Introduction

(1) I have argued that proto-IE */p/ survived fricated to /ɸ/ in Cisalpine Celtic, represented by the character digamma ← ꞌ = ⟨v⟩ in the Alphabet of Lugano, in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino (LexLep CO·48) in Eska 1998 & 2013.

(2) This claim is straightforward for the form uvamoKozis, which ultimately continues, in proto-Indo-European terms, *upm̩mo-gʰosti-s ‘having supreme guests’, but the dative plural form uvlTiauioPos has, thus far, resisted all attempts at etymological analysis.

(3) In this paper, I provide an analysis that supports the view that digamma ⟨v⟩ represents /ɸ/ in both forms in this inscription and offer some remarks about the analysis of the dative plural form ariuonePos, with which uvlTiauioPos is syntactically construed.

Prelude

(4) The inscription on the stone of Prestino is carefully engraved between orientation lines in sinistrograde ductus. The sandstone slab on which it is engraved is 375 cm. long, 15–19 cm. in height, and 31–35 cm. broad; the inscription itself is 190 cm. long; the characters are ca. five cm. in height.


1 https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/wiki/CO%C2%B748.
The inscription is transliterated as:

uvamoKozis : Plialeθu : uvlTiauioPos : ariuonePos : siTeš : TeTu

The forms in the inscription are currently analysed as follows:


b. **Plialeθu** is evidently to be construed with **uvamoKozis**, though its etymological analysis and flexional morphology are in dispute. It has variously been interpreted as a patronymic, cognomen, ethnonym, functionary title, or even a verb.

c. **uvlTiauioPos ariuonePos** is a dat. pl. indirect object phrase, the subject of this paper. The forms have been interpreted as cognomina, gentilicia, ethnonyms, patronymics, theonyms, names of priests or magistrates, and personal names.

d. **siTeš** is the acc. pl. direct object, evidently cognate with Lat. sēdēs ‘seat’.


e. **TeTu** is a 3. sg. preterite verb, probably continuing the proto-IE root *dʰeh₁- ‘give’.

**Typological comparanda**

In view of the verb the presence of the verb **TeTu**, it appears that we should look to the Transalpine Celtic dedicatory inscriptions that include 3. sg. pret. ΔΕΔΕ ‘gave’, which certainly is cognate, adv. ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ‘in gratitude’, and acc. sg. ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ / N ‘tithe’. The tokens of this formula in which all three words are overtly attested are:

---

2 For a potential parallel of the offering of a ‘seat’ in a Messapic dedicatory inscription, cf. hezzan ... apistaθi (*MLM* 3 Ro) under the analysis of de Simone 1988: 403–404. I should like to thank Corinna Salomon for calling this inscription to my attention.

3 I follow Hamp 1991: 36 in the view that *dʰeh₁- ‘put’ was replaced by *kerhx₁- ‘scatter, pour out’ in Celtic; cf. OIr. docuireθtar ‘put’ and probably Cisalp. Celt. KariTe (*LexLep* VA–6).
a. RIGG–27 = RIIGBDR-09-01:
    ΟΥΗΒΡΟΥΜΑΡΟC ΔΕΔΕ ΤΑΡΑΝΟΟΥ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘Vebrumaros gave a tithe to Taranus in gratitude.’

b. RIGG–148 = RIIGVAU-08-01:
    ‘×××lusos ×××liakos gave a tithe to Graselos in gratitude.’

c. RIGG–183 = RIIGGAR-04-01:
    ΕΚΙΛΙΟC ΡΟΥΜΑΝ[Ι] ΟΥΜΑΝ[Ι] ΟΑΝ ΔΟΟΥΝ ΝΑΒΟ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘Ekilios R[?]uman[?]os gave a tithe to the underworld goddesses in gratitude.’

d. RIGG–203 = RIIGGAR-10-01:
    ΑΡΤΑΡΟC ΙΛΛΑΝΟΥΙΑΚΟC ΔΕΔΕ ΜΑΤΡΕΒΟ ΝΑΜΑΥΣΙΚΑΒΟ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘Artar[os I]llanuiakos gave a tithe to the Mātrēs of Nîmes in gratitude.’

e. RIGG–206 = RIIGGAR-10-04:
    ΚΑΣΣΙΑΤΑΛΟC ΟΥΕΡΚΟC ΚΝΟC ΔΕΔΕ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘Kassitalos Versiknos gave a tithe to Ala×einos in gratitude.’

Tokens that include two of the formulaic words are:

a. RIGG–28 = RIIGBDR-10-01:
    ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΠΟΡΞΙΟC ΙΟΥΓΙΛΙΑΚΟC ΔΕΔΕ ΒΕΛΕΙΝΟ
    ‘Porix Iugilliakos gave (a tithe) to Belenos in gratitude.’

b. RIGG–64 = RIIGBDR-12-02:
    ΜΑΤΡΕBΟ ΓΑΛΑΝΙΣΧΑΒΟ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘(X gave) a tithe to the Mātrēs of Glanum in gratitude.’

c. RIGG–65 = RIIGBDR-12-03:
    ΚΟΡΝΗΛΙΑ ΡΟΚΛΟΙΚΟC ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘Kornelia (gave) a tithe to the listening goddesses in gratitude.’

d. RIGG–214 = RIIGGAR-12-01:
    [... ΟΣ] ΔΑΡΕΣΙΚΝΟC ΔΕΔΕ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ
    ‘[...] Adressiknos gave a tithe to ... in gratitude.’

(9) The conclusion to be drawn is that the recipient(s) in inscriptions with 3. sg. pret. ΔΕΔΕ are divine beings. I adopt the working hypothesis that the recipients in the inscription on the Prestino stone are, likewise, divine beings; similarly, Morandi 2004: 639 & 2017: 425 on the same grounds.
Digamma in Cisalpine Celtic epigraphy

(10) The earliest attestation of digamma in the Cisalpine Celtic corpus occurs in a fragmentary form engraved upon a beaker from Sesto Calende (LexLep VA·4.1). There is no reason to doubt that it represents /w/ in this inscription.

(11) It may also be attested in a second inscription upon the same beaker (LexLep VA·4.2), although it has also been read as zeta (z).

(12) There is no evidence that /φ/ occurs in the earliest stratum of Cisalpine Celtic epigraphy as attested at present.

(13) But we should expect that, were it to be discovered some day, it would be recorded as a digraph ← ☐ = ⟨vh⟩, as in earliest Etruscan. Though the character 8 came to be employed early to represent /f/ in northern Etruria, there is evidence from the seventh century BCE for use of the digraph, e.g.g.:

a. vheίσalna (ET² AS 2.15)
b. vhlakunaie (ET² Vt 3.1)
c. v(ḥ)la(𝑣)e (ET² Cl 2.20)

(14) The digraph was adopted in at the beginning of the Latin epigraphic tradition, e.g., 3. sg. pret. vheivhaked (CIL i² 3) ‘made’ and in Venetic, e.g., vhetiana (LVEs 51) ‘IDIONYM’, also sometimes inverted to ⟨hv⟩, e.g., 3. sg. pret. hva.g.s.to (LVPa 15) ‘made’, as also in Etruscan itself, e.g., hvuluves (ET² Ve 3.30).

(15) Once the reform in the Roman alphabet, already early in the Very Old Latin period, was made whereby upsilon V = ⟨u⟩ came to represent /w/, as well as /u/, e.g., 2./3. fut. impv. saluetqo (AE 1991, 396; ca. 620–610 BCE) (Wallace 2011: 15), Latin reduced the digraph to digamma ☐, now = ⟨f⟩, by the first half of the sixth century BCE as attested in 3. sg. pret. feced (CIL i² 4; ca. 600–550 BCE) ‘made’.

(16) The use of the digraph, by and large, was retained in Venetic, but after the loss of /h/ in Cadore, was reduced to heta η, e.g., → η/XXXΟ’ς = futto.s. (LVCa 15) ‘IDIONYM’ (Lejeune 1966: 162–163; Wallace 2004: 845); cf. Latinised FVTVS. (LVCa 62).

4 The form is engraved as vqlae, but the transcription is guaranteed by flave (e.g., ET² Vt 1.23).
In view of the fact that upsilon \( \upsilon = \langle u \rangle \) in the Alphabet of Lugano, as in the Roman alphabet, came to represent /w/, as well as /u/, at a relatively early date, e.g., dat. sg. Kuašoni (LexLep TI∙27.1; fifth to early fourth century BCE) and in dat. pl. ariuonePos in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino itself,\(^5\) it seems clear that the on-going use of digamma \( \digamma \) precisely where inherited proto-IE */p/ is continued in uvamoKozis and, as we will see, also in dat. pl. uvlTiauioPos, plus phonological considerations, leads to the conclusion that, as in Latin, digamma \( \digamma \) represents a voiceless bilabial fricative in Cisalpine Celtic epigraphy.

**Epigraphic matters**

The sequence uvlT- has caused a great deal of consternation to all who have attempted an etymological analysis of uvlTiauioPos. Whether one takes digamma \( \langle v \rangle \) to represent /\( \phi \)/ or /w/, the sequence represents an illicit syllabic onset for a Celtic or any Indo-European language.

It seems clear that we have to deal with an epigraphic error. And, in fact, this has been suggested several times:

a. Tibiletti Bruno 1966: 292–294 and Prosdocimi 1986: 240 suggest that lambda \( \lambda = \langle l \rangle \) is an error for iota \( \iota = \langle i \rangle \), thus yielding uv\( \langle i \rangle \)TiauioPos, which bears licit syllabic structure, but Motta 2000: 197 notes that there are no good comparanda for such a form.

b. Morandi 2004: 639 & 2017: 425 proposes that digamma \( \digamma \) represents the lenition of pre-Cisalp. Celt. */pʰ/ followed by ‘una eventuale scrittura Uvl-per Viul’. He does not provide any motivation for the lenition of */pʰ/ in initial position, however, and there are no phonetic grounds to expect that it would evolve to /w/ other than before /n/.

c. Lambert 2008: 256, likewise, proposes that \( \langle uv \rangle \) is an error of transposition for \( \langle vu \rangle \), suggesting that it was triggered by dittography with the initial two characters of uvamoKozis —, which, likewise, provides for licit syllabic structure. He suggests that putative \( \langle vu \rangle \)lTi- could be cognate with OIr. folt, MW gwalt, OCorn. gols, OBret.

\(^5\) Probably also in Teu (LexLep VA∙6), which I understand to represent /te:wu:/ < pre-Celt. */dejwo:/, dated to the mid-sixth century BCE by de Marinis 2009 and to ca. 500 BCE by LexLep ([https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/wiki/VA%C2%B76](https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/wiki/VA%C2%B76)), and Piu (LexLep BG∙41.13) = /piwu:/ .
guolt ‘hair (of the head)’; such a connection can be excluded, however, because the etymon attested in Insular Celtic continues */wolto/- with a different root vowel.

d. De Bernardo Stempel 2014: 95 also sees the etymon for ‘hair’ in **uvlTi-**, claiming that */o/ was velarised to /u/ before /l/. Upon the basis of such forms as Cisalp. Celt. KolieTu (LexLep VR-19), mesiolano (LexLep MI-10.1), and sola (LexLep NO-20), it is clear that such a sound change did not occur.

e. Isaac 2007: 14 tentatively proposes that a character has been left out and that we might read **uvl[a]TiauioPos**, still reading **(uv)** as a digraph = /w/. He connects the initial string with */wlati/- as attested in OIr. flaith ‘sovereignty, ruler’, OW OCorn. gulat, MW gwlat, MCorn. gulas, MBret. gl(o)at ‘country, kingdom’, but does not attempt to account for the auio- sequence of the form.

(20) None of these proposals are compelling, but another proposed error, in my view, is very promising. Stifter 2002/2003: 239 proposes an error of transposition and suggests that we read **uvl(iT)iauioPos**. The sequence **(i)Tiauio**- can be read straightforwardly as an ijo-derivative of proto-IE *pʰl̩th₂-ʊ-ih₂, which is attested in the Indic theonym Pṛthivī ‘earth’ and, as a dat. sg. ijī-derivative, in Transalp. Celt. LITAVI ‘(goddess) pertaining to the earth’.⁶

(21) The transposition of characters is not an uncommon epigraphic error. There are numerous tokens in Etruscan, for example, some of which are listed here (kindly provided to me by Rex Wallace):

a. aleθans for aleθnas (**ET** AT 1.111)
b. evtes for vetus (**ET** Cl 1.1901)
c. ammarce for mamarce (**ET** Cr 7.1)
d. pevtial for petvial (**ET** Pe 1.431)
e. uļezni for ulznei (**ET** Ta 1.198)
f. maļce for mlace (**ET** Vs 1.179)

(22) A possible token in Transalpine Celtic is PIYTMOC (e.g., RIGG–535 = Lejeune 1995: 103 = RIIGBDR-16-26) for PIYTMOC (e.g., RIGG–533 = Lejeune 1995: 103 = RIIGBDR-16-24), though we expect **PITOYMOC according to the orthographic conventions employed in Celtic inscriptions engraved in Greek characters.

⁶ Attested four times at CIL xiii 2887, 5599, 5601, and 5602, possibly a fifth time at 5600.
Analysis

(23) Stifter reads initial 〈uv〉 in uv(li)TaulioPos as representing /ϕ/, i.e., as a digraph, though he reads the same orthographic sequence in uvamo- as representing /uϕ/, with each character representing a different phoneme; such a double analysis can hardly be correct.

(24) A better approach that understands 〈uv〉 to represent two phonemes, viz., /uϕ/, in both forms is to posit the presence in uv(t)aulioPos of the Celtic adposition *uϕo < proto-IE *upo ‘under’, thus */uϕo-ϕu̯litawjo/ → /uϕlitawjo/- ‘situated under the earth’ via haplology, some examples of which are:

a. Engl. probably ⇒ [pʰuəblɪ]
b. Gk. τετράδραχμον ⇒ Lat. tetrachmum ‘a silver coin worth four drachmas’
c. Engl. library ⇒ [laɪbəi]
d. Gk. ἀμφιφορεύς ⇒ ἀμφορεύς ‘amphora’

(25) Indeed, given that the sequence of the first three syllables of the underlying etymon, viz., */u.ϕo.ϕli/, are a succession of round vowel + bilabial fricative + round vowel + bilabial fricative, a phonological reduction would have been virtually inevitable.

(26) In view of the fact that the bilabial fricative in the haplologised form occurs in the highly sonorous environment V__L, it was probably realised phonetically as [β]. Here is it worth noting again that, should digamma 󰍌 represent /ϕ/ in uv(t)aulioPos, we can only conclude that it also does so in uvamo- < *upamo- < *up̩mo-.

(27) Under this analysis, uv(t)aulioPos is a prepositional governing compound of the very common type. Such compounds are formed with an adposition as the first member of the compound and a thematic or *i̯i̯o/-stem as the second member, e.g.g.:

a. Ved. ádhi-gart-yā- ‘situated upon the chariot’
b. Gk. κατά-χθόν-ιος ‘situated under the earth’
c. Lat. ē-greg-ius’ situated away from the flock’
d. Umb. am-peř-ia (abl. sg.) ‘situated around the foot’
e. Transalp. Celt. Are-nor-ic-i (nom. pl.) ‘situated before the sea’
f. Lith. ańt-žem-is ‘situated above the earth’
Underworld deities are well known to have existed in the ancient Celtic world. We have the ANΔΩΟΥΝΩΝΑΒΟ (RIGG–183 = RIIGGAR-04-01; dat. pl.) ‘underworld goddesses’, whose name is cognate with Annwfn, the name of the Otherworld in Welsh tradition. The same form is very probably attested in antumnos (RIGL–98 2b4).

