The textual arrangement of Alise-Sainte-Reine [L-13]

Zusammenfassung


The aim of this article is to contribute to the understanding of the textual make-up and the epigraphic embellishment of the Gallo-Latin inscription from Alise-Sainte-Reine, Côte-d'Or [L-13]. Despite its being one of the best studied and, indeed, best understood Gaulish texts, uncertainties remain in its analysis. The text of the inscription runs thus:

MARTIALIS · DANNOTALI
I EVRV · VCVETE · SOSIN
CELICNON · ETIC
GOBEBBI · DVCHIONTHO
IN [ ] JALISILA

I stands for ‘longa’ in the inscription, which in view of its distribution I interpret here as a sign for the glide /i/ after the homorganic vowel /i/. Whether this glide is regarded as phonemic /j/, as I do, or as an automatic subphonemic, that is, phonetic [], after /i/, is actually of no importance for the interpretation of the text. What is important is that I regard the spellings <licas> and <letis> as representing disyllabic sequences. It does not matter that in <MARTIALIS> no <I> is used, because the spelling of the Roman name could follow Roman orthographic practice (see below). STOKES (1886: 131) reads the double <Ii> in dugiontis and Alisila as cursive spellings for <Ei>. But since the letter <E> otherwise appears in its capital form in this inscription, and since the two vertical strokes of cursive <E> are usually of equal length, which is not the case in L-13, Stokes’ suggestion can be disregarded. The letters O and T in Dannotali are written in ligature, but can only be sensibly interpreted as representing the sequence

* Work on this paper was undertaken within the FWF-funded project P20755-G03 “Die altkeltischen Sprachreste in Österreich” (The Old Celtic language remains of Austria). I want to thank Stefan Schumacher, Jürgen Ulrich and an anonymous reviewer for valuable input to this article. All errors are mine.
2 Gaul. "Damnos 'magistrate, dignitary', the first member of the compound name Dannotalos, makes a perfect equation with Latin sanctuarii 'sanctuary' - PIE *dʰʰ₁ʰ₁s₁h₁, from the root *dʰ₁h₁s₁ 'belonging to the religious sphere' (this root is *dʰ₁, dass- in religiösen Begriffen) in IEw
-ot-; cf. the name TanoTalos (= DumnoTalos) in the Gallo-Etruscan inscription from Briona [E-1]. The words are separated either by raised dots or by hederae, ivy leaves. The technical term for them is hederae distinguenter, mentioned once in an inscription from Cirta in Numidia (CIL VIII 6982). The shape and the fine representation of the hederae on 1–13 are remarkable even in the wider context of Latin epigraphy. Ivy leaves are absent altogether from inscriptions until the beginning of the Augustan period; even then they occur chiefly in texts from Gaul and other marginal areas of the empire, becoming frequent only in the course of the 1st century a.d. and later (HÖHNER 1985: 111–112; HÖMEL 1979: 360–362). The exceptional graphic quality of the hederae in 1–13 can perhaps be taken as indicating a provenance of the inscription from some time after the Augustan period; LIEBENZ 1988: 147 assigns the inscription to the Flavian period (late 1st century a.d.). The positional role of the third hedera is not easy to determine: it is positioned roughly halfway between lines 5 and 6, and it could either, together with the leaf at the beginning of line 5, form a graphic emphasis of Ucuetis, or it could mark the very end of the sentence after Alisia. Since Ucuetis, unlike any other line-final word on the stone, is already followed by a word divider in the shape of a raised dot, the likelihood is greater that the third hedera closes the sentence, or has simply been placed there out of horror ucevi, that is to say, in order to occupy otherwise empty space on the face of the stone. The inscription is damaged in line 6 between in and Alisia; it is generally agreed that the damaged area probably contained a word divider, perhaps a raised dot or another ivy leaf, but not a letter or a word (ESKA 2003: 111). The inscription can be translated as

Martialis (son) of Dumnosalos* offered this edifice to Ucuetis* and to with the smiths

who worship (?) Ucuetis' in Alisia.

One syntactic aspect of the inscription in particular has frequently been commented upon. The main bone of contention is whether gobedī is to be interpreted as a dat-

259. NII 102, 123 114 analyses it as the PIE root *deh₁eh₁- 'dellen, legen, setzen; herstellen, machen', enlarged by -ī. The original meaning of dominos may have been 'religious official'.

2 This dot is visible on photographs of the inscription, but it is ignored in the edition of RGG I 13. The position of this dot is a bit too low that of the other word separators in the inscription, so the possibility cannot be excluded that it is rather an accidental hole in the stone.

3 I take no strong stance as to the semantic interpretation of the relative verbal form daglitiātis. A meaning 'who worship' is suggested by the context, but ultimately cannot be proven. The only PIE root that fits formally is *deh₂gā- 'to happen, succeed, achieve' ('treffen', LIV 148–149), but this is hard to square semantically with the present context. I find the translation 'façonnier' suggested by LIEBENZ (RGG II 1, 134) less likely because it requires a semantic development for *deh₂gā- which has a parallel in Greek τρόφος 'to manufacture, accomplish, produce' alone and may be specific to that language. Moreover, it requires the additional assumption that the lexeme Ucætis is used metonymically for 'metal' in this inscription. Morphologically, the verb has been explained by most scholars as a ποι-<present of the root *deh₂gā-. In view of what JASAHO (2004: 155) says about 'full set[s] of derivatives' from 'stative stems' in *eh₁- (< PIE instrumental), daglitiātis could also be interpreted as the formal continuation of a stative present *deh₂gāeh₁-ē > PC *dagliātēs. The transitive structure of the clause, however, is an obstacle to this interpretation.


ive plural 'to the smiths' or as a comitative or sociative instrumental 'with the smiths' (see EISA 2003: 105–112 for a discussion of previous scholarship). If it is the former, it is noteworthy that the complex dative phrase, which consists of the deity Ucute and etic gobedhi dugtiontio Ucuetin in Alisfia, is discontinuous. EISA (2003: 112–113) makes the valid argument that complex phrases can be split and heavy constituents can be moved to the right for pragmatic reasons. In favour of the instrumental reading of gobedhi it can be advanced that the ending -bi is inherited from the Indo-European instrumental ending *-bi and that, with our present knowledge of Gaulish, it cannot be proven (nor, indeed, disproven) that it had fallen together functionally with the inherited ending of the dative plural -bo. However, the use of an instrumental together with the conjunction 'and' would be quite extraordinary. In addition to the discussion about gobedhi it has been suggested by KOCK (1982) and SCHUYLER (1997: 183) that etic is not the connector 'and' < *eti-kœ, but rather the 3sg. of the copula *esti with anctic 'iœ' and '7 attached to it. EISA 2003 discusses the various syntactic problems posed by these hypotheses and ultimately rejects them in favour of the received view that etic gobedhi mean 'and to the smiths'.

I want to draw attention to a lesser studied aspect of the inscription, that is, the question as to whether it can be read as a metrical or poetic text. Such a proposal

gobam 'smith'. The Gaul word is explained as continuing *gubaha*- *gobam-, the OIr word as continuing *gobam- *gobas-, generalised from a hysterostemtic paradigm Proto-Celtic *gobha, goban- < pre-Celtic *gubaha*- *gobas- (cf. possessive derivative meaning 'having skill' of the stem *gubaha*- *gobas, *gobam- 'skill, dexterity'). The root would be the same as in various Lith. words like gubas, gubas 'able, skilled' etc. However, the syncopated stem OIr gobas disproves this explanation: it requires the syncopation of a front vowel, i.e. *-ent-, which cannot go back to pre-Celtic *-ent- (SCHUYLER 1995: 455–456 and McCONAL 1996: 66).

3 The synchronism evinced by the OIr dative plural ending -ub can be adduced as a parallel for such a development, but this parallel is, first of all, typological, not automatically genetic. Gaulish seems to maintain the instrumental case as a separate morphological and syntactic category at least in some stem-classes and numbers (EISA 2003: 865, 867). This is one piece of evidence to show that Gaulish did not evolve in the same direction as Irish. Consequently, it cannot be taken for granted that the ending -bi (later -be) in Gaulish stands for the dative, and alternative analyses must be considered as well.

7 According to SCHUYLER (1997: 183), iœ is used as a relative marker here; he translates etic gobedhi as 'which is to the smiths' (i.e. made by the smiths).

6 EISA (2003: 105–107) discusses possible cases of dative and instrumental plurals in -bi in Gaulish. To the material adduced by him, dubhema < humber A from Zentj-k NEG- (Slovenia) may be added (NISSIMA 2002). If it is not the genitive singular of an o- or to-stem (OKE 1903: 29–30) or of a compound name ending in 'bubis' 'slayer', the only other viable IE or Celtic interpretation for the morpheme is would be as a dative plural ending, referring to the recipient of the donation. SCHMIDT (1999: 339), on the other hand, mentions the inscription as a possible example of Raetic and reads it either as *sugubuenaor as *-unbunuaor (*u- being a letter peculiar to Raetic). On a wall painting in a Roman villa from Melkirch, canton Bern, Switzerland, a possible Gaulish dat. pl. mapobis is found (FUCHS et al. 2004: 107–109). Regarding possible Celtic plural datives, attention must also be drawn to the following two forms: not far from Zentj-k NEG- a Celtic or perhaps Venetic dative plural in -bos is attested on two Latin votive inscriptions to deities called Vebobos in Warmbad Villach (Carinthia) ('L'anne époigraphique 1975: 660 + 661 = ILLPRON 642 + 643). A further example of a Celtic dative plural in -bos has been claimed for an inscription from Tiffin (Carinthia) by DOLCINI & DE RENZATO STAMPER (2004: 738–740). This, however, is doubtful, since it is exactly the ending -bes which has to be conjectured to arrive at the form Senasbeos 7 to the old (goddesses).
has been made twice before (Rutys 1906: 276–282; Gray 1942: 442), but Lejeune, who reports their suggestions in RIG II.1, concludes definitively ‘s’il n’est pas exclu a priori que l’inscription soit en vers, on estimerait que toute démonstration est présentement, et risque de demeurer, hors de portée’ (Lejeune 1988: 153). Eska & Mercado (2005: 180) come to the same conclusion and state that for them ‘there is no reason, as yet, to believe that this inscription is metrical’. Nevertheless, I want to make a new attempt at such a demonstration. Let us review the two earlier suggestions first. For Rutys (1906: 281), ‘the metre is accentual hexametre’, consisting of two lines of 3+3+3+3+3+2 syllables, each foot having a single stress. In order to arrive at this pattern, he has to arbitrarily attribute accents to the words, scattering them around as he sees fit, not to speak of other liberties he takes in regard to the reading of the text:

Martišiaš | Dannotsalij ieu Šr. Uješčuš [sic!] | sōsin celićnimen.
Ætic gošebdi duq iuntišo Šr. Uješčun | iūn [sic]! ulisija.

