

SOME SOUTHWEST IBERIAN INSCRIPTIONS

(Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum 40)

Fred C. Woudhuizen

The Southwest Iberian inscriptions are conducted in a variant of the Iberian family of scripts, which originates from the Phoenician alphabet but became subject to a secondary process of partial syllabification. Now, the Southwest Iberian inscriptions presumably date from an earlier period than the Celtiberian ones of the Meseta in northeast central Spain, and hence it is a dangerous procedure to plug in the values as valid for the later Celtiberian inscriptions. In some instances, namely, signs of the Southwest Iberian script may well render a more original or simply alternative value. Therefore, this study sets out with a scrutiny of the values of the signs before embarking on linguistic interpretation. Having done so, it appears that among the total of ten texts selected for their workable state of preservation there can be distinguished three categories: (1) bilateral dedications, (2) dedications more in general, and (3) funeral inscriptions. Moreover, the language can positively be identified as a local dialectal variant of Celtic, most closely related to Celtiberian and Gaulish. To underline this point of view, the final sections are dedicated to overviews of the relevant linguistic evidence and a provisional grammatical sketch.

Section A: Introduction

For this paper I have selected 10 texts on the criterion of that they are completely preserved or, in one case, emendable on the basis of a recurrent expression. The study of these inscriptions is facilitated by Jürgen Untermann and Dagmar Wodtke's monumental *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum* IV [= *MLH* IV] of 1997, which, alongside providing a corpus of Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions, presents improved drawings of the texts in question.

With the help of *MLH* IV, I had already reached some results in retrieving the contents of the inscription on the ovular stone from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1), which is now lost but of which a good drawing is preserved, but I did not find the time to work out these results into a paper. Then I was informed in August of 2011, by professor Wolfgang Meid in e-mails and a letter about his visit of the Celtic congress at Maynooth and the hand-out of the paper by John T. Koch, who also argued that the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions were con-

ducted in a Celtic vernacular. I was immediately struck by his identification of the sequence *ka-a-ś-e-ta-a-n-a* in the Alacalá del Río inscription (an element I had up till then explained away as part of an onomastic formula) with Celtic *casidanos* “tin-master”, an honorific title or occupational term.

Encouraged by this fine discovery, I did my best to acquire all the relevant publications by John Koch on the topic of the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions, which were not available in the libraries in the Netherlands, and managed to get a hold on his paper to *Palaeohispanica* 9 of 2009, his work co-edited with Barry Cunliffe of 2010 and his monograph focused on the newly discovered Mesas do Castelinho text (in fact up to this moment the largest extant inscription of its kind) entitled *Tartessian 2* of 2011. Unfortunately, his *Tartessian* [1] of 2009 is no longer available, but, as the author is repeating his arguments in the publications I did get a hand on, I do not think I missed something vital as a result of this fact.

Some time ago, professor Meid from Innsbruck University was so kind to draw my attention in a letter dated February 2, 2014, to the revised and expanded edition of Koch’s *Tartessian* [1] of 2013 and the second volume in the series *Celtic from the West*, co-edited with Barry Cunliffe, also of 2013. Of both these works I acquired a copy in order to be fully up-to-date.

From the above it is already clear that my thanks are due to professor Meid, who encouraged me to pick up the thread in this field of study where I had left it, and whose comments to an earlier draft of the manuscript in a letter dated November 3, 2011, stimulated me to think over some of the weakest points of the interpretations I presented and to rework the sections of the manuscript in question. To this comes that he, as noted in the preceding, kindly drew my attention to the latest publication in the field. Furthermore, I warmly thank Maarten de Weerd for presenting me with a copy of the catalogue of the exhibition of *Die Iberer* 1997, which contains a useful section on the Iberian script by Javier de Hoz. Next, Carlos Jordán Cólera generously sent me a copy of his informative book on Celtiberian from 2004, otherwise unavailable in Dutch libraries, and thanks to this my attention was drawn to his handsome introduction to the Celtiberian language of 1998. Finally, I feel privileged to have been among the “chosen ones” to be rewarded with a copy of Meid’s overview of the history and culture of the Celts of 2010 – the English version of the German edition of 2007 also in my possession owing to professor Meid’s kindness.

Finally, I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for suggestions as to the improvement of an earlier draft of the manuscript, the gist of the argument being that Celtic comparanda, if available, should be preferred to the ones from other Indo-European languages.

Even though I do agree with Koch that the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions are indeed conducted in a Celtic tongue, my readings of the texts are for the most part fundamentally different. This is due to two facts: (1) my reading of a number of signs is different from the ones applied by Koch, who as regards this issue predominantly follows the edition by Untermann and Wodtko

in this respect, and, partly as result of this, (2) my division of the texts, which are in *scriptio continua*, into separate elements also varies substantially.

As such, I think Koch is premature in his claim to the decipherment of the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions, and the same verdict applies to the elaboration of his findings in a provisional vocabulary, phonology, morphology, and grammar. It deserves attention in this context that in a decipherment a key-role is played by the attribution of values to the individual signs of the script, whether it is an hieroglyphic one with determinatives, logograms and syllables or consonants, a syllabary, an alphabet, or, as in the present case, a mixture of the latter two categories (to be more precise: the Iberian script concerns a partly resyllabification of the alphabet). Hence our adagium: *get your values right before you start to read, because every wrong value leads to wrong readings and mistaken interpretations*. Accordingly, I will first discuss the signs of which the value is in need of elaboration and focus on the formation of a reliable grid of the signary (section B) before turning to the interpretation of the contents of the selected texts (section C) and the determination of the language (section D), which is followed by a final section with an overview of the vocabulary based on Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) roots (section E).

Section B: The script

The Southwest Iberian script belongs to the Iberian family of scripts, which has been deciphered by Manuel Gómez Moreno in 1925. This decipherment led to the linguistic elucidation of texts conducted in one particular branch of the Iberian script-family, the Celiberian as found in the region of the Meseta in northeast Spain. In other fields, however, like the Southeast Iberian and Southwest Iberian, linguistic interpretation lagged behind, because the signaries are not identical to the Celiberian and some of the signs remain unexplained. In the case of Southwest Iberian, however, new opportunities to establish the values of as yet unclear signs were offered by the discovery of the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1), in which the first 13 signs, which are all of Phoenician antecedents, are enumerated in the order of their Phoenician counterparts (De Hoz 1991).

Notwithstanding so, Untermann and Wodtko in their monumental edition of the Southwest Iberian inscriptions, *MLH IV*, feel forced to leave a number of signs without proper value in their transliterations and resort to presenting their form only. In other instances, their transliterations are in my opinion improperly founded and incorrect. The same verdict applies to the transliterations used by De Hoz and Koch, who, apart from a few differences in detail, mainly follow the lead by Untermann and Wodtko.


In the following, then, I will discuss the problematic signs and try to provide a more properly founded value for each of them.



(1) § Owing to its presence in the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1), this sign, which is commonly transliterated as *ba* or *pa* (de Hoz 1991, 681-682; *MLH IV*, 153, Abb. 2; Koch 2010, 206), can definitely be identified as the vertical variant of


Phoenician *mēm*. This particular form precedes the horizontal variant of the same sign (see below), which is attested for the Phoenician mother-script for the first time in the “Baal of Libanon” inscription from Limassol in Cyprus, dated to *ca.* 750 BC. As a side remark, it may be deduced from this observation that the date in question serves as a *terminus ante quem* for the transmission of the Phoenician alphabet to the indigenous population of southwest Iberia. In any case, our identification of the sign as expressing the alphabetic value *m* leads us to the following readings: (a) *masetaala* in the inscription from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1), which can be explained as an adjectival derivative in *-l-* of the geographic name *Meseta*; (b) the object *m₂uteeman* in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho, of which the root recalls Greek μύθημα “story”; (c) the recurrent stem *eromare-* (so in inscriptions from Abóbada [J.12.1] and Fonte Velha [no. 6 = J.1.1]) or, in adjectival derivative in *-na-*, *eromarena-* (so in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho and likewise to be emended in that from Cerro dos Enforcados [J.22.1]), which, like Gaulish *Aremorici* “the (inhabitant)s (living) along the sea” (Delamarre 2003, 52), is to be analyzed as a compound of a writing variant of the preposition **ara* < **para* “along” (< PIE **per-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]) with a reflex of the PIE root **mori-* “sea” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 748; note that the loss of *p*-initial in the preposition is a regular Celtic feature); (d) the sequence *romatee maremanai keentii* in D sg. “on behalf of the Roman maritime people” in the inscription from Mealha Nova (no. 1 = J.18.1), and the endingless N(m/f) sg. of the MN *rawarmar* in yet another inscription from Fonte Velha (no. 3 = J.1.2), of which the second element corresponds with Gaulish *maro-* “great” (Delamarre 2003, 218-219). The arguments for an, in my opinion mistaken, labial-reading of the sign are ultimately rooted in *m/b*-interchange as evidenced by the correspondence between Celtiberian *ratubar* and *katubaré* to the Celtic MNs *Ratumāros* and *Catumāros* (Koch 2011, 57). But, as the exact date of the change from nasal *m* into labial *b* is not determined as yet, it cannot be decided when the sign for *m* under discussion became used for the expression of the labial *b* or *p*, or, syllabificated *ba* or *pa*. If our identification of the sequence *romatee maremanai keentii* “on behalf of the Roman maritime people” applies, it may reasonably be argued that the production of Southwest Iberian texts continued into the period of Roman occupation, for which the end of the second Punic war, in 201 BC, likely serves as a *terminus post quem*.

(2) **M**: The alphabetic value *m* of this sign, which is attested for inscriptions from Abóbada (J.12.1), Ameixial (J.7.8), and San Martinho (Koch 2010, 255), is not in dispute, only, in my view, it presents a secondary form of the alphabetic letter in question, transliterated here as *m₁*, which is horizontal instead of vertical, and therefore its introduction into the Southwest Iberian script may safely be assigned to the period after *ca.* 750 BC. As its closest cognates are from the Greek, Lydian, and Phrygian scripts (Jeffery 1998, Table of letters), this sign-variant clearly confronts us with secondary Aegean influences on the in this respect original Phoenician model. Note, however, that in my opinion the writ-

ing of the endingless N(m/f) sg. of the MN *m,umat(e)* in the Abóbada-text (J.12.1) represents, in line with the Celtiberian TN *Numantia*, **Numaⁿt(os)* and as such exemplifies a case of regressive assimilation.

(3)  : Again, the alphabetic value *m* of this sign, which occurs in the inscriptions from Mesas de Castelinho (Koch 2011, 43) and one from Pardieiro (J.15.1) (Koch 2010, 236), is not in dispute, but it clearly constitutes a loan from the Celtiberian script, and hence serves as a marker of a late date of the inscription in question, for which reason it is transliterated here as *m*₂ (cf. the mention of *m,uteeman* sub [1] above). In view of the Cypro-Minoan background of the arrow-shaped *t*-sign (see sub [5] below), it might plausibly be argued that this particular sign originates from the Cypro-Minoan one for *ru* or *lu*, and its derivative, the Lydian one for *l* or *l*₂, but has subsequently been attributed with a secondary value entirely unrelated with the original one, in like manner as this happened with, for example, Greek *psi* < *khi* < Phoenician *kap* (cf. Gusmani 1964, 29).

(4)  : On account of its likeness in form to the Phoenician *qôp*, the present sign has been identified by De Hoz in his contributions of 1991 and 1997 as the syllabified variant of a velar sound, *kí*. But this sign does not occur in its expected place in the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1), which seriously undermines the argument. Therefore, in actual fact we may merely be dealing here with a writing variant of  *tí* characterized by a long hasta¹. At least, it can be argued that such an interpretation is in conformity with the correspondence of the root of the form *latiiuuij* (D sg. in *-i*) from the inscription of Mesas do Castelinho with Gaulish *latis* “hero” (Delamarre 2003, 197-198), and the identification of *poojatii* from an inscription from Fonte Velha (no. 3 = J.1.2) as the 3rd pers. sg. of the pres./fut. in *-ti* of the verbal root *po(ia)-* formally corresponding to that of Greek *ποιέω* “to make, do”, hence “he will make” (see further the discussion of *po* sub [10] below). Note that this variant of *tí* is to be distinguished from the rounded variant of the otherwise angular sign for *ti*, which is open at the top, as attested for an inscription from Fonte Velha (J.1.1: *rekaaⁿtiiś*, corresponding to Latin *regentis* [G sg.] “during the reign” < PIE **reǵ-* “to rule”; cf. Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 854-855; Delamarre 2003, 261).