And the inscription from Chamalières (RIGL–100) references the andedjon ... Mapo(ʻon) (acc. sg.) ‘infernal Maponos’ and appeals to the anderon (gen. pl.) ‘infernal (gods)’.

We, thus, apparently are dealing with some underworld deities in the inscription upon the stone from Prestino, which leads us to a consideration of the form ariuonePos. 7

A number of proposals have been made about the etymology of ariuonePos, most of which would not align with the proposal advanced in (24–27) that uvli(a)uioPos is a prepositional governing compound meaning ‘situated under the earth’.

a. Motta 1983: 66, 2000: 198, & 2009: 297 suggests that this form may be an ethnonym connected to the toponym Airuno, a town not distant from Como, but the resemblance is superficial at best.

b. De Bernardo Stempel has connected ariuonePos to OIr. aie‘freeman’ < *ar-jo-on a number of occasions, e.g., in 1999: 349 saying that it is a nasal expansion of an original jo-stem, in 2003: 60* saying further to explain the form as ‘entspr[ich][t] ... einem Singular Ariu mit gekreuztem oblique Stamm Ari(ʻon)’ and ‘an exceptional conflation of the -u(-) of the nominative and the regular declensional morpheme -on-of the oblique cases’, respectively, then in 2023: 17 showing ‘strengthening of *aryon- to ariuon-’. None of this convinces. An exceptional, and not otherwise attested, conflation is ad hoc, as is strengthening of /jo/ to putative /juo/ in view of Cisalpine Celtic forms such as mešiolano (LexLep MI·10.1), sipiconios (LexLep BI·1), and uv(i)TauioPos in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino itself. We would then expect to find *ario- in view of personal names such as Latinised Eastern Celt. Ariomanvs (CIL iii 4594) and Ariovindo (AE 1912, 40; dat. sg.).

c. A connection to aie‘guarding, protecting’ < *ar-jā potentially provides suitable semantics, but is excluded for the same reason; cf. Latinised Eastern Celt. Ariag̃ne (RIUiii 938; gen. sg.).

7 I should like to thank Sasha Nikolaev for extensive discussion upon the analysis of ariuonePos.
d. Markey & Mees 2003: 152–153 seek a connection to the ‘plough’ root and propose a secondary \( \mu \omega n \)-stem built to an \( i \)-stem, thus \(*h_2er(h)\)-i-\( \mu \omega n \), seeing a tribal name ‘\*Ariwones “the tillers”, or “those who serve \*Ariwũ< \*Ariw(ũ) or \*Ariwos” or “those from the settlement founded by \*Ariwos”. Such formations are perfectly possible, as attested, e.g.g., by Ved. \( k\̄r̥ṣ\)-i-\( v\̄n \)-‘providing ploughing’ and \( śruṣ\̄\̄t\)-i-\( v\̄n \)-‘providing listening’ (Debrunner 1954: 900–901). I note that, though there are a large number of nominal derivations known to be built to the root \(*h_2erh_3\)-, an \( i \)-stem is hitherto unattested; see the conspectus of derivations listed in NIL 322–328.

e. Morandi 2004: 639 & 2017: 425 suggests that it is plausible to see a connection between \*ariuonePos and Transalp. Celt. \*aruerijatin, an epithet of the divinity \*Mapor\( or \) in the inscription of Chamalières (RIGL–100; acc. sg.), but, again, the resemblance is superficial at best.

f. Prósper 2008: 46 sees \*ariuonePos as an ethnonym with the weak stem \(*arī\-mn\>- \*arī\̃n\-, then becoming \*ariuon- via an epigraphic error of transposition. While the phonological/epigraphic scenario that she sets out is plausible, Ved. \*aryamān- ‘ hospitable patron’ suggests that we would not have to do with an ethnonym. A theonym is certainly plausible — N.B. Ved. \*Aryamān—, but the plural number of \*ariuonePos suggests that we are concerned with a class of divine beings.

(32) At face value, it seems clear that \*ariuonePos is a \( \mu \omega n \)-stem. Such derivatives typically possess either possessive semantics, i.e., ‘provided with X’, or agentive semantics, i.e., ‘providing X’.

(33) As demonstrated in (31a–b), \*iō- and \*iā- nominal stems must be excluded, so we are obliged to seek an \( i \)-stem. However, a nominal \( i \)-stem \(*arī\)-is not otherwise attested in Celtic.

(34) There is an intra-Celtic analysis available, however, based upon the semantics of \*aire, a \*iō-stem in Old Irish. It sometimes means ‘freeman’, but more commonly is attested in the meaning ‘noble’, which suggests that it is not cognate with Ved. \*aryā-, but, instead, is a derivation of the adposition \(*prḥ_i \>- proto-Celt. \*für > pre-OIr. \*ari- ‘fore-\(' \*\-iō, which would regularly develop to OIr. aire and would mean ‘fore(most) one’ \(→ \) ‘noble’.
The derivation of nouns from adpositions has long been known to occur in Celtic. Thurneysen 1928: 4 & 61–74 establishes that OIr. aitire ‘suretyship, surety’ is based upon the adposition eter ‘between’ < *enter and derived with *-iā (see further Russell 1985: 163–164). Breathnach 1983 adds inne ‘quality; inmost part’ from *in ‘in’ + *-iā and echtrae ‘expedition’ from *exter ‘outside of’ + *-iā, more tentatively acc. sg. aire ‘excess’ from *ari- ‘before’ + *-iā (see further Russell 1985: 164–166) and acc. sg. íarmai ‘lack’ from *eφiro- ‘after’ + *-iā.8

Such derivations are not unknown in Continental Celtic. In the Transalpine Celtic inscription from Chamalières (RIGL–100), we find acc. sg. andedjon ‘infernal’ < *ande ‘under’ + *(V)dio-, as well as gen. pl. anderon ‘infernal ‘gods’ < *ande ‘under’ + *-ro-, and in the accounts from the ceramic works at La Graufesenque, we find nom. pl. uxsedia ‘total’ (GLG 18.2) < *uxse ‘over’ + *(V)dio- (Lejeune 1985). See further Lambert 1995, who proposes that ambio-, ario-, and cantio- in the first members of compound personal names are nominal derivations from adpositions.

Under the latter scenario, we would have a nominal derivative in *-_u̯on-. Under such an analysis, ariuonePos would appear to be a possessive derivation meaning, broadly, ‘(those) having foremostness’, perhaps → ‘noble ones’ vel sim., an appropriate designation for (a class of) divine beings.

Though the analysis provided here on ariuonePos is less firmly grounded than the analysis provided for uvli(T)auioPos, understanding it as a nominal derivative from an adposition, viz., ari-uon-, seems reasonable upon the basis of the existence of such formations elsewhere in Celtic and the general semantics. It is, of course, not possible to be any more specific about the nature of the divine recipients in this inscription, but ‘infernal (noble) deities’ is in harmony with what we expect to find upon the basis of the Transalpine Celtic comparanda listed in (36).

Takeaways

a. Proto-IE */p/ has been lost in initial position in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino, but survives in medial position as /ɸ/.

b. It appears likely that /ɸ/ was articulated as [β] in the highly sonorous environment V_L, as is attested in Old Irish.

8 See Thurneysen 1946: 516 for some comment about the source of the nasal.
c. Emended uvl(iT)auioPos is a prepositional governing compound meaning ‘situated under the earth’ and comports with other evidence for infernal deities in Celtic tradition.

d. ariuonePos may be a nominal derivation from an adposition, as is attested elsewhere in both Continental and Insular Celtic.
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