

## Introduction

- (1) I have argued that proto-IE \*/p/ survived fricated to /ϕ/ in Cisalpine Celtic, represented by the character digamma ← Ϝ = ⟨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, \**upr̥mo-ǵʰosti-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 /ϕ/ 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 sinistroke 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.
- (5) It is dated to the end of the sixth or beginning of the fifth century BCE by Morandi 2004: 638 & 2017: 424 and *LexLep*<sup>1</sup> — or, indeed, somewhat later — to 480–450 BCE by Markey & Mees 2003: 116, 475–450 BCE by de Marinis & Motta 1990/1991: 221 and Motta 2000: 197, or even later, into the period of Romanisation, by Tibiletti Bruno 1989.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/wiki/CO%C2%B748>.

(6) The inscription is transliterated as:

**uvamoKozis : Plialeθu : uvlTiauiopos : ariuonePos : siTeś : TeTu**

(7) The forms in the inscription are currently analysed as follows:

- a. **uvamoKozis** is a nom. sg. personal name < \**up̥mmo-ǵ<sup>h</sup>osti-s* ‘having supreme guests’; cf. Ved. *Upamásrava-* (*RV*10.33.6–7) ‘having supreme fame’, Run. **hlewagastir** (*RÁF*43) ‘having famous guests’, and Ven. **ho.s.tihauo.s.** (*LVPa* 7) ‘who honours guests’ (Watkins 1995: 245–246).
- 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. **siTeś** is the acc. pl. direct object, evidently cognate with Lat. *sēdēs* ‘seat’. Cf. the use of -*SEDLON* ‘seat’ in Transalp. Celt. *CANECOSDLON* (*RIGL*–10) in a dedicatory inscription to a divine being.<sup>2</sup> Dupraz 2019 translates -*SEDLON* as ‘exèdre’.
- e. **TeTu** is a 3. sg. preterite verb, probably continuing the proto-IE root \**deh<sub>3</sub>*- ‘give’.<sup>3</sup>

### Typological comparanda

(8) 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/Ν ‘tithe’. The tokens of this formula in which all three words are overtly attested are:

---

<sup>2</sup> For a potential parallel of the offering of a ‘seat’ in a Messapic dedicatory inscription, cf. **hezsan ... apistaθi** (*MLM3* Ro) under the analysis of de Simone 1988: 403–404. I should like to thank Corinna Salomon for calling this inscription to my attention.

<sup>3</sup> I follow Hamp 1991: 36 in the view that \**d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>*- ‘put’ was replaced by \**kerh<sub>x</sub>*- ‘scatter, pour out’ in Celtic; cf. OIr. *docuirethar* ‘put’ and probably Cisalp. Celt. **KariTe** (*LexLep* VA-6).

- a. *RIGG-27 = RIIGBDR-09-01:*  
 ΟΥΗΒΡΟΥΜΑΡΟΣ | ΔΕΔΕ ΤΑΡΑΝΟΥ | ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ  
 ‘Vebrumaros gave a tithe to Taranus in gratitude.’
- b. *RIGG-148 = RIIGVAU-08-01:*  
 \*\*\*ΛΟΥΣ[ΟC] | \*\*\*ΛΙΑΚΟΣ [Γ|Ρ]ΑCΕΛΟΥ[Ι Β]||[Ρ]ΑΤΟΥ ΔΕ(ΔΕ) [ΔΕ]|ΚΑΝΤΕΜ  
 ‘\*\*\*lusos \*\*\*liakos gave a tithe to Graselos in gratitude.’
- c. *RIGG-183 = RIIGGAR-04-01:*  
 ΕΚΙΛΙΟ[C Ρ<sup>[?]</sup>]ΟΥΜΑΝ[Ι]|ΟC ΑΝ|ΔΟΟΥΝ|ΝΑΒΟ Δ|(Ε)Δ(Ε) ΒΡΑΤΟ|[Υ] ΔΕΚΑΝ|ΤΕΝ  
 ‘Ekilios R<sup>[?]</sup>uman[i]os gave a tithe to the underworld goddesses in gratitude.’
- d. *RIGG-203 = RIIGGAR-10-01:*  
 ]ΑΡΤΑΡ[ΟΣ Ι]ΛΛΑΝΟΥΙΑΚΟΣ ΔΕΔΕ | ΜΑΤΡΕΒΟ ΝΑΜΑΥΣΙΚΑΒΟ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕ(ΚΑΝΤΕΝ)  
 ‘]artar[os I]llanuiakos gave a tithe to the Mātrēs of Nîmes in gratitude.’
- e. *RIGG-206 = RIIGGAR-10-04:*  
 ΚΑCΚΙ|ΤΑΛΟΣ | ΟΥΕΡCΙ|ΚΝΟΣ Δ|ΕΔΕ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ Δ|ΕΚΑΝΤ|ΕΝ ΑΛΑ|ΧΕΙΝΟ|ΥΙ  
 ‘Kassitalos Versiknos gave a tithe to Alaχeinos in gratitude.’

