

Language and writing among the Lusitanians

Eugenio R. Luján

1. Defining Lusitanian

Lusitanian is an Indo-European language that was spoken in western Spain and Portugal in Antiquity, in the territory of the Roman province of Lusitania. We do not know how the speakers of the language called it themselves and its modern name “Lusitanian” was proposed by Antonio Tovar (1966-1967: 243) after the publication of the inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas, on the basis of its attestation in that Roman province.¹ It has since then generally been accepted in the scholarly bibliography.

We have to be cautious when using the name “Lusitanian” in discussing information about the indigenous languages of the western area of the Iberian peninsula (cf. Guerra 2010): geographically, all the linguistic evidence of any indigenous language coming from the province of Lusitania could be labelled as “Lusitanian”. The evidence is, however, not homogenous and does not belong together as a whole with the language that we conventionally call “Lusitanian”. In fact, we know, from both ancient sources and modern archaeological and linguistic studies, that there must have been a number of speakers of Celtic languages in this area (§6). Therefore, when analysing single, specific names from this region we must keep in mind that all of them are “Lusitanian” in the sense that they appear in Lusitania, but they may not be “Lusitanian” in the sense that they can be evidence of languages different from the one that we refer to that in that way.

Moreover, we have evidence of the “Lusitanian” language outside the province of Lusitania, as is the case with certain proper names coming from the two northwestern *conuentus* of the *Tarraconensis* (the *Callecia* region), especially from the more southern *conuentus bracarensis* or *bracaraugustanus*, with its capital town *Bracara Augusta* (§6). This area has provided a significant number of god names that since Untermann’s pioneer studies (especially Untermann 1985) have been grouped together with the god names appearing in Lusitania and they are usually referred to as “Lusitanian-Galician” god names.

In addition to the intrinsic linguistic difficulties, the reader should be aware that due to the state of preservation of the inscriptions and the type of stone on which

¹ “Une nouvelle découverte des archéologues portugais est venue augmenter nos éléments d’information en révélant au Cabeço das Fráguas [...] une très importante inscription. [...] Cette hereuse découverte contribue à définir entre le Douro et le Tage une région linguistique que nous pouvons appeler lusitanienne.” (Tovar 1966-1967: 242-243) Previously the linguistic remnants of this region were simply referred to as western Hispanic or similar.

many of them were carved, readings are frequently uncertain. Good epigraphic editions are required to ensure that we are dealing with the right indigenous names before attempting their linguistic interpretation, especially when they occur only once and cannot be checked on other inscriptions.

Excepting the Viseu inscription, first published by Fernandes, Carvalho and Figueira (2009), the other Lusitanian inscriptions have been found either outside its original archaeological context or else are rock inscriptions that cannot be clearly associated to a precise context. This is a major drawback when trying to provide an assured chronology for the inscriptions. They are usually considered to date back to the first two centuries of the era (De Hoz 2013: 88), on the basis that they are linked to the coming of the Romans and the arrival of Latin epigraphy to the area. In fact, Lusitanian inscriptions are all written in the Latin alphabet and most of them are bilingual texts displaying code-switching between Latin and Lusitanian. The editors of the Arronches inscription (Carneiro *et alii* 2008) dated it to the 1st century AD, but it has been thought to be slightly earlier (1st century BC) on linguistic grounds (Villar and Prósper 2009: 14). The inscription from Arroyo de la Luz III has been dated back to the 2nd century BC, due to the archaic shape of the open <P> (Villar and Pedrero 2001b: 240-242), which occurs at Arronches as well. Nevertheless, Edmondson's (2002: 52) warnings about dating these texts solely on palaeography are in order, since older epigraphic usages seem to have survived longer here than in other areas.

That we are dealing with an homogeneous group has been clear since the discovery of the inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas: it was noted that it shared part of its vocabulary, including what appeared to be animal nouns and god names, with the inscription from Lamas de Moledo, which in a seminal paper Balmori (1935) had started to interpret in the right direction. As pointed out by Tovar (1966-1967: 242-243, 1985-1986: 23), it was also evident that they were related to the lost inscription from Arroyo de la Luz, found in the 18th century and fortunately copied and reproduced by J.F. Masdéu in the 19th volume of his *Historia crítica de España y de la cultura española*. The new inscription from Arroyo de la Luz (Almagro-Gorbea, Ortega and Villar 1999; Villar and Pedrero 2001a, 2001b), as well as the Arronches inscription also belong in this group of inscriptions with similar contents, structure (series of Accusatives + Datives), and vocabulary (cf., lately, Vallejo 2013: 273). The recently discovered Viseu inscription does not share any word with the others and shows somewhat special phonetic traits (§3.1.3); nevertheless, given the area in which it has been found, it seems safe to assume that it belongs to the same linguistic layer – its different nature can account for the lack of coincidences with the other inscriptions and is the natural link between the major Lusitanian inscriptions and the Latin ones mentioning Lusitanian god names.

2. Lusitanian inscriptions and writing in the Lusitania

The number of inscriptions written totally or partially in Lusitanian is quite limited: basically, to this date we know 6/7 inscriptions in which Lusitanian vocabulary and/or grammatical words occur. The uncertainty about the exact number lies on the fact that the lost inscription from Arroyo de la Luz (CC.03.01) actually consisted of two pieces and, even if it is likely that they belonged to the same inscription, it cannot be proved.² In order to understand the sociolinguistic situation of the Lusitanian language, it is highly relevant that more than half of the inscriptions combine Latin and Lusitanian.

To these we can add the information provided by a large number of god names on Latin inscriptions (Untermann 1985, Prósper 2002). These god names are not only interesting for their etymology and the information that they provide about vocabulary and word formation – it is frequently the case that the god name keeps its indigenous endings even if the inscription is in Latin.

We can establish the following scale, according to the degree of bilingualism displayed in the texts, which range from the few inscriptions wholly written in Lusitanian (at least their preserved parts) to those written in Latin and simply having Lusitanian names:³

1. the whole inscription is written in Lusitanian: Cabeço das Fráguas, Arroyo de la Luz III (?), and Arronches (except for personal names);
2. the bulk of the inscription is written in Lusitanian, but its introduction is in Latin: Lamas de Moledo, Arroyo de la Luz I;
3. Latin inscriptions displaying Lusitanian god name(s) and/or their epithets with Lusitanian endings and Lusitanian words: Viseu;⁴

² This is why the inscription from Arroyo de la Luz found in the 90's of the 20th century (CC.3.2) was called "Arroyo de la Luz III" in the first editions. In order to avoid confusion, I will also follow that practice in this chapter.

³ Gorrachategui and Vallejo (2010: 71-72, 2015: 338-339) and Vallejo (2013: 275) explicitly state that inscriptions in our group 4 should also be considered Lusitanian. Wodtko (2009: 23-24) rightly emphasizes that a scale of Latinisation cannot be taken as an indication of absolute chronology, but rather as "a chronological or typological tendency of increasing Latin inference."

⁴ We could also add in this group the inscription mentioning the *Deibabo Nemucelaicabo* (HEpOL 6939, Búa's 1997: 60 reading), with *Deiba-* 'goddess'. This would raise the problem how to classify inscriptions with god names such as *Reue*, *Bandi*, or *Crougae*, and many others (Prósper 2002: *passim*), which we suspect were also common names in Lusitanian, e.g. *Reue* 'river' (Villar 1996) but, as Wodtko (2009: 24-25) suggests, were probably interpreted as proper names in a Latin context. The limits between group 3 and 4 are, therefore, blurry and they depend on our knowledge and interpretation of certain god names. For a further subgrouping of the Lusitanian god naming formulae on Latin inscriptions, see Untermann (1985: 348-351, 358-361) and De Hoz (2013: 89-90).

4. Latin inscriptions displaying Lusitanian god name(s) and/or their epithets with Lusitanian endings. Again, there are various degrees of Latinisation here (Wodtko 2009: 10-22): inscriptions with Lusitanian endings in both the god name and the epithet(s) or only in the god name.
5. Latin inscriptions displaying Lusitanian god name(s) and/or epithets, but no Lusitanian endings. A further distinction can be made between inscriptions with Lusitanian god names and epithets and those with Latin god names and Lusitanian epithets. The epithets may display Lusitanian or Latin suffixes, i.e. *-aeco-* and its variants vs. *-ensis* (Wodtko 2009: 22). We could also include here Latin inscriptions having Lusitanian personal names (see, however, §5).

The text of all the inscriptions belonging to groups 1-3 is provided in Appendix 1, as well as some selected examples of groups 4-5. An additional classification of these inscriptions could be made depending on their nature (Wodtko 2009: 2, De Hoz 2013: 89): inscriptions in groups 1-2 are public, monumental and “official” in some way; in contrast, inscriptions in groups 3-5 are dedications to gods made by individuals.

With the available information, our knowledge of the Lusitanian grammar is, not surprisingly, quite limited, for group 4 only provides clues about the dative and group 5 does not provide any grammatical information at all. Moreover, it is safe to classify an inscription as belonging in groups 1-3, but it is not so straightforward to determine whether Latin inscriptions of this region belong to groups 4-5; as we saw in § 1, we cannot always ascertain whether an isolated indigenous name is Lusitanian or not.

In contrast to other languages and areas of the Iberian peninsula, Lusitanian was only written in the Latin script and no attempt seems to have been made to adapt it to the specific needs of the language. As De Hoz (1995: 3-4) remarked, in most of the the Indo-European area of Hispania literacy began when the Romans arrived. This applies well to our area with the few exceptions of some Southwestern and Iberian inscriptions in the Southern script which belong to a different period (Luján *et alii* 2012: 200-202, Luján 2013: 126-127 with the references). The various types of code-switching between Lusitanian and Latin reflected in most Lusitanian inscriptions point to a situation of bilingualism, or rather diglossia, among the speakers, since Latin was used for most purposes and, in the end, it came to completely replace Lusitanian (Wodtko 2009: 2).

Furthermore, as Untermann (*MLH* IV 725) and De Hoz (1995: 4, 2013: 89) have stressed, it is not likely that a proper epigraphic habit developed among the Lusitanians. Even if we now know a few more Lusitanian inscriptions, the global image has not changed so much: from the extant evidence, we can state Lusitanian was not used for writing any of the types of inscriptions that were common among other peoples in Antiquity, not even funerary steles or graffiti on pottery. The lack of

regularity, even within the same text (§§3.1.4, 3.2.1.1) or the variations in the transcriptions of the same god name on Latin inscriptions are further evidence that there was no tradition of writing in Lusitanian (De Hoz 2013: 90-91).

If we are to judge from the contents of the surviving texts, writing in Lusitanian must have been limited to a very specific context: all the texts are religious in nature, whether we are dealing with god names on Latin inscriptions or with Lusitanian inscriptions mentioning sacrifices carried out on behalf of various gods. The general conservative nature of religion and its resistance to change is a well fact and this must have prompted some individuals who were Lusitanian speakers and could write in Latin to put down in writing some Lusitanian religious formulae or ritual descriptions. This may have been made in order to differentiate themselves from other non-Lusitanian speaking peoples of the area (De Hoz 2013: 94), cf. §6.

The inscriptions from Arroyo de la Luz I and Lamas de Moledo first mention, in Latin, the individuals in charge of writing the Lusitanian texts. This possibly means that they were responsible for putting those Lusitanian sacred formulae in writing for the first (and last) time. Even if they were not the “authors” of the texts, it might well be that they arranged them and were responsible for carrying out the sacrifices referred to (Wodkto 2009: 2).

The area in which Lusitanian was spoken can be determined by using the various types of inscriptions mentioned above. If we stick to inscriptions in groups 1-3, the area was quite limited (Figure 1: map): the six inscriptions have been found in a triangle roughly delimited by the current towns of Viseu (to the north-west), Badajoz (south-west), and Cáceres (east). Except for the Arronches inscription (POA.01.01), they cluster in two groups: three inscriptions from Viseu and its surroundings (VIS.01.01, VIS.02.01, GUA.01.01) and two from Arroyo de la Luz (CC.03.01 and .02). This shows, once again, that Lusitanian writing was a sporadic phenomenon and it did not spread among the speakers of the language.

The distribution of the inscriptions displaying Lusitanian-Galician god names partially overlaps with this area, because it extends further beyond, especially to the north, and reaches the two northwestern *conventus* of the *Tarraconensis* province. This lack of coincidence calls for an explanation, especially when not all the god names attested in the area are linguistically homogeneous and a number of them show traits that cannot be compatible with what we know about the Lusitanian language (Prósper 2002: 422-427).

3. Lusitanian language

In the following paragraphs I will provide a sketch of what we know about the Lusitanian language, basically in a synchronic perspective. To proceed in the

appropriate methodological progression, my descriptions are primarily based on inscriptions in the Lusitanian language (groups 1-3) and then the results will be checked with the information provided by inscriptions in groups 4-5. As is frequently the case when dealing with fragmentary languages, the interpretation of some facts is controversial; for further information, the relevant chapters of *MLH IV*, Prósper's (2002) book, and the on-line edition of Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2016) in the Hesperia databank should be checked.

3.1. Phonology

3.1.1. Stops

Lusitanian had the usual three arrays of stops in the Indo-European languages: velar, dental (or alveolar), and labial, with a contrast between a voiceless and a voiced phoneme for each: /k:/g/, /t:/d/, /p:/b/.

In this area of the Iberian peninsula there was an ongoing process of lenition of intervocalic voiceless stops, as shown by *ifate* (POA.01.01)/*ifadem* (GUA.01.01), *Munitie* (POA.01.01)/*Munidi* (HEpOL 22150), *Laepo* (HEpOL 20484, 20485, 24159)/*Laebo* (GUA.01.01), or *[Re]ue Langanitaeco* (HEpOL 20005)/*Reue Langanidaegui* (HEpOL 20082).⁵ This change was already pointed out by Tovar (1961) as a differential characteristic of this language, in contrast to Celtiberian. No correlation can be established between the levels of our scale in §2 and the presence of a voiced or voiceless stop. Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2010: 72-73, 76-77)'s recent analysis of this phenomenon shows that it happens frequently with god names, while the voiceless stops are preserved in personal names, as proved by names from the stems **katu*, **klouto-*, **touto-*, or **trito-*, among others. God names would, therefore, provide a closer reflection of the actual phonetic developments that Lusitanian common vocabulary was undergoing; in contrast, personal names would be more conservative (Vallejo 2013: 282-283), cf. §5.

Geminated stops are rare in Lusitanian inscriptions, which fits well with the similar conclusion drawn by Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2015: 342) from the names of this area. In groups 1-3 we have only the following instances, three of which are *-kk-*: *Iccona*, *Iccinui*, and *isaiccid*, and one *-pp-*: *puppid*. *-kk-* must be the outcome of the Indo-European cluster **kw* (§4.1), while *-pp-* involves a cluster of dental plus labiovelar (§3.2.2). *Attedia* occurs in POA.01.01 in the Latinate part. *Labbo* is an alternative reading to *Laebo* in GUA.01.01, but since gemination is unexpected in Lusitanian, this may be an argument for choosing the second possibility.

⁵ It is not always easy to tell apart <C> and <G> in the inscriptions; therefore, some alternations of those letters for etymological /k/, as in *porcom/porgom*, might not be phonetic.

3.1.2. Nasals, lateral, and vibrant

There were two nasals (labial and dental or alveolar) in Lusitanian, as typified by *singeie+o* and *Ampilua*. A geminated nasal occurs in *Loiminna* (GUA.01.01), but the alternative spelling *Loemina* on CC.03.01 shows that this must be an additional instance of the lack of systematicity when writing Lusitanian.

Lusitanian had a lateral /l/ and a vibrant /r/, as in *Loiminna*, *oila*, *Carlae*, *praisom*, etc. In contrast to other Palaeohispanic languages, we do not have any hint that there was an opposition between two different vibrants.

3.1.3. Sibilants and other fricatives

Lusitanian had a sibilant /s/, as shown by *sintamom*, *secias*, *Harase*, etc. There is no clear evidence of a second, additional sibilant, in contrast to Iberian and Celtiberian. In groups 1-3 we only have one instance of a geminated sibilant in *usseam* (GUA.01.01), which has been usually explained as the outcome of **ut-syo-* ‘one year old’ (cp. Latin *uetus* ‘old’, Gk. ἔτος). If we take into account that there is an unexpected geminated *n* in the suffix of *Loiminna* in the same inscription, I wonder how much weight we must give to it in order to accept the existence of a phonological opposition between two sibilants in Lusitanian.

Some sibilants must be the result of the evolutions of clusters involving dental stops. *Praisom* in CC.03.01 has been explained by Prósper (2002: 70-73) as **preh₂i-d^hh₁-tom* (§3.2.1.1), with the evolution **-d^ht- > *-ss- > -s-*, after the loss of the laryngeal. This is also the case with the god name *Cossue*, from **kom-d^hh₁-t-*, which is also attested i.a. as *Cusue* and *Cosei* (Prósper 2002: 235-241). The latter forms probably show that *-ss-* resulting from the evolution of clusters had a tendency to merge with *-s-*. Moreover, even if in the territory of the *Lucensis* (§§1, 6), the forms *Cohue* and *Cuhue* also occur (Prósper 2002: 244-247), proving that the new *s* resulting from these changes could participate in the ongoing process that will be described next.

The sibilant was undergoing a process of lenition leading to various results. In initial and intervocalic position it evolved into an aspirate /h/, which could eventually be lost in some cases: e.g. in *Araco Arantoniceo* (CIL II 4991 = HEpOL 21924) vs. *Haracui*, if they are related, as Wodtko (2009: 33) and Gorrochotegui and Vallejo (2010: 73-74) suspect, or if *Harase* is related to the *mansio ad Septem Aras* (the name of Arronches in the Antonine Itinerary) and to *Arasei Collouesei Caieloni Cosigo* (Carneiro *et alii* 2008: 170), with the new reading for this inscription proposed by D’Encarnação and Guerra (2010: 95).

The lack of final *-s* of what must be Plural Accusatives followed by the Latin numeral *X* ‘ten’ in POA.01.01 (§§3.2.1.1-2), such as *oila X* or *t{.}au[ro] ifate X*, can be easily accounted for as the final outcome of a change **-s > -h > -∅*. Villar and Prósper (2009: 29) suggested that this loss may be restricted to instances in which *s* followed a long vowel (as in the Plural Accusatives) or went before a consonant, but the information is too scarce to be conclusive. That this lack of final *-s* is not a fact of writing is proved by the Latinate names *Apinus Vendicus Eriacainu[s]* in the same inscription.

The Dative Plural endings *-abor* and *-obor* in VIS.02.01 show an alternative evolution of the lenited final *-s*, that is, its rhotatisation, which may be an interesting hint to the existence of dialectal variation in Lusitanian: loss of final *-s* occurs in the southernmost inscription, rhotacism is attested in one of the three inscriptions of the Viseu-area (unfortunately the other two do not provide information about this) and, finally, in the central area (inscriptions from Arroyo de la Luz), final *-s* appears to be preserved in *secias* and *muitieas*, whatever their morphological interpretation may be (§3.2.1.2). In Latin inscriptions there are six cases of Dat. Pl. *-bo*-endings in the Lusitanian-Galician area, which have been discussed by Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2010: 74-75 and 78): they lack both *-s* and *-r*.

Given that no final aspiration occurs in the extant texts, we can attempt an integrated account for all the cases of lenition of */s/* in Lusitanian, depending whether they happen in initial-medial or final position:

- initial-medial position: ** (-)s > (-)h- > -∅*;
- final position: **-s > -r > -∅*.

In addition to */h/*, Lusitanian displays */f/*, assured by *ifadem* and *ifate*. In a seminal paper Albertos (1985-1986) thoroughly collected all the occurrences of *<f>* and *<h>* in the Palaeohispanic materials, the interpretation of which is controversial and has deep implications for the classification of Lusitanian within the Indo-European family (§4).

3.1.4. Vowels and diphthongs

Five different vowels (*/a/*, */e/*, */i/*, */o/*, */u/*) existed in Lusitanian, as reflected also in god names and personal names (Vallejo 2005: 688-696).

E is sometimes raised to *i*, as in *sintamo-* < **sen-tamo-* or the personal names in *Pent-/Pint-* (Tovar 1966-1967: 250, Gorrochategui 1985-1986: 78). This is probably the case with the conjunction *indi* < **nd^{hi}*, as well. The vowel *e* alternates with *ei* in personal names in such cases as *Anceitus/Anceti*, *Cabureina/Caburena*, *Malceinus/Malcenus* and others (Vallejo 2004, 2005: 689-693). Following Vallejo, this is probably an attempt to reflect the closing of the vowel.

As for the diphthongs, all six combinations of /a/, /e/, and /o/ as first element and /i/ and /u/ as second element do occur in the Lusitanian texts, as well as *-ui-*. Alternation of diphthongs in *-i* with the corresponding forms in *-e* (*ai/ae* and *oi/oe*), as in *Loiminna/Loemina*, may reflect a tendency to mutual assimilation of the elements (§§3.2.1.1 and .2). This would not be remarkable if it did not occur within the same inscription, as typified by the first two Lusitanian words in CC.03.01: *Carlae praisom*. Moreover, we find *praesondo* in the same inscription, a word that has been etymologically related to *praisom* (Prósper 2002: 75-76, with references). Such variation has usually been accounted for (e.g. Untermann, *MLH* IV 725) as a mere graphic fact due to the lack of tradition of writing in Lusitanian, without further implications for the study of linguistic variation. This seems to be also De Hoz's (1995: 4) view when he states that Lusitanian orthography was never well established. Similar alternations can be traced in personal names, e.g. *Aibarus/Aebarus* or *Coema/Coimia* (Vallejo 2005: 696-700).

As opposed to Celtic languages, *eu* is preserved in Lusitanian *teucaecom* and *teucom* (both in CC.03.01). In personal names this diphthong is preserved: *Leurius*, *Leucinius*, *Treouatus* (Vallejo 2005: 698, 2013: 281). But according to Prósper (2002: 393), *eu* > *ou* in god names, as in *Toudadigoe/Toudopalandaigae*, *Crougiai*, and *Roudeaeco*.

3.1.5. Semi-vowels

Initial *wau* is attested in *ueamnicori* (VIS.01.01) and *ueaun* (CC.03.01), as well as in such god names as *Vestio* or *Vaseco* (Prósper 2002: 221-222, 344). It also occurs in typical personal names of the area: *Viriatus* and the names of the stems in *uir-* and *uis-* (Vallejo 2005: 450-458).

Since Tovar (1965-1966), it has been assumed that *oila* meant 'sheep' and is the outcome of diminutive **owi-la* (cp. Latin *ouis*, Skt. *aví-*, etc.); from the point of view of the interpretation of the texts, this makes sense in the context of a ritual of *suouetaurilia*, given that Acc. *oilam* and *oila* appear alongside Acc. *taurom/tau[ro]* 'bull' and *porcom* 'pig', however, it is easy to find instances of preservation of intervocalic *-w-* in the Lusitanian texts (*aua*, *Iouea*, *Reue*), as well as in the god names on Latin inscriptions: *Nauiae*, *Reue*, *Edouio*, etc. (Prósper 2002: 405-407). Moreover, no instances of loss of intervocalic *-w-* seems to be documented in the personal names of this area (Gorrochategui and Vallejo 2010: 73 and 78, map 3), but Prósper (2002: 405-416) acknowledges the loss of *-w-* in certain specific contexts (cf. also Vallejo 2005: 695).

Instead of weakening and loss, there are frequent cases of betacism, i.e. *w* > *b* in intervocalic position, as proved by Dat. Pl. *Deibabor igo deibobor* 'to the goddesses and gods' (from **deiwā-* and **deiwo-*) or the alternations in the god names *Nauia/Nabia*, *Endouellico/Enobolico*, and others (Prósper 1997). In this case, the phenomenon is well

documented also in the personal names of the area, as typified by the highly frequent *Douiterus/Dobiterus* (Gorochategui and Vallejo 2010: 73, 2015: 342).

Vallejo (2013: 283) has tried to provide a phonetic explanation for the uniqueness of the loss of *-w-* in *oila-*. This would only happen in the context **-ow- > -o-*, but this can hardly be accepted: next to *Douiterus/Dobiterus*, we also have *Endouellico/Enobolico* with the same phonetic environment.

In the Lusitanian texts, intervocalic *-i-* must stand for yod, as in *comaiam* (GUA.01.01), *Broeneiae* (POA.01.01), or *Singeie+o* (CC.03.01). This must be also the case with sequences of *-CiV*, as in *muitieas* (CC.03.01). The evolution of yod in god names is too complex to be discussed in detail here (cf. Prósper 2002: 399-405).

3.1.6. Clusters and syllabic structure

Lusitanian shows a remarkable tendency to simple onsets and codas in its syllabic structure. In fact, no clusters are allowed in the onset except the combinations of stop + */r/*: */pr/* in *praisom*, *praesondo*; */tr/* in *Trebopalam*, *Trebarune*, *Petranioi*; */kr/* in *Crouceai*; and */br/* in *Broeneiae*, *Caolobrigoi*.

In middle position, only the vibrant and the nasals are allowed in the coda, as shown by:

- *Carla/Carlae*; *erba/erbam*[:]; *Rurse+co*; *porcom*;
- *indi*, *praesondo*, *Bandi*, *Panditi*; *singeie+o*, *angom*; *sintamo/sintamom*, *Cantibidone*, *Canti*, *doenti*;
- *pumpi*, *Ampilua*; *Veamnicori* (if this reading is correct, and not *Veaminicori*).

A few additional clusters of the same type could be added if we take into account personal names, such as *Talticus* or *Docquirus*, or god names such as *Vortiaeco* (Wodtko 2009: 36).

In addition to vowels and diphthongs, only *-m*, *-d*, *-r*, and *-s* appear to be allowed in final position. Excepting final *-m*, which occurs frequently, the status of the other consonants is peculiar: *-d* seems to occur only with pronouns (§3.2.2). *-s* is only found in the suspect words *secias* and *muitieas* of the lost inscription CC.03.01, in which *ueaun*, with final *-n*, must also be wrong and final *-ec* looks like an abbreviation. Finally, *-r* only appear as part of the ending *-bor* and is due to a specific phonetic evolution (§3.1.3). The possibility of final *-t* acknowledged by Wodtko (2009: 7) is dependant on reading *Pandit* (and not *Panditi*) in POA.01.01.

This simple syllabic structure must be the result of phonetic changes that led to the simplification of the clusters usually found in the other old Indo-European languages, such as the loss of *n* before *s* or the evolutions of clusters with dentals (§3.1.3).

3.2. Morphology

The small number of texts, their brevity, and their repetitive character are the reasons why our information about Lusitanian morphology is so poor. In what follows I have tried to systematise our current knowledge.

3.2.1. Nominal morphology

Whole categories are not attested at all in the extant documents and we do not even know one complete paradigm. Given the contents and structure of the Lusitanian inscriptions, the Accusative and the Dative are the most frequent cases and, therefore, we have somewhat more information about their morphology. In addition, inscriptions in group 4, which by large outnumber groups 1-3 all together, only provide information about the Dative. In contrast, only one Nominative can be identified with a certain degree of confidence and the occurrence of Genitives is far from assured. I will summarise the attested endings of each declensional type in Table 1 and then briefly review the evidence.

		-O-STEMS	-A-STEMS	ATHEMATIC STEMS
Sg.	Nom.			
	Acc.	<i>-om</i>	<i>-am</i>	<i>-em(?)</i> <i>-i-stems: -im(?)</i>
	Gen.			
	Dat.	<i>-oi, -oe, -o, -ui,</i> <i>-u</i>	<i>-ae, -e</i> masc. <i>-ai, -</i> <i>ae, -a</i>	<i>-e, -i</i>
Pl.	Nom.	<i>-i</i>		
	Acc.		<i>-a, -as(?)</i>	<i>-e(?)</i>
	Gen.			
	Dat.	<i>-obor, -obo</i>	<i>-abor, -abo</i>	

Table 1: Lusitanian nominal endings

Gender distinction between masculine thematic nouns and feminine *-a*-stems was previously known from the dedications to such couples as *Arentiae et Arentio* (HEpOL 20032, 22156, etc.) and it is now confirmed by the initial words of VIS.02.01: *Deibabor igo deibobor* ‘to the goddesses and to the gods’. If they stand in the same relationship, the difference in vowel degree between *Iccinui* (POA.01.01) and *Iccona* (GUA.01.01) calls for an explanation.

3.2.1.1. Thematic declension

- The weird ending of the personal name *Trites* (CIL II 5556 = HEpOL 11889) has been explained as Nom. Sg. **tritijos* by Prósper (2013: 191-193), cf. Nom. Pl. below and §3.2.1.3.
- Acc. Sg.: *angom lamaticom* (VIS.01.01), *arimom sintamom* (CC.01.01), *+edagarom teucaecom* (CC.01.01), *porcom* (GUA.01.01), *taurom* (GUA.01.01), *tadom porgom* (VIS.01.01), *teucom sintamo(m?)* (CC.03.01).
- Some -o-endings (e.g. *sintamo* in CC.03.01) were interpreted as Singular Genitives by Untermann (MLH 732-733), but this is very unlikely.
- Dat. Sg.: *Magareaicoi Petranioi* (VIS.01.01), *Caelobrigoi* (VIS.01.01), *Vesucoi* (HEpOL 15871), *Nabiagoi* (CIL II 2419 = HEpOL 8247); *Tongoe* (CIL II 2419 = HEpOL 8247), *Toudadigoe* (CIL II 2565 = HEpOL 8375); *Laebo* (GUA.01.01), *Rurse+co(?)* (CC.03.01); *Haracui* (POA.01.01), *Iccinui* (POA.01.01), *Isibraiegui* (HEpOL 20126), *Langanidaeigui* (HEpOL 20082), *Nilaiqui* (HEpOL 18920), *Reagui* (HEpOL 24731), *Vordiaigui* (HEpOL 28727); *Langobricu* (HEpOL 18511), *Quangeiu* (HEpOL 20564).

Villar and Pedrero (2001b: 252-254) thought that -oi vs. -o depended on a north-south dialectal difference, but the southernmost inscription (POA.01.01) shows -ui, what led Wodtko (2009: 10-12, 47) and Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2010: 74 with fn. 16) to rather advocate an east-west division. We cannot rule out that there was synchretism of originally different cases in the prehistory of Lusitanian, but the attested endings can all be accounted for starting from Dat. *-ōi. This would evolve into -oe or -ui by mutual assimilation of the elements of the diphthong. -o and -u can be explained by loss of the second element of the diphthong, even if in some cases -o must simply be the Latin ending. It is remarkable that two endings -oi and -oe can occur next to each other on the same inscription, as in *Tongoe Nabiagoi* (CIL II 2419 = HEpOL 8247), which points, once again, to an orthographic rather than a phonetic feature.

