

Quiemonis and the epichoric anthroponymy of Ig

Quiemonis v luči avtohtonih ižanskih osebnih imen

Luka REPANŠEK

Izvleček

Prispevek obravnava osebno ime *Q(u)iemoni(s)*, izpričano na novoodkritem nagrobnem spomeniku iz cerkve sv. Janeza Krstnika v Podkrajju, ki kot *hapax legomenon* predstavlja izjemen doprinos k poznavanju avtohtonih osebnih imen rimskodobnega Iga. Imenu se posveča s stališča epigrafike in etimologije (predlaga se izpeljava iz praindoevropskega korena **k^hieH₁-* ‘umiriti se, spočiti si’ s približnim pomenom latinskega ‘quiētus’), posebna pozornost pa je namenjena njegovi umestitvi v sklopu obširne in zahtevne problematike onomastičnih plasti ižanskega imenskega fonda.

Ključne besede: Slovenija, Ig, Podkraj, rimska doba, epigrafika, osebna imena, etimologija, metodologija

Abstract

The main focus of the article is the personal name *Q(u)iemoni(s)*, recently discovered on a tombstone found in the Church of sv. Janez Krstnik (St. John the Baptist) in Podkraj. Recognising its profound importance for a better understanding of the autochthonous onomastic tradition of Roman-period Ig, the etymological and epigraphic approach to the name (recognised as a derivative of the Proto-Indo-European root **k^hieH₁-* ‘(have a) rest’, probably close in meaning to Latin ‘quiētus’) are coupled with a critical and refined insight into the layered nature of the epichoric anthroponymy.

Keywords: Slovenia, Ig, Podkraj, Roman period, epigraphy, anthroponymy, etymology, methodology

INTRODUCTION

The onomastic tradition handed down on the numerous epigraphic monuments originating from the territory in and around present-day Ig¹ is famous for its conspicuously local character. The

latter is due to the peripheral position of Ig² within the wider North-Adriatic *Namenlandschaft*, which most notably comprises the Venetic, Histrian and

immigrant families from the Ig area (Šašel Kos, personal communication).

² “Ig” here does not refer specifically to the present-day town of Ig but will be used throughout as shorthand for “the Ig area” (Sln. *Ižansko*), as was also the original, older use of this geographical name. Roman stone monuments have been found in and around present-day Brest, Golo, Ig, Iška vas, Kamnik pod Krimom, Matena, Planinca, Podkraj (on the latter secondary find-spot see the contribution by Veranič and Repanšek (2016) in this volume), Pungart, Staje, Strahomer, and Tomišelj.

¹ The tombstones from Emona which feature epichoric names typical of Ig are generally assumed to have been imported from the Ig area (cf. Katičič 1968, 61), but this is not necessarily conclusive. A few *stelae*, which apart from their evident onomastic association with the Ig area betray no absolute signs of importation, may in fact be epichoric and attributed to the local enclave of

Liburnian onomastic systems and terminates to the north-east in the Emona basin. The latter region can properly be viewed as the contact zone between the Pannonian and the North-Adriatic onomastic areals. Secondary bibliography dealing with the onomastic material from Ig is gradually expanding but for the time being still remains exceptionally manageable. The only comprehensive and for that reason also authoritative study is Katičić 1968, building on Katičić 1966, 158–159 *et passim*, and summarised in Katičić 1976, 182–183 (the results of Katičić's studies are reevaluated and slightly revised in Matasović 2003, 12–13). Prior to this, the names were already partly included in Krahe's lexicons (Krahe 1929; id. 1955, *pass.*)³ and occasionally receive a brief mention in Untermann 1961 (a more general outline is provided in § 214). Basing his account on Šašel's unpublished index (now kept at the Institute of Archaeology, ZRC SAZU),⁴ Lochner von Hüttenbach provided the first extensive linguistic treatment of the material in his 1965 article. After more than a decade, Hamp contributed two short studies in the form of a set of commentaries and brief remarks to Lochner-Hüttenbach in 1976 (= Hamp 1976a; the name *Neunt(i)us*, which he does not mention, received a more detailed treatment in the journal *Indogermanische Forschungen* in the same year [Hamp 1976b]) and to Katičić 1968 (Hamp 1978), largely focusing on the supposedly Celtic onomastic traces purported by both preceding investigations. The problem of the Ig onomastic legacy was taken up again by Meid in 2005 in his comprehensive study of Gaulish personal names in Pannonia (see pp. 27–30 for an overview; a significant number of the names are discussed in chapter II.B.3, 250 ff.) and, most recently, by Stifter, who contributed two important studies (2012a and 2012b), largely based on the corpus⁵

³ A number of names from Ig and Šmarata have also been included in Holder's thesaurus (*AcS* I–III) and also occasionally recur in Delamarre 2007, both corpora that on the whole aim to sift through the Celtic linguistic material.

⁴ Note also Šašel's 1955 contribution, which deals with the name *Buccio* (later catalogued in *ILJug* 297) in an innovatory way that in several aspects anticipates Untermann's approach.

⁵ The revised and partly augmented classification of the entire onomastic corpus was first presented in the *European Science Foundation Standing Committee for the Humanities Exploratory Workshop: Personal names in the Western Roman empire*, Cambridge, 16.–18. September 2011 under the title *Linguistic studies of the names from Ig*. The database also includes names from Šmarata,

appended to Stifter 2012b (pp. 261–263).⁶ Stifter's compilation of names is obviously intended to offer a comprehensive and reliable database for further research, so it may be useful to bring the attention to the few mistakes and deficiencies in order to prevent them from spreading to future specialist treatment of the material:

– The tombstone containing the Latin cognomina *Cossuti*, *Secund(a)e* and *Valentis* has been published in Hostnik 1997, no. 24 (however, the monument is wrongly copied there), cf. *Iupa* 5566.

– *Festu Fecun(di)* and *Tertullae Mrti* on a now lost tombstone from Kamnik pod Krimom (*CIL* III 3795) should be added to the list of Roman names, although *Festu* may arguably represent a hybrid name of the *Amatu* type. *Mrti* is unclear and may have been wrongly copied but it is very unlikely to represent a non-Roman name.

– The provenance of *CIL* III 3816 and 10735 = *AIJ* 142 = *RINMS* 88 (*Tertius*, *Eppo*, *Boleriavus* / *Bolerianus* and *Pusilla*) should now be adduced as Podkraj rather than Tomišelj (see Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 312).

– *Buccicu* (*CIL* III 3787) as if for **Bukk-ikūn-* (to an underlying **Bukk-iko-* ← **Bukko-*) is very uncertain and may be a ghost-form. The now lost inscription was copied as *BVCCI / REGA / SVIS / BVCCIC / V [---]*. The same obviously goes for the tentatively assumed compound name *Bucci-rega*.

– The reading *Bolerf* in *CIL* III 3788 = 10727 (= *CIL* III 2328¹⁸⁸) is ultimately uncertain and should not be silently adduced as a further example of the name *Bolerianus* / *Boleriavus* in Ig.

– *Coemo[n]ius* (*CIL* III 3792) should in view of the missing left part of the stele rather be more cautiously adduced as *Coemo/[---]ius*.⁷ The restoration of *n* is very probable, however (there is room for approximately two letters on the missing part of the inscription field).

– The isolated names *Venix* and *Empetonis* (*CIL* III 3820) can on account of the most recently discovered monument, which contains a double occurrence of the hypocoristic **Petton-*: *Petto*

which, however, do not strictly speaking belong here. All the four tombstones from Šmarata received a detailed and reliable treatment in Šašel Kos 2000.

⁶ A very useful overview of all the attested names with painstaking reference to the available corpora is now also offered by Radman-Livaja and Ivezić 2012, 147–151.

⁷ The name is wrongly adduced as a nasal stem *Coemo* in Meid 2005, 191.

(line 1) and *Petonis* (line 6-7),⁸ now unreservedly be read as *Venixem(a)* and *Petonis* = **Pettonis*, as was already anticipated by Krahe 1929, 125 and Katičić 1968, 77 (*contra* Mócsy 1959, 206); see also Stifter 2012a, 543; id. 2012b, 257.

– The isolated gentile name *Poetii* in the second line of *AIJ* 124 from Šmarata should be read *Potei*. The same name also appears in line 6 as *Poteii* and in line 8 as *Po{p}teius* (rather than *Po{r}teius* as in Stifter 2012b, 263).⁹

– *Ruti* (*CIL* III 3821) is probably a ghost. Judging from the ligature, the filiation could either be read *Ruii* or *Ruf(i)*. Note that Šašel (unpublished reading) proposes to restore *Buii*, but this assumption is based solely on analogy and is not at all necessitated paleographically.

– The reading of the sequence of letters in the first and second lines of *AIJ* 125 from Šmarata as *emphVot[Ji* is spurious. The inscription reads *Turoio Nepoti Vot[...] f(ilio)*.¹⁰

– *Volt(ilius)* in *AIJ* 221 (Grosuplje) is used as a fully functional gentilic, regardless of its probable North-Adriatic origin¹¹ and should not be (silently) included in the list of non-Roman names.

Note that Katičić's and Matasović's accounts involve a few incorrect readings and/or ghost-forms as well. These can now be safely regarded as inconsequential to the debate seeing that they have already been taken into account and silently remedied in Stifter 2012b. For the sake of completion of this brief critical overview, however, it will be useful to summarise the main points of departure. Katičić 1968:¹² *Coemoius* for *Coemo[---]ius*, *Cumi* for *[---]cumi*, and *Gio* for *[---]gio* (all *CIL* III 3792); *Etiia* for *filia(e)* (*CIL* III 3874 = *AIJ* 197); *Seciois* for *Secio* (*CIL* III 3810). *Secu* in the same inscription is uncertain, as is *Secu* in *CIL* 3861 = 10758: *et Secu / Secco Emon(i)s*, where, judging from the syntax of the inscription, it could well be a mistake. For *Buccicu*, *Bucirega*, *Venix* and *Poetius* (Šmarata), which have been adopted by Stifter 2012b, see above. Matasović 2003: *Gaulun(i)us* for *Galunus* (*CIL* III 3815 (p. 10731) = *AIJ* 141 = *RINMS* 87) is probably a typographical error. *Seccoemo* (*CIL* III 3861 = 10758) on pp. 13 and 21 is a misreading for

Secco Emon(i) and *Lasalu* (*CIL* III 3817) on p. 13 is an obvious misprint – the name is correctly restored on p. 19 as *Lasaiu*.

THE NAME INVENTORY WITH FURTHER REMARKS ON THE READING

In an equally recapitulatory fashion, a comprehensive overview of the extant name inventory¹³ will be offered here. The following account is devised as an abstract summary of all the names (be it recurring or uniquely attested) in order to provide a reliable *minimal* set of all the involved stems¹⁴ and to outline the system of productive formal means (suffixes). Especially for the latter reason every derivational family has been subsumed under a singular heading (in bold print). The latinised nominative singular form is given first, followed by the reconstruction of the stem-form (preceded by an asterisk). Whenever a particular name is only recorded in the dative or in the genitive singular, the nominative (in its Latin guise) has been restored without explicit recourse to the actually attested form(s).

It is undeniable that the names characteristic of Šmarata are ultimately connected to the onomastic tradition of Ig. Note that Stifter (2012b, 255) questions the separate status of Šmarata on account of the scarcity of the available linguistic material (only four monuments survive!). Indeed, there is no knowing whether names such as *Feucont-* may actually represent infiltrations from adjacent territories, as he rightly points out (cf. the case of *Hostius* in Ig). However, it is not only the presence of *f* where in Ig we would expect a *b* (*vide infra*) which divorces both onomastic traditions. Especially noteworthy is the fact that *Feucont-* stands in collocation with a consider-

⁸ Attested twice in the same inscription: *Petto*, *Petonis* (genitive singular). See the contribution by Ragolić (2016) in this volume.

⁹ Cf. Šašel Kos 2000, no. 2 + p. 99.

¹⁰ See Šašel Kos 2000, no. 4.

¹¹ Cf. Untermann 1961, 128 and 170 (s.v. *voltignos*).

¹² The same applies to Katičić 1966, 158–159.

¹³ *Acinor-* on a votive altar from Staje (*AE* 1997, 571; first published by Lovenjak 1997, no. 4) almost certainly stands for a divine rather than personal name (see Lovenjak, l. c.; Hainzmann, de Bernardo Stempel 2003, 142–144).

¹⁴ Note that it is impossible to determine the original quantity of the nasal suffix *-on-*. All the names in *-ō* come down to us already fully integrated into the 3rd Latin declensional pattern, which has generalized the long variant throughout the paradigm (cf. Lat. *Catō*, *-ōnis*). The vernacular might have had a different distribution, however: either a) long **-ō* in the nominative singular vs. short **-on-* in the rest of the paradigm, or b) a mixed paradigm of the type also found in Venetic, i.e. nom.sg. **-ō*, gen.sg. **-n-os*, dat.sg. **-on-i* ...

able number of other names which only turn up in Šmarata, not lastly the female name *Feva* (again with the initial *f*), which does receive convincing correspondences in Venetic, but its occurrence as a female name in *-ā* is actually unparalleled. Moreover, the use of gentile names clearly connects Šmarata with the rest of the north Adriatic, while the peripheral position of Ig is betrayed by the retention of the old patronymic formula (*vide infra*). It is therefore safe to assume that the characteristics which connect Ig and Šmarata are due to nothing more than the fact that both traditions properly belong to the North-Adriatic complex and that there are in fact no indicators which would allow for a recognition of a special link between the two onomastic micro-regions (cf. Katičić 1968, esp. p. 108; Šašel Kos 2000, p. 99–100; but cf. Stifter 2012a, 539 ft. 2 for a more sceptical view). Conceding that the evidence from Šmarata can thus only have marginal relevance for the names attested in Ig, its name inventory will accordingly be listed separately.

The Ig area and Emona

Adnomatus = **Adnomato-*; *Aico* = **Aik(k)²on-*;
Ama = **Am(m)²ā* (f.); *Amatu* = **Amātūn-* (f.);
Ampo = **Ampon-*;

Beatulo = **Beatul(l)²on-*; *Bolerianus* or *Boleriavus*
= **Boler(-)i-ano-* / **Boler(-)i-avo-*; *Brocc(i)us* =
Brokko-*; *BUG-**: 1 *Buctor* = **Buk-tor-* < **Bug-*
tor-; perhaps also ***BUKKO-**: *Buccus* = **Bukko-* ~
Bucca = **Bukkā* (f.) ~ *Bucco* = **Bukkon-* ~ *Buccio*
= **Bukk-ḡon-* ~ *Buccicu* (?) = **Bukk-ikūn-* (f.) ~
Buquorsa = **Bukuorsā* (f.); 2 *Bugia* = **Bug-iā*
(f.) ~ [*Bu*]gio = **Bug-ḡon-*; *Buiius* = **Buiḡo-* ~
Buiio = **Buiḡon-*; ¹⁵ *Butto* = **Button-*;

Cetetiu (?) = **Ketet-i-ūn-* (f.); *Coemo...ius* =
**Koemo...-ḡo-*; *Cotiu* = **Kot(t)ḡiūn-* (f.); ¹⁶

Decomo = **Dekomon-*; (?) *Deuonti* or *Deuontia*
= **Deuontī* / **Deuontīā* (f.);

Ebonicus = **Eboniko-*; *Ecco* = **Ekkon-*; *Elia*
(?) = **Elīā* (f.); *Emo* = **Em(m)²on-*; ¹⁷ *Eniconis*
or *Enico* = **Eni-koni-* / **En(n)²-ikon-*; *Enignus*
= **Eni-gno-*; ***ENNO-**: *Enno* = **Ennon-* ~ *Enna*
= **Ennā* (f.) ~ *Ennia* = **Enn-iā* (f.); *Eninna* =
**En-innā* (f.); ¹⁸ *Eppo* = **Eppon-*; *Ergiano* or
Ergianus = **Ergiano-* / **Ergianon-*;

Galunus = **Galuno-*;

***OSTI-**: *Ostius* = **Ost(i)ḡo-* ~ *Ostila* = **Ostilā*
(f.);

Laepius (gentilic!) = **Laepḡo-*; (?) *Lasc(i)onti*
or *Lasc(i)ontia* = **Lask(i)ontī* / **Lask(i)ontīā*
(f.); ***LASSO-**: *Lasso* = **Lasson-* ~ *Lassaiu* =
**Lass-aḡiūn-* (f.);

Manu = **Manūn-* (f.); *Moiota* = **Moi(-)otā*
(f.); *Mosso* = **Mosson-*;

Nammo = **Nammon-*; *Neuntius* = **Neuntḡo-*;

***OPPO-**: *Oppa* = **Oppā* ~ *Oppalo* = **Opp-*
alon- ~ *Oppalus* = **Opp-alo-*; *Otto* = **Otton-*;
Ovis = **Oui-* (f.) (*i*-stem!);

Petto = **Petton-*; ¹⁹ *Pl(a)etor* = **Plae-tor-*
~ **Ple-tor-*; *Plunco* = **Plunkon-*; *Provius* =
**Prou(-)ḡo-* (gentilic?);

Rega = **Regā* (f.); ²⁰ *Ruttus* (?) or *Ruiius* (?) =
**Rutto-* / **Ruiḡo-*;

Sacciar(us) = **Sakk-ḡ-ar(o)²-*; *Secco* = **Sekkon-*;
Sennus = **Senno-*; *Sublo* (attested as *Sublo{a}ni*)
= **Sublon-*;

Talsus = **Talso-*; *Tetiu* = **Tetiūn-* (f.); *Tetta*
= **Tettā* (f.);

Uccio (very improbable; see below s.v.); *Uss...*;

Veitro = **Veḡtron-*; *Venixama* = **Veniksamā* (f.)
+ its phonetic variant *Venixema*; *Vibunn(i)²a* =
Vibunn(i)²ā* (f.) (+ gentilic *Vibunnius*); *VOLTO-**:

¹⁵ Geminat **-ḡi-* (expectedly not reflected in writing) is very probable on analogy with other comparable hypocoristic formations.

¹⁶ This female name is a recent discovery (see Ragolič 2016, 282, 284).

¹⁷ The restoration of a geminate *-mm-* is very probable on analogy with other hypocoristic names, cf. **Aikkon-* above.

¹⁸ Assuming alternation in the position of the geminate in a hypocoristic form: **Enn-inā* = **En-innā* (?).

¹⁹ See above for the reference.

²⁰ For *Rec[a]* see *ILJug* 299.

Volta = **Voltā* (f.) ~ *Voltia* = **Volt-īā* (f.) ~ *Volt-an*(*V*?)- ~ *Voltielus* = **Volt-ī-elo-* ~ *Voltaro* = **Volt-aron-* (+ its phonetic variant *Voltaren-*) and (?) *Voltaronti* or *Voltarontis* = **Voltar-ontī* / **Voltarontis* (f.) ~ *Voltofnas* = **Volto-gnā-* or **Volto-gna-* < *-*gno-*; ***VOLTU-**: *Volturex* = *Voltu-rēg-* (+ its phonetic variant **Volte-reg-* and the recurrent syncopated version **Volt-reg-*) ~ *Voltparis* = **Voltu-pari-*.²¹

Šmarata

a – cognomina:

*Feuconts*²² = **Feugont-*; *Feva*[= **Feu(u)ā* (?);²³

Planius = **Plan(-)iō-*; *Pletor* = **Ple-tor-*;

Tatsoria = **Tatsor(-)iā*;

Volta = **Voltā*; *Vot...*;

b – gentilicia:

Lassonius/-a = **Lasson-iō-*;²⁴

Poteiuis = **Potei-iō-*;

perhaps also *Turoius* = **Turo(-)iō-*.

Commentary

Aico

The inscription (*CIL* III 3853) reads *Avitus Aiconi*. It seems safe to assume that we are here dealing with the genitive singular of a hypocoristic formation **Aikkon-* (cf. Pannonian *Aicca*, *RIU* 769), so that the correct restored reading of the inscription should actually be *Avitus Aiconi(s)*. Geminate spelling is frequently disregarded in Ig (the phenomenon seems to have been purely orthographical) and so is the omission of final

²¹ To be added are [---]gio for (...)gio = *(...)gion- and [---]cumi (*CIL* III 3792) for (...)cumus = *(...)kumo- (*CIL* III 3792), both lacking any obvious candidates for identification.

²² The nominative form is impossible to restore with certainty. *Feuconts* = **Feukonts* would have been the expected form, as is also the case in Venetic (cf. *ia.n.t.s.*, *LVen*. Vi 3 = *MLV*, no. 124), but **Feukont* or **Feuko(n)*, both from **Feukonts*, are not inconceivable either. Note that Katičić 1968, 105 restores *Feucon* and Mócsy 1983, 126 has *Feuco*, cf. *OPEL* II, 140. Needless to say, both latter assumptions are equally *ad hoc*.

²³ Probably a hypocoristic form **Feuūā*, cf. Ven. *fo.u.v.o.s.* (*vide infra*).

²⁴ Cf. the individual name *Lasson-* in Ig.

-s in filiation. This makes Katičić's (restoring an *o*-stem *Aiconius*, 1968, 65) and Lochner von Hüttenbach's (1965, 16: *Aicon(i)us*) doubts as to the stem-class of the name obsolete. It may be useful to note that Stifter (2012, 259 ft. 19) has tentatively proposed to derive the place-name *Ig* from a hypothetical **Aīg-*, which according to his view could conceivably represent the starting point for the actually attested hypocoristic variant **Aikkon-*. This etymology is impossible as much as it is incredible. Notwithstanding the numerous phonetic obstacles on the way from a putative Vulgar Latin **Aigu* to Slavic **Igъ*, **Aikkon-* cannot be a hypocoristic formation of a simple **Aigos*, because the latter name would simply be too short to induce the creation of a hypocoristic variant in the first place. It would also be completely unparalleled to derive a place-name directly from a personal name without the use of any suffixes (typically possessive). It is a common misconception (and a much perpetuated one at that) that *Ig* must go back to a pre-Slavic name because it has no convincing etymology within Slavic. This is misconstrued. It is a methodological caveat that non-transparent etymology should not be the main reason for assuming that a name belongs to an unidentified substratum! As a matter of fact, Slav. **Igъ* has received a perfectly legitimate Slavic etymology (Torkar 2007, 250–251). Admittedly, though, a reliable word-formational parallel in the realm of Slavic toponymy is yet to be identified (see Furlan 2013).

Amatu

Clearly a feminine name in *ILJug* 297 and *CIL* III 10741 = *AIJ* 136. *CIL* III 3785 = 10726 is ambiguous, however. The inscription reads *Amatu · f · Volta / ronis · filius · Opalo / Hostius filiu(s) / filia · Moiota · v · f · m*. It seems indubitable that *Amatu*, *Op(p)alo*, *Hostius* and *Moiota* are all *fili* of the same father, whose name *Voltaro* was therefore regularly omitted in all filiations but the first. The identification *filius* in the second line thus actually refers to the following individual name *Op(p)alo* and not to *Amatu*, which will then on analogy have to be read as *Amatu f(ilia)* and provide a further instance of this feminine idionym.

Bolerianus / Boleriavus

The reading *Boleriavus* (ligature *AV* rather than *AN*) cannot be entirely dismissed on paleographic grounds (cf. *RINMS*, p. 279). In fact, this would enable direct comparison with *Boleriavus* from Staje (Lovenjak 1997, no. 4 = *AE* 1997, 571) and remove *Bolerianus* from the long list of hapaxes. From the point of view of name-formation, however, both *Boleri-ano-* and *Boleri-avo-* are equally plausible. For a good example of the latter suffix in Ig cf. *Voltan(V²)-* (*vide infra*), and for **-a_{uo}-* consider the likes of Ven. *klutaviko.s.* (*LVen*. Ca 18). In *Secundus Boleriav(u)s* (Lovenjak 1997, no. 4, now *AE* 1997, 571) *Boleriavus* probably plays the role of a pseudo-gentilic. This, however, does not speak against its original status of a genuine individual name.

Buccus

The simple thematic (i.e. *o*-stem) variant should probably be recognised in the case of *BVCCI/REGA* (*CIL* III 3787). The sequence is much more likely to represent an inverted onomastic formula rather than a single compound name because *Bucci-* would be difficult to account for as an *i*-stem and the few examples of the weakening of the composition vowel in Ig (such as *Volte-* for *Volto-* or *Voltu-*, *vide infra*) do not seem to support the spread of *-i-* at the expense of original *-o-*. In addition, **Bukko-* also appears in *CIL* III 398* (*[B]uccio Bucci*), which according to M. Šašel Kos (personal communication) should not be considered a *falsum*. The genitive *Biatvi* on the same inscription is very uncertain and cannot be confirmed.

Note that even if this group of names does not in fact go back to a hypocoristic shortening of **Buktor-*, where **g* was regularly devoiced to **k* in contact with the voiceless dental **t* (**Bug-tor-* > **Buk-tor-*), devoicing (necessarily accompanied by gemination, of course) would still be expected in a hypocoristic formation. This makes Hamp's doubts (1976a, 4–5 and p. 8 ft. 3) as to the possible connection between the names involving *-g-* and their hypocoristic derivatives in *-kk-* obsolete.

Bugia

Bugla[...] in *CIL* III 3797 may well stand for *Bugia* if the *L* was wrongly read for an actual *I* (i

longa?). The tombstone is now lost, so the original reading is impossible to verify. Note that Šašel's unpublishing reading of this monument has *Bugia* and Katičić (1968, 100) wrongly adduces it as *Ugla*, missing the detached *B* in line 4. A possible parallel to a putative *Bugla* is however offered by *Bucla* from *Intercissa*, Pannonia (*RIU* 1219, cf. Meid 2005, 260), which can easily represent a mere graphic variant of *Bugla*.

Cetetiu

Stifter (2012, 258 ft. 16) tentatively proposes *et Tetiuni* which would provide a parallel to the hapax *Tetiu*, but this is decidedly ruled out on paleographic grounds and by the syntax of the inscription: *Enno Secconis f(i)lius vivus f(ecit) Cetetiuni Rustic[i] f(i)liae (obitae) an(norum) L et fil(io) Valentioni* etc. (*CIL* III 3861 = 10758). It is not inconceivable, however, that *CETETIUNI* (ligature *ET*) stands for *sibi et Tetiuni* (thus Müllner 1879, no. 26), i.e. *S(ibi) ETETIUNI = s(ibi) et (T)etiuni* with straightforward haplography or intentional simplification (*ETET-* → *ETET-*). The abbreviation *S* for *SIBI* is rather rare but not exceptional. The main problem with this interpretation is that it implicitly presupposes that *C* would either have been erroneously written for an *S* (which, incidentally, would be highly unusual in Ig) or, as a slightly likelier alternative, wrongly transcribed and/or transmitted by Apianus (1534, 371, 4), who appears to be the sole source of the reading of this particular inscription.

Deuonti (?) ~ Lasc(i)onti (?) ~ Voltaronti (?)

Pace Šašel Kos 1998, p. 338, the female name *Voltaronti* in *CIL* III 3877 (+ p. 1734) = Šašel Kos 1998, no. 7, is not to be restored to a putative **Voltaro* but rather represents the nominative singular of an *ī-* or possibly an *i*-stem, i.e. **Voltarontī* or **Voltaronti(s)* respectively. The same sequence *Voltaronti* also appears in *CIL* 3860 = *AIJ* 185 = Šašel Kos 1998, no. 3, where it is generally recognised to be functionally a dative.²⁵ The latter inscription reads *Enninae Voltergis f(i)liae Buiio Senni f(i)lius uxori suae*

²⁵ Cf. Stifter 2012b, 258, where the nominative function of *Voltaronti* in *CIL* III 3877 is correctly recognised, revising the older view (put forward in 2012a, 543 ft. 9)

et sibi v(ivus) f(ecit) et Voltaronti Voltregis f(ilia) sorori suae et sibi v. f. [my underlinings]. The use of the possessive adjective and the repetition of the formula *et sibi v. f.* would at least at face value speak in favour of the possibility that even in the subsidiary dedicatory formula it is still *Eninna* who is the beneficiary rather than her sister *Voltaronti*, who in this case would additionally attest to the nominative *Voltaronti*. This is not necessarily so, however, as both irregularities may receive viable extra-linguistic justification while two successive dedicators in an inscription would be rather unique.²⁶

If *Voltaronti* in *CIL* III 3877, which must surely represent a nominative of this problematic stem, is to be restored as **Voltarontī*, the name can offer a rare insight into vernacular morphology, which points to the preservation of the old Indo-European feminine long *ī*-stems. Moreover, juxtaposing the male name **Voltaron-* with **Voltarontī*, it becomes apparent that the latter suffix must have been in use in Ig as a productive means to form gamonyms from underlying male names. This word-formational pattern (first recognised by Stifter 2012b, 258) is unique to Ig, while Venetic displays a much simpler model, viz. simple transference of a masculine consonant stem such as *vho.u.go.n.t-* into the first declension feminine *ā*-stem by the simple addition of **-ā*, as in *vho.u.go.n.t-* (m.) → *vho.u.go.n.t-a* = **-ont-ā* (f.).²⁷ Unfortunately, the lack of comparable juxtapositions in Ig (or Venetic, for that matter) makes it impossible to determine whether the female names in **-ontī* were only built to male names in **-on-* or the derivational base of *Voltaronti* (f.) is in fact **Voltar-*, which, incidentally, also underlines *Voltaro* = **Voltaron-* (m.). However, on the evidence of the coexistence of *Lascontiae* beside *Lasciontiae* (both dative singulars), which, if the names are to be recognised as representatives of the same pattern, points to the variance in the suffix of the underlying **Laskon-* vs. **Lask-īon-*, it would appear

likely that these feminines did in fact represent the counterpart of masculine nasal stems in **-on-*. Be that as it may, it is safe to assume that the original locus of the feminine suffix **-ontī* is the present participle (cf. Ancient Greek φέρουσα ‘ferens’ < **-o-ntī*), where it regularly appeared beside its masculine counterpart in **-o-nt-* (nicely preserved in the Latinised genitive *Feucontis* for vernacular **Feukont-os* in Šmarata). Subsequently, the extrapolated suffix must have been generalised as a productive (i.e. fully operational) means in the formation of female names, which promoted its spread beyond the original sphere of use. Both dative forms *Lascontiae* ~ *Lascio{a}ntie* ~ *[La]sṣiontiae* and *Devontiae* undoubtedly belong to the same pattern, so that their respective nominative forms should rightly be restored as *Lascionti* and *Devonti*. Although their original inflectional ending seems to have been disguised by Latin, it is significant that they were integrated into Latin as *iā-* rather than simple *ā*-stems. This plainly betrays their original inflectional pattern: **-ont-ī* (nom.sg.) vs. **-ont-īā-* in the oblique cases, the dative singular being almost certainly **-ont-īāi* (i.e. identical to Latin *-iae*), cf. Ven. *vhugin-īa.i.*, so that in this particular case Latinisation could be effortless. Stifter (2012b, 258) convincingly accounts for the apparent discrepancy between the latter dative forms and *Voltaronti* in *CIL* III 3860 by recognising in *-iae* : *i* two separate attempts to integrate vernacular morphology into the ready-made Latin declensional paradigms. If *Voltaronti* (*CIL* III 3860) indeed represents the dative form, which is most probable, another option would be to recognise in it a dative of a feminine *i*-stem, to which *Voltaronti(s)* (*CIL* III 3877) would then represent the nominative. Such alternative explanation cannot of course be fully dismissed but at any rate it appears much less convincing, seeing that from the point of view of historical morphology the word formation behind a putative **Voltaronti-* (f.) would in this case remain difficult to account for, while one would also be forced to divorce *Voltaronti* from *Lasc(i)ontiae* and *Devontiae* on purely morphological grounds.²⁸

that the dative must have been mistakenly used instead of the nominative.

²⁶ Šašel Kos 1998, 334.

²⁷ Pace Lejeune (*MLV* § 75) such gamonyms have no informative value for the reconstruction of the vernacular Venetic reflex of the inherited feminine counterpart of the present participle. Note that the gender-neutral participle known from Latin (e.g. *ferens*, *-ent-*) is the result of a combination of several internally motivated, specifically Latin phonetic and morphological developments and cannot be used as a typological parallel of epicene morphology.

²⁸ Note that given the uncertain and conflicting nature of the available evidence, it is not possible to completely dismiss the possibility that in the case of *Lasc(i)ontiae* and *Devontiae* the respective nominative forms are in fact to be restored as *Lasc(i)ontia* and *Devontia* rather than *Lasc(i)onti*, *Devonti*.

Elia

The existence of this name (*CIL* III 10739) is very uncertain. The sequence could also stand for *filia* (ligature *FI*) but the syntax rather speaks in favour of a personal name here. Perhaps only the last part of it is preserved and *Elia* should in fact be considered a ghost-form (Müllner 1879, no. 45, reads [*Aur*]/*elia*; Mócsy 1959, 173 proposes [*A*]/*elia*). The right side of the stele is too badly damaged to afford a clear interpretation of the lines 5–8. Note that the following patronymic *Buii*[---] could theoretically also belong with *Valeriu*[s] rather than securing the status of a personal name for the putative *Elia*. Ultimately, the unreliability of this name has to be conceded.

Eniconis / Enico

As it stands (*AIJ* 140), the name is morphologically ambiguous. It is perhaps better interpreted as belonging with the group of hypocoristic formations **Enno*-(*i*)*ā*, **Ennon*- (cf. Untermann 1961, 146 *et pass.*), also quite common in the Venetic onomastic tradition. **En(n)ikon*- would thus be completely parallel to Carnic Venetic **En(n)ikon*-, implied by the nomen gentile *Eniconeio* (*LVen.* Ca 73) = **En(n)ikon-ejjo*-, which appears beside *Eniceius* (*LVen.* Ca 58), built to the unextended variant **En(n)iko*- (for the patronymic suffix **-ejjo*- see *MLV* § 4b; Untermann 1961, § 111–112, § 151). It would however also be possible to recognise in *Eniconis* the genitive of an *i*-stem (similarly already Hamp 1976a, 6). This putative **Eni-koni*- would at least at face value have to be traced to Proto-Indo-European (PIE) **ken*- ‘originate (from)’ (i.e. an alternative root to **g^henH₁*- ‘beget’, cf. **Eni-gno*- ‘born inside’), its word formation being fully parallel to compound names in **-pori*- to PIE **perH₃*- ‘obtain, acquire’ (cf. Lat. *pariō* ‘acquire, create, give birth to’), as probably indirectly preserved in *Voltu-pari*- (*CIL* III 3791, *vide infra*). However, even though a compound name in **-kon(H)-i*- is not improbable from the point of view of historical morphology, no reliable parallels can be offered to support the idea of such a derivative. It would therefore seem prudent, for the time being, to leave the matter open and restore *Enico(ni)*-.

Enignus ~ Enignas

Both *Enigus* and its genitive *Enigni* (*CIL* III 3793 etc.) may either reflect the originally thematic = *o*-declension **Eni-gno*- (parallel to a single Venetic attestation *vo.l.ti-gno.s.* (*LVen.* Es 8)) or they may be Latinisations of the original athematic = consonantal, *quasi* 3rd declension **Eni-gnā*- (parallel to Vedic *-jā-* ‘nātus’), attested once in the nominative *Volto-gnas* (*AIJ* 221) in Gatina by Grosuplje. The latter could also be a *vox hybrida* in a Pannonian context, as has already been suggested by Meid (2005, 28; cf. Krahe 1955, 62, followed by *NIL* 139 and ft. 11), where *a* for **o* is the regular outcome (cf. Pannonian *Teutanus* < **Teutonos*). If the two formations do, however, belong together, they most probably reflect the older athematic **-g^hηH₁-s* (> **-gnās*)²⁹ occurring side by side with its thematised variant **-g^hn(H₁)-o*- (along the same lines already Stifter 2012a, 545; id. 2012b, 260). Such coexistence of the archaeo- and its corresponding neo-form within one and the same system would not be at all unusual, cf. Gaul. (*an*) *ando-gnam* (cf. *RIG* II/2, 98: 2a10, 2a11, 2b12) < **-g^hηH₁-m* (accusative singular) beside Gaulish **-gn-o*- < **-g^hn(H₁)-o*- (= our *-gnus*) as in *Certio-gno*- (*RIG* II/2, L–66). There is of course nothing about either of these formations that would necessarily point to Gaulish,³⁰ seeing that they are nicely integrated into the derivational models also typical of the North-Adiratic complex. Further note that within the Gaulish onomastic tradition there is in fact a marked difference in the distribution of these homonymous elements: as opposed to the ubiquitous **-geno*- and **-gnāto*-, which display a wide distribution, **-gno*- only occurs in Transalpine and, more sporadically, Cisalpine Gaul. The limited areal of its occurrence is comparable to the undoubtedly Gaulish **-gento*-,³¹ which as the fourth variant of the same verbal adjective with the general meaning ‘born’ does not appear to be attested outside Noricum and Pannonia at all.

²⁹ I.e. with the typologically expected reflex of the sequence **-ηH₁-*, cf. Lat. *nātus* < **g^hηH₁-tó*- and perhaps *Plator* (a variant of *Pletor* ~ *Plaetor* widespread in Dalmatia) if for **Plātor* from **p|H₁-tor*- to PIE **pleH₁*- ‘implere’, which is uncertain, however.

³⁰ De Bernardo Stempel’s proposal (2014, 273; based on ead. 2013 75–76) to recognise in **-gnos* (= Latinized *gnus*) a syncopated by-form of the normal Gaulish **genos* > **-gfnos* is unwarranted.

³¹ See Meid 2005, 130–133. Meid’s doubts as to the Celticity of **-gento*- are in my opinion unnecessary.

Concerning the vocalism of the second element of **Voltuparis**, i.e. **-par-i-* (= *i*-stem!), the situation is very similar to that regarding *-gnus* vs. *-gnas* (vide supra). If *-paris* stands for **por(H₃)-i-* (= Old Greek πόρις ‘heifer’), it must be a loan from Pannonian or any such system of the “Illyrian” complex which has regularised *a* at the expense of the inherited **o* (cf. Krahe 1942, 143–145). However, seeing that the same element also had some currency in Venetic: cf. *Volta Vero-paris f.*³² and, notably, even a patronymic adjective *vo.l.to-pariko.s.* (*MLV*, no. 209) = **Voltoparis filius*, it would appear more economical to assume that both in Ig and Venetic **-par-i-* represents the vernacular reflex of zero-grade **-prH-i-*,³³ which to **por(H₃)-i-* = Gr. πόρις would be like **-gnās* to **-gno-* discussed above.³⁴

Laepius

In *CIL* III 3804 = 10731 = *AIJ* 134 <ae> must either stand for hiatus /a-e/ (possibly /a \dot{a} e/) or represent inverted writing of the Latin digraph <ae> (which at this point had already been regularly monophthongised to \bar{e}) for the actual long ** \bar{e}* . The latter might in turn also encode the contracted result of **a-e* or **aje* > \bar{e} . The same applies in the case of *Pla \bar{e} -tor* ~ *Pl \bar{e} -tor*, but here we are most likely dealing with two different graphic representations of the original form **Pl \bar{e} -tor-*. Note that the third variant, viz. *Pla \bar{a} -tor*, which was especially popular in Dalmatia and Apulia and does not occur in Ig or Šmarata, is most likely to be the result of different morphology (cf. Untermann 1961, 113 and see above) rather than phonology and is thus only indirectly related to the above forms. *Laepius* represents a rare case of a nomen gentile in Ig and as such may very well be imported from another subsystem of the North-Adriatic complex (such as Šmarata, for instance), for which see the discussion below. This would not be the only example of an imported name in Ig. Consider the likes of **Hostilius Ergiano** (*CIL* III 3841) from Emona, who carries a gentile name originally typical of the Venetic and Histrian regions (see *OPEL* II,

186). In our case it is certainly used as an already fully functional Latin gentilicium, cf. *Voltilius* (*AIJ* 221) mentioned above. The relationship between (simple or derived) names in *Hosti-* and those without the initial *H-* is not entirely transparent, however. While Venetic *ho.s.ti-* (cf. the compound name *ho.s.ti-havo.s.*, *LVen.* Pa 7) clearly retains the expected outcome of PIE **g^hosti-* ‘hospes’ (see *MLV* § 169–170 *et pass.*), the derivational family around *Osti-* (**Ost $\bar{i}o-$* , **Ost $\bar{i}ar-$* , **Ost $\bar{i}lo-$* , *Ost $\bar{i}alo-$*), amply attested on vernacular and Latin inscriptions, may be ultimately related (via the loss of initial *H-*, for which, incidentally, there is no firm proof!), or we may be dealing with two different names altogether. The matter is further complicated by the probable influence of Latin *Hosti-* and its derivatives. In any event, it cannot be maintained (pace Untermann 1961, 118; cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 26) that *Hosti-* is secondary (be it through Latin influence or by the addition of an otiose *H-*) in relation to *Osti-* names. It is a fact, however, that the cognomina (probably hypocoristic in origin) *Hostius* vs. *Ostius* as well as the feminine version *Hostila* vs. *Ostila* are limited to Histria and Ig/Emona, where they appear side by side. For Ig cf. *Hostius* (*CIL* III 3785 = 10726; *CIL* III 10740 = *AIJ* 131), gen. *Osti* (*CIL* III 3806 = 10732 (+ p. 2328¹⁸⁸) = *AIJ* 135), *Hostila* (*CIL* III 10746 (+ p. 2328¹⁸⁸) = *AIJ* 139), *Ostila* (*CIL* III 3853 (+ p. 1734) = *AIJ* 181), all used as individual names (cf. Untermann l. c.; Katičić 1968, 82–83). However, if *Q(u)iemoni(s)* indeed points to the vernacular **-is* for **-ios*, as will be argued below, at least *Hostius* must be recognised to have been imported, that is regardless of the origin of the initial *H-*, which, in case it indeed goes back to **g^h*, cannot of course be epichoric, as **g* would otherwise be normally expected in Ig.

Lasc(i)onti (?)

CIL III 3792 actually reads ...*Jstiontia \bar{e}* , but the *t* is very uncertain. However, on analogy with *CIL* III 3855 and *CIL* III 3895 (+ p. 1736) = *AIJ* 216 = *ILJug* 326 it would seem reasonable to restore **Lasciontia \bar{e}* . On the putative nominative form *Lascionti* see above.

³² Reported by da Castoia *apud* Crevatin 1990, 109; now *AE* 1991, 792.

³³ Again with the typologically expected reflex, as in Latin *valeō* < PIE **u^hH-eH₁-ie/o-*.

³⁴ A similar view has already been put forward by Stifter 2012b, 260; revising Stifter 2012a, 545.

Neuntius

Even on close inspection the correct reading of this name (*CIL* III 10746 + p. 2328¹⁸⁸ = *AIJ* 139) indeed seems to be *Neuntii* rather than *Nevāntii*. The latter reading would in fact represent the more logical outcome (but cf. Hamp 1976b) if the etymological connection to the Indo-European numeral **H₁neun̥* ‘9’ (cf. Lat. *novem* < **neuen*) is correctly conceived. Its word formation clearly betrays the ordinal value ‘nōnius’.

Rega ~ Rec[a]

Rec[a] (*ILJug* 299) exceptionally displays a -c- instead of the normal -g-. This should in view of *-recis* (*CIL* III 3796; *CIL* III 3805) probably be recognised as a purely graphic phenomenon (*pace* Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 33). It is not impossible, however, that *Reca[a]* is to be read as **Rekkā*, which in relation to **Rēgā* would regularly display hypocoristic gemination and devoicing (i.e. **g* > **kk*), probably accompanied by the shortening of the root-vowel **ē* to **e*.

There can be no doubt that this exclusively female name belongs with the element **rēg-* attested several times as *rex*, gen. sg. *-regis* ~ *-recis*. The latter would generally have been considered epicene and as such could be used for both genders (as is still the case in Gaulish, for example, see Stüber 2005, 86), but judging from the actual attestations it appears that in Ig **rēg-* was reserved to refer to the members of the male population. Our **Rēg-ā* is, however, not the expected feminine form, so that the name may either be a case of superficial feminisation by the addition of the predominantly feminine suffix **-ā* as in Ven. *.u.kon-ā* (f.) to *.u.ko.* = **Ukkon-* (m.), *vho.u.go.n.t-ā* (f.) to *vho.u.go.n.t-* (m.) etc. (see *MLV* § 48b), or, as was already proposed by Stifter (2012a, 546), it may represent a short name (*Kurzname*), extrapolated from compound names such as *Voltu-*rex** (cf. the female name **Volt-ā* and its hypocoristic variant **Volt-īā*, both very clear cases of feminine short names to compounds in **Volto-* / **Volutu-*). The problem with this scenario is that *Kurznamen* are usually built to first rather than second members of compounds, cf. Gaulish *Sega*, *Nerta* etc. to *Sego-*, *Nerto-* (see Stüber 2005, 68–69).

Sublo

CIL III 3855 reads *Lascioāntiae Quinti Subloāni*, the latter name clearly representing the filiation of the father. As such it must essentially stand for a cognomen, so that either *Subloni(s)* to **Sublon-* or *Sublani* to **Subl-ano-* are probable. However, seeing that in the same inscription the same ligature *AN* also redundantly appears in the individual name *Lascio{a}ntie* for *Lascionti(a)e*, it would seem safe to assume the same graphic peculiarity for *Subloāni* and restore the genitive *Sublo{a}ni(s)*.

Tetiū

Müllner (1863, 66 *apud* Müllner 1879, no. 55) reads *Tetiuni*... rather than *Tetiunie* (*CIL* III 3814), which would otherwise point to an underlying **Tetiunia*. If the latter reading is correct, it should probably be interpreted as a mistake (conceivably through the pleonastic addition of an *ā*-stem dative singular ending *-ae* to the already dative form *Tetiuni*) rather than a derivative in **-īā* to **Tetiūn-* (i.e. ***Tetiūn-īā*), for which there is little support in the available comparative evidence. The tombstone appears to be lost, however. Müllner copied it when it was still immured in the cemetery wall of the Church of sv. Križ in Iška vas, but its current location is unknown. It is noted as already lost by Saria in 1938. On reconsideration, the nominative should either be restored as *Tetiunia** or, which appears more likely, *Tetiū** = **Tetiūn-*.

Uccio

The attestation of this name is very unreliable. *AIJ* 133 reads *Nammo et T. fili(i) parentibus d(e) s(uo) vivi f(e)cerunt et Buquorsa Uccio nuro*. Judging from the damage that was suffered by the inscription field, the last part could conceivably also stand for *et Buquorsa(e) Buccio(ni) nuro*. The dative form *nuro* for *nuruī* (i.e. as if it were a noun belonging to the 2nd declension) is an understandable simplification on analogy with the predominant stem class in Latin. If the generally accepted reading is correct, the North-Adriatic character of the name is of course transparent. Hypocoristic names in *Ukk-* are common in Venetic and in Carinthia, but, significantly, the only forms actually attested either

point to *Ukkon-: .u.ko (*LVen.* Es 91, + gamonym .u.kon-a, *LVen.* Es 89), *Ucconis* (*CIL* III 5084; *CIL* III 5463; *ILLPRON* 1354; Stifter 2004, 769), or *Ukko- (*CIL* III 4838; *CIL* III 5451). Recent autopsy, however, has reaffirmed the older reading of the name by Šašel as *Buccio*, rendering all other interpretations obsolete.

Uss̄ [---]

The name reads *Vibunna Uss̄[---]* f. (*CIL* III 3863 = 10759 = *AIJ* 189, Emona). It is incautious to assume that this must represent a Gaulish compound name. Disregarding the fact that the name may practically stand for any number of imaginable sequences seeing that only the first three letters are actually preserved, it is not at all likely that *uss- conceals the typically Gaulish preposition *uχs- < *ups- (*pace* Meid 2005, 194, but cf. p. 244). One would not in fact expect *χs to be spelt <ss> but either <x> or <xs> as is the usual practice in latinised Gaulish names involving the cluster *χs, cf. *Uxela* (*CIL* III 13406; Meid 2005, 208) from Pannonia. The simplification to *s in *Eṡ-cinga* (Šentrupert, see Lovenjak 1997, no. 10 = *ILSI* 71) for *Eχs-kingā, on the other hand, is regular in Gaulish and goes back to an entirely different phenomenon (see Delamarre 2007, 98 for attestations and cf. Stifter 2013, 118), so that it proves nothing in relation to the variation in spelling of *χs in the questionable case of *Uss-*. Ultimately, this isolated name cannot be reconstructed. The accompanying name **Vibunna**³⁵ is only in this particular case attested as a feminine individual name and expectedly appears side by side with the uniquely epichoric female name **Deuontī* (*vide infra*). All other occurrences are limited to the pseudo-gentilic *Vibunnius*, which typically appears in all-Latin contexts (cf. *Vibunnia Matrona*, *CIL* III 14354¹⁶ = *RINMS* 60, Emona; *Sextus Vibunnius Avitus*, *AIJ* 163 = *RINMS* 27, Emona; *Vibunnius Valerius*, *lupa* 4564, *Pann. Sup.*).

Voltan(V)?-

It is very unclear what declension this name originally belonged to. The reading *Voltani* (*CIL* III

3790 = *RINMS* 82) by A. Tyfernus (*Cod. Vindob.* 3528 f. 70) cannot be checked because of the severe damage that the gravestone suffered since its first autopsy. If it is correct, however, it would singularly point to *Voltano-* (gen. sg. *Voltani*), but there seems to be good evidence that the name did not originally belong to *o*-declension.³⁶ *Voltanis* in *CIL* III 3802, by contrast, may belong to a consonantal or an *i*-stem **Voltan-* / **Voltani-*. The latter is also secured by *Voltani* (*CIL* III 3821), which, judging from the context of the inscription, must be a dative rather than a genitive. *Voltān* (*CIL* III 3821), on the other hand, has no informative value.

Voltielus

Untermann (1961, 131, cf. pp. 128, 171) tentatively proposed to understand *Voltielus* as a diminutive form, which at the outset may be recognised as rather *ad hoc*, conceding that the problematic suffix has no obvious parallels within North-Adriatic name formation. However, it would not be at all impossible to interpret *-elo-* as a marginally productive hypocoristic suffix, extrapolated from derivatives in **-lo-* to thematic stems (i.e. **-e-lo-*) as in Lat. *porculus* < **pork'-elo-*; cf. Venetic **de.i.volo-*, implied by the patronymic *de.i.volajo(.s.)* (*LVen.* Ag 1) < **aijo-*, if it goes back to **deju-elo-* (i.e. with what seems to be the regular Venetic development of **ue* to **uo*). If this interpretation is correct, **Volti-elo-* would probably have to be understood as a hypocoristic form built to the underlying short name **Volt-jo-*. Müllner (1879, no. 59) interprets the debatable part of the inscription as *SVRVVS / VOL^{TI}FILIVIVS* = *Surus Volti(i)? fili(us) viv(u)s* (with ligature *LTI* erroneously read as *LT*). Notwithstanding the fact that *FILIVIVS* would be a highly extraordinary mistake (although not impossible if it were due to haplography, for example) and that the fourth letter is actually an *E* and not ligature *FI* (correctly read by Hirschfeld; see *CIL* III 10748), it is the masculine individual name **Volto-* or **Voltjo-*, implied by this interpretation, that presents the main crux of the problem. Apart from **Voltā* and **Voltiā*, which expectedly occur as short female names, such *Kurznamen* do not seem to have had

³⁵ For the new probable reading of *Vibunna* as *Vibunna* with ligature *NI* see Šašel Kos, Emona and its pre-Roman population: epigraphic evidence, forth.

³⁶ Note that Mócsy 1959, 197; id. 1983, 318 and *OPEL* IV, 182 decide in favour of a consonant stem **Voltan-*, restoring the nominative form *Voltans*; Katičić 1968, 102 reconstructs an *i*-stem nominative *Voltanis*.

any real currency among male names. The only hypocoristic form attested is *Voltionis* from Pannonia (*CIL* III 4112: *Maximu[s] Voltion[is] fil(ius)*; *CIL* III 10927: *Maximi Voltionis con(iugi)i*; not mentioned by Meid 2005). Perhaps *Vot[...]* in *AIJ* 125 (Šmarata) is to be read *Volti(i)* (i.e. with ligature *LT*), but this is impossible to ascertain due to severe damage suffered by the inscription field. The suggestion put forward by Stifter (2012a, 546) was to read the inscription as *Surus Volti(a)e li(bertus)*, which however is completely improbable for historical reasons.

Voltu-

As has been ingeniously demonstrated by David Stifter in his first detailed study of Ig anthroponymy (Stifter 2012a, 544–547; cf. id. 2012b, 256), the *u*-stem variant *Voltu-* (*CIL* III 3811 etc.), which appears beside *Volto-* (*AIJ* 221 etc.) and, outside of Ig, the ubiquitous *i*-stem *Volti-*, should not be readily ascribed to the weakening of the medial vowel such as evidently under way in *Volte-regi* (*CIL* III 3825 + p. 1731 = *AIJ* 143). It must be conceded that *Voltu-* beyond doubt represents the autochthonous version of the same noun, which uniquely occurs in Ig. Both **uol-ti-* and **uol-tu-* of course go back to PIE **u_l-ti-/tu-* ‘voluntās’, nicely preserved in Venetic *vo.l.tiio* (instr. sg.) < **u_lti-jo-* (corresponding functionally and semantically to Lat. *libens*) and its homonym *vo.l.te.r.ko-* < **uel-tr-iko-* (see *MLV* § 77², 21). If this is so, the development PIE **R₃* > **oR* is irreproachably confirmed for Ig. Note that any number of names in *Volti-* could theoretically also be infiltrations from the adjoining areas such as is clearly the case with *Hostius* and *Pl(a)etor*, while the syncopated *Volt-* (cf. *Volt[†]-recis*, *Volt[†]-regis*, *Volt[†]-regisi*, *Volt[†]-rex*) and the third variant viz. *Volto-* are silent seeing that the latter can easily go back to **uol-to-* rather than **u_l-to-* and the former may reflect either of the alternative formations. Incidentally, the etymology of *Voltu-* opens up the possibility to account for the place-name *Nau-portus* as in fact at least partly reflecting native phonology. It is generally thought that this Latin-looking name is an adaptation of a similarly sounding epichoric name (*pace* Delamarre 2004, 122–123, there is no reason, however, to see in it a translation of Gaulish **Longo-ritu- vel sim.*; also note that the supposed connection between *Nauportus* and *Longaticum* is entirely misconstrued). While

Πάμπορτον, Ναύποντον (Strabo IV,6,10; VII,5,2; see Šašel 1966, 501; Šašel Kos 1990, 20; ead. 1997, 36) probably stand for nothing else but *Nauportus*, being due to the simple confusion of letters in transmission, it cannot be altogether excluded that at least the second element of the Latin compound place-name *Nauportus* integrates the vernacular *portus* < **p_r-tú-* (i.e. like *Voltu-* < **u_l-tú-*). It cannot be ascertained, however, whether the meaning was *‘the place of crossing/passing’ as originally also in Latin (the prevalent meaning ‘harbour’ is secondary in Latin; *portitor* and *portorium* ‘toll’ both clearly derive from the original meaning ‘place of crossing’, further preserved in *angi-portus*) and Old Norse *ffjörðr*, Old High German *furt*, Avestan *pər^otu-*, Gaulish *ritu-* etc., or specialised to *‘that which crosses’ > *‘ferry’. However that may be, the element *Nau-* is almost certainly a Latin addition and may either stand for archaic *Nau-* (i.e. instead of the normal *Navi-*, which would be expected in Classical Latin) as in *nau-stibulum*, *nau-fragium*, or the regular Vulgar Latin outcome *Nau-* for *Navi-* in front of a consonant (cf. *cantavit* > VL **cantaut*): **Navi-portus* > **Nau-portus*.

Šmarata:

Turoius = *Turo(-)jo-

At face value, *Turoius* (*CIL* III 10724, *CIL* III 10725 = *AIJ* 125; Šašel Kos 2000, no. 3,4, line 1) seems to be a gentile name. If *Feva[. Tu] ro[...]* (ib., line 3) stands for **Feva Turoia*, sharing the nomen gentile with the *coniunx* *Turoius Nepos* *Vot[...]* *fas* is clearly the case in *Sexstiliae Tatsoriae* beside *Planus [Sex]st[i]lius Feucontis f* (*AIJ* 123 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 1), its status would be secured. However, the fragmented part could easily stand for **Feva Turoii (filia)*, which would then obviously point to the function of a cognomen for *Turoius** in both instances. Most ingeniously, Stifter (2012b, 255 and 257) has suggested to see in *Turoius* the reflex of the PIE ordinal numeral **k^utur-(H₂)ó-* > **turó-* ‘quārtus’.³⁷ This is very probable. Unfortunately, even on comparative evidence it is impossible to know for certain whether the suffix *-jo-* in this case

³⁷ Etymological connection with Gaulish **turo-* ‘potens’ suggested by De Bernardo Stempel (2014, 273) is unnecessary and improbable from the point of view of word formation.

carries the function of a gentile (**Turo-īo-* = Lat. *Quartius*) or belongs to the underlying appellative **turo-īo-* ‘quārtus’. The latter would certainly find a nearly perfect parallel in Old Indic *turīya-* ‘id.’ (further cf. Ven. **turījo-* as preserved in the dat. sg. of a personal name *turijone.i.*, *LVen.* Ca 24) < PIE **k^utur-ījo-* and provide reliable evidence to recognise in *Turoius* a simple personal name.

THE POSITION OF IG WITHIN NORTH ADRIATIC

The greater majority of the names attested in Ig ally themselves with the rest of the North-Adriatic onomastic tradition and do not in fact show any closer affinity with the Pannonian group of names.³⁸ Owing to its outlying position in relation to the rest of the North-Adriatic *Sprachraum*, the onomastic tradition in Ig typically reflects the characteristics of a transitory contact zone, meaning that a certain amount of infiltration from other onomastic traditions can be expected. This may even be the case within the greater *Namenlandschaft* that the microregion belongs to (cf. *Hostius & co., Pl(a)etor*). The remarkable number of names uniquely attested in Ig, however, is due both to the peripheral position of the area and the exceptionally isolated and self-contained status of the corresponding indigenous settlement, while the integral component in the name inventory still remains characteristic of what we call North-Adriatic. It is dangerous, however, to put too much weight on the singular occurrences (hapaxes) of a particular name, simply because their seeming restriction to Ig may be a matter of attestation. Such caution is, of course, unnecessary in the case that the names associated with Ig are firmly integrated in a derivational family, be it one also uniquely attested in Ig (such as **BUI(I)-*) or one that has obvious cognates elsewhere (e.g. **VOLT-*). Another criterion that can safeguard the epichoric status of a hapax is its typical morphology and/or word-formation which on internal reconstruction has proved to be typical of Ig (cf. female names in **-ūn-* and **-ontī*).

That the *language* to which the greater majority of the indigenous names belong is also closely related to other linguistic systems around the *caput Adriae* is not in doubt. This can be most convincingly demonstrated on the basis of over-

arching similarities in the historical development of the inherited phoneme inventory. The historical phonology³⁹ can be recovered from names with reliable etymologies. Together with the more or less directly adjacent territories to the south and south-west, most notably Venetic, the vernacular names in Ig clearly point to a centum-language such as both Italic to the west and Pannonian to the east (cf. *Deçomonis* and *-gnus* in *Enignus*; the expected corresponding preservation of **k^u* is now observable in *Quiemonis*). The syllabic **N* (\pm *HV*) and **R* yield **aN* and **oR*, for which cf. *Venixama* < **-isṃHo-* and *Volti/u-* < **u₃-ti/u-*. This is completely parallel to Venetic with cases such as *vo.Lti-*, *murtuvoi* (for **mortuo-* < **m₃-*, cf. Lat. *mortuus*) or *donasan* and *iiuva.n.t-* etc., and in partial contrast with Latin and Sabellic (i.e. Oscan and Umbrian), which are characterised by the development **N* > **eN* ~ **aN* and **R* > **oR* ~ **uR*. In Pannonian (i.e. the language to which belong most of the place-names and indigenous, pre-Gaulish personal names in Pannonia and adjacent territories),⁴⁰ on the other hand, the behaviour of the syllabic liquids is markedly different. As can be determined on the basis of numerous place-names such as *Mursa*, *-burgium*, *Pultovia*, *Carnuntum*, *Acumincum*, the Pannonian reflexes were undoubtedly **uN* and **uR*. As in Pannonian, the inherited Indo-European diphthong **eu* seems preserved in Ig, although the evidence is very scarce (cf. *Neuntius*). This situation also holds true for Šmarata (*Feucontis*), while in Venetic, which undoubtedly represents the innovatory centre of the “North-Adriatic” language continuum, **eu* has largely developed to **ou* (*Feucont-*, *CIL* III 10722–24 = Ven. *vo.u.go.n.t-*, cf. *MLV* 319,⁴¹ and possibly *Feva*, *AIJ* 125, vs. Ven. *fo.u.vo.s.* = **Fouuo-*, *LVen.* Ca 21, *fovo fouvoniko.s.* = **Fouuon-*, *LVen.* Ca 66), as is also the case in Italic. The latter feature gives Ig and Šmarata a slightly archaic character, but given the trivial nature of the preservation of **eu*, this particular feature does not in fact move them closer to Pannonian but rather secures their peripheral position within North-Adriatic. In the case of Ig, this marginal position is further guaranteed by

³⁹ Similar descriptive accounts already in Untermann 1961, § 224–228 *et pass.*, and Stifter 2012a, 540–541; id. 2012b, 254–256.

⁴⁰ For the definition of Pannonian see Anreiter 2001, esp. 9–21; and Meid 2005, esp. 9–30.

⁴¹ The digraph <vh> (Carnic Venetic <f>) corresponds to *f* in the Venetic alphabet.

³⁸ This is partly conceded by Meid (2005, 27).

the simple deaspiration of the inherited voiced aspirated consonants $*b^h$, $*d^h$, $*g^h$ and $*g^{uh}$ to b (and, on analogy also $*d$, $*g$, $*g^u$, but there is only evidence for $*b^h > b$), while all other adjacent territories (notably also Šmarata) share the desonorisation of $*b^h$, $*d^h$, $*g^h$ and $*g^{uh}$ to $*\varphi$, $*\vartheta$, $*\chi$ and $*\chi^u$ with Italic⁴² (at least at the beginning of the word, where both $*\varphi$ and $*\vartheta$ later coalesce into $*\varphi$). This phenomenon can be nicely observed in *Buctor* (Ig) < $*B^hug-tor-$ vs. *Fuctor-jo-* (CIL V 8422, Aquileia),⁴³ *Bugia* (Ig) < $*B^hug-iā$ vs. Ven. *vhugia-*, both related to *Feucont-* (Šmarata) = Ven. *vhō.u.go.n.t.-*, and *Butto* vs. (Carnic) Ven. *fu(.)t(.)to.s*. The self-evident preservation of the inherited long $*ē$ in $*Rēgā$, $*-rēx$ in Ig is only significant as far as the comparison with Gaulish is concerned (in Proto-Celtic the Proto-Indo-European $*ē$ typically yields long $*ī$, cf. Gaul. $-rīχs$ = Ig $*-rēks$). The same goes for the preservation of the short $*o$ in both Ig (cf. *Buctor-*, *Voltaronti*) and Šmarata (cf. *Feucontis*),⁴⁴ which is typical of the entire North-Adriatic complex and only plays the role of a diagnostic feature in relation to adjacent Pannonian, where $*a$ is the normal outcome (cf. *Teutanus*, (*Aquae*) *Iasae* etc.).

The question of Gaulish vs. North-Adriatic onomastic traditions in Ig

It is generally believed that the peripheral position of Ig within the North-Adriatic complex made it especially susceptible to influences from other onomastic traditions, most notably Celtic (read Gaulish).⁴⁵ The opinions on the linguistic attribution of all the potential candidates to Gaulish vary and to an extent rule each other out in several aspects (depending, of course, on the weight attached to each individual methodological criterion), but it

⁴² Cf. Lat. *frāter* = Ven. *vrater-* < $*b^hrā-ter-$, Lat. *fac-* = Ven. *vha.k-* < $*d^ha-k-$, Lat. *hostis* = Ven. *hosti-* < $*g^hosti-$ etc.

⁴³ See Untermann 1961, § 157.

⁴⁴ Already observed by Untermann 1961, 131 ft. 271.

⁴⁵ The difference between the two designations can be compared to the one between Slavic versus Slovene. As much as it is accurate to claim that a particular name is Celtic, it is imprecise to define it solely as such if it has in fact clearly been coined in Gaulish (or any other Celtic language for that matter), cf. the likes of *Exouna* = $*Eχsoynā$, *Acaunissa* = $*Akaunissā$, *Dumnorix* = $*Dumnorīχs$ etc., which besides their being clearly Celtic also display typically Gaulish sound changes.

would not be imprecise to generalise that early scholarship nearly unanimously pronounces nearly half of all the names that recur in Ig to be more or less certainly Gaulish, cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965 (based on a limited corpus of 34 names/derivational families): *Adnomatus*, *Aicon(ius)* [recte *Aico*], *Amatu*, *Bucca* & co. (?), *Bugia*, *Elia*, *Enico(nis)*, *Enignus*, *Galun(ius)*, *Manu*, *Nammo*, *Secco*, *Sennius*, and Katičić 1968: *Adnomatus*, *Aicon(ius)* [recte *Aico*], *Amatu*, *Brocc(ius)*, *Bucca* & co. (but considered North-Adriatic in Katičić 1976, 182), *Bugia*, *Butto*, *Cetetiu*, *Coemoius* [sic!], *Decomo*, *Devontia* [recte *Devonti*], *Ecco*, *Elia*, *Emo* (?), *Eppo*, *Lucius*, *Manu*, *Moiota* (in the final synthesis but not actually on p. 86), *Mosso*, *Nammo*, *Otto* (?), *Ovis* (?), *Peto* [recte *Petto*], *Sacciarus*, *Sennus*, *Secco*, *Talsus*, *Tetiu*, *Tetta*, *Uccio*, *Uss*[...], *Venixema* (+ $**Venix$, in spite of *Peto*!), *Vibunna/-ius*.

Hamp 1976a; 1978, which is a synthesis of both Lochner-Hüttenbach and Katičić's contributions, admits *Adnomatus*, *Aicon(ius)*, *Amatu*, *Brocc(ius)*, *Bucca* & co., *Bugia*, *Buia* & co., *Cetetiu* (?), *Coemoius* [sic!], *Elia* (?), *Eppo*, *Eninna*, *Elia*, *Galun(ius)*, *Manu*,⁴⁶ *Ovis* (?), *Secco*, *Senn(ius)*, *Tetta*. Importantly, he removes four items from the list of possible Gaulish names, viz. *Decomo*, *Emo*, *Enignus* (still considered Celtic in 1976, however), and *Talsus*.

Matasović 2003 study, however, which in a similar fashion to both Hamp's contributions is primarily intended as an analysis from the point of view of Celtic, retains most of Katičić's proposals for Gaulish names and adds a few others: *Adnomatus*, *Amatu*, *Brocc(ius)*, *Bucca* & co., *Bugia*, *Buia* & co., *Butto*, *Cetetiu*, *Coemo* [sic!], *Decomo*, *Devontia* [recte *Devonti*], *Ecco*, *Emo* (?), *Enignus*, *Manu*, *Mosso*, *Nammo*, *Ovis*, *Peto* [recte *Petto*], *Sacciarus* [sic!], *Secco*, *Seccoemo* [sic!], *Talsus*, *Tetiu*, *Tetta*, *Uccus* [recte *Uccio*], *Venixema* (+ $**Venix$), *Vibunna/-ius*.

Meid 2005 (based on a limited corpus of 28 names/derivational families) represents a more balanced approach and remains noncommittal about the great majority of these names, but still retains *Adnomatus*, *Amatu* (understood by Meid as a hybrid with the Latin participle *amātus*), *Bugia*, *Cetetiu* (?), *Coemo* [sic!], *Devontia* [recte *Devonti*], *Galunus*, *Nammo* (?), *Uccio* (?), *Uss*[...]

⁴⁶ *Matu* mentioned by Hamp (1976a, 6; 1978, 60) does not exist. It is probably an oversight for *Manu*.

Lastly, Stifter (2012b, 250–254) rejects on sound methodology a number of less obviously non-Celtic names (explicitly in the case of *Broccus*, *Buccio*, *Decomo*, *Deuonti*, *Enignus*, *Eppo*, *Talsus* and implicitly for many others), concluding that “despite a certain readiness of earlier scholarship to ascribe names to Celtic, the actual evidence for their Celticity is very thin.” (o. c., p. 254). This is also the standpoint adopted by the present author and rests on both the deductive approach to the linguistic material from the point of view of Celtic / Gaulish as well as the recognition of the epichoric nature and important formal characteristics of the entire anthroponymical corpus attested in Ig.

Already on first impression it is transparently obvious that apart from *Ad-nomato-*,⁴⁷ which however significantly differs from its proper Gaulish equivalent by uniquely displaying an *o* where we would in fact expect an *a* = /ā/ if this was good Gaulish, there are no good Celtic-looking names in Ig. Contrary to the general opinion expressed by previous authors, I do not include here the typically Gaulish name *Exouna* (CIL III 13403 = AIJ 222) = *Eχs-ouñā < *Eχs-omñā < *Eχs-obnā ‘Fear-less’ (cf. *Exobna*, AE 1982, 413; *Exomna*, CIL XIII 8409 etc.) from Mala Žalna, which is clearly a case of a singular occurrence of a short female name common in Noricum and Pannonia⁴⁸ on the frontier of Gaulish influence in the central part of the south-eastern Alpine region. The pronouncedly non-Gaulish character of Ig is reinforced by the conspicuous lack of typically Gaulish hypocoristic suffixes such as *-illo-, *(u)llo-, *-eio-, *-ino-, *-āko-, *(u)ko-, *(i)ssā, *(u)ssā etc., otherwise fairly well represented in both Noricum and Pannonia (cf. *Vind-illo/-a*, *Tessila*, *Mess-illa*, *Trouc-illus*, *Ress-ilus/-a*, *Verc-illa*, *Suadulla*, *Iantullus/-a*, *Catullus/-a*, *Adiatullus*, *Aiuca*, *Cocc-eius*, *Aged-inus*, *Catussa*, *Belatusa*, *Troucetissa*). This marked characteristic trait naturally goes hand in hand with notable absence of typically Celtic compound names such as *Comnertus*, *Curmi-sagius*, *Ex-cingeto-rīx*, *Nemeto-*

mārus on account of numerous short names and simple hypocoristic derivatives⁴⁹ (predominantly structured as sequences of *C₁VC₂C₂on-, e.g. *Bukkon-, *Petton- etc.), which often form complex derivational families. The use of an array of functionally opaque suffixes in formation of individual names such as *-iko-, *-on-, *-avo-, *-ar-, *-an- etc. at the expense of compounding is characteristic of both North-Adriatic to the (South-) West and Pannonian to the East and clearly sets it aside from the onomastic traditions typical of the various Celtic languages.

This was partly already recognised by Katičić, who correctly concluded that the Celtic (*recte* Gaulish) element in Ig must surely be secondary (1968, 114–117; id. 1976, 182–183; cf. Hamp 1978, 62) and evidently a result of a later overlay or penetration. This is historically undoubtedly connected to the penetration of the Gaulish population and the accompanying western spread of Gaulish and Gaulish personal names from Pannonia along the rivers Sava and Drava, roughly around the 3rd century BC. There can be no question that the onomastic complex of both Noricum (especially southern) and Pannonia should rightly be regarded as the immediate centre of Gaulish influence on the neighbouring or adstratal onomastic traditions, while an older Gaulish incursion into the Alpine region, to which Katičić ascribes a number of names with recognisable parallels in the Celtic world excluding Noricum and Pannonia (cf. *Aiconus* [*recte* *Aicco*], *Broccus*, *Ecco*, *Eppo*, *Moiota*, *Mosso*, *Otto*, *Ovis*, *Secco*, *Talsus*, *Tetta*, and, he should have added if his reasoning were followed consistently, *Venixama*; see Katičić 1968, 115–116; id. 1976, 182; cf. Hamp 1978, 62–63), is historically unjustified and finds no real support in the available linguistic material.

It is indubitable that Ig was to a certain extent open to external influences from both Pannonian and Gaulish onomastic traditions, but the almost equal proportion of the epichoric and non-autochthonous material is in fact due to a misleading impression, created through the application of unsuitable criteria for linguistic attribution of the individual names and reinforced by indiscriminately perpetuating

⁴⁷ There are two attestations of this name in Ig: *Adnoma[t]us* (CIL III 10740 = AIJ 131; cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 15, following Šašel’s autopsy) and *Adnomati* (CIL III 3819 + p. 1047, 1822 = 5038 = 10736), which CIL III 5038 has erroneously ascribed to Breže (*Friesach*). See *lupa* 4185; Stifter 2012a, ft. 22. It is therefore safe to assume that this particular name is in fact unique to Ig.

