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While there is general consensus that the Hispano-Celtic form LVGVEI is the dative singular of the divine name Lugus, there is none at all about what its orthography represents phonologically and morphologically; from the proto-Celtic perspective, the form should appear as orthographic *〈LVGOVEI〉. This paper assesses previous scholarship and argues that the attested form, in fact, continues the inherited form in a regular way.
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I. INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

1. Though a general consensus exists that the epigraphic form LVGVEI, attested twice in the long Hispano-Celtic inscription from Peñalba de Villastar (MLH K.3.3)¹, is the dative singular of the u-stem theonym Lugus – cf. Transalp. Celt. nom. sg. λουγος (RIG G–159) (see Wodtko 2000, pp. 234–236), the same cannot be said concerning the morphology and phonology of the form.

¹ I should like to thank Raimo Anttila, Jay Friedman, Jared Klein, Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine for helpful discussion. All opinions expressed herein are my responsibility alone.

— Epigraphic abbreviations: Round brackets ( ) indicate characters left out by the engraver; square brackets [ ] indicate characters which are restored; the underdot • indicates characters which have been damaged or which are no longer clearly legible; angled brackets ◐ ◐ indicate characters which replace those erroneously incised by the engraver; the tie-bar — indicates ligatures; the pipe | indicates line breaks.

¹ Untermann 1997, pp. 624–625 allows that the first token could be read as LVGVEȘ, though the syntactic analysis of the inscription by Ködderitzsch 1985, pp. 213 leaves no doubt in my mind that it should be read as dat. sg. LVGVEI.
2. The singular flexion of $u$-stems in proto-Indo-European followed a proteorokinetic flexional pattern\(^2\), such that the root bore full-grade and the suffix nil-grade vocalism in the strong cases (Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 208–212)\(^3\), while the opposite situation obtained in the weak cases. In the $u$- (and $i$-) stems of the Indo-European daughter languages, however, this situation has been simplified. Nil-grade vocalism in the root occurs in all but a vanishingly small number of strong stems, and the accent is fixed on the root or the suffix throughout the paradigm of an etymon; thus the nil-grade vocalism in the root of Transalp. Celt. nom. sg. $\lambda o\nu\gamma o\varsigma /lu\gamma us/$.

This leads us to expect $^*-\text{o}\nu\gamma$ as the dative singular desinence in Hispano-Celtic $u$-stems, as attested by Skt. $^*-\text{a}\nu\gamma$, OLat. $^*-\text{e}\nu\gamma$ (later $-\text{ui}$), and OChS $^*-\text{o}\nu\gamma^4$. A number of scholars have treated the discrepancy between attested LVGVEI and expected $^*lu\gamma o\nu\gamma$, explaining it via morphological, phonological, and orthographical factors. In this brief reassessment of a problem whose analysis is rendered more difficult by the fragmentary nature of the Hispano-Celtic corpus, I offer some commentary on previous research and introduce some new elements into the discussion.

II. OTHER RELEVANT FORMS

3. The principal relevant epigraphic comparanda for LVGVEI from ancient continental Europe are as follows (see also Stifter 1997, pp. 216–217)\(^5\):

---

\(^2\) It appears that proteorokinetic flexion may have been confined to the singular in proto-Indo-European; animate plurals of these nouns may have borne hysterokinetic flexion, in which the root bears nil-grade and the suffix full-grade vocalism in the strong cases (Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 208–212), while the opposite situation obtained in the weak cases. In the $u$- (and $i$-) stems of the Indo-European daughter languages, however, this situation has been simplified.

\(^3\) The strong cases in the singular flexion are the nominative, accusative, and vocative, and sometimes also the locative (see Meier-Brügger 2002, p. 203).

\(^4\) The Transalpine Celtic $u$-stem dative singular theonym $\tau a\nu\nu\nu o\nu /\text{taranou}/$ (RIG G–27) either is modelled after the $i$-stem pattern gen. sg. $^*-\text{e}\nu\gamma$, dat. sg. $^*-\text{e}\nu\gamma$ (via $^*-\text{e}\nu\gamma$ by haplology) (cf. the Transalpine Celtic $i$-stem dative singular theonym $\text{vccve}t\text{i}$ to acc. sg. $\text{vccve}t\text{in}$ (RIG L–13) and Latinised dat. sg. $\text{vccve}t\text{i}$ (CIL xiii 11247)), thus $u$-stem gen. sg. $^*-\text{ou\gamma}$, dat. sg. $-\text{o}\nu$ (via $^*-\text{ou\gamma}$) (so Klingenschmitt 1992, p. 119), or has syncretised with inherited loc. sg. $^*-\text{ou}$ with shortening of the diphthong (so Thurneysen 1946, p. 194).

