Quiemonis and the epichoric anthroponymy of Ig

Quiemonis v luči avtohtohnih ižanskih osebnih imen

Luka REPANŠEK

Izvleček

Prispevek obravnava osebno ime Q(u)iemoni(s), izpričano na novooodkritem nagrobnem spomeniku iz cerkve sv. Janeza Krstnika v Podkraju, ki kot hapax legomenon predstavlja izjemni doprinos k poznavanju avtohtohnih osebnih imen rimskodobnega Iga. Imenu se posveča s stališča epigrafike in etimologije (predlaga se izpeljava iz praindoevropskega korena *k̥jelH₁, ‘(have a) rest’, probably close in meaning to Latin ‘quiētus’) posebna pozornost pa je namenjena njegovi umestitvi v sklopu obširne in zahtevne problematike onomastičnih plast ižanskega imenskega fonda.
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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 Krstnika (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 *k̥jelH₁, ‘(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.
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INTRODUCTION

The onomastic tradition handed down on the numerous epigraphic monuments originating from the territory in and around present-day Ig is famous for its conspicuously local character. The latter is due to the peripheral position of Ig within the wider North-Adriatic Namenlandschaft, which most notably comprises the Venetic, Histrian and immigrant families from the Ig area (Šašel Kos, personal communication).

1 The tombstones from Emona which feature epichoric names typical of Ig are generally assumed to have been imported from the Ig area (cf. Katičić 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 Luka REPANŠEK.

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, Planina, Podkraj (on the latter secondary find-spot see the contribution by Veranić and Repanšek (2016) in this volume), Pungart, Staje, Strahomer, and Tomišelj.
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.) 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), Löchner von Hüttchenbach 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 Löchner-Hüttchenbach 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 corpus.\footnote{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.}

\footnote{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.}

\footnote{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).\footnote{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.}}

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)ae and Valentis has been published in Hostnik 1997, no. 24 (however, the monument is wrongly copied there), cf. lupa 5566.

– Festu Fecun(di) and Tertulliae 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 = AJU 142 = RINMS 88 (Tertius, Eppo, Bolerianus / 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-ikun- (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 Boler[ 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 / Bolerianus 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.\footnote{The name is wrongly adduced as a nasal stem Coemo in Meid 2005, 191.} 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.
(line 1) and Petonis (line 6-7), 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 Poo[pe]tious as in Stifter 2012b, 263).

- Ruti (CIL III 3821) is probably a ghost. Judging from the ligature, the filiation could either be read Ruiti or Ruff(i). Note that Šašel (unpublished reading) proposes to restore Buiti, 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 iliio].

- Vol[ilius] in AIJ 221 (Grosuplje) is used as a fully functional gentilic, regardless of its probable North-Adriatic origin 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: Coemotius for Coemo[---]ius, Cumi for [---][cumi], and Gio for [---][gio] (all CIL III 3792); Etia for filla(e’o) (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 Bucicu, 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 Lasalıu (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 inventory 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 stems 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: Peto, Petonis (genitive singular). See the contribution by Ragolič (2016) in this volume.


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 Acigor- 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 -o 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, -onis). The vernacular may have had a different distribution, however: either a) long *-o 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. *-o, gen.sg. *-nos, 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 ff. 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 = *Ajk(k)’on-; Ama = *Am(m)’ā (f.); Amatu = *Amatūn- (f.); Ampo = *Ampon-;

Beatulo = *Beatul(l)’on-; Bolerianus or Boleriavus = *Boler(-)l’ano- / *Boler(-)l-avo-; Broc(i)us = *Brokko-; *BUG: 1 Buctor = *Buk-tor- < *Bugar-tor-; perhaps also *BUKKO: Buccus = *Bucco- ~ Bucca = *Bukkā (f.) ~ Bucco = *Bukkon ~ Buccio = *Bukk-’on- ~ Buccieu (?) = *Bukk-ikūn- (f.) ~ Buquorsa = *Bukuorsā (f.); 2 Bugia = *Bug-ja (f.) ~ [Bugjio = *Bug-jon-; Buius = *Bujo- ~ Buio = *Buijjon-;15 Butto = *Button-;

Ceteti (?) = *Ketet-’ūn- (f.); Coemo...ius = *Koemo...-jo-; Cotiu = *Kot(i)jūn- (f.);16

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

Ebonicus = *Eboniko-; Ecco = *Ekkon-; Elia (?) = *Elīa (f.); Emo = *Em(m)’on-;17 Eniconis or Enico = *Eni-кон- / *En(n)’ikon-; Enignus = *Eni-gno-; *ENNO: Enno = *Ennon- ~ Enna = *Ennā (f.) ~ Ennia = *Enn-ja (f.); Ennina = *En-inna (f.);18 Eppo = *Eppon-; Ergiano or Ergianus = *Ergiano- / *Ergianon-;

Galunus = *Galuno-;

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

Laepius (gentilic!) = *Laepjo-; (?) Las(i)onti or Lasc(i)ontia = *Lask(i)ontī / *Lask(i)ontiā (f.); *LASSO-: Lasso = *Lasson- ~ Lassaiu = *Lass-’ajūn- (f.);

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

Nammo = *Nammon-; Neuntius = *Neuntjo-;

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

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

Rega = *Regā (f.);20 Ruttus (?) or Ruius (?) = *Ruttoo- / *Ruijo-;

Sacciar(us) = *Sak-ii-ar(o)’?; Secco = *Sekkon-; Sennus = *Senno-; Sublo (attested as Sublo/a/nī) = *Sublōn-;

Talsus = *Talos-; Tetriu = *Tetiūn- (f.); Tetta = *Tettā (f.);

Uccio (very improbable; see below s.v.); Usṣ...;

Veitro = *Veitron-; Venixama = *Veniksamā (f.) and its phonetic variant Venixema; Vibunn(i)’ā = *Vibunn(i)’ā (f.) (+ gentilic Vibunnii); *VOLTO-:

---

15 Geminate *-ij- (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. *Ajkkon- above.
18 Assuming alternation in the position of the geminate in a hypocoristic form: *Enn-īnā = *Enn-innā (?)
19 See above for the reference.
20 For Rec/aj see ILJug 299.
Volta = *Vūta (f.) ~ Volitia = *Volt-jā (f.) ~ Volt-ān(V)~ ~ Voltielius = *Volt-j-elo ~ Voltaro = *Volt-aron- (± its phonetic variant Voltaren-) and (?) Voltaronti or Voltarontis = *Voltar-onī / *Voltarontis (f.) ~ Voltognas = *Voltog-nā- or *Volto-gna- ~ *-gno-. *VOLTU-: Volturex = Voltu-rēg- (± its phonetic variantVolt-reg- and the recurrent syncopated version *Volt-reg-) ~ Voltuparis = *VOLT-ari-; 21

Śmarata

a – cognomina:
Feuconts = *Feugont-; Feva(?) = *Fey(y)ā (?); 22
Planius = *Plan(-)-jo-, Pletor = *Ple-tor-;
Tatsoria = *Tatsor(-)-jā;
Volta = *Vūta; Vot.;

b – gentilicia:
Lassonius/a = *Lasson-jo-; 23
Poteius = *Potej-jo-;
perhaps also Turoius = *Turo(-)-jo-.

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

-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 *Aig-, 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 *Ig, *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) thin 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. *Ig comes to have 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 filii of the same father, whose name Voltaro was therefore regularly omitted in all filiations but the first. The identification filiu(s) 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 (filia) and provide a further instance of this feminine idionym.

21 To be added are (…)-gio for (…)gio = *(…)gio- and (…)cumus (CIL III 3792) for (…)cumus = *(…)cumo- (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. i.a.n.t.s., LVen. Vi 3 = MLV, no. 124), but *Feukont or *Feyko(n), both from *Feukonts, are not inconceivable either. Note that Katičić 1968, 105 restores Feucon and Mócsy 1983, 126 has Feuca, cf. OPEL II, 140. Needles to say, both latter assumptions are equally ad hoc.


24 Cf. the individual name Lasson- in Ig.
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(V) - (vide infra), and for *-ayo- consider the likes of Ven. klutaviko.s. (LVen. Ca 18). In Secundus Boleriavirus (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 Uglia, missing the detached B in line 4. A possible parallel to a putative Bugla is however offered by Bucl 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 Cetetiu, but this is decidedly ruled out on paleographic grounds and by the syntax of the inscription: Enno Secconis f(ilius) vivus f(ecit) Cetetiu Rustic[i] f(iliae) (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 Mülner 1879, no. 26, i.e. S(ib)i ETETIUNI = s(i)bi et (T)etiuni with straightforward haplography or intentional simplification (ETETIUNI → ETETI-). 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 i- or possibly an i-stem, i.e. *Voltarontī or *Voltaronti(s) respectively. The same sequence Voltaronti also appears in CIL 3860 = Ald 185 = Šašel Kos 1998, no. 3, where it is generally recognised to be functionally a dative.25 The latter inscription reads Enninae Voltergis f(iliae) Buito Senni f(ilius) 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(vivus) 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 *Voltaronti, the name can offer a rare insight into vernacular morphology, which points to the preservation of the old Indo-European feminine long i-stems. Moreover, juxtaposing the male name *Voltaron- with *Voltaronti, 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 *-ä, as in vho.u.go.n.t- (m.) → vho.u.go.n.t-a = *-ont-ā (f.). 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 Lascioniatae (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-jon-, 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 *Feykont-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]sctionea and Devontiae undoubtedly belong to the same pattern, so that their respective nominative forms should rightly be restored as Lascionte and Deventi. Although their original inflectional ending seems to have been disguised by Latin, it is significant that they were integrated into Latin as āa- rather than simple ā-stems. This plainly betrays their original inflectional pattern: *-ont-i (nom.sg.) vs. *-ont-āa- in the oblique cases, the dative singular being almost certainly *-ont-jāā (i.e. identical to Latin -iae), cf. Ven. vhugin-iāa., 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 Voltarontti(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


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]/el/ia; Mócsy 1959, 173 proposes [A]/el/ia). 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 Bui[i---] 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 *EnnoL-/j jã, *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-ei/jo-, which appears beside Eniceius (LVen. Ca 58), built to the unextended variant *En(n)iko- (for the patronymic suffix *-eijO- 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 enH/form ‘beget’, cf. *Eni-gno- ‘born inside’), its word formation being fully parallel to compound names in *-pori- to PIE *perH ‘obtain, acquire’ (cf. Lat. pario ‘acquire, create, give birth to’), as probably indirectly preserved in Volto-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 derivation. 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 Teutagnus < *Teutōnos). If the two formations do, however, belong together, they most probably reflect the older athematic *\textit{gn}"Ht-s (> *-gnās) occurring side by side with its thematised variant *\textit{gn}n(H)t-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) \textit{ando-gnam} (cf. RIG II/2, 98: 2a10, 2a11, 2b12) < *\textit{gn}"Ht±m (accusative singular) beside Gaulish *-gn-o- < *\textit{gn}n(H)t-o- (= our -\textit{gnus}) as in Certo-gno- (RIG II/2, L–66). There is of course nothing about either of these formations that would necessarily point to Gaulish, 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-, 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. See Meid 2005, 130–133. Meid’s doubts as to the Celticity of *-gento- are in my opinion unnecessary.

\footnote{I.e. with the typologically expected reflex of the sequence *-nH-s. cf. Lat. nātus < *\textit{gn}"Ht-ō- and perhaps Plutor (a variant of Pletor – Plætor widespread in Dalmatia) if for *P\textit{l}ātor from *\textit{p}Ht-ar- to PIE *pleHr- ‘implere’, which is uncertain, however.}
Concerning the vocalism of the second element of *Volltuparis*, i.e. *-par-i-* (= i-stem!), the situation is very similar to that regarding *-gnus* vs. *-gnas* (vide supra). If *-paris* stands for *por(H_3)*-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. and, notably, even a patronymic adjective *Volo-topariko.s.* (MLV, no. 209) = *Volltuparis 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-*, which to *por(H_3)*-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 /aj-e/) or represent inverted writing of the Latin digraph <ae> (which at this point had already been regularly monophthongised to ē) for the actual long *ē*. The latter might in turn also encode the contracted result of *a-e* or *aje > ē*. The same applies in the case of *Pleg-tor ~ Plē-tor*, but here we are most likely dealing with two different graphic representations of the original form *Plē-tor*-.. Note that the third variant, viz. *Plg-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. *Volutius* (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 hos.s.ti-* (cf. the compound name hos.s.ti-havo.s., LVen. Pa 7) clearly retains the expected outcome of PIE *gʰosti-* ‘hospes’ (see MLV § 169–170 et pass.), the derivational family around *Ost*- (*Ostio-*-, *Ostjar-*-, *Ostilo-, *Ostiălo-), 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 *Ost*-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. 2328) = AIJ 135), *Hostila* (CIL III 10746 (+ p. 2328) = 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)iemonti(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 *gʰ*, cannot of course be epichoric, as *g* would otherwise be normally expected in Ig.

**Lasc(i)onti (?)**

*CIL* III 3792 actually reads *...]sitiontiae*, 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 *Lasciontiae*. On the putative nominative form *Lascioni* 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 *va-leō* < PIE *yH-eH*-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. 2328 = AJI 139) indeed seems to be Neuntii rather than Nevantii. The latter reading would in fact represent the more logical outcome (but cf. Hamp 1976b) if the etymological connection to the Indo-European numeral *H_ney ‘9’ (cf. Lat. novem < *neyen) 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 be 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 Rec[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- (f.) to *u.ko. = *Ukkon- (m.), vho.u.go.n.t-g (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-rēx (cf. the female name *Volt-ā and its hypocoristic variant *Volt-jā, both very clear cases of feminine short names to compounds in *Volto- / *Voltu-). The problem with this scenario is that Kurznamen are usually built to first rather than second members of compounds, cf. Gaulish Seg, 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 *Subloni- 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[ā]ntie for Lascioni[ā]te, it would seem safe to assume the same graphic peculiarity for Subloani and restore the genitive Sublo[ā]ni(s).

Tetiu

Müllner (1863, 66 apud Müllner 1879, no. 55) reads Tetiu... 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 Tetiun) rather than a derivative in *-jā to *Tetiun- (i.e. **Tetiūn-jā), 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, Tetiu{* Tetiun-.

Uccio

The attestation of this name is very unreliable. AJI 133 reads Nammo et T. fili(i) parentibus d(e) s(uo) vivi f(eecerant) 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 nurui (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, + gamronym .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 Bucchio, rendering all other interpretations obsolete.

Usş [---]

The name reads Vibunna Usş[---] 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 *u.ss- < *ups- (pace Meid 2005, 194, but cf. p. 244). One would not in fact expect *xs to be spelt <ss> but either <x> or <xs> as is the usual practice in latinised Gaulish names involving the cluster *xs, cf. Uxela (CIL III 13406; Meid 2005, 208) from Pannonia. The simplification to *s in Eξ-cinga (Šentrupert, see Lovenjak 1997, no. 10 = ILSI 71) for *Eξs-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 *xs in the questionable case of Uss-. Ultimately, this isolated name cannot be reconstructed. The accompanying name Vibunnija35 is only in this particular case attested as a feminine individual name and expectedly appears side by side with the uniquely epichoric female name *Devonī (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.).

Voltn(V)3.

It is very unclear what declension this name originally belonged to. The reading Voltni (CIL III 3790 = RINMS 82) by A. Tyferus (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 Voltno- (gen. sg. Voltni), but there seems to be good evidence that the name did not originally belong to o-declension.36 Voltnan in CIL III 3802, by contrast, may belong to a consonantal or an i-stem *Voltnan- / *Voltnan-. The latter is also secured by Voltni (CIL III 3821), which, judging from the context of the inscription, must be a dative rather than a genitive. Voltn (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 < *porkel-; cf. Venetic *de.i.volo-, implied by the patronymic de.i.volajo(.)s(.) (LVen. Ag 1) < *aijo-, if it goes back to *deijlo- (i.e. with what seems to be the regular Venetic development of *ye to *yo). If this interpretation is correct, *Volți elo- would probably have to be understood as a hypocoristic form built to the underlying short name *Voltjo-. Müllner (1879, no. 59) interprets the debatable part of the inscription as SFRYS / VOLI FIIIVVIVS = Surus Voltti(i)ʔ fill(u)s viv(u)s (with ligature ITI 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 ITI (correctly read by Hirschfeld; see CIL III 10748), it is the masculine individual name *Volto- or *Volto-, 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 Vibunija 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 *Voln-, restoring the nominative form Voltn; Katičić 1968, 102 reconstructs an i-stem nominative Voltnis.
any real currency among male names. The only hypocoristic form attested is Voltionis from Pannonia (CIL III 4112: Maxima[ts] Voltion[is] filius; CIL III 10927: Maximi Voltionis confugi); not mentioned by Meid 2005). Perhaps Volt[... ] in AIJ 125 (Šmarata) is to be read Voliti(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 Volit(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 *yol-ti- and *yol-tu- of course go back to PIE *yu-li-tu- ‘voluntās’, nicely preserved in Venetic vo.l.tii:o (instr. sg.) < *ytii:jo- (corresponding functionally and semantically to Lat. ibens) and its homonym vo.l.te.r.ko- < *yel-triko- (see MLV § 772, 21). If this is so, the development PIE *R > *Ar is irrefutably 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. Volti-recis, Volti-regis, Volti-regisi, Volti-rex) and the third variant viz. Volto- are silent seeing that the latter can easily go back to *yuol-to- rather than *yul-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, Ναύποτον (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 < *pr-tu- (i.e. like Voltu- < *yul-tu-). 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 fjôrðr, Old High German fltr, Avestan par:tu-, 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 Nav- (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 Fevaf. Tu[j] ro[... ] f as is clearly the case in Sexstiliae Tatsoriae beside Planius [Sex][st][i]lius Feuconitis f (AIJ 123 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 1), its status would be secured. However, the fragmented part could easily stand for *Feva Turoia (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 *kê:tu-r- (H)jô- > *turô- ‘quârtus’. 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- ‘po-tens’ 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-jo- = Lat. Quartius) or belongs to the underlying appellative *turo-jo- ‘quārtus’. The latter would certainly find a nearly perfect parallel in Old Indic turīya- ‘id.’ (further cf. Ven. *turijo- as preserved in the dat. sg. of a personal name turijone.i., LVen. Ca 24) < PIE *k²tur-ijo- 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 micregion 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 exceptionality 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 integrated in a derivational family, be it one also

archiving similarities in the historical development of the inherited phoneme inventory. The historical phonology\(^{39}\) 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. Decomonis and -gnus in Enignus; the expected corresponding preservation of *k² is now observable in Quiemonis). The syllabic *N (±_HV) and *R yield *aN and *aR, for which cf. Venixama < *-isHyHo- and Voltii/u- < *yI-iti/u-. This is completely parallel to Venetic with cases such as vo.Li-ti-, mu:tvoi (for *mortyo- < *mr-, cf. Lat. mortius) or donasa and iuva.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 Myrsa, -burgium, Pulitvua, Carnuntum, Acuminicum, the Pannonian reflexes were undoubtedly *uN and *uR. As in Pannonian, the inherited Indo-European diphthong *ey 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, *ey has largely developed to *oy (Feucont., CIL III 10722–24 = Ven. vho.u.go.n.t.-, cf. MLV 319,\(^{41}\) and possibly Ševga, AIJ 125, vs. Ven. fo.u.vo.s. = *Fovyo., LVen. Ca 21, foxy foxyvonik.s. = *Fovyon.-, 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 *ey, 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

---

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


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

41 The digraph <vh> (Carnic Venetic <T>) corresponds to / in the Venetic alphabet.
the simple deaspiration of the inherited voiced aspirated consonants \( *b^h \), \( *d^h \), \( *g^h \) and \( *g^uh \) to \( b \) (and, on analogy also \( *d, *g, *g^a \), 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 \( *φ, *χ \), and \( *χ^p \) with Italic\(^{42} \) (at least at the beginning of the word, where both \( *φ \) and \( *χ^p \) later coalesce into \( *φ \)). This phenomenon can be nicely observed in

\[
\text{Buctor (Ig)} < *\text{B}^\text{ug-tor-} \text{ vs. Euctor-jo-} \quad (\text{CIL V 842}, \text{Aquileia}),
\]

\[
\text{Bugia (Ig)} < *\text{B}^\text{ug-i} \text{jā} \text{ vs. Ven. \text{thugia-}}, \text{both related to Feucont-} \quad (\text{Šmarata})
\]

\( = \text{Ven. \text{vh}o.u.go.n.t.}-, \text{and Butto vs. (Carnic) Ven. \text{fu}(.)t(.)o.s}. \)

The self-evident preservation of the inherited long \( *\bar{e} \) in \( *\text{Rēgā}, *-rēx \) in Ig is only significant as far as the comparison with Gaulish is concerned (in Proto-Celtic the Proto-Indo-European \( *\bar{e} \) typically yields long \( *ι \), cf. Gaul. \( -\text{rēxs = Ig} \) \( *\text{-rēks} \)). The same goes for the preservation of the short \( *ο \) in both Ig (cf. \( \text{Bucyr-}, \text{Voltaronti} \)) and Šmarata (cf. \( \text{Feucontis} \)),\(^{43} \) which is typical of the entire North-Adriatic complex and only plays the role of a diagnostic feature in relation to adjacent Pannonian, where \( *\text{a} \) is the normal outcome (cf. \( \text{Teutanus, (Aqua) I} \) \( \text{saes etc.} \)).

### 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 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: \textit{Adnomatus, Aicon(i)us [recte Aico], Amatu, Bucca & co. (?), Bugia, Elia, Enico(nis), Enignus, Galun(i)us, Manu, Nammo, Secco, Sennius, and Katičić 1968: Adnomatus, Aicon(i)us [recte Aico], Amatu, Brocc(i)us, Bucca & co. (but considered North-Adriatic in Katičić 1976, 182), Bugia, Butto, Cetetiu, Coemoius [sic!], Decomo, Devontia [recte Devonti], Ecco, Elia, Eno (?), Eppo, Lucius, Manu, Moiotu (in the final synthesis but not actually on p. 86), Mosso, Nammo, Otto (?), Ovis (?), Peto [recte Petio], Sacciarus, Sennus, Secco, Talsus, Tetiu, Tetta, Uccio, Uss[...], Venixema (+ **Venix, in spite of Peto!), Vibunali-ius.).

Hamp 1976a; 1978, which is a synthesis of both Lochner-Hüttenbach and Katičić’s contributions, admits \textit{Adnomatus, Aicon(i)us, Amatu, Brocc(i)us, Bucca & co., Bugia, Buia & co., Cetetiu (?), Coemoius [sic!], Elia (?), Eppo, Eninna, Elia, Galun(i)us, Manu,\(^{46} \) Ovis (?)}, Secco, Senn(i)us, Tetta. Importantly, he removes four items from the list of possible Gaulish names, viz. \textit{Decomo, Eno, Enignus} (still considered Celtic in 1976, however), and \textit{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: \textit{Adnomatus, Amatu, Broc(i)us, Bucca & co., Bugia, Buia & co., Butto, Cetetiu, Coemo [sic!], Decomo, Devontia [recte Devonti], Ecco, Eno (?), Enignus, Manu, Mosso, Nammo, Ovis, Peto [recte Petio], Sacciarus [sic!], Secco, Seccoemo [sic!], Talsus, Tetiu, Tetta, Uccio [recte Uccio], Venixema (+ **Venix), Vibunali-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 \textit{Adnomatus, Amatu} (understood by Meid as a hybrid with the Latin participle \textit{amātus}), \textit{Bugia, Cetetiu (?), Coemo [sic!], Devontia [recte Devonti], Galunus, Nammo (?), Uccio (?), Uss[...].}

---

\(^{42} \) Cf. Lat. \textit{frāter = Ven. \text{vh}rater-}< *\text{b}^\text{hrā-ter-}, \text{Lat. \text{f}ac- = Ven. \text{vh}a.\text{k-}< *\text{d}^\text{ha-k-}, \text{Lat. \text{hostis = Ven. \text{hosti-}< *\text{g}^\text{ostti-} etc.}


\(^{44} \) Already observed by Untermann 1961, 131 ff. 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 \textit{Exouna = *Eţo\text{ş}onţă, Ac\text{a}unissa = *A\text{a}cu\text{a}nissă, Dum\text{m}orix = *\text{D}um\text{m}or\text{i}ţ\text{ţ} etc., which besides their being clearly Celtic also display typically Gaulish sound changes.}

\(^{46} \) \text{Manu} mentioned by Hamp (1976a, 6; 1978, 60) does not exist. It is probably an oversight for \text{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 = /a/ 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 = AJ 222) = *Eχs-omnā < *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 Pannonia 48 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)llō, *-eio-, *-ino-, *-āko, *-(u)ko, *-(i)sā, *(u)sā etc., otherwise fairly well represented in both Noricum and Pannonia (cf. Vind-illo/-a, Tessila, Mess-illa, Trouc-illus, Ress-illus/-a, Verc-illa, Suadulla, Iantullus/-a, Catullus/-a, Adiattullus, Aiucu, Cocc-eius, Aged-inus, Cattussa, Belatusa, Troucetissa). This marked characteristic trait naturally goes hand in hand with notable absence of typically Celtic compound names such as Com- nertus, Curmi-saguis, Ex-cingeto-rīx, Nemeto-
mārus on account of numerous short names and simple hypocoristic derivatives 49 (predominantly structured as sequences of *C,VC,Č,on-, e.g. *Bukkan-*, *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 Katićić, 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 Katićić 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 Katićić 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 thin 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: Adnomatius (CIL III 10740 = AJ 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 Breža (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 *suada- ‘süvis’, Dumnacus to *dumno- ‘profundus’ etc.) but largely rest on short names, which almost without exception go back to compound names (e.g. Troucetit-maroro → *Trout’t-V → Troucillius beside Troucetissa, derived directly from the compound name *Trouc’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 the juxtaoposition 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 *dēyo- ‘deus’* (e.g. *Dēvo-gnātā, *Dēvo-rīx*). Here the phonological criterion would arguably have been satisfied, because the change of *ej* to *ē,* which is what we have in Proto-Celtic *dēyo- from PIE *deīyo- ‘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 *Devonti* 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 *ej* to *ē* is a rather universal phenomenon (cf. Lat. *deus < *deīyo-*) and at least in this phonetic environment (i.e. before *y(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. *Veito*, 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 *-ontī* in Gaulish, so that a putative Gaulish *Dēqontī* would in fact represent an isolated occurence of an underrepresented word-formational pattern.

Especially instructive are also *Decomo* and *Coenomius* [recte *Coemo...ius,* which Katičić (1968, 74–75)51 connects to diachronically (i.e. historically) incomparable and unrelated Gaul. *dekmeto- ‘decimus’, *dektant- ‘decem’* (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 *ej,* cf. *deījo.s.* (*Ven. Vi 2) ‘deōs’.

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’-m-(H)o- rather than *Decomo- in Ig (but cf. Ven. *dekomo- = ‘decimus’ < *-m-(H)o-).

Exceptionally prudent is Katičić’s unreasiness to ascribe Galunus (gen. *Galuni: CIL III 3815 + p.1731 = AJI 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 *galol-/ā ‘ardour, fury’ and to the fully fledged Latin nomen Gallionius, 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 held any real currency in Latin, is not in fact a Gaulish word (cf. Mc-Cone 2008, 4–6)! Meid’s account of these forms (2005,196) implies the existence of an adjective Gaul. *galon-/ having ardour, furious, bellicose’ ← *galol-/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 Broc(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 antroponymy. 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 names be it compound or derived) especially susceptible to almost universal recurrence. Such names abound in Ig (consider the likes of *Ajkk’-o-, *Buṣṣ’-o-, *Bukkon-, *Button-, *Ekkon-, *Emn’on-, *Enno-, *Ep̣’on-, *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. → Vol-ta, Vol-ti-e-lo-, perhaps Buttor → 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 distribution 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 proximity 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-jon-, perhaps also *Bukk-ikūn-), which makes it quite safe to assume that it belongs to the autochthonous name-inventory. The rather common Norican *Bukk-jon- and cases such as *Bukkon- and *Bukkā from Pannonia (Intercisā; 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). 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. 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 */fn 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, is, of course, completely ad hoc and does not seem credible. *Bug-jo/-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-jo- 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-ioo/-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 ~ Nammus, perhaps even Namuso = *Namuso 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.
The real problem then remains how to account for the tight group of names such as Butto, Otto.\textsuperscript{58} Petto, Ucco that so obviously link Ig with southern Noricum (perhaps paired with another feature, namely the spread of predominantly female names in *-un-, 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 Bremiatis 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).\textsuperscript{59} Since besides 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 *Butto- (attested five times), both going back to *b/u/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 folt, Welsh gwalt). 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., Venixema 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

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

\textsuperscript{58} Especially noteworthy is the juxtaposition of Otto in Ig versus one or two occurrences of Ot(ō)u (F) = *Ottān- from Noricum, each time paired with a genuinely Gaulish hypocoristic name: …otān Mocconis (fīliae) (CIL III 11657) and perhaps Ot(u) (I) Senonis (fīliā) (ib. 14368\textsuperscript{b}). Neither of these attestations for Otto are absolutely certain, however.

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

\textsuperscript{57} 325 = ILSl 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.
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),
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 *ys < *ks. *Venixama is undoubtedly the result of syncopation of the unaccented vowel -i- (*Enik-†samā < *Enik-isamā), perfectly parallel to cases such as *Volt-†rex < *Vólto/†re̞x or *Vólto/†rēx (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.g. petari.s. for *ék†-pētari-< e.kupetari.s., ušedika for up†-sedika < *upo-sēdika, vo.lte.r.ko.n. for *voltirko- < *yōltriko-, vene.t.†ke(n).s. < *veneti- or *venet-o-ken-jo-, va.n.t.(.)†kenia < *vant-o-ken-jā- 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- probably also had some currency in Gaulish, but in case *Venixamus is to be understood as *Enik-†samā < *Enik-isamo-, the syncopation 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 syncopation in Gaulish such as Mogit†marus (CIL III 3325) < *Moget-o-†māro-. That both the underlying *yenik-ko- ‘amīcus, carus’ and the superlative suffix *-isamo- < *-is-ηHo- (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 indubitable, which in this case renders the similarity between both names merely coincidental.

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-†jon-t* Gaulish *kaito- ‘silva’, 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, Manu, Las(s)aju, Tetiu (possibly derived from *Tet-t-jā, which to the female hypocoristic form *Tettā would represent a pair of the type seen in Volta to Volta), and perhaps Bucciu (?) 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 Cotti, which may find an admissible correspondence in Gaulish names derived from *kotto- ‘old’ 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 an- rather than an o-stem, which renders the similarity with *Manūn- in Ig superficial and all the more coincidental.

63 In this respect compare the surely non-Celtic (despite the more than apparently Gaulish affiliation Bussumari f.) hapax Voltsisema (AE 1989, 587; ib. 1996, 1190, see HD018282) from Aguntum (Noricum), which must undoubtedly go back to a departicular superlative formation *yolt-isamo- (and ultimately to *yolt-< *yl-tō- ‘dēsiderātus’, for which see above s.v.).

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


66 In this respect compare the surely non-Celtic (despite the more than apparently Gaulish affiliation Bussumari f.) hapax Voltsisema (AE 1989, 587; ib. 1996, 1190, see HD018282) from Aguntum (Noricum), which must undoubtedly go back to a departicular superlative formation *yolt-isamo- (and ultimately to *yolt-< *yl-tō- ‘dēsiderātus’, for which see above s.v.).

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

68 For original *aj 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 Kētōv (Ptol., Geogr. II,13,1; 14,1; 15,1) beside Hispano-Celtic Ķartō-þpēž (Ptol. II,5,2), both to *kaio-.

69 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.

61 Cf. Cotti (E.m.) (e.g. CIL III 11630) if for *Cotta and a typically Gaulish hypocoristic formation in Cotul(i)tia (CIL III 5107 = Djura Jelenko, Visočnik 2006, 371–372).
These four or five examples of female names in */-ān- do, however, at least at face value share their characteristic word-formation with predominantly but not exclusively female names within the southern Noricand and Pannonian onomastic complex. The derivational base of a number of these names is indisputably Gaulish in origin: Caletiē (f.) to */kal-eto- ‘firmus’, Suadru (f.) to */syad-ro- ‘suāvis’,57 and perhaps also Aĭ (f.) (although it is not diagnostically Gaulish, the name appears beside other typically Gaulish hypocoristic derivatives such as Aĭuca, Aĭulo) to */aĭ- ‘vita’ (?) (thus Meid 2005, 213) or more likely a simple by-form of */Ajjā. Further possible instances of genuinely Gaulish names include Cauru (f.) (if for Gaulish */kava-ro- ~ */kau̇ro- ‘heroes’ and not (Carnic) Venetic */kavar- implied by the patronymic kavaron: s */kav=ar=on-jo-),68 Mats/l/iu (on account of the <ls>, possibly reflecting the diagnostically Gaulish */‘t/), Su-cel/lu (m.) (if to Gaul. Su-cella, Su-cellus rather than Carnic Venetic ke.l./.os.), 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 */-ā (with regular and diagnostically Celtic transition of the inherited */-ā to */-ā in the nominative singular) and oblique */-ān- (e.g. genitive */-ān-os → Latinised to */ānis etc.) was actively employed in the formation of hypocoristic names. It was probably the coexistence of the two patterns, viz. */-ā, */-ān-os and the “normal” */-ā, on-os, which prompted large-scale translation of these names into the Latin pattern in */-ā, -ān-is in the first place.69 The alternative */-ān-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 tουτουνια (RIG I, G–163), implying */Attūn- and */Toytūn- rather than the usual */Atton- and */Toyton- (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. Amatsu). Such a categorical borrowing between two onomastic traditions would be extremely unusual. Seeing that both Venetic resun. ko.s. (LVen. Ca 7), votu.n. ké.a. (LVen. Tr 6) and Plunco in Ig show traces of */-ān- 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 */-ā < */-AH (such as for instance indirectly reflected by Latin socrus, -ās) and nasal stems in */-on- (suggested also by Stifter 2012b, 258), probably modelled on the pattern */-ā, */-o-ān- → -ā, */-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 */-ān- 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

57 */syad-ro- beside */syad-u- (cf. the deadjectival hypocoristic form Sua/dula. LSl 93 = RINMS 147) is an archaic by-form of the Gaulish adjective (see Meid 2005, 206–207), only typical of Noricum and Pannonia.

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

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

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

70 Cf. Untermann 1961, 100 ff. 170: “kan man ihn (i.e. the transition of */-ā to */-ū) nicht einfach als “keltisch” bezeichnen ..., sondern muß in ihm jeweils locale Son- dererscheinung sehen.”

71 This criterion is often drawn upon by Lochner von Hütttenbach, 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 *Blatúrīx for *Blátu. 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 filiatory 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 jo-stem of the type observable in the Venetic patronymic adjective vo.ltio[.n.m]ni.s. (LVen. Es 34; MLV 16; ib. § 875) < *voltjomn-jo- ‘Voltjomni 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

_Quemon-jo-.pseudo-gent. < patr. (X⁷⁵gn. – omitted)
← *Quiemō+gn.+ patronymic / filiation.

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

---

⁷⁴ QIEMONI · vi(vus) · f(ecit) · [si]/bi · eī · Vēnixemāē / co(n)iugi · v(ivae) · eī · Māij ·← · / filiaē · θ[obita] · / a[m(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 Ollognatius Secundus (CIL XIII 4159), derived from their respective father’s cognomina Carantus (Meōhillius 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.\textsuperscript{76} Voltrex Plaetoris f\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 1073 = AIJ 142 = RINMS 88), Secundus Voltregegis 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 Voltregegis are actual patronymics in *-io- 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 Bolerianius, Sublo[an]ius, or indeed Talsius as representing old patronymics or even family names.\textsuperscript{79} As nearly all of them are represented by hapaxes,\textsuperscript{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),\textsuperscript{81} while patronymic derivatives in *-io- 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.\textsuperscript{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 naming formula 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. Turoi Plotor Feucitonis f. (CIL III 10724 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 3), Voltei Lassontiae Plani f. (CIL III 10723 = AIJ 124 = Šašel Kos 2000, no. 2). This is especially well observable in the case of Plotoris Potei Feucitons f. (ib.) = *Pletor Poteius Feucitons f. and Planius Po<i>p>titius Pletor(i)s f. (ib.), where both the father and his son carry the same patronymic adjective Potetus,\textsuperscript{83} while their respective filiations reflect

\textsuperscript{76} CIL III 3823 + p. 1731 = AIJ 143 = RINMS 89.

\textsuperscript{77} CIL III 3825 + p. 1731.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{79} Pace Šašel Kos in RINMS, pp. 277, 279.

\textsuperscript{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).

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

\textsuperscript{82} Cf. the case of Platino [Platoris Tizi filius)] filiation (CIL III 2788), which would correspond to *Platino Tizia gent.

\textsuperscript{83} See also Šašel Kos 2000, p. 99 et pass.
their direct patrilineal descent (*Pot(e)i(o)s → *Feuco Potej-ios paternalic → 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-jo- and *Lasson-jo-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. F85 (LVen. Es VII), possibly replacing the old type vol.ti.mno.s. iuva.n.i.t.s. a.riun.s. (LVen. Es 25) (< *Iuvant-jo- *Ariun-jo-) 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 gentilicum, regardless of the overwhelmingly identical structure (both in *-jo-), 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 adject-

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.kea. (MLV, no. 224).

Derivatives in *-jo- such as Laepius (in Pletor Laepius, CIL III 3804 = 10731 = AIJ 134), Coemo...ius (CIL III 3792, see above), or Pronius (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 *-jo-86 based on the underlying individual names (concerning Laepius cf. Histrian Laep-oko-, Liburnian Laep-iko-, and Venetic Laep-on-jo-),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[ê]mon-jo-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 gentilicum 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 (= *Quiemont 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 underly-

---

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) < *Enon-jo-, 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-jo-, e.n.mon.nia (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).
86 Note that both Laepius and Coemous [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 onymisation\(^{89}\) of an underlying substantivised adjective, derived from the nasal stem (*Quiemon- = *K\(i\)\(e\)-\(\acute{e}\)-\(m\)-\(o\)\(n\)-) with the help of the ubiquitous suffix *-\(i\)\(o\)\(-\), 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 *-\(i\)\(o\)- current in name-giving. If so, we are here almost certainly dealing with the Proto-Indo-European verbal root *\(k\(i\)\(e\)H\(i\)- ‘ausruhen’ (LIV\(^2\) 393–394; IEW 638), which is known from Latin quiescere ‘to rest’, or Slavic *\(p\(o\)-\(c\(i\)\(t\)i ‘to take a rest’ and *\(p\(o\)-\(k\(o\)-jo) ‘rest’ etc. The closest cognate of our name, however, is represented by the abstract noun ‘rest(ing)’, derived from the verbal root *\(k\(i\)\(e\)H\(i\)- with the feminine suffix *-\(t\)-i (i.e. PIE *\(k\(i\)\(e\)H\(i\)-\(t\)-i) and continued by Young Avestan \(s\(h\)\(\acute{a}\)\(t\)-ti- ‘peace’, Old Persian \(s\(h\)\(\acute{a}\)\(\acute{a}\)\(\acute{a}\)ti- ‘welfare, peace, happiness’ and, notably, also Lat. qui\(\acute{e}\)s ‘sleep, repose’ < *\(k\(i\)\(e\)-\(t\)-i-. In the case of Quiemonis(s), on the other hand, the underlying noun would represent an old nasal derivative in *-\(m\)-\(o\)-n- i.e. *\(k\(i\)\(e\)-\(\acute{e}\)-\(m\)-\(o\)-n- < PIE *\(k\(i\)\(e\)H\(i\)-\(m\)-\(o\)-n-, from which *\(k\(i\)\(e\)m\(o\)-\(n\)-jo- would be derived as the corresponding adjective of appurtenance, essentially adding up to the meaning very near to that of Lat. qui\(\acute{e}\)tus ‘peaceful’ < *‘that has to do with’ is connected to rest’ or, perhaps, qui\(\acute{e}\)scens ‘rest-ing’. Structurally, *\(k\(i\)\(e\)H\(i\)-\(m\)-\(o\)-n-jo- is immediately comparable to Venetic *ter\(m\)on\(i\)\(s\) ‘terminālis’ (attested as ter\(m\)on\(i\)\(o\)\(s\) ‘terminālēs’, see MLV 257) < *ter\(m\)-\(o\)-jo- to PIE *\(t\)er(H\(i\)\(z\)-\(m\)-\(o\)-n- ‘boundary’ as preserved by Lat. term\(d\) ‘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 (*Ěm/Aǐm-ōnā versus *K\(i\)\(e\)-\(m\)-\(o\)-n-) - 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, Albina, Aliona, 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\(i\)\(e\)-.*

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, Repašek 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 *\(C\(j\)\(V\)> 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-iV* (e.g. *quietus* = /kʰi-i-jë-tus/ not **/kʰi-jë-tus/ as was the inherited sequence), the indigenous sequence *kʰjëS* (vs. normalised Latin *kʰiŠēS*90) would conceivably present a challenge for normal graphic representation.

Acknowledgements
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90 The dollar sign marks the end of a syllable.
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Prispevek prinaša študijo obširne in kompleksne problematike fonda nelatinskih osebnih imen, ki so na rimskih nagrobnih spomenikih večinoma izpičana na Ižanskem, tj. na območju današnjega Iga (z grajskim hribom), Lijške vasi, Kamnika pod Krimom, Matene, Staj, Strahomerja, Tomišlja in Podkraja, deloma pa tudi v Emoni (velja za redke primere nagrobnih stel z avtohtonimi imeni, za katere ni mogoče zanesljivo trditi, da so bile kot spoljne prinesene z Iga) in v Gatini pri Grosupljem (AIJ 221). Tematiki 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 Podkraju pri Tomišlju 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

Quiemonis v luči avtohtonih ižanskih osebnih imen

Povzetek


1 Gl. Veranič, Repanšek 2016 v tej številki Arheološkega vestnika.
V pričujočem prispevku je najprej opravljena tekstnokritična študija celotnega nabora pojavljačiš sklonskih oblik posameznih predrimskih imen, ki so sežeto podana v obliki s komentarji opremljene pragi latiniziranih imenovalniških oblik in rekonstruiranih imenskih osnov, npr. Buccio = *Bukk-jo- za dejansko izpričano Buccio, Buccionis[š], Buccioni (za kritični pregled čitanj posameznih imen gl. v glavnom 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 SEZMAN

Ižansko in Emona:

Adnomatus; Aico; Ama; Amatu; Ampo;
Beatulo; Bolerianus (?) ; Boleriavus; Brocc(i)us;
Buctor, Buccus ~ Bucca ~ Bucco ~ Buccio ~
Buccicu (?) ~ Buquorsa; Bugia ~ [Bu]gio; Buiuis ~
Buiio; Butto;
Cetetiu (?) ; Coemo...ius; Cotiu;
Decemo; Devonti ali Devonta;
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)onta; Lasso ~ Lassiai;
Manu; Mioiota; Mosso;
Nammo; Neuntius;
Oppa ~ Oppalo ~ Oppalus; Otto; Ovis;
Pettio; Pl(a)etor; Pluno; Provisius;
Rega; Rutus (?) ali Ruiuis (?) ