

SIR JOHN RHÛS MEMORIAL LECTURE

THE LABYRINTH OF CONTINENTAL CELTIC

By D. ELLIS EVANS

Read 26 October 1977

PROMINENT among Sir John RhÛs's many and varied scholarly works, completed it should be remembered during the last ten years of his long and active life, is the series of important papers he delivered to this Academy on a good deal of epigraphic evidence concerning Continental Celtic in Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul. These lectures are well known in the versions published in early volumes of the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, his 'Celtae and Galli',¹ 'The Celtic Inscriptions of France and Italy',² 'Notes on the Coligny Calendar',³ 'The Celtic Inscriptions of Gaul. Additions and Corrections',⁴ 'The Celtic Inscriptions of Cisalpine Gaul',⁵ and 'Gleanings in the Italian Field of Celtic Epigraphy',⁶ The very titles of the lectures somehow reflect the familiar pattern of so much of RhÛs's work, pioneering, cumulative, revising, piling theory upon theory as he went on learning, by and large being rather too venturesome and employing not infrequently overmuch of what the late Sir Thomas Parry-Williams graciously termed 'a vivid imagination', and tending all the while to be 'diffuse and digressive'.⁷

Nevertheless, his work on the inscriptions is still of great value for the establishing of good readings and for the analysis and interpretation of texts. Professor Joshua Whatmough, in his opening sentence in the Prolegomena to his own great work entitled *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*, said 'Even the late Sir John Rhys, although he was not a competent critic of such matters, came in time to understand that the pre-Latin dialects of Gaul and of northern Italy present related problems of classification, at least in Provence and the western part of Gallia Cisalpina . . .'.⁸ This quite caustic condemnation, so typical of Whatmough, is really unjustified and could be very easily

Note: Abbreviations used in this lecture correspond, in general, to those used in *Bibliographie linguistique* (Utrecht-Anvers).

¹ *PBA* ii (1905-6), 71-134.

² *Op. cit.* 273-373.

³ *Op. cit.* iv (1909-10), 207-318.

⁴ *Op. cit.* v (1911-12), 261-360.

⁵ *Op. cit.* vi (1913-14), 23-112.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 315-69.

⁷ *John RhÛs, 1840-1915* (Cardiff, 1954), 55, 57.

⁸ *HSCP* lv (1944), 1.

countered. Rhÿs was a Celtic scholar of immense learning and, I think, did not allow his learning to weigh too heavily on him.

For me, therefore, there were several good reasons why I should have chosen to speak on certain aspects of the study of Continental Celtic in this memorial lecture, not least Rhÿs's own distinction and contributions in this field and my own indebtedness to his work which I first came to know as a young undergraduate in Henry Lewis's stimulating classes at Swansea. Another reason was that it seemed to me to be an appropriate time to look at a number of problems, developments, and trends in a field which I have long found on the one hand exceedingly demanding and on the other hand joyously rewarding, and a sector of Celtic linguistic studies which has by and large been traversed or surveyed, not to say monopolized, rather too often perhaps by scholars who have not come to it with a competent knowledge of Celtic, especially neo-Celtic. I hasten to add that there are some notable exceptions, as we shall see. Also I should mention here a point that would have to be developed in detail if we were concentrating on the history of Celtic scholarship, namely that there is an especially strong tendency to repeat a great number of pet theories and etymologies and quite doubtful readings in handling the evidence concerning Continental Celtic. And we must recognize that there are on the one hand a goodly number of interesting new texts and some new developments in methodology of late and on the other hand that there is need for a healthy, though not uncritical, respect for the achievements of scholars of the past, more especially from about the middle of the last century onwards. Knowledge of the way in which our understanding of the field has developed does give us a better perspective and a better appreciation of the valid and important contributions of scholars of earlier generations. The latest theory or interpretation is, for sure, not of necessity the best, and this *does* deserve a mention here in a discussion of a field in which so much depends on a well-controlled interpretation of many proper names. The specialist in Continental Celtic needs to know well the work of a galaxy of formidable scholars of the last century such as Glück, de Belloguet, Pictet, Stokes, and especially, I think, d'Arbois de Jubainville. My researches have utterly convinced me of the importance of this point.

Concentration on the sphere of Continental Celtic as distinct from Insular Celtic can be faulted as easily as it can be justified. The unity of the Celtic family of languages, insular and

continental, is paramount. And this has been realized more or less clearly from antiquity to the present day. Cornelius Tacitus declared that there was little difference between the language of the Britanni and the Galli; writing of the Britanni he said in the *Agricola* (chap. 11), 'proximi Gallis et similes sunt, . . . sermo haud multum diversus'. Beatus Rhenanus, in his *Rerum Germanicarum libri tres* of 1531 (p. 111), declared the similarity between the later Insular Celtic and the language of the Gauls, '. . . non desunt qui putent ueterem Gallorum linguam non absimilem fuisse Britannorum catalecto, quos Anglia Vualos uocat'. He realized that Germanic was different from Celtic, but that it had left its mark on it, 'quam minimum sed tamen aliquid'. William Camden, in his *Britannia* of 1586, was one of the first to try to demonstrate the correspondence of many lexical items in Gaul and Britain: 'haec omnia Gallorum veterum fuisse verba, ex authoribus illis constat, et vides quam apposite, et sono et sensu cum nostris Britannicis conueniant' (p. 17).

We have to emphasize, therefore, the underlying affinity or similarity of Insular and Continental Celtic, a similarity that can be most easily observed by modern scholars, as it was in antiquity, between Brittonic and Gaulish. Professor Léon Fleuriot, in his Oxford O'Donnell Lecture, demonstrated anew the merit of not treating Gaulish and Brittonic separately. And this basic attitude can be extended and applied to a discussion of all parts of the Celtic world and to many aspects of the civilization and heritage of the Celts apart from that of the sphere of language. Incidentally we can understand the late Myles Dillon's benevolent insistence on a strict definition of Celts as 'people who spoke or speak a form of Celtic',¹ although he was himself unduly pedantic and restrictive, not to say slightly inconsistent, in the use he made of the terms 'Celt' and 'Celtic'. We must be able to speak, for example, of Celtic institutions, law, religion, mythology, and art. At the same time the linguistic criterion is basic and must not be decried even by those who seek to identify the emergence of the Celts in prehistory, focusing perforce without the aid of contemporary vernacular texts on burial customs, art forms, weapons, pottery, brooches, and all manner of more or less early and mute artefacts.

The justification for the broad division of Celtic into Continental Celtic and Insular Celtic is geographical and historical.

¹ See Myles Dillon, *Celts and Aryans* (Simla, 1975), 19.

There have been several attempts to single out and explain aberrant insular features, reflecting in part perhaps areal convergent trends, and these attempts are now more properly acclaimed and better appreciated than when they were first made known. By and large, however, the Insular-Continental cleavage cannot be based satisfactorily on internal linguistic criteria. It has much more to do with the location and dating and amount of linguistic evidence available. The Continental evidence is vestigial, derives from a very wide area and dates partly from an era that brings us closer to the period of far-flung Celtic expansion in Europe. It is important that this evidence should be properly managed and controlled in the fascinating study of the so-called 'rise and fall' of the Celts. It comprises the earliest linguistic records concerning the Celts. It might even teach us something of importance concerning the origin, the cradle, of the Celts and of the Celtic group of languages, although I am rather sceptical concerning this. Indeed, it could be argued that we should not speak of Celts until we can speak of the development of a distinct Celtic branch of languages.¹ Moreover, the study of Continental Celtic of necessity presents us with the challenge of trying to reconstruct not only the Celtic 'Grundsprache' but also the linguistic map of Europe and of Asia Minor in antiquity, involving a multiplicity of languages and dialects, many of which we cannot recognize at all or else can recognize in a very limited and uncertain way. Therein lies some of the splendid attraction of our subject. We have to face full-front the difficult problems of language reconstruction and language change; we have to recognize the continual modification of historical and comparative linguistics as an explanatory science, and we have to try to control primary sources that are fairly scant and that yield results which are of necessity more limited than those to be obtained from a study of the modern Insular Celtic languages.

Before proceeding to discuss inherent problems and specific developments we should remind ourselves of some of the most important advances of the last eighty years or so, being deliberately and ruthlessly selective. I will single out the names of only some distinguished workers who have left their mark on the study of Continental Celtic in this period in a special way. Alfred Holder's *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* (1891-1913), a pro-

¹ See Chadwick's remark concerning the Greeks in R. A. Crossland and Ann Birchall (eds.), *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean* (London, 1973), 254.

digious three-volume thesaurus bringing together as thorough a collection of Old Celtic material as one could wish for in his day, errs constantly on the side of being too voracious and uncritical, and his work has the clear advantages and disadvantages of a 'readily consulted, but not illuminating, merely alphabetical order', as Whatmough brusquely put it,¹ and the barest minimum of analysis or linguistic commentary. The revision and updating of this splendid work is a task for a rare and hardy breed of scholar and ideally should entail a much more extensive and guarded discussion of particular forms and patterns. Georges Dottin's main contribution was his unique handbook of 'Gaulish', *La Langue gauloise* (1920), a useful introduction to some of the evidence, but, like handbooks in general, inevitably failing to deal with a host of items and aspects and of course paying little or no attention to non-Gaulish evidence and being over-concise in handling most of the important evidence included in the grammar, the corpus of texts, and the glossary. It was Leo Weisgerber, it seems, who first employed the term Continental Celtic in his renowned 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten' (1931), depicting in considerable detail the *status quaestionis* and emphasizing a number of aspects in a way that had not been done before, e.g. the survival of Celtic on the Continent in historical times,² dialectal differences in Continental Celtic, and the need for investigating particular regions with special reference to tribal divisions. Weisgerber had already tried to distil information about Galatian in Asia Minor in the Geffcken *Festschrift* in 1931³ and went on to study the proper names of the tribes of the Rhineland in a series of papers published over a period of more than thirty years, culminating in his long monograph on the names of the Ubii, which Manfred Faust rightly termed not only a handbook of Ubian personal names but also a veritable 'Lehrbuch der Namenforschung'.⁴ The work is, however, dedevilled by the difficulty of determining with reasonable accuracy and certainty the linguistic association of a high proportion of names and by

¹ Op. cit. 3.

² On this theme see further his article in *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, ix (1939), 23-51, which somehow has not received the attention it deserved.

³ 'Galatische Sprachreste' *Natalicium Johannes Geffcken* (Heidelberg, 1931), 151-75.

⁴ *Die Namen der Ubier* (Köln-Opladen, 1968). See Faust, *Kratylos*, xiv/1 (1969), 46-54, also Schmidt, *IF* lxxiv (1969), 205-9, Seebold, *PBB(T)* xcii (1970), 314-21, and especially Untermann's critique in *BNF* v (1970), 174-83 (cf. Weisgerber's rejoinder in *BNF* v (1970), 420-4).

the constraints of restricting the survey to a comparatively small geographical division.¹

Joshua Whatmough gathered in a wealth of evidence concerning Celtic in Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul in Part III of the *Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* (1933) and in his bulky *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul* (1949–51) with its 'Prolegomena' (1944).² He arranged the material from Transalpine Gaul and areas bordering on it according to the broad imperial subdivisions, drawing up lists of proper names (local and ethnic, divine and personal), lists of glosses, inscriptions and graffiti, many of which had been read by him at first hand. His firm conviction that, for Gaul at least, the material available should yield up information about dialectal variation and linguistic strata was abundantly justified, though only haphazardly and very partially illustrated in his own compilations and interpretative work. His lively, often truculent, writing about his own work most unfortunately encouraged some malicious detractors to keep the spotlights away from the more valuable parts of his important contribution.³

Antonio Tovar is the scholar who was inspired more than anyone else to reap a rich harvest from the great work of his *maestro* Manuel Gómez-Moreno⁴ on the Hispanic peninsula. We owe a great deal to Tovar for drawing attention in many writings to the importance of evidence concerning Hispano-Celtic (or Celtiberian, as it is more often and somewhat unhappily termed) and for demonstrating that we have in the

¹ For a collection of his work on the Rhineland, including also his 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten', see Leo Weisgerber, *Rhenania Germano-Celtica* (Bonn, 1969); reviews: *BNF* v (1970), 205–7 (Untermann); *PBB(T)* xcii (1970), 194–200 (Schróder); *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* cviii (1972), 202–10 (Birkhan); *IF* lxxvii (1971), 317–19 (Schmidt); *Revista Española de Lingüística* iii (1973), 225–30 (Tovar). The latest paper by Weisgerber known to me is 'Zu den rheinischen -inius-Bildungen', *Festschrift Matthias Zender, Studien zu Volkskultur, Sprache und Landesgeschichte*, hrsg. v. Edith Ennen u. Günter Wiegelmann, Bd. ii (Bonn, 1972), 931–48. We do now need a new and comprehensive summary of knowledge concerning Continental Celtic, listing in detail the relevant literature in a way not dissimilar from that of Weisgerber. I should stress that this lecture was at no stage conceived as a continuation of his 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten'; that would be an altogether different exercise.

² The 1949–51 work and the 'Prolegomena' were published in one volume by Harvard University Press in 1970. Only one part of his *Grammar of The Dialects of Ancient Gaul* was published (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963).

³ See Hamp, *General Linguistics*, xi (1971), 56–9; Lejeune, *Kratylos*, xv/1 (1970 [1972]), 97–100; Evans, *CR*, ns, xxii (1972), 243–5.

⁴ See Antonio Tovar, 'In memoriam Manuel Gómez-Moreno', *Madridrer Mitteilungen*, xii (1971), 297–302.

Iberian peninsula in a sense what he termed a new branch of Continental Celtic.¹ The work of Tovar's pupils, Manuel Palomar Lapesa² and especially María Lourdes Albertos,³ has made available detailed indices of the early personal names of this area together with studies of their formation, distribution, and various associations.

M. Michel Lejeune's many works on the languages of the ancient world include monographs on the remains of Hispano-Celtic as found in inscriptions and coin-legends, in his *Celtiberica* (1955), and on the so-called Lepontic inscriptions of an area around modern Lugano in Switzerland, in his *Lepontica* (1971) (also published as 'Documents gaulois et para-gaulois de Cisalpine' in *Études celtiques* xii/2). One of his other major contributions was the long discussion of lapidary inscriptions (some previously unedited) of Narbonensis, published in *Études celtiques* xii/1.⁴ Ulrich Schmoll's *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen-Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische* (1959) contains a valuable collection of epigraphic evidence and a fair analysis of morphology and phonology. Professor Jürgen Untermann's most important works⁵ affecting the study of Continental Celtic, like those of M. Lejeune, deal with the Iberian peninsula, Narbonensis, and northern Italy, including the pioneer *Sprachräume und Sprachbewegungen im vorrömischen Hispanien* (1961), the *Elementos de un Atlas Antropontmico de la Hispania antigua* (1965), the treatment of Gaulish and Iberian in Gallia Narbonensis published in *Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina* xii, and the discussion of northern Italian 'Namenlandschaften' in *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* x-xi, all relying especially on the interpretation of anthroponymic and morphemic distribution maps.

¹ See *Kratylos*, iii (1958), 1-14. For a bibliography of Tovar's publications (to 1971) see *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar* (Madrid, 1972), 9-38. Note especially his *Estudios sobre las primitivas lenguas hispánicas* (Buenos Aires, 1949), *The Ancient Languages of Spain and Portugal* (New York, 1961), and *Sprachen und Inschriften* (Amsterdam, 1973).

² *La Onomástica personal pre-Latina de la antigua Lusitania. Estudio lingüístico* (Salamanca, 1957).

³ See *La Onomástica personal primitiva de Hispania: Tarraconense y Bética* (Salamanca, 1966) (with supplements in *Emerita* xxxii, xxxiii, xl, and xlv).

⁴ See also now his 'Textes gallo-grecs' in *EC* xv/1 (1976-7), 105-50; xvii (1980), 55-100.

⁵ Untermann's *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum.*, Bd. I, *Die Münzlegenden* (Wiesbaden, 1975), Bd. II, *Die iberischen Inschriften aus Südfrankreich* (Wiesbaden, 1980), is another important recent publication. See also id., in *Actas del II Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la Peninsula Ibérica* ed. A. Tovar et al. (Salamanca, 1979), 41-67.

M. Édouard Bachellery delivered a carefully restrained lecture on Continental Celtic to the Fourth International Congress of Celtic Studies at Rennes in 1971, giving pride of place to questions of phonology and morphology and not belittling the problems involved in drawing conclusions from the material available.¹ Professors Karl Horst Schmidt and Léon Fleuriot are two other distinguished European scholars, both with a special interest and competence in Insular Celtic, Goidelic and Brittonic, who are making extensive and significant contributions to the better understanding of Continental Celtic. Schmidt's work ranges from his well-executed monograph on composition in Gaulish personal names (1957)² to his Innsbruck lecture entitled 'Die festlandkeltischen Sprachen' (1977)³ in which an attempt is made to draw some firm conclusions concerning the separation of the Celtic languages, both Insular and Continental. Fleuriot has concentrated on the reinterpretation of a number of formulae and graffiti and the presentation of tricky new linguistic evidence (based on recent discoveries) concerning the ancient Celts, especially in Gaul.⁴ Both Fleuriot⁵ and Schmidt⁶ have published the most exhaustive and ambitious interpretations of Face A of the new Botorrita text, demonstrating dramatically what can happen when several specialists try to work out a detailed interpretation of a difficult new text. The literature on the Botorrita bronze is in fact mushrooming in a way that is in itself an exciting, not to say disturbing, revelation for the student of the way scholars handle an ancient text in a difficult script and a little-known language.

There are several reasons for my paying attention in these preliminary remarks to the work of some of the distinguished scholars who have worked fruitfully on the records of Continental Celtic. There is no basis for the view sometimes put

¹ See *EC* xiii/1 (1972), 29–60.

² *ZCP* xxvi (1957), 33–301.

³ = Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge 18 (Innsbruck, 1977); for an English version see *BBCS* xxviii (1978–80), 189–205.

⁴ Note, for example, his 1975 Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture to the British Academy and his study of the vocabulary of the Gaulish inscription of Chamalières in *EC* xv/1 (1976–7), 173–90; xvi (1979), 135–9; xvii (1980), 145–59.

⁵ *EC* xiv/2 (1975), 405–42.

⁶ *BBCS* xxvi/4 (1976), 375–94 (also *id.*, *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, ed. Anna Morpurgo Davies Wolfgang Meid (Innsbruck, 1976), 359–71; *Word* xxviii/1–2 (1972 [1977]), 51–62).

forward by people who should know better that the study of these records leads us to a quiet or stagnant backwater. The misconception has arisen mainly from a lack of familiarity with the welter of intricate and quite often bewildering sources available, both primary and secondary. Interest in the Old Celtic languages of Europe has been maintained throughout most of the territory to which the Celts took their languages in antiquity. The gradual discovery of new texts, more especially in Italy, Gaul, and the Hispanic peninsula, accounts partly for the lively activity in the study of the evidence concerning old Celtic. And this is paralleled by the interest in the study of other old languages, of language contact and interaction, of the gradual eclipse of some languages and the evolution of new languages. It is not in the least surprising that so much time and energy has been spent on a good deal of remote and seemingly unintelligible evidence that does shed some light on the development, spread, and separating out of Celtic languages.

In saying this we should in no way disguise or belittle the problems connected with handling the early linguistic evidence and the limitations of the information to be gleaned from it.

This is not the proper place to enter into details concerning the strength and weakness and interpenetration of various methods of linguistic comparison. The traditional threefold methods of comparison, historical and comparative (or genetic), areal, and typological, still retain a certain pride of place. A penetrating evaluation of several aspects of each of these methods was published recently by Professor Karl Horst Schmidt,¹ stressing in effect that the differentiation of various methods and norms and the confrontation of one with the other is of primary importance and considering at the same time the combinatory possibilities that should be recognized. This eclectic approach has of late been reflected more commonly in the study of what I still prefer to call Celtic philology,² indicating greater tolerance and understanding, though not in itself perhaps leading hitherto to striking new insights or advances in knowledge, in the practical application of that approach.

¹ *Der Sprachvergleich* [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge 17] (Innsbruck, 1977).

² This is in harmony with Professor Kenneth Jackson's Presidential Address to the Modern Humanities Research Association in 1976 (see *MLR* lxxi (1976), xxiii-xxxvii).

There has been a fair amount of tilting at windmills in the discussion of the dichotomy between the synchronic and diachronic approach in linguistics. Peter Wunderli's recent discussion of 'Saussure, Wartburg und die Panchronie'¹ brings back a welcome tone of sanity into the debate, with his insistence on the fact that the homogeneity of language, of both continuity and change in language, cannot be denied, but that the radical dichotomy is necessary in practice—'andernfalls wäre eine sinnvolle wissenschaftlich ergiebige Erfassung und Behandlung des Untersuchungsgegenstandes gar nicht möglich'.² This is not to deny the extreme complexity and the central position in linguistics of seeking to understand what linguistic change entails.³

The study of Continental Celtic has always brought us very close to the problems of reconstruction, of the Celtic 'Grundsprache', of the concept of Indo-European and Indo-Europeans, and of the protohistory or prehistory of the Celts. The inductive reconstruction of 'Grundsprachen' or meta-linguistic models is important as a frame of reference or corrective in the historical assessment of the genetic relationship of historically attested and cognate languages.⁴ But I am quite convinced that it really cannot safely take us far beyond historical reality in determining details concerning provenance and development.⁵ As for the reconstruction of pronunciation, for example, Charles V. J. Russ rightly reminds us of methodological difficulties arising from the choice of the initial phonetic value of a symbol which 'has important consequences for the description of the sound changes in the historical development of languages'.⁶

¹ *ZRPh* xcii (1976), 1–34.

² *Op. cit.* 33.

³ On this theme see Roy Harris, *On the possibility of Linguistic Change* (Oxford, 1977). See also Roger Lass, *On Explaining Language Change* (Cambridge, 1980).

⁴ See Schmidt, *op. cit.* 9. See also now Henrik Birnbaum's paper entitled 'Linguistic reconstruction: its potential and limitations in new perspective' (*JIES*, Monograph No. 2, n.d.) and Paolo Ramat, 'Linguistic Reconstruction and Typology', *JIES* iv (1976), 189–206.

⁵ See J. Kuryłowicz, *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European* (Heidelberg, 1964), 58.

⁶ 'The Data of Historical Linguistics: sources for the reconstruction of pronunciation from written records', *York Papers in Linguistics*, vi (1976), 65–73 (here 67). Note also R. Lass and J. M. Anderson, *Old English Phonology* (Cambridge, 1975), 203 ('As far as we can tell, historical investigation does not permit us to recover much more than grossly binary (i.e. classificatory) specifications').

Hypotheses on the genesis of the Indo-European family of languages of which Celtic is one of the earliest attested members are still being proliferated and refined and not infrequently disparaged. Claims for linguistic palaeontology and the quest for 'Ursprache' have in particular been modified, if not altogether discredited. They are now certainly less extravagant than they used to be and are more carefully based on improved models. One of the most recent attempts at understanding the origin and varied migrations of the Indo-Europeans, that of Bernfried Schlerath,¹ gropes for an elaborate development in three stages, from a vague primary period of consolidation and settlement to a second period of infiltration of Indo-European peoples to their later home (involving a longish period of contact with other languages and of acceptance of the conquerors' languages by the conquered) and a third stage involving the historically attested spread of the Indo-Europeans. This new analysis relies very largely in regard to linguistic theory on the resilient 'Stammbaumtheorie' and the in some ways dubious concept of change through the influence of substrata.²

I am of the view that not a great deal can be said for certain about the prehistory of the Celtic languages. It is little wonder that we have extreme postures in regard to the dating of the emergence of the Celts. Myles Dillon became increasingly committed to the view that the separation of Celtic from Indo-European may have been as early as 2000 BC³ following Professor Stuart Piggott's contention that 'From the beginning of the second millennium BC we move, without a substantial break, into a central Europe that, by early in the first, can hardly be other than Celtic and perhaps Germanic-speaking'.⁴ Dillon even suggested that Celtic settlement in the British Isles

¹ *Die Indogermanen. Das Problem der Expansion eines Volkes im Lichte seiner sozialen Struktur* [IBS Vorträge 8] (Innsbruck, 1973).

² See Ködderitzsch, *ZCP* xxxiv (1975), 338-41. A great deal of ink has been spilt on these matters without arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. See especially Rüdiger Schmitt, 'Proto-Indo-European Culture and Archaeology: Some Critical Remarks', *JIES* ii (1974), 279-87; J. P. Mallory, 'Time perspective and proto-Indo-European culture', *World Archaeology*, viii (1976), 44-56.

³ See *Celts and Aryans* (Simla, 1975), 20 f.; also Myles Dillon and Nora K. Chadwick, *The Celtic Realms* (London, 1967), 3 ff. See further the view of P. Bosch-Gimpera, e.g. in *EC* v (1950-1), 359 (= P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Paletnología de la Península Ibérica* [Graz, 1974], 477). Compare now Antonio Tovar, in *Indogermanisch und Keltisch*, hrsg. v. Karl Horst Schmidt (Wiesbaden, 1977), 57 ff. See also P.-M. Duval *et al.*, *Alba Regia* xiv (1975), 9-247.

⁴ *Ancient Europe* (Edinburgh, 1965), 91.

may have occurred very early in the second millennium BC.¹ Other commentators, archaeologists and prehistorians included, are more prepared to speak with confidence of the Celts from a period immediately preceding the one from which we have references to them in the works of Greek and Latin writers, from about the sixth century BC,² although traditional orthodoxy would see in the ethnic composition or structure of the historical Celts an amalgam of the so-called 'civilization' of the Bronze Age Tumulus people and the 'civilization' of the Urnfield People.³

The primary sources for the study of Continental Celtic are characterized (a) by their wide diffusion in Europe itself and beyond Europe in Asia Minor, and (b) by their fragmentary character. They consist of inscriptions, graffiti, coin legends, tile stamps, and potters' stamps, items in a great variety of writings of the ancient and early medieval period, glosses,⁴ and substrat words and features. In terms of relative abundance proper names, local and ethnic, divine, and especially personal, are by far the most numerous and constitute the only type of extant evidence that is distributed more or less clearly and consistently over nearly the whole continental territory occupied by the Celts in antiquity. Even these are by and large more abundant in Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul and the Hispanic peninsula than elsewhere. In many areas, especially in central and eastern Europe, they are the only primary evidence available to establish fair proof of the presence of a Celtic language and they become extremely difficult to control and to interpret in situations of language contact, language mixture, and language transition. The primacy of river names as indicators of old

¹ See also Hawkes, *EC* xiii/2 (1973), 607–28; *Helinium*, xii/2 (1972), 105–16; Harbison, *JIES* iii (1975), 101–19; cf. Leslie Alcock, in *The Iron Age in the Irish Sea Province*, ed. Charles Thomas (London, 1972), 108.

² W. Kimmig, 'Die Herkunft der Kelten als historisch-archäologisches Problem', in *Hommages à Albert Grenier*, vol. ii (Bruxelles–Berchem, 1962), 884–99, is still one of the most careful and well-balanced attempts at tracing the origin of the Celts. See also V. Kruta, *Les Celtes* (Paris, 1978).

³ See Jan Filip, *Celtic Civilization and its Heritage*, tr. R. F. Samsour (Prague, 1962), 23 f.; id., *EC* xiii/2 (1973), 583 f. The whole problem is exceedingly complex; see now Tovar's careful reappraisal from the linguistic point of view in *Indogermanisch und Keltisch*, 44–65 (esp. 57 ff.). For a bibliography and discussion of recent works on the origin of the Celts see Loicq, *EC* xiv/2 (1975 [1976]), 594–627. On the imprecise use of terms such as 'civilization' and 'culture' see Hawkes, *Antiquity*, xlvii (1973), 176 ff.

⁴ See Whatmough, *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*, 30.

languages has been emphasized many times¹ and was, of course, exploited with unsatisfactory results by Hans Krahe in his theorizing concerning 'Alteuropäisch'. Personal names are notoriously unreliable and difficult to handle as evidence for the precise history and structure of particular languages,² and this is especially frustrating when they constitute the largest single element in the residual primary sources available for analysis. The more abundant our onomastic data the more sure results should be in the discussion of their testimony. However, they are especially dangerous for the construction of syntheses concerning the remote prehistory of languages, especially languages concerning which we have relatively little information. One extreme example of this that we can refer to here is the highly controversial manipulation of names (especially local and ethnic names) to try to demonstrate pre-Indo-European links between western Europe and the Caucasus, the so-called Euscaro-Caucasian theory that has been condemned as being very doubtful or indeed been totally rejected.³

Although names loom large in Celtic inscriptions and graffiti, especially in funerary and votive texts, these sources have attracted most attention from linguists because they sometimes contain important items and clues concerning the structure of language that cannot be revealed at all by the onomastic records. A cardinal factor here is the right interpretation and reading of various alphabetic systems and styles. Celtic texts have been preserved in North Etruscan, Greek, Roman, and Iberian scripts. A satisfactory method for deciphering the Iberian script was first publicized by Gómez-Moreno in 1922, although this did not have a major impact until his theories were exploited by Caro Baroja and Tovar a long time afterwards.⁴ Failure to read properly the texts available is bound to bedevil attempts at interpretation. This occurred, to take but one example, with the now famous Banassac (Lozère)

¹ See Hans Krahe, *Ortsnamen als Geschichtsquelle* (Heidelberg, 1949), quoting Leibnitz (p. 30). See the review by Winter in *Language*, xxviii (1952), 269-72. See now Antonio Tovar's careful survey in his Heidelberg lecture entitled *Krahes alteuropäische Hydronymie und die westindogermanische Sprachen* [Sitz. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.; Jg. 1977, Abh.2] (Heidelberg, 1977).

² See Krahe, op. cit. 10.

³ See especially Tovar's prudent review of Hubschmid in *Lg.* xlvi (1970), 695-9.

⁴ See Antonio Tovar, *The Ancient Languages of Spain and Portugal* (New York, 1961), Chap. I; Albertos Firmat, *Boletín 'Sancho el Sabio'*, xvii (1973), 73 (with refs.).

Gaulish graffito in a cursive Latin script discovered in 1871 and misread by Héron de Villefosse¹ as *neddamon delgu linot*, the reading quoted in turn by Rhÿs, Dottin, and Whatmough.² Vendryes published a corrected reading of the last word in 1955, reading *linda* for *linot*, giving a firm base for a brilliant and thoroughly convincing reinterpretation of this short but important text.³ We should note here that better control of the important testimony of the Botorrita bronze would have been possible if it could have been read more completely and more accurately. So many texts are too fragmentary or mutilated to allow specialists to establish a sure reading and satisfactory interpretation.

The study of forms preserved by manuscript tradition can be vitiated by inaccuracies on the part of modern editors, by distortions and variations in the manuscript tradition itself, and by unsatisfactory recording, for various reasons, by an ancient author or compiler at the very outset. This lesson was driven home forcibly for me by the study of some names in Caesar's *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, concerning the textual transmission of which and of the whole *Corpus Caesarianum* there is still so much disagreement.⁴ The name of the leader of the Sotiates is usually read *Adiatuanus*, which may be correct for Caesar, as distinct from *Adietuanus* in coin legends of the Sotiates. The emendation *Adiatuanus*, favoured by Meusel, has also been preferred as the one Caesar may have written down and reported, and this may receive some support in Nicolaus of Damascus's graecized Ἀδιάτομος (as preserved by Athenaeus). Professor Eric Hamp's new formulation of the underlying lexical item here as one reflecting an old ablauting root (**ieN-tu* : -*iaN-tu* - < -*iN-ti*-) tries to take the analysis forward on a point of theory concerning morphology, but cannot remove our hesitation concerning the reading; Hamp is well aware of the difficulty presented by the reading of the coin

¹ *BSAF* 1872, 141.

² In fairness to Whatmough (*The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*, no. 133) it should be said that the text could not be found for him to read in 1929. Rhÿs too, it seems ('Celtic Inscriptions of Gaul. Additions and Corrections', *PBA* v. 328), did not see the text.

³ *EC* vii/1 (1955), 9-17.

⁴ See D. Ellis Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names* [abbr. *GPN*] (Oxford, 1967), 21 ff.; see also W. Hering, *Helikon*, ii (1962), 345-55; id., *Die Recensio der Caesarhandschriften* (Berlin, 1963); Virginia Brown, *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's Civil War* [*Mnemosyne*, Suppl. xxiii] (Leiden, 1972) (v. Rambaud, *REA* lxxvi (1974), 386 f.).

legends and has to concede that there is no firm answer as to whether *-e-* in *Adietuanus* in the coin legends is a contamination from a variant name element *ientu-* or whether it is original and superior to the testimony of all the Caesar manuscripts.¹ It is, I think, a nice example of the type of dilemma in regard to a 'correct' reading with which the student of Continental Celtic is confronted so very frequently.

Leaving aside for the moment the difficulty of recognizing and dating Celtic material and defining satisfactorily what we mean by Celtic inscriptions, the fact remains that the epigraphic material hitherto available comes from ancient Gaul (mostly from Narbonensis), from Spain and Portugal, and from northern Italy. In recent years concentration on these sources, which is both necessary and understandable, has undoubtedly sometimes caused a certain lack of good perspective and a certain distortion in the over-all task of conducting reliable and coherent surveys based on a full range of sources. The tendency has been to equate each concentration of inscriptions with Celtic 'languages', variously named and separated out. There are quite serious difficulties and dangers inherent in this tendency, however carefully conceived and founded the structures of theory may be. Even Whatmough himself, for all his criticism of others in these matters, had pangs of hesitation concerning the merits of particular classifications and labels.² Geographical arrangement, no less than alphabetical, can fail to distinguish between different languages and dialects.³

It is doubtful what degree of homogeneity or cohesion or exclusive patterning one should expect to emerge from concentration on particular sets of texts, Lepontic, Celtiberian, Narbonensian, or the like, as distinct from a distillation from a more comprehensive and, on the face of it, less uniform range of sources. In this connection we have at the same time to remember that some testimonia, especially glosses, loans, and substrat features, cannot be precisely localized or clearly assigned to a particular area, and chronology too can be as doubtful as geography.⁴ This makes proper control of the evidence for the establishing of local or dialectal variation particularly difficult. Moreover, it is precisely these items that

¹ See *Ériu*, xxvii (1976), 1-3, 16-17.

² See R. S. Conway, J. Whatmough, and S. E. Johnson, *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* [abbr. *PID*] (London, 1933), vol. ii, pp. viii-ix.

³ See *PID* ii. 179 n. 1.

⁴ See, *inter alia*, Whatmough's preliminary remarks to *PID*, item 340, and *DAG*, items 178, 220. See also *DAG*, p. 877.

are in general difficult to stratify chronologically. Vittorio Bertoldi, dealing with lexical items, attempted to distinguish what he called 'arcaismi celtici', i.e. inter-Celtic types common to Gaulish and Insular Celtic, from peripheral Gallic regionalisms and the substrat forms assimilated by Gaulish. This was in his renowned article on 'Arcaismi e innovazioni al margine del dominio celtico' in the 1929 Ascoli *Festschrift*,¹ and Bertoldi himself was well aware of the uncertainties and limitations of his survey. For example, the etymology he proposed for a Gallic word for 'ivy', *bolusseron* in pseudo-Apuleius,² is dubious; he attempted to see here a dissimilation of an earlier *bolusellon*, the second element in which he would relate to Celtic **uxello-* 'high', leaving the first element unexplained³ and tending to deny a link with Insular Celtic. The variant readings, *as reported*, make it particularly difficult to base a good etymology on the form and to determine its regional restriction. Moreover, Dioscorides records a lexical variant *σοβίτης* 'ivy' (with other variant readings reported: *σοι-*, *-ίτης*).⁴ There are semantic problems here again in relating this word⁵ to Insular forms such as Ir. *subh* 'strawberry', W. *syfi*, and Br. *sivi*, for which a plausible Indo-European etymology has been suggested.⁶ Ernault thought that *σοβίτης* could be explained as a compound **su-bi-* 'well-cut (leaf)'. This reminds one of Bechtel's comment, 'Eine Etymologie, die nichts weiter als eine linguistische Möglichkeit ist, gleicht einem Kartenhause, denn die nächste linguistische Möglichkeit, die bekannt wird, bläst sie um.'⁷ The fundamental difficulty with the handling of the Old Celtic lexicon is that our knowledge of it is so very limited.

This is related to the central problem of the recognition of Celtic. There are many reasons why this problem is so disconcerting and it is little wonder that scholars who have touched on the difficulties involved have had to take up a more or less defensive or sceptical position.⁸ There are, it seems to me, two main aspects to be considered here. On the one hand, it is

¹ *AGI* xxii-xxiii (1929), 484-541.

² See *DAG*, item. 178 (p. 552), beside *AGI*, vol. cit., 498 f.

³ He rejects comparison of Bret. *bolos* 'prunelle' partly on semantic grounds and partly for etymological reasons. ⁴ See *DAG*, item 178.

⁵ Ernault (*GMB* 629) hinted at this possibility (whence Holder, *AcS* 2. 1651, Dottin 289).

⁶ See J. E. Caerwyn Williams, *BBCS* xvii (1958), 264-7; also Vendryes, *LEIA* S-197 f.

⁷ Quoted by Weisgerber in his 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten', p. 159.

⁸ See *GPN* 16.

intrinsically difficult to define the term 'Celtic' in relation to the comparatively early records available and in a situation in which new discoveries must lead to continual reappraisal and modification. On the other hand, the separating out of Celtic material from non-Celtic material is bound to be difficult for fairly remote periods in which records are relatively sparse, where there is language contact and intermixture, with various strata preserved for us by a tradition that is insecure and not infrequently misleading. I do not think that I am taking up a standpoint that is too extreme in its scepticism on either count. In regard to the first, i.e. the definition of Celtic, Karl Horst Schmidt recently stressed properly and succinctly two fundamental principles: '. . . ist der Begriff *keltisch* durch die Gesamtheit aller für die keltische Grundsprache nachweisbaren Transformationen zu definieren. Sofern eine neuentdeckte keltische Sprache von dem Rekonstrukt der keltischen Grundsprache abweicht, muß das relevante Transformationsbündel entsprechend modifiziert werden.'² And the 'Grundsprache' has been variously defined by comparativists who lay stress on various correspondences and classifications as a basis for their theories. Depending on the criteria adopted, on the data which are thought to be of prime importance and on the historical pose adopted by various commentators, Celtic has in turn been labelled 'peripheral', 'western', 'central', and 'southern' in its position in the Proto-Indo-European nexus.

Of course Schmidt's principles beg the question how are we unflinchingly to recognize Celtic features, especially in relatively early sources, whether those sources are newly discovered or not, and indeed is it possible or in what sense is it possible to reconstruct the Celtic 'Grundsprache'.

There is no doubt now that there is important evidence concerning Old Celtic in the Hispanic peninsula and that it shows a number of archaic features. But there is no unanimity on the way we can and should separate out the various languages, Indo-European and non-Indo-European, attested there before the arrival of the Carthaginians, the Greeks, and the Romans. The Celticity of a number of inscriptions and coin legends in a central and northern area has been stressed; special interest has been aroused by the bronzes of Luzaga and Botorrita and the rock inscriptions of Peñalba de Villastar.² A number

¹ *Die festlandkeltischen Sprachen* [IBS, Vorträge 18] (Innsbruck, 1977), 15.

² We should note in passing that some scepticism has been voiced concerning the Celticity of the Botorrita text; see *ZCP* xxxv (1976), 350.

of features can be claimed as typical of the language or languages reflected in these texts: e.g. the retention of the IE labio-velar k^w ; the tendency to develop *an* and *am* from IE syllabic n and m ; an *o*-stem gen. sg. in *-o*; an *o*-stem nom. pl. in *-ōs* and dat. pl. in *-bos* (the latter is also found in Lepontic as distinct from *-bo* in Gaulish); the repetition (at Botorrita) of enclitic **k^we* 'and' and **-ue* 'or', the use of the relative *iom* perhaps as a temporal conjunction, a series of forms in *-Tus* that are probably verbal and doubtless comparable with similar forms in Gaulish and Lepontic; a number of interesting lexical items such as *veramos/poramos* (*-om*) probably showing the loss of IE p . It is now fairly common orthodoxy that we are here dealing with Hispano-Celtic or 'Celtiberian'.¹ But this 'language' or 'branch' really is rather ill-defined in regard to its extent and relationship to other early Indo-European 'languages' or 'dialects' in the peninsula. It has been shown many times over, especially by Pokorny,² that there are clear signs of the retention of IE p in a number of Hispanic forms,³ as, for example, in *Complutum*, *Segontia Paramica*, and *Poemana*, and attention has been drawn to this feature in western inscriptions such as those of Lamas de Moledo⁴ and Cabeço das Fráguas.⁵ This suggested to Tovar the presence of another non-Celtic IE language in the west.⁶ Several theories have been propounded. Tovar and Schmoll⁷ have in turn argued for the concept of several layers of Indo-European languages in Spain and Portugal, including a Celtic layer. Untermann,⁸ relying more especially on the distribution pattern of personal names, was inclined to assume that the Lusitanian inscriptions on the

¹ See, Albertos Firmat, *Boletín 'Sancho el Sabio'*, xvii (1973), 84 ff.; Faust, *MM* xvi (1975), 197 ff.; Schmidt, *Actas del II Coloquio . . .*, 103 ff.

² J. Pokorny, *Zur Urgeschichte der Kelten und Illyrier* (Halle, 1939), 171 f.; *Essays and Studies . . . Eoin MacNeill*, ed. John Ryan (Dublin, 1940), 239; *VR* x (1948-9), 228. See also U. Schmoll, *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische* (Wiesbaden, 1959), 93; A. Tovar, *The Ancient Languages of Spain and Portugal*, 99 f.

³ One is reminded here of the debate concerning Hans Kuhn's controversial 'Nordwestblock' theory in which the retention of IE p is a prime criterion. See, for example, G. Neumann, *NAWG* 1977, 87 ff.

⁴ See Hernando Balmori, *Emerita*, iii (1935), 77-119; Tovar, *op. cit.* 91 f.

⁵ See Tovar, *EC* xi/2 (1966-7), 237 ff.

⁶ See *The Ancient Languages of Spain and Portugal*, 91 f.; *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica* I (Madrid, 1960), 101, 125 f.; *EC*, vol. cit., 263 f.

⁷ *Op. cit.* 119-24.

⁸ See *II. Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemine Sprachwissenschaft. Innsbruck . . . 1961* [IBK, Sonderheft 15] (Innsbruck, 1962), 71.

one hand and the so-called Celtiberian ones on the other indicated that there was at one time one Indo-European language spoken in non-Iberian areas of pre-Roman Hispania, but that it had split up or diverged into two 'dialects' by the time of the evidence preserved for us. Because of the divergent character of some of the western features Tovar¹ would isolate the western sector as one revealing particularities that cannot be connected with historically attested Celtic and would recognize there a language that he would tentatively term Lusitanian. Heinrich Wagner ('for convenience sake', as he puts it)² would term this Indo-European element, which is attested particularly in north-western Spain, as Illyrian, invoking the old ghost of the unsatisfactory pan-Illyrian theories of Pokorny. Wolfgang Meid was at one stage moved by the aberrant features of the Hispanic peninsula (notably the *o*-stem genitives in *-o*) to doubt the Celticity of 'Celtiberian'.³

The discovery of the Botorrita text has clinched the matter, I think, beyond all doubt. There are clear traces of the existence of Hispano-Celtic. But the problems presented by the evidence over-all in the Iberian peninsula are typical of difficulties in so many other areas. It is of course improper to judge Continental Celtic too strictly in the light of evidence concerning Insular Celtic or to use anachronistic names or labels for the earliest extant evidence. It is also dangerous to rely too much on a quite small scatter of sources. That is why one should not reject out of hand the possibility that there may be traces in relatively early texts in the Western part of the Iberian peninsula of the peripheral retention in Celtic of the old *p* that was generally lost in that branch of Indo-European.⁴ It is not surprising that we also find divergent morphological and syntactic features here too. It could be argued that we have in the genitive formations in *-o* an archaism which may correspond to Hittite and Mycenaean formations,⁵ and that the corresponding genitive in *-i* in Gaulish, Lepontic, and Insular Celtic is a separate innovation.⁶

¹ See *EC*, vol. cit., 240 ff., 265 ff. Cf. id., *Celticum*, vi (Suppl. à *Ogam*, no. 86 (1963)), 383.

² *Actas del I Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la península ibérica* (Salamanca . . . 1974), ed. Francisco Jordá et alii (Salamanca, 1976), 389.

³ *Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, vol. ix (The Hague-Paris, 1972), 1191 f.

⁴ See now the stimulating discussion by Hoenigswald in *JIES* i (1973), 324-9.

⁵ See Hamp, *BSL* lxvi/1 (1971), 225 n. 14.

⁶ See Schmidt, *Die festlandkeltischen Sprachen*, 23; id., *Fest. E. Dickenmann* (Heidelberg, 1977), 335-44; compare Faust, *MM* xvi (1975), 199.

Manfred Faust has interestingly compared the evidence of the inscriptions with that of some proper names usually counted as Celtic (personal names in *maro-* and *geno-* and local names in *-briga* and others likely to be Celtic). This reveals a remarkable distribution, showing the best attestation in the area traditionally regarded as Celtiberian. But he too is ready to concede¹ that the definition of Celtic on which this patterning is based may rely too heavily on comparison with Gaulish name fashions. In other words there is a danger in adopting a definition for Celtic that is too stereotyped or too closely bound to the traditional view that the proper yardstick is the norm in Gaulish. Names and other formations must be discussed more comprehensively,² and for sure not in isolation. It is equally important in dealing with Hispano-Celtic to heed Wagner's warning that 'In the light of ancient history it is . . . desirable that each single Indo-European language should be seen as a synthesis of all the languages which have contributed, on account of their geographical position, to its making'.³ A satisfactory synthesis of that kind is, I fear, beyond our reach, and this is especially true of the Celtic of the Iberian peninsula.

The dynamic evidence of extant languages and of languages with a more or less rich tradition of written records is bound to take pride of place over the scant and intricate evidence of old forgotten languages. But therein lies a danger. It is tempting, it is also misleading, to think all the while in terms of Brittonic or Goidelic when we are trying to recognize and analyse Old Celtic dialects on the Continent. This has bedevilled much of the discussion of the *p/q* split of the Indo-European labio-velar *kʰ* in Celtic. In Continental Celtic *p* and *q* may well have been allophonic at certain stages and in certain environments. However, I am not so sure how much weight one should attach to the use of terms such as archaism or innovation in relation to the distribution of *p* and *q* in Continental Celtic sources. It is difficult enough to establish significant correlations, geographical distributions, and especially chronological trends. The incidence of *q*(/qu/c) in certain well-known forms in Gaul,⁴

¹ Op. cit. 205.

² See especially J. Untermann, *Elementos de un Atlas antroponímico de la Hispania antigua* (Madrid, 1965) and Albertos Firmat in *Actas del I Coloquio . . .*, 57–86; *Actas del II Coloquio . . .*, 131–67.

³ See *Actas del I Coloquio . . .*, 388.

⁴ See, GPN 407.

such as *equos*, *quimon*, *cutio(s)/cutios* (from the Calendar of Coligny), the local and ethnic names *Sequana*, *Sequanus*, *Sequani*, the divine name *Singwas* (or *Sinquatis*, *-tes*), has been variously interpreted. One indication of this is that *q*-forms in Gaul, such as the ones mentioned, have been explained in turn as an archaism¹ and as part of the evidence for '... an extreme case of coexistent phonematic system, which regularly appears when a language is dying out'.² But each instance really needs to be studied separately with reference to etymology, congeners, and correlations.

We have tried to argue against pedantic and preconceived views about the identification of Celtic in the Iberian peninsula. We could make a similar plea for so many other sectors of continental Celtic territory. Northern Italy and Alpine regions and South-Eastern Gaul present another especially difficult area. We are here troubled by a plague of unsatisfactory linguistic terms such as Ligurian (also Proto-Ligurian), Celto-Ligurian, Lepontic, Gallic, and Celtic. The Ligurian problem is, in my opinion, one that still admits of no satisfactory solution. The pan-Ligurian theories of d'Arbois de Jubainville seem to have had a brief new lease of life in Johannes Hubschmid's 1969 study of the characteristic *-asko-/-usko-* suffix.³ The theoretical extension of the 'Ligurian' layer into a pattern of language diffusion admitting very remote connections between western Europe and the Caucasus is at best unreliable.⁴ The separating out of Ligurian and the attempt to recognize it as a pre-Indo-European or non-Indo-European language that acquired an overlay of Indo-European, and the relating of it to neighbouring languages, are based on quite limited primary sources that are difficult to manage.⁵ I think that Antonio Tovar was right in insisting that even 'the old question of the Indo-European or non-Indo-European character of Ligurian

¹ See Wagner's view implied in *Actas del I Coloquio* . . . , 395, and compare Schmidt, *Die festlandkeltischen Sprachen*, 17.

² See the references given in *GPN*, loc. cit.

³ *Die asko-/usko-Suffixe und das Problem des Ligurischen* (Paris, 1969). See especially Tovar's review in *Lg.* xlvii (1970), 695-9, and that of Pisani in *Paideia* xxix (1974), 216-18.

⁴ Wagner (*Actas del I Coloquio* . . . , 387 f.) accepts an approach similar in some ways to that of Hubschmid. He insists that 'The study of pre-Indo-European substratum languages is one of the principal tasks of Western European linguistics' (op. cit. 395).

⁵ See especially Schmoll, *Rivista di studi liguri*, xxv (1959), 132-8; Untermann, *Onoma*, xiv/1-2 (1969), 180-95.

remains obscure'.¹ Recourse to the concept of 'Proto-Ligurian' on the one hand, based on the testimony of local names, personal names, and 'Reliktwörter' in modern languages, and of 'Ligurian' on the other hand as a 'Superstratsprache' of the pre-Indo-European 'Proto-Ligurian'² adds to the confusion.

Moreover, the so-called 'Lepontic' inscriptions, grouped around the North Italian lakes, counted Celtic long ago by Rhys, were shunned by many students of Continental Celtic, largely because of the views expressed by a succession of eminent scholars, including Kretschmer, Pauli, Conway, and Pedersen. Whatmough, relying overmuch, I feel sure, on Pedersen's dubious argumentation concerning these sources tried openly and honestly to have the best of both worlds by calling them 'Kelto-Liguric'.³ In recent years the study of the evidence from north-western Italy has received a fresh impetus and attracted fresh attention from Celtic scholars through the discovery of new texts and a new interest in the status of Lepontic and Gallic and other texts in northern Italy.⁴ There is in general a recognition of the difficulty of separating out clearly Ligurian from Celtic or Gallic.⁵ Such has been Professor Tibiletti Bruno's attitude and we owe her a debt of gratitude for editing a number of texts, including a comprehensive corpus of material from the neighbourhood of Lake Como. M. Lejeune's *Lepontica*, published in 1971, is in essence an examination of the linguistic evidence (relying heavily perforce on the testimony of anthroponymy) of 'Lepontic' texts with special regard to their Celtic or non-Celtic affiliation. The title adopted for this work in *Études celtiques* vol. xii is 'Documents gaulois et para-gaulois de Cisalpine', which is in some ways less precise.⁶ Lejeune was especially concerned with texts from

¹ See *Lg.*, vol. cit., 697. Whatmough (*PID* ii. 153-8) was more incautious.

² See especially G. R. Solta, *Zur Stellung der lateinischen Sprache* (Wien, 1974), 32-4, 64-7.

³ See *HSCP* xxxviii (1927), 1 ff., lv (1944), 77-80; *PID* ii. 65-73; See also Lejeune, *Lepontica*, 117. The term is justified by reference to Strabo's Κελτολίγυες (iv. 6.3, p. 203 C) (cf. Kretschmer, *KZ* xxxviii (1902), 111).

⁴ See M. G. Tibiletti Bruno, 'Problemi Gallo-Liguri' in *Studi sulla città antica*. Atti del Convegno di Studi sulla città Etrusca e Italica Preromana [Convegni e Colloqui I] (Istituto per la Storia di Bologna, 1970), 373-89; ead., 'Il mondo culturale di Comum' in *Mem. Ist. Lomb., Acc. Scienze e lettere*, vol. xxx, fasc. 3 (Milano, 1969), 169-315.

⁵ See Tibiletti Bruno, 'Problemi Gallo-Liguri', 379; ead., 'Ligure, Leponzio e Gallico' in *Lingue e dialetti* [Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica, vol. vi], ed. A. L. Prosdocimi (Rome, 1978), 129-208.

⁶ See Granucci, *SE* xliii (1975), 227 n. 7.

a particular geographical area in his *Lepontica*; he gave clear and salutary vent in an article published in 1972¹ to the difficulty he felt concerning the proper nomenclature for the so-called 'Lepontic' texts, for which he sought to demonstrate the propriety of using, within certain limits, a name such as 'luganien'. Devoto disliked his methodology,² charging him with interpreting the evidence for Lepontic in a restrictive, essentially epigraphic, manner and with bringing it completely into a Celtic ambit although Lejeune had in fact sought hesitantly to recognize the confrontation of two dialects or languages or variant codes, the one based on epigraphic testimony which could be termed Lepontic or Luganian, the other based on onomastic evidence which could be termed Ligurian or North Appennine, with the resemblances and dissimilarities of two neighbouring languages that are very inadequately known from sources differing the one from the other. Lejeune has argued strongly in favour of the Celticity of the language or dialect he defined as Lepontic.³ This to a certain degree is a reversion to the somewhat simplistic views of Danielsson⁴ and Rhÿs, views also accepted by Krahe.⁵ But we would do well to heed the scepticism of a number of Italian scholars such as Devoto, Granucci,⁶ and Maggiani.⁷ In fact we are unable to improve on Weisgerber's admission in 1931⁸ that the allocation of epigraphic sources to particular languages was in many cases still debatable. Lejeune was right in stressing⁹ that in speaking of Celtiberian, Gaulish,¹⁰ and Lepontic we can only

¹ 'Un problème de nomenclature: Lépointiens et Lépointique', *SE* xl (1972), 259-70. See also now id., *CRAI* 1977, 582 ff.

² 'Quanti italici', *SE* xl (1972), 247-57 (esp. 254 f., 257).

³ See *Lepontica*, par. 48 (pp. 121 ff.), *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar* (Madrid, 1972), 265-71. Lejeune conceives of two successive waves of Celtic invaders, the earlier by the Leponti or Lepontini and the second (at the beginning of the fourth century BC) by the Galli; this resulted in a close merging or symbiosis of the Celtic-speaking peoples.

⁴ O. A. Danielsson, *Zu den venetischen und lepontischen Inschriften* (Skrifter Uppsala xiii/1 (1910), 14 ff).

⁵ H. Krahe, in *Fest. f. Herman Hirt*, ii (1936), 241-55.

⁶ See *SE* xliii (1975), 224-48 (esp. 231).

⁷ See *SE* xliv (1976), 258-66 (esp. 258 n.), retaining the term 'Leponzio-figure' for all its inadequacy.

⁸ 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten', 173 (= *Rhenania Germano-Celtica*, 33 f.).

⁹ *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar*, 265 (see also his *Lepontica*, 122 f.).

¹⁰ He would maintain a distinction between a Cisalpine form of Gaulish and Lepontic and would link the former with the Gaulish of Transalpine Gaul. On the new Cisalpine Gaulish and Latin inscription of Vercelli see

speak very generally of the languages or dialects of certain groups of people who employed in various sites various alphabets (Iberian, Etruscan, Greek, and Latin) in their inscriptions, and that we cannot speak of people constituting 'groupes d'une complète unité linguistique'. Continental Celtic must have consisted of a number of divergent languages and dialects and it is not surprising that there is now a return to Rhys's pioneering, though crude and clumsy, attempt at recognizing dialectal variation within Gaulish. This in fact is what Joshua Whatmough tried, and failed, to do for Ancient Gaul and what Lejeune and K. H. Schmidt in particular have tried to illustrate on a broader front in recent years. But the pet theorizing that has from time to time surrounded the discussion of Ligurian and Lepontic is in itself sufficient warning that we have to be very careful in any attempt at reconstructing linguistic prehistory.

In central and eastern Europe the evidence for Celtic is even more difficult to identify and interpret. Here again account has to be taken of fragmentary contact languages such as Illyrian, Thracian, Dacian, and Scythian and (in Asia Minor) Lydian and Phrygian, and of the intermixture of Celtic with other languages such as these. Evidence for Celtic has to be gathered in from the writings of ancient authors and from the writings of ancient authors and from non-Celtic inscriptions and graffiti and substrat survivals. All the while Celtic items have to be separated out from non-Celtic texts and distinguished from items belonging to other contact languages. As a rule this is most easily achieved with the most powerful contact languages, Greek, Latin, and, later on, Germanic, the languages that were the main cause of the decline and eventual eclipse of Continental Celtic.

The old Illyrian theories of scholars such as Pokorny and Krahe, still courted in a sense by Wagner, have been superseded by more realistic (though still, to my mind, uncertain) claims for a distinct Illyrian language.¹ Recent attempts to identify and classify 'Illyrian' names, especially by Alföldy² and Katičić,³

Lejeune, *CRAI* 1977, 582–610; beside Tibiletti Bruno, *RALinc*, xxxi/5–6 (1976 [1977]), 355–76 (Pls. I–II); Pisani, *Die Sprache*, xxv (1979), 49–53.

¹ See, for example, H. Krahe, *IF* lxix (1964), 201–12; H. Kronasser, *BalkE* iv (1962), 5–23; id., *Die Sprache*, xi (1965), 155–83.

² See Géza Alföldy, *BNF* xv (1964), 55–104; id., *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia* (Heidelberg, 1969); id., *Noricum* trans. Anthony Birley (London and Boston, 1974).

³ See R. Katičić, *Arheološki vestnik*, xvii (1966), 145–68; id., *GABiH*

would detect several distinct 'Illyrian' areas in the provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia, for example. But the whole concept of 'Illyrian' is in dispute.¹ Fritz von Lochner-Hüttenbach rightly stresses² that there is still a lot of confusion concerning so-called Illyrian 'Namengebiete' or 'Namenlandschaften'. In any case a 'Namengebiet', however well conceived or established, is different from a 'Sprachgebiet'.³

Therein lies much of the difficulty of sifting the linguistic evidence concerning the Celts in central and eastern Europe, in the Balkans and Asia Minor. This can be seen in so much of the work that has been done in these areas, only a small fraction of which can be referred to here. Professor Alföldy, for example, has devoted an important volume to the study of personal names in the Roman province of Dalmatia.⁴ Names supposed to be Celtic have been separated out⁵ as such, but with many of them there is in my view very considerable doubt as to their Celticity.⁶ Holder's *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* is the main yardstick. Alföldy himself declares a doubt concerning the linguistic affiliation of a minority of the names listed. His distribution map does not really bear out the claim that it is possible to confirm the view that there was a strong 'Bevölkerungsschicht' in north-western and north-eastern Dalmatia on the basis of onomastic evidence. He, like Hans Krahe many years before him, readily concedes the difficulties involved, especially in trying to distinguish between Celtic and Illyrian names, and it is clear that a name rarely attested or only once attested in an ethnically mixed area can belong to any one of the languages

iii (1965), 53-76; id., *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde. Gedenkschrift für W. Brandenstein*, hrsg. M. Mayrhofer (Innsbruck, 1968), 363-8; id., *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*, Part I (The Hague-Paris, 1976), 154-86.

¹ See V. Polák, 10. *Internat. Kongress f. Namensforschung, Wien 1969. Abhandlungen* i (1969), 429-35.

² 'Illyrier und Illyrisch', *Das Altertum*, xvi/4 (1970), 216-28.

³ Katičić readily concedes this in *Gedenkschrift für W. Brandenstein*, 364, 368.

⁴ Géza Alföldy, *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia* (Heidelberg, 1969).

⁵ See op. cit. 358.

⁶ See Jürgen Untermann, 'Venetisches in Dalmatie', *GABiH* vii (1970), 5-21 (esp. par. 4, p. 7 with n. 10); R. Katičić, 'Zur Frage der keltischen und pannonischen Namengebiete im römischen Dalmatien', *GABiH* iii (1965), 53-75 (esp. p. 66); id., *GABiH* vi (1968), 61-120 (cf. Hamp, *Acta Neophilologica* ix (1976), 3-8; xi (1978), 57-63); J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London, 1969), 159, 171. On some problems connected with the identifying of Celtic personal names see D. Ellis Evans, in *Actas del II Coloquio . . .*, 117-29.

that were being spoken or that had been spoken there and indeed may not belong to any language native to that area. This presents an insoluble problem and is a quite serious distorting factor of course in Weisgerber's cumulative analysis of the names of the Rhineland in antiquity. In Dalmatia the name *Sicu*, for example, attested in Doljani, was previously claimed as Illyrian by Krahe and Mayer and as Thracian by Detschew. This is the only example of this name in this particular form. Alföldy would claim it as Celtic¹ on the basis that it occurs in the territory of the Iapodes (declared by Strabo to be ἐπιμικτον Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ Κελτοῖς ἔθνος)² and that it shows (in its nominative ending in *-u*)³ a morphological feature which is common in Celtic names in Noricum and Pannonia. Neither of these criteria is in fact at all conclusive.

Katičić in his important discussion of Celtic and Pannonian 'Namengebiete' in Roman Dalmatia⁴ drew attention to much of the difficulty when he declared that the name-areas of Celtic lands had not been thoroughly investigated and that we therefore did not have a secure basis for comparison.⁵ I think that the situation is still problematic and Katičić's own work has (mercifully in a sense) compounded the difficulties involved because he has drawn attention to various methodological possibilities and imponderables. For Noricum too studies of nomenclature have tended to detect differences in practice in various areas and these differences have been interpreted in several ways. Alföldy ventures to suggest that they 'presumably derive from the fact that different Celtic dialects were spoken in north and south [Noricum], and [that] this may provide evidence for a different origin of these two groups of Celtic peoples'.⁶ Katičić tried to identify and analyse the Celtic personal names of Slovenia in antiquity and concluded that there was here a stratum of names that could be distinguished

¹ See *BNF* xv (1964), 63 and *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*, 15. It is not a woman's name as reported by Alföldy. See also Katičić, *GABiH* iii (1965), 60, 61.

² Strabo iv. 6. 10, C. 207. See also Wilkes, *op. cit.* 157 ff.

³ See Patsch, *Wissenschaftliche Mittheilungen aus Bosnien und Hercegovina*, v (1897), 343; Falkner, in *Frühgeschichte und Sprachwissenschaft* (Arbeiten aus dem Institut f. allgemeine u. vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft hrsg. v. W. Brandenstein) (Wien, 1948), 39 ff.

⁴ *GABiH*, vol. cit., 53-76 (see esp. p. 53 n. 1). See also now Katičić's 'Recent Studies in 'Illyrian' Anthroponymy' in his *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*, Part I, pp. 178-84.

⁵ See *op. cit.* 56.

⁶ Géza Alföldy, *Noricum* trans. Anthony Birley, 24.

from those of the Noric and Pannonian Celts and that showed links with the bearers of a North Adriatic style of name and with the Celts of an eastern Alpine zone.¹ We have recently had from Pavlović² a very risky attempt at establishing the intercrossing of two Celtic branches in Illyricum, one from central Europe and the other originating in Gaul. This is based on very limited and shaky toponymic evidence.

I think that there is an ever-present danger in making the evidence available to carry more weight than it can safely bear. Some reliable conclusions emerge, for sure. For example, the dominance of Celtic in Noricum at the time of the Roman conquest or the progress of Romanization reflected in the decline in the number of native *cognomina* from the mid-first century to the end of the third century.³ In regard to proper names Alföldy himself is well aware of the difficulties in controlling and interpreting their evidence, especially on the fringe of the Celtic world, as he puts it. Even when we think we can assign items to particular languages there is always the possibility that they have been taken over by people who were not speakers of those languages.⁴ Incidentally, one of the boldest attempts to wrest information from Celtic personal names in central Europe has been Miklós Szabó's examination of names in Pannonia.⁵ He assumed, over-confidently, that apparent changes and trends in the mode of formation of personal names might coincide with changes in the social and economic organization of their bearers. This is an extra-linguistic point but it does illustrate the exceedingly dubious conclusions which specialists can be easily tempted to suggest when they have to deal with material on which their researches by and large yield comparatively few reliable results.