- Nom. Pl. *ueamnicori* (or *ueamni cori*) (VIS.01.01). According to Untermann (1985-86: 65), -i would be the ending of -io-stems (cf. Nom. Sg. above, and §3.2.1.3), assuming that -cori is related to IE **korio-* 'lord'. The enigmatic *Ougu++ni* in POA.01.01 could also be a Nominative Plural (Carneiro *et alii* 2008: 172), but also a Latinate Genitive (Wodtko 2002: 5).
- Although syntactically *t}{au[ro]* in POA.01.01 must be an Accusative Plural, the inscription is damaged and the ending is not preserved.
- Dat. Pl.: *Deibobor* in VIS.02.01, but -obo in *Arabo Corobelicobo Talusicobo* (HEpOL 20343). According to Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2010: 75), -obo could be the result of the loss of -s (§3.1.3) or an analogical reshaping from the Instrumental *-b^{hi}. No

forms of the Instrumental are attested in Lusitanian and the phonetic explanation remains more likely.

As for thematic neuters, *praisom* in CC.03.01 is most probably a Sg. Nom.-Acc., explained by Prósper (2002: 70-73) as **preh₂i-d^hh₁-tom*, a verbal adjective in *-to-* from **d^heh₁* ‘set’ and preffix *prai-* (cp. Lat. *prae-*). Formally *aua* in the same inscription could be a Pl. Nom.-Acc. Pl.

3.2.1.2. -a-stems

- Nom. Sg. *Attedia* occurs in POA.01.01 alongside other personal names with Latin endings, so we cannot be sure that this is the Lusitanian ending. Forms in *-a* in GUA.01.01 were considered Nominatives by Untermann (*MLH* IV 758) and Ablatives by Búa (1999: 317-327), but this is unlike for syntactic reasons.
- Acc. Sg.: *oilam* (GUA.01.01), *oilam usseam* (GUA.01.01), *oilam erbam* (POA.01.01), *comaiam* (GUA.0.01).
- Dat. Sg.: *Broeneiae* (POA.01.01), *Carlae* (CC.03.01, .02); *Munitie* (POA.01.01); *Ampilua* (CC.03.01), *Icona Loiminna* (GUA.01.01), *Loemina* (CC.03.01), *Deiba* (HEpOL 28728), *Arant[i]a O[c]elaeca* (HEpOL 24147), *Lacipaea* (HEpOL 22951), *Domina Ataecina*, etc.
Masculine nouns: *Crouceai Magareiacoi Petranioi* (VIS.01.01), *Crougiai* (CIL II 2565 = HEpOL 8375), *Corougai* (HEpOL 15871); *Crougeae* (HEpOL 18920); *Trebopala* (GUA.01.01), *Iouea Caelobrigoi* (VIS.01.01).

As with thematic nouns, the possibility of synchretism cannot be excluded, but all the forms can be explained if we start from **-āi > -ae*, along the same lines as the thematic nouns (§3.2.1.1). Variation between *-ai* and *-ae* can be merely orthographic, as shown by *praisom* vs. *praesondo* in CC.03.01.

- Acc. Pl.: *oila*, twice, followed by numeral X ‘ten’ (POA.01.01). The ending *-a* can be accounted for as originating from **-ans > *-ās*, with loss of the final *-s* (§ 3.1.3). *-as* may, in fact, be attested, if *secias* and *muitieas* can be analysed as Acc. Pl. in CC.03.01 (e.g. Villar and Pedrero 2001b: 260; Prósper 2002: 73-74, 77, 83), but their morphological, syntactic, and semantic interpretation is far from assured.
- Dat. Plu.: *Deibabor* (VIS.02.01), but *Deibabo Nemucelaicabo* (HEpOL 6939, with Búa’s 1997: 60 reading). Explanation along the same lines as thematic *-obor/-obo* (§§3.1.3 and 3.2.1.1).

3.2.1.3. Athematic stems

- There are no assured Nominatives, but Wodtko (2012: 343) wonders whether *Laebo* and *Ailatio* are Nominatives of *-on*-stems, showing the same development as in Latin (**-ōn > -ō*).

- Acc. Sg: *ifadem* (GUA.01.01). If this is a *-t*-stem, we would have here IE $*-m̄ > -em$, but the outcome of the vocalic sonorants is uncertain (§6) and this form has alternatively been explained as the Accusative of a *-io*-stem (Prósper 2004: 169-176).
nurim and *enupetanim* (CC.03.01) are usually analysed as Accusatives of *-i*-stems (e.g. Wodtko 2009: 8), but Untermann (MLH 732) and Prósper (2002: 78-79 and 82) have explained them as *-io*-thematic stems with the change $*-Cjom > -Cim$ (cf. §3.1.1.1).
- Dat. Sg.: *Cantibidone* (POA.01.01), *Harase* (POA.01.01), *Reue* (GUA.01.01, POA.01.01), *Trebarune* (GUA.01.01) with *Trebarune/Trebaronne*, *Trebaro[nm]a*, and *Triboruni* on Latin inscriptions (Prósper 2002: 47). Endings *-e* and *-i* occur frequently on Latin inscriptions, but with *-i* it is impossible to determine whether it is Lusitanian or Latin in many cases; for actual occurrences see Prósper (2002: *passim*). Similar variations of endings are found in *Cossue*, *Cosu*, *Cosei*, *Cose*, *Coso*, showing even transfer to the thematic declension in Latin (Búa 2003: 162), as in *Reuo/Reo* next to the more frequent *Reue* on Latin inscriptions (see Prósper 2002: 128-144).
It is doubtful that *Panditi* (POA.01.01) may be a Dative instead of a Latin Genitive.
Bandi (POA.01.01) is usually considered an *-i*-stem, but *Bandi*, *Bandu*, *Bandue*, *Bandei*, and *Bande* occur on Latin inscriptions, which have been variously accounted for.
- Villar and Pedrero (2001b: 252 and 255) considered the possibility that *puppid* and *isaiccid* are Ablatives of *-i*-stems, but this is less likely than other possibilities (§3.2.2).
- Acc. Pl.: *ifate*, followed by the numeral X ‘ten’ (POA.01.01). If this is a dental stem, it would be the final outcome of $*-m̄s > *-ens > *-ēs$, with weakening and loss of final *-s* (§3.1.3), but cf. the alternative explanation for Acc. Sg. *ifadem* above.
- Dat. Pl. *-ubo* for *-u*-stems occurs in *Lugubus Arouieis* (HEpOL 16032), with a phonetic variant *-obo* in *Lucobo Arousa(eco)* (HEpOL 24548). Both inscriptions come from Lugo, in the *Lucensis*, and taking into account that they refer to the pan-Celtic god Lugu, might be Celtic and not Lusitanian (§§1 and 6).

3.2.2. Pronominal morphology

Our knowledge is limited to the word *puppid* (CC.03.02), which must probably be the Nom.-Acc. Neut. of a pronoun, from $*k^wod-k^wid$ (Villar and Pedrero 2001b: 256, Prósper 2002: 85-86), more probably a relative than an indefinite, as argued by Prósper. The identification of various combinations of pronominal stems in *isaiccid* (CC.03.02) defended by Prósper (2002: 84-85) is less straightforward.

3.3.3. Verbal morphology

Only two verbal forms seem to occur in the extant Lusitanian texts, but they clearly display Indo-European morphology: 3rd Sg. *rueti* (CC.03.02) and 3rd Pl. *doenti* (VIS.01.01). Even if *pandit* (and not *Panditi*) were to read in Arronches, it is unlikely that it is a verb, as suggested by Wodtke (2009: 7).

For *rueti*, analysed as a verb by the editors of the inscription (Villar and Pedrero 2001b: 257-258), Prósper (2002: 86) has suggested a relationship to Lat. *ruō*, in what would be an introductory formula of the text that *runs* below.

The interpretation of *doenti* is more straightforward. It must be the 3rd person plural of the Indo-European verb **deh₃* ‘give’, without reduplication (cp. Celtiberian **zizonti**) and probably with levelling from the *o*-grade of the singular: being an athematic stem, **dh₃-enti* would be due and it would evolve into **denti* (Gorrochategui 1985-1986: 88-89).

The verbs show the expected endings in an Indo-European language, *-t* for the 3rd person singular and *-nt* for the 3rd person plural, both with the addition of *-i* in the secondary endings employed for the present tense. We do not know any Lusitanian verbal form of the past and we cannot be certain, therefore, that the opposition between primary and secondary endings was kept. Given the preservation of the final *-i* in the present, we can conjecture that this opposition was still alive, in contrast to Latin and to the later fate of this *-i* in the Celtic languages (see De Hoz 1997).

It has been argued that *singeie+o* (frequently read as *singeieto*) must also be a verbal form.⁶ For its interpretation as a verb it is crucial that we acknowledge an ending *-to*. Tovar (1961: 93) and Schmidt (1985: 334-335) analysed *-to* as the 3rd person singular ending of the middle voice, so that *singeieto* would be a middle aorist or imperfect. If this is a verbal form, Prósper’s (2002: 76-77) arguments that it should rather be analysed as an imperative in **-tōd*, with loss of final *-d*, are more cogent: a verbal formation in *-eyo-* can only belong to the present stem and, therefore, an aorist is ruled out. From a semantic point of view, an imperfect would be unexpected due to its durative value, which would not fit with an inscription of this type. She interpreted it as **sem-kih-eye-tōd* (cp. Lat. *cieō* ‘set in motion’), with the meaning ‘bring together’. Nevertheless, *singeie+o* is followed by the copulative conjunction *indi*, which in this inscription coordinates noun phrases, and comes after the words *arimo praesondo*, both ending in *-o*. This would rather suggest that there is agreement in the Dative case between the three words *arimo praesondo singeie+to* and a parallel construction of Acc. Pl.(?) + Dat. Sg. in *secias erba* and *muitieas arimo praesondo singeie+o*.

⁶ Villar & Pedrero (2001b) interpreted *erba* in CC.03.01 as a god name related to *Erbine* and *Erbieco*, but Prósper (2002: 74) argued that it may be a verbal form, which is much less convincing and, in fact, appears to be ruled out now by the occurrence of *erbam*[in POA.01.01.