(5)  : This sign ultimately originates from the arrow-shaped Cypro-Minoan *ti*-sign, which in the Lydian (Gusmani 1964, 29) and Phrygian (Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 4; 34; 79; 226; 256) alphabets apparently developed into an alphabetic

¹ Note that both signs occur separately in the lower version of the Espanca alphabet, but the second one takes the position of the *qôp* in the upper version which latter is distinguished by the fact that the hasta starts at the lower side of the lozenge or circle at its top and does not penetrate this.



secondary sign for *t*, to be transliterated as *t*₁ in Phrygian and *t*₂ in Lydian². This original dental value is still traceable in the variant writing *keentii* of regular *keentii* (J.12.1; J.16.1; J.17.2; J.18.1) in an inscription from Herdade do Pêgo (J.19.2), see Koch 2010, 244; cf. for the given form the D sg. *genti* of Latin *gens*, G *gentis* “people” < PIE **ǵenh*₁- “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373-374; cf. Wodtko 2000, 178-182 for Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*). Later on, however, this sign is used for the unrelated secondary value *pí*, as possibly attested for a Southwest Iberian inscription from Vale dos Vermelhos (no. 3 = J.7.1) and certainly for the form *arateetunpiites* “the (inhabitant)s (of the region) along the *Dedunbaitis*” (N[m/f] pl. in *-es*) from the inscription found at Alcalá del Río (J.53.1: with the preposition *ara* < **para* “along” (< PIE **per*- [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]) as in Gaulish *Aresequani* “the (inhabitant)s (living) along the Seine”, see Delamarre 2003, 52, showing the typical Celtic loss of *p*-initial in like manner as this is the case in the compound *eromare-* or *eromarena-* discussed above). This secondary value is acknowledged by De Hoz (1991, 682; 1997, 209).

(6) **D** : This sign, for, to me at least, unclear reasons read as *be* by Koch (2010, 251; 2011, 87), constitutes a roundish variant of the Phoenician triangular *dālet*, the latter of which occurs in its regular fourth position in the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1) and is used for the related syllabified value *tu* (note that the Southwest Iberian script does not distinguish between voiced *d* and unvoiced *t*). Now, it is generally acknowledged that the variant of the triangular *dālet* with a notch at its lower side is used for the related syllabic dental value *to* (MLH IV, 153, Abb. 2; cf. Koch 2010, 206). Accordingly, we arrive for the roundish variant under discussion, which, like the particular variant of the horizontal *m*, should be attributed to Aegean substrate influences on the original Phoenician model (Jeffery 1998, Table of letters; note in this connection also the Carian variant in the MN *Darqpeon* “Tarkumbios” in a bilingual inscription from Sais, cf. Adiego 2007, 32-3), at a dental value. In order to distinguish it from the notched triangular *to*, this particular sign, which occurs in the verbal from *poⁿtó* “they have made (as an offering) for themselves” (3rd pers. pl. of the middle-passive of the past tense in *-ⁿto*, see Beekes 1990, 285 [Greek ἐλύοντο) and the D sg. in *-e* of the TN *tóopiarite* “on behalf of Botorríta” of the inscription from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1; for the this interpretation, which rests on the assumption of metathesis of the first two consonants in the given TN, see discussion of the text below), will be transliterated here as *tó*.

(7) **✱** : This particular sign, which is variously attributed with the syllabic value *bu* (MLH IV, 153, Abb. 2; Koch 2010, 206) or *po* (De Hoz 1991, 682) – which

² Note that the dental value of the arrow-shaped sign in Phrygian is now verifiable thanks to the presence of *t₁emeney* (cf. Greek τέμενος) in the apodosis of the damnation-formula of the bilingual inscription from Vezirhan (B-05), cf. Gorbachov 2008.


propositions, because Southwest Iberian does not distinguish between voiced *b* and unvoiced *p*, in effect do not differ fundamentally from each other – in my opinion reads *ku*. At any rate, we can interpret *kuuoi* in an inscription from Fonte Velha (no. 3 = J.1.2.) as the N(m/f) sg. of the relative pronoun, corresponding to archaic Latin *qoi* (< PIE **k^we-*, *k^wo-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 644]). If so, the first phrase of the inscription, *kooreli poojatii kuuoi* “Who(ever) will make (a sacrifice) to Korelos”, smacks of the offering formula *qoi med mitat* “who(ever) sends me” following the introductory phrase in the archaic Latin inscription on the so-called Duenos vase. As an immediate consequence of this identification, the Southwest Iberian language can, just like its closest cognate Celtiberian (**equeisos* < PIE **e^kkw^o-* “horse”, *kuekue-* “whosoever” < PIE **k^we-*, and *-kue* “and” < PIE **-k^we* as identified by Meid 1996, 16, 30-31, and Meid 2000, 11), be classified as *q*-Celtic³. The latter conclusion can further be underlined by the variant writing *kooi* of the N(m/f) sg. of the relative pronoun as encountered in the inscription from Alcalá del Río, and the identification of the first word of this particular inscription, *kotuu*, as the N-A(n) sg. of the relative pronoun, corresponding to Latin *quod*.

(8) : There is agreement in *MLH* IV, 153, Abb. 2 and Koch 2010, 206 about the reading of this sign as a secondary *r*, transliterated *ř*, but, what seems to be the underlying idea, a correspondence to the sign for *r* in Celiberian (cf. De Hoz 1997, 209), fails for the lack of any formal relationship between the signs in question. In reality, therefore, it may perhaps be argued that we are dealing with a writing variant of “the Lydian *yôd* sign”, , on the basis of the fact that the form accordingly read as *kooi* in the inscription from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1) confronts us with a mere writing variant of *kuuoi*, as we have just noted the N(m/f) sg. of the relative pronoun corresponding to archaic Latin *qoi* “who(ever)” (< PIE **k^we-*, *k^wo-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 644]). Moreover, such an analysis also makes sense for the use of the sign in final position of tribal names, usually followed by the D sg. form *keentii* or one of its variant writings (see, for example, *altusielnai keentii* in Abóbada [J.12.1], *arune er<o> marenai keenii* in Cerro dos Enforcados [J.22.1], *romatee maremanai keentii* in Mealha Nova 1 [J.18.1], *tiirtoosjemanai keeni* in Fonte Velha 3 [J.1.2], and *ástapoopiirnai keenai* in Vale dos Vermelhos 3 [J.7.1]), as a marker of the D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stems, because *these entire sequences are invariably conducted in the dative case!*

(9) : *MLH* IV, 153, Abb. 2 distinguishes a variant of this sign with two hori-

³ Note, however, that the linguistic situation in Southwest Iberia happens to be more complicated in view of the fact that the inscription from Barradas (J.5.1) clearly bears the testimony of *p*-Celtic. Of importance in this connection may be a difference in the dating of the inscriptions, the *p*-Celtic one presumably being posterior to the *q*-Celtic ones. However, in actual fact proper archaeological datings are in the main lacking and we therefore have to rely solely on indications from epigraphy or the contents more in general.


zontal bars, rendering the value *te*, from the one with three horizontal bars, which in their opinion represents the value *ku*. Untermann and Wodtke are followed in this distinction by Koch (2010, 206). Deviating from this interpretation, De Hoz (1991, 681-682) assumes that the variant with three horizontal bars renders the value *te* in like manner as the one with two horizontal bars. In fact, I agree with the analysis by De Hoz that we are indeed dealing here with mere writing variants of one and the same sign for the expression of the value *te*. I would only add that close examination of the use of this particular sign reveals that, alongside its syllabic use, it is on its way of becoming an alphabet letter, *t*. Thus, on the one hand the syllabic use for *te* is evidenced by forms like the composite *arateetunpītes* (Alcalá del Río [J.53.1]; note especially its expression here of the ending of the N(m/f) pl. in *-es* of the consonant stems), *kaaltee*, and *m₂uteeman* (both forms from Mesas do Castelinho, but note that the first is also attested for Abóbada [J.12.1]), whereas its alphabetic use for *t* can be exemplified by forms like *betasiioonii* (Fonte Velha 6 [J.1.1]), *ástanapolon* (Vale dos Vermelhos 3 [J.7.1]), and *vartoi* (Cerro dos Enforcados [J.22.1]). Marking the stage in between the development from syllabic sign to alphabetic letter is the patently mute vowel *e* in the sequence *m₁umat(e) eromareí*, where the sign is used only in anticipation of the front vowel of the next word being *e*. Note, by the way, that, for the recurrent nature of *eromare-*, we are, just like in the case of *pooiⁿt(e) eromare* in Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1), clearly confronted here with two distinct words, and that hence the inference by Koch in the frame of his discussion of the phenomenon of *scriptio continua* that “a sequence of Tartessian signs will never break as two words between **t^a** and the following **a** or **b^o** and **o**, and so on” (Koch 2011, 37; cf. 141) is clearly mistaken.

(10)  : This sign is analyzed as representing the syllabic value *bo* in *MLH IV*, 153, Abb. 2 and Koch 2010, 206. In contrast, De Hoz 1991, 682 places it at the position of *pu* in his grid of the signary. I follow De Hoz in connection with the consonant being the unvoiced *p*, but agree with *MLH IV* and Koch that the vowel consists of *o*. My reasons for doing so are twofold. In the first place, the sign features prominently in verbal forms based on a root which shows a striking formal resemblance to that of Greek *ποιέω* “to make, do” (< PIE **k^wei-* [Mallory/Adams 2007, 220]), three of which, *pooiatii* (Fonte Velha 3 [J.1.2]), which renders the 3rd pers. sg. of the pres/fut. in *-ti*, *pooiⁿt(e)* (Fonte Velha 6 [J.1.1]), which represents the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense in *-t*, and *poⁿtó* (Alcalá del Río [J.53.1], which expresses the 3rd pers. pl. of the middle-passive of the past tense in *-ⁿto*, we already came across in the preceding. To these instances can be added the form *pootii* (Mealha Nova 1 [J.18.1]), which also renders the 3rd pers. sg. of the pres/fut. in *-ti*, and *pooiir* (Mesas do Castelinho), which stands for the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense in *-r* (cf. Hittite *-er* or *-ir* [Friedrich 1974, 77]) and Latin *-re* in *vīdēre* [Beekes 1990, 282] for the same function). Secondly, the sign is used for the expression of the root *pou-* < PIE **g^wou-* “ox” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 482), which corresponds to the first ele-

ment of Celtiberian *pouštom* “cow-shed” (Meid 1993, 106). Of course, we are in reality confronted here with the typical Celtic development of the PIE labiovelar $*g^w > b$, and the labial as such likely represents the voiced b in this instance, but nevertheless, from a graphic point of view, with our present transliteration we stay close to that applied for the closest cognate of the Southwest Iberian language, Celtiberian. To this comes that for the expression of the voiced labial b the Southwest Iberian script preferably uses the second letter of the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1), as in *beⁿtasiioonii* “to Bendasion” (Fonte Velha 6 [J.1.1]; D sg. in *-i* of the consonant stems) < PIE $*b^hend^h-$ “to bind” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 127), *liibianii* “Libians” (Mesas do Castelinho; N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the *o*-stems) corresponding to the inhabitants of the region of the town Libia (= present-day Herramélluri in the region of Rioja along the upper-Ebro) called *Libienses* by Plinius, *Plin. Nat.* 3.3.24 (cf. Jordán 1998, 146). But it should be realized that this last argument is somewhat undermined by cases in which, like in that of *pou-* representing $*bou-$, p is clearly used to express the voiced b , as in *arateetunpiites* “the (inhabitant)s (of the region) along the *Dedunbaitis*” (N(m/f) pl. in *-es* of the consonant stems), of which the last element corresponds to Greek Βάρτις, the ancient name of the Guadalquivir River along which the find spot of the text, Alcalá del Río, is situated, and *tóopiarite* “on behalf of Botorrita” (also Alcalá del Río [J.53.1]; D sg. in *-e* of presumably the *c*-stems). The verbal root *po(ia)-* shows, as we have noted, a formal resemblance to that of Greek ποιέω “to make, do”, but whether it likewise originates from PIE $*k^wei-$ (Mallory/Adams 2007, 220) remains to be determined and in the mean time this matter should not affect our identification of the Southwest Iberian language as *q*-Celtic in the above or question the fact that the latter language shares with Celtic in general the typical Celtic loss of *p*-initial.

(11) **4** : About the sign for the vowel *u* it is duly remarked by De Hoz (1991, 676) that in the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1) it follows the cross sign for *ta*, which in its turn corresponds to the last letter of the Phoenician alphabet, *tāw*. This fact is probably to be attributed to subsidiary Aegean influences, because *upsilon* is also placed after *tau* in, for example, the Greek alphabet. Note, however, that this particular instance of subsidiary Aegean influence does not stand on its own, but we have already above pointed out the Aegean influence discernable in the forms of the horizontal *m*, the roundish *d*, the Lydian type of *yôd*, and the arrow-shaped Cypro-Minoan *ti*-sign. Therefore it deserves our attention that some further subsidiary Aegean influences are observable in, for example, the M-shaped *ś*, which corresponds to the Aegean (Lydian and some of the Greek alphabets) *san*, the stance of the *a*, which is that of the Aegean (Lydian, Phrygian, and Greek) *alpha*, the upturned *lambda* (Lydian), to which might perhaps be added the relationship of the “trident” shaped *ti* to the Aegean *sampi*, and the archaic Lydian form for *f* consisting of a vertical stroke with a circle at either end as attested for an inscription from Alcoutim, see Schmoll 1961, 56, Nr. 23, *MLH* IV, J.9.1, and Koch 2010, 226. Notwithstanding all these subsidiary Aegean

influences, the relationship of Southwest Iberian *u* with its Phoenician predecessor *wāw* is underlined by the fact that this sign is also used to express the value of the semivowel *v* as in *vartoi* “the Vartoi” (Cerro dos Enforcados [J.22.1]; N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the *o*-stems) and *ravarmar* (Fonte Velha 3 [J.1.2]; endless N(m/f) sg. of MN).

