    6
    ANTE · COLOMNAS
    EX · LAPIDE

‘Q. P., son of . . . , offers from his (property) (i.e. paid for) three columns and the stone pedestal in front of the columns to F’.

Just as we would expect, the accusative argument which has been shifted rightward to the end of the sentence is syntactically complex (25), while that to which it is conjoined is not (26):

(25) [NP [NP CREPIDINEM] [PP ANTE COLOMNAS] [PP EX LAPIDE]]

(26) [NP [N COLOMNAS] [Num III]]

§ 14. In the end, while we cannot know the precise grounds for the discontinuity between the two dative arguments in the Martialis-inscription, the traditional morphosyntactic analysis and translation of it remain the only tenable way of dealing with it in view of the lexical semantics and syntactic constituency of CELICNON and the cross-linguistically-attested features of the morphosyntax of the inscription in toto.
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