⁴⁸ Cf. *Exounomara* (RIU 1359), on which see Meid 2005, 174.

⁴⁹ Gaulish hypocoristic names are partly derived from adjectives (e.g. *Suadulla* to *sūadu- ‘suāvis’, *Dumnacus* to *dumno- ‘profundus’ etc.) but largely rest on short names, which almost without exception go back to compound names (e.g. *Trouceti-marō* → **Trouc*²*V*- → *Troucillus* beside *Troucetissa*, derived directly from the compound name **Trouc*²*eti-mārā*).

the results of earlier analyses such as Katičić's and Lochner-Hüttenbach's studies, which still seem to be recognised as the authoritative works in this field. However, even a brief overview of the principles behind most of the decisions to assign a particular name to Celtic will reveal a methodology that rests on three extremely delicate criteria, viz. geographical distribution, contextual collocation, and synchronically based etymological comparison, usually paired with reference to authoritative works such as Holder's *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* (*AcS*). That the fact that a particular name happens to have been included into one of the corpora of Continental Celtic linguistic remains such as Holder's *AcS* or Delamarre 2007 does not of course by itself make a good case for assuming that that name is actually Celtic, has been already warned against by Matasović 1997, 94–95 and Sims-Williams 2012, 151. Note that in both Katičić's and Hamp's contributions (occasionally even applied by Meid 2005) Celticity was often assumed on account of the juxtaposition with other names, for which a Celtic explanation was adopted on the basis of other unsuitable criteria. The circularity of both lines of argumentation is obvious.

Taking each of these commonly used criteria in turn, it must first and foremost be warned here that the last criterion should not actually represent a methodologically acceptable guideline at all. Basing any assumptions about the origin of a particular name on superficial similarity with another name, especially when one or both are etymologically non-transparent, bluntly obviates the fact that names are ready-made words and as such represent a set of formal properties (phonological, morphological, word-formational, syntactical) which cannot be silently disregarded. A name as a full-fledged and autonomous unit of a particular language should first and foremost be *formally admissible* as belonging to that language, which means that its phonological, morphological, and syntactical makeup should all be in line with the formal characteristics specific to that language.

A case in point, also discussed by Stifter (2012b, 252), is the hapax **Devonti** / **Devontia**, which has been claimed to be Celtic (recte Gaulish) on superficial comparison with numerous Gaulish names involving the appellative **dēuo-* 'deus' (e.g. **Dēvo-gnātā*, **Dēvo-rīx*). Here the phonological criterion would arguably have been satisfied, because the change of **eĭ* to **ē*, which is what we have in Proto-Celtic **dēuo-* from PIE **deĭuo-* 'deus', is a

typically Celtic sound change. But, importantly, it is neither *specifically* nor *diagnostically* Celtic / Gaulish, which means that this sound change does not occur solely in Celtic and as such does not represent a distinguishing feature which would *a priori* provide a reliable criterion in the identification of a particular name as being Celtic / Gaulish in origin. One should never lose sight of the fact that names or elements with plausible Celtic etymologies which, *per contra*, bear no diagnostically Celtic/Gaulish trait, are open to more than one etymological interpretation. There can thus be no guarantee that *Deuonti* indeed goes back to the word for 'god' and in case this particular etymological connection is in fact correct, the name does not necessarily display Celtic / Gaulish historical phonology. The monophthongisation of **eĭ* to **ē* is a rather universal phenomenon (cf. Lat. *deus* < **deĭuo-*) and at least in this phonetic environment (i.e. before **u(o)*) could after all have been characteristic of the vernacular language of Ig as well – on internal comparative evidence, however, this purely theoretical possibility is not entirely likely – cf. *Veitro*, which may point to the preservation of the diphthong.⁵⁰ Furthermore, in the particular case of *Devonti* the indecisiveness of the phonetic criterion is actually a good portent of the problems the name will present for Gaulish morphology: note that while a productive model has been demonstrated for Ig, which involves the formation of female names in **-ontī* from the underlying masculine stems (see above), there is no trace of a denominative suffix *-ont-ī* in Gaulish, so that a putative Gaulish **Dēuont-ī* would in fact represent an isolated occurrence of an underrepresented word-formational pattern.

Especially instructive are also **Decomo** and **Coemon²ius** [recte *Coemo...ius*], which Katičić (1968, 74–75)⁵¹ connects to diachronically (i.e. historically) incomparable and unrelated Gaul. **dekameto-* 'decimus', **dekant-* 'decem' (?) = Ogam *DECED(D)-*, and to Old Irish *coim*, cf. Ogam *COIMA-GNI* 'pulcher; carus' < **koĭmogno-* < PIE **k'oĭ-mo-* (see Matasović 2009, 279), respectively. Let it be warned once again that a plausible Celtic root-etymology does not automatically make the name Celtic. To base the comparison principally on Celtic, specifically Old

⁵⁰ Note that Venetic preserves the inherited diphthong **eĭ*, cf. *de.i.vo.s.* (*LVen. Vi 2*) 'deōs'.

⁵¹ Cf. Meid 2005, 268 and 191; concerning *Coemo(...)* *ius* cf. Hamp 1978, 59.

Irish in the case of *Como...ius*, is to assume that not only was the Celtic element in Ig particularly strong, but that the Gaulish nomenclature used in Ig uniquely involved a number of names not attested elsewhere in Gaulish. Neither of these assumptions is of course justified seeing that the first finds no support in the available onomastic material, while the argument behind the latter supposal is entirely dependent on the former. Giving precedence to Celtic in the identification of a name uniquely attested in Ig is therefore based on a circular argument. Contrary to Meid's opinion (2005, 268) *Decomo-* is not "von durchsichtiger Bildung" and cannot be so easily compared with Latin *decimus*. In fact, it probably has nothing to do with the numeral at all. Note that if the proposed equation were valid, we would expect ***Decamo-* < **dek'ḡ-(H)o-* rather than *Decomo-* in Ig (but cf. Ven. **dekomo-* = 'decimus' < **-ḡ-(H)o-*).

Exceptionally prudent is Katičić's unreadiness to ascribe **Galunus** (gen. *Galuni*: *CIL* III 3815 + p.1731 = *AIJ* 141) to Gaulish, concluding that "[s]eine Verbindungen mit der keltischen Namengebung sind also recht unbestimmt und fragwürdig." (1968, 82). This is especially surprising because his doubts were not shared by any of the other scholars (Stifter 2012b does not mention it, however), who readily connect it to Gaulish **galo/-ā* 'ardour, fury' and to the fully fledged Latin nomen *Gallonius*, undoubtedly built to the ethnic name *Gallus* 'a Gaul'. Such interpretation bluntly disregards the fact that *Galunus* (once even attested as a cognomen in Pannonia) uniquely displays a single *l* and that *Gallus* (and its derivatives), which only had any real currency in Latin, is not in fact a Gaulish word (cf. McCone 2008, 4–6)! Meid's account of these forms (2005, 196) implies the existence of an adjective Gaul. **galōn-* 'having ardour, furious, bellicose' ← **galo/-ā*, but this is highly problematic seeing that the attested forms are actually *o*-stems (i.e. *Galunus* not ***Galunius!*) and as such cannot be convincingly compared with Lat. *Gallonius* at all. Moreover, on internal grounds there exists no conclusive evidence that would support the existence of such an adjective in Gaulish, which in fact is normally represented by **gal-ati-*, cf. the ethnonym *Galates* etc.

A similar problem is posed by **Brocc(i)us** (the genitive may stand for *Broccus* or *Broccius*), which is usually tentatively assumed to go back to Gaulish **brokko-* 'badger'. At face value, the similarity is of course obvious, but note that this word never

had any real currency in Gaulish anthroponymy. It is actually improbable that this is anything else but another occurrence of a Latin cognomen used as an individual name in Ig. The name may even have a pseudo-Celtic etymology, i.e. is etymologically Celtic/Gaulish but is only used as a name in another, in this case Latin, tradition, and should therefore properly be considered Latin (cf. Stifter 2012b, 252, based on the overview Katičić 1968, 67, which clearly indicates that the greater majority of the occurrences is limited to overly non-Celtic contexts; similar view was already put forward in Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 19–20).

A different problem is posed by homophony and/or homography of etymologically unrelated or at best only indirectly related names (or individual constituent elements of names such as the non-diagnostic **-gno-*, for which see above). Generally, the chance for homophony increases in proportion with the shortness of the word involved, which makes abbreviated, hypocoristic versions of full names⁵² (be it compound or derived) especially susceptible to almost universal recurrence. Such names abound in Ig (consider the likes of **Aikk'on-*, **Buij'on-*, **Bukkon-*, **Button-*, **Ekkon-*, **Emm'on-*, **Ennon-*, **Eppon-*, **Lasson-*, **Mosson-*, **Nammon-*, **Otton-*, **Petton-*, **Sekkon-*, **Tetton-* (implied by *Tetta*) etc.). Many of the identifiable connections expectedly point to the wider North-Adriatic complex and to a limited degree to Pannonian (cf. *Aicca* and non-exclusively also *Buka* = **Bucca*, *Butto*). At the same time, a significant number of such names find good correspondences in more central Gaulish areas, but missing the Norican and Pannonian onomastic landscapes. This was one of the main reasons for Katičić's assumption that these hypocoristic names must somehow be Celtic and represent an older "non-Noric" Celtic stratum surfacing in Ig (*vide supra*). It will appear clear from the foregoing discussion that the trivial similarity between hypocoristic names (and to a certain extent also short names), given

⁵² *Hypocoristic names* may be derived from simple or compound names by clipping and the addition of typical suffixes, which vary from language to language (*Volto-rex* vel sim. → *Volt-ia*, *Volti-elo-*, perhaps *Buctor* → *Bucco*, *Buccio* etc.). *Short names* (*Kurznamen*), by contrast, are non-derived randomly truncated versions of simple or compound names (*Volto-rex* vel sim. → *Volta*). It is purely formal aspects that define such a name; whether any connotative function such as familiarity (nick-names), endearment (pet-names) etc. is involved at all is inessential (and ultimately undetectable in a poorly attested language).

their universal, non-distinguishing morphology, should be regarded the least reliable factor in linguistic attribution (cf. Stifter 2012b, 253), so that any exclusive correspondences between Ig and Gaul, given the historical and sociolinguistic background, should reasonably be recognised as chance similarities. It should be warned that drawing conclusions about the linguistic attribution of a particular sequence such as **Bukkon-* solely from its geographical distribution⁵³ is a dangerous criterion because such maps are blind to diachrony and can as a rule be suspect of giving a misleading impression as to the historical propinquity of homophonic sequences.

Consider the interesting case of **Bucc(i)o**. The derivational family of hypocoristic names in **BUKK-* is remarkably well developed in Ig (*Bukko/-ā*, **Bukkon-*, **Bukk-ĭon-*, perhaps also **Bukk-ikūn-*), which makes it quite safe to assume that it belongs to the autochthonous name-inventory. The rather common Norican **Bukk-ĭon-* and cases such as **Bukkon-* and **Bukkā* from Pannonia (*Intercisa*; *Parndorf*) may or may not be its cognates. In any event, neither seems to find a convincing connection with the properly Gaulish hypocoristic **Bukko-*, which expectedly and in fundamental disagreement with the latter group appears side by side with genuinely Gaulish hypocoristics such as *Buccillus*, *Buccullus*, all of which are especially common on potters' stamps (also note two occurrences of *Buccio* in *La Graufesenque* and *Rheinzabern*).⁵⁴ Potters' names, however, can hardly be recognised as examples of correlative occurrence of a particular name seeing that they belong to a very particular milieu where hypocoristic names must have enjoyed considerable popularity.⁵⁵ Note that if the Venetic hypocoristic female name *bu.k.ka* (*LVen.* Es 46) belongs with the attestations in Ig, the latter cannot be etymologically connected to the root **Bug-* and to **Buk-tor-* as has been suggested above, because we would in this case surely expect an initial **f* in Venetic. It is important to add that it is similarly impossible to know for certain whether the female name *Bugia*, a few times attested in Noricum and Pannonia, is a genuinely Gaulish name. If it is

connected with undoubtedly Gaulish compound names such as *Adbugissa* (*CIL* XIII 4127) or *Adbugiouna* (*CIL* III 10883), its Celticity cannot be in question, but this affiliation is impossible to prove. The generally accepted etymological connection with Middle Irish plant-name *buga* (see Meid 2005, 157–158; Stüber 2005, 109), some kind of a bright-coloured flower,⁵⁶ is, of course, completely *ad hoc* and does not seem credible. **Bug-ĭo/-ā*, three times attested in Ig (note that *CIL* III 3788; cf. Hostnik 1997, no. 30, notes the reading *Bucioni* rather than *Bugioni*, which makes **Bugion-* beside **Bug-ĭo-* a ghost-form), is undoubtedly an indigenous name, given its close integration within the derivational family around the root **BUG-* and its Venetic cognates *vhug-iio-/vhug-ia*.

A more pertinent question, therefore, is how to assess the few good matches between Ig and the central Gaulish areas, which include southern Noricum. Leaving open the possibility that even such correspondences simply represent unrelated homophones, we could in the event of historically related forms either be dealing with:

- a – genuine cases of Gaulish names in Ig, which spread from Noricum, or
- b – exclusive correspondences between Ig and southern Noricum with comparable but historically/etymologically unrelated occurrences elsewhere in the *Keltiké*.

Given the negligible number of *exact* equivalents between all the three areas such as *Nammo*, *Secco* or *Tetto* and the fact that outside Ig (especially in Gaul), such names occur in close association with their derivational equivalents and are firmly integrated into their respective derivational families (cf. central Gaulish *Nammo* ~ *Nammius* ~ *Namma* ~ *Nammiola*, perhaps even *Namuso* = **Namusso* near *Aquincum* etc., all short and/or hypocoristic names derived from **Nāmant-*), the second alternative seems much more likely. Note that **Nammo** = **Nammon-* has been claimed to be Gaulish solely on the assumption that it is a hypocoristic form of *Adnomatus*, which in turn is the only genuine case of a Gaulish name in Ig (see below). However, this connection presents several problems phonetically (*o* vs. *a*) and morphologically (one would not expect the loss of the preposition *ad-* in a hypocoristic formation, cf. the genuinely Gaulish hypocoristic **Adnamon-* (*ILJug*

⁵³ Cf. Šašel 1955 for *Bucco* and *Buccio*.

⁵⁴ Hartley, Dickinson 2008, 121.

⁵⁵ Note that the frequent use of hypocoristic names on potters' stamps cannot be *directly* (if at all) connected to the physical limitations of the objects on which they were printed. After all, hypocoristic formations represent full not abbreviated names.

⁵⁶ Usually described in the glossaries as a blue or green plant. See *DIL* s.v.

325 = *ILSI* 69) beside **Adnamo-*, **Adnam-jo-*). However, even in the unlikely event that the name is indeed ultimately connected to **Adnomato-*, there is nothing Gaulish about it seeing that regardless of its ultimately Gaulish etymology, **Adnomato-* itself properly speaking belongs to the Ig name-inventory, into which it has been integrated.⁵⁷

The real problem then remains how to account for the tight group of names such as *Butto*, *Otto*,⁵⁸ *Petto*, *Ucco* that so obviously link Ig with southern Noricum (perhaps paired with another feature, namely the spread of predominantly female names in *-*ūn-*, for which see below). Outside Ig, the attested correspondences generally occur in juxtaposition with clearly Gaulish names, but as both southern Noricum and Pannonia are characterised by mixed onomastic traditions, this is not saying much. It is a basic fact that non-Celtic names could be carried by Celtic-speaking people. Consider the obvious case of *Talsa Bremitis f.* (cf. *lupa* 2348) from Šentvid na Glini (*Sankt Veit an der Glan*), which corresponds to diagnostically non-Gaulish *Talsus* singularly attested in Ig, *CIL* III 3811).⁵⁹ Since beside the obvious lack of correlation between the “language of a personal name” and the “language of the bearer” (Sims-Williams 2002, 7) one should also expect borrowing between different traditions, it can reasonably be assumed that the contextual collocation of a problematic name can only be of very limited usefulness. Indeed, as a rule, the hypocoristic names in question are etymologically poorly transparent and not a single case can be assumed to be either diagnostically nor specifically Gaulish. It would therefore not seem unthinkable that, should at least some of the correspondences actually be historically related, they must rather belong to the autochthonous, originally homogenous

onomastic tradition, which in Noricum was later superimposed and assimilated by Gaulish. This is perhaps partly corroborated by the fact that, apart from the obvious case of *Ucco* beside Venetic *.u.ko* = **Ukkon-*, the hypocoristic name *Butto* (represented as a plain thematic stem *Butto-* in Noricum) also seems to connect both regions with (Carnic) Venetic, where it expectedly surfaces as **Futto-* (attested five times), both going back to **b^hut/d-*. The question is further complicated by the possibility that there may be more interrelations such as these but cannot be recognised due to the underrepresentation of actual attestations and the fact that personal names are famous for the ease with which they can migrate from one onomastic tradition to another. Generally speaking, the array of possibilities and circumstances under which the fragmentarily attested linguistic situation might have come about should be enough to put us on guard against automatically assuming Celticity for any of the hypocoristic names attested in Ig.

It is not only in short sequences, however, that homophony/homography may be encountered. Partly based on the abundance of simple, derived and compound names in *Volto-*, typically concentrated around the north Adriatic, and partly because it appears in collocations with diagnostically non-Celtic elements such as *-rēx*, no one would claim, for instance, that *Volto-*, also quite common in Ig, is in fact Celtic, basing the comparison on Gaul. *Volto-* such as appears in the diagnostically Gaulish female name *Volto-daga* (*CIL* XIII 5816), where it goes back to a completely different root meaning ‘hair’ (cf. Old Irish *fol*, Welsh *gwallt*). Why then would one make the silent assumption that **Venixama**, which within the North-Adriatic tradition represent a *unicum*, must despite the obvious similarity be intimately connected to the Gaulish male name *Venixamus*, attested in *Germania Superior* and twice in *Aquitania*? Despite the fact that both representatives are each in turn embedded in transparently epichoric onomastic contexts (*Venixama Plunconis f.*, *Venixema Voltregis f.*, *Venixem(a) Petonis f.* vs. *Venixamus Meddili f.* etc.), which in itself is already a strong indicator that they represent parallel occurrences in two separate onomastic traditions, there are actually a number of important differences between the two groups of attestations of this name. Even if we grant the fact that their exclusive use as a female and a male name respectively may be due to chance (this is very unlikely, however, given the remarkable regularity of this pattern in

⁵⁷ By contrast, **Nammon-* in Noricum may be a genuinely Gaulish short name if it is from **Nāmanto-*, but this is impossible to corroborate.

⁵⁸ Especially noteworthy is the juxtaposition of *Otto* in Ig versus one or two occurrences of *Ot(t)u* (f.) = **Ottūn-* from Noricum, each time paired with a genuinely Gaulish hypocoristic name: ...*otuni Mocconis f(iliae)* (*CIL* III 11657) and perhaps *Otu* (!) *Senonis f(ilia)* (ib. 14368⁴). Neither of these attestations for *Ottu* are absolutely certain, however.

⁵⁹ This is one of the few instances of a diagnostically non-Celtic name on account of the preservation of *-*ls-* for expected *-*ll-* were the name Gaulish in origin. Note that *pace* Katičić (1968, 99) **Talso-* can in no way be historically connected to Gaulish **talu-* ‘frons’ nor its hypocoristic derivative **Talusso-*, **Talisso-*.

relative proportion to the number of attestations), they each in turn display an unshared phonetic peculiarity: the oscillation between *-ama* and *-ema* in the case of *Venixama* points to the weakening of the unaccented vowel comparable to that of *Voltaronis* ~ *Voltarenis* (see Stifter 2012a, 543),⁶⁰ while the spelling of the consonantal cluster **-ks-* as *<xs>* (*CIL* XIII 1357) and *<xx>* (*CIL* XIII 1125) very probably points to the typically Gaulish **χs* < **ks*. *Venixama* is undoubtedly the result of syncope of the unaccented vowel *-i-* (**U̇enik-ḥsamā* < **U̇enik-isamā*), perfectly parallel to cases such as *Volt-ḥrex* < **Vólto/u-rex* or **Vólto/u-rèx* (cf. Stifter 2012b, 256–257), which points to sporadic syncope of the vowel immediately following the stressed syllable – a phenomenon also typical of Venetic derivatives and compounds (cf. *.e.p.petari.s.* for **ékḥ-pètari-* < *.e.kupetari.s.*, *úsedika* for *upḥ-sedika* < **úpo-sèdikā*, *vo.l.te.r.ko.n.* for **voltrḥko-* < **uóltriko-*, *vene.t.ḥke(.).n.s.* < **veneti-* or **venet-o-ken-jo-*, *va.n.t(.).ḥkenia* < **vant-o-ken-iā-* etc.). Gaulish *Venixamus*, on the other hand, may be the result of syncope or it may not (note that beside the regular Celtic superlative suffixes **-amo-* and **-isamo-*, the variant *-samo-*⁶¹ probably also had some currency in Gaulish), but in case *Venixamus* is to be understood as **U̇enik-ḥsamo-* < **U̇enik-isamo-*, the syncope has no genetic connection with the one characteristic of North-Adriatic names but can be explained on internal grounds, for which consider other clear cases of syncope in Gaulish such as *Mogitḥmarus* (*CIL* III 3325) < **Moget-o-māro-*.⁶² That both the underlying **u̇eni-ko-* ‘amicus, carus’ and the superlative suffix **-isamo-* < **-is-ḥHo-* (a conspicuous Italo-Celtic isogloss), including the trivial combination of the two elements in each respective linguistic system, are shared rather than borrowed features, is thus

⁶⁰ In this respect compare the surely non-Celtic (despite the more than apparently Gaulish affiliation *Bussumari f.*) hapax *Volitsema* (*AE* 1989, 587; ib. 1996, 1190, see HD018282) from *Aguntum* (*Noricum*), which must undoubtedly go back to a participial superlative formation **uolt-isamo-* (and ultimately to **uol-to-* < **u̇l-tó-* ‘dēsīderātus’, for which see above s.v.).

⁶¹ Generalised from cases where **-amo-* was added to stems ending in *-s*, such as **uχs-amo-* > **uχsamo-* ‘highest’ → *-samo-*, for which consider the personal name *Olusamos* on the newly found *defixio* from Chartres (Repanšek 2013, 183).

⁶² See De Bernardo Stempel 2013, 78–79, and Sims-Williams 2015, 327–328 *et pass.*

indubitable, which in this case renders the similarity between both names merely coincidental.⁶³

Much more problematic to evaluate are borderline cases such as *Cetetiu* (if the name is in fact genuine, for which see above), which on the one hand seems perfectly consistent with Gaulish and has no obvious connections elsewhere, but on the other would in fact represent an isolated occurrence of such a name within Gaulish itself (or indeed any Celtic language for that matter). It has been proposed to interpret it as **Kait-et-jo-* to Gaulish **kai̇to-* ‘silva’,⁶⁴ so that *Cetetiu*, which is clearly a female name, would mean ‘silvāna’ *vel sim.* (Meid 2005, 263–264; Repanšek 2014, 249). The question is intimately bound with the peculiar morphology of short feminine names in *-ūn-* such as *Amatu*,⁶⁵ *Manu*, *Las(s)aiu*, *Tetiu* (possibly derived from **Tett-iā*, which to the female hypocoristic form **Tettā* would represent a pair of the type seen in *Voltia* to *Volta*), and perhaps *Buccicu* (?) and *Secu* (?) (*vide supra*), all of which are etymologically obscure and, contrary to previous claims, receive no convincing parallels elsewhere. The same can be claimed for the recently discovered hapax *Cotiu*, which may find an admissible correspondence in Gaulish names derived from **kotto-* ‘old’⁶⁶ but apart from its possible root-etymology cannot be claimed to be in any way demonstrably Gaulish. Note that *Manu* was believed to be Gaulish by Katičić and Lochner von Hüttenbach, primarily on account of the element *mano-*, especially common as the second member of Gaulish compound names (cf. *Ariomanus*, *Catamanus*). However, on the evidence of Old Irish personal name *Maun* < **Mānu-* (cf. Ogam *MANU*) Gaulish **mānu-* seems to have been a *u-* rather than an *o-* stem, which renders the similarity with **Manūn-* in Ig superficial and all the more coincidental.

⁶³ The same conclusion is tentatively also offered by Meid 2005, 305.

⁶⁴ <*e*> for original **ai̇* is not problematic in Gaulish, where it may reflect vernacular monophthongisation to **ē* or go back to Latin inverted spelling, cf. the place-names such as Κέτιον (*Ptol.*, *Geogr.* II,13,1; 14,1; 15,1) beside Hispano-Celtic Καῖτό-βριξ (*Ptol.* II,5,2), both to **kai̇to-*.

⁶⁵ Not at all necessarily built to Latin *amātus* as proposed by Katičić (1968, 87), Meid (2005, 251) and Stifter (2012b, 261 s.v.). Synchronic similarity between attested sequences will not do, especially not when we are dealing with isolated names.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Cotu* (f./m.) (e.g. *CIL* III 11630) if for **Cottu* and a typically Gaulish hypocoristic formation in *Cotul(i)a* (*CIL* III 5107 = Djura Jelenko, Visočnik 2006, 371–372).

These four or five examples of female names in **-ūn-* do, however, at least at face value share their characteristic word-formation with predominantly but not exclusively female names within the southern-Norican and Pannonian onomastic complex. The derivational base of a number of these names is indisputably Gaulish in origin: *Caletiu* (f.) to **kal-eto-* ‘firmus’, *Suadru* (f.) to **sʷad-ro-* ‘suāvis’,⁶⁷ and perhaps also *Aiu* (f.) (although it is not diagnostically Gaulish, the name appears beside other typically Gaulish hypocoristic derivatives such as *Aiuca*, *Aiulo*) to **aiu-* ‘vita’ (?) (thus Meid 2005, 213) or more likely a simple by-form of **Aijā*. Further possible instances of genuinely Gaulish names include *Cauru* (f.) (if for Gaulish **kauro-* ~ **kauřro-* ‘heros’ and not (Carnic) Venetic **kauro-* implied by the patronymic *kavaron:s* <**kau=ar=on-jo-*),⁶⁸ *Mats[i]ju* (on account of the <ts>, possibly reflecting the diagnostically Gaulish **/tʰ/*), *Su-celu* (m.) (if to Gaul. *Su-cella*, *Su-cellus* rather than Carnic Venetic *ke.l.lo.s.*), *Attu*, *Materiu*, *Mottu* (f.) (if to Gaul. **motto-* ‘membrum virile’), and *Tulliu*, the last four being additionally inconclusive due to their non-specific appearance. The easiest and universally received explanation for this occurrence in strongly Celticised areas such as Southern Noricum to assume that it reflects an epichoric Gaulish development, by which the alternative declensional pattern with nominative **-ū* (with regular and diagnostically Celtic transition of the inherited **-ō* to **-ū* in the nominative singular) and oblique *-ūn-* (e.g. genitive **-ūn-os* → latinised to *-ūnis* etc.) was actively employed in the formation of hypocoristic names. It was probably the coexistence of the two patterns, viz. **-ū*, **-ūn-os* and the “normal” **-ū*, *on-os*, which prompted large-scale translation of these names into the Latin pattern in **-ō*, *-ōnis* in the first place.⁶⁹ The alternative **-ū*, **-ūn-os* pattern is known to have been generalised in Celtiberian and traces of it are preserved elsewhere in Gaulish, cf. the patronymics *αττουνιος* (*RIG I*, G–108) and *τουτουνια* (*RIG I*,

G–163), implying **Attūn-* and **Touūn-* rather than the usual **Atton-* and **Touyton-* (see Stüber 1998, 93), so that the phenomenon would not be at all unlikely to also surface in Noricum. What is significantly less likely, however, is the assumption that this morphological trait could have spread from Noricum and/or Pannonia to Ig as a productive pattern (hypothesised by Meid 2005, 251 s.v. *Amatu*). Such a categorical borrowing between two onomastic traditions would be extremely unusual. Seeing that both Venetic *resun.ko.s.* (*LVen.* Ca 7), *votu.n.ke.a.* (*LVen.* Tr 6) and *Plunco* in Ig show traces of **-un-* or **-ūn-* where normally one would expect **-on-* or **-an-* (cf. the functional parallelism between **-unko-* and **-onko-*, **-anko-* in Venetic), it seems reasonable to assume that this may be a local phenomenon,⁷⁰ possibly going back to a combination of the inherited class of exclusively feminine nouns in **-ū-* <**-uH₂*- (such as for instance indirectly reflected by Latin *socrus*, *-ūs*) and nasal stems in **-on-* (suggested also by Stifter 2012b, 258), probably modelled on the pattern **-ō*, **-o/ōn-* → *-ū*, **-ūn-*, which in Ig was obviously reserved for male names. Be that as it may, the crucial point is that even though the exact nature of the relationship between the names in **-ūn-* in southern Noricum/Pannonia and Ig cannot at present be recognised, the pattern such as it surfaces in Ig does not *need* to be accounted for by virtue of Gaulish historical phonology, because it can just as easily (or even more so) reflect indigenous morphology. To claim Celticity for any number of these names based solely on the homophony of the involved suffixes⁷¹ is a prime example of circular reasoning.

In conclusion it will be useful to reiterate that, ultimately, there are no decisive elements among the names recorded in Ig which would speak in favour of a Celtic (i.e. Gaulish) onomastic layer. In fact, the linguistic situation in Ig seems in line with what appears to be a rather coherent syndrome in any area where Celtic element is weak or altogether questionable:⁷² if there are

⁶⁷ **sʷad-ro-* beside **sʷad-u-* (cf. the deadjectival hypocoristic form *Suadulla*, *ILSI* 93 = *RINMS* 147) is an archaic by-form of the Gaulish adjective (see Meid 2005, 206–207), only typical of Noricum and Pannonia.

⁶⁸ Note that despite *LVen.* II, 116 there is no reason to assume that this Venetic name is in fact a borrowing from Gaulish.

⁶⁹ I cannot agree with Wedenig, De Bernardo Stempel (2007, 622–623) that this is an unmarked survival of archaic Gaulish morphology.

⁷⁰ Cf. Untermann 1961, 100 ft. 170: “kan man ihn (i.e. the transition of **-ō* to **-ū*) nicht einfach als “keltisch” bezeichnen ..., sondern muß in ihm jeweils lokale Sondererscheinung sehen.”

⁷¹ This criterion is often drawn upon by Lochner von Hüttenbach, Katičić, Hamp and occasionally even Meid (see s.v. *Manu*).

⁷² Note that an isolated case of a Celtic-looking name in a marginal area does not prove its Celtic or Celticised character (cf. Sims-Williams 2006, 37).

genuinely Celtic names, they will normally appear as a cohesive group, whereas any isolated instance of an inconclusively Celtic name in a decidedly non-Celtic onomastic context will ultimately most likely be non-Celtic. The disconcerting vocalism of *Adnomatus* is perhaps symptomatic seeing that as the only indubitable example of a diagnostically Gaulish name in Ig, *Adnomatus* too shows unmistakable and meaningful signs of external interference unique to Ig. The *o* for the expected *a* has been convincingly explained by Stifter (2012b, 250–251) as phonetic substitution of vernacular **o* or perhaps **ō* for Gaulish **ā*, which was probably a low rounded vowel as can be surmised on the basis of sporadically attested graphic alternation between <a> and <o>, most notably in *Bloturix* for **Blātu-*.⁷³ If this explanation is correct, it offers an important insight into the nature of the relationship between the epichoric and the allochthonous Gaulish onomastic tradition – the latter represented a very marginal source from which new names could occasionally be borrowed, while it neither played a prestigious nor superstratal role in relation to Ig, or, for that matter, North-Adriatic in general.

THE NAME Q(V)IEMONI(S)

As I have demonstrated in the preceding contribution (see Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 313–316), the name *Q(u)iemoni(s)* (the attested sequence is to be irreproachably read as *QIEMONI*) as it stands⁷⁴ can despite difficulties (viz. the lack of filiation and a rather unusual representation of the Latin digraph *QV*) hardly be anything else but the nominative singular of a unique and unitary personal name. As a case of anticipatory fronting a dative singular *Q(u)iemoni* is theoretically not impossible, but this type of mistake would be typologically unparalleled, while a genitive *Q(u)iemoni(s)* would necessarily require the sequence to have a filiation function, which is not at all convincing (*vide infra*). It cannot be excluded that the name in fact represents an *i*-stem, but as long as such derivational model has not been identified elsewhere to afford viable comparative evidence,

it may be best recognised as reflecting a *io*-stem of the type observable in the Venetic patronymic adjective *vo.l.tiiof.n.m]ni.s.* (*LVen.* Es 34; *MLV* 16; ib. § 87^d) < **uoltiomn-jo-* ‘*Voltiomni filius*’. The reason for its unusual isolated appearance, as has been surmised (see Veranič, Repanšek l.c.), may be a mistake or a deliberate omission of the father’s name in the genitive. The latter practice, which, incidentally, does not find a single parallel in the entire corpus of names attested in Ig, might in our case be singularly employed for reasons of overall contextual clarity or lack of space, maybe even a combination of both. Theoretically, an abbreviation of the underlying **Quiemonis Quiemoni f.* would also be at least thinkable, but it seems unlikely that even in the case of tautology, the filiation would have been entirely omitted if the individual name were not still understood as deriving from the father’s name, i.e. as being in effect a patronymic used in place of the individual name. There is, however, no proof for this type of conversion in Ig (or elsewhere for that matter) and, typologically speaking, it also seems very unlikely that in such an event a newly created patronymic would be employed rather than that the name be based on an old stock of such petrified patronymics which in turn had lost their original semantic connection to their underlying individual names (as is the case in Venetic or Gaulish, for example). This would by implication render the tautology in the putative **Quiemonis Quiemoni f.* a mere coincidence and thus makes it difficult to see any *formal* reason for the omission of the father’s name in the formula. It would still be possible, however, to see in *Quiemonis* a gentilic, i.e. something like

Quiemon-jo-pseudo-gent. < patr. (X^{cgn.} – omitted)
← **Quiemō*^{cgn.} + *patronymic / filiation*.⁷⁵

There are a few very uncertain cases of this phenomenon in Venetic (see Untermann 1961, § 25–26), but they are all restricted to indigenous Venetic inscriptions and never occur in a Latin formula, where such gentilicia would normally be accompanied by a cognomen. Moreover, there remains the question whether gentile names can

⁷³ See Sims-Williams 2003, 56 ft. 210; Raybould, Sims-Williams 2009, 138.

⁷⁴ *Quiemoni* · *v(ivus)* · *f(ecit)* · [si]/bi · *eT* · *Vēnixemāē* / *co(n)iugi* [-] *v(ivae)* [-] *eT* · *Māi*[-] / *filiaē* · *Θ*(obitae) · / *añ*(*norum*) · *XX* (Veranič, Repanšek l. c.).

⁷⁵ Consider cases such as Gaulish *Seccia Secci f.* (*CIL* XII 4151), *Comagia Comagi f. Severa* (*CIL* XII 2939), or, less obviously, *Carantia Aelia* (*CIL* XIII 6534) and *Ollognatus Secundus* (*CIL* XIII 4159), derived from their respective father’s cognomina *Carantus* (*Meððillius Carantus*) and *Ollognatus* (*M. Ammutius Ollognatus*), see Stüber 2007, 88.

be demonstrated to have ever played any role in the Ig tradition of name-giving in the first place.

The fact that the most common type of the naming formula in Ig involves filiation (e.g. *Volteregi Buctoris fi* = *Volterex Buctoris f.*,⁷⁶ *Voltrex Plaetoris f.*⁷⁷ etc.) speaks strongly against the possibility that the old patronymic adjective, in case it was ever customary before the Roman period, was understood as a gentile name. This situation is strongly reminiscent of the situation in Gaulish and is typical of the entire adjoining Eastern-Alpine region, including Pannonia,⁷⁸ where patronymic adjectives are regularly translated into the father's name in the genitive, normally followed by *filius/filia*. This clearly indicates that it was the function of the Latin cognomen + filiation rather than that of the praenomen + nomen gentile which best corresponded to the inherited function of the indigenous names. Note that Roman cognomina may also be used in place of the indigenous individual names, with which they were evidently most closely associated, cf. *Terti(a)e Secundi f.* (CIL III 3798, RINMS 84) or *Tertia Sabini f.* (AIJ 128), where both the daughter and her father bear a Roman cognomen as their individual names.

There are a few cases of a more developed onomastic formula, in which the entire name of the father has been incorporated in the filiation, e.g. *Tertius Epponis Boleriani / Boleriavi f.* (CIL III 3816 and 10735 = AIJ 142 = RINMS 88), *Secundus Volturegis Talsi f.* (CIL III 3811). This undoubtedly represents a more prominent attempt to integrate the indigenous naming formula into the Roman model, which alongside filiation also included the family name. Although the structure of the innovatory onomastic formula established in Ig still differs significantly from the Roman practice, it does manage to essentially copy the reduced Roman formula by incorporating both patronymics, viz. that of the actual father and the "pater familias". That neither *Epponis* nor *Volturegis* are actual patronymics in *-jo- is made perfectly clear by the like of *Quarta Firmi Galuni (f.)* (CIL III 3815 + p. 1731 = AIJ 141 = RINMS 87) and *Lascio{a}nti(a)e Q(inti) Sublo{a}ni f.*, where both

Firmus and *Quintus* clearly represent the Roman cognomen, used as the individual name of the father. Nor is it at all certain that these indications of filiation point to *Bolerianus*, *Sublo{a}nius*, or indeed *Talsius* as representing old patronymics or even family names.⁷⁹ As nearly all of them are represented by hapaxes,⁸⁰ their function(s) cannot be decided, but as far as their structure is concerned, there is nothing that would have them point decisively in the direction of gentile names. The suffix *-ano-* may in fact be attested in an individual name in Ig (*Voltano-*, CIL III 3790 + p. 1731 = AIJ 129; CIL III 3821),⁸¹ while patronymic derivatives in *-jo- based on individual names cannot be determined (at least on the basis of the available material) as a productive category at all. It is therefore much more probable that these names stand for customary individual names of the father's father, which normally appeared in the filiation of the immediate father and were, for reasons suggested above, quite exceptionally carried over to the assertion of filiation of the youngest descendant.⁸² This is further supported by *Ep(p)o/Buquorsa/Adnomatus P(ubli) Varisidi Hosti f.* (CIL III 10740 = AIJ 131), where the entire tripartite name of the father (i.e. *Publius Varisidius Hosti f.*, where *Varisidius* clearly stands for a nomen gentile) has been included in the filiation.

Interestingly, gentile names in the form of patronymic adjectives were in fact in general use in Šmarata, e.g. *Turoius Pletor Feucontis f.* (CIL III 10724 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 3), *Voltae Lassoniae Plani f.* (CIL III 10723 = AIJ 124 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 2). This is especially well observable in the case of *Pletoris Potei Feucontis f.* (ib.) = **Pletor Poteius Feucontis f.* and *Planus Po<p>teius Pletori(s) f.* (ib.), where both the father and his son carry the same patronymic adjective *Poteius*,⁸³ while their respective filiations reflect

⁷⁹ Pace Šašel Kos in RINMS, pp. 277, 279.

⁸⁰ In the case of *Firmus Galunus*, the latter name is clearly attested as a cognomen in *T. Ael. Galunus* (RIU, Suppl. 120; Meid 2005, 196).

⁸¹ On the suffix *-ano-* see Untermann 1961, § 201, § 204, *LVen.* II, p. 213. In case the correct reading is *Tertius Epponis Boleriavi f.* (*ilius*), for which see above, the suffix *-auro-* would decidedly point in the direction of a personal name.

⁸² Cf. the case of *Platino [Platoris Tizi f(ilia)] filiation* (CIL III 2788), which would correspond to **Platino Tizia^{gent.} Platoris f.*, the latter type also being quite common in Dalmatia, cf. *Sestus Platurius Triti f.* (CIL III 15055) = **Sestus [Triti Platoris f.] filiation* etc.

⁸³ See also Šašel Kos 2000, p. 99 *et pass.*

⁷⁶ CIL III 3823 + p. 1731 = AIJ 143 = RINMS 89.

⁷⁷ CIL III 3825 + p. 1731.

⁷⁸ As far as female names are concerned, the not yet completed transition of the old patronymic adjective to a nomen gentile can sporadically also be observed in Venetic, cf. *NERCA VANTICCONIS F.* = **ne.r.ka va.n.tikna* (see Untermann 1961, § 75, § 208).

their direct patrilinear descent (*Pot(e)i(o)s² → *Feuco Potej-*ios*^{patronymic} → Pletor Poteios^{gentilic} Feuontis f.^{filiation} → Planius Poteius^{gentilic} Pletoris f.^{filiation}). It is very likely that these are old gentilicia, which were simply carried forward to appear as such in the Latin onomastic formula. This situation would tally well with the notable preponderance and liberal use of autochthonous gentile names such as *Potej-*io-* and *Lasson-*io-*⁸⁴ at the expense of traditional Latin gentilicia such as *Sextillius/-ia* (CIL III 10722). The situation is comparable to cases such as Ven. *VANTI ENONIO TI. F*⁸⁵ (LVen. Es VII), possibly replacing the old type *vo.l.tiomno.s. iuva.n.t.s. a.riun.s.* (LVen. Es 25) (< *Iuvant-*io-* *Ariiun-*io-*) and in turn signals the rather early functional transition of the patronymic to a gentilic in this area (in line with other late North-Adriatic onomastic traditions and, expectedly, in dire contrast to the situation prevalent in Ig). Old patronymics would namely not have been identified with the Latin gentilicium, regardless of the overwhelmingly identical structure (both in *-*io-*), because of their inherently filial function. It cannot be completely ruled out, however, that even in Šmarata the autochthonous formula still expressed filiation by a patronymic, normally transformed into the genitive of the father's name under the Roman influence, the gentile names then being secondary creations on the Latin model.

On the basis of the available evidence presented above it is not possible to establish the pre-Roman onomastic formula of the indigenous population of Ig. It may be that only the individual names were in use, or they may have been originally accompanied by a patronymic. The switch to the Romanised formula would expectedly have translated the old patronymics to the genitive of the father's individual name seeing that it was the father's *praenomen* which was normally used in Latin filiation. It is possible that old patronymics are preserved in some of the idionyms that bear suffixes otherwise typical of patronymic adjectives,

⁸⁴ Cf. *Las(s)on-, twice attested as individual name in Ig: CIL III 3790 (+ p. 1731) = AIJ 129; CIL III 3821.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Ennonio* (dative) < *Ennon-*io-*, which is used as a gentile name in an otherwise heavily Latinised dedication *VANTI ENONIO TI. F* (LVen. Es VII; Untermann 1961, 57) and appears beside the normal Venetic patronymic adjectives *.e.n.non.s.* (LVen. Es 91) < *Ennon-*io-*, *.e.n.nonitia* (LVen. Es 90), *ENNONIOI* (LVen. Es 108), *ENNONIA* (LVen. Es XXXIII), all presumably derived from the individual name *Ennon-, attested once as *.e.n.no* (LVen. Ca 69).

tives, a case in point being perhaps *Plunco** (CIL III 3793 (twice) and 3825 + p. 1731), to which cf. Ven. *suro.s. resun.ko.s.* (MLV, no. 152) vs. *votu.n.ke.a.* (MLV, no. 224).

Derivatives in *-*io-* such as *Laepius* (in *Pletor Laepius*, CIL III 3804 = 10731 = AIJ 134), *Coemo...ius* (CIL III 3792, see above), or *Prouius* (in *Firmo Prouio*, CIL III 3797) accompanying the individual name, are highly exceptional in Ig. It is inherently unlikely that such cases could represent the remnants of an older indigenous onomastic formula, but should rather be read as pseudo-gentile names in *-*io-*,⁸⁶ based on the underlying individual names (concerning *Laepius* cf. Histrian *Laep-oko-*, Liburnian *Laep-iko-*, and Venetic *Laep=on-io-*),⁸⁷ which are typical of the adjacent Venetic, Histrian and Dalmatian regions (including Šmarata), rather than Ig itself. If *Quiemonis* in fact reflects a token of native morphology and goes back to *K^uiē-mon-*io-s*, as will be suggested below, the Latinised sequence *-ius* in the likes of *Laepius* cannot be original. It is conceivable, however, that since *Laepius* clearly had the function of a nomen gentile, morphological adaptation of the original *-is* to match the Latin model would have been spontaneous if not deliberate. However, it is also quite possible that the form is not in fact native to Ig at all, so that the typical ending *-ius*, if it is not in fact copying the Latin model altogether, could well reflect vernacular morphology. It may not be at all coincidental that this nearly singular example of a gentilicium in Ig occurs in conjunction with *Pletor* and **Laep-*, both of which decidedly point to the south(west)! However that may be, the status of an individual name for *Quiemonis* seems secured seeing that if in this particular case the name did go back to an older gentile name, as has been tentatively suggested above in relation to the possible reasons for the omission of the filiation, it would almost undoubtedly surface as ***Quiemonius* (= **Quiemoni filius*)⁸⁸ under the Latin influence, which would seemingly have prompted its creation in the first place.

As far as its formal structure is concerned, however, there is no need to assume an underlying

⁸⁶ Note that both *Laepius* and *Coemoius*[sic!] are recognised as cognomina by *OPEL* (III, 16; II, 68). I can see no compelling reasons to endorse this view.

⁸⁷ Cf. Untermann 1961: § 118; for the attestations see *OPEL* III, 16 s.v. *Laepicus*; ib. III, 17 s.v. *Laepocus*.

⁸⁸ Compare the likes of *Baezocrusu Lavia*^{gentilic} *Lavi filia* (CIL III 14321 = 2781).

ing patronymic adjective. The name can equally likely be a superficial onymisation⁸⁹ of an underlying substantivised adjective, derived from the nasal stem (**Quiemon-* = **K^uiē-mon-*) with the help of the ubiquitous suffix *-*io-*, which in this case should then be recognised as belonging to the sphere of word-formation on the level of the lexical/appellative stock rather than having the function of the homophonous deonomastic suffix *-*io-* current in name-giving. If so, we are here almost certainly dealing with the Proto-Indo-European verbal root **k^uiēH₁-* ‘ausruhen’ (LIV² 393–394; IEW 638), which is known from Latin *quiētus* ‘peaceful’, *quiēscere* ‘to rest’, or Slavic **po-čiti* ‘to take a rest’ and **po-kojъ* ‘rest’ etc. The closest cognate of our name, however, is represented by the abstract noun ‘rest(ing)’, derived from the verbal root **k^uiēH₁-* with the feminine suffix *-*ti-* (i.e. PIE **k^uiēH₁-ti-*) and continued by Young Avestan *šā’ti-* ‘peace’, Old Persian *šiyāti-* ‘welfare, peace, happiness’ and, notably, also Lat. *quiēs* ‘sleep, repose’ < **k^uiē-ti-*. In the case of *Q(u)iemoni(s)*, on the other hand, the underlying noun would represent an old nasal derivative in *-*mon-*, i.e. **k^uiē-mon-* < PIE **k^uiēH₁-mon-*, from which **k^uiēmon-*io-** would be derived as the corresponding adjective of appurtenance, essentially adding up to the meaning very near to that of Lat. *quiētus* ‘peaceful’ < *‘that has to do with/ is connected to rest’ or, perhaps, *quiēscens* ‘resting’. Structurally, **k^uiēH₁-mon-*io-** is immediately comparable to Venetic **termon(i)s* ‘terminālis’ (attested as *te.r.mon.io.s.* ‘terminālēs’, see MLV 257) < **termon-*io-** to PIE **ter(H_{1/2})mon-* ‘boundary’ as preserved by Lat. *termō* ‘boundary post’ = Ancient Greek τέρμων.

The probability that the proposed etymological solution is in fact correct is increased by the unique structure of the root, which significantly reduces the set of possible contenders for its etymological explanation. Moreover, the proposed morphological analysis, which successfully and convincingly accounts for the function and the internal structure of the name, is based both on internal as much as on external reconstruction and as such leaves little doubt as to its accuracy. From the point of view of historical linguistics it will therefore appear unnecessary to dwell on this any further. However, since upon the discovery of the tombstone I was bewildered by the amount of

nonspecialist speculation that the name attracted, a few further comments will be unavoidable. A name, be it personal or geographical, is after all a word, thus being in essence a *structured system*, based on the phonemic, morphological, and syntactical peculiarities of the language/linguistic system in which the word was coined. One cannot thus dissect it at random but needs to diagnose its constituent parts, progressing from the last suffix in the suffixal chain towards the underlying minimal etymon (i.e. from right to left) in such a way that every phoneme or phoneme sequence is assigned its morphological function (in other words, there needs to be a perfect match between phonemes and morphemes, leaving no redundant or unassignable sequences) – the importance of word-formation for reliable and acceptable etymology can thus not be overstated here. It would, for example, be ultimately impossible to see in our name an etymological connection with the geographical name *Emona*, not solely on account of the manifestly incomparable word-formational structure of both names (**Ēm/Aīm-ōnā* versus **K^uiē=mon-*io-**, both of which have irreproachable external cognates in terms of word-formation; for *Emona* cf. the numerous cases of place-names in *-ōnā* such as *Aenona*, *Albona*, *Aluona*, *Flanona*, *Glemona*, *Narona*, *Salona* etc.), but particularly for the reason that such juxtaposition would neglect the fact that a word is first and foremost a consolidation of formal properties and would thus violate the main principle of analytical linguistics in as much as it would not manage to assign all the phonemes to their respective morphemes, bluntly disregarding the initial sequence **k^ui-*.

It remains to speculate on the nature of the omission of the element <u> in the normal Latin digraph <qu>. It has been proposed (see Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 314) that this may indicate the simple attempt at saving space seeing that the inscription field is comparatively short. It may also be a mistake, but despite the rather frequent errors on the tombstones manufactured in Ig workshops this type of aberration would be unparalleled unless it goes back to haplography. It is also uncommonly rare in Latin epigraphy in general and the few instances that can be identified (cf. *OPEL* IV, 17) may in fact reflect Vulgar Latin phonology. The idea may therefore be tentatively put forward that this unique graphic representation could in theory reflect vernacular phonology. Seeing that monosyllabic sequences **CiV-* are foreign to Latin, which in such cases has generalised disyllabic

⁸⁹ I.e. conversion of the underlying appellative to a name without the use of any outward formal means.

sequences **Ci-īV-* (e.g. *quietus* = /*k^hi-īē-tus*/ not **/*k^hīē-tus*/ as was the inherited sequence), the indigenous sequence **k^hīēš-* (vs. normalised Latin **k^hišjēš-*⁹⁰) would conceivably present a challenge for normal graphic representation.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank (in alphabetical order) Milan Lovenjak, Patrick Sims-Williams, Marjeta Šašel Kos, Sneža Tecco Hvala, and Michael Weiss for their stimulating comments, from which the first draft of this article has greatly benefited. Needless to add, all opinions and errors remain entirely my responsibility.

The research behind this article was made possible by the kind support of the Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana.

⁹⁰ The dollar sign marks the end of a syllable.

Abbreviations / Kratices

AcS = A. Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* I–III. – Leipzig (1896–1907), reprinted Graz (1961–1962).
 AE = *L'Année épigraphique*.
 AIJ = V. Hoffiller, B. Saria, *Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslavien. Heft I: Noricum und Pannonia Superior*. – Zagreb 1938.
 CIL = *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*.
 DIL = *Dictionary of the Irish language (and Contributions to a dictionary of the Irish language)*. – Dublin 1913–1975 (compact edition 1983).
 HD = Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg (Service provider: Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften). <http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de>
 IEW = J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. – Bern, München 1959–1969.
 ILLJug = A. et J. Šašel, *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt* (Situla 5). – Ljubljana 1963; iidem, *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMLX et MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt* (Situla 19). – 1978; iidem, *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMII et MCMXL repertae et editae sunt* (Situla 25). – 1986.
 ILLPRON = M. Hainzmann, P. Schubert, *Inscriptionum lapidarium Latinarum provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices*. – Berlin 1986.
 ILSI = M. Lovenjak, *Neviodunum. Inscriptiones Latinae Sloveniae I. Neviodunum* (Situla 37). – Ljubljana 1998.
 LIV² = H. Rix, M. Kümmel, Th. Zehnder, R. Lipp, B. Schirmer, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen* (zweite erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von M. Kümmel und H. Rix). – Wiesbaden 2001.
 LVen. = G. B. Pellegrini, A. L. Proscodimi, *La lingua venetica* I–II. – Padova 1967.
 lupa = UBI ERAT LUPA – Roman Stone Monuments (Service provider: CHC – Archäometrie und Cultural Heritage Computing, Universität Salzburg). <http://www.ubi-erat-lupa.org>
 MLV = M. Lejeune, *Manuel de la langue vénète*. – Heidelberg 1974.
 NIL = D. S. Wodtko, B. Irslinger, C. Schneider, *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. – Heidelberg 2008.

OPEL = B. Lőrincz, *Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, Vol. I: *Aba – Bysanus*, Budapest 2002; Vol. II: *Cabalicius – Ixus*, Wien 1999; Vol. III: *Labareus – Pythea*, Wien 2000; Vol. IV: *Labareus – Pythea*, Wien 2002.
 RIG = *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*. Vol. I: M. Lejeune, *Textes gallo-grecs*, Paris 1985. Vol. II, 1: M. Lejeune, *Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre*, Paris 1988. Vol. II, 2: P.-Y. Lambert, *Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum*, Paris 2002.
 RINMS = M. Šašel Kos, *The Roman inscriptions in the National museum of Slovenia / Lapidarij Narodnega muzeja Slovenije* (Situla 35). – Ljubljana 1997.
 RIU = *Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns*. – Budapest 1972–2001.
 RIU, *Suppl.* = P. Kovács (ed. / ur.), *Tituli Romani in Hungaria reperti. Supplementum*. – Budapest, Bonn 2005.
 ANREITER, P. 2001, *Die vorrömischen Namen Pannoniens*. – Budapest.
 CREVATIN, F. 1990, *Storia linguistica dell'Istria preromana e romana*. – In / V: E. Campanile (ed. / ur.), *Rapporti linguistici e culturali tra i popoli dell'Italia antica*, Pisa, 6–7 ottobre 1989, 43–109, Pisa.
 DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, P. 2013, *The phonetic interface of word formation in Continental Celtic*. – In / V: J. L. García Alonso (ed. / ur.), *Continental Celtic word formation: The onomastic data*, 63–83, Salamanca.
 DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, P. 2014, *Meißner, Torsten (Hrsg.): Personal names in the western Roman world ... 2012 ...* – *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 61, 266–278.
 DELAMARRE, X. 2007, *Nomina Celtica antiqua selecta inscriptionum / Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique*. – Paris.
 DJURA JELENKO, S., J. VIŠOČNIK 2006, *Rimski spomeniki slovenske Koroške / The Roman stone monuments of Slovenian Carinthia*. – *Arheološki vestnik* 57, 345–415.
 FURLAN, M. 2013, *Miklošičev adjektivizirajoči "Suffix ɳ": da ali ne*. – In / V: J. Grković-Major, A. Loma (eds. / ur.), *Miklosichiana bicentennialia. Zbornik u čast dvestote godišnjice rođenja Frana Miklošiča*, 247–263, Beograd.
 HAINZMANN, M., P. DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2007, *Zwei neue altkeltische Gottheiten: Ollodevos und Acinoris*. –

- In / V: M. Hainzmann (ed. / ur.), *Auf den Spuren keltischer Götterverehrung, Akten des 5. F.E.R.C.A.N.-Workshop, Graz 9.–12. Oktober 2003*, 139–146, Wien.
- HAMP, E. P. 1976a, On the Celtic names of Ig. – *Acta neophilologica* 9, 3–8.
- HAMP, E. P. 1976b, Illyrian *Neunt(i)us*. – *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81, 43–44.
- HAMP, E. P. 1978, Further remarks on the Celtic names of Ig. – *Acta neophilologica* 11, 57–63.
- HARTLEY, B. R., B. M. DICKINSON 2008, *Names on terra sigillata. An index of makers' stamps and signatures on Gallo-Roman terra sigillata (Samian ware)*, Vol. 2: *B to CEROTOCUS*. – London.
- HOSTNIK, M. 1997, *Cerkev sv. Mihaela v Iški vasi*. – Ljubljana.
- KATIČIĆ, R. 1966, Keltška osobna imena u antičkoj Sloveniji. – *Arheološki vestnik* 17, 143–168.
- KATIČIĆ, R. 1968, Die einheimische Namengebung von Ig. – *Godišnjak 6 (Centar za balkanološka ispitavanja)*, 61–120.
- KATIČIĆ, R. 1976, *Ancient languages of the Balkans*. – The Hague.
- KRAHE, H. 1929, *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen*. – Heidelberg.
- KRAHE, H. 1942, Beiträge zur illyrischen Wort- und Namenforschung. – *Indogermanische Forschungen* 58, 131–152.
- KRAHE, H. 1955, *Die Sprache der Illyrer*, Bd. I. – Wiesbaden.
- LAMBERT, P.-Y., 2000, Remarks on Gaulish place-names in Ptolemy. – In / V: D. N. Parsons, P. Sims-Williams (eds. / ur.), *Ptolemy. Towards a linguistic atlas of the earliest Celtic place-names of Europe*, 159–168, Aberystwyth.
- LOCHNER-HÜTTENBACH, F. 1965, Die antiken Personennamen aus Ig bei Ljubljana. – *Situla* 8, 15–45.
- LOVENJAK, M. 1997, Novi in revidirani rimski napis v Sloveniji (Die neuen und revidierten römischen Inschriften Sloweniens). – *Arheološki vestnik* 48, 63–88.
- MATASOVIĆ, R. 1997, O metodologiji onomastičkih istraživanja (na primjeru keltske onomastike). – *Folia onomastica Croatica* 6, 89–98.
- MATASOVIĆ, R. 2003, Jezični tragovi Kelta u Iliriku. – *Latina et Graeca* 3, 5–25.
- MATASOVIĆ, R. 2009, *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. – Leiden, Boston.
- McCONE, K. 2008, *The Celtic question: Modern constructs and ancient realities. Myles Dillon memorial lecture, April 2008*. – Dublin.
- MEID, W. 2005, *Keltische Personennamen in Pannonien*. – Budapest.
- MÓCSY, A. 1959, *Die Bevölkerung von Pannonien bis zu den Markomannenkriegen*. – Budapest.
- MÓCSY, A. 1983, *Nomenclator provinciarum Europae Latinarum et Galliae Cisalpiniae*. – Budapest.
- MÜLLNER, A. 1879, *Emona. Archaeologische Studien aus Krain*. – Ljubljana.
- RADMAN-LIVAJA, I., H. IVEZIĆ 2012, A review of South-Pannonian indigenous anthroponymy. – In / V: B. Migotti (ed. / ur.), *The archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia. The state of research and selected problems in the Croatian part of the Roman province of Pannonia*, 137–158, Oxford.
- RAGOLIČ, A. 2016, The funerary stele of Petto from Ig / Nagrobna stela za Petona z Iga. – *Arheološki vestnik* 67, 277–296.
- RAYBOULD, M. E., P. SIMS-WILLIAMS 2009, *Introduction and supplement to the Corpus of Latin inscriptions of the Roman empire containing Celtic personal names*. – Aberystwyth.
- REPANŠEK, L. 2013, The inscription from Chartres. – *Études celtiques* 39, 181–192.
- REPANŠEK, L. 2014, Two notes on Old Celtic morphology. – *Acta linguistica Petropolitana* 10/1, 239–254.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, P. 2002, The five languages of Wales in the pre-Norman inscriptions. – *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 44, 1–36 (= P. Sims-Williams, *Studies on Celtic languages before the year 1000*, 179–214, Aberystwyth, 2007).
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, P. 2003, *The Celtic inscriptions of Britain: Phonology and chronology, c. 400–1200*. – Oxford.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, P. 2006, *Ancient Celtic place-names in Europe and Asia Minor*. – Oxford, Boston.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, P. 2012, Celtic personal names. – In / V: T. Meißner (ed. / ur.), *Personal names in the Western Roman world. Proceedings of a workshop convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16–18 September 2011*, 152–166, Berlin.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, P. 2015, The Celtic composition vowels *-i-* and *-u-*. – In / V: G. Oudaer, G. Hily, H. Le Bihan (eds. / ur.), *Mélanges en l'honneur de Pierre-Yves Lambert*, 313–331, Rennes.
- SNOJ, M. 2009, *Etimološki slovar slovenskih zemljepisnih imen*. – Ljubljana.
- STIFTER, D. 2004, Keltische Namen im burgenländischen Landesmuseum. – In / V: H. Heftner, K. Tomaschitz (Hrsg. / ur.), *“Ad fontes!” Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004 dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden*, 757–772, Wien.
- STIFTER, D. 2012a, Eine V.I.P. zwischen Pannonien und Tirol. – In / V: W. Meid, P. Anreiter et al. (eds. / ur.), *Archaeological, cultural and linguistic heritage, Festschrift for Erzsébet Jerem in honour of her 70th birthday*, 539–549, Budapest.
- STIFTER, D. 2012b, On the linguistic situation of Roman-period Ig. – In / V: T. Meißner (ed. / ur.), *Personal names in the Western Roman world. Proceedings of a workshop convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16–18 September 2011*, 247–265, Berlin.
- STIFTER, D. 2013, Two Continental Celtic Studies: The vocative of Gaulish, and *Essimnus*. – In / V: J. L. García Alonso (ed. / ur.), *Continental Celtic word formation: The onomastic data*, 99–122, Salamanca.
- STÜBER, K. 1998, *The Historical Morphology of n-Stems in Celtic*. – Maynooth.
- STÜBER, K. 2005, *Schmied und Frau. Studien zur gallischen Epigraphik und Onomastik*. – Budapest.
- STÜBER, K. 2007, Effects on language contact on Roman and Gaulish personal names. – In / V: L. Hildegard, C. Tristram (ed. / ur.), *Papers from the workshop within*

- the framework of the XIII International congress of Celtic studies, Bonn, 26-27 July 2007, 81-92, Potsdam.*
- ŠAŠEL, J. 1955, A new Roman stele from Ig near Ljubljana. – *Živa antika* 5, 373-382 (= *Opera selecta*, Situla 30, Ljubljana 1992, 234-240).
- ŠAŠEL, J. 1966, Keltisches *portorium* in den Ostalpen (zu Plin. n. h. III 128). In / V: R. M. Swoboda-Milenović (ed. / ur.), *Corolla memoriae Erich Swoboda dedicata*, 198-204, Graz, Köln (= *Opera selecta*, Situla 30, Ljubljana 1992, 500-506).
- ŠAŠEL KOS, M. 1990, *Nauportus*: antični literarni in epigrafski viri / *Nauportus: Literary and Epigraphical Sources*. – In / V: J. Horvat, *Nauportus (Vrhnika)*, Dela 1. razr. SAZU 33, 17-33.
- ŠAŠEL KOS, M. 1997, The end of the Norican kingdom and the formation of the provinces of Noricum and Pannonia. – In / V: B. Djurić, I. Lazar, *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kolloquiums über Probleme des provincialrömischen Kunstschaffens, Celje, 8.-12. Mai 1995 / Akti IV. mednarodnega kolokvija o problemih rimske provincialne umetnosti, Celje, maj 1995*, Situla 36, 21-42.
- ŠAŠEL KOS, 1998, The Thalnitscher Lapidarium / Dolničarjev lapidarij. – *Arheološki vestnik* 49, 329-353.
- ŠAŠEL KOS, M. 2000, Rimski napisi iz Šmarate. – *Kronika* 48/1-2, 95-101.
- TORKAR, S. 2007, Substrat, adstrat ali neprepoznana slovanska dediščina? Ig – Krim – Bača. – *Naukovyĭ visnyk Černiveckoho universytetu. Slov'janska filolohija. Zbirnyk naukovyĭx prac'ь*, 250-258, Černivci.
- UNTERMANN, J. 1961, *Die venetischen Personennamen*. – Wiesbaden.
- VERANIČ, D., L. REPANŠEK 2016, Rimski kamniti spomeniki iz cerkve sv. Janeza Krstnika v Podkrajju pri Tomišlju / Roman stone monuments in the Church of St. John the Baptist in Podkraj near Tomišelj. – *Arheološki vestnik* 67, 297-320.
- WEDENIG, R., P. DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2007, Keltisches in norischen Personennamen, Namengrafitti aus der Provinz Noricum. – In / V: H. Birkhan (ed. / ur.), *Kelten-Einfälle an der Donau. Akten des Vierten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologinnen und Keltologen, Linz/Donau, 17.-21. Juli 2005*, 619-630, Wien.

Quiemonis v luči avtohtonih ižanskih osebnih imen

Povzetek

Prispevek prinaša študijo obširne in kompleksne problematike fonda nelatinskih osebnih in deloma gentilnih imen, ki so na rimskih nagrobnih spomenikih večinoma izpričana na Ižanskem, tj. na območju današnjega Iga (z grajskim hribom), Iške vasi, Kamnika pod Krimom, Matene, Staj, Strahomerja, Tomišlja in Podkrajja, deloma pa tudi v Emoni (velja za redke primere nagrobnih stel z avtohtonimi imeni, za katere ni mogoče zanesljivo trditi, da so bile kot spolije prinesene z Iga) in v Gatini pri Grosupljem (*AJJ* 221). Tematici se je doslej posvečalo sorazmerno malo pozornosti, skromno število novih odkritij v zadnjih desetletjih pa vse do odkritja nagrobnega spomenika Kviemoniju (*Quiemonis*) v cerkvi sv. Janeza Krstnika v Podkrajju pri Tomišlju¹ ni bilo zadosten povod, da bi se celotna problematika stratifikacije antičnih ižanskih imen (v nadaljevanju: ižanska imena) ponovno postavila pod vprašaj. Takšno stanje raziskav raziskovalcu sicer ponuja redko priložnost, da si pridobi celovit pregled nad sekundarno strokovno literaturo. Prvi obsežnejši študiji ižanske antroponimije brez dvoma predstavljata

Lochner von Hüttenbach 1965 in Katičič 1968 (s predštudijo l. 1966 in povzetkom l. 1976, in sicer v širšem kontekstu jezikov in njihovih imenskih tradicij v severovzhodnih Alpah, Panoniji in na Balkanu). Slednja, do danes edina neselektivna študija celotnega imenskega fonda se običajno tudi upošteva kot avtoritativno delo na tem področju. Ker sta avtorja obeh zgodnjih razprav o ižanskem imenskem fondu ugotavljala, da je precejšnje število osebnih imen z rimskih nagrobnikov, ki prihajajo z ižanskega prostora, keltskega (natančneje galskega) izvora, sta bili deli kmalu deležni tudi pozornosti keltologov. S keltističnega gledišča je obe študiji s komentarji prvi opremil Hamp (l. 1976 študijo Lochnerja von Hüttenbacha [Hamp 1976a, 1976b] in l. 1978 Katičičevo delo [Hamp 1978]), krajši komentar je 2003 prispeval Matašević, zadnja celovitejša obravnava domnevnih keltskih in nekeltskih imen pa je Meidova študija iz leta 2005. Gre za celovito analizo keltskega (tj. galskega) imenskega odtisa v panonskem prostoru. Najnovejša strokovna prispevka sta Stifter 2012a o tematsko zamejeni problematiki epihoričnega elementa **Voltu-* v osebnih imenih, kot sta *Voltuparis*, *Volturex*, in Stifter 2012b o ižanski onomastični tradiciji nasploh.

¹ Gl. Veranič, Repanšek 2016 v tej številki *Arheološkega vestnika*.

V pričujočem prispevku je najprej opravljena tekstnokritična študija celotnega nabora pojavljajočih se sklonskih oblik posameznih predrimskih imen, ki so sežeto podana v obliki s komentarji opremljenega seznama latiniziranih imenovalniških oblik in rekonstruiranih imenskih osnov, npr. *Buccio* = **Bukk-jo-* za dejansko izpričano *Buccio*, *Buccioni[s]*, *Buccioni* (za kritični pregled čitanj posameznih imen gl. v glavnem besedilu pod posameznimi iztočnicami). S tem postopkom namreč postanejo bolj jasno razvidni oblikovna in besedotvorna struktura imen ter sistem povezav med posameznimi imeni, kadar gre za besedno družino (gl. pod *BUKKO-*, *VOLTO-* ipd.).

ABECEDNI SEZNAM

Ižansko in Emona:

Adnomatus; *Aico*; *Ama*; *Amatu*; *Ampo*;
Beatulo; *Bolerianus* (?); *Boleriavus*; *Brocc(i)us*;
Buctor, *Buccus* ~ *Bucca* ~ *Bucco* ~ *Buccio* ~
Buccicu (?) ~ *Buquorsa*; *Bugia* ~ *[Bu]gio*; *Buiius*
 ~ *Buiio*; *Butto*;
Cetetiū (?); *Coemo...ius*; *Cotiu*;
Decomo; *Devonti* ali *Devontia*;
Ebonicus; *Ecco*; *Elia* (?); *Emo*; *Eniconis* ali
Enico; *Enignus*; *Enno* ~ *Enna* ~ *Ennia*; *Eninna*;
Eppo; *Ergiano* ali *Ergianus*;
Galunus;
Ostius ~ *Ostila*;
Laepius (gentilno ime); *Lasc(i)onti* ali
Lasc(i)ontia; *Lasso* ~ *Lassaiu*;
Manu; *Moiota*; *Mosso*;
Nammo; *Neuntius*;
Oppa ~ *Oppalo* ~ *Oppalus*; *Otto*; *Ovis*;
Petto; *Pl(a)etor*; *Plunco*; *Provius*;
Rega; *Ruttus* (?) ali *Ruiius* (?);
Sacciar(us); *Secco*; *Sennus*; *Sublo* (izpričano
 kot *Sublo{a}ni*);
Talsus; *Tetiu*; *Tetta*;
Uss...;
Veitro; *Venixama* (z varianto *Venixema*);
Vibunn(i²)a (+ nomen gentile *Vibunnius*); *Volta*
 ~ *Voltia* ~ *Volt-an(V²)-* ~ *Voltielus* ~ *Volto* ~
Voltoaronti ali *Voltoarontis*; *Voltognas*; *Volturex* (z
 variantama **Volte-reg-* in **Volt-reg-*) ~ *Voltuparis*.

Šmarata:

a – osebna imena:

Feuconts; *Feva*[; *Planius*; *Pletor*; *Tatsoria*;
Volta; *Vot...*;

b – gentilna imena:

Lassonius/-a; *Poteiius*; *Turoius* (?).²

V skladu s čedalje bolj izostrenim vpogledom v imensko gradivo in poglobljenim razumevanjem jezikovnega izvora, nastajanja in življenja ižanskih imen je v tej razpravi v mejah ugotovljivega podan *oblikotvorni* (morfološki), *besedotvorni* (derivacijski) in *glasoslovni* (fonetični) opis konkretnega jezika,³ tj. rimskodobne "ižanščine", v katerem je bil tvorjen tisti del imenskega fonda, za katerega je mogoče trditi, da je na Ižanskem avtohton. Sem torej spadajo vsa imena, ki jih z večjo verjetnostjo ni ustrezno pripisati infiltraciji imen iz drugih, sosednjih onomastičnih tradicij, kot sta panonska in galska, predvsem pa ne pretoku imen v okviru širšega, t. i. severnojadranskega onomastičnega kroga, v katerega primarno sodi tudi ižanski prostor. Ta namreč leži na stičišču panonskega in severnojadranskega jezikovnega areala, ki ju definira konkretna zemljepisna razprostranjenost panonskih oz. severnojadranskih imen (= panonski oz. severnojadranski (imenski) krog), v jezikovnem smislu pa skupne, nadregionalne značilnosti tovrstnih imen kot npr. njihove glasovne ali oblikovne karakteristike. Panonska ploskev zaobsega Panonijo, severnojadranski areal pa je osrediščen na venetsko (vključujoč karnijsko venetščino v Karniji) in histrijsko (večji del Istre) ter liburnijsko (vzhodna Istra in severni del vzhodne jadranske obale) imensko tradicijo. Ižanski prostor se nahaja na skrajnem vzhodnem obrobju severnojadranskega areala in s tem ne le geografsko, ampak tudi po svojih jezikovnih karakteristikah, ki ga jasno ločijo od ostalih podsistemov severnojadranskega kroga, predstavlja njegov periferni (obrobni) del. Osebna in gentilna imena, ki so sporočena na štirih nagrobnih stelah, odkritih v Šmarati, so z ižanskimi le posredno povezana, tj. le toliko, kolikor oba onomastična podsistema pripadata severnojadranskemu imenskemu tipu, sicer pa se šmaratska imena po jezikovnih in drugih značilnostih zelo jasno vklaplajo v že omenjeni

² Teoretično gre lahko tudi za osebno ime (gl. dalje spodaj).

³ Gre za t. i. *onomastični jezik*, ki ga je mogoče preučevati le na podlagi ohranjenega imenskega gradiva. Ker vsak onomastični sistem v svojem jedru predpostavlja obstoj jezikovnega sistema, tj. njegov vir, v katerem so bila lastna imena tvorjena z istimi jezikovnimi sredstvi kakor občna, je posredno torej tudi zgolj na podlagi lastnih imen mogoče tvoriti posplošitve o značilnostih jezika, ki mu lastna imena pripadajo.

histrijsko-liburnijski krog imen, ki na ta prostor pritekajo z jugovzhodne smeri.

Izrazito periferen in tudi geografsko izoliran položaj ižanskega onomastičnega podsistema do izraza prihaja na štirih ravneh:

a – zelo malo je imen, ki so na Ižansko zašla iz drugih podsistemov severnojadranskega kroga (npr. *Hostius*, *Pletor*, verjetno tudi *Laepius*, o čemer gl. spodaj);

b – pričakovana in tudi jasno razvidna je infiltracija imen iz sosednjih imenskih tradicij (v prvi vrsti panonske in galske), kar je posledica mejnega položaja na stiku severnojadranskega z drugimi imenskimi krogi (npr. *Aico*, *Adnomatus*);

c – številna imena nimajo očitnih vzporednic v drugih podsistemih severnojadranskega kroga (npr. *Bolerianus* / *Boleriavus*, *Bucco*, imena na *Voltu-*, imena na *-rex*), poleg tega pa tovrstna imena pogosto izkazujejo nekatere oblikovne in besedotvorne inovacije, ki so značilne le za Ižansko;

č – jedrni, torej avtohtoni del ižanskih imen poleg inovacij izkazuje tudi številne arhaične poteze, in sicer tako v sklopu glasovnih, oblikovnih kot tudi besedotvornih značilnosti.⁴

Glavne poteze, po katerih se severnojadranska ploskev jasno loči od panonske, so vse glasovne (fonetične) narave, in sicer:

a – severnojadranski sistem ohranja praindoevropski (pide.) *o (npr. *Buctor* ~ *Fuctor*, *Hosti-*), medtem ko ima panonski sistem na vseh mestih *a (npr. panonsko *Teutanus*, (*Aquae*) *Iasae*);

b – kjer fonetika avtohtonih imen severnojadranskega sistema izkazuje *or*, *ol* ter *an*, *am* (**mortuo-* = lat. *mortuus*, *Volti-*, **donasan*, *Venixama*), ima panonščina vselej *ur*, *ul*, *un*, *um* (*Acumincum*, *Pultovia*, *Teutoburgium*, *Ulcisia*);

c – za praindoevropske pridihnjene zvoneče soglasnike tipa **b^h*, **d^h* se vsaj na začetku besede v okviru imen severnojadranskega kroga pojavlja odraz **f* (**frāter-* ‘brat’ < **b^hrā-ter-*, *Fuctor* < **b^hug-tor-*, *faksto* ‘je napravil’ < **d^hak-*), medtem ko panonščina ohranja *b*, *d* (*Teutoburgium*, *Andautonia*).

Ravno v okviru zadnje glasovne značilnosti se ižanski prostor dodatno potrjuje kot obrobje severnojadranske ploskve, saj ga opisana glasovna sprememba, ki se je iz italskega prostora širila v vzhodni smeri, ni več dosegla, medtem ko je

šmaratski podsistem še prizadela, prim. šmaratsko *Feucont-* in *Feua* (identično z venetskima **Feugont-* ~ **Fougont-* in **Fouuo-*) ob ižanskem *Buctor* (= venetsko **Fuctor*) in *Bugia* (= venetsko **Fugia*). Na dejstvo, da je bilo središče severnojadranske ploskve, od koder so se proti vzhodu širile inovacije, ravno venetski prostor, dodatno opozarja odraz podedovanega indoevropskega dvoglasnika **eu*. Ta je v središču že zgodaj prešel v **ou*, vendar je bil v tem primeru domet glasovne inovacije tako ozek, da v celoti ni prizadel niti obrobnih venetskih narečij. Ta poteza ločuje venetski prostor od ostalih podsistemov severnojadranskega areala, vključno s šmaratskim in ižanskim (prim. že nakazano razliko med šmaratskim **Feucont-*, **Feua* in osrednjim venetskim **Fougont-*, **Fouo-*), in ga proti jugu povezuje z italiskim.

Ižanska imena v odnosu do imen drugih podsistemov severnojadranskega kroga loči tudi vrsta pomembnih arhaičnih potez in hkrati tudi nekaj inovacij v sklopu oblikotvorja in besedotvorja. Najpomembnejši arhaizem je ohranitev ženskih osnov na **-ontī* (prim. starogrške deležnike na *-ουσα* < **-o-ntī* tipa φέρουσα ‘nesoča’), ki ga je z veliko verjetnostjo mogoče prepoznati vsaj v ženskem imenu *Voltaronti*, v isto skupino pa lahko sodita tudi imeni *Devonti* in *Lasc(i)onti* (sicer izpričani le v dajalniški funkciji *Devontiae* oz. *Lasc(i)ontiae*). V imenovalniku se pripona **-ontī* lahko potrjuje v zapisu *Voltaronti* na nagrobni steli *CIL* III 3877 (+ s. 1734) = Šašel Kos 1998, št. 7, medtem ko je v obliki *Voltaronti* (*CIL* III 3860 = *AIJ* 185 = Šašel Kos 1998, št. 3) ustrežneje prepoznati latinsko adaptacijo izvorne dajalniške oblike. Če je interpretacija imenovalniškega zapisa *Voltaronti* = **Voltarontī* (*CIL* III 3877) pravilna in ne gre za kratko *i-*osnovo, tj. *Voltaronti(s)* z neizpisanim izglasnim *-s*, se v imenu potrjuje izjemen arhaizem, hkrati pa tudi ena najzanimivejših in najpomembnejših besedotvornih inovacij ižanskega jezikovnega sistema. Imena na *-onti*, torej vsaj *Voltaronti*, zelo verjetno pa tudi *Devonti* in *Lasc(i)onti*, v ižanščini namreč niso deležniki tipa stgrš. φέρουσα, kjer ima pripona **-ontī* tudi svoj najverjetnejši izvor, temveč ženska imena, ki so bila tvorjena na podlagi moških imen na *-on-*. Slednje je jasno razvidno iz razmerja *Voltaro* = **Voltaron-* (m.) proti *Voltaronti* (ž.) = **Voltarontī*. Pripona **-ontī*, ki sicer služi za tvorbo tvornosedanjih deležnikov ženskega spola (tip sln. *nesoča*), izvorno predstavlja integralni del glagolskega sistema, vendar se je na Ižanskem po vsej verjetnosti osamosvojila in

⁴ Obe zadnji značilnosti sta na splošno pričakovani za vsak jezikovni oz. imenski sistem na skrajnem obrobju nekega jezikovnega oz. imenskega kontinuuma, kakršen je bil tudi severnojadranski kompleks.

postala tvorna kot živo, tj. produktivno sredstvo za tvorbo ženskih imen.

Pomembna je tudi produktivna kategorija izključno ženskih imen na *-ūn-, kot so *Amatu*, *Cetetiū* (?), *Manu* in *Tetiū*. Ker so tovrstna imena pogosta tudi zunaj ižanskega prostora, in sicer primarno na območju južnega Norika, kjer se pripona pojavlja tudi pri značilno galskih osebnih imenih (*Caletiu*, *Suadru*, morda *Cauru*, *Aiu*), je v razpravah doslej prevladovalo mnenje, da se je tvorba razširila z noriškega prostora (prim. zlasti Meid 2005, 251) in da gre torej v takšnih primerih za galski vpliv. V galščini bi namreč po glasovnih pravilih v primeru podedovane nosniške pripone *-ōn- pričakovali ravno *-ūn- (prim. galsko gentilno ime τούτων-ια < **Toutōn-*). Tak pogled pa se vendarle zdi preozek, saj posega po najočitnejši razlagi, pri tem pa ne upošteva pomembnega dejstva, da do medsystemske izposoje običajno ne prihaja na ravni besedotvornih sredstev. Poleg tega cela vrsta tako tvorjenih noriških imen ni enoznačno in zagotovo galskih (*Attu*, *Materiu*, *Mottu*, *Sucelu*), zaporedja -ūn-/un-, za katera niti ni mogoče predvideti galskega vira, pa se pojavljajo tudi v drugih kategorijah v sklopu severnojadranskega oblikotvorja (prim. venetsko pripono -unko-). Vprašanje je v okviru trenutno razpoložljivega gradiva težko dokončno rešljivo, vsekakor pa velja, da za ustrezno razlago nastanka ižanskih ženskih imen na *-ūn- nikakor ni treba operirati s tujimi sistemi, kakršen je npr. galski. Povsem verjetno je namreč, da gre za interno ižansko inovacijo, kjer so bila kratka ženska osebna imena po modelu moških imen na -ō, -on- (tip *Bucco* ~ latinizirani rodilnik *Bucconis*) tvorjena s pripono *-ū, *-ūn- (*Amatu*, latinizirani rodilnik *Amatunis*). Osnove na *-ū- tipa latinsko *socrus*, *-ūs* so namreč podedovane iz indoevropskega prajezika, kjer so bile tvorne le pri samostalnikih ženskega spola. Verjetno tudi ni naključje, da na Ižanskem velja jasno ločena razporeditev moških imen med osnove na -ō, -on- in ženskih na *-ū, *-ūn-, medtem ko sta v galščini obe varianti načeloma v rabi za oba spola. Iz povedanega logično sledi ugotovitev, da zgolj na podlagi opazovanja, da neko ime na Ižanskem v svoji morfološki strukturi izkazuje problematično pripono, sklep, da je to ime *a priori* po izvoru galsko, nikakor ni metodološko upravičen.

Kot zelo pomembno je treba omeniti tudi Stifterjevo ugotovitev (2012a), da fond ižanskih imen med leksikalnimi posebnostmi ohranja edinstveni imenski element **uol-tu*- 'volja, želja' (< **ul̥-tú-*),

kakršen je na primer izpričan v moških imenih *Voltu-paris* in *Voltu-rex*. Ta se na Ižanskem pojavlja poleg istopomenskega elementa **uol-to-* (*Volto-rex*, *Volto-gnas*) in predstavlja besedotvorno različico k varianti **uol-ti-* < **ul̥-tí-*, ki je močno razširjena v drugih severnojadranskih imenskih tradicijah,⁵ med avtohtonimi ižanskimi imeni pa je ni najti. To hkrati pomeni, da je različica **uoltu-* na Ižanskem avtohtona, s tem pa se za ižanski podsistem severnojadranske ploskve tudi neposredno potrjuje odraz *ol* za praindoevropski (pide.) **l̥*. Iz tega je mogoče sklepati, da je bil vzporedno odrazu *ol* odraz pide. **r* v istem jezikovnem sistemu **or*. Ta ugotovitev med drugim odpira zanimivo možnost, da se v naselbinskem imenu *Nauportus*, za katero se tudi sicer sumi, da verjetno ne predstavlja imena latinskega izvora, prepozna epihorično ime v latinski preobleki oz. adaptaciji. Drugi element v imenu, tj. *portus* 'prehod' < pide. **pr-tú-*, bi se namreč v primeru, da je avtohton, v jezikovnem sistemu, ki je lahko hkratni vir ižanskih osebnih imen oz. je s tem jezikovnim sistemom soroden, glasil enako kot v latinščini.⁶

Starejše obravnave ižanskega imenskega fonda so poleg dominantne in jasno razvidne plasti imen, ki primarno sodi v severnojadranski jezikovni oz. imenski areal, prepoznavale tudi keltsko plast imen. Ta naj bi po Katičiču deloma predstavljala neki starejši keltski substrat, deloma pa galski super- ali adstrat, vendar domneva o dveh kronoloških plasteh keltskih imen na Ižanskem temelji na napačni interpretaciji jezikovnih dejstev in je ne podpirajo niti zunajjezikovna, torej zgodovinska in arheološka dejstva, ki skupaj z jezikovnimi (razporeditev galskih osebnih in zemljepisnih imen v Evropi) zarisujejo dokaj jasno sliko o galskih migracijah in s tem širjenju galskega jezika zunaj osrednjega galskega prostora. Za celotni fond keltskih imen na jugovzhodnem alpskem prostoru je mogoče zanesljivo trditi, da je primarno rezultat galske jezikovne kolonizacije, razpoložljivo imensko gradivo pa ne predvideva kronološko starejše sporadične importacije keltskih osebnih imen.

Na jugovzhodni alpski prostor je galščina prišla sorazmerno pozno (grobno rečeno, je za celotni relevantni prostor o keltizaciji mogoče govoriti

⁵ Tj. kot *Volti-* in *Vols-* < **Voltī-*, prim. venetsko *vo.l.ti.gno.s.* (LVen. Es 8), *V.OLS-OMNOS* (LVen. Ca 58) itd.

⁶ *Nau-* je seveda po vsej verjetnosti latinski dodatek, in sicer *nau-* 'ladja', naj si bo po starejšem, neklasičnolatinškem modelu tipa *nau-stibulum* namesto *navi-stibulum* ali z vulgarnolatinškim odrazom lat. *navi-* v položaju pred sledečim soglasnikom, torej *navi-portus* > vlat. *Nau-portus*.

od 3. st. pr. n. št.), in sicer iz vzhodne, panonske smeri, kamor se je val razširil navzdol ob reki Donavi. Prodor proti zahodu v alpski prostor (in s tem sekundarna naplastitev na stično območje severnojadranske in panonske ploskve) je potekal predvsem po Savi in Dravi, pri čemer je večinoma ostal omejen na rodovitne ravnice savsko-dravskega medrečja. V tem prostoru je tudi razvidna največja gostota galskih osebnih imen. V Panoniji se kaže močnejša jezikovna keltizacija, prav tako v južnem Noriku v okviru osebnih imen, kjer je adstratna oziroma superstratna galska jezikovna plast integrirala elemente starejših jezikovnih sistemov, na katere se je vsidrila, medtem ko je vpliv galske onomastične tradicije na emonski prostor izrazito omejen. Imena, kot je *Exouna* iz Male Žalne (*CIL* III 13403 = *AIJ* 222) so zagotovo zadnji podaljšek takšnega vpliva, ki se z vzhodne smeri ob reki Savi že do vstopa v emonski prostor dokončno izredči. Pomembno je poudariti, da korpus nelatinskih ižanskih imen že na prvi pogled daje vtis, da gre za izrazito nekeltsko imensko območje, saj v primerjavi z drugimi območji galskega jezikovnega vpliva (četudi gre za še tako obrobne in oddaljene primerke galskih imen v Evropi in Mali Aziji) ižanska onomastika ne izkazuje dveh poglobitvenih lastnosti galske imenske tradicije, tj. tipično galskih zloženih imen, kot so *Com-nertus*, *Ex-cingeto-rix*, *Nemeto-marus*, *Tessi-marus* itd., in značilnih pripon v okviru nezloženih, okrajšanih imen tipa *Vindillo*, *Tessilla*, *Adiatullus*, *Cocceius*, torej *-illo-*, *-isso-*, *-eio-*, *-ako-* itn. Čeprav sta obe potezi prisotni v noriško-panonskem sklopu galskih osebnih imen, ki je edino verjetno izhodišče, od koder bi se toretično lahko razširil vpliv galskega imenskega fonda tudi na avtohtono ižansko imensko tradicijo, je kot edini zanesljivi primer nedvomno galskega osebnega imena na Ižanskem mogoče identificirati le ime *Adnomatus*. Vendar je za razumevanje celotne narave galskega vpliva na ižansko onomastiko tudi v tem primeru bistvena sicer mnogokrat prezrta razlika med ižansko varianto *Adnomatus*, vselej z *o*, in dejanskim galskim *Adnamatus* = **Ad-nāmatos*, ki v komponenti gal. **nāmato-* 'sovražnik' brez izjeme izkazuje ajevski samoglasnik. Ravno ta razlika kaže, da je bilo ime iz galščine v ižanski fond imen izposojeno in vanj v celoti integrirano, s čimer je postalo živi del ižanskega imenskega inventarja (onomastikona), po funkciji in rabi enakovredno avtohtonim imenom. Ime *Adnomatus* torej kljub svojemu primarno galskemu etimološkemu izvoru samo po sebi ne narekuje in ne napoveduje, da se v fondu ižan-

skih imen dejansko ohranja plast galskih osebnih imen. Neupravičenost splošno sprejete domneve, da galski element v okviru ižanskega imenskega fonda predstavlja razvidno in integrirano imensko plast, se dodatno potrjuje tudi ob natančnem pregledu ostalega imenskega gradiva. Pregled utemeljitev o galskem izvoru posameznih imen, ki so v sekundarni literaturi privedle do splošne ugotovitve o številčno nezanemarljivi prisotnosti galskega imenskega elementa med ižanskimi imeni (zlasti študiji Lochnerja von Hüttenbacha in Katičiča), namreč razkrije uporabo neustreznih in metodološko neutemeljenih prijemov.

Starejši avtorji so namreč na etimološki izvor določenega imena sklepali zlasti na podlagi razprostranjenosti pojavitev istih ali podobnih osebnih imen v Evropi. Tovrstni pristop sam po sebi ni in ne more biti metodološko uspešen in s tem poveden kriterij za določitev izvora naključnega imena, saj distribucijske karte uspejo zabeležiti le razporeditev istih oz. primerljivih zaporedij (tj. zaporedij glasov, ki sestavljajo dotično ime), hkrati pa so slepe za zgodovinsko (tj. diahrono) povezavo med temi zaporedji. Nihče ne bi na primer trdil, da zaporedje *Volto-*, ki je izpričano tako na Ižanskem kot v Galiji, predstavlja isti element, njuni sinhroni identičnosti navkljub, saj je jasno razvidno, da je vsak element zase dobro zasidran v svoji avtohtoni onomastični tradiciji, tj. severnojadranski oz. galski, in etimološko gledano med njima ni mogoče govoriti o jezikovni sorodnosti (prim. galsko **uolto-* v pomenu 'lasje'). Drugače je z imeni, ki so etimološko dejansko povezana, vendar gre pri njih zgolj za vzporedno nastale tvorbe v različnih indoevropskih jezikih, npr. *Venixamo-* (gl. spodaj), kar dodatno opozarja na dejstvo, da je pri uporabi distribucijskega kriterija pri tvorbi kakršnih koli posplošitev potrebna velika previdnost. Poleg tega je znano, da lahko osebna imena prehajajo med posameznimi, bolj ali manj stičnimi onomastičnimi tradicijami in da jezikovni sistem, v katerem je bilo neko ime tvorjeno, ni nujno prekriven z jezikovnim sistemom, ki ga nosilec imena dejansko uporablja pri komunikaciji. Kadar določeno ime migrira iz ene tradicije v drugo in tam postane živi del imenskega fonda, njegov dejanski etimološki izvor postane torej brezpredmeten.

Izjemno delikatno je prav tako kriterij, ki omogoča posplošitve o izvoru imena na podlagi imenskega konteksta, v katerem se na konkretnih napisih obravnava ime pojavi. Če gre v takšnih primerih za večinsko galski imenski kontekst, se običajno

tudi za ime, ki nima poznanega izvora in je etimološko nepregledno, posredno sklepa na enak izvor. In obrnjeno, če se domnevno galsko ime vsakokrat, ko je zabeleženo, pojavi v kolokaciji z očitno negalskimi imeni, bo praviloma označeno za po vsej verjetnosti negalsko. Tovrsten pristop je neustrezen, saj je slep ravno za pravkar omenjeno dejstvo o prehajanju imen med onomastičnimi tradicijami, na kar med drugim opozarja primer *Adnomatus*, ki bi ga morali na podlagi zgolj tega kriterija označiti za avtohtono ižansko ime.⁷ Kriterij je zelo dovteten tudi za krožno argumentacijo in argumentacijo *e silentio*, ki pa je z metodološkega gledišča brez vsakršne informativne vrednosti. Če namreč za imena, ki tvorijo neposredni kontekst, v katerem se obravnava problematično ime pojavi, ni mogoče v celoti in enoznačno ugotavljati, da so na primer galska, je lahko tudi nadaljnje posploševanje o njihovem izvoru interpretativno popolnoma napačno.⁸

Če sta pravkar omenjena kriterija torej premalo stabilna, da bi sama po sebi omogočila interpretativno zanesljivo analizo imen, pa še vedno velja, da nista v celoti neuporabna, saj zlasti prvi v kombinaciji z drugimi, zanesljivejšimi kriteriji lahko posredno potrjuje njihove izsledke oz. jih deloma tudi korigira. Ravno na podlagi distribucijskega kriterija je na primer mogoče ugotavljati, da je varianta *Adnomatus* proti *Adnamatus* omejena zgolj na Ižansko, medtem ko se druga pojavlja le na noriško-panonskem arealu. Enako velja za distribucijo elementa *Voltu-* proti *Volti-*, ki v kombinaciji s pravilno etimološko interpretacijo obeh zaporedij omogoča, da se v prvem prepozna pomembno inovacijo, ki ižansko skupino imen nadalje loči od drugih onomastičnih podsistemov severnojadrskega kompleksa (gl. zgoraj).

Povsem neustrezen pa je v nasprotju s kontekstualnim in distribucijskim kriterijem pristop, ki jezikovnogenetski izvor imena ugotavlja na podlagi etimološko nedognane in s tem napačne razlage imena. V starejših obravnavah so v pod-

poro ugotovitvam tovrstnemu kriteriju pogosto dodajali navedbo obravnavanega problematičnega imena v korpusih, kakršen je Holderjev tezaver *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz (AcS)*. Da vključenost imena v referenčno delo tega tipa ni noben znanstveni kriterij za ugotavljanje njegovega dejanskega izvora, v današnjem času seveda ne bi smelo biti več metodološko vprašanje.

V nadaljevanju bodo izpostavljena tista imena ižanskega imenskega fonda, za katera keltska interpretacija v nadaljnjih obravnavah po Katičiču in Lochnerju von Hüttenbachu še ni bila dokončno ovržena (zlasti Meid 2005 s.v.).

Za podrobno obravnavo in reference gl. glavno besedilo članka pri posameznih imenih.

Broccus je zelo očitno primerljiv z galskim zoonimom **brokko-* 'jazbec', vendar etimon dejansko ni imel vloge pri tvorbi galskih osebnih imen, tako da ga v tej funkciji ni mogoče pričakovati niti sredi emonskega prostora. Poleg tega je zoonim po vsej verjetnosti iz galščine že zgodaj prešel v latinsko nomenklaturu in tam postal produktiven v okviru osebnih imen. *Broccus* na Ižanskem po vsej verjetnosti torej ni nič drugega kot latinski kognomen.

Bugia (v glavnem besedilu gl. pod *Bucco*) se etimološko neutemeljeno povezuje z galskim elementom **bugiā*, ki se pojavlja le v zloženih imenih tipa *Ad-bugissa*, *Ad-bugi-ouna*, *Ver-bugia*. Sam zase se element pojavi le na Ižanskem, na prostoru, kjer je galski element močan oz. avtohton, pa nikdar, medtem ko venetski prostor z imeni **Fugios* (m.) in **Fugia* (ž.) izkazuje popolnoma identično tvorbo. To dejstvo etimološko primerjavo s časovno in prostorsko oddaljenim srednje(!)irskim pomenom etimološko nepreglednega fitonima *buga* (ime nekakšne svetlo obarvane rastline) dela še manj verjetno, predlagani pomen 'modrooka'⁹ pa izključuje kot v celoti *ad hoc*.

Ime **Cetetiu** je izjemno problematično. Če bi bilo zares upravičeno branje *Cetetium*, in ne *s(ibi) e(t) Tetium* (*CIL* III 3861 = 10758; za *Tetiu* prim. *CIL* III 3814 = 10734), bi ne mogli zanesljivo ovreči morebitne galske etimologije imena (h gal. **kaīto-* 'silva') niti z uporabo strogih kriterijev etimološke analize. O pravilnosti tovrstne interpretacije pa je mogoče dvomiti iz drugačnih

⁷ V obravnavah ižanskih imen so starejši raziskovalci kontekstualni kriterij pogosto navezovali na distribucijski kriterij, s čimer je bilo ime, kot je npr. *Elia*, označeno za galsko zgolj na podlagi kolokacije z imenom *Buiio* (*Elia Buii f.*, *CIL* III 10739), to pa je bilo predhodno označeno za galsko na podlagi ugotovitve, da se podobno ime pojavlja tudi v Galiji in Noriku.

⁸ V kombinaciji z drugimi posplošitvami tega tipa akumulativna vrednost tovrstnih ugotovitev ne nazadnje lahko privede celo do izkrivitve interpretacijske slike celotne zgodovinske situacije na ižanskem prostoru.

⁹ Tako Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 21; Meid 2005, 179.

razlogov, ne nazadnje zato, ker bi bilo tovrstno ime v sklopu galskih osebnih imen popolnoma brez vzpostrednice.¹⁰

Imena **Coemo...ius** ni mogoče zanesljivo v celoti rekonstruirati, tako da je vsakršni poskus etimološke razlage tvegan, še bolj pa kakršne koli posplošitve na podlagi predlaganih etimoloških rešitev (Katičičeva rekonstrukcija *Coemioius* je napačna, prav tako nenatančno Meid neupravičeno vzpostavlja nosniško osnovo *Coemo*, *-on-*).

Če gre za avtohtono ime, **Decomo** etimološko ne more biti povezan z indoevropskim števnikom **dekʷm* '10' oz. njegovimi izpeljavami (prim. Meid 2005, 268), saj bi v tem primeru na Ižanskem pričakovali ***Decamo* (tj. z *am* za **m* kot v *Venixama*, vendar prim. ven. **dekomo-* < **dekʷm-(H)o-* 'deseti'). Še manj očitna je povezava s keltskim gradivom, ki jo zastopa Katičič (1968, 75), saj tako galski števniki *decam-eto-* 'deseti' < **-e-to-* kot staroirsko ime *Deichet* (rodilnik ednine) = ogamsko *DECEDDAS* < **dekant-* < **dekʷm-t-*, ki ju navaja v podporo svoji etimološki rešitvi, izkazujejata bistveno drugačno in neprimerljivo besedotvorje.

Žensko osebno ime **Devonti** oz. **Devontia** so starejši avtorji¹¹ za galsko ime brez nadaljnega razglasili na podlagi domneve, da se v zaporedju *Devo-* ohranja pida. **dejuo-* 'bog', in sicer v prvi vrsti zato, ker bi po pravilih glasovnega razvoja ravno v galščini (oz. prakeltščini nasploh, ko govorimo o nezadnjem besednem zlogu) pričakovali razvoj **dejuo-* v **dēuo-*. To etimološko interpretacijo moti zlasti dejstvo, da imen tovrstne strukture keltski jeziki vključno z galščino ne poznajo,¹² medtem ko je bilo ob primerjavi z imenom *Voltaronti* jasno prikazano, da je model, po katerem se ženska imena tvorijo k moškim s pomočjo pripone **(on)tī* in kamor z veliko verjetnostjo sodi tudi obravnavano ime, dobro zasidran ravno v okviru avtohtonega ižanskega imenotvorja. Poleg tega ni nujno, da se v imenu *Devonti* ohranja praindoevropski etimon **dejuo-*, razvoj **ej* v **ē* pa tudi ni samo keltski, temveč je dovolj splošen, da bi ga bilo mogoče teoretično predvideti tudi za ižanski prostor, prim. latinsko

deus < **dēuo-* < **dejuo-* (toda prim. ime *Veitro*, ki morda vendarle kaže na ohranitev dvoglasnika **ej*).

Ime **Galunus** je za nekeltsko dediščino označil že Katičič (1968, 82), vendar ga kot verjetno galskega zopet uvajata Hamp (1978, 60) in Meid (2005, 196),¹³ ki primerjata latinsko gentilno ime *Gallonius* in obe imeni etimološko povezujeta z galskim **galo-* oz. **galā* 'srd, bes'. Pri tem je spregledano dejstvo, da etimon *Gallo-* ni galska, temveč v celoti latinska beseda, ki etimološko z galskim **galo/-ā* (ta se v galščini ohranja le v samostalniku **gal-ati-*, k čemur prim. etnonim Γαλάτης) niti ni povezana. Poleg tega *Galunus* v nasprotju z *Gallo-*, *Gallonius*, *Gallius* ipd. izkazuje enojni *-l-*, ki zagotovo ni le grafične narave; izkazuje pa tudi zaporedje *-un-* namesto *-on-*, ki ga kljub Meidu nikakor ni mogoče pojasniti na podlagi domnevne galskega **Gallōn-*.

Manu, gl. zgoraj pri omembi ženskih imen na *-ūn-*.

Nammo je običajno opredeljeno kot galsko ime¹⁴ na podlagi domneve, da gre za kratko, hipokoristično varianto (glede te imenske kategorije gl. spodaj) k imenu *Adnomatus*. To ni zelo verjetno, saj v tem primeru ne bi pričakovali odpada prvega zloga *Ad-*. Poleg tega bi bilo ime *Nammo* treba za negalsko opredeliti celo v primeru, da je bilo dejansko izpeljano iz imena *Adnomatus*. Kakor je bilo prikazano, je bilo slednje ime namreč živi del ižanske imenske sfere in s tem tudi *Nammo* v primeru etimološke povezanosti obeh imen ižanska in ne galska varianta daljšega imena.

Uccio (?), gl. spodaj.

Uss... nastopa v vlogi patronimika v filiaciji (*Vibunnnija Uss[---] f.*, *CIL* III 3863 in 10759 = *AIJ* 189). Ker zaradi izprane napisne površine ni mogoče rekonstruirati celotnega imena, je zanesljiva etimologizacija nemogoča, na podlagi morebitne rekonstrukcije imena pa ni utemeljeno osnovati nadaljnjih posplošitev. Meid (2005, 194) predpostavlja,¹⁵ da je v ohranjenem delu imena

¹³ Poleg Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 25–26.

¹⁴ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1965, 29–30; Katičič 1968, 87; Hamp 1976a, 4; id. 1978, 58; Meid 2005, 278.

¹⁵ Ob tem domnevo o galskem izvoru imena *Uss[---]* uporabi celo v sklopu kontekstualnega kriterija in žensko ime *Devontia* z istega nagrobnika, neupravičeno označi kot "klarerweise ein keltischer Name".

¹⁰ Povsem enako velja za ime *Cotiu* (morda za izvorno **Cottiu*) z novoodkritega nagrobnika – gl. Ragolič 2016, 292, 293–294.

¹¹ Katičič 1968, 75; Hamp 1978, 60; Meid 2005, 194.

¹² Kljub Hamp l.c.

mogoče prepoznati galski predlog **uxs*, vendar ta etimološka rešitev ni ustrezna, saj v tem primeru ne bi pričakovali zapisa <uss>, temveč <ux> ali eventualno <uxs>, k čemur med drugim prim. galsko žensko osebno ime *Uxela* (*CIL* III 13406).

Žensko osebno ime **Venixama** je na prvi pogled primerljivo z nedvomno galskim moškim imenom *Venixsamus* ~ *Venixxamus*, trikrat izpričanim na osrednjem galskem območju. V obeh primerih gre za ime, osnovano na presežniku (superlativu), ki je bil s pripono *-*isamo*- < pide. *-*is-ṃHo*- tvorjen k pridevniku **uēni-ko*- 'prijateljski', torej **uēnik-isamo*- 'carissimus'. Vendarle pa podrobna analiza pokaže, da sta obe pojavitvi nedvomno posledica vzporednega nastanka, in sicer v dveh različnih jezikovnih sistemih na podlagi istih sredstev, ki so bila tako v galščino kot v jezikovni sistem, ki je vir ižanskih imen, podedovana iz indoevropskega prajezika in poleg tega doživela tudi vzporeden razvoj. Na to dejstvo dodatno opozarjajo številne drobne razlike med imenom, kot sta konsistentna raba le ženske oz. le moške variante imena in zaporedje -*ks*-, ki ga v *Venixama* odraža zapis <x>, medtem ko <xs> in <xx> kažeta na pričakovano galsko *-*χs*- < *-*ks*-. Varianta *Venixema*, ki je značilna le za ižansko skupino, z zapisom <e> odraža šibitev samoglasnika v nenaglašenem zlogu, kakršno je mogoče zaslediti tudi v primeru ižanskega imena *Voltarenis* za pričakovano in tudi izpričano *Voltaronis*, medtem ko za galščino ta pojav ni značilen.

Podoben in pomemben primer enakozvočnih zaporedij, ki so se na isti način izoblikovala iz istih podedovanih sredstev v različnih jezikih, je element **-gnus** (*Enignus*) s pomenom '(ki je) rojen'. Ta se na Ižanskem pojavlja skupaj z istopomenskim elementom **-gnas** (*Voltognas*), izpričanim v Gatini pri Grosupljem (*AIJ* 221), ki prav tako nastopa kot drugi člen v dvodelnem osebnem imenu in v primerjavi s prvim zagotovo predstavlja le bolj arhaično varianto *-*gnā*- < pide. *-*g'ṃH₁*- (v imenovalniku ednine torej *-*gnā-s* < pide. *-*g'ṃH₁-s*). Obe varianti sta poleg bolj pogostih *-*geno*- in *-*gnāto*- razširjeni tudi v galščini, vendar nikakor ne le tam,¹⁶ saj element *-*gno*- med

drugim pozna venetščina (prim. *vo.l.tigno.s.*, Es 8). Imenski element *-*g'ṃH₁(o)*- s pomenom '(ki je) rojen' je namreč kot drugi člen v dvodelnih osebnih imenih podedovan že iz prajezika in je zato v konkretnem primeru povsem trivialen indic za določanje izvora imena. Poleg tega gre lahko v primeru ižanskega elementa *-gnus* tudi zgolj za latinizirano varianto avtohtonega *-gnas*, ki bi se v tem primeru neposredno ohranjal v imenu *Voltognas* (*AIJ* 221), v imenih tipa *Enignus* pa le posredno.

Nepovedni za določanje etimološkega izvora danega imena so tudi vsi hipokoristiki s strukturo *(*C₁*)VC₂C₂(*i*)on- (m.) oz. *(*C₁*)VC₂C₂(*i*)ā (ž.),¹⁷ ki v okviru ižanskih imen predstavljajo najproduktivnejšo imensko kategorijo, prim. **Aicco*, **Amma*, *Buccus* ~ *Bucco* ~ *Bucca* ~ *Buccio*, *Buiio*, *Butto*, **Emmo*, *Enno* ~ *Enna* ~ *Ennia*, *Eppo*, *Nammo*, *Oppa*, *Otto*, *Petto*, *Secco*, *Sennus*, *Tetta*, *Uccio*. Hipokoristiki so imena kratkih zaporedij, ki iz daljših imen (običajno dvo- ali večdelnih) nastanejo s krnitvijo (skrajšanjem) in dodatkom značilne hipokoristične pripon. Nabor teh pripon se razlikuje iz sistema v sistem; medtem ko je za galščino značilen pestrejši nabor pripon tipa *-illo-*, *-ullo-*, *-isso-* (gl. zgoraj), se za tvorbo tovrstnih imen na Ižanskem potrjuje zlasti pripona *-*on*- oz. *-*ion*- za imena moškega in *-*ā* oz. *-*iā* za imena ženskega spola. Imena tega tipa, mnogokrat celo identična, se pojavljajo tudi zunaj ižanskega prostora. Ime *Aicco* je na primer nedvomno povezano s panonskim hipokoristikom *Aicca* (*RIU* 769), medtem ko so nekatere vzporednice z bolj oddaljenimi območji, zlasti pa z osrednjim galskim prostorom, neprepričljive, saj so v metodološkem smislu povsem brez informativne vrednosti. Morfološka zgradba hipokoristikov je namreč univerzalna, ker pa gre pri tem še za zelo kratka zaporedja, je možnost, da se bo isto zaporedje pojavilo tudi v drugih jezikih oz. onomastičnih sistemih, toliko večja. Etimološko in/ali genetsko takšna enakozvočna imena večinoma niso povezana oz. vsaj ne morejo predstavljati kriterija, na podlagi katerega bi bilo metodološko upravičeno delati posplošitve o izvoru nekega imenskega fonda nasploh. Številna izmed teh imen je Katičič

¹⁶ Dvodelna galska imena z elementom *-*gno*- se pojavljajo izključno v Galiji (deloma tudi Galiji cisalpini), medtem ko sta istopomenska in neprimerno bolj pogosta elementa *-*geno*- in *-*gnāto*- razširjena po celotnem nekdanj galsko govorečem ozemlju. Tretja varianta, *-*gento*-, je

omejena na noriško-panonsko galsko imensko tradicijo (gl. Meid 2005, 130–133; Raybould, Sims-Williams 2009, *Table of Second and Third Elements*, s.v.).

¹⁷ C = soglasnik, V = samoglasnik, C₁ = soglasnik, ki praviloma ni enak soglasniku C₂.

v svoji študiji po distribucijskem kriteriju namreč prepoznal tudi na osrednjem galskem prostoru, njihovo prisotnost na Ižanskem pa razložil kot posledico starejše keltske naselitve v jugovzhodnih Alpah, saj se cela vrsta tovrstnih imen ne pojavlja v noriško-panonski skupini galskih imen. Omembe vredno je predvsem dejstvo, da se dejansko zelo redki *identični* hipokoristiki (*Nammo, Secco, Tetto* ipd.), ki jih najdemo v osrednji Galiji, praviloma pojavljajo v zelo specifičnem kontekstu, namreč na lončarskih žigih, ki *mutatis mutandis* predstavljajo specifično socialno okolje,¹⁸ kjer je bila tvorba in raba tovrstnih imen v enaki meri produktivna in priljubljena kot na ižanskem prostoru.

Resno vprašanje o izvoru pa se postavlja pri hipokoristikih, ki si jih ižanski prostor deli z južnim Norikom, prim. zlasti *Butto, Otto, Petto, Ucco* (?).¹⁹ Trenutno je gradivo preskopo, da bi bil mogoč bolj izostren vpogled v naravo razmerja med ižansko in južnonoriško imensko dediščino, vsekakor pa se zdi verjetno, da je ta povezava starejša od naplastitve galskih imen. Na to jasno kažeta hipokoristika *Butto* in morda tudi *Ucco*, ki sta izpričana tudi v okviru venetskega imenskega fonda, drugi celo v pričakovani venetski varianti **Futto* (tj. *s f* za *b* kot v **Fugia ~ Bugia*), s čimer se ne potrjuje le njuna pripadnost severnojadranskemu imenskemu arealu, temveč tudi enak, obrobni položaj znotraj samega areala.

Sklep

Na podlagi formalnih meril (glasoslovje, oblikotvorje, besedotvorje, skladnja), ki predstavljajo edini zanesljivi in metodološko neoporečni pristop k analizi imenskega fonda, lahko sklenemo, da v okviru ižanske antroponimije ni mogoče identificirati prepričljivih znakov, ki bi med izpričanimi imeni dokazovali prisotnost galskega imenskega elementa. Ta primarno avtohtoni in presenetljivo izolirani značaj predrimskega ižanskega onomastikona potrjuje tudi natančna študija novoodkrita imena *Q(u)iemoni(s)* na nagrobniku v cerkvi sv. Janeza Krstnika v Podkraju pri Tomišlju (gl.

¹⁸ Da pri priljubljenosti hipokorističnih variant osebnih imen na lončarskih žigih ne gre neposredno za posledico fizične omejitve glede na velikost predmeta, je jasno razvidno iz dejstva, da tu ne gre za iz pragmatičnih razlogov okrajšana, temveč polno funkcionalna imena.

¹⁹ Ime se na Ižanskem morda pojavi enkrat, in sicer v obliki *Uccio* (*AIJ* 133), vendar branje ni zanesljivo. Za tekstnokritični komentar gl. glavno besedilo.

Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 301–305), ki je bil kot izrazito nekeltsko ime povod za ponovni pretres celotne problematike izvora ižanskih imen.

Če je interpretacija zaporedja *QIEMONI* kot enotnega osebnega imena v imenovalniku ednine pravilna (gl. Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 303–304), se moško osebno ime **Q(u)iemoni(s)** jasno pridružuje številnim osebnim imenom, ki so izpričana le na ižanskem prostoru. Osamljenih (tj. le enkratnih) pojavitev določenega imena (*hapax legomenon*) zaradi izrazito fragmentarne narave gradiva nasploh sicer ni metodološko ustrezno označiti za avtohtono dediščino neke onomastične tradicije, vendar tako besedotvorje novoodkrita imena kot njegova glasovna podoba narekujejo, da gre nedvomno za pristni element severnojadranskega sistema, če ne celo za unikum, vezan na periferno in s tem v marsičem samosvojo ižansko podskupino istega kompleksa. Na to opozarja tudi pomembna in presenetljiva oblikotvorna podoba imena, ki s končajem *-is*, in ne *-ius*, kakor bi morda pričakovali, ponuja vpogled v avtohtono oblikotvorje osnov na *-io-* s soglasnikom pred pripono (v konkretnem primeru torej *-n-io-*). Imena s tako strukturo so namreč doslej v okviru osebnih imen zanesljivo izpričana le v stranskih sklonih (prim. roditelj *Neuntii* < **Neuntj-ī*), z imenom *Q(u)iemoni(s)* pa prvič tudi v imenovalniku. Zdi se torej verjetno, da se je vsaj v okviru ižanskega sistema imenovalnik ednine tovrstnih osnov končeval na **-is* (→ latinizirano *-is*), in ne na **-ios* (→ latinizirano *-ius*), kar ga v sklopu drugih podsistemov severnojadranske ploskve družijo vsaj z venetščino (prim. karnijskovenetski patronimik **Kauaron-io-s* > **Kauaron-is*, izpričano kot *kavaron:s* ob številnih drugih zgledih tovrstnega razvoja izglašnega zaporedja **-io-s* v venetščini).

Ime *Q(u)iemoni(s)* se na nagrobniku sicer pojavi brez filiacije, kar je v primeru, da gre dejansko za osebno ime, za ižansko imensko formulo neobičajno. Vendarle pa ni zelo verjetno, da bi se v imenu ohranjal star patronimik v funkciji gentilnega imena (v tem primeru torej z eliptičnim izpustom osebnega imena), saj so ta na ižanskem prostoru izjemno redka. Ižanska onomastika v večini primerov izkazuje enoimenski sistem z dvodelno formulo, kar pomeni, da osebnemu imenu sledi očetovo ime v obliki filiacije – ta vsebuje osebno ime očeta v roditeljniku ednine in oznako *filius* / *filia*, kar natančno ustreza latinskemu zaporedju kognomen + filiacija, npr. *Venixema Pettonis f(ilia)* (*CIL* III 3820). Ta formula je značilna za celoten

alpski prostor (zastopana je tudi na latiniziranih galskih napisih), medtem ko je za ostale podsisteme severnojadranskega kroga, vključno s šmaratskim, že značilen prehod starih patronimikov v gentilna imena. Redkejši so primeri dvoimenskega sistema, ki poleg osebnega imena v filiaciji vključujejo celotno ime očeta (tj. osebno ime in filiacijo), prim. *Tertius [Epponis Boleriani] f.* (CIL III 3816 in 10735 = AIJ 142 = RINMS 88).

Edini jasni in dobro ohranjeni primer nelatinskega gentilnega imena na Ižanskem je ime *Laepius* (CIL III 3804 in 10731 = AIJ 134), ki pa po vsej verjetnosti ni avtohtono, na kar kaže tako njegova jasna povezava z jugozahodnim predelom severnojadranskega kroga, prim. histrijsko *Laep-oko-*, liburnijsko *Laep-iko-* in venetsko *Laep=on-jo-* (vsa gentilna imena), kot kolokacija z osebnim imenom *Pletor*, ki najverjetneje predstavlja imenski infiltrat iz neke druge onomastične tradicije v okviru histrijskega oz. liburnijskega podsistema. Iz tega sledi ugotovitev: če bi ime *Q(u)iemoni(s)* na Ižanskem dejansko nastopalo v vlogi gentilnega imena, bi bilo kot tako lahko izoblikovano šele sekundarno, in sicer po latinskem modelu, saj so gentilna imena izanskemu onomastičnemu sistemu sicer tuja. S tem bi se ime tudi oblikovno brez dvoma zgledovalo po latinskih gentilnih imenih na *-ius*, kar pomeni, da bi v tem primeru po vsej verjetnosti pričakovali obliko ***Quiemonius*. Utemeljeno je torej skleniti, da se v zaporedju *Q(u)iemoni(s)* ohranja osebno ime in da je torej v konkretnem primeru pripona *-jo-* najverjetneje posledica pridevniškega besedotvorja in pravzaprav nima imenotvorne funkcije – osebno ime je torej formalno identično s pridevnikom, na katerem temelji.

V imenu je najverjetneje treba prepoznati posamostaljeno pridevniško tvorbo k praindoevropskemu glagolskemu korenu **k^uieH₁-* '(s)počiti (si), umiriti se', kakršna se na primer ohranja še v latinskem *quiēs* 'počitek, spanec', mladoavestijskem *šā'ti-* 'mir' in staroperzijskem *šiyāti-* 'mir, sreča, blagostanje' < pide. **k^uieH₁-ti-*, ki po pomenu približno ustrezajo izpeljanki **k^uiē-mon-* < pide. **k^uieH₁-mon-*. Ta se skupaj s pripadnostno pripono *-jo-* ohranja v pridevniku **k^uiēmon-jo-* > *Quiemonis*, ki bi pomensko, če je etimološka razlaga pravilna, še najbolje ustrezal latinskemu *quiētus* 'miren' oz. *quiēscens* 'ki se umirja'. Strukturno vzporednico k pridevniški podstavi, na kateri temelji ime *Quiemonis* = **k^uiēmonis* < **k^uiē=mon-jo-*, je mogoče identificirati vsaj še v venetskem pridevniku **termon-jo-* 'končen, mejen' (< **ki* je v zvezi z

mejo, mejnikom') k pide. **ter(H_{1/2})-mon-*, kar se dalje ohranja v latinskem *termō* in starogrškem τέρμων 'mejniki'.

V zapisu <QI-> (torej *Quiemoni(s)*) za pričakovano <QVI-> bi se lahko prepoznalo redko napako (morda haplografskega izvora) ali namerno izpušitev elementa <V> v <QV> zaradi pomanjkanja prostora. Ni pa teoretično izključena možnost, da bi tak zapis utegnil odražati drugačno, enozložno izgovarjavo zaporedja **k^uiē-*, ki je bila latinščini in s tem latinski grafiji tuja – v latinščini tovrstna podedovana enozložna zaporedja namreč regularno postanejo dvozložna (prim. *qui-ē-tus*).

V zaključku kaže ponovno poudariti, da je vsako ime v prvi vrsti beseda nekega jezika. Glavna lastnost vsake besede je, da je razdeljena na smiselne pomenske oz. funkcijske enote, tj. morfeme, ki so razporejeni v logična zaporedja, in sicer tako, da pri postopnem prepoznavanju zaporednih morfemov besede od desne proti levi na koncu ni ostanka. Z etimološko analizo imena *Q(u)iemoni(s)* lahko v zaporedju prepoznamo tri morfeme: koren besede **k^uieH₁-*, prvi sufiks **-mon-* za tvorbo izglagolskega samostalnika **k^uieH₁-mon-* in drugi sufiks *-jo-*, ki je podstavn samostalnik **k^uieH₁-mon-* pretvoril v pridevnik **k^uieH₁=mon-jo-*. Nemogoče bi bilo torej ime *Quiemonis* etimološko povezovati na primer s krajevnim imenom *Emona* ~ *Aemona*. To pa ne le zato, ker ima vsako izmed imen jasne besedotvorne vzporednice v primerjalnem gradivu, ki jasno narekujejo segmentacijo **k^uiē-mon-jo-* proti **(A)em-ōnā* (prim. *Aen-ona*, *Alb-ona*, *Alu-ona*, *Flan-ona*, *Nar-ona*, *Sal-ona* itd.), temveč v prvi vrsti zaradi dejstva, da bi bil rezultat tovrstne primerjave ostanek neuvrščene zaporedja **k^ui-*, s čimer bi se prekršilo glavno pravilo, na katerem temelji celotno analitično jezikoslovje.

Raziskava za članek je bila izvedena v času avtorjevega strokovnega usposabljanja na Inštitutu za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU.

Luka Repanšek

Oddelek za primerjalno in splošno jezikoslovje
Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani

Aškerčeva 2

SI-1000 Ljubljana

luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si