\(^5\) These and many other epigraphic tokens of derivatives of the root $l(o)ug$– attested in ancient Hispania, including theonyms, idionyms, and toponyms, are listed by Sagredo & Hernández Guerra 1996. See also Tovar 1981 & 1982.
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(1) Nominative singular:
   a. Transalp. Celt. λουγους (RIG G–159)
   
   Nominative plural:
   b. Transalp. Celt. LVGOVES (CIL xiii 5078)
   
   Dative plural:
   c. Hisp.-Celt. LVČÖVVB (IRG 18)
   d. Transalp. Celt. LVCVBVS (CIL xii 3080)
   e. Hisp.-Celt. LVCVBO (IRG 19)
   f. Hisp.-Celt. [L]VCBO (CIL ii 6338 = ECEDO 7)
   g. Hisp.-Celt. LVGOVBVS (CIL ii 2818)
   h. Hisp.-Celt. LVGOVVEBV[S] (AE 1912, 12)

There is little doubt that (a) is an inherited Celtic form, and it is possible that (b) is, as well, though a Latinised form would not differ from the inherited nominative plural save in the vowel quantity of the desinence, which is not captured by the orthography. The remaining forms all occur in Latin contexts, however, and have been Latinised in various ways. (c) preserves the inherited vocalism of the suffix, but has adopted Latin vocalism in the desinence. (g) and (h) go further and affix the normal Latin u-stem dative plural desinence -ibus to the Celtic stem. (e) and (f) reflect the common development of /-us/ > /-s/ word finally in the Latin of Hispania (Carnoy 1906, pp. 179–180) and demonstrate the differential treatment of inherited */ou/ as /o/ or /u/ attested in this regional Latin, as well (Carnoy 1906, pp. 63–64). It is probable that (d), too, attested in Transalpine Gaul, evinces a Latinised monophthongisation of the inherited stem vowel. Among these

---

6 I regard the writing of «C» for /g/ not as an error by the engraver or evidence that we are dealing with a different etymon, but as a token of quasi-phonetic orthography in view of the fact that /g/ is normally realised as [k] phonetically in the modern Celtic languages. I intend to publish on this matter in the future.

7 The reading is after Untermann 1980, p. 375. CIL reads VGNO and ECEDO reads VOPO, but the photograph in ECEDO clearly supports Untermann’s reading.

8 Loss of final /-s/ in (c) in a highly characterised desinence such as the dative plural is not surprising; Carnoy 1906, pp. 179–199 lists numerous contexts in which it does not appear in the Latin of Hispania.

9 The lowering of /i/ to /e/ in (h) reflects a common development in the Latin of Hispania post-tonically, as well as in other positions; see Carnoy 1906, esp. p. 23.
forms, (c), (g), and (h) are key in that they demonstrate that the inherited form of the suffix was preserved in the weak stem.

III. PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

4. There have been a variety of attempts to elucidate the unexpected shape of LVGVEI. The first, with which I am in sympathy in principle, posits that u-stem dat. sg. -VEI directly continues inherited *-oujei. Though he is not explicit, Lejeune 1955, pp. 9 & 98 apparently suggests that *-oujei > *-ouje. He does not, however, discuss the realisation of the latter as orthographic -\(<\)VEI>. One might presume that he would have agreed with Wodtko’s 2000, p. 235 report that there are not any geminates attested in the inscription.10 Schmidt 1960, p. 183 suggests that Hisp.-Celt. -VEI evolved in precisely the same way as OLat. -VEI, viz., proto-IE *-ejei > *-oujei > *-ouje, written -\(<\)VEI> (as per Leumann 1977, p. 135)11. Villar 1997, p. 923 likewise believes that inherited *-oujei underlies orthographic -\(<\)VEI>, but he does not explain the process via which the change would have occurred.

5. Jordán 2004, p. 114 maintains that u-stem dat. sg. -VEI is analogical with the dative singular of i-stems. I do not understand his statement, for the attested i-stem desinence in Hispano-Celtic is -E < proto-Celt. *-ej < proto-IE *-ejei by haplology, e.g.:  

(2) a. GENTE (MLH K.11.1); cf. nom. sg. CenTeś (e.g., MLH K.1.3 i 39)  
b. ŞTeNIOTeś (MLH K.11.1); cf. gen. sg. ŞTeNIOTeś (MLH K.17.1)12

10 Though I note that it is not certain that there are any phonological geminates that could have been recorded in the inscription. Only the first person plural verb COMEIMV, which has been connected by Ködderitzsch 1985, p. 217 to *mei- ‘change’ and by Meid 1994, p. 389 to *he-i- ‘go’, appears to be at all possible.

11 My view is very substantially the same as Schmidt’s, though with some added details which are presented in §§8–10.

12 This idionym has often been understood to be a nt-stem, but TiriCanToś (Bot. IV A3) now guarantees that the genitive singular desinence of this stem class bore o-grade vocalism. Other attested forms of this idionym are nom. sg. ŞTeNIOTeś (MLH K.1.3 iv 2) and Latinised gen. sg. ŞTeNIOTeśIS (HEp. 3, 191). All are consistent with classification of the idionym as an i-stem. ŞTeNIOTeś and ŞTeNIOTeś represent monophthongisations of dat. sg. *-eţ and gen. sg. *-eţî, respectively. For -eţ for expected -i- in the final syllable of nom. sg. ŞTeNIOTeś, one can compare afę- (e.g., MLH K.6.1) < *arî; one might also compare
An analogy with the *i*-stem desinence would have yielded dat. sg. *-ou*, as may have been the case in Translapine Celtic (see n. 5).

6. Wodtko 2000, p. 235, in addition to the view that *-VEI* continues inherited *-*ouëi, also suggests that *u*-stems in Hispano-Celtic were remodelled after consonant stems, yielding *lugu*- as the stem for the toponym. The existence of forms such as Latinised *LVGOVBVS* and *LVCOVBV* render such a view extremely unlikely, however, for inherited */ou* was monophthongised in Latin (cf. §3); the diphthong must, then, be Celtic.

7. Stifter 1997, pp. 218–219 proposes that not only *LVGVEI*, but also the dative singular verbal abstracts (which function as infinitives) in (3), which likewise bore inherited proterokinetic flexion13, reflect a remaking of the proterokinetic flexion in the dative singular of Hispano-Celtic only, such that the inherited full-grade vocalism of the weak stem suffix was replaced by nil-grade *-*u-.

(3) a. [ajmPTinCounei (*MLH K.1.1 A6*)
   b. Taunei (*MLH K.1.1 A2*)
   c. Tisaunei (*MLH K.1.1 A2*)
   d. [ujerTaunei (*MLH K.1.1 A2*)
   e. u´s mounei (*Bot. IV A6*)

The motivation for this change, according to Stifter, would be that the proterokinetic flexional paradigm possessed a descriptively hysterokinetic or amphikinetic (see Meier-Brügger 2002, pp. 218–220) instrumental singular (Schindler apud Hollifield 1980: 45)14, in both of which the suffix bore nil-grade vocalism, and that syncretism between the dative and instrumental singular commonly occurs in later Celtic.

*Caraues* (*MLH A.66*), which appears to be identical with the toponym attested as *Káρκουν* (Appian, *Hisp.* 43: acc. sg.) and *Caravi* (*It. Ant.* 443.1), though the identification of the desinence remains under discussion.

13 Whether they continue the nil-grade of the formans *-*uyin- or *-*men-*, which remains uncertain.

14 To which Stifter 1997, p. 219 adds the directional case of proto-Indo-European after the teaching of Martin Peters.
But syncretism between cases normally involves not the suffix of a noun, but the desinence, e.g., cf. inherited n-stem dat. sg. -on-ei, e.g., Piuonei (CI 26), with innovatory -on-i, e.g., Kušóni (CI 20), ← locative singular in early Cisalpine Celtic (Eska & Wallace 2001). We do not have hard evidence for syncretism elsewhere in Hispano-Celtic, but we can look to Old Irish. To be sure, proto-IE instr. pl. *-bʰis replaced dat. pl. *-bʰos in all stem classes in Old Irish as evidenced by -(a)ib. But it is the instrumental desinence that took over the function of the dative case. It is also far from clear that the dative and instrumental cases syncretised in any stem class in Old Irish, as demonstrated in (4).

(4) a. Thematic dative singulars, e.g., fiur «man», presuppose a desinence with u-quality, which could continue proto-Celt. instr. sg. *-u < proto-IE *-oh₁, but could equally well represent an apocope of proto-Celt. dat. sg. *-uí < proto-IE *-ój < *-o-ei j. Compare earlier Transalp. Celt. dat. sg. -oui = -uui/, e.g., in the idionym oðgeðhνου (RIG G–208), with later -v = -uui/, e.g., in the idionym ELVONTIV (RIG *L-4). Such an apocope lies behind Latin thematic dat. sg. -di < *-ój (Leumann 1977: 425–426).

b. ā-stem dative singulars, e.g., túaith «tribe», presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably *-i, which likely represents a contraction of inherited dat. sg. -/ai/ < *-aºi¾ < proto-IE *-oºi¾ < *-eºei¾. Cf. earlier Transalpine Celtic -ai, e.g., in the idionym ekeγγνα (RIG G–146) with later -v = -/u/, e.g., in the theonym ḇηληνσµµ (RIG G–153).

c. i-stem dative singulars, e.g., cnáim ‘bone’, presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably *-i, which continues inherited proto-Celt. dat. sg. *-ej ← proto-IE *-ejej. Cf. the Transalpine Celtic theonym VCVETE (RIG L–13) and see n. 5.

d. u-stem dative singulars, e.g., mug ‘slave’, presuppose a desinence with u-quality; it is not consistent with the -/ou/ attested to by Transalp. Celt. dat. sg. u-stem taraµvoyn (RIG G–27), but one can compare -ou = -/u/ in Transalp. Celt. βρατου ‘with gratitude’ (e.g., RIG G–28), if it is to be identified as a u-stem instrumental singular (though note that identification as a thematic instr. sg. -uí < *-oh₁ is also possible; cf. Oscan thematic neut. acc. sg. βρατουµ ‘(willing) gift’ (ST Lu 39.6), gen. sg. brateis (ST Lu 1.6) and see Thurneysen 1946, p. 196).

e. Consonant stem long dative singulars, e.g., ríg ‘king’, presuppose a desinence with palatal quality; it was probably -i, syncretised from the
inherited locative singular. Cf. Transalp. Celt. Epadatetorojrici (Rig L–6), though it could have been *-i̯, which continues inherited proto-Celt. dat. sg. *-e̯i̯, as attested by earlier Cisalpine Celt. -ei̯, e.g., aTilonei (CI 12).

In only the thematic and the u-stems, then, is it possible that the dative singular continues the instrumental singular form. But even were one to grant that such a merger is what occurred, we should note that the proto-Indo-European suffix – *-o̯- or *-ir-, respectively – and desinence *-i̯h, had long since merged in the distant prehistory of Celtic and that, in synchronic terms, it is the desinence, not the suffix, that syncrætised in Old Irish.

IV. A NEW APPROACH. CELTIC TEXT AND LATIN ORTHOGRAPHIC PRACTICE

8. The view of Lejeune, Schmidt, and Wodtko that inherited *lugoue̯j > *luguue̯j appears to me to have substantial merit. It is well known that there is a tendency in Hispano-Celtic for /o/ to be labialised to /u/ when adjacent to a non-final labial (Eska 1995: 9–13). Thus proto-IE thematic dat. pl. *-o̯-bo̯s is usually attested as -uPo̯s, e.g., *ouCaɪTeɪTuPo̯s (MLH K.0.7), but may appear with unaltered stem vowel in OILOBOS (MLH K.3.11) 15. Cf. also COMEIMV (MLH K.3.3) and rûsimus (MLH K.1.1 A11), which, in my view, continue 1. pl. *-mos.

9. Should we adopt the view that *lugoue̯j > *luguue̯j, I would suggest that the engraving of ‹v› for /uw/ may not be either merely a random failure to note an orthographic geminate (as hinted at by Wodtko) 16 or a regular orthographic practice of Hispano-Celtic when engraved in Roman characters (as per Schmidt, who sees an identity with Latin orthographic practice) 17. The fact that the inscription is engraved in Roman characters may be pivotal to our analysis, however. As an alternative explanation, then, I would propose that the orthographic representation of /uw/- by ‹v›- is a token of «econo-

15 Cf. the fact that in Old Latin, all unstressed vowels were rounded to proximate phonetic [Y], spelt both as <u> and <i>, before labial consonants; see Leumann 1977, pp. 87–90, Sommer & Pfister 1977, pp. 82–85, and Meiser 1998, p. 68.

16 Though let us note TVRROS (MLH K.3.8) beside TVROs (MLH K.3.9) in the graffiti from Peñalba de Villastar.

17 For which, to the best of my knowledge, there is no evidence either for or against.
mic orthography», a feature of Latin orthography attested throughout the Roman world, e.g.g.: 

(5) a. FLVIA /fluwia/ (CIL i² 584.9) 
    b. IVENT(us) /juwentus/ (CIL ii 3479) 
    c. OINVORSEI /oinuworsi/ (CIL i² 581.19) 

Under such an analysis, Schmidt’s view is substantially correct, though the economic orthography would not be native to Hispano-Celtic practice, but an artifact of the inscription being engraved in Roman characters.

For a typological parallel, compare the situation in the Sabellic languages, in which /i/ and /j/ in combination and /u/ and /w/ in combination are normally both written in the native script, while economic orthography is employed to an overwhelming degree in inscriptions engraved in Roman characters (Buck 1904, pp. 28–29), e.g.g.: 

(6) a. Osc. eítuuvam (ST Po 3.1) : eituam (ST Lu 1.19) 
    b. Umb. triía (ST Um 1 iv 2) : trio (ST Um 1 vii i 51) 
    c. Umb. prinuvatus (e.g., ST Um 1 i³ 19) : prinuatur (e.g., ST Um 1 v³ 50) 

That such a literate Roman practice should be employed in a Hispano-Celtic inscription should not be surprising. There were a number of Latin inscriptions engraved at Peñalba de Villastar; one, located amongst the Celtic inscriptions and engraved in the same type of hand, even is so erudite as to record a sentence from the second book of Vergil’s Aeneid (II 268–269) (see further de Hoz 1979, pp. 245–246): 

(7) tempus erat quo prima quies mortalibus aegris inc[ipit] 

“It was the time when, for weary mortals, their first rest begins”.

10. The orthography of LVGVEI, then, is likely not to be essentially aberrant in any way. While it is possible that it represents a common sound change and a random failure to engrave an orthographic geminate, it is at least as likely to represent a token of a Latin orthographic practice solely because the inscription is engraved in Roman characters. As so often in the Conti-

---

18 It is possible that the forms LVCBVBS and LVCVBO, discussed in §3, are susceptible to a similar analysis.
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V. CODA. THE FORMANS -UN- IN VERBAL ABSTRACTS

11. The fact that LVGVEI and the dative singular verbal abstracts in -un- listed in (3) both appear to bear nil-grade vocalism in their suffixes when full-grade is expected does not mean that both must be explained in the same way. The verbal abstracts, for which we expect proterokinetic *-yenej or *-menej, are not susceptible to the phonological and orthographic explanation that I have advanced for LVGVEI. Their unexpectedly vocalism can only be explained as analogical.

12. Whether the verbal abstracts continue the formans *-yer/-n- or *-men-, I propose that the nil-grade vocalism in -un- is simply modeled after the strong stem, where it is regular. It is well known that the Celtic languages have a pronounced tendency to level paradigmatic ablaut. An example is found even in the fragmentary Hispano-Celtic corpus, in which hysterokinetic non-neuter n-stems have leveled the vocalism of the suffix throughout the paradigm after that inherited in the nominative singular, viz.:

(8) nom. sg. melmu (MLH K.1.1 B2)
gen. sg. meljmunoś (MLH K.0.11)
dat. sg. TIATV‹N›EI (MLH K.3.3)19

A precise parallel exists in Luwian, which forms its verbal abstract (= infinitive) by affixing -un-a (with allative singular desinence), instead of expected full-grade *-yan-a, directly to the verbal root (Starke 1990, pp. 531–535), just as appears to be the norm in Hispano-Celtic.

VI. RECAPITULATION

13. I conclude by rehearsing the findings of this paper:

---

19 The sixth character of this form is clearly engraved as ‹M›, but it is mostly likely to be analysed as a n-stem idionym.
a. The most straightforward way to get to the unexpected orthography of LVGVEI is to propose that */o/ in inherited *lugoyej was labialised yielding */luɡuwei/.

b. Rather than assuming that /uw/ was normally spelt ‹v› in Hispano-Celtic epigraphy, as is common in Roman practice, it is probable that this token of economic orthography represents a Roman spelling rule applied to a Celtic text engraved in Roman characters. A strong typological parallel is attested in the Sabellic languages.

c. There is no reason to assume that the unexpected suffixal vocalism of LVGVEI and the Hispano-Celtic verbal abstracts in -un- are manifestations of the same linguistic phenomenon.

d. Whether the verbal abstracts in -un- are yer/n- or men-stems, it seems most straightforward to think that the unexpected nil-grade vocalism of the formans is modelled after the strong stem, in which it would be regular, especially in view of the fact that the Celtic languages are known for commonly levelling paradigmatic ablaut. A precise parallel exists in Luwian, which forms its verbal abstract (= infinitive) by affixing nil-grade -una directly to the verbal root, just as Hispano-Celtic does.
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