3.4. Syntax

The scarcity of inscriptions in the Lusitanian language does not allow for a thorough study of its syntax. In the extant documents we can note that Lusitanian had a ‘standard syntax’ for an ancient Indo-European language: Nominative is used for the subject of the verb, Accusative for the direct object, and Dative for the beneficiary (indirect object), with an SVO word order, as typified by the following sentence in VIS.01.01:

<i>Veamnicori</i>	<i>doenti</i>	<i>angom lamaticom</i>	<i>Crouceai Magareaicoi Petranioi</i>
SUBJ	VERB	DIRECT OBJECT	INDIRECT OBJECT

The Dative may have been used with Locative value in Lusitanian, if, as argued by Prósper (2002: 70-73), *Carlae* is a place name in the inscriptions from Arroyo de la Luz and the phrase *Carlae praisom* (Arroyo de la Luz I) means ‘issued at Carla’ (see §3.2.1.1 for *praisom*). The occurrence of *Carla* in POA.01.01, however, renders this interpretation less likely.

As for grammatical words, Lusitanian has a copulative conjunction *indi* ‘and’ (cp. OHG *unti* > *und* ‘and, according to Tovar 1985: 239, or Lat. *inde* ‘thence’ according to Prósper 1996, 2002: 355-356). It is used as a connector between nominal phrases, as typified, e.g., by the beginning of the inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas:

<i>oilam</i>	<i>Trebopala</i>	<i>indi</i>	<i>porcom</i>	<i>Laebo</i>
sheep.ACC	Trebopala.DAT	and	pig.ACC	Laebo.DAT
‘a sheep for (the god) Trebopala and a pig for (the god) Laebo’				

A conjunction *igo* occurs in the Viseu inscription. It is usually considered copulative (cp. Goth. and OHG *auk*, OEngl. *eac*, etc.), even if De Bernardo and Hainzmann (2010) point to the possible parallel of use of Lat. *seu/siue* in inscriptions. The Lusitanian part of this inscription reads as follows:

<i>Deibabor</i>	<i>igo</i>	<i>deibabor</i>	<i>Vissaiegobor</i>
goddess.DAT.PL	and	god.DAT.PL	from_Viseu.DAT.PL
‘to the goddesses and the gods from Viseu’			

4. The dialectal classification of Lusitanian

The main scholarly debate about the classification of Lusitanian has been whether it should be considered a Celtic language or not. The confronting views can be represented by Tovar and Untermann. Tovar (1985-1986: 23) summarized his views why Lusitanian could no be considered Celtic: preservation of IE */p/ and the diphthong *eu*, which evolved into *ou* in Celtic; the word *tauros* ‘bull’ without the metathesis shown by Celtic languages (e.g. Gaulish *taruos*, Irish *tarb*), and the different evolution of the voiced aspirates, as in *ifadem* and others (see Tovar 1966-67, as well). Tovar also considered relevant the sonorization of stops in western areas of the Iberian peninsula (§3.1.1) or the so-called “vowel infection”: the development of *ue* due to the influence of the yod or /i/ of the following syllable, as in *teucaecom* if it were the outcome of a former **teucaciom*). He also mentioned the thematic Nom. Pl. ending *-i* (vs. Celtiberian *-os*), verbal forms in *-to* (see §3.3.3), and the conjunction *indi* vs. Celtiberian *-kue* (cf. Schmidt 1985).

In contrast, during his whole life J. Untermann tried to prove that all the remnants of Indo-European languages in Hispania could be ascribed to one single Celtic language. Untermann (1985-1986: 60-69), therefore, listed a whole series of lexical isoglosses of Lusitanian, both with Gaulish or Insular Celtic and with Celtiberian, and discussed the relevance of the preservation of /p/ in Lusitanian, as we will see below (§4.1).

In a very influential paper, Gorrochategui (1985-1986) reviewed in depth the arguments that could be taken into account in order to decide the question of the Celticity of Lusitanian. He came to the conclusion that Lusitanian was not a Celtic language and this has been the view favoured by most scholars thereafter. In what follows I will review the main questions at issue, according mainly to the structure of Gorrochategui’s paper and updating his data when this is possible.

4.1. The fate of IE */p/ in Lusitanian and related matters

Lusitanian shows initial and medial /p/ in words like *porcom/porgom* ‘pig’, *Petranioi*, *pumpi*, *praisom/praesondo*, or *enupetanim* in the inscriptions in Lusitanian, to which we can add god names such as *Trebopala*, a compound of *trebo-* and *-pala* (cp. Skt. *Viśpala*), or *Poemanae* and *Pemaneieco* (Prósper 2008: 56-57), and also personal names such as *Pisira*, *Paugenda*, *Peicanus*, etc. (Vallejo 2013: 278), to mention just a few instances. Even if some of these /p/’s can be explained as coming from IE **k^w-*, such as *Petranioi*, *puppid* or the second /p/ of *pumpi* (if from **p^hk^we* ‘five’), the number is large enough to be significant. We can compare this to Celtiberian inscriptions in the Latin alphabet: absolutely no <p> occurs in them.

Untermann (1985-1986: 69-73) and, more recently Wodtko (2013: 359-360), have argued that the preservation of IE */p/ is not diagnostic enough for determining

the Celticity of a language. He mentioned the occurrence in Hispania of forms both with and without initial labial stop, such as the Celtiberian coin legend **letaisama** (A.68), modern *Ledesma*, vs. *Bletisam[ensi]* on a Latin inscription (*HEpOL* 26085), both from the superlative **pleth₂-is^omeh₂* ‘flatest’. This second form would show the lenition of an initial *p-* that, remarkably, had been preserved and then had started to weaken prior to disappearing. Therefore, the Celts that arrived into the Iberian peninsula would still keep their /*p*/’s and this process would have gradually taken place *in situ*. However, this hypothesis involves assuming that the loss of /*p*/ happened in various Celtic languages independently, because this is a pan-Celtic phonetic evolution, and this would be quite unexpected (further arguments in Prósper 2008: 57-61).

De Hoz (2011: 565) has stressed that, according to McCone (1991: 46-47), a whole series of changes must have occurred prior to the generalized loss of /*p*/ in Celtic:

1. **sept-* > *sext-*: Lat. *septimus*, but Gaul. *sextametos*, OIr. *sechtmad*, W *seithfed* ‘7th’.
2. **p...k^w* > *k^w...k^w*: e.g. **penk^wetos* > **k^wink^wetos* > Gaul. *Pimpetos*, OIr. *cóiced* ‘5th’.
3. *p* > *b* / *V_1*: e.g. **pi-p|h-se-ti* > **ibla-seti* > OIr. *eblaid* ‘conducirá’.
4. *p* > *w* / *o_*: e.g. **swopnos* > **swownos* > **sōnos* > OIr. *súan* ‘sleep’.

From this perspective, we could envisage the possibility that there might be especially old Celtic languages that still preserved their /*p*/’s, at least partially.

For Lusitanian, we are not informed about most of these changes, but, if, as De Hoz (2011: 265-266) notes, we can judge from the onomastic data from Lusitania, we can take into account the series of personal names in *pint-*, such as *Pentius*, *Pintus*, *Pintamus*, etc. As showed by Villar (1994), they must come from **penk^wtos*, a different formation for the ordinal ‘5th’ not showing the expected evolution in a Celtic language. This, together with other cases such as the pronoun *puppíd* (§3.2.2), shows that there was a merger of both IE **/k^w/* and **/p/* in Lusitanian /*p*/. Further examples may be the ethnonym *Copori* (Pl.NH 4.111) and certain personal names of the same stem (Gen. *Copori*, Dat. *Coporino*, etc.), if they stem from IE **pok^w-* ‘cook’ (Prósper 2013: 189-191).

We have apparent counterexamples, such as the god name *Icona* and the personal name *Iccinui*, frequently mentioned in this regard, in which IE **/k^w/* seems to have evolved into **/kk/*. Nevertheless, if they derive from Indo-European **ek^wos* ‘horse’, as is usually assumed, there was never a labiovelar in it, but a cluster, which may have evolved differently, as proved by its outcomes in Sanskrit and Greek.

In close parallel to the development **/k^w/* > **/p/*, some Lusitanian /*b*/’s may come from IE **/g^w/*, as possibly shown by the personal names *Boutius*, *Bouana* or *Boecius*, if they stem from IE **g^wōw-* ‘cow’ (Vallejo 2013: 281), or the god names *Borea* and *Boro*, from **g^woro-* ‘mountain’ according to Prósper (2002: 173).

4.2. The outcome of the Indo-European voiced aspirate stops in Lusitanian

We saw above (§3.1.3) that Lusitanian had a fricative /f/, as shown by *ifadem/ifate*. The word appears after *tauro-* ‘bull’ in its two occurrences: Acc. Sg. *taurom ifadem* (GUA.01.01) and Acc. Plu. *tau[ro] ifate* X (POA.01.01). The traditional etymology is due to Tovar (1966-1967: 257-258), who connected it to the IE root **eib^h-/ieb^h-* ‘breed’, so that the phrase would mean ‘breeding bull’. Relying on this etymology, it was argued that Indo-European voiced aspirates evolved into fricatives in Lusitanian, which would be a further argument for classifying Lusitanian as non-Celtic. Alternative etymologies have been proposed (Prósper 2004: 169-175), such as **en-b^hat-yo-*, from *b^hat-* ‘fight’, so that *taurom ifadem* would mean ‘fighting full’ (as opposed to a castrated ox), but the /f/ would, nevertheless, be the outcome of a voiced aspirate. Other /f/’s show up in god names of the area, always in initial position of the word: *Nimidi Fiduenarum* (CIL II 5607a = HEpOL 11944) has been explained as deriving from IE **b^heid^h-* (Tovar 1985: 244, fn. 70),⁷ and *Lari Sefio* (HEpOL 7570) from **s(w)ē-b^hyo-* (Gorrochategui 1987: 85).