For him, ‘the characteristic portion of the lines is the last two feet’, that is, ‘sōsin celićnimen’ and ‘iūn ulisija’. These supposedly exhibit the typical clausula of a dactylus followed by a trochaen at the end of hexameters, but only under the unverifiable supposition that these words were accented as Rutys wants them to be. While there seems to be a certain consistency on Rhys’s side in trying to attribute penultimate accents to the words, the accent on the ultima in gošebdi, in order to save the rhythm, is haphazard. Furthermore, the accent on the preposition iūn ‘in’, his emendation of attested in, defies all likelihood, given that prepositions are typically weakly stressed or unstressed.

Gray (1942: 442), in trying to establish the quantitative trochaic dimer as a common Italo-Celtic metre, imposes a trochaic structure upon the text, but in doing so he has to take recourse to a degree of arbitrariness that exceeds even that of Rutys. With disregard to orthographic conventions, he takes liberal decisions as to the vocalic or consonantal values of letters, without providing explanations for his decisions:

Martišiaš Danototalia
jeu Šr. Uješčun [sic] sōsin
celićnimen etic gošebdi
diq iuntišo Šr. Uješčun
in ulisija.

In particular, Gray’s unsystematic rendering of ¼I of the inscription, partly as syllabic /ii/, partly as geminate /jj/, a sound for which no evidence otherwise exists in Gaulish, does not help to inspire confidence in his method. The line break between demonstrative sōsin and its head noun celićnimen, in order to arrive at neat lines of four feet, runs against natural tendencies of versification, according to which phrasal and clausal breaks often coincide with line breaks. Because of their methodological shortcomings, both Rhys’s and Gray’s respective attempts can be rejected as failed. It comes as no surprise that in a recent evaluation, Eska & Mercado (2005: 178–180) come to the conclusion that the text is not metrical and displays no marked poetic syntax. Nevertheless I think that there is a valid reason to look out anew for features that are indicative of a poem.
Any analysis of the Alise-Sainte-Reine inscription that seeks to detect poetic embellishments in the widest sense of the word has to take into consideration both the syntactic structure of the text and the orthographical system behind the inscription. There is a kind of break in the sentence between celticon and ete, graphically expressed by the ivy leaf after celticon. Even though Eska recognizes the break (he uses the term 'discontinuity'; Eska 2003: 107, 115), he rejects the idea that the ivy leaf has been put there on purpose and thinks of a mere space filler instead, the central positioning of which between the two words of the line is merely incidental. I think that this is underestimating the evidence: the ivy leaf splits the text into two halves of approximately matching length (first half: 6 words, 42 letters; second half: 6 words, 36 letters; the lines are likely to match in syllable count as well, see below). In almost all respects the first ivy leaf takes up the middle position in the inscription. Under the working hypothesis that a deliberate stylistic rationale lies behind this arrangement, I will tentatively speak of two lines.

Words 1–6 constitute a complete sentence, a vocative formula with the syntactic structure SVO...Ovo. This structure is a variant of the dominant configuration in Gaulish SVO (Eska 1994: 23 – 2007a: 84, and Eska 2007b). It is also found in other dedicatory texts, e.g. Auxey, Côte-d’Or [1–9].

3 Even though chronologically -io of dagitiitio could be regarded as a separate, seventh word, the graphic layout of the inscription reveals that the person who wrote the text did not do so; there is no word-separator, i.e. it did, ivy-leaf or blank space, between dagitiitio and io, like there is between all other words of the text.
ICCAVOS - OP[INICOS - IEV|RV - BRIGINDONI | CANTALON
'Icavos Oppianicos offered to Brigindona at the cantalon';

or Autun, Saône-et-Loire [L-10]:

LICNOS CON|TEXTOS - IE|RV | ANVALONNACV | CANECOSEDLO
' Licnos Contextos offered to Anvalonacos at the canecoseldon'.

Words 1–6 of L-13 can thus be regarded as the formulaic nucleus of the inscription. They take up a complete line = line 1. The following words 7–12 can be grouped together as a second line = line 2. Line 2 consists of two words (etic gobedto), which — assuming that etic = 'and' — syntactically belong to the preceding clause, and of a relative clause of four words dependent on the second word in line 2. The second line as a whole adds information to the formulaic nucleus in line 1. The juncture between the two lines postulated by this hypothesis is explicitly indicated by the epigraphic means of an ivy leaf. Viewed under the hypothesis of a textual arrangement in two lines, a series of structural similarities emerges between them:

(1) Both lines consist of six words.
(2) The third word in both lines is a verb (line 1: iecar, line 2: dugtiontio).
(3) In both lines, the fourth slot is taken up by the deity 'Ucuetis to whom the inscription is dedicated (line 1: dative Ucutes, line 2: accusative Ucuetin).
(4) The fact that the subject of the main clause, Martialis Dannotuli, occupies the first two slots of line 1 may bear on the interpretation of gobedto in the second slot of line 2. If there is parallelism in the layout of the two lines and in the assignment of functional roles, gobedto could be read as a sociative instrumental (co-dedicatory), adding a further argument to the corresponding subjectual constituent in line 1. While the use of the opening conjunction etic 'and' of line 2 is entirely predictable if gobedto is interpreted as an additional dative argument (co-reipient or benefactive; cf. ESAKA 2003: 112–113), it poses a problem if the word is taken to be a sociative instrumental, since in such a construction it would actually be superfluous. Under the hypothesis advocated here, there may be redundancy involved in the choice of the words here, in the sense that an extra word was needed to parallel the two words, referring to the agent, at the beginning of line 1.
(5) The fifth word of line 2, the preposition in 'in', is most certainly unstressed; the fifth word of line 1, the demonstrative subject 'this', may be weakly stressed or unstressed, too. The use of a demonstrative pronoun in a dedicatory formula of this type finds a parallel in the Gallo-Greek inscription from Vaison-la-Romaine, Vauchuse [G-153], which refers to the dedicated sacred site as e ntvupel 'this nemeion'; on the other hand, inscriptions L-9 and L-10 cited above display no demonstrative reference to the objects dedicated, cantalon and canecoseldon, both possibly, like celicenon, structures of some kind (ESAKA 2003: 191).
(6) All other words can be regarded as fully stressed; this is also true for the first word of line 2, the conjunction etic 'and'. Etymologically, it is composed of connective PIE *(h)et(e 'beyond, further' and the enclitic connecter *-ke 'and'
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(Eskra 2003: 108). *(h)ēti was a fully stressed word in PIE, cf. Ved. ātī, Greek ἄτι. The fact that enclitic -(h)ēti could be attached to it underlines that *ēti must have been accented in Gaulish or at least in its prehistory, too.

(7) Before the number of syllables in each line can be determined, a few ambiguous spellings have to be discussed. The Roman letter <i> represents both the vowel /i/ and the glide /j/. Consequently *iēurō could be di- or trisyllabic. In Gallo-Greek inscriptions, what corresponds to the initial <i> of Gallo-Latin iēura is written with the digraph <EI> - otherwise used for vocalic /i/ - in rōnapo (Vaison-la-Romaine, Vaucluse [G-153]) and perhaps *e[ou]nrapo (Nîmes, Gard [G-528]). In Gallo-Greek inscriptions, <el> is used for word-initial /i/, cf. *e[k]λαμπος (Saint-Chamas, Bouches-du-Rhône [G-28]; from PC *'īgarō 'yoke') and Brumontus [M-73] where the constituent members of Iotoboko are inverted.10 [louu[ou]nrapo (Cavaillon, Vaucluse [G-556]) cannot be used as evidence since the beginning of the word is missing. This distribution suggests a vocalic value for the first phoneme of rōnrapo and rōnapa. The use of the digraph <EI> in these spellings does not necessarily prove a long /i/, since <el> may simply have been employed to avoid orthographic confusion with /i/ - consonantal /i/ in word-initial position. Cf. also rivō[v]nrapo (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône [G-79]), where <EI>11 most certainly represents /i/. The Gallo-Greek evidence therefore strongly suggests that iēura has to be read as a trisyllabic word.

The divine name Ucēur presents a similar problem: is it dissyllabic /ukēer-/ or trisyllabic /ukēer-/? In the present inscription and in a Latin inscription excavated in its immediate proximity (DEO VCVELET [CF XIII 112/17]), the name is spelt with the sequence <CV>, not with the Latin digraph <CV> for /k[ê]/. One is reminded of the spellings cuet[i]c and beside cuet[i]c = *ko-ēti-kê(e) (with the allomorph /ko/ for /kou/) on the Gaulish lead tablet from Larzac, Aveyron [L-98, 1tb], where <ew> most certainly stands for /kou/ or /kou/, not /kê/.12 Therefore

10 From PC *'īnrom, romh, romh; cf. DMG I 192, but differently Dusmaurier 2007: 42 < *'īnro-ura "Nourriture de Vie" (or "de Monde").
11 Unless one has to read <EI>, cf. RGG 1, 92.
12 Schmidt 1996: 2-3 explains (cueti) as *'ak-ētī, a verbal abstract 'Ansprechung, Anrufung' derived from the PIE root *akēbhīk- 'to speak'. This etymology is (1) morphologically (Ersatz von [DES expected] -ēr-durch -ētī'- why?), (2) phonologically (kê could be expected to have become debalabialized after u, cf. Kömmke 2007: 321 and Wahn 1994: 137-139; and even if this rule no longer applied in Gaulish, kê would be expected to have become p in this language), (3) epigraphically (<CV> more likely stands for /kou/ than for /kê/) and (4) semantically (the apparent connection of the god with smithies is not addressed) dubious. In this context I want to state explicitly that I regard the theory that a number of words with apparent or actual /kê/ in Gaulish are due to phonological archaisms in religious terminology (as in Schmidt 1996: 2) as implausible. Phonological archaisms in the religious sphere are - to my knowledge - conceivable and observable only with written corpora of sacred texts. If evidence can be attached to what Caesar (Bell. Gall. 6. 14. 3-4) says about the druid’s refusal to accept writing in religious affairs, the opposite of such a situation prevailed in Gaul. In particular, I do not see what greater religious significance a month’s name Equus, a rivername Séquuan, or an ethnic name Quattōtēs should have over the name of the goddess Epona. The only unambiguously religious term in this group is Epona, which actually shows the expected treatment of the toponym. On a more methodological note, admitting arbitrariness to phonological developments seriously undermines one of the fundamental pillars of the
it may be concluded that *Ucueti* consists of three syllables. It could now be
assumed that the *<i>l</i>* in the name of the dedicant *Martialis* should have syllabic
value as well. But noting that the sequence *<i>lm</i>* + back vowel is otherwise spelt
with an intervening *<i>l</i>* in *longo*, it is at least conceivable that *<i>l</i>* represents a glide in *Martialis* and that the word is trisyllabic.5 In Latin vulgar speech, prevocalic *<i>i</i>* and *<i>e</i>* had turned into the glide *<i>lm</i>* by the 1st century A.D., as evidenced by the
inscriptions from Pompeii (VÄRMEN 1963: 47 §77). This could be the state of
affairs represented by the spelling *Martialis*. Or the name – a loan from Latin –
could simply have retained its Roman spelling, without providing any clue as
to its pronunciation. Putting all things together, we arrive at two lines of equal
or nearly equal syllabic count (19 syllables each or 20/19 syllables, depending
on how *Martialis* is read).

(8) Provided the trisyllabic analysis of *Martialis* holds true, both lines can
furthermore be broken into two half-lines a and b, the first of which consists
of ten syllables with three stresses, the second one of nine syllables with two
main stresses. I will not speculate as to where the stress may have been in these
words; to me, the present knowledge about Gaulish accentuation is too limited
to warrant the drawing of any conclusions for a particular text (pace LAMBERT
2003: 48; DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 1999). Consequently, I will not attempt to
impose a rhythmical pattern upon L-13, as RITFÜS (1966) and GRAY (1942) have
done.

(9) Half-lines 1b and 2b both begin with the deity *Ucuetis*, the main recipient
of the dedication. Possibly, graphic emphasis was laid on *Ucuetis* in line 2b by
surrounding it with two ivy leaves, but this is very uncertain (see the remarks
above).

---

13 The two sequences *<i>ko</i>* and *<i>ko</i>* side by side in Gallo-Greek texts (for instance on the
inscription from Vaison-la-Romaine, Vandelme [G-153], i.e. oullovny and toumyna) could be
regarded as mere graphic variants of a single morpheme, one phonemic, the other one
quasi-phonemically reflecting "lowering" of *<i>ko</i>* before a back vowel. But in view of the fact that
Celtic had inherited two suffixes *<i>ko</i>*- and *<i>ko</i>*- from PIE, one can also ask the question if the
to spellings stand for the two suffixes respectively, for example in G-153 *<i>ko</i>* – *<i>i</i>* and *<i>ko</i>* – *<i>i</i>*. Due to the constraints of the transmission, the behaviour of Gaulish in this
respect must necessarily remain largely unclear, in contrast to the insular Celtic languages.
In Gaulish the two suffixes merged and underwent a unitary treatment, i.e. largely resulting in
Old Irish reflexes of *<i>ko</i>*-; but of *<i>ko</i>*- in a few cases (see BALLAS 1999 for a revision of UHLICH
1993, who had assumed separate treatments of the two suffixes in Gaulish). But in the British
languages *<i>ko</i>* and *<i>ko</i>* were kept apart phonologically, the former resulting in *<i>ko</i>* affec-
tion within the word, the latter giving e.g. *<i>W</i>*- *<i>ko</i>*- *<i>ko</i>* comprehensively traces the
developments from IE to the British languages.
The following structural analysis of the text is thus arrived at. The numbers refer to the positions of the words in the line, *x* marks the syllables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>line 1: Martialis Dannotali ieuru</td>
<td>Ucuetis soisin celichenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>line 2: etic gobedhri duglioniio</td>
<td>Ucuetin in Alissia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
<td><strong>x</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless we want to discard as purely accidental the amount of parallelism between the two lines (equal number of words, equal or nearly equal number of stressed words in the half-lines, equal or nearly equal number of syllables, correspondence in the positions of the verbs and of the name of the god Ucuetis*), we are forced to assume some stylistic or poetic scheme behind the arrangement of the text. But the poetic features employed in l. 13 are not those of classical Greek and Latin metrics. An analysis with regard to syllable length reveals no regular alternation of long and short vowels in the text.\(^{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>line 1:</td>
<td>– ( – )</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line 2:</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be concluded that l. 13 offers a glimpse at the perseverance of an autochthonous Gallish poetic tradition well into the period of the Roman occupation.\(^{13}\) With the prominence apparently given to parallelism in the number of words, syllables and stresses, and with the possibility of breaking a line into two shorter units with an unequal number of stresses and syllables, its metrical system is somewhat reminiscent of the poetic systems of old Germanic languages and perhaps of the so-called retorics of early Irish tradition (fixed numbers of words or stresses play a role at least in some variants of retorics). But it nevertheless lacks typical features of those advanced traditions, such as alliteration, not to speak of the intricate patterns of vowel and/or consonant correspondence found in later Irish rhyming poetry or in Welsh cynghanedd. The only words coming anywhere near alliteration in l. 13 are Ucuetis in Alissia in l. 2b and some vague consonantal resemblances between gobedthri and

\(^{12}\) See ESKA & MERCADO (2009a) for a larger sample of metrically analysed Gaulish texts.
moni gnatha · gab · buddatston imon
‘go,’ girl, take; this" buddatston (= take this as a b. = kiss?)