(12) : This particular sign, which appears to originate from Phoenician *hē'*, but in the Espanca alphabet (J.25.1) occurs among the subsidiary signs, goes without proper transliteration in *MLH IV*, and is suggested by Koch 2010, 206 to represent the value *ha*. Contrarily, de Hoz 1991, 682 placed it in his grid of the signary on the place of *i*, however, without conviction as on the previous page 681 the given value is replaced by a question mark. In my opinion, these doubts are not necessary, as, within the wider Mediterranean context, the use of Phoenician *hē'* for the vowel *i* is paralleled for the Lycian alphabet (Hajnal 1995, 7-8). All in all, then, we arrive at the following grid of the signary of the Southwest Iberian script (Fig. 1):



		k-	p-	t-	b	l	m	n	r	ś	s
a	A	∧		X	9	1	ζ	γ	4	M	≠
e	o	∣	∩	⊞			μ				
i	4 7	∩	∩	4			γ				
í			↑	⊙	⊙						
ì				↑							
o	≠	⊞	□	∧	D						
u	4	⊞		Δ							
sol	 			&	3						

Fig. 1. Overview of the signary of the Southwest Iberian script.

Section C: Selected inscriptions

In connection with the archaeological context, it is observed by Koch (2011, 38) that “many of the stones were found in or near Early Iron Age necropoleis,” from which observation he deduces that “so it appears that they are mainly funerary inscriptions”. In one case, that of the stele from Abóbada (J.12.1), Koch (2010, 199) is particularly specific in this respect as the stone has been found “placed directly over a large jar filled with cremated remains”. The conclusion, however, that the contents of most texts therefore must be funerary in nature is short-sighted. In the first place, it does not affect the inscription from Alacalá del Río (J.53.1), which is not a rectangular stone stele, but an oval shaped platform for a dedication. Secondly, it should be realized that, as duly stressed by Powell (1980, 168), religious and funerary practices were concentrated in the sacred places of the Celts, addressed to in the relevant literature as *drunemeton* (= a sacred grove), and that, in accordance with the evidence afforded by Powell (1989, 174-175 with fig. 126), one can find built sanctuaries with cremations. Finally, complications surely arise from the fact that stones were reused in the course of time, as can be argued persuasively for the stele from Abóbada (J.12.1). In this particular case close examination of the object points out that in the figurative scene depicting an armed warrior on a platform, which, in the light of the parallels, presumably represents a chariot, the afore-said platform is intersected by the lines forming the frame for the inscription, which therefore must have been added secondarily (see the excellent photographs in Koch 2010, 232; Koch 2011, 50; Koch 2013a, 73-75). All in all, then, texts of a non-funerary, but, for example, dedicatory nature should not be ruled out beforehand.

Notwithstanding this, it deserves our attention that the lower side of rectangular stones is usually left uninscribed, because this part was placed in the ground in order to keep the stele upright.

All texts are in *scriptio continua*, and accordingly the distinction of the individual words and linguistic elements needs to be argued case for case. As far as dating is concerned, Koch (2010, 199-200) tends to assign the inscriptions to the overall period of the 7th to 5th or 4th century BC. As we have already noted, the figurative scene of the Abóbada stele is older than the inscription, and may well date its primary use into the 8th century BC. The same verdict does not apply to its inscription, which is added afterwards. In regard to the seeping in of signs from the Celtiberian script, like that of *m*₂ in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho and one from Pardieiro (J.15.1), some of the inscriptions may well be of a later date than assumed thus far, like the 2nd or even 1st century BC, which inference coincides with our reading of **romati-* “Roman, from Rome” in the selected inscription from Mealha Nova (J.18.1), for which the end of the Second Punic War in 201 BC may well serve as a *terminus post quem*. A similar late dating may, as observed in note 3 above, apply to the inscription from Barradas which is conducted in *p*-Celtic in contradistinction of the otherwise *q*-Celtic nature of the Southwest Iberian language.

I. BILATERAL DEDICATIONS

(1) J.53.1 **Alcalá del Río** (56 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 339-340; Koch 2010, 251-252; Koch 2011, 85-87; Koch 2013a, 114-115.

Drawings: *MLH* IV, 340; Koch 2010, 251; Koch 2011, 86; Koch 2013a, 115.

Description: oval shaped platform for a dedicatory object; the first part of the inscription follows the curve of the stone and runs in left-to-right direction of writing (1), whereas the second line is put in the remaining open space, starting near the beginning of the first part and running *boustrophedon*-wise in right-to-left direction of writing (2).

1. *ko-tu-u a-r-a-te-e-tu-n-pí-i-te-s & a-n-o-r m-a-s-e-ta-a-l-a
ke-e-n-tí-i r-a-í-a ka-a-ś-e-ta-a-n-a*
2. *po-tó ko-o-i tó-o-pi-a-r-í-te*

1. “What the (inhabitant)s (of the region) along the Dedunbaitis and the man from the Meseta, tin-master on behalf of the people (and) king (of the afore-said country Meseta),
2. (what they) have made (as an offering) for themselves – (he) who (= the tin-master) (also made so) for/on behalf of (the capital) Botorrita”.

Comments

kotuu: N-A(n) sg. of the relative pronoun *ko(o)-* or *kuuo-* “who, what”, corresponding to Latin *quod*. Cf. also the Celtiberian forms of the relative pronoun *ku-* or *kue-*, see Woudhuizen 2015.

arateetunpiites: N(m/f) pl. in *-es* of the consonant stems of the composite *Arateetunpiit-*, consisting of the preposition *ara* < **para* “along” (< PIE **per-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]) and the river name *teetunpiit-*, the latter component of which corresponds to Greek Βαῖτις, the ancient name of the Guadalquivir River. Accordingly, after the pattern of Gaulish *Aresequani* “the (inhabitant)s (living) along the Seine” (Delamarre 2003, 52), we arrive at the interpretation “the (inhabitant)s (of the region) along the Dedunbaitis”. On the basis of this form, it can be deduced that the Southwest Iberian language is, as typical for Celtic more in general, characterized by the loss of *p*-initial. Furthermore, owing to the reference to the ancient name of the Guadalquivir River, the possibility that we are dealing here with an importation from southern Portugal, the region where most Southwest Iberian inscriptions were found, can be positively ruled out. As a consequence, it may safely be deduced that, in line with Koch’s assertion, Southwest Iberian is indeed the language of the inhabitants of Tartessos, which country according to the reconstruction by Adolf Schulten (1922; 1950) entailed the entire region from the area of the lower Guadalquivir west of Cadiz to that of Huelva situated near the lower Guadiana.

&: sign not in Espanca alphabet (J.25.1) and otherwise unknown, suggesting an *ad hoc* solution by the scribe to express parity between the two counterparts involved in the dedication comparable to our modern &.

anor: endingless N(m/f) sg. of the noun *anor*- “man”, corresponding to Greek ἀνήρ, G ἀνδρός of the same meaning (< PIE **h₂ner-*; cf. Delamarre 2003, 235; Fortson 2004, 71). Against the backdrop that forms like *Nerii* and *Nerti-* in the realm of onomastics also bear testimony of a reflex of the PIE root **h₂ner-* (see below), it may reasonably be argued that such reflexes in the realm of vocabulary, viz. *anor-* and its counterpart *anir-* in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho, are to be distinguished from the former category. For the use of *anor* “man” as an honorific title, which also holds good for its equivalent *anir-* as attested for the Mesas do Castelinho inscription, cf. Sumerian LÚ, Luwian hieroglyphic *ḫarmahī-*, etc.

masetaala: endingless N(m/f) sg. of an adjectival derivative in *-l-* of the geographic name *Maseta*- “Meseta”. As in the latter region the Celtiberian inscriptions are found, the counterpart in the present dedication is likely to be identified as a Celtiberian functionary.

keentii: D sg. of the noun *keent-* “people”, corresponding to Latin *gens*, G *gentis* of the same meaning < PIE **ǵenh₁-* “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373-374). Cf. Wodtko (2000, 178-182) for the related Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*.

raia: D sg. of the root *rai-*, corresponding to Welsh *rhi*⁴ and Old Irish *rí* “king” < PIE **reǵ-* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 854-855; cf. Delamarre 2003, 261). The problem with this form is that, as we will see in the discussion of Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1) below, the regular reflex of PIE **reǵ-* is *reka-* as in the G sg. of the participle *rekaaⁿtiiś* “during the reign”, corresponding to Latin *regentis* of the same meaning. Are we confronted here with a Gaulish loan? Or do we have here evidence for a tendency of the voiced velar *g* to be dropped similar to the one attested in Celtiberian, as exemplified by *tuateroś* (G sg.) *tua[t]tereś* (N pl.) < PIE **d^hugh₂ter-* “daughter” from Botorrita 3 (K.1.3, III, 24; II, 40), and TNs in *-bria* alongside those in *-briga* < PIE **b^hṛǵ^h-* “high” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 140-141; Fortson 2004, 340) as attested for indigenous Celtiberian coin legends like *Nertobis* “Nertobriga” (A.50) occurring alongside *Śekobirikes* “Segobriga” (A.89) (for the Celtiberian coins, see Untermann 1975 [= MLH I]) as well as TNs in Latin script like *Augustabria*, *Caliabria*, etc. occurring alongside the aforesaid *Nertobriga*, *Segobriga*, etc. (Villar 1995, 22 [with some more examples, like the variants of the following personal names: *Mailo* alongside *Magilo* and *Meiduenus* alongside *Medugenus*]; Jordán 1998, 29-30)? In any case it is clear that a similar loss of the voiced velar typifies the form *rino* < Gaulish *rig-*

⁴ According to professor Meid in his letter of November 3, 2011, the form *rhi* is Welsh as indicated by Delamarre by the abbreviation gall. (instead of gaul.) and as coincides with Jordán 2004, 57, 308.

ani or *rigana* “queen” (Koch 2013a, 215; cf. Delamarre 2003, 258) in the inscription from Barradas (J.5.1), see discussion below.

kaasetaana: endingless N(m/f) sg. of a root which, thanks to its formal resemblance to Celtic *casidanos* “tin-master” (Delamarre 2003, 108) as established by Koch (2009b, 346; 2010, 274-275; 2011, 85-87, 126; Koch 2013a: 184), can be positively identified as the honorific title or occupational term of the “man (from) the Meseta”.

potó: 3rd pers. pl. of the middle- passive of the past tense in *-ⁿto* (cf. Greek ἐλόοντο) of the verbal root *po(ia)-* “to make (as an offering), do”, bearing a striking resemblance to that of Greek ποιέω of the same meaning. For the suppression of the writing of the *n* before *t* in Southwest Iberian, cf. **Numaⁿt-* from Abóbada (J.12.1), and *rekaaⁿtúis*, *pooiⁿt(e)*, and *Beⁿtasiioonii* from Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1) as discussed below.

kooi: N(m/f) sg. of the relative pronoun *ko(o)-* or *kuuo-* “who, what”, corresponding to archaic Latin *qoi* (< PIE **k^we-*, *k^wo-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 644]) of the same function. Cf. also the Celtiberian forms of the relative pronoun *ku-* or *kue-*, see Woudhuizen 2015.

tóopiaríte: D sg. in *-e*, of what in the light of the parallels should most likely be analyzed as an *i*-stem of a formation which, if our assumption is right, should appear as **Tóopiaritis* in the nominative. It so happens, however, that the closest correspondence to the element *rite* is provided by the entry *rita* in an Celtiberian inscription from Gruissan (K.17.1). This is preceded here by the abbreviation *ke* for *ken(t)-* “tribe”. In line with this comparison we would arrive at the interpretation of *rite* as a D sg. of a tribal name from the region of the Meseta (cf. Jordán 1998, 132). On the other hand, it so happens that *rita* is also the final element of the TN *Botorrita* (= Celtiberian *kontebakom belaiskom* or Roman *Contrebia Belaisca* [Jordán 2004, 197, 200-201]), where the longest Celtiberian inscriptions have been found and which no doubt functioned as a capital of the region. Accordingly, it might reasonably be argued that *Tóopiarit-*, by means of metathesis of the first two consonants (so *Tópia-* actually represents *Potia-*), is a reflex of the TN *Botorrita*. If this latter suggestion is considered a plausible one, it necessarily follows that the D sg. ending *-e* is not confined to the *i*-stems, but also applied in other stems, here most likely a consonant stem. In any case, considering its location along a river, viz. the Huerva, a tributary of the Ebro, the second element of the TN *Botorrita* no doubt corresponds to Gaulish *ritu-* “ford, river-crossing” < PIE **prt-* (Delamarre 2003, 259).