Gorrochategui (1987: 87), however, concluded the section of his paper devoted to the outcomes of voiced aspirates in Lusitanian wishing for a form that should undoubtedly come from IE **b^h*, such a Dat. Pl. in **-b^hos*. We now have these forms in VIS.02.01, in which we find Dat. Pl. masc. *-obor* and fem. *-abor*, showing that the outcome of IE **b^h* was, in fact, Lusitanian *b*. We must, therefore, look for other explanations of Lusitanian /f/ or accept different outcomes depending on the phonetic environment, as suggested by Búa (2000: 156), who noted that /f/ always occurs before *-i-*. García Alonso (2011) has challenged the phonetic interpretation of this <F>: in his opinion a [β] (< **[b]* < **[b^h]*) could have been rendered both as <F> and . In fact, with Prósper’s etymology for *ifadem*, all Lusitanian /f/’s are word-initial, so a different outcome of the voiced aspirates in initial and medial position can be envisaged, as in some Italic languages.

Personal names show a merger of aspirates and non-aspirates, as in *Boudenna* and *Boudelus* (< **b^houd^hi-*) or *Albicus* and *Albonius* (< **alb^h-*) (Vallejo 2013: 278-279) and this seems to occur also with god names such as *Candeberonio* or *Celiborcae*, with a second term from **b^her-* (2004: 176-177). This would also be the case with *treb-*, in *Trebopala*, from **treb^h-* ‘dwell’.

The adjective *angom* (in the phrase *angom lamaticom*, VIS.01.01) is usually thought to mean ‘narrow’ and thus derive from IE **anǵ^ho-*. In that case, the voiced aspirate would have evolved into a simple voiced stop in medial position. However, as

⁷ Alternatively, it has been explained as related to **widu-* ‘tree’, cp. OIr. *fid*, OEngl. *widu* (Schmoll 1959: 99, cf. Búa 1999: 317), but this does not seem likely in view of the existence of initial wau in Lusitanian (§3.1.5).

Gorrochategui (1987: 87) remarked, the preceding nasal may have conditioned the outcome, for a stop, and not a fricative, is expected after a nasal, as is the case in Latin. Other etymologies proposed so far involving IE $*d^h$ and g^h are more uncertain.

4.3. Other relevant phonetic features

Other phonetic features that are worth mentioning are the following:

- Long /o:/ sometimes appears as <u> (/u:/ or /u/?), as in thematic Dat. Sg. *-ui* (< $*-ōi$ >), but this is not systematic, as we have seen (§3.2.1.1). Nevertheless, the fact that Lusitanian shows $*-oi$ excludes the expected Celtic development (see further Prósper 2008: 62-63).
- The diphthong /ei/ is sometimes preserved, as shown by *Deibabor igo deibabor*, but sometimes it seems to have evolved into [e:], as in Dat. Sg. *Reue*, probably from $*reiw-$ ‘river’ (cp. Lat. *rīuus*), as shown by Villar (1996). Although the change $*ei > \bar{e}$ was thought to be common Celtic, it is hardly probing for classification, given that there seems to be a similar situation in Celtiberian.

4.5. Vocabulary

Untermann (1985-1986: 60-69) listed a whole series of lexical isoglosses of Lusitanian, with both Gaulish or Insular Celtic and Celtiberian, in his efforts to prove its genetic relationship to the Celtic languages, but, as stressed by Gorrochategui (1985-1986: 80-81, 88), not all the vocabulary has the same weight when classifying a language: common vocabulary is easier to borrow, but grammatical words are more resistant. As far as we know (§3.4), Lusitanian grammatical words (copulative *indi* and *igo*) are different from those found in the Celtic languages (e.g. Celtib. *-kue* and *uta*).

Pace Untermann, the stock of personal and place names cannot be a reliable source in this case, either. The spread of personal and place names at the times when our information starts to be significant can blur the previous linguistic distribution due to contact between different populations (§6).

4.6. General remarks and further possibilities

It is hard to imagine that there was a Celtic language that preserved its /p/’s and showed all the above-mentioned differences to the other Celtic languages. Certainly, if we go back enough in time, the ancestor of Proto-Celtic would be expected to display all those features, but we can hardly call Celtic a language that has not undergone any of the diagnostic changes characteristic of Celtic languages. Specifically for Lusitanian, it would be a very peculiar kind of Celtic language, in that

it would be a P-Celtic language (with change **/k^w/ > */p/* characteristic of Gaulish and Brythonic) but with the IE **/p/* preserved at the same time.

In my opinion, it seems clear that we cannot consider Lusitanian a Celtic language. In any case, following McCone's (1996) terminology, we could call such a language "para-Celtic". It is hardly believable that the speakers of a pre-proto-Celtic language entered the Iberian peninsula and then this language evolved into two separate branches (at least): Lusitanian and Celtiberian, given that Celtiberian shares so many isoglosses with the other Celtic languages that we cannot envisage a scenario in which after separation they underwent the same phonetic changes.

Certain scholars have stressed more recently the similar developments that have taken place both in Lusitanian and in the Italic languages, such as the outcome of the voiced aspirates (§4.2) or the rhotacism of final *-s* (§3.13), together with some cultural and religious correspondences, such as the gods *Cossue* and *Collouesei* next to *Consus* and *Coluluies* in Italy or *comaiam* and Umbr. *gomia/kumiaf* (Villar and Pedrero 2001a: 687; Prósper 2002: 429-433, 2008: 56-63).

In order to account for the relationship between Lusitanian and the Celtic languages, on the one hand, and the similar developments to the Italic languages, we can assume that Lusitanian diverged from a group of Western Indo-European dialects before the kern of what would later evolved into the Celtic and Italic families had constituted as such. From this perspective, we should rather study the relationships between Lusitanian and the Celtic and Italic languages in the larger frame of the isoglosses shared by Western Indo-European languages.

5. Lusitanian personal names

It is not easy to match the data coming from Lusitanian inscriptions and Lusitanian-Galician god names with the evidence provided by the personal names of this area (cf. Vallejo 2009). As we have seen, Untermann assumed that there was not a clearcut onomastic border separating the stock of names employed in Lusitania from other Indo-European areas of ancient Hispania, even if he was well aware that there were two different cultural and linguistic areas in the west. Gorrochategui (1985-1986) rightly stressed that, even if Untermann was right in general terms, things started to look differently if attention was paid to the extremes of that continuum. He (Gorrochategui 1993: 420-421) drew attention, for instance, to the fact that, in contrast to the Celtic personal names with second element *-genos* that appear in the Celtiberia and neighbouring areas, what we find in the Lusitanian-Galician area are names in *-enus*, which Vallejo (2013: 276) explained later as due to a change *ug > u* (cf. *Matugenus/Matuenus* or *Medugenus/Meiduenus*).

Lusitanian personal names have been collected and thoroughly studied by Vallejo (2005), who in a recent paper (Vallejo 2013: 273-274) has emphasised how the area II-III, identified by Untermann (1965: 19) in his seminal work on the onomastic areas of the Iberian peninsula in ancient times, basically overlaps with the linguistic area established by Tovar on the basis of the Lusitanian inscriptions. In spite of this coincidence, it has not been naturally assumed that both linguistic entities belong together. This is due to the difficulties of telling apart Celtic and Lusitanian linguistic materials in the Lusitanian area (see §6), but also, as Vallejo acknowledges, to the fact that personal names from Lusitania, unlike god names, do not always display the linguistic features that would be expected according to what we know from Lusitanian inscriptions, such as lenition of voiceless stop (§3.1.1).

Furthermore, as argued by Vallejo (2013: 275-277) and Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2015: 338-339 and 349-350, maps 5-7), the distribution of the main Lusitanian god names, the typically Lusitanian personal names (identified as such by their high frequency and exclusivity in this area), and the area where Lusitanian inscriptions are found (groups 1-4 of our classification in §2), appears to be basically coincidental and, therefore, would allow for grouping together all this various linguistic evidence, in spite of the difficulties.

We would, therefore, have to search for a different explanation of the observable linguistic differences between the Lusitanian inscriptions, the Lusitanian-Galician god names, and personal names from Lusitania. They would be due to sociolinguistic factors, according to Vallejo (2013: 282-283) and Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2015: 343-345), which would make god names behave like common vocabulary and display the ongoing innovations of the language. Personal names would show more conservative features and this could be in relation to the fact that personal names, unlike god names, always display Latin morphology in the Lusitanian inscriptions (Vallejo 2005: 715-720). This is an interesting explanation and is descriptively right, however, from a general perspective, it should be noted that it would be surprising that personal names would be more conservative than religious texts and inscriptions and god names.

6. Language contact in Lusitania

Lusitanian was in contact with various languages. Since we do not know when it started to be spoken in the area where it is attested, we can only wonder whether it was at some time in contact with the speakers of the language of the southwestern inscriptions and Iberian, given that, as already mentioned (§2), some inscriptions in those languages have been found in what came to be later the Lusitanian area.

When our information about the Lusitanian language begins, we have extensive evidence of its contact with Latin. I have referred to this all throughout this chapter, so I will not insist here.

A few classical sources (Str.3.3.5, Pl.NH 3.13) mention movements of Celtic peoples to the Lusitania and the presence of Celtic peoples (called *Celtici* in literary and epigraphic sources), both north and south of the province is assured by modern archaeology as well (Lorrio 2011, with further references). In this sense Gorrochategui (1985-1986: 81) must be right when recalling the relevance of the information transmitted by Pliny (NH IV 1.110) about the place that was formerly called *Amanum portus* and then *Flauiobriga colonia*, with a Celtic *-briga*-name. More evidence of the presence of Celtic peoples in this western area is provided by the Celtiberian mint of *Tamusia* (Mon.91) and some related Celtiberian inscriptions (CC.04.01, .02), even if their authenticity is disputed. A few other Celtiberian inscriptions have also been found in the Lusitania: the silver bowl from Monsanto da Beira (CSB.00.01) and the knife from Almaraz (Luján and Lorrio, forthc = CC.02.01).

According to Untermann (1985-1986: 619), the Celtisation of western areas of the Iberian peninsula is also proved by the fact that the *Vettones*, a people who lived in the central, eastern region of the Lusitania province, show a mixture of characteristics of both their eastern Celtiberian and their western Lusitanian neighbours: in the Latin inscriptions of their territory both the god names characteristic of the Lusitanian-Galician area and the typically Celtiberian family names in Genitive Plural occur.

Certainly, a most telling feature about the presence of Celtic populations is the spread of place names in *-briga* in this western part of the Iberian peninsula, such as *Talabriga*, *Langobriga*, or *Conimbriga* between the rivers Tajo and Duero and north of this, *Tongobriga* and *Coiliobriga* (Wodtko 2009: 28). This led Untermann (e.g., *MLH* IV 726) to consider Lusitania as a part of the *Hispania Celtica*, which in a sense it was, however, this does not involve that Lusitanian itself was a Celtic language (§4). It is especially interesting that *-briga* place names are the base of adjectives used as epithets of the Lusitanian-Galician gods. This is the case e.g. with Dat. *Iovea Caelobrigoi* in VIS.01.01 and it is very frequent in Latin inscriptions of the area, such as *Bandi Langobricu*, *Bandue Ne[me]tobrico*, etc. (Prósper 2012: *passim*).

The word *-briga* shows the characteristic development of IE **r̥* > Celtic *ri*. It has been argued that the outcome of IE **r̥* in Lusitanian was either *ur* > *or* (Prósper 2002: 399) or *ar* (Vallejo 2005: 710). In either case *-briga* cannot be Lusitanian, but Celtic. Incidentally, the outcome of vocalic nasals in Lusitanian is not assured: see §3.2.1.3 for possible *em* in *ifadem*, but *an* and *am* are more likely (Prósper 2002: 399, Vallejo 2013: 281).

It has been thought that Lusitanian might have taken other loanwords from Celtic, such as *trebo-* (cf. **treb-* ‘dwell’), as already pointed out by Schmidt (1985: 332 and fn.41), but Gorrochategui (1985-1986) rightly stressed that this root occurs in other branches of Indo-European, so that it may have been inherited by Lusitanian as well (§4.2). Given that the word *nemeto-* ‘sacred enclosure’ is only attested in Celtic, a much better candidate is the ethnonym *Nemetates* (Ptol.3.5), which is related to the god names *Nimidi Fiduenarum* (CIL II 5607a = HEpOL 11944) and *Domino Deo Nemedeco* (HEpOL 24152).

Prósper (2002: 422-427) compiled a list of the various linguistic features that would characterise the western Celtic language of the Iberian peninsula. Nevertheless, after her revision of the evidence, Wodtko (2009: 41-42) concluded that it is not always easy to tell apart Celtic and Lusitanian linguistic materials in this area. This can be exemplified with the controversy about the etymology of *Band-/Bandu-* and its linguistic classification either as Lusitanian (Pedrero 1999, Prósper 2002: 269-276) or Celtic (De Bernardo 2003)

As emphasized by Gorrochategui (1993: 422), there seems to be an interesting difference between the two *conuentus* of the Callaecia: the cultural and linguistic evidence from the *conuentus Bracarenensis* appears to be more similar to what is found in Lusitania, while the *Lucensis* shows its own traits (see also Prósper 2013: 182). This can be exemplified with the presence of the cult of the pan-Celtic god Lugu in the *Lucensis* (§3.2.1) and its absence elsewhere in the western part of the Iberian peninsula. Moreover, certain god names from the *Lucensis* appear to be particular of this area and do not reccur elsewhere, as *Laho*, *Cohuetene*, and *Virrore/Verore*.

Appendix 1: Lusitanian inscriptions

For groups 1-3, I provide the text of all the extant inscriptions with my own readings and the main variants; for additional information, see the editions by J. Untermann (*MLH* IV 745-758), B. Prósper (2002: 41-87), and J. Gorrochategui & J. M. Vallejo (2006) in the Hesperia databank.

For groups 4-5 only a selection of a few representative inscriptions is provided. Variants in readings and bibliography can be easily found with the references to Hispania Epigraphica on-line (*HEpOL*): <http://eda-bea.es/>. Vallejo (2013), Estarán (2014: II 481-546) and Gorrochategui and Vallejo (2015) provide a comprehensive list of Latin inscriptions displaying Lusitanian endings in both god names and epithets.

GROUP 1:

- Cabeço das Fráguas (L.3.1 = GUA.01.01):

OILAM · TREBOPALA · / INDI · PORCOM · LAËBO · /³ COMAIAM · ICCONA ·
LOIM/INNA · OILAM · VSSSEAM · / TREBARVNE · INDI · TAVROM / IFADEM[/ REVE ·
+RE[

Line 2: LAËBO : LAËBO.

- Arroyo de la Luz III (Almagro-Gorbea, Ortega and Villar 1999, Villar and Pedrero 2011a and 2011b = CC.03.02):

ISAICCID · RVETI · [/ PVPPID · CARLAE · EN[/]TOM · INDI · NA+[/]IOM [/]M · [

GROUP 2:

- Arroyo de la Luz I (L.1.1. = CC.03.01):

1st fragment:

AMBATVS / SCRIPSI /³ CARLAE PRAISOM / SECIAS · ERBA · MVITIE/AS · ARIMO ·
PRAESO/ºNDO · SINGEIE+O / IN<D>I · AVA · INDI · VEA/VN · INDI · +EDAGA/ºROM ·
TEVCAECOM / INDI · NVRIM · I+ / VDE +EC · RVRSE++CO /¹² AMPILVA / INDI

Line 4: MVITIE : probably MV[N]ITIE (cf. POA.01.01, line 5). Line 6: SINGEIE+O : SINGEIETO. Lines 8-9: VEAVN : probably VEAMNI (cf. VIS.01.01, line 4).

2nd fragment:

ŁOEMINA · INDI · ENV/PETANIM · INDI · AR/³IMOM · SINTAMO/M · INDI · TEVCOM /
SINTAMO

Line 1: ŁOEMINA : ĞOEMINA.

- Lamas de Moledo (L.2.1 = VIS.01.01)

ŔVFINŪS ET / TĪRO SCRIP/³SERŪNT / VEAMNICORI / DOENTI /⁶ ANGOM /
LAMATICOM / CROVCEAI MAGA/⁹REAICOI PETRANIOI TĪ/ADOM PORCOM IOVEA /
CAELOBRIGOI

Line 4: VEAMNICORI : VEAMĪNICORI : VEAMĪNI CORI. Lines 9-10: TĪADOM : RĪADOM. Line 10: IOVEA :
IOVEAI. Line 11: CAELOBRIGOI : CAĪELOBRIGOI

- Arronches (Carneiro *et alii* 2008 = POA.01.01):

[-c.5-]AM · OILAM · ERBAM[---] / HARASE · OILA · X · BROENEIAE · H[---] /³ OILA · X ·
REVE · A · HARACVI · T{ }AV[RO?] / IFATE · X · BANDI · HARACVI AV[---] / MVNITIE
CARLA CANTIBIDONE · +/ (*vacat*) /⁶ APINVS · VENDICVS · / ERIAÇAINV(S) /
OVGV++NI /⁹ ICCINVI · PANDITI · ATTEDIA · / M · TR / PVMPI · CANTI · AILATIO

Line 3: A · HARACVI : AHARACVI. Line 8: OGVV++NI : OGVVRANI. Line 9: PANDITI : PANDIT · I.

GROUP 3:

- Viseu (Fernandes, Carvalho and Figueira 2009= VIS.02.01):

Deibabor/ igo /³ Deibobor / Vissaieigo/bor /⁶ Albinus / Chaereae / f(ilius) /⁹
u(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito)

GROUP 4

a) God names and epithets display Lusitanian endings

- Braga (CIL II 2419 = HEpOL 8247):

[Cae]licus · Fronto / Arcobrigensis /³ Ambimogidus / fecit / (*uacat*)/ Tongoe /⁶
Nabiagoi /(*uacat*)/ Celicus fecit / Front(o)

- Bemposta, Penamacôr (HEpOL 20126):

Bandi / Isibraiegui / Cilius / Camali / f(ilius) u(otum) s(oluit)

- Guiães, Vila Real (*HEpOL* 16423):

Reue Ma/randigui / Albinia / Albina / a(nimo) · l(ibens) · u(otum) · s(oluit)

- Xinzo de Limia, Orense (*CIL* II 2565 = *HEpOL* 8375, con lectura de Gorrochategui 1994: 320-323):

Crougiai / Touda/digoe / Rufonia / Seuer[a]

- Águas Frias, Chaves (*HEpOL* 6939, with Búa's 1997: 60 reading):

Deibabo / Nemucel/aicabo / Fuscinus / Fусci f(ilius) / u(otum) l(ibens) (a)nimo s(oluit)

- Arroyomolinos de la Vera, Cáceres (*HEpOL* 20343):

Arabo / Corobe/licobo / Talusico/bo / M · T · V / · D · M · / · L · A ·

b) God names with Lusitanian endings and epithets with Latin endings:

- Rairiz de Veiga, Orense (*HEpOL* 6490):

V(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito) / Bandue / Veigebr/eaego / M(arcus) Siloni/us Gal(eria) Si/lanus / sig(nifer) coh(ortis) I Gall(icae) c(ivium) R(omanorum)

- Monterrey, Orense (*HEpOL* 16707):

Bandue / Cadogo / Ter[enti]a / Rufina / u(otum) l(ibens) m(erito) s(oluit)

GROUP 5

- Talaván, Cáceres (*HEpOL* 22150):

Munidi Ebe/robrigae • / Toudopala/ndaigae Am/maia • Boutila • / [ex v(oto)?]

- Ponte de Lima, Viana do Castelo (*HEpOL* 6409):

Camala • Ar/qui • f(ilia) • Tal/abrigen/sis • Genio • T/iaurauceai/co u(otum) • s(oluit) • l(ibens) • m(erito)

- Castelo Branco (*HEpOL* 16434):

Iunoni / Lineai/gae / Talaius / Caburi f(ilius) / d(e) s(uo) d(edit)

- Vilela, Amares (*HEpOL* 7531):

Lucretius / Sabinus / Genio Vi/riocelen/si / u(otum) • s(oluit) • l(ibens) • m(erito)

REFERENCES

Albertos, M. L. 1987. "Las aspiradas en las lenguas paleohispánicas: la *fy* y la *h*." In *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas*, Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985, ed. J. Gorrochaegui, J.L. Melena and J. Santos (= *Veleia* 2-3), 139-143. Vitoria.

Almagro-Gorbea, M., J. Ortega Blanco and F. Villar. 1999. "Una nueva inscripción lusitana: Arroyo de la Luz III." *Complutum* 10: 167-173.

Balmori, C. H. 1935. "Sobre la inscripción bilingüe de Lamas de Moledo." *Emerita* 3: 77-119.

Búa, C. 1997. "Dialectos indoeuropeos na franxa occidental hispánica." In *Galicia fai dous mil anos. O feito diferencial galego*, vol. I *Historia*, ed. G. Pereira, 51-99. Santiago de Compostela.

Búa, C. 1999. "Hipótesis para algunas inscripciones rupestres del Occidente peninsular." In *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras en la Hispania prerromana. Actas del VII Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas*, ed. F. Villar and F. Beltrán, 309-327. Salamanca.

Búa, C. 2000. *Estudio de la teonimia lusitano-gallega* (PhD dissertation of the University of Salamanca).

Carneiro, A., J. d'Encarnação, J. de Oliveira and C. Teixeira. 2008. "Uma inscrição votiva em língua lusitana." *PalHisp* 8: 167-178.

De Bernardo, P. 2003. "Los formularios teonímicos: *Bandus* con su correspondiente *Bandua* y unas isoglosas célticas." *Conimbriga* 42: 197-212.

De Bernardo, P. and M. Hainzmann. 2010. "Sive in theonymic formulae as a means for introducing explications and identifications." In *Celtic Religion across Space and Time (IX Workshop FERCAN)*, ed. J.A. Arenas-Esteban, 28-39. Toledo.

De Hoz, J. 1995. "Las sociedades celtibérica y lusitana y la escritura." *AEspA* 68: 3-30.

De Hoz, J. 1997. "When did the Celts loose their verbal *-i*?" *ZCPH* 49-50: 107-117.

- De Hoz, J. 2011. *Historia lingüística de la península Ibérica en la Antigüedad*, vol. 2. Madrid.
- De Hoz, J. 2013. “La epigrafía lusitana y la intersección de religión y lengua como marcador identitario.” *Revista da Faculdade de Letras. Porto* 12: 87-98.
- D’Encarnação, J. and A. Guerra. 2010. “The current state of research on local deities in Portugal.” In *Celtic Religion across Space and Time. IX Workshop F.E.R.C.AN*, ed. J.A. Arenas-Esteban, 95-112. Toledo.
- Edmonson, J. 2002. “Writing in Latin in the province of Lusitania.” In *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West*, ed. A.E. Cooley, 41-60. Portsmouth.
- Estarán, M.J. 2014. *El latín y las lenguas locales en las culturas epigráficas del Occidente romano: las inscripciones bilingües y mixtas*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Zaragoza.
- Fernandes, L. da Silva, P. Sobral Carvalho and Nádia Figueira. 2009. “Divindades indígenas numa ara inédita de Viseu.” In *Acta Palaeohispanica X (= PalHisp 9)*, 143-155. Zaragoza.
- García Alonso, J.L. 2009. “Lenguas indoeuropeas prerromanas en el Noroeste peninsular.” *PalHisp 9*: 163-174.
- García Alonso, J.L. 2011. “Oclusivas aspiradas, celtas y lusitanos.” In *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street. Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz*, ed. E.R. Luján and J.L. García Alonso, 175-189. Innsbruck.
- Gorrochategui, J. 1987. “En torno a la clasificación del lusitano.” In *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas*, Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985, ed. J. Gorrochaegui, J.L. Melena and J. Santos (= *Veleia* 2-3), 77-91. Vitoria.
- Gorrochategui, J. 1993. “Las lenguas de los pueblos paleohispánicos.” In *Los celtas: Hispania y Europa*, ed. M. Almagro-Gorbea, 409-429. Madrid.
- Gorrochategui, J. 1994. “La declinación céltica de los temas en -a y los datos hispanos.” In *Indogermanica et Caucasic. Festschrift für K. H. Schmidt*, ed. R. Bielmeier and R. Stempel, 316-330. Berlin – New York.

Gorrochategui, J. and J.M. Vallejo. 2010. "Lengua y onomástica. Las inscripciones lusitanas." *Iberografías* 6: 71-80.

Gorrochategui, J. and J.M. Vallejo. 2015. In *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen*, ed. E. Dupraz and W. Sowa, 337-356. Rouen and Le Havre.

Gorrochategui, J. and J.M. Vallejo. 2016. "Lusitano." In *Banco de Datos Hesperia* [on-line edition (= http://hesperia.ucm.es/presentacion_lusitano.php)].

Guerra, A. 2010. "A propósito dos conceptos de 'lusitano' e 'Lusitania'." In *Serta Palaeohispanica in Honorem Javier de Hoz* (= *PalHisp* 10), 81-98. Zaragoza.

Lorrio, A.J. 2011. "Los celtas en el occidente de Iberia." In *Castros y verracos. Las gentes de la Edad del Hierro en el occidente de Iberia*, ed. G. Ruiz Zapatero and J. Álvarez-Sanchís, 45-100. Ávila.

Luján, E.R. 2013. "La situación lingüística de la Meseta Sur en la Antigüedad." In *Acta Palaeohispanica IX* (= *Palaeohispanica* 13), 103-136. Zaragoza.

Luján, E.R. 2016. "Sobre los nombres de las unidades familiares indígenas en la Hispania antigua (1.ª parte). *Veleia* 33.

Luján, E.R., T. Chapa, J. Pereira, A. Cabrera and C. Charro. 2012. "Nueva inscripción ibérica sobre granito del Cerro de la Mesa (Alcolea de Tajo, Toledo)." *PalHisp* 12: 195-209.

Luján, E.R. and A.J. Lorrio. Forthc. "Un puñal celtibérico con inscripción.", *ÉC*.

McCone, K. 1991. "The PIE stops and syllabic nasals in Celtic." *SCJ* 4: 37-69.

McCone, K. 1996. *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. Maynooth.

Pedrero, R. 1999. "Aproximación lingüística al teónimo lusitano-gallego *Bandue/Bandi*." In *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras en la Hispania prerromana. Actas del VII Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas*, ed. F. Villar and F. Beltrán, 535-543. Salamanca.

Prósper, B. 1996. "Una nota sobre la clasificación del lusitano: la conjunción *indi*." In *Las lenguas de corpus y sus problemas lingüísticos*, ed. A. Agud, J.A. Fernández Delgado and A. Ramos Guerreira, 69-76. Salamanca.

Prósper, B. 1997. "El nombre de la diosa Lusitana *Nabia* y el problema del betacismo en las lenguas indígenas del Occidente peninsular." *'Ilu* 2: 141-149.

Prósper, B. 1999. "The inscription of Cabeço das Fráguas revisited. Lusitanian and *Alteuropäisch* populations in the west of the Iberian peninsula." *TPhS* 97.2: 151-183.

Prósper, B. 2002. *Lenguas y religiones prerromanas del Occidente de la península Ibérica*. Salamanca.

Prósper, B. 2004. "Varia Palaeohispanica Occidentalia." *Palaeohispanica* 4: 169-194.

Prósper, B. 2008. "Lusitanian. A non-Celtic Indo-European language of western Hispania." In *Celtic and Other Languages in Ancient Europe*, ed. J.L. García Alonso, 53-64. Salamanca.

Prósper, B. 2013. "Sifting the evidence: new interpretations on Celtic and non-Celtic personal names of Western Hispania in the light of phonetics, composition and suffixation." In *Continental Celtic Word Formation. The Onomastic Data*, ed. J.L. García Alonso, 181-200. Salamanca.

Schmidt, K.H. 1985. "A contribution to the identification of Lusitanian." In *Actas del II Coloquio de Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, 319-342.

Schmoll, U. 1959. *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Spaniens und das Keltiberische*. Wiesbaden.

Tovar, A. 1961. *The Ancient Languages of Spain and Portugal*. New York.

Tovar, A. 1966-1967. "L'inscription du Cabeço das Fraguas et la langue des lusitaniens." *ÉC* 11.2: 237-268.

Tovar, A. 1985-1986. "Lenguas y pueblos de la antigua Hispania: lo que sabemos de nuestros antepasados protohistóricos." In *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas*, Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985, ed. J. Gorrochaegui, J.L. Melena and J. Santos (= *Veleia* 2-3), 15-34. Vitoria.

Untermann, J. 1962. "Personennamen als Sprachquelle im vorrömischen Hispanien." In *II Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, 63-93. Innsbruck.

Untermann, J. 1965. *Elementos de un atlas antroponímico de la Hispania antigua*. Madrid.

Untermann, J. 1985. "Los teónimos de la región lusitano-gallega como fuente de las lenguas indígenas." In *Actas del III Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, ed. J. de Hoz, 343-364. Salamanca.

Untermann, J. 1985-1986. "Lusitanisch, keltiberisch, keltisch." In *Studia Palaeohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas paleohispánicas*, Vitoria/Gasteiz, 6-10 mayo 1985, ed. J. Gorrochaegui, J.L. Melena and J. Santos (= *Veleia* 2-3), 57-76. Vitoria.

Vallejo, J.M. 2004. "El cierre -e- > -ei- en la antroponimia hispana y su delimitación geográfica." *Veleia* 21: 115-125.

Vallejo, J.M. 2005. *Antroponimia indígena de la Lusitania romana*. Vitoria/Gasteiz.

Vallejo, J.M. 2009. "Viejas y nuevas cuestiones de lengua en el Occidente peninsular: el lusitano y la onomástica." *PalHisp* 9: 271-289.

Vallejo, J.M. 2013. "Hacia una definición del lusitano." In *Acta Palaeohispanica XI*, 273-291. Zaragoza.

Villar, F. 1994. "Los antropónimos en *Pent-*, *Pint-* y las lenguas indoeuropeas prerromanas de la península Ibérica". In *Indogermanica et Caucasica. Festschrift für K. H. Schmidt*, ed. R. Bielmeier and R. Stempel, 234-264. Berlin – New York.

Villar, F. 1996. "El teónimo lusitano *Reve* y sus epítetos." In *Die größeren Altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler*, ed. W. Meid and P. Anreiter, 160-211. Innsbruck.

Villar, F. and R. Pedrero. 2001a. "La nueva inscripción lusitana: Arroyo de la Luz III." In *Religión, lengua y cultura prerromanas de Hispania*, ed. F. Villar and P. Fernández Álvarez, 663-698. Salamanca.

Villar, F. and R. Pedrero. 2001b. "Arroyo de la Luz III." *PalHisp* 1: 235-274.

Villar, F. and B. Prósper. 2009. "Nueva inscripción lusitana procedente de Portalegre." *Emerita* 77: 1-32.

Wodtko, D. 2009. "Language contact in Lusitania." *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 6: 1-48.

Wodtko, D. 2012. "The problem of Lusitanian." In *Celtic from the West*, ed. B. Cunliffe and J.T. Koch, 335-367. Oxford.