16 METS (2008b: 202) offers a slightly different analysis of the text.
18 Pae De BERNARDO STEMPPEL (2005), I remain convinced of the traditional interpretation of Celt. ḡab as possessing the inherited meaning ‘take’ (see LJV 195) in Celtic. The only instance where the context supports strongly the meaning ‘give’ for the root ḡab in a Celtic environment is that of the deities called ḡ̣āg˛abviar ‘the all-giving’ (CIL XIII, 7653 and 7280), in and near Mainz, see De BERNARDO STEMPPEL 2005: 190–191). But these may be due to a superficial Gallisation of originally Germanic Alagabiria (CIL XIII, 8829, Burgel). A linguistic ascription of the related Alagabiria (CIL XIII, 7937–7940, Rovenit) is not possible.
19 Following a suggestion by Stefan Schumacher, I translate imon as ‘this’, taking it as a parallel to or as an exact cognate of Ved. imam, i.e. demonstrative stem ‘- in’ + accusative ending ‘- m’, or a thematic acc. sg. ending. A frequently proposed alternative interpretation is to equate imon plus a few possible further, albeit ambiguous instances of the word (see DGL 1999) with the Greek possessive pronoun ὑπὸς ῶνυ.
While there is nothing a priori to exclude this possibility, a couple of objections must be addressed: (1) the unexpected raising of initial ‘e’ to ‘i’ via ‘a’ in the putative preform *ẹmaits finds a superficial phonological parallel in the Gaul. 1sg. of the copula ὑπ. (G: 13) and perhaps imi [L-120] < Proto-Celtic *emais ‘I am’ (contrast OIr. am without raising) – unless the latter forms are themselves instances of the putative possessive pronoun and in the proposition in < - emais, unless it is due to interference from Latin. But the phonetic environments are not equivalent: whereas those two words were unstressed (at least judging by their behaviour in related languages), putative Pro-Celtic *emais is built on the pronominal stem *em-, which is thought to represent the stressed allomorph of the PIE 1sg. pronominal stem ‘-m- and which therefore a priori should be expected to be stressed in Gaulish, too. But in stressed wordforms the raising ‘e’ to ‘i’ in open syllables did not take place in Gaulish before nasals, e.g. compound names with emi- as first member (DGL 163). Furthermore, the raising in imnai < *emnais and in < *eni may have been supported by the i of the second syllables. So *imais < *emais would, at best, be an example of an exceptional, irregular raising of ‘e’ to ‘i’ in a stressed or half-stressed word. (2) The status of the putative stressed pronominal stem allomorph *em- in Indo-European is in itself disputed. Reflexes of it are only found in Anatolian (Hitt. anamak T), Greek (ὑπ. ‘me’, ὑπὸς ‘my’) and Armenian (im ‘my’), but not in Albanian im ‘my’, which is rather made up of article + inherited possessive pronoun (see MARTZINGER 1998: 191–192). While it is basically possible that those three branches alone contain inherited stressed forms of the oblique bg. pronoun, the opposite is also conceivable, namely that we are looking at independent nachgrundsprachlich contaminations of the PIE oblique stem ‘-m- with the ‘e’ of the 1sg. subject pronoun *ẹg̣ar, (cf. KORN 1988: 92). Since Greek and Armenian are known to have many innovations in common, they do not count as separate witnesses in this process, but they more likely shared in an areal phenomenon. As to the position of Celtic in this regard, it must be also noted that – to my knowledge – apart from the possible case of Gaul. *imai, the putative pronominal stem *em- is not reflected elsewhere in Celtic pronominal systems. If the 1sg. subject pronoun was mi/mi in Gaulish (e.g. LAMBEER 2003: 69), this must continue the PIE accusative pronoun *m- in ‘me’ with secondarily lengthened vowel, the usage of which, rather than putative *em-, would in itself speak against the latter’s presence in Celtic.

20 For phonological reasons, buddatston cannot be connected with Early Ir. bot ‘tail; penis’ < *gʰatar (< as suggested, for example, by WATKINS 1999: 542). Such a preform ought to yield Gaul. *botto, cf. Gallo-Latin *pettoe ‘piece’ < *khēzdia (MW petth, OIr. emt, s. DGL 249f). Instead, a comparison with the rare ModIr. bos ‘bog’ (ModIr. pus, Sc.-Gael. bus) < *bʰos- is formally more satisfying.
This may be analysed as a short poetic composition consisting of two lines; one raised dot separates the two clauses which I analyse as two lines; another raised dot corresponds to the change of lines on the inscribed object. If some speculation is allowed, the poetic core can be taken to be:

moni gnatha
gabi ... imon

These four words are linked by numerous devices: syllabic equality (2+2 : 2+2), possibly equal or nearly equal syllabic weight; alliteration (gnatha : gabi), phonological 'mirroring', i.e. reverse phonological ring composition (moni : imon), consonantal and vocalic allomorphy (moni : gabi; gnatha : gabi; moji : gnatha). The only word in the short poem that falls out of the quasi-metrical framework is buddhat (with internal 'assonance' -udd- : -utt-; WATKINS 1999: 541), which by its very isolation is awarded special prominence and is thus rendered the focus of attention of the text. In addition to these features, WATKINS (1999: 511) has drawn attention to the fact that the text can also be read as a '11 syllable verse line with caesura after the fourth syllable, thus a 4 | 7 pattern that is characteristic both of Vedic and Iranian metric texts'.

Another old Celtic inscription that can with some certainty be claimed to contain a metrical text is the late Lepontic inscription from Ornavasso [Lexlep VB: 3:1]. It can be analysed as a trochaic tetrameter (LEJEUNE 1985: 499), but, like L-13, it does not contain any further poetic embellishments. Considering its late date for a Lepontic inscription (end of the 2nd cent. a.C., see Lexlep at VB: 3:1), the use of a quantitative metre will best be attributed to Latin or Greek influence. Like in L-13, however, the word divisions play a central role in the graphic expression of the metrical units. The strongest break - the caesura - is felt between the two constituent phrases (indirect object - subject) of the text, consequently that break is expressed by four dots. Each part of the sentence is in turn made up of two constituents, two coordinated recipients in the case of the indirect object, noun and attributive adjective in the case of the subject. In order to indicate that the break is slighter than that between the parts of the sentence, three dots are used. Finally, the connector -Pe 'and' < 'K'am is attached to the second constituent of the indirect object, but separated from that preceding stressed word by merely two dots which mark the enclitic nature of the element:

laTumarul : saPsuTai : Pe = uinom : nasom

21 In order to arrive at such an analysis, gnatha has to be read as /gnaṭā/ (allowance being made for a lengthened pronunciation of [a]). The final short a could be due to shortening in the vocative, i.e. loss of the PIE laryngeal in pause; the short a in the first syllable follows Schumacher's account of the development of PIE laryngeals in Celtic (SCHUMACHER 2000a: 136–138, 349–350). It is needless to say that this is a mere hypothesis for which neither positive nor negative evidence can be adduced. The short vowel of moni will have to be measured long, however, against the probably short -i ≤ *-je of gabi.

22 Helmut BURKHANS (2003) has proposed a new interpretation of nasom, not as /naṣim/ (vel sim.) 'Naxian (wine)', the widely preferred analysis, but as /naṣim/ (vel sim.) = */n đ-om or */n đ-som, a past participle of the root */nä*- 'to bird, tie' (recte */naṣom/ = */gilä-om, past participle of the root */gilä/- found in OIr. nascd, Millet. nasa; cf. SCHUMACHER 2000a: 499; vs. */Hätä/-, LIV 2: 227). For Bridgman, the delicacy contained in the vessel for the buried
Returning to L-13, the following can be said in conclusion. Although the text of the Alise-Sainte-Reine inscription is not metrical (there is no detectable pattern of syllable length or stress), and although there is nothing in its syntax that looks overtly artificial or contrived as could be expected of poetry, the measured, even distribution of syllables and words and the graphic prominence in the shape of an ivy leaf placed at the main discontinuity speak for a deliberate stylistic design behind the layout of the text. In that sense it is possible to speak perhaps of measured prose or of a poetic arrangement in a wider sense of the word. It is true that the discontinuous syntax can be explained by grammatical exigencies as has been done by Eska (2003: 112–115), but I want to draw attention to the possibility that a conscious stylistic design may have played a role as well.

Appendix: verb-initial relative clauses in Gaulish?

Schumacher (2004a: 98 fn. 100) has argued that in Gaulish the relative particle *jo < *tod had become enclitic and thus occupied Wackernagel's position after the first word in the clause. The implication is that the clause-initial slot could have been filled by word classes other than verbs and that Gaulish probably did not have relative verbal forms of the Old Irish type (Schumacher 2004a: 743 fn. 34). Schumacher argues that in order to develop fully grammaticalised relative verbal forms, it is prerequisite that a language belong to the VSO-type. Since the unmarked word order in Gaulish probably was SVO (as in the first part of L-13; see Eska 1994: 23 = 2007a: 84; Eska couple Latomaros and Sapanta is not *reine from Naxos*, but *reine (from vine*) took up (in contrast to vines spreading on the ground). While Kirkham's analysis is unimpeachable on morphological, phonological and lexical grounds, it is possible to defend the wide-spread translation 'Naxian' on paleographic grounds. Kirkham assails the phonetic interpretation of the letters *san* as *'sak* [sic] and demands that it be strictly considered as representing a Proto-Celtic combination of details and/or subdetails, i.e. *tan Gallachum* (like in annamitaires < *andec-o-pidetio* [San bernardino di Prisca, L-1/ Lexlep NO 21] and biaik < *trias-ton* [Vergiate, Lexlep VA 6]; both are my own examples). But he overlooks the fact that the letter rendered as *s* in the transcription is actually a variant that is found merely in two or three inscriptions (see Laffont 1971: 374 and Lexlep s. v. S). This particular variant consists of a body shaped like an X, the two lower ends of which are connected by an understroke. A very uncertain example is VA 1.2, which is very likely to be read as *Tu*; the understroke which would turn it into *t* looks very much accidental. In the only other inscription purported to contain it [Novate, Lexlep MI 1], traditionally read as *Pe*ku, the phonograph reveals that the understroke has been added accidentally and does not belong to the letter (see Studi Itroscoli 60 (1995), tav. LVII b and LXIX a; cf. Morandi 2006: 419). The name in Lexlep MI 1 has rather to be read as *Peku* (thus also Morandi 2004: 460), perhaps a short name based on the numeral *petuora* '4'. Consequently, Lexlep VB 3.1 remains the sole instance for this particular shape of the letter. This raises the question if the letter should be read as *san* at all, whereas in other inscriptions from the late Lepontic period for *san* the so-called "butterfly-sign" is used [San Pietro di Stabio, Lexlep TI 44; Malosto, Lexlep NO 18; Stress, Lexlep VB 127]. So it is best to follow the suggestion by Rüg (1913: 86) that the letter in the inscription from Ornabasso is not *san*, but a loan grapheme from Latin X = /ks/, to which has been added an understroke as a diacritic in order to distinguish it from morphosynthetic native Lepontic X = /lx/. The letter m in Lexlep VB 3.1, which does not show the inherited flag-like shape, betrays Latin graphematic influence, too (Laffont 1987: 304f, 306). The word could thus be read overtly as *nakšom*. The /j/ of the supposedly underlying jo-adjective /nakšom/ must be assumed to have been "absorbed" into the preceding /ks/, or could the diacritic understroke actually represent the /j/?
2007b), it is not impossible that constructions may have existed where the relative particle "to" was attached to other word classes, but primarily to nominal subjects. In conscious contrast to Vendryes's restriction, he thinks that it is only due to the chances of transmission that in the few relative clauses that we find attested in Gaulish, the particle always comes after a verb. The syntactic, not the formal correspondence, between Gaulish 3pl. relatives in -ontio and their Old Irish counterparts in -te would thus have been rendered a little bit less close than hitherto assumed. Two possible examples of verbs with attached relative particle "to in Gaulish (dugiottio [L-10] and toncisentio [L-100]) will be discussed below. Other alleged instances of relative verbs (augiottias, seriottimio) are of dubious transmission or uncertain interpretation or amenable to other analyses and will be ignored here.22

In L-13 we have a case of a relative clause with subject antecedent. The word order of the relative clause is unmarked SVO. Since the subject is expressed in the matrix clause (gobadh), the relative particle "to stands in as the overt subject in the dependent clause: \(-S_{2,0}:V_{2,0}:O_{2,0}:a_{2,0}\). The relative particle, however, being elicit, must be attached to the next available host, which is the verb, and in consequence the slot before the verb becomes phonologically empty: \(-S_{2,1}:V_{2,0}:O_{2,0}:a_{2,0}\). The verb is thus superficially promoted to the first position of the clause by syntactic rules and as a consequence of the underlying constituent order SVO. At the same time, the position of the verb dugiottio in the third slot of line 2 also fulfills a stylistic purpose by corresponding to the position of the verb in the first line. Two different factors therefore conspire to place the verbal form at exactly that position of the text, namely a syntactic factor which is specific to relative clauses with subject antecedents, and a stylistic factor. It would therefore be rash to adduce this particular verbal form as good evidence for verb-initial syntax in Gaulish relative clauses.

In line 9 of the lead tablet from Châtalières [L-100], another possible example of a relative verb in Gaulish is attested, viz. toncisentio. If this is a single word and a verb, which is far from certain,23 it is sp. (ontio), it is furthermore likely to be a future formation (-siur < *-siu-v-). It is relative (-io), and it may stand in a figura etymologica relationship to the preceding phrase se caudattonnanam.24 The second part of the latter has been surmised to contain the verbal abstract (verbal noun) tonceannor of the verb toncisentio and thus its internal object. In one possible analysis of the construction, tonceannor could belong to the matrix clause25 and provide the object antecedent of the relative verb, which on its own would constitute the relative clause: '... the tonceannor which they will [tone ...]'. Here the relative particle "to represents

22 Larraz's sogiottias (L-98) could be a present participle (LAMBERT 2002: 266); regarding seriottimio from Marcellus of Bordeaux's De medicamentis liber: the genre of magical formulae, to which the presumed Gaulish charms in Marcellus' treatise belong, and the specific textual conditions which obtain in that genre disqualify these texts as a source of Gaulish altogether (BLOM 2007: 58-126).

23 Cf. the various suggestions reported in LAMBERT (2002: 278-279) and SCHUMACHER (2004a: 651-652), but note the arguments advanced by LINDEMANN (2007) against taking toncisentio (which has a clear word break in the middle) as a single form.

24 The sequence could finds a parallel in the sequence [...]eu of a hitherto unrecognised text, which does not seem to be Latin and may perhaps be regarded as Gaulish (STETTER forthcoming). The function of [...]eu within that text, however, remains totally unclear.

25 Note, however, that under this analysis the further syntactic position of tonceannor in the matrix clause remains quite unclear.
the object in the dependent clause. The subject is not overtly expressed because it is inherent in the verb; in consequence, the slot before the verb becomes phonologically empty: → "SV[tenseless]Oступил" → "V-O-TL". Again, in observance of Wackernagel's Rule, the relative particle attaches itself to the first stressed element of the clause, which this time – since there is only one element present – means no visible movement at all; the object slot as such is deleted because it is empty now: → "V-foT" → V-fo.

Eska (1994: 27–28 = 2007a: 86–87), on the other hand, regards the whole phrase secouit toncunam Tonsitiorio as the relative clause, the head of which is phonologically null and in which 'topicalisation of secouit toncunam has occurred following verb-fronting and clitic placement'. He translates 'those who will swear the oath of Segowas', i.e. a relative clause with covert subject antecedent. Although under his analysis the construction seems to disprove Schumacher’s claim (a priori one might have expected something like "secouit-fo toncunam Tonsitiorio"), this is only so on the surface. If, as Eska suggests, topicalisation of secouit toncunam within the clause occurred after the cliticisation of fo, the following path of events is conceivable:

"S_{Tonsitiorio}V_{tenseless}O_{tenseless}Tonsitiorio"
→ "SV_{tenseless}IfoO_{tenseless}secouit (cliticisation)"
→ O_{tenseless}tenseless]\V_{tenseless}Ifo (topicalisation)

Again neither this verbal form nor the construction in which it appears (be it surface configuration or underlying structure) provide unequivocal evidence for a rule of clause-initial verbs in Gaulish relative clauses. It would only be fatal to Schumacher’s above-cited claim if there turned up in the Gaulish corpus an instance of a relative clause with non-subject antecedent in which despite the presence of an overt nominal subject within the relative clause the verb were promoted to the first slot. According to Schumacher’s claim, for such a case a surface configuration S-foV(O) → "S-foV(O)" → "X_{fo}SV(O)" would be expected. X represents the slot for the non-subject constituent (which could also represent O), for which the relative particle stands in, and which is being deleted after the clitic has been moved to the position after the first stressed word. If, however, an input structure "X_{fo}SV(O)" would be represented by a surface configuration V-foR(O), i.e. with promotion of the verb to the initial slot in order to host the relative clitic, Schumacher’s claim would have to be regarded as positively falsified.
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