(2) [no number] **Mesas do Castelinho** (84 signs + 4 reconstructed ones)

Editions: Guerra 2010, 67-74; Koch 2011, 43-45; Koch 2013a, 125-128.

Photos: Guerra 2010, 70, 3.2 and 3.3.

Drawings: Guerra 2010, 71, 3.4; Koch 2011, 44; Koch 2013a, 127.

Description: rectangular stone stele, somewhat rounded at the top side, incised with bands to contain the inscription, which starts at the lower right side in right-

to-left direction of writing, runs all along the outer margin of the stone up till the starting point (1a-b), and then continues in the same direction of writing in two lines at the right side of the open space in the middle (2) in order to end up in left-to-right direction of writing in the third line in this particular space (3).

- 1a. *tí -i-l-e te-u-r-po-u-a-r-ka-a-s -ta-a m₂-u-te-e-m-a-n*
- 1b. *tí -i-l-e po-o-i-i-r e-r-o-m-a-r-e-n-a-i ke[-e-n-tí-i] l-a-tí-i-u-u-í*
2. *l-i-i-ḫ-i-a-n-i-i -ta-a e a-n-i-r-a ka-a-l-te-e -ta-a o*
3. *b-e-s-a-r-u sol-a-n*

1. “At that (meeting): the oral agreement also on the divine-oxen-fund, at that (meeting) they have made (this as sacrifice) to the hero of the coastal people:
2. (i.e.) on the one hand the Libians and on the other hand for this occasion the man on behalf of the Celt: so
3. (they have made it [= the agreement] as) an out-of-free-will-binding solar sacrifice”.

Comments

The elucidation of this text should take recurrent elements as its starting point. In the first place, it deserves our attention that the combination *tí-i-l-e* at the start recurs later on in section (1), and hence may be considered to introduce a phrase or part of a phrase. Secondly, the sequence *e-r-o-m-a-r-e-n-a-i ke[-e-n-tí-i]* is a familiar element of other Southwest Iberian inscriptions and as such easy to emend. In the third place, it is conspicuous that in section (2) two elements are followed by the sequence *-ta-a*, which in accordance with this observation may reasonably be assumed to function as an enclitic conjunction related to the non-enclitic PIE conjunction **eti* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 344) represented by Hittite *ta* (Friedrich 1974, 161) and Latin *et* “and” (the enclitic variant in the realm of IE Anatolian is Luwian *-ḫawa* and in Latin *-que* “and” < PIE **-k^we*). Note that this same element likely appears in the first part of section (1) as well. If our analysis of the element *-ta-a* applies, the structure of section (2) confronts us with the coordination of the sequences *l-i-i-ḫ-i-a-n-i-i* and *a-n-i-r-a ka-a-l-te-e* after the pattern: X as well as Y. A final recurrent element may be traced in the combination *po-o-i-i-r*, which in the light of the parallels comes into consideration as a verbal form based on the root *po(ia)-* “to make, do”, bearing a striking resemblance to that of Greek *ποιέω* of the same meaning. If so, its ending in *-r*, considering its possible relationship to Hittite *-ir* or *-er* (Friedrich 1974, 77) and Latin *-re* as in *vīdēre* (Beekes 1990, 282), no doubt expresses the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense. At any rate, such an inference coincides with the plural nature of section (2), which, along this line of reasoning, may contain the subject of the phrase. Now, it is of course highly attractive to explain the form *l-i-i-ḫ-i-a-n-i-i*, notwithstanding the uncertainty about the *b*, as a N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the o-stem of the ethnonym Libian, hence “the Libians” against the backdrop of the Celtiberian legend *Libiaka* as attested for two inscriptions of unfortunately unspecified

find spot (K.0.4 and K.0.5), which confronts us with an adjectival derivative in *-ako-* of the TN *Libia* (Untermann/Wodtko 1997 [= *MLH* IV], 545) as recorded for the region east of Zaragoza along the Ebro-river and identified with present-day Herramélluri in the Rioja-region. At any rate, the population in the region of this town is referred to by Plinius, *Plin. Nat.* 3.3.24 as *Libienses* (Jordán 1998, 146). The counterpart in this particular dedication must be traced in the sequence *e a-n-i-r-a ka-a-l-te-e*. In this sequence we come across the familiar elements *Kaaltee*, which is also present in Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1) discussed below and rightly explained by Koch as a form related to the ethnonym Κελτοί, *Galatae*, etc. (Koch 2010, 188; 2013a, 182). Furthermore, against the backdrop of the Greek variant form ἀνέρα alongside regular A(m) sg. ἄνδρα (Koch 2011, 70), the preceding *anira* may well come into consideration as a variant of *anor* “man” from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1), which, as we have seen in the above, strikingly recalls Greek ἀνήρ (< PIE **h₂ner-*). The only drawback to this line of reasoning is formed by the fact that Greek ἀνέρα renders the A(m) sg., whereas for its parity with the patent N(m/f) pl. *Liibianii* in the structure of the text it cannot be assumed otherwise than that it is used for the N(m/f) sg. here. Furthermore, the associated *Kaaltee* is, on the analogy of its use in Fonte Velha 6, likely to be analyzed as a D sg. in *-e* of the *i*-stems, so the man in question is stated to act “on behalf of the Celt”, in which it is unclear whether the form expresses an adjectival meaning, “Celt(ic side)” or is used for the expression of a plural one, “Celt(s)”. However this may be, the preceding *e* surely represents a separate element of pronominal nature, related to the Latin pronoun of the 3rd person *is, ea, id*. To all probability the form in question represents the D sg. **ei* and hence underlines that “the man on behalf of the Celt” functions as such “for the occasion” at hand. Now, it seems clear that with the ethnonym *Kaaltee* reference is made to the Southwest Iberian counterpart in this bilateral dedication, who accordingly consider themselves to be Celts. Furthermore, it seems clear that the object is expressed by *m₂-u-te-e-m-a-n*, which form is characterized by the A(m/f) sg. in *-n* and the root of which recalls Greek μύθημα “story”, perhaps used here for “oral agreement”. Finally, the indirect object is, notwithstanding the fact that the final *i* is uncertain, likely to be traced in the sequence *l-a-tí-i-u-u-i*, no doubt a D sg. in *-i* of the *o*-stems of the root *latíuu-*, corresponding to Gaulish *latis* “hero” (Delamarre 2003, 197-198).

Recapitulating the foregoing exposé, then, we accordingly arrive at the following interpretation of the inscription in its bare outline: *Liibianii -taa e anira Kaaltee -taa* “on the one hand the Libians and on the other hand for this occasion the man on behalf of the Celt” *pooiir* “have made” *m₂uteeman* “the oral agreement” *latíuuí* “for the hero”.

In an attempt to fill in the remaining parts, it first of all is clear that the sequence *e-r-o-m-a-r-e-n-a-i ke[-e-n-tí-i]* corresponds to the indirect object *latíuuí* and defines the hero in question as being of the “coastal people”. At any rate, there can be little doubt that *eromarenai* renders the D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stems of an adjectival derivative in *-na-* of the composite *eromare-*, of which, on the analo-

gy of Gaulish *Aremorici* “the (inhabitant)s (living) along the sea” (Delamarre 2003, 52), the first element *ero-* consists of a writing variant of *ara-* < **para* “along” (< PIE **per-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]) and the second element *mare-* shows a reflex of PIE **mori-* “sea” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 748), whereas *keentū* is the D sg in *-i* of the consonant stems of the noun *keent-* “people”, corresponding to Latin *gens*, G *gentis* of the same meaning < PIE **ǵenh₁-* “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373; cf. Wodtko 2000, 178-182 for Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*). So, in sum we arrive at the translation of the indirect object as: “for the hero of the coastal people”.

Much harder nuts to crack are the residual sequences *tí-i-l-e*, *te-u-r-po-u-a-r-ka-a-s* and *o b-e-s-a-r-u sol-a-n*. I suggest the following solutions:

tí -i-le: a combination of the preposition *tí-* “at”, related to Lydian *tí-* as in *tí-Sardi₁* “at Sardis” and Dutch *t(e)-* as in *t(e)huis* “at home” and *thans* (< *te-hants*) “directly, now (lit.: at hand)” (< PIE **de-* “at” with reflexes in Celtic, see Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 181-182), with the D sg. of the demonstrative pronoun *ile*, corresponding to Latin *illi*. If so, we arrive at the meaning “at that”, which must be a reference to the meeting of the counterparts when they decided to make their oral agreement.

te-u-r-po-u-a-r-ka-a-s: I analyze this as a compound consisting of the three elements. In the first place, the final part *a-r-ka-a-s* renders the G sg. in *-s* of the noun *arka-*, corresponding to Latin *arca* “fund”. Next, the first part *te-u-r-* is likely to be based on PIE **diyēw-* “(sky)god” (cf. Fortson 2004, 61, etc.; Mallory/Adams 2007, 329), and should perhaps be taken for an adjectival derivative meaning “divine”. Thirdly, the element *po-u-* in the middle strikingly recalls the first element of Celtiberian *pouštom* “cow-shed” (Meid 1993, 106), and therefore to all probability likewise originates from PIE **g^wou-* “ox” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 482). The meaning of the combination in its entirety in this manner appears to be “of the divine-oxen-fund”, which specifies the exact nature of the object *m.uteeman* “oral agreement”, or, as may be stressed by the enclitic *-taa*, here rather “also” than “and”, a part of it (in which case the G sg. functions as a partitive).

o b-e-s-a-r-u sol-a-n: this sequence, which is set apart by being largely conducted in a different direction of writing, in my opinion presents an additional clause, introduced by *o*, which reflects Greek ὅς “so, in this manner”. The final element, characterized by a solar symbol which probably confronts us with a variant writing of the one recorded for Mealha Nova 1 (J.18.1) discussed below, just like in the latter instance is marked by the A(m/f) sg. in *-n*, and as such likely functions as an object; perhaps, within the given context, we should think of a solar sacrifice. This leaves us with *besaru*, which I am inclined to analyze as a compound of Gaulish *bessu-* < PIE **b^hend^h-* “to bind” (Delamarre 2003, 74) with *aru-*, a root which reoccurs in the form *arune* of Cerro dos Enforcados, and from an Indo-European point of view might be considered related to Luvian hieroglyphic and Lycian *arawa-* “freedom” (Melchert 2004, 4) and Lycian *aru-* “(free) citizen” (Xanthos trilingual, lines 5-7). If so, we appear to be dealing here

with a solar sacrifice which is specified by a complex adjective to be “out-of-free-will-binding”. Note that the fund for the divine oxen, to which the agreement is restricted, in this manner is addressed as (being reserved for) a solar sacrifice, in which context I cannot resist the temptation to remind the reader to the Homeric expression Ἡελίου βόεξ “the oxen of Helios” (Hom. *Od.* 12, 343, etc.).

Note with respect to the foregoing 2 inscriptions that relations of the Tartessians with the Celtiberians are recorded in our historical sources at the time of the Carthaginian invasion of Iberia under the leadership of Hamilcar, the father of Hannibal, from 237 BC onwards, see D.S. 25.10.1, where it is related that Hamilcar defeated a coalition of Tartessians, Iberians, and Celtiberians headed by the king of the latter, *Istolatio*s (for the suggestion that second element of this name is based on Gaulish *latis* “hero”, which we just came across as *latiui* in the dative case in phrase 1b of the inscription of Mesas do Castelinho, see Delamarre 2003, 197-198).

(3) J.1.1 **Fonte Velha 6** (75 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 204-208; Koch 2010, 210-211; Koch 2013a, 29-33.

Photos: Harrison 1988, 142, Fig. 95; Koch 2010, 210 (right side); Koch 2013a, 30 (right side).

Drawings: Schmoll 1961, 53, Nr. 15; cf. Harrison 1988, 143, Fig. 97, No. 305; *MLH* IV, 206; Koch 2010, 210 (left side); Koch 2011, 30; Koch 2013a, 30 (left side).

Description: rectangular stone stele incised with bands to contain the inscription, which starts at the lower right side and runs in right-to-left direction of writing along the outer margins of the stone and continues in the same direction of writing in an inner band covering three sides only. Note that the linguistic entities distinguished do not match with the distinction between the outer and the inner band, but that the first part of the text (1) is directly followed by the second (2), which runs from the lower left corner of the outer band up to the end of the text in the lower left side of the inner band.

1. *l-o-ko-o-po-o n-i-i-r-a-po-o í-o a-i a-i-r-i-ka-a-l-te-e*
l-o-ko-o-n-a-n-e-n-a-i r-e-ka-a-ti-i-ś
2. *i-i-n-ko-o-l-o po-o-i-i-t(e) e-r-o-m-a-r-e b-e-t(e)-a-s-i-i-o-o-n-i-i*

1. “During the reign Airikeltis of the Lugonamena(-people) over the Lugii (and Nerii, who (sent an envoy) for (the occasion),
2. the inhabitants have made (as a sacrifice) to the coastal Bendasio”.