Tokens that include two of the formulaic words are:

- a. *RIGG-28 = RIIGBDR-10-01:*  
 ΒΡΑΤΟΥ  
 ]ΠΟΡΕΙΞ ΙΟΥΓΙΛΛΙΑΚΟΣ ΔΕΔΕ ΒΕΛΕΙΝΟ  
 ‘]porix Iugilliakos gave (a tithe) to Belenos in gratitude.’
- b. *RIGG-64 = RIIGBDR-12-02:*  
 ΜΑΤΡΕ|ΒΟ ΓΛΑ|ΝΕΙΚΑ|ΒΟ ΒΡΑ|ΤΟΥ ΔΕ|ΚΑΝΤΕΝ  
 ‘(X gave) a tithe to the Mātrēs of Glanum in gratitude.’
- c. *RIGG-65 = RIIGBDR-12-03:*  
 ΚΟΡΝΗΛΙΑ ΡΟ|ΚΛΟΙCΙΑΒΟ | ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑΝΤ(ΕΝ)  
 ‘Kornelia (gave) a tithe to the listening goddesses in gratitude.’
- d. *RIGG-214 = RIIGGAR-12-01:*  
 [... ΟC] ΑΔΡΕCΣΙΚΝΟC | [ΔΕΔΕ ... Ο]ΥΙ ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΔΕΚΑ(ΝΤΕΝ)  
 ‘[... -os] 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 ← ϷϠ = ⟨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. **vheiśalna** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> AS 2.15)
  - b. **vhlakunaie** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Vt 3.1)
  - c. **v⟨h⟩la(v)e** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Cl 2.20)<sup>4</sup>
- (14) The digraph was adopted in at the beginning of the Latin epigraphic tradition, e.g., 3. sg. pret. **vhe:vhaked** (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup> 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., **hvuluveš** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Ve 3.30).
- (15) Once the reform in the Roman alphabet, already early in the Very Old Latin period, was made whereby epsilon V = ⟨u⟩ came to represent /w/, as well as /u/, e.g., 2./3. fut. impv. **saluetōđ** (*AE*1991, 396; ca. 620–610 BCE) (Wallace 2011: 15), Latin reduced the digraph to digamma Ϡ, now = ⟨f⟩, by the first half of the sixth century BCE as attested in 3. sg. pret. **feced** (*CIL* i<sup>2</sup> 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 H, e.g., → H^XX◇`ʹ = **futto.s.** (*LVCa* 15) ‘IDIONYM’ (Lejeune 1966: 162–163; Wallace 2004: 845); cf. Latinised FVTV.S. (*LVCa* 62).

---

<sup>4</sup> The form is engraved as **vϕlae**, but the transcription is guaranteed by **flave** (e.g., *ET*<sup>2</sup> Vt 1.23).

- (17) In view of the fact that upsilon V = ⟨u⟩ 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.g., dat. sg. **Kuaśoni** (*LexLep*TI·27.1; fifth to early fourth century BCE) and in dat. pl. **ariuonePos** in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino itself,<sup>5</sup> it seems clear that the on-going use of digamma Ϝ precisely where inherited proto-IE \*/p/ is continued in **uvamoKozis** and, as we will see, also in dat. pl. **uvtiauiopos**, plus phonological considerations, leads to the conclusion that, as in Latin, digamma Ϝ represents a voiceless bilabial fricative in Cisalpine Celtic epigraphy.

### Epigraphic matters

- (18) The sequence **uvt-** has caused a great deal of consternation to all who have attempted an etymological analysis of **uvtiauiopos**. Whether one takes digamma ⟨v⟩ to represent /ϕ/ or /w/, the sequence represents an illicit syllabic onset for a Celtic or any Indo-European language.
- (19) 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 λ = ⟨l⟩ is an error for iota ι = ⟨i⟩, thus yielding **uv(i)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 Ϝ represents the lenition of pre-Cisalp. Celt. \*/p<sup>h</sup>/ followed by ‘una eventuale scrittura *Uvl-* per *Vul-*’. He does not provide any motivation for the lenition of \*/p<sup>h</sup>/ 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 ⟨uv⟩ is an error of transposition for ⟨vu⟩, 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 ⟨vu⟩**lTi-** could be cognate with OIr. *fol̄t*, MW *gwallt*, OCorn. *gols*, OBret.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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>), 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 **u**l**Ti**-, claiming that \*/o/ was velarised to /u/ before /l/. Upon the basis of such forms as Cisalp. Celt. **KoliueTu** (*LexLep* VR·19), **mešiolano** (*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 **u**vl**[a]**T**ia**u**io**P**os**, 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. *g(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<sup>1</sup> proposes an error of transposition and suggests that we read **u**vl⟨**i**T⟩**auio**P**os**. The sequence ⟨**li**⟩**Tauio**- can be read straightforwardly as an *ijō*-derivative of proto-IE \**plth<sub>2</sub>-u-ih<sub>2</sub>*, which is attested in the Indic theonym *Prthivī* ‘earth’ and, as a dat. sg. *ijā*-derivative, in Transalp. Celt. LITAVI ‘(goddess) pertaining to the earth’.<sup>6</sup>
- (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*<sup>2</sup> AT 1.111)
  - b. **evtes** for **vetus** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Cl 1.1901)
  - c. **ammarce** for **mamarce** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Cr 7.1)
  - d. **pevtial** for **petvial** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Pe 1.431)
  - e. **uļezni** for **ulznei** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Ta 1.198)
  - f. **maļce** for **mlace** (*ET*<sup>2</sup> Vs 1.179)
- (22) A possible token in Transalpine Celtic is P**Y**T**M**O**C** (e.g., *RIGG*-535 = Lejeune 1995: 103 = *RIIGBDR*-16-26) for P**I**T**Y**M**O**C (e.g., *RIGG*-533 = Lejeune 1995: 103 = *RIIGBDR*-16-24), though we expect \*\*P**I**T**O**Y**M**O**C** according to the orthographic conventions employed in Celtic inscriptions engraved in Greek characters.

<sup>6</sup> 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⟩**TauioPos** 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 **uvl**⟨iT⟩**auioPos** of the Celtic adposition \*uϕo- < proto-IE \*upo- ‘under’, thus \*/uϕo-ϕlit<sup>h</sup>awjo/- > /uϕlit<sup>h</sup>awjo/- ‘situated under the earth’ via haplology, some examples of which are:
- Engl. *probably* ⇒ [p<sup>h</sup>ɹabli]
  - Gk. τετράδραχμον ⇒ Lat. *tetrachmum* ‘a silver coin worth four drachmas’
  - Engl. *library* ⇒ [laɪbɹi]
  - 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 Ϝ represent /ϕ/ in **uvl**⟨Ti⟩**auioPos**, we can only conclude that it also does so in **uvamo-** < \*upamo- < \*up<sup>h</sup>mmo-.
- (27) Under this analysis, **uvl**⟨iT⟩**auioPos** 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 \*i̯o/ā-stem as the second member, e.g.g.:
- Ved. *ádhi-gart-ya-* ‘situated upon the chariot’
  - Gk. κατα-χθόν-ιος ‘situated under the earth’
  - Lat. *ē-greg-ius* ‘situated away from the flock’
  - Umb. **am-peř-ia** (abl. sg.) ‘situated around the foot’
  - Transalp. Celt. *Are-mor-ic-ī* (nom. pl.) ‘situated before the sea’
  - Lith. *añt-žem-is* ‘situated above the earth’

- (28) Underworld deities are well known to have existed in the ancient Celtic world. We have the AN|ΔOOYN|NABO (*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 2<sup>b4</sup>).
- (29) And the inscription from Chamalières (*RIGL*-100) references the *andedjon ... Mapon(or)* (acc. sg.) ‘infernal Maponos’ and appeals to the *anderon* (gen. pl.) ‘infernal (gods)’.
- (30) 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**.<sup>7</sup>
- (31) 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 **uvl(iT)auioPos** 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. *aire* ‘freeman’ < \**ar-jo-* on a number of occasions, e.g., in 1999: 349<sup>33</sup> saying that it is a nasal expansion of an original *jo-* stem, in 2003: 60<sup>127</sup> & 2010: 107<sup>6</sup> going further to explain the form as ‘entspr[i]ch[t] ... einem Singular *Ariu* mit gekreuztem oblique Stamm *Ar(u)on-*’ 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 **me*si*olano** (*LexLep*MI-10.1), **siPionios** (*LexLep*BI-1), and **uv<li>T*auio*Pos** 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. **ARIO**MANVS (*CIL* iii 4594) and **ARIO**VINDO (*AE* 1912, 40; dat. sg.).
  - c. A connection to *aire* ‘guarding, protecting’ < \**ar-ia* potentially provides suitable semantics, but is excluded for the same reason; cf. Latinised Eastern Celt. **ARIA**GNĒ (*RIU*iii 938; gen. sg.).

---

<sup>7</sup> 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  $\mu\text{on}$ -stem built to an  $i$ -stem, thus  $*h_2er(h_3)-i-\mu\text{on}$ -, seeing a tribal name  $*Ariwones$  ‘the tillers’, or ‘those who serve  $*Ariw\bar{u}$  <  $*Ariw\bar{d}(n)$  or  $*Ariwos$ ’ or ‘those from the settlement founded by  $*Ariwos$ ’. Such formations are perfectly possible, as attested, e.g., by Ved.  $kṛṣ-ī-\text{van}$ - ‘providing ploughing’ and  $śruṣṭ-ī-\text{vān}$ - ‘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 *Mapon(on)* 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  $*ari\text{ō}-mn-$  >  $*ari\text{ō}n-$ , then becoming **ariun-** via an epigraphic error of transposition. While the phonological/epigraphic scenario that she sets out is plausible, Ved. *aryamán*- ‘hospitable patron’ suggests that we would not have to do with an ethnonym. A theonym is certainly plausible — N.B. Ved. *Aryamán*—, 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  $\mu\text{on}$ -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),  $\text{ī}o$ - and  $\text{ī}ā$ - nominal stems must be excluded, so we are obliged to seek an  $i$ -stem. However, a nominal  $i$ -stem  $*ari$ - is not otherwise attested in Celtic.
- (34) There is an intra-Celtic analysis available, however, based upon the semantics of *aire*, a  $\text{ī}o$ -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. *aryá*-, but, instead, is a derivation of the adposition  $*prh_x-i$  > proto-Celt.  $*\phi\text{ari}$  > pre-OIr.  $*ari$ - ‘fore-’ +  $\text{ī}o$ -, which would regularly develop to OIr. *aire* and would mean ‘fore(most) one’ → ‘noble’.

- (35) 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 \**-jā* (see further Russell 1985: 163–164). Breatnach 1983 adds *inne* ‘quality; inmost part’ from \**in* ‘in’ + \**-jā* and *echtrae* ‘expedition’ from \**exter* ‘outside of’ + \**-jā*, more tentatively acc. sg. *aire* ‘excess’ from \**ari* ‘before’ + \**-jā* (see further Russell 1985: 164–166) and acc. sg. *íarmai* ‘lack’ from \**epi-ro-* ‘after’ + \**-jā*.<sup>8</sup>
- (36) 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)djo-*, 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)djo-* (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.
- (37) Under the latter scenario, we would have a nominal derivative in \**-uon-*. 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.
- (38) Though the analysis provided here on **ariuonePos** is less firmly grounded than the analysis provided for **uvl(iT)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

- (39) a. Proto-IE \*/p/ has been lost in initial position in the inscription upon the stone of Prestino, but survives in medial position as /ϕ/.  
 b. It appears likely that /ϕ/ was articulated as [β] in the highly sonorous environment V\_L, as is attested in Old Irish.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Thurneysen 1946: 516 for some comment about the source of the nasal.

- c. Emended **uwl(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.

## References

- Breatnach, Liam. 1983. On abstract nouns from prepositions in Irish. *Celtica* 15: 18–19.
- de Bernardo Stempel, Patrizia. 1999. *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- . 2003. Die sprachliche Analyse keltischer Theonyme (“Fontes Epigraphici Religionis Celticae A[n]tiquae”). *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53: 41–69.
- . 2010. Celtic taboo-theonyms, *Góbanos / Gobánnos* in Alesia and the epigraphical attestations of *Aisos / Esus*. In Gaël Hily, Patrice Lajoie, Joël Hascoët, Guillaume Oudaer, & Christian Rose (eds.), *Deuogdonion. Mélanges offerts en l’honneur du Professor Claude Sterckx*. Rennes: Tir, 105–132.
- . 2014. Livelli di celticità linguistica nell’Italia settentrionale. In Philippe Barral, Jean-Paul Guillaumet, Marie-Jeanne Roulière-Lambert, Massimo Saracino, & Daniele Vitali (eds.), *Les Celtes et le nord de l’Italie. Premier et Second Âges du Fer / I Celti e l’Italia del nord. Prima e Seconda Età del Ferro*. Dijon: Revue Archéologique de l’Est, 89–102.
- . 2023. *The accents of Celtic. New light on the older and oldest stages*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik ii/2, Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- de Marinis, Raffaele C. 2009. La stele di Vergiate. In Raffaele C. de Marinis, Serena Massa, & Maddalena Pizzo (eds.), *Alle origini di Varese e del suo territorio. Le collezioni del sistema archeologico provinciale*. Roma: «L’Erma» di Breschneider, 684–687.
- , & Filippo Motta. 1990/1991. Una nuova iscrizione lepontica su pietra da Mezzovico (Lugano). *Sibirium* 21: 201–225.
- de Simone, Carlo. 1988. Iscrizioni messapiche della Grotta della Poesia (Melendugno, Lecce). *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di lettere e filosofia* 18: 325–415.
- Dupraz, Emmanuel. 2019. Sur le forme gauloise *canecosedlon*. *Keltische Forschungen* 8: 59–75. Available at <https://journals.univie.ac.at/index.php/kf/article/view/6235>.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1998. PIE \*p> Ø in proto-Celtic. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 58: 63–80.
- . 2013. In defense of Celtic /ϕ/. In Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau, & Michael Weiss (eds.), *Multi nominis grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 32–43.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1991. Varia. 2. The Lepontic Vergiate epitaph. *Celtica* 22: 34–38.
- Isaac, Graham R. 2007. *Studies in Celtic sound changes and their chronology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1995. Préverbes gaulois suffixes en *-io-*. *Ambio-, ario-, cantio-*. *Études celtiques* 31: 115–121.
- . 2008. Review of *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53 (2003). *Études celtiques* 36: 254–257.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1966. Notes de linguistique italique. XXI. Les notations de *f* dan l’Italie ancienne. *Revue des études latines* 44: 141–181.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1985. Notes d’étymologie gauloise. IX. Gaulois *uxedios*. *Études celtiques* 22: 81–87.

- . 1995. Compléments gallo-grecs. *Études celtiques* 31: 99–113.
- Markey, Thomas L., & Bernard Mees. 2003. Prestino, patrimony, and the Plinys. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53: 116–167.
- Morandi, Alessandro. 2004. *Celti d'Italia* ii, *Epigrafia e lingua*. Roma: Spazio Tre.
- . 2017. *Epigrafia italica 2*. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider.
- Motta, Filippo. 1983. Su alcuni elementi dell'iscrizione di Prestino. In Enrico Campanile (ed.), *Problemi di lingua e di cultura nel campo indoeuropeo*. Pisa: Giardini, 61–74.
- . 2000. La documentazione epigrafica e linguistica. In Raffaele C. de Marinis & Simonetta Biaggio Simona (eds.), *I Leponti tra mito e realtà*. Locarno: Armando Dadò, ii 181–222.
- . 2009. Tipologie dell'onomastica personale celtica nell'Italia antica. In Paolo Poccetti (ed.), *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica. Aspetti linguistici, storici culturali, tipologici e classificatori*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 295–318.
- Prosdocimi, Aldo L. 1986. L'iscrizione leponzia di Prestino. Vent'anni dopo. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 41: 225–250.
- Prósper, Blanca María. 2008. En los márgenes de la lingüística celta. Los etnónimos del noroeste de la Península Ibérica y una ley fonética del hispano-celta occidental. *Palaeohispanica* 8: 35–54.
- Russell, Paul. 1985. Varia. I. 1. Prepositional derivatives in Irish. *Ériu* 36: 163–166.
- Stifter, David. 2002/2003. Review of Helmut Birkhan, *Kelten. Bilder ihrer Kultur / Celts. Images of their culture*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (1999). *Die Sprache* 43: 237–243.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1928. *Die Bürgerschaft im irischen Recht*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, in Kommission bei W. de Gruyter.
- . 1946. *A grammar of Old Irish*, rev. ed. D. A. Binchy & Osborn Bergin. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Tibiletti Bruno, Maria Grazia. 1966. L'iscrizione di Prestino. *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di lettere e scienze morali e storiche* 100: 279–319.
- Wallace, Rex E. 2004. Venetic. In Roger D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 840–856.
- . 2011. The Latin alphabet and orthography. In James Clackson (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 9–28.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to kill a dragon. Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.