It is unlikely that study of the primary linguistic sources of antiquity in central and eastern Europe can of itself bring us near to a secure location of the cradle or early homeland of

¹ 'Keltska osobna imena u antičkoj Sloveniji', *Arheološki vestnik*, xvii (1966), 145-68. See also p. 520 n. 3 above.

² Milivoj Pavlović, 'Le Rencontre des Celtes de l'Europe centrale et des Gaulois en Illyricum', *BALM* xiii-xv (1971-3 [1976]), 295-301.

³ See Alföldy, *Noricum*, 134 ff., with Table 4.

⁴ See *ibid.* 17. For a summary of some evidence for Pannonia and Upper Moesia see András Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia. A History of the Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire* (London and Boston, 1974) (esp. chapters I and III).

⁵ 'A pannóniai kelta személynévanyag vizsgálata', *Archaeologiai Értektő*, xci (1964), 165-75.

the Celts. One of the latest theories, based on a lively and enlightened discussion of the linguistic geography of old Indo-European families of languages in central Europe, is that of Professor Heinrich Wagner,¹ who has stressed correspondences between Celtic and Thracian, Phrygian, and Ossetic and concluded that one could justify locating the Celtic homeland 'in an area west or north-west of the Thracian domain'. Such correspondences as Wagner claims for Celtic and Thracian are minimal² and, on his own admission, 'cannot be used as definite proof of original close relationship'. Like Wagner I had got the impression that there were a goodly number of forms in Detschew's large collection of allegedly Thracian material that seemed to be equivalent to Celtic items. But this is a very uncertain basis for any firm conclusion, especially as some recent discussion of the position of Thracian in the Indo-European family of languages has produced differing conclusions, none of which would emphasize Celto-Thracian links or correspondences.³ And there really is no satisfactory deliverance in archaeological evidence, as Weisgerber stressed so very clearly and firmly when he came to discuss Old Celtic and its neighbouring (or contact) languages.⁴

The complex and central problems of language change and language descent are relevant for our study. They are important for our understanding of the language substitution that occurred over a wide area, over a long period of time and in greatly varying social communities, in the gradual waning and so-called 'death' of Continental Celtic. We are familiar with the discussion of both the 'survival' and the 'end' of Celtic in Gaul, for example, with the treatment of language contact and especially of external change and the detection of substratum and adstratum influences and loan relationships and language transference in the development from Celtic Gaul to Roman

¹ 'The Origin of the Celts in the light of linguistic geography', *TPhS* 1969, 203-50.

² See Birkhan, *Kratylos*, xvi (1971 [1973]), 204.

³ See R. A. Crossland in *L'Ethnogenèse des peuples balkaniques*. Symposium international sur l'ethnogenèse des peuples balkaniques, Plovdiv . . . 1969 (Sofia, 1971), 225-36; Ivan Duridanov, 'Die Stellung des Thrakischen im Kreise der indoeuropäischen Sprachen', *Academia litterarum Bulgarica. Primus Congressus Studiorum Thracicorum. THRACIA I* (Serdicae, 1972), 231-44. See also R. Katičić, *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*, Part I, pp. 128-53; Vladimir I. Georgiev, *Trakite i tehnijat ezik* (Sofija, 1977).

⁴ See 'Die Sprache der Festlandkelten', 168; also Werner Schröder, *PBB(T)* xcii (1970), 195.

Gaul to French France. We can say far less than we would like to do about both internal and external change insofar as it affected Celtic throughout the length and breadth of Europe, because adequate data are never at our disposal, and for some areas they are very sparse and insignificant indeed.

Weisgerber rightly complained¹ about a lack of balance and good sense in the discussion of the development and survival of Continental Celtic, ranging from unrealistic constructs concerning development to over-hasty syntheses concerning survival. The most extreme position in the argument for a late survival of Celtic in Europe was that of J. U. Hubschmied² who maintained that Celtic may have been alive in some Swiss valleys as late as the twelfth century AD. This was based on over-dependence on the evidence of the allegedly late 'translation' of Celtic local names.³ Hubschmied's more important contribution was to draw attention to Celtic 'Reliktwörter' which might reflect relatively late phonological developments in Gaulish. This has some direct bearing on the disagreements that have occurred concerning the view that Celtic may have survived to a sufficiently late period in north-western Gaul for the present-day Celtic language of Brittany to be in part a continuation of or descendant of Gaulish. This is an old idea seriously advanced anew several times by François Falc'hun.⁴ His in some ways controversial theories have been countered, but by no means altogether demolished, by several commentators. The most ambitious recent attack on this front is that of Fleuriot⁵ who has refused to take it for granted that Gaulish 'had died out in Armorica as early as the end of the fifth century'. He placed considerable emphasis, possibly too much, on the evidence of Venantius Fortunatus and of Gregory of Tours for the survival of Celtic in central Gaul as late as the

¹ See especially *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, ix (1939), 23-51 (= *Rhenania Germano-Celtica*, 150-74). On the external history of Gaulish see also Joshua Whatmough, *HSCP* lv (1944), 1-85; D. Ellis Evans, *BBCS* xvi (1954-6), 165-81; K. H. Schmidt, *ZCP* xxxvii (1979), 287-8.

² *VR* iii (1938), 48-155. ³ See Weisgerber's criticism, art. cit. 45-9.

⁴ See his *Historie de la langue bretonne d'après la géographie linguistique*² (Paris, 1963), 157 f. See also *AB* lxix (1962), 413-28; lxx (1963), 425-54; *RLR* xxx (1966), 324-43; *Mém. soc. hist. et arch. de Bretagne*, xliiii (1963), 5-17; *Proc. 8th. Int. Congr. Onom. Sc.*, ed. D. P. Blok (The Hague-Paris, 1966), 138-46; and now F. Falc'hun, *Les Origines de la langue bretonne, 1. Argumentation historique = Studi*, no. 8 (juin 1977), passim.

⁵ See *Antiquity*, li (1977), 106-8. See also now Léon Fleuriot, *Les Origines de la Bretagne* (Paris, 1980), esp. Chap. III.

end of the sixth century. He would insist that we have in Breton not a direct continuation of Gaulish but rather a Gaulish substratum which left its mark in particular on the so-called KLT (Kernev-Leon-Treger) area as distinct from the zone in which the Vannetais dialect developed (a dialect reflecting more markedly Romance influence).¹ Falc'hun had curiously insisted that the survival of Gaulish is more easily traced in the Vannes dialect than it is in the others, relying largely on the testimony of accentuation and modern place-names now decried by Fleuriot. I doubt whether the matter can be argued to a convincing conclusion from the evidence mustered so far.

We should heed Weisgerber's warning² about seeking a middle way between over-zealous hunting for confirmation of a theory and timid renunciation or abandonment of it. We should also recognize the close and constant relationship between Britain and Gaul. The Breton migration was in a sense only a special manifestation or quickening of movements to and fro across the Channel that had occurred for a very long time, movements that were certainly not restricted to the extreme north-western sector alone.

Celtic did fall apart, recede, and come to an end gradually, with a variation in pace and date from one region and community to another. But quite apart from the special case of Breton there is good sense in the view that Continental Celtic never did die out completely but contributed to the making of many non-Celtic languages in Europe. The traces are clearer in some areas than others, for instance in northern France, where the combined effect of migrations from Britain is an additional compounded factor. The fullest information concerning Celtic features, especially lexical items, has been compiled for France and the Hispanic peninsula, especially in the work of von Wartburg³ and Corominas.⁴ However, trying to establish

¹ See Fleuriot, in *Btr. zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie, Julius Pokorny . . . gewidmet*, hrsg. v. Wolfgang Meid [= *IBK* Bd. 13] (Innsbruck, 1967), 159-70).

² See *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, vol. cit. 51 (= *Rhenania Germano-Celtica*, 174).

³ Especially his *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn u. Leipzig, 1922-), on which see Kurt Baldinger, *Introduction aux dictionnaires les plus importants pour l'histoire du français* (Paris, 1974). In his *Évolution et structure de la langue française* (Leipzig und Berlin, 1934), 15, von Wartburg estimated that some 180 Gaulish words were to be found in French.

⁴ See, most recently, *Actas del I Coloquio . . .*, 87-164. Works on individual languages or groups of languages pay some attention to substrata. See, for

the effect of Celtic before it disappeared on other languages involves scholars in many vexed problems. We can refer to one important example, namely the view that Continental Celtic knew something of a system of lenition comparable with that of Insular Celtic. Meyer-Lübke long ago¹ pointed out some of the difficulties, as he saw them, in assuming a widespread form of lenition in Gaulish, and Pokorny later on insisted² that there is no satisfactory proof of the presence of lenition as a characteristically Celtic phenomenon in Gaulish. Pedersen, very largely because he wrongly wanted to bring in the anomalous alternation of *s-* and *h-*³ into a systematic general Celtic lenition, sought a relatively early date for it, as early as the end of the first century AD. A number of scholars, including Louis Gray,⁴ Martinet⁵ and Tovar,⁶ have claimed more or less convincingly that certain tendencies in consonantal mutation, notably in sources from Spain and Gaul, reflect a pre-Romance Common Celtic lenition that has been carried over into western Romance dialects. Opinion is markedly divided on this matter mainly because of a tendency to confuse what has been termed the systematic morphophonemic lenition which characterizes the neo-Celtic languages with the incontestable leniting tendencies that have been observed in fair profusion in the inscriptions, Gaulish, Celtiberian, and Latin, of the Celtic West and in literary texts in antiquity. Although there had been hints concerning this before by Thurneysen⁷ and Marstrander,⁸ as far as I know Falc'hun is the only scholar who has recently tried to demonstrate that there is some evidence of initial consonantal mutation in Late Gaulish. He has suggested⁹ that this evidence can be gleaned from some (hitherto really very few) place-names such as *Tallevende* (south-west of Vire, Calvados)

example, Carlo Tagliavini, *Einführung in die romanische Philologie* (München, 1973), Chap. II (see Schmidt, *ZCP* xxxv (1976), 337-40).

¹ *ZRPh* xlii (1922), 332-6.

² *VR* x (1948-9), 254-67.

³ See K. H. Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain* (Edinburgh, 1953), 515 ff. See also *GPN* 397 n. 2.

⁴ See *Lg.* xx (1944), 223-30.

⁵ See *Lg.* xxviii (1952), 192-217, and the revised French version in Martinet's *Économie des changements phonétiques. Traité de phonologie diachronique* (Berne, 1955), 257-96.

⁶ *REL* xxix (1951), 102-20.

⁷ *ZCP* xiv (1923), 10.

⁸ *Symbolae Osloenses*, iii (1925), 48. See also now Fleuriot, *EC* xiv/2 (1975 [1976]), 415 ff, and compare Fulk, *BBCS* xxix/1 (1980), 1-16.

⁹ *Travaux de l'Institut phonétique de Strasbourg*, no. 6 (1974), 1-12; *Word*, xxviii (1972 [1977]), 37-50.

beside *Tal-y-fan* in Welsh, *Andillac* (Tarn), *Mardilly* (Orne) and **Darandasia* (: *Darandasiensis* 583), mod. *Moutiers-Tarentaise* (Savoie). This is slender and suspect and may be yet another instance of trying to force the evidence into a certain pattern in order to gain a little more detail about the development of a language such as Gaulish.¹

The most instructive and encouraging development has been the discovery of new primary evidence and some of the attempts at reading and interpreting both these new sources and sources previously available.² We are have had detailed publication and discussion of several important Gaulish texts, especially from Chamalières³ and Lezoux.⁴ New evidence at long last, by way of proper names, has been gathered in and is being gathered in concerning Galatian in Asia Minor, leading to a tentative new synthesis,⁵ and for the Hispanic peninsula the discovery of the Botorrita bronze announced in 1971 has provided us with what may be the longest native (i.e. non-Greek or non-Latin) inscription in western Europe.⁶

There is to my mind hardly any doubt about the Celticity of the Botorrita text and the likelihood that it is a declaration of a juridical or quasi-juridical nature. It has greatly exercised the minds of several leading experts. Differences of opinion in some measure concerning the reading and more especially concerning both the general and the detailed interpretation of the inscription are bound to make us feel rather uneasy about claims that we have achieved a fairly full and proper understanding of the text.⁷ There have been some reliable gains here

¹ For J. U. Hubschmied's work see p. 525, above. Cf. Pokorny, *VR* x (1948-9), 220-67.

² This does not deny that there is also some utter rubbish. Barry Fell's bewildering *America B.C.: Ancient Settlers in the New World* (New York, 1976) is a hugely bizarre 'revelation' of trans-Atlantic Continental Celtic. See now Anne Ross and Peter Reynolds, 'Ancient Vermont', *Antiquity*, lii (1978), 100-7; Marshall McKusick, op. cit. liii (1979), 121-3.

³ See Lejeune and Marichal, *EC* xv/1 (1976-7), 156-68 (Pl. XIV); Fleuriot, *ibid.* 173-90; id., *EC* xvi (1979), 135-40, xvii (1980), 145-59; Lambert, *ibid.* 141-70; Schmidt, *BBCS* xxix/2. 256-68.

⁴ See now Lejeune and Marichal, loc. cit. 151-6; Fleuriot, *EC* xvii (1980), 127-44.

⁵ See especially Stephen Mitchell, *The History and Archaeology of Galatia*, D. Phil. (Oxon.) dissertation, 1975; also Strubbe, *BNF* xiii (1978), 361-81.

⁶ See J. Maluquer de Motes, *Pyrenae: Cronica Arqueológica*, x (1974), 151. Cf. K. H. Schmidt, *BBCS* xxvi/4 (1976), 376; Lejeune, *CRAI* 1973, 624.

⁷ Literature: Antonio Beltrán, 'Avance al estudio del bronce ibérico de Botorrita (Zaragoza)', in *XII Congreso nacional de Arqueología, Jaén 1971*

in our knowledge of the Old Celtic lexicon, of morphology, and of syntax, and of the use made at an early date (exactly how early we cannot say) of a Celtic language in a text which, it has been argued, may be a witnessed agreement or contract concerning land tenure.¹ The literature on Botorrita shows once more much of the frustration and the satisfaction that the worker on Continental Celtic experiences as he wrestles with old patterns and formations. I want to mention here only one vital example from Botorrita. Some forms in *-Tu(s)* are tantalizingly difficult. A number of these have been identified as verbal forms by K. H. Schmidt;² he interpreted them as third person imperatives, with *-Tu* a third singular, a conglomerate of injunctive *t* and a particle *-u*, and with *-Tus* a third plural, with *-s* a marker of plurality (as also perhaps in *iourus* in a Gaulish inscription from the source of the Seine, in *lubitus* at La Graufesenque, and in *karnitus* at Briona).³ This interpretation is fundamentally important for Schmidt's first comprehensive treatment of the whole Face A text at Botorrita and is justified on comparative evidence from within Celtic and from non-Celtic languages. However, we are still left wondering,

(Zaragoza, 1973), 451-4; id., 'La inscripción ibérica sobre bronce de Botorrita (Zaragoza)', *Homenaje a D. Pío Beltrán*, = *Anejos del Archivo Español de Arqueología*, vii (1974), 73-85; Antonio Tovar, 'Las inscripciones de Botorrita y de Peñalba de Villastar y los límites orientales de los celtíberos', *Hispania Antiqua*, iii (1973), 367-405; id., 'Ein neues Denkmal der keltiberischen Sprache: die Inschrift von Botorrita', *ZCP* xxxiv (1975), 1-19; M. Lejeune 'La Grande inscription celtibère de Botorrita (Saragosse)', *CRAI* 1973. 622-47 (see also *École pratique des hautes études: Annuaire*, IV section, 1974-5, 857); Javier de Hoz-Luis Michelena, *La Inscripción celtibérica de Botorrita* (Universidad de Salamanca, 1974); J. Maluquer de Motes, 'El bronce escrito de Botorrita (Zaragoza)', *Pyrenae: Crónica Arqueológica*, x (1974), 151-64; K. H. Schmidt, 'Zur keltiberischen Inschrift von Botorrita', *BBCS* xxvi/4 (1976), 375-94; id., 'Historisch-vergleichende Analyse des der keltiberischen Inschrift von Botorrita zu Grunde liegenden Morpheminventars', in *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, ed. A. M. Davies and W. Meid (Innsbruck, 1976), 359-71; id., 'Der Beitrag der keltiberischen Inschrift von Botorrita zur Rekonstruktion der protokeltischen Syntax', *Word*, xxviii/1-2 (1972 [1977]), 51-62; L. Fleuriot, 'La Grande inscription celtibère de Botorrita', *EC* xiv/2 (1975 [1976]), 405-42; J. Gil, *Habis*, viii (1977), 161-72; Francisco R. Adrados, *Actas del I Coloquio . . .*, 25-47; Fleuriot, *Actas del II Coloquio . . .*, 169-84.

¹ This theory was advanced by Professor Fleuriot (see *EC*, loc. cit.).

² See *BBCS* xxvi/4 (1976), 392 s.v. *usaPiTus*; *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics . . .*, 367 f. See also Lejeune, *CRAI* 1973, 647; de Hoz and Michelena, op. cit., 87 ff; Fleuriot, *EC* xvi (1979), 130 ff.

³ See *ZCP* xxxiii (1974), 329 f.; Lejeune, *EC* xvi (1979), 110 f.

with Lejeune,¹ whether the resemblance to the preterites *karnitu* at Todi (also *καρνιτου* at Saignon), *karnitus* at Briona, and *lubitus* at La Graufesenque is illusory or not. We also wonder whether *TaTus*, attested twice on Face A, is a verb at all, meaning 'sie sollen setzen, bzw. opfern', as suggested by Schmidt,² or a noun meaning 'gift' as claimed by Fleuriot,³ who would connect with it the form *uerTaTos* at Botorrita (understood by him as a form meaning 'transferred', a derivative of the root **uert-* 'turn' where Schmidt has thought of a link with the root **uer-* 'to close up').⁴ There are very many differences between Schmidt's detailed interpretation of this text and that of Fleuriot. Where Schmidt interpreted *Tiris maTus* as 'three bears', Fleuriot interpreted it as meaning 'good lands' and where Schmidt detected a co-ordinate conjunction *uTa* 'and' (cognate with Indo-Iranian *uta*), not otherwise attested in Celtic, Fleuriot saw an ablative form which he rendered uncertainly as 'par taille, coupe, compte' (cognate with Lat. *puto* and *computo*).⁵ These differences reflect special interpretations of Face A over-all and need not surprise us; this is normal with a difficult text.⁶ We should rather stress that there is fair agreement among several scholars concerning the identification and interpretation of a number of important forms from Botorrita such as *amPiTseTi*, *anCioś* and *esanCioś*, *Camanom*, *PouśTom*, pronominal *io-* and *so-* forms and enclitic *-Cue* and *-ue*.

Fresh attempts by Fleuriot at the interpretation of texts such as two of the formularies of Marcellus of Bordeaux and one of the graffiti of Banassac⁷ and by Lejeune of a series of inscriptions on spindle-whorls and from Alise-Sainte-Reine and other sites,⁸ have shown clearly that something new may still be gleaned from sources known to us already for some time. We thereby recover forms such as *velor*, a first singular deponent perhaps meaning 'I wish' or 'I should like', *axati* (or *axat*) a third singular present subjunctive linked with OIr. *-aga* (reflecting perhaps along with Brittonic the fusion of the *-s-* and *-a-* morphemes of the subjunctive), a second singular imperative *lubi* 'love', and *tiedi* (if it is correctly interpreted as

¹ *CRAI* 1973, 647.

² See *BBCS*, vol. cit. 389.

³ See *EC*, vol. cit. 429, and *Actas del II Coloquio . . .*, 178.

⁴ See op. cit. 429, and *BBCS*, vol. cit. 391.

⁵ See op. cit. 392, and *EC*, vol. cit. 438, 439.

⁶ Note Lejeune's comment (*CRAI* 1977, 608) concerning the bilingual inscription of Verceil.

⁷ See *EC* xiv/1 (1974), 57–66; xiv/2 (1975), 443–50; xvi (1979), 123–34.

⁸ See *EC* xv/1 (1976–7), 95 ff., xvi (1979), 101 ff.; xvii (1980), 55 ff.

ti edi, the dative of the second singular personal pronoun together with the third singular of the verb 'to be') corresponding to MBret. *az eux*, again perhaps showing the common development of Brittonic and Gaulish.¹ Lejeune has identified possible instances of the first singular present indicative of the verb 'to be' for Gaulish.² Szemerényi's so simple and convincing resegmentation of the Narbonensian formula as δεδε βρατου δεκοντεμ³ meaning 'in gratitude dedicated the tithe' got rid of a number of old difficulties, but it also produced a new puzzle which has resulted in a fresh round of speculation. Meid has recently suggested a new interpretation for the inscription ουενικουμεδου on a drinking-cup of Belgentier (Var),⁴ not as the name or names of the owner but rather like the Banassac text *neddamon delgu linda* referring to the use to be made of the cup; accordingly Meid would see here two forms, one a *u*-stem dative singular in *-u* (μεδου), the other a dative in *-oi* (ουενικου) archaic in its ending or showing Greek influence, together meaning, he thinks, 'für freundschaftlichen Met'. This very brief selection of references to new interpretations of Gaulish texts reveals at once how etymologizing ranges perforce from that which is reasonably sound to that which must be viewed as more or less venturesome guess-work.⁵

There is, therefore, need for constant reappraisal of the evidence embedded in our sources concerning topics such as orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax, the lexicon, onomastics, and dialectal cleavage. For example, as Hoenigswald has argued,⁶ the more or less general loss of IE *p* in Celtic does not necessarily antedate the assimilation of **p . . . k^u* to **k^u . . . k^u* in Celtic as Bolelli⁷ and others have taken for granted. This assimilation is not one with rule-character and cannot be treated as a common Italo-Celtic innovation because of well-known problems of relative chronology.⁸ The discrepant 'Latin-from-Celtic' name of the Hercynian Forest⁹ is

¹ Fleuriot's ingenious interpretation of the Banassac graffito depends on a number of fresh morphological divisions and etymological speculations.

² See *EC*, xv/1 (1976-7), 103 f., 109. Compare Schmidt's remarks (*BBCS* xxix/2 (1981), 264) on some forms in *-mi* at Chamalières.

³ *KZ* lxxxviii (1974), 246-86.

⁴ *Die Sprache* xxii/1 (1976), 52 f.

⁵ See *BBCS* xxvii/2 (1977), 245.

⁶ *JIES* i (1973), 324-9.

⁷ *Ricerche linguistiche*, v (1962), 101.

⁸ See Watkins, in *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, ed. H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966), 33; de Coene, *BBCS* xxvii/3 (1977), 406-8.

⁹ See Whatmough, *DAG*, item 241; Meid, *Scottish Studies*, xii/1 (1968),

still important in the discussion of this problem, *Hercynia silua*, Ἑρκύνια ὄρη, Ἑρκύνιος δρυμός a name attested in ancient sources from Aristotle onwards. It was the name of the forest separating northern from southern Germany in antiquity. If it is to be related to IE **perkus* 'oak' it may be connected with OHG *Firgunna*, Goth. *fairgun* 'mountain', and OE *fyrgen* 'forest, mountain'. It was discussed long ago by d'Arbois de Jubainville,¹ but the possibility that there is here a Celtic **cuno-* 'high' (once favoured by Rhÿs)² is now discredited.³ The name may still be an important pointer within Celtic to the fact that Proto-Celtic did retain IE *p* and that the **p . . . k^u > *k^u . . . k^u* change does not have a sound-law character.⁴ The evidence of the Germanic forms here is important but difficult to control in relation to the prehistory of the name *Hercynia*. Whatmough had seen the importance also of the divine name *nymphae Percernes* of Vaucluse, which he claimed as 'perfectly good Ligurian',⁵ beside the ethnic name *Querquerni* (v.l. *Quar-*) and the local name *Aquae Querquernae* in Galicia.⁶

In regard to orthography there are many difficulties, for example, in the way of assigning a definite phonological value to each and every instance of written *ei*, *ei*, *ηi*, etc. But the Continental Celtic evidence, ranging from Galatia to Celtiberia, from Gallia Cisalpina to Gallia Transalpina, shows that the change of IE *ei* to *ē* could not have occurred universally in Proto-Celtic.⁷

In regard to nominal inflexion the identification by Untermann in 1967⁸ of *o*-stem genitive singular forms in Hispano-Celtic disclosed a feature not retained, as far as we know, elsewhere in Celtic, both Insular and Continental. It contrasts

49; Kuhn, in Rolf Hachmann, George Kossack, and Hans Kuhn, *Völker zwischen Germanen und Kelten* (Neumünster, 1962), 114; Maher, *JIES* i (1973), 457 f; Wolfram, *MIÖG* lxxxiv (1976), 241 ff.

¹ *RC* xi (1890), 216–19.

² *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 6th ser. vii (1907), 87 ff. (esp. 87 n. 1).

³ See Helmut Birkhan, *Germanen und Kelten bis zum Ausgang der Römerzeit* (Wien, 1970), 350 n. 825.

⁴ See Hoenigswald. op. cit. 327 f. ⁵ See *Language*, xxvi (1950), 303.

⁶ See Pokorny, *VR* x (1948–9), 231; *MSS* vii (1955), 67; *IEW* 822; Whatmough, *Language*, loc. cit., *CPh.* xlvii (1952), 112; Krahe, *BNF* xiii (1962), 270; Meid, *Scottish Studies*, vol. cit. 53; Solta, *Die Sprache*, ix (1963), 216; id., *Zur Stellung der lateinischen Sprache*, 12 n. 22.

⁷ See Lejeune, *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar* (Madrid, 1972), 270; Bachellery, *EC* xiii/1 (1972), 45; Schmidt, *Die Festlandkeltischen Sprachen*, 15; Birkhan, op. cit. 254 f.

⁸ In *Btr. zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie, Julius Pokorny . . . gewidmet*, hrsg. v. Wolfgang Meid (Innsbruck, 1967), 281–8.

with *-i* in Gaulish and Lepontic and Insular Celtic. As Schmidt has shown,¹ such coexistence or double representation of morphs in *o*-stem genitives is found also in Faliscan and Baltic. I can see no way of proving the primacy of one or other of these two endings for Celtic. We should not attempt such a proof perhaps. In any case a great deal depends on our view concerning the origin of the apparently aberrant *-o* ending, because we cannot rely on the suggestion that it may ultimately be a reflex of an ablative *-ōd*. A reasonable argument could be drawn up concerning the use of both *-i* and *-o* in favour of interpreting them both in turn as an archaism and as an innovation. The mere fact that we have no examples of *-i* in Hispano-Celtic does not mean that they did not occur in it. And Schmidt has demonstrated some of the extensive and dynamic revision of the Indo-European case system in Celtic through case syncretism, with both a semantic motivation and a phonematic and paradigmatic morphemic motivation.² This in itself shows the danger of using the exclusive reflection of **-ōd* in Hispano-Celtic as an indication that it was separated out as a language at an early date.³

Even with the testimony of recently discovered texts the examples of Old Celtic verbal forms do not enable us to arrive at firm conclusions concerning some of the long-standing problems of the Celtic verbal system, including the origin of the distinction between absolute and conjunct forms that is characteristic of Old Irish verbal flexion. For example, the numerous instances of finite third person verbal forms in *-T* or *-Ti* on the Botorrita bronze are inconclusive because we cannot determine the phonological value of the personal endings on account of the special character of the Iberian syllabic script in which these forms are recorded.⁴ One typical example of the problems involved is the third plural *sisonT* or *sisonTi* of Botorrita, compared by Tovar, de Hoz and Michelena, Lejeune, and Schmidt, with Lat. *serunt* (< **sisonTi*),⁵ but interpreted now perhaps more satisfactorily by Fleuriot⁶ as a reduplicated present reflecting earlier **sistonti* 'existent' or 'se tiennent',

¹ See *Studies . . . Leonard R. Palmer*, 363; *Actas del I Coloquio . . .*, 334 f.; *Die festlandkeltischen Sprachen*, 15. Professor Eric Hamp has kindly drawn my attention to his recent discussion of the Balto-Slavic thematic genitive singular. See also p. 515 above.

² See *BBCS* xxv/4 (1974), 402-7.

³ Cf. Schmidt, *Studies . . . Leonard R. Palmer*, loc. cit.

⁴ See Schmidt, *BBCS* xxvi/4 (1976), 376 n. 5; id., *Studies . . . Leonard R. Palmer*, 365 f.; Fleuriot, *EC* xiv/1 (1974), 66 n. 2.

⁵ See Schmidt, *BBCS*, vol. cit. 388.

⁶ *EC*, vol. cit. 418.

containing the same root as OIr. *ar-sissedar* and comparable rather with Lat. *sisunt* and, more importantly, with Hispano-Celtic *sistat* in the main rock inscription of Peñalba de Villastar.¹ Here Schmidt's interpretation of the Botorrita inscription again differs from that of Fleuriot, who tentatively explains *TiTaś* (a reflex, he thinks, of *(s)tigtas 'passages') as the plural subject of the verb,² whereas Schmidt regards that form as an object accusative plural feminine 'die gesaugt Habenden' cognate with the dubiously read *TinaTu[s]* which he would explain as a third plural imperative cognate with OIr. *den(a)id* 'sucks'.³

A lot has been said anew in recent years concerning syntactic structures in Celtic languages and concerning the reconstruction of these structures on the basis of historically attested syntactic patterns.⁴ There has been much projection and debate concerning Indo-European syntax too. D. Gary Miller, for instance, has claimed recently⁵ that 'It seems probable that Indo-European languages were originally VSO which shifted to SOV, and were in the process of shifting to SVO at the time of our earliest records in most areas'. Scholars have, understandably, tended to be either very restrained⁶ or downright sceptical⁷ about the significance of word order in the records of Continental Celtic, and it is well known that a proper understanding of syntactic change is exceedingly difficult, especially when an attempt is made to bring it into the framework of a general theory of historical syntax, involving explanations for syntactic structures generally.⁸

It seems to me that the evidence of Continental Celtic inscriptions (mostly votive and funerary, but also more rarely incantational and juridical or quasi-juridical) is in the main formulaic,⁹ if not quite as predictable or stereotyped and as commonly contaminated as is sometimes thought.¹⁰ The Basic

¹ See Tovar, *Hispania Antiqua*, iii (1973), 402.

² See *EC*, vol. cit. 425.

³ See *BBCS*, vol. cit. 390.

⁴ See especially the writings of W. P. Lehmann, in *PMLA* lxxxvii (1972), 976-93; *Glossa*, vii (1973), 81-90; *Language*, xlix (1973), 47-66; *Proto-Indo-European Syntax* (Austin: Univ. of Texas, 1974) (for criticism of Lehmann see *GL* xvi (1980), 150 ff.).

⁵ *Lingua*, xxxvii (1975), 31-52 (here 31).

⁶ See Henry Lewis, *The Sentence in Welsh* [The Sir John Rhys Lecture 1942] (reprinted from *PBA* xxviii), 4.

⁷ See Proinsias Mac Cana, *Ériu*, xxiv (1973), 93.

⁸ See W. P. Lehmann, *PMLA*, vol. cit. 984.

⁹ Henry Lewis readily admitted this (see *The Sentence in Welsh*, loc. cit.).

¹⁰ See Mac Cana's dismissal of the evidence (*Ériu*, loc. cit.).

Order SOV¹ is attested (as in the Seraucourt, Cher, text: *buscilla sosio legasit in alixie magalu*). In Gaulish inscriptions the dominant pattern is SVO (as in the Alise-Sainte-Reine *martialis dannotali* text and the δεδε βρατου inscriptions) although there are many variant correlations. Instances of VSO in the important verb-initial relative clause (we have an example in the *dugiontio ucuetin* of Alise, if that is the correct reading) may well be archaic.² But I very much doubt whether even now we should press particular theories on the basis of the scanty evidence that has come to light. It becomes even more hazardous to correlate this evidence with that of Insular Celtic transformations for which explanations have come thick and fast over the last twenty years or so, especially in regard to the so-called 'development' of the grammatically-bound verb-initial order in both Brittonic and Goidelic languages.³ Discussion of the 'irregular' syntax of Old Irish now tries to gain new insights and greater refinement by the recognition and separating out of types representing (1) an archaic language stratum, (2) an artificial intermediate stratum, and (3) the classical language. A most stimulating and important contribution published in 1977 is the late Pádraig Mac Coisdealbha's *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish*.⁴ Bergin's 'law' or 'rule' has been both redefined and challenged so that it has been divested of its special pivotal position (a position or rank not claimed for it by its author).⁵ An improved understanding of an increasing number of Continental Celtic texts does allow us to consider in greater detail the various positions of elements in the sentence at an earlier stage than even the most archaic of archaic Irish and often in a formulaic or artificial patterning that is governed by the function and nature of the texts. We should not be lulled into accepting the far too simple view that the continental

¹ Schmidt (see *Word*, xxviii [= *Celtic Linguistics* 1976, ed. Robert A. Fowkes], 51 ff.) follows Winfred P. Lehmann's structural principle in not considering the location of the subject.

² See D. G. Miller, *Lingua*, xxxvii (1975), 35 f.

³ For an important study of order in the sentence in Welsh see T. Arwyn Watkins, *Studia Celtica* xii-xiii (1978), 367-95.

⁴ This is a printing of the author's 1974 University of Bochum doctoral dissertation.

⁵ See especially contributions by David Greene, Pádraig Mac Coisdealbha and Heinrich Wagner now available in *Indogermanisch und Keltisch*, Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn, Vorträge . . . hrsg. v. Karl Horst Schmidt (Wiesbaden, 1977). See also Carney, *Éigse*, xvii/4 (1978-9), 430-5; McCone, *Ériu*, xxx (1979), 1-34.

evidence now available reflects what is loosely and inadequately termed a comparatively 'free' word order. I am not convinced that Henry Lewis's instinct was right when, speaking to this Academy thirty-five years ago, he suggested 'that if by some miracle a large amount of Gaulish material became available, there might be far less discrepancy between it and that of its sister [i.e. Insular Celtic] languages than now appears in this particular connexion [i.e. in regard to word order]'.¹ Until that 'large amount' of material is uncovered we cannot tell. However, the monolithic character of Continental Celtic has already been shown to be a figment of the imagination of ill-informed commentators and an increasing number of aberrant and divergent features have been revealed in recent years.

At the same time I would submit that attempts to identify from the testimony of Continental Celtic more or less clear signs of dialectal cleavage and of the course and order of the separation of the Celtic languages have been in themselves laudable but hardly conclusive.² This has become clear from the sensitive writings of scholars such as Antonio Tovar, Michel Lejeune, and Karl Horst Schmidt. They have all made important suggestions concerning dialectal variation and the splitting of Old Celtic. We are able for convenience to speak of Celtiberian or Hispano-Celtic, of Lepontic, of Gaulish, and of Galatian, and to do so in a certain sense in much the same way as we speak of Goidelic or Brittonic or indeed Pictish. But it is important that we should strive to maintain proper control here. We should, I believe, stress the following points. (1) It is a serious methodological error to look for Proto-Goidelic or Proto-Brittonic traits in the records of the dialects of Continental Celtic. (2) I am not convinced that, with the fragmentary material available so far, we can expect to identify dialectal boundaries or to determine the degree of independence of so-called dialects of Continental Celtic. (3) There is a tendency among scholars, albeit sticking faithfully to the facts selected for attention, to rely on the testimony of too limited a number of sources. (4) There are obvious dangers in assuming too much from a few inconclusive and often confusing phonological and morphological correspondences and differences in various sources in a number of Old Celtic areas; this becomes exceedingly hazardous in some of the attempts to compare Continental

¹ *The Sentence in Welsh*, 6–7. For a valuable survey of the evidence of Face A of the Botorrita bronze see K. H. Schmidt, *Word*, vol. cit. 51–62.

² See now Lejeune, *BAB* 5^e sér. lxiv (1978), 108–21.

Celtic with Insular Celtic, although some recent approaches seem to be much more perceptive and fruitful in regard to the handling of specific features and the treatment of general trends, developments, and inter-relationships. In particular we must accept that we cannot detect a complete linguistic unity for the Celts of the Hispanic peninsula or Gaul or northern Italy and we should not expect to find that unity. We have been more or less obliged or accustomed to use terms such as Celtiberian, Gaulish, and Lepontic rather too imprecisely and timidly merely of various groups of peoples who have left us relatively brief and problematic texts limited to the sites at which those peoples were settled after some among them had learned to use an alphabet to record their language.

Our sources are difficult to unravel and are for that reason all the more tantalizing. I have never found it difficult to maintain a strong and constant faith in the value of the evidence to be gleaned from the records of Continental Celtic. However, the tortuous and intricate links in time and space and the various degrees of uncertainty in regard to interpretation that confront us make the handling of the total structure a peculiarly delicate and demanding task. New general syntheses cannot, or should not, come easily. Etymology, an awesome monster¹ concerning which opinion too often looms larger than fact, still dominates our studies so very much. Rhÿs, dubbed the Corsen of Celtic studies,² was not as obscurantist as some scholars have suggested. His attempt at recognizing dialectal differences in Gaulish, for example, was essentially no more clumsy or unnerving than a number of much more recent guesses. But the perennial problem that we have not got enough data to establish clear dialectal divisions is still with us. Even the discovery of a long and important new text such as that of Botorrita, incompletely and uncertainly understood as it still is, adds to the complexity of our task.

This is not a cry of despair but rather a reasoned appreciation of the particular quality of the data available. The great Camille Jullian's racy and unashamedly romantic preface to Georges Dottin's *La Langue gauloise* bitinglly criticized those historians who would understand the past merely by the remains of that past; 'ils le tuent,' he said, 'si je peux dire, une seconde fois'.³ We could declare a similar fear about the

¹ See Françoise Le Roux-Guyonvarc'h, *Latomus*, xxxiv (1975), 264.

² See Whatmough in *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*, ii. 68.

³ *La Langue gauloise* (Paris, 1920), p. ix. See further now Jürgen

handling of many of the records of Celtic on the continent of Europe and in Asia Minor. Jullian could not forgive Rome and Caesar for what he called their intellectual crime in Ancient Gaul. What would be unforgivable for us would be to fail to make available carefully and comprehensively the numerous groups of early evidence that have been preserved in our day concerning Celtic languages in antiquity and fail to study that evidence with equal care and thoroughness in all its tantalizing intricacy and diversity.

Untermann's sensitive *Trümmersprachen zwischen Grammatik und Geschichte* [Vorträge, Rheinisch-Westfälische Akad. d. Wissenschaften: Geisteswiss.; G245] (Opladen, 1980). See also contributions by Katičić, Neumann, K. H. Schmidt, de Simone, and Untermann, in *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* (= *BJ*, Beihefte Bd. xl (1980)).