Comments

At the outset of the discussion of this inscription it should be stressed that, although positioned in a damaged spot, the reading of *r* in *r-e-ka-a-ti-i-ś* is ascertained by the photograph published by Koch (2010, 210), lower right side, and

adopted in the transcription of the text by, for example, Harrison 1988, 143, Fig. 97, No. 305.

Now, having established this, it next can be observed that close analysis of this inscription points out that it consists of two sections: (1) a dating formula, singled out as such by the participle *rekaaⁿtiś*, corresponding to the Latin G sg. *regentis* “during the time while reigning”, translated here as a temporal genitive (cf. *rekiioś* from the Sasamón-inscription [K.14.1] for a Celtiberian equivalent of a dating formula); and (2) the actual dedication or offering, in which the key-role is played by the verb *pooiⁿt(e)*, the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense in *-ⁿt* of the root *po(ia)-* “to make, do” – here used, as in the previously discussed inscriptions in which it appears, with the religious connotation of making a sacrifice or offering –, bearing a striking resemblance to Greek *ποιέω* with the same meaning.

The participle *rekaaⁿtiś* is associated with a personal name in the D sg. in *-e* of the *i*-stems *Airikaaltee*. This personal name in turn is grammatically lined with the D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stems *Lokoonanenai*, which to all probability is to be taken for a tribal name. Note that the latter suggestion can be reinforced by the observation that the element *-nena-* likely stands for *-mena-* as attested for the tribal name *Tiirtoosiemana-* in Fonte Velha 3 (J.1.2) and the pseudo-tribal name *Maremana-* “maritime” in Mealha Nova 1 (J.18.1). Note in this connection that the use of the D sg. in the name-formula contrast with the case used in connection with the participle *rekaaⁿtiś*, which we have just shown to render the G sg. In any case, the dating-formula is preceded by two forms rightly analyzed by John Koch (2011, 32-33; 2013a, 31-32) as being characterized by the D pl. in *-po*, *Lokoopo Niirapo*. Moreover, the root of the latter is plausibly identified by Koch (2011, 211; 2013a, 204) as a reflex of the ethnonym *Nerioi* or *Nerii*, a tribe of the Celtici in the northwest corner of Spain after whom *promontorium Nerium*, the present-day Cape Nariga near Coruña is named (see *RE*, s.v.; cf. cover illustration of Koch 2013a). However, if the second element of this combination can positively be identified as an ethnonym, the same no doubt applies also to the first element, which accordingly, contra to Koch’s divine *Lugoues* (plural of *Lug*), refers to a Celtic tribe *Lougoi* or *Lugii* named after the god *Lug* as actually encountered in other parts of the Celtic world outside Iberia proper (Scotland and north of Bohemia, see Ptol. *Geog.* 2.3.12, 11.10). In sum, then, the dating-formula runs as follows: “during the reign of Airikeltis of the Lugonamena(-people) over the Lugii (and) Nerii”.

This leaves us with the residual elements: *i-o* and *a-i*. Of these, the first cannot be dissociated from the Gaulish relative pronoun *-io* “who” (Delamarre 2003, s.v. *dugiiontiiio*). In case of the second element *ai* we are no doubt dealing with the D sg. of the pronoun of the 3rd person which in monophthongized form *e* we already came across in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho. The expression is obscured by its *brevitas*, but the most likely interpretation is that it were the Lugii and Nerii of the province Galicia in northwest Spain “who for the occasion” had sent an envoy to represent them in the ceremony with which the remainder of the text deals.

Whatever the extent of these latter observations, it is in any case clear that most of the given names are based on well known Celtic onomastic elements, like *Lug-*, a reflex of the name of one of the foremost gods in the Celtic pantheon (< PIE **l(e)ug^h-* “to bind” [cf. Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 687]), in the ethnonym *Lugi* and the gens-name *Lugonamena-* (Delamarre 2003, 211), and *ario-* “free citizen” (< PIE **ario-* or **ar(y)o-* “noble, free” [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 67; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1995, 657-658]), which appears as *aire* in Old Irish (Delamarre 2003, 55) as well as *Keltis*, a reflex of the ethnonym *Κελτοί*, *Galatae*, etc., in *Airikeltis*. Note in this connection that, as already indicated in the context of the occurrence of the element *Kaaltee* in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho, the comparison of root of this form to the given ethnonym is given by Koch (2010, 188; 2013a, 182). Finally, Koch (2013a, 204) rightly traces the root of the ethnonym *Nerioi* or *Nerii* back to PIE **h₂ner-* “man” – with reflexes of which in vocabulary we already were confronted in form of *anor* from the inscription from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1) and *anir-* in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho.

The second part with the actual dedication formula actually consists of a phrase of a quite transparent nature: it starts with the subject, *iinkoolo*, which form presumably represents the N(m/f) pl. of the *o*-stems in *-i*, *iinkooloⁱ*, of which the root corresponds to Latin *incola* “inhabitant”. For clarity’s sake: reference is made here to the local inhabitants as distinguished from foreigners of the first section of the inscription, which hence is of bilateral nature, again. This is followed by the verb *pooiⁿt(e)*, which we have already identified as the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense in *-ⁿt* of the root *po(ia)-* “to make, do”. In third and final position, then, we are dealing with a combination of two forms in the D sg., *eromare* and *Betasiioonii*, the first marked as such by the ending in *-e* of the *i*-stems and the second by that in *-i* of the consonant stems, so that we likely have here the indirect object or more in specific the recipient of the dedication or offering, probably of divine nature. The latter inference can subsequently be further underlined by the identification of the sequence *beta-* at the start of the final form as a reflex of PIE **b^hend^h-* “to bind” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 127) from which the Celtiberian equivalent of the female Thracian GN *Bendis*, viz. *Bandua* or *Bandia* (Schmoll 1959, 42, 80; cf. Anderson 1985, 321, 323), is derived. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the element in question represents *beⁿta-* and that what we have here is a Southwest Iberian counterpart of the given GNs reading *Bendasion*. With the preceding adjective **eromari-* as a shorthand variant of *eromarena-* “coastal”, we are by now familiar owing to its recurrence in the previously discussed inscription from Abóbada (J.12.1).

As a final remark in the context of the treatment of this inscription the reader may be reminded to the fact that in the preceding we have already pointed out the parallels for the (against the backdrop of the recurrent *keent-* “people”) incidental suppression in writing of *n* before *t* in the context of the verbal from *poⁿtó* from Alcalá del Río and the MN **numaⁿt-* from Abóbada, which feature appears to be quite common in the present inscription, being exemplified by *Beⁿtasiioon-*, *pooiⁿt*, and *rekaaⁿtiś*. A similar phenomenon is traceable in Celtiberian, where, alongside its regular writing in *Konterbia*, *tirkantam*, *pionti*, *sisonti*, *ausanto*, and *eśianto*, we

are confronted with the incidental suppression of the writing *n* before *t* in *Kaiskata* alongside *Cascantum*, *kete* alongside *gente*, *Sekotias* alongside Σεγόντια, *steniotes* alongside *Stenionte*, etc., cf. Jordán Cólera 2004, 75-76.

(4) J.22.1 **Cerro dos Enforcados** (28 signs + 2 reconstructed ones)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 316-319; Koch 2010, 246; Koch 2013a, 103-104.

Drawings: Schmoll 1961, 54, Nr. 17; *MLH* IV, 318; Koch 2010, 246; Koch 2013a, 103.

Description: rectangular stone stele incised with a band along the right, top, and upper part of the left side of the stone containing the inscription, which begins at the lower right side and runs in right-to-left direction of writing.

1. *v-a-r-t(e)-o-i i-r<-u>-s a-r-u-n-e e-ʔ<-o>-m-a-r-e-n-a-i*
ke-e-n-i-i

1. “The Oretani have dedicated to the free coastal people”.

Comments

vartoi: N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the *o*-stems of the tribal name *Varto-*, the root of which corresponds to that of the *Oretani*, who are situated in the region in between present-day Estremadura, La Mancha, east Andalusia, and Múrcia, which in effect means the land in between the upper courses of the Guadiana and Guadalquivir Rivers. The northern group of this tribe was known as the Germani, which emphasizes their possible Indo-European nature (Bosch-Gimpera 1939, Map IV; cf. Wikipedia, s.v. *Oretani*). According to Meid (1996, 13) the root of the ethnic is related to Greek ὄρος or οὔρος “mountain”, so designates “mountaineers”.

ir<u>s: 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense of the verb *i-* “to dedicate”, corresponding to Gaulish *iourus* as in the inscription from Saint-Germain-Sources-Seine, reading: *Aresequani Ariios iourus Lucio[n] Nertecoma[ri]* “The (inhabitant)s (living) along the Seine (and) Arios have dedicated the (stele of) Lucios, (the son) of Nertecomaros” (see Delamarre 2003, 188, 335; Meid 1994, 30-33; cf. Meid 1989, 32-35). Note that we are confronted here with the plural variant of *iru* “he has dedicated” from the Abóbada text, which further likely occurs in an inscription from Azinhal dos Mouros (J.7.9: also at the start of the text, like in the one from Abóbada, see Koch 2010, 225) and one from Monte Nova do Visconde (J.23.1: combination at the end of the first section, see Koch 2010, 247 and its treatment below). Note that the verbal root *i-*, notwithstanding Delamarre’s pertinent rejection of this analysis (Delamarre 2003, 189), is traced back by Isaac 1997 to PIE **yē-* or **yeh₁-* (Mallory/Adams 2007, 389) from which, for example, Hittite *iya-* “to make, do”, Greek ἵημι “to place, do” and Latin *iacio* “to erect, build” are derived. According to this analysis, the element *-r-* functions as a marker of a deponens or middle-passive and the ending consists of the 3rd pers. sg. in *-u* or pl. in *-us*.

arune: D sg. in *-e* of the consonant stems of an adjectival derivative in *-n-* of the root *aru-* “free”, which we argued to be present as well in section (3) of the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho.

er<o>marenai: D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stems of the adjective *eromarena-* “coastal”, with which we are already familiar owing to the fact that it is also present in the text from Mesas do Castelinho, discussed in the above.

keenii: D sg. in *-i* of the consonant stems of a variant form *keen-* of the noun *keent-* “people”, which we frequently encountered in the texts discussed previously and of which we noted the correspondence to Latin *gens*, G *gentis* of the same meaning < PIE **ĝenh₁-* “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373-374; cf. Wodtko 2000, 178-182 for the related Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*). Note, however, in this connection that the present form of the noun occurs as second element in the ethnonym *Cilbiceni*, a people associated with the Tartessians in Avienus, 255, see Freeman 2010, 309. As duly remarked by Schulten (1950, 125), the first element of this ethnonym corresponds to Lydian Κίλβοϛ, and its derivatives, Κίλβανοί, and Κίλβιανὸν πεδίων.

(5) J.18.1 **Mealha Nova 1** (33 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 301-303; Koch 2010, 242; Koch 2011, 102-103; Koch 2013a, 94-95.

Drawings: *MLH* IV, 303; Koch 2010, 242; Koch 2011, 103; Koch 2013a, 94; Koch 2013b, 128.

Description: rectangular stone stele with inscription running in right-to-left direction of writing along the edges of the stone, on the left in a somewhat roundish way.

1. *po-o-tí-i sol-a-n a-ke-e-r-to-o r-o-m-a-te-e m-a-r-e-m-a-n-a-i ke-e-n-tí-i*

1. “He (who) will make a solar sacrifice as headman on behalf of the Roman maritime people”.

Comments

poottí: 3rd pers. sg. of the pres./fut. tense in *-ti* of the verb *po(ia)-* “to make, do”, bearing a striking resemblance to Greek ποιέω of the same meaning.

sol-an: A(m/f) sg. in *-n* of the noun *sol-a-*, which, on the analogy of the use of a variant form of the sign *sol* in an otherwise identical formation in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho, likewise refers to a solar sacrifice.

akertoo: endingless N(m/f) sg. of the noun *akertoo-* “headman”, an honorific title which constitutes a derivative in *-to-* of the PIE root **áker-* “high, top” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 20). Reflexes of the same PIE root were also used for the expression of honorific titles in the case of Celtiberian *ocris* “headman” (Meid 1994, 36-37; 1996, 17-18) and, for example, Luwian hieroglyphic *a*194kar-* “headman” (Körkün § 2). If this identification applies, the Southwest Iberian language may, just like its closest relative, Celtiberian on the basis of the

case of **equeisos* < PIE **ek^wo-* “horse” (Meid 1996, 16), for the velar reflex of PIE **k* be identified as a *centum*-language.

romate: D sg. in *-e* of the *i*-stems of the ethnic **Romati-* “Roman”.

maremanai: D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stem of a derivative in *-mana-*, a formation also used in the tribal name *Tiirtoosjemana-* from Fonte Velha 3 (J.1.2, see discussion below), of the root *mare-* < PIE **mori-* “sea” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 748), no doubt expressing the meaning “maritime”.

keentii: D sg. in *-i* of the consonant stems of the noun *keent-* “people”, corresponding, as we have already noted before, to Latin *gens*, G *gentis* of the same meaning < PIE **genh₁-* “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373; cf. Wodtko 2000, 178-182 for Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*).

II. DEDICATIONS MORE IN GENERAL

(6) J.12.1 **Abóbada** (40 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 270-272; Koch 2010, 230-232; Koch 2011, 49-52.

Photos: Koch 2010, 232; Koch 2011, 50.

Drawings: Harrison 1988, 143, Fig. 96; *MLH* IV, 271; Koch 2010, 231.

Description: rectangular stone stele, decorated with a warrior standing on a platform which likely represents a chariot. The figurative scene is enclosed on the right, top, and left side by a band containing an inscription running from the lower right side to the lower left side in right-to-left direction of writing (1), whereas the final part of the inscription is added in the free space to the left while running *boustrophedon*-wise in left-to-right direction of writing (2).

1. *i-r-u a-l-t(e)-u-s-i-e-l-n-a-i ke-e-n-tí-i m₁-u-m-a-t(e)*
2. *e-r-o-m-a-r-e-i a-ta-a-n-e-ṛ-te-e*

1. “Numat(os), on behalf of the Altusielna-people, has dedicated
2. to the coastal (goddess of) regeneration”.

Comments

m₁umat(e): endless N(m/f) sg. of a MN the root of which, on the basis of regressive assimilation, is likely to be identified as **Numaⁿt-* also represented by the Celtiberian TN *Numantia*. For the occasional suppression of the writing of *n* before *t* in Southwest Iberian, cf. *poⁿto* from Alcalá del Río (J.53.1) and the examples of this phenomenon in Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1), both discussed above.

iru: 3rd pers. sg. of the past tense of the verb *i-* “to dedicate”. This form corresponds to Gaulish *ieuru* or *ετορρο* (Delamarre 2003, 188-189) and can also be traced in form of *iró* in the Celtiberian inscription from Sasamón (K.14.1), where, however, it is used for the expression of the plural.

altusielnai keentii: D sg. in *-i* of the tribal name *Altusielna-* and the noun *keent-*

“people”, which we have already noted in the above to be related to Latin *gens*, *G gentis* of the same meaning < PIE **ǵenh₁-* “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373; cf. Wodtke 2000, 178-182 for the related Celtiberian *kenei* [D sg] and *kentis*). As the recipient of the dedication is mentioned in section (2), which is singled out by a change in the direction of writing (see below), the only possible option left for the translation is that the dedicator, Numantos, acted “on behalf of the Altusienna-people”. For the formation in *-sie-*, cf. the tribal name *Tiirtoosjemana-* in Fonte Velha 3 (J.1.2) discussed below.

eromareí atanertee: combination of two forms characterized by the D sg. *-ei* or *-e* of the *i*-stems, and therefore likely functioning as indirect object. The root of the first form, **eromari-*, we have already come across in adjectival variant *eromarena-* and explained, on the close analogy of Gaulish *Aremorici* “the (inhabitant)s (living) along the sea” (Delamarre 2003, 52), as a compound of the preposition *ero*, a variant writing of *ara* < **para* “along” (< PIE **per-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]), with *mare-* < PIE **mori-* “sea” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 748). The root of the second form, **Atanerti-*, also consists of a compound, this time of the prefix *at(a)-* “re-” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 70; Delamarre 2003, 57) attached to the root *nert-* “strength” also present in the Celtiberian TN *Nertobriga*, the Gaulish MN **Nertecomaros*, and the Germanic GN *Nerthus*. Now, the stem *Nert-* is explained as a derivative in *-to-* of the PIE root **h₂ner-* “strength” (Delamarre 2003, 235; Fortson 2004, 71), and should be distinguished, as we noted in the above, from the reflex in the realm of vocabulary of the same PIE root, *anor-* or *anir-* “man” (cf. Greek ἀνήρ). Presumably, we are, against the backdrop of Germanic *Nerthus*, dealing here with a female divine name, literally “the (goddess of) regeneration”⁵. If so, the preceding *eromare-* likely functions as a shorthand variant of the adjectival derivative *eromarena-* and expresses the adjectival meaning “coastal”.

(7) J.5.1 **Barradas** (41 signs; 3x word-divider)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 231-232; Koch 2010, 219-220; Koch 2013a, 48-50.

Drawings: *MLH* IV, 232; Koch 2010, 219; Koch 2013a, 49.

Description: roughly rectangular stone incised with four rudimentarily indicated bands containing the inscription, of which the first three are clustered together whereas the fourth one is set somewhat apart below them. The inscription itself runs *boustrophedon* in the first three lines, while in the fourth line it runs in right-to-left direction of writing. Note the three-times use of a word-divider in the form of a vertical stroke.

⁵ Note in this connection that the goddess in the central scene on the Gundestrup cauldron is not drowning the armed pedestrian men, waiting in a row, in the liquid contained by the cauldron, but *regenerating* or *immortalizing* them, so that, after their treatment, they drive away triumphantly as true heroes on their horse, see Best 1991.

1. *s-a-po-o-i/i-s-ta i-po-o r-i-n-o e-po-o*
2. *a-n-a ke-e-n-a -pe/e/i-po-o-i-i m-a-v m-a-r-tí-i-i*

1. “The Saboi this to the ones (who are) Horse Queen”.
2. “The nobles and people (have dedicated) on this (occasion): horses to the warlike Martis”.

Comments

sapooi: N(m) pl. in *-i* of the noun *sapoo-*, which, against the backdrop of the formally related Greek Σάβοι bearing reference to officials in the cult of *Dionysos Sabazios*, may reasonably be argued to denote some religious group in the local society.

ista: endingless A(f) sg. of the demonstrative pronoun corresponding to Celtiberian *iste* and related to Latin *iste, ista, istud* (Koch 2013a, 180).

ipoo rino: this sequence is likely to be analyzed as a combination of the noun *ipoo-*, corresponding to Greek ἵππος “horse”, with the adjective *rino-*, derived from a reflex of Gaulish *rigani* or *rigana* “queen” (Koch 2013a, 168, 215; cf. Delamarre 2003, 258), of which both elements render the N(m) sg. Note that for the *o*-stems this particular case is endingless, just like in Gaulish inscriptions of late date. The literal meaning of this sequence hence appears to be “queenly horse”. At any rate, it is clear that *ipoo-* “horse” confronts us with a *p*-Celtic reflex of PIE **ek^wo-* (cf. Fortson 2004, 428). Note that the initial vowel [i] is paralleled for the Lusitanian form of address of Gaulish *Epona* (Delamarre 2003, 163), *Icona* (rock inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas). In connection with our interpretation of the initial *Sapooi*, it deserves attention that the goddess *Epona* may reasonably be argued from iconography to have also been venerated by the Thracians.

epoo: D pl. in *-poo* of the pronoun of the 3rd person *e-*, corresponding to Latin *is, ea, id* (< PIE **e-, ei-, i-*, see Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 281).

ana keena -pe: note that the elements of the sequence, of which the second consists of the noun *keena-* “people” with which we are already familiar, are paired by the enclitic conjunction *-pe* “and”. Now, this latter reflex of PIE **-k^we* (see Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 635) also happens to be characteristic for *p*-Celtic (cf. Lepontic *-pe* “and”, see Jordán Cólera 2004, 69) and is therefore fully consistent with *ipoo-* for “horse”. With a view to the context, the first element *ana* may be compared to Gaulish *anaw* “richness” (Delamarre 2003, 45) and have a bearing on the wealthier part of the society, the nobles.

e: D sg. of the pronoun of the 3rd person *e-*, which we already came across in our discussion of the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho where it likewise expressed the meaning “for the occasion”.

ipooii: N(m) pl. in *-i* of the *o*-stems of the noun *ipoo-* “horse”.

mav: abbreviation of the corresponding Southwest Iberian form of Latin *Māvortius* “bellicose, war-like, martial”, an adjective typical for the Latin war-god *Mars*.

martii: D sg. in *-i* of the consonant stems of the divine name *Mart-*, corresponding to the Latin war-god *Mars* (G *Martis*).

III. FUNERAL INSCRIPTIONS

(8) J.23.1 **Monte Nova do Visconde** (39 signs; 2x word-divider)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 321-324; Koch 2010, 247; Koch 2013a, 106-107.

Drawings: *MLH* IV, 323; Koch 2010, 247; Koch 2013a, 107.

Description: rectangular stone inscribed with three lines of text running in right-to-left direction of writing. The first line runs from bottom to top along the right side of the stone bending to the left as far as its last sign is concerned, whereas the second line continues from top to bottom along the left side of the stone. The third section, finally, runs with a slight bend in order to stress its continuation with the preceding part in the free space left in the centre of the stone from bottom to top. Note the two-times use of the word-divider in the form of a vertical stroke.

1. *b-e-tí-i-s-a-i te-e-e m-a-r-e-n-tí-i i-r-u*
2. *a-r-ku-u-i e-l-n-a-i r ke-e/n/u-ś-n-e-e*

1. “The Baetisians and coastal (people) have dedicated
2. to Arkos Elnas because of (his) noble birth”.

Comments

betiisai: N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the *a*-stems (?) of the ethnic *Betiisa-* (or alternatively of the consonant stem *Betiis-*) “Baetisan” referring to inhabitants along the River Βαῖτις, the ancient name of the Guadalquivir-river. Note that the difference of the writing of the basic root *piit-* in *Arateetunpiites* “the (inhabitant)s (of the region) along the Dedunbaitis” in the inscription from Alcalá del Río may be due to a lapse of time between the periods in which these two texts were written down.

tee: coordinative conjunction “and” with which in enclitic variant *-taa* we are already familiar owing to its three times occurrence in the inscription from Mesas do Castelinho.

mentii: N(m/f) pl. in *-i* of the *o*-stems (?) of the ethnic *Marent(o)-* (or alternatively of the consonant stem *Marent-*) “coastal (inhabitant)”, a derivative in *-nt(o)-* or *-nt-* of the noun *mare-* “sea” with which we are already familiar owing to its presence in the composite *eromare-* “coastal” (with *ero* < **para* “along” and *mare-* < **mori-* “sea”) as attested for the inscription from Abóbada (J.12.1) and its derivatives in *-na* as attested for the inscriptions from Mesas do Castelinho and Cerro dos Enforcados (J.22.1), treated in the above. Note that if we are indeed dealing with consonant stems in case of the ethnics in question, viz. *Betiis-* and *Marent-*, we would rather have expected the N(m/f) pl. in *-es*.

iru: 3rd pers. sg. of the past tense of the verb *i-* “to dedicate”. This form corresponds to Gaulish *ieuru* or *εἰωρον* (Delamarre 2003, 188-189) and Celtiberian

íro as attested for the inscription from Sasamón (K.14.1). Note that the latter form is used here for the plural *irus* (Gaulish *iouros*) as reconstructed for the inscription from Cerro dos Enforcados (J.22.1).

arkuui: D sg. in *-i* of the *o*-stems of the praenomen *Arkuu-*, which Koch (2013a, 58, 141, 145) in connection with a wrong reading of the first entry of Ameixial 2 (J.7.6) rightly identifies as “archer”, cf. Latin *arcus* < PIE *h_aérk^wo-* (Mallory/Adams 2007, 246).

elnaí: D sg. in *-i* of the gentilicium *Elna-*.

r: shorthand variant of the preposition *ro* < **pro* (c. D) as attested for sure in the sequence *ro kolione ertaune* “being put on top on behalf of Kolionis” from an inscription from Siruela (J.55.1), with *ertaune* as the Southwest Iberian equivalent of Celtiberian *uertaunei* (Koch 2013a, 117), analyzed by Wolfgang Meid (1993, 37-38, 118-119) as a compound of PIE **uper* “over, above” and PIE **dh_é-* “to put” (cf. Fortson 2004, 71). Note that the legend in question is indeed added on top of an earlier one placed regularly within a band. In the present context the preposition *ro* expresses the meaning “because of”.

keen: shorthand variant of *keenii*, the D sg. in *-i* of *keen-* “people, gens” as attested for Mealha Nova 1 (J.18.1), but more likely to be used here for the expression of the meaning “birth”

usnee: D sg. in *-e* of the *i*-stems of the adjective *usn(i)-* “high”, which is related to Celtiberian *usama* (Οὔζαμα) < PIE **ups-* “high, above” (see Wodtko 2000, 463 ff.; cf. Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 1106-1107).

(9) J.1.2 **Fonte Velha 3** (41 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 209-211; Koch 2010, 211-212; Koch 2011, 104-106.

Drawings: Schmoll 1961, 52, Nr. 13; cf. Harrison 1988, 143, Fig. 97, No. 301; *MLH* IV, 211; Koch 2010, 212; Koch 2011, 106.

Description: rectangular stone stele incised with a band containing the inscription which runs from the lower right side in right-to-left direction of writing along the outer margins of the stone and continues with a line in the inner space up to the upper left side. Like in the case of Fonte Velha 6 (J.1.1.) the linguistic entities distinguished (1 and 2) do not run parallel with the outer and inner sections.

1. *ko-o-r-e-l-i po-o-i-a-tí-i ku-u-o-i*
2. *r-a-v-a-r-m-a-r tí-i-r-to-o-s-i-e-m-a-n-a-i ke-e-n-i*

1. “Who(ever) will make (a sacrifice) to Korelos”.
2. “Rawarmar(os) on behalf of the Tirdosiemana-people”.

Comments

This text consists of two sections: (1) an offering formula, and (2) the name of the dedicator and the tribal name on whose behalf he acted. In the first section, we come across the following elements:

kooreli: D sg. in *-i* of the *o*-stem of the MN **Koorelo-* “Korelos”. This name occurs in variant writing *Corali* in the G sg. of the *o*-stems (Correa 1989, 250, note 53), which confirms the nature of the thematic vowel; cf. also its Celtic patronymic equivalent *Corellius* (Evans 1967, 339).

pooiatii: 3rd pers. sg. of the pres./fut. in *-ti* of the verb *po(ia)-* “to make, do”, which we also encountered frequently in the previously discussed texts.

kuuoi: N(m/f) sg. of the relative pronoun *kuuo-* or, as we traced it in the Alcalá del Río text (J.53.1), *ko(o)-* “who, what”, corresponding to archaic Latin *qoi* (< PIE **k^we-*, *k^wo-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 644]) of the same function. Note also in this context the N-A(n) form *kotuu*, corresponding to Latin *quod*, as found at the outset of the text last mentioned.

Now, this offering formula smacks of its archaic Latin counterpart: *qoi med mitat* “who(ever) sends me”, as attested for the so-called Duenos vase. It urges people who visit the grave to make a proper offering.

The second section presents us with the endingless N(m/f) sg. of the MN *Ravamar*, of which the latter part bears testimony of the Gaulish onomastic element *-maros* “great” (Delamarre 2003, 218-219) < PIE **mōro-* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 704; Fortson 2004, 276). This is followed by the combination of the tribal name *Tiirtoosjemana-* and the variant *keen-* of regular *keent-* “people” which we also came across in the previously discussed inscription, both marked by the D sg. in *-i* of the *a*-stems and consonant stems, respectively. As it seems, then, Ravamar(os) acted in accordance with a decision by his own people, whose name, by the way, is based on a reflex of the PIE numeral **tri-* “3”, or, to be even more exact, against the backdrop of Greek τρίτος “third” < PIE **tr̥tīyo-* “third” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 1090-1091), an ordinal variant of it characterized by the additional morpheme *-to-* (cf. the Celtiberian onomastic element *tirta-*, *tirto-* or *tirtu-*, see Jordán 1998, index s.v.; Jordán 2004, 196). The morpheme *-mana-* at the end comes into consideration of a formans of tribal names; in any case it is, as we already observed in the above, also present in the formation *maremana-*, based on *mare-* “sea” < PIE **mori-* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 748), as encountered in Mealha Nova 1 (J.18.1).

(10) J.7.1 Vale dos Vermelhos 3 (28 signs)

Editions: *MLH* IV, 236-237; Koch 2010, 221.

Drawings: Schmoll 1961, 56, Nr. 25; cf. Harrison 1988, 143, Fig. 97, No. 308; *MLH* IV, 237; Koch 2010, 221.

Description: rectangular stone stele inscribed with an inscription starting at the lower right side and running in right-to-left direction of writing along the right and, somewhat roundish, along the left side of the stone.

1. *a-ś-t(e)-a-po-o-pí-i-r-n-a-i ke-e-n-a-i*
2. *a-ś-t(e)-a-n-a-po-o-l-o-n*

1. “On behalf of the Astapopirna-people”:
2. Astanapolon”.

Comments

This is a very basic text, which only presents us with (1) the name of the dedicator and (2) the tribal name of the people in accordance of whose decision he acted. The first element consists of the endingless N(m/f) sg. of the MN *Astanapoolon*, and the second, which precedes it, shows the tribal name *Astapoopiirna-* in combination with the variant *keena-* of the shorthand version *keen-* we are already acquainted with thanks to its occurrence in the two previously discussed texts of regular *keent-* “people”, both characterized by the D sg. ending in *-i* of the *a*-stems.

On the basis of the close correspondence of the contents of this text with that of the second section in *Fonte Velha 3* (J.1.2), it may reasonably be assumed that the nature of the present inscription is funerary, but this is not certain because, contrary to the latter text, no name of the deceased person is recorded.

Section D: Classification of the language

The following features are of importance for the classification of the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian language:

(1) *akeertoo-* “headman” < PIE **a^hker-* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 20), bearing testimony of the velar reflex of PIE **k̑*.

(2) *arateetunpiites*, *eromare(na)-*, of which the first element *ara-* or *ero-* originates from **para* “along” (< PIE **per-* [Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 812]), and the preposition *ro*, which originates from **pro*, and as such presents us with evidence for the typical Celtic loss of *p*-initial. It deserves our attention in this connection that initial *p-* is preserved in the verbal root *po(ia)-* “to make, do”, which, as we have noted, bears a striking resemblance to Greek ποιέω of the same meaning < PIE **k^wei-* (Mallory/Adams 2007, 220), but the origin of this verbal root is unclear and the initial *p-* is not necessarily to be traced back to labiovelar **k^w* like in the Greek case. In other instances, like *pou-* < **g^wou-* “ox”, which phonetically represents /bou-/, *piit-* in *teetunpiit-* which shows a reflex of the name of the river known from Greek as Βαῖτις, and *tóopiarit-*, which by metathesis of the first two consonants, corresponds to the Celtiberian TN *Botorríta*, *p* represents *b*.

(3) The forms of the relative pronoun, N(m/f) sg. *kuuoi* or *kooi* “who” and N-A(n) sg. *kotuu* “what”, corresponding to Latin *goi* > *qui* and *quod*, respectively, originate from PIE **k^we-*, *k^wo-* (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 644; cf. Beekes 1990, 247), and as such may be considered the hallmark of a *q*-Celtic dialect. Further relevant in this context is the praenomen *Arkuu-* “archer”, which, like Latin *arcus* “bow”, originates from PIE **h₂érk^wo-*. Note, however, that one inscription, namely the one from Barradas (J.5.1), is consistently conducted in *p*-Celtic as deducible from the vocabulary word *ipo-* “horse” < PIE **é^hk^wo-* and the coordinative conjunction *-pe* “and” < PIE **-k^we*.

(4) The development of PIE $*g^w > p$ as exemplified by *pou-* < $*g^wou-$ “ox” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 482), is typical for Celtiberian as well, as it can be traced as a first element in *pouštom* “cow-shed” (Meid 1993, 106). But, what is more, because the proper phonetic reading of *pou-* in both these instances is no doubt /bou-/, this verdict applies to Celtic in general (see Delamarre 2003, 79, 80).

(5a) The origin of the noun *keent-* “people”, which also occurs in shorthand variants *keen-* and *keena-*, from PIE $*ĝenh_1-$ “to procreate” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 373) enables us to argue for a velar reflex of the PIE palatal $*ĝ$. This particular case can be further underlined by the fact that the participle *rekaaⁿtiiš*, corresponding to Latin *regentis*, can be positively traced back to PIE $*reĝ-$ “to direct, rule” (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 854-855; Delamarre 2003, 261). As a *tertium comparationis*, it may be pointed out that the Tartessian royal name Ἀργανθώνιος on the basis of sound arguments is explained in terms of a distorted reflex of the Celtic magistracy *argantodanos* “silver master, exchequer” (Koch 2010, 260; cf. Delamarre 2003, 54), from which it would follow that the word for silver in the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian language is the same as in Celtic (note that Delamarre 2003, 53 explicitly considers the word for silver *sub* Gaulish *argenton* as pan-Celtic, and that Celtiberian should be included here on the basis of *arkanta toutinikum* [magistracy corresponding to the aforesaid Gaulish *argantodanos* “silver-master, exchequer”] and *arkata* “silver”, see Meid 1996, 42 and Meid 2000, 13, respectively). As Celtic *argenton* and related forms originate from PIE $*h_2(e)rĝ-$ “white” (Delamarre 2003, 53), this provides us with yet another case in which the PIE palatal $*ĝ$ is rendered in Southwest Iberian or Tartessian by a velar.

(5b) The only exceptions to the, what appears to be, regular velar reflex of PIE $*ĝ$ are formed by the word *rai-* “king” and the adjective *rino-* “queenly” < PIE $*reĝ-$ “to direct, rule”, according to which the PIE palatal $*ĝ$ has been dropped. But similar forms are traceable in Welsh *rhi* and Old Irish *rí* “king” < PIE $*reĝ-$ (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 854-855; Delamarre 2003, 261), whereas Gaulish in this particular case in the main shows preservation of the velar as in the onomastic element *-rīx* or *-peīξ* or *-piξ* < PIE $*reĝ-$, but note its dropping in the variant *-ris* (Delamarre 2003, 260-261). Against the backdrop of these comparative data we may well be dealing here with late Gaulish loans. Alternatively, this evidence may be indicative of a tendency for the voiced velar to be dropped as further exemplified, for example, by TNs in *-bria* alongside those in *-briga* (< PIE $*b^hrĝh(i)-$ “high”).

(6) *m/b*-interchange is evidenced by the correspondence between Celtiberian *ratubar* and *katubaré* to the Celtic MNs *Ratumāros* and *Catumāros* (Koch 2011, 57). Therefore, it is very well possible that the oldest letter for *m* in form of a vertical zigzag at a certain point in time became pronounced as *b*, but, as we do not know exactly when, it is, at least in my opinion, safest to provisionally stick to the nasal transliteration of this sign – until the time someone can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt when and where the development of nasal *m* to labial *b* had taken place.

Section E: Overview of vocabulary based on a PIE root

In the preceding pages, while discussing a selection of Southwest Iberian or Tartessian inscriptions, we have noted words based on the following Proto-Indo-European roots, featuring in the relevant sources (Pokorny 1959 or 1994, Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1995, Fortson 2004, Mallory/Adams 2007), be it sometimes in slightly adapted form:

Proto-Indo-European	Southwest Iberian
* <i>áker-</i> “high, sharp”	<i>akeertoo-</i> “headman”
* <i>ar(y)o-</i> “noble, free”	<i>airi-</i> “free citizen”
* <i>at(a)-</i> “re-”	<i>ata-</i> “re-”
* <i>b^hend^h-</i> “to bind”	<i>beⁿtasiioon-</i> (GN)
* <i>diyēw-</i> “sky-god”	<i>teur-</i> “divine”
* <i>e-, ei-, i-</i> “the, he”	<i>a-, e-</i> “the, he”
* <i>ékwō-</i> “horse”	<i>ipoo-</i> “horse” (<i>p</i> -Celtic)
* <i>eti</i> “and; also”	<i>-taa-, -tee</i> “and”
* <i>ĝenh₁-</i> “to procreate”	<i>keent-, keen(a)-</i> “people”
* <i>g^wou-</i> “ox”	<i>pou-</i> “ox”
* <i>h₂ner-</i> “strength”	(1) <i>anor-, anir-</i> “man” ⁶ ; (2) <i>Nerii, *(Ata)nerti-</i>
* <i>h₂(e)rĝ-</i> “white”	Ἀργανθώνιος (MN)
* <i>h_aérk^wo-</i> “bow”	<i>Arkuu-</i> “archer” (<i>q</i> -Celtic)
* <i>-k^we</i> “and”	<i>-pe</i> “and” (<i>p</i> -Celtic)
* <i>k^we-, k^wo-</i> “who, what”	<i>k^wuoi/kooi</i> “who”, <i>kotuu</i> “what”
	(<i>q</i> -Celtic)
* <i>l(e)ug^h-</i> “to bind”	<i>lokoo-</i> (onomastic element)
* <i>mori-</i> “sea”	<i>mare-</i> “sea”
* <i>mōro-</i> “great”	<i>-mar-</i> (onomastic element)
* <i>per-</i> “along”	<i>ara-, ero-</i> “along”
* <i>p₁rtu-</i> “ford, river-crossing”	<i>rit-</i> (toponymic element)
* <i>reĝ-</i> “to direct, rule”	(1) <i>rekaaⁿtiiś</i> (G sg. part.) ⁷
	(2) <i>raí-</i> “king”, <i>rino-</i> “queenly”
* <i>t(e)-, ti-</i> “at”	<i>ti-</i> “at” ⁸
* <i>t₁rtiyo-</i> “third”	<i>t₁irtoos-</i> (onomastic element)
* <i>ups-</i> “high”	<i>uśn(i)-</i> “high, noble”

⁶ As noted in the above, distinction should be made in connection with the reflexes of this PIE root between vocabulary words and onomastic elements.

⁷ Note that alongside evidence for preservation of palatal *ĝ as a voiced velar there is also evidence for its incidental loss.

⁸ Related to Anatolian *ti-* as in Kültepe-Kanesh *ti-Smurna* “at Smyrna” and Lydian *ti-Sardi*, “at Sardis” on the one hand and Dutch *t(e)-* as in *t(e)huis* “at home” and *thans* < *te-hants* “directly, now (lit.: at hand)”, and ultimately derived from PIE **de-* “at” with reflexes in Celtic, see Pokorny 1959 or 1994, 181-182.

It may be a somewhat redundant observation, after our classification of the Southwest Iberian or Tartessian language as Celtic, that, like the latter, it definitely belongs to the Indo-European group of languages. But this has been doubted for so long that it is almost impossible to bring about an overkill of the evidence in the matter.

NOUN			
	sg.		pl.
N	—		-i, -es
A	-n		
D	-i, -e(i)		-po
G	-s		
PRONOUN			
	sg.		pl.
N(m/f)	<i>koi, kuoi</i>		
A	<i>ista</i>		
N-A(n)	<i>kotu</i>		
D	<i>ile, ai, e</i>		<i>epo</i>
G			
VERB			
		active	middle-passive
pres/fut.	3rd pers. sg.	<i>poti, poiati</i>	
	3rd pers. pl.		
past tense	3rd pers. sg.	<i>iru</i>	
	3rd pers. pl.	<i>poiⁿt, poir; ir<u>s</i>	<i>poⁿto</i>
participle		<i>rekaⁿt-</i>	

Table I: Overview of the evidence for (pro)nominal declension and verbal conjugation.

Examples of nominal declension

N sg.: *ana* (a-stem), *acerto* (o-stem), *anor* (*anira*), *Astanapolon*, *kena*, *Numat*, *Ravarmar* (c-stems)

A sg.: *m₁uteman* (a-stem), *sol-an*

D sg.: *Altusielnai*, *Astapopirnai*, *Elnai*, *eromarenai*, *Lokonanenai*, *maremanai*, *Tirtosiemanai* (a-stems), *Airikalte*, *Atanerte*, *eromarei*, *eromare*, *Kalte*, *Romate*, *uśne* (i-stems), *Arkui*, *Koreli*, *latiui* (o-stem), *arune*, *Beⁿtasioni*, *ken(a)i/kenti*, *Marti*, *Topiarite* (c-stems)

G sg.: *arkas* (a-stem), *rekaⁿtiś* (c-stem)

N pl.: *Betisai* (a-stem), *inkoloⁱ*, *ipoi*, *Libiani*, *Marenti*, *Sapoi*, *Vartoi* (o-stems), *Aratetunpites* (c-stem)

D pl.: *Lokopo*, *Nirapo* (c-stems)

Distinction of the various endings and stems in accordance with Delamarre (2003, 342-346). For a handy overview of the Celtiberian nominal declension, see Jordán Cólera (1998, 33-34), and note that with respect to the A(m/f) sg. Southwest Iberian, with *-n*, is more closely related to Gaulish than Celtiberian, which applies *-m* for the same function. The same holds true for the D pl. in *-po*, which is closer to Gaulish *-bo* than Celtiberian *-bos*.

As far as verbal conjugation is concerned, Jordán Cólera 1998, 88-89 presents ample evidence for the fact that, like in Southwest Iberian, the 3rd pers. sg. of the pres./fut. is marked in Celtiberian as well by the primary ending in *-ti* (*ampi-tiśeti*, *aśekati*, *auseti*, *capiseti*, *cuati*, *ropiśeti*, *uersoniti*), whereas the pl. counterpart, of which we so far lack evidence in Southwest Iberian, conform Jordán 1998, 91 in the latter language is represented by the expected primary ending in *-nti* (*pionti*, *sisonti*), which also applies to Gaulish *dugionti* “they venerate” (Meid 2010, 21; cf. Delamarre 2003, 337: Alise-Saint-Reine, L-13). Of the secondary endings in *-t* and *-nt* for the 3rd pers. sg. and pl. of the past tense, evidence for the first in our view is still lacking in Southwest Iberian, but traceable in Celtiberian in form of *sistat* “he has placed” as recorded for the inscription from Peñalba de Villastar (K.3.3; see Meid 1994, 36; 1996, 15-16, 18; Jordán Cólera 2004, 148), whereas the first, again, is abundantly represented in Gaulish (αουουωτ, *auuot* “he has made”, Delamarre 2003, 331-332: Alise-Saint-Reine, G-257, Caudebec, L-22, and Saint-Germain-Sources-Seine, G-271; *legasit* “he has offered”, Delamarre 2003, 336, Séraucourt, L-79; *neat* “he has deposited”, Delamarre 2003, 331: Argenton-sur-Creuse, L-78; etc.) and the second turns up at least once here (*senant* “they have accomplished”, see Delamarre 2003, 335: Paris L-14). Comparative evidence for the 3rd pers. pl. of the past tense of the middle-passive in *-nto* in Southwest Iberian from Celtiberian as produced by Jordán Cólera 1998, 91-92, in form of *ausanto* (K.1.3, 01) and *esianto* (K.0.14

or *řes*-bronze), can in the latter case now be positively confirmed (see Woudhuizen 2015). Furthermore, it deserves our attention that the 3rd pers. sg. of the past tense of the verb *i-* “to dedicate”, *iru*, and its 3rd pers. pl. counterpart *ir<u>s* have irreproachable counterparts in Gaulish *ieuru* or ειουρω and *iourus*, respectively, whereas the first mentioned form though used for the expression of the plural is represented by *i’o* in a Celtiberian inscription from Sasamón (K.14.1). Finally, participles in *-nt-* are, to the best of my knowledge, as yet not recorded for Celtiberian and Gaulish.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adiego, I.J. 2007: *The Carian Language* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 86, Section One: The Near and Middle East), Leiden/Boston.
- Anderson, J.M. 1985: Preroman Indo-European Languages of the Hispanic Peninsula, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 87, 319-326.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1990: *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap, Tussen Sanskrit en Nederlands* (Aula Paperback 176), Utrecht.
- Best, J. 1991: The Thracian Connection, Puzzling out the Poem’s Plot, in: Kaul, F./I. Marazov/J. Best/N. de Vries (eds.), *Thracian Tales on the Gundestrup Cauldron*, Amsterdam, 76-89.
- Bosch-Gimpera, P. 1939: *Two Celtic waves in Spain* (The Sir John Rhÿs Memorial Lecture, British Academy), London.
- Brixhe, C./M. Lejeune 1984: *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*, I. Textes, II. Planches, Paris.
- Correa, J.A. 1989: Posibles antropónimos en las inscripciones en escritura del SO. (o tartesia), *Veleia* 6, 243-252.
- Delamarre, X. 2003: *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise, Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris.
- Evans, D.E. 1967: *Gaulish Personal Names, A Study of some Continental Celtic Formations*, Oxford.
- Freeman, P.M. 2010: Ancient References to Tartessos, in: Cunliffe, B./J.T. Koch (eds.), *Celtic from the West* [1], *Alternative Perspectives from Archaeology, Genetics, Language and Literature*, Oxford, 303-334.
- Friedrich, J. 1974 (3. Auflage): *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I*, Heidelberg.
- Fortson IV, B.W. 2004: *Indo-European Language and Culture, An Introduction*, Malden/Oxford/Carlton.
- Gamkrelidze, Th.V./V.V. Ivanov 1995: *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans, A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*, Part I: *The Text*, Part II: *Bibliography, Indexes*, Berlin/New York.
- Gorbachov, Y. 2008: Nine Observations on the Old Phrygian Inscription from Vezirhan, *Kadmos* 47, 91-108.
- Guerra, A. 2010: Newly Discovered Inscriptions from the South-West of the Iberian Peninsula, in: Cunliffe, B./J.T. Koch (eds.), *Celtic from the West* [1], *Alternative Perspectives from Archaeology, Genetics, Language and Literature*, Oxford, 65-79.
- Gusmani, R. 1964: *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Hajnal, I. 1995: *Der lykische Vokalismus*, Graz.
- Harrison, R.J. 1988: *Spain at the Dawn of History: Iberians, Phoenicians and Greeks*, London.
- Hoz, J. de 1991: The Phoenician Origin of the Early Hispanic Scripts, in: Baurain, Cl./C. Bonnet/V. Krings (eds.), *Phoinikeia Grammata, Lire et écrire en Méditerranée, Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15-18 novembre 1989*, Namur, 669-682.

- Hoz, J. de 1997: Schrift und Münzen, Die iberische Schrift, in: *Die Iberer* (Exhibition Catalogue), 207-219.
- Isaac, G.R. 1997: Two Continental Celtic Verbs, *Studia Celtica* 31, 161-171.
- Jeffery, L.H. 1998: *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (= *LSAG*), Oxford (reprint of revised edition with a supplement by A.W. Johnston).
- Jordán Cólera, C. 1998: *Introducción al Celtibérico* (Monografías de Filología Griega 10), Zaragoza.
- Jordán Cólera, C. 2004: *Celtibérico* (Monografías de Filología Griega 16), Zaragoza.
- Koch, J.T. 2009a: Tartessian [1]: *Celtic in the South-west at the Dawn of History* (Celtic Studies Publications 13), Aberystwyth.
- Koch, J.T. 2009b: A Case for Tartessian as a Celtic Language, *Acta Palaeohispanica X/Palaeohispanica* 9, 339-351.
- Koch, J.T. 2010: Paradigm Shift? Interpreting Tartessian as Celtic, in: Cunliffe, B./J.T. Koch (eds.), *Celtic from the West* [1], *Alternative Perspectives from Archaeology, Genetics, Language and Literature*, Oxford, 185-301.
- Koch, J.T. 2011: *Tartessian 2: The Inscription of Mesas do Castelinho, ro and the Verbal Complex, Preliminaries to Historical Phonology*, Aberystwyth.
- Koch, J.T. 2013a: *Tartessian: Celtic in the South-west at the Dawn of History, Second Edition, Revised & Expanded, Including new discoveries & historical linguistic analysis* (Celtic Studies Publications 13), Aberystwyth.
- Koch, J.T. 2013b: Out of the Flow and Ebb of the European Bronze Age: Heroes, Tartessos, and Celtic, in: Koch, J.T./B. Cunliffe (eds.), *Celtic from the West 2, Rethinking the Bronze Age and the Arrival of Indo-European in Atlantic Europe*, Oxford/Oakville, ON, 101-146.
- Mallory, J.P./D.Q. Adams 2007: *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*, Oxford (Reprint of 2006 edition).
- Meid, W. 1989: *Zur Lesung und Deutung gallischer Inschriften* (Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 40), Innsbruck.
- Meid, W. 1993: *Die erste Botorrita-Inschrift, Interpretation eines keltiberischen Sprachdenkmals* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 76), Innsbruck.
- Meid, W. 1994: *Gaulish Inscriptions, Their Interpretation in the Light of Archaeological Evidence and their Value as a Source of Linguistic and Sociological Information* (Archaeolingua, Series Minor 1), Budapest (Second, revised edition).
- Meid, W. 1996: *Kleinere keltiberische Sprachdenkmäler* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 64), Innsbruck.
- Meid, W. 2000: Forschungsbericht, Altkeltische Sprachen, 3. Keltiberisch, *Kratylos* 45, 1-28.
- Meid, W. 2007: *Die Kelten* (Reclams Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 17053), Stuttgart.
- Meid, W. 2010: *The Celts* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Neu Folge, Band 2), Innsbruck.
- Melchert, H.C. 2004: *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor, MI/New York.
MLH = Untermann 1975 and 1997.
- Pokorny, J. 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisch Wörterbuch*. I. Band, Bern.
- Pokorny, J. 1969: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, II. Band, Bern.
- Pokorny, J. 1994 (3. Auflage): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Tübingen/Basel.
- Powell, T.G.E. 1980: *The Celts*, London (New edition).
- RE = Pauly, A.F./G. Wissowa/K. Ziegler (eds) 1894-1980: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 84 vols., Stuttgart.
- Schmoll, U. 1959: *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische*, Wiesbaden.
- Schmoll, U. 1961: *Die südlusitanischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.
- Schulten, A. 1922: *Tartessos, Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens* (Hamburgische Universität, Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde, Band 8, Reihe B: Völkerkunde, Kulturgeschichte und Sprachen, Band 5), Hamburg.
- Schulten, A. 1950: *Tartessos, Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens* (Universität

- Hamburg, Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandkunde, Band 54, Reihe B: Völkerkunde, Kulturgeschichte und Sprachen, Band 30), Hamburg.
- Untermann, J. 1975: *Die Münzlegenden*, 1: *Text*, 2: *Tafeln* (Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum I [= *MLH* I]), Wiesbaden.
- Untermann, J./D.S. Wodtko 1997: *Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*, unter Mitwirkung von Dagmar Wodtko (Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum IV [= *MLH* IV]), Wiesbaden.
- Villar, F. 1995: *A new Interpretation of Celtiberian Grammar* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 62), Innsbruck.
- Wodtko, D.S. 2000: *Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften* (Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum V.1 [= *MLH* V.1]), Wiesbaden.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 2015: Some Celtiberian *Tesserae Hospitales*, *Ollodagos*, *Actes de la Société Belge d'Études Celtiques/Akten van het Belgisch Genootschap voor Keltische Studies* 31, 3-36.

Fred C. Woudhuizen
Het Hoekstuk 69
NL-1852 KX Heiloo
The Netherlands
fredwoudhuizen@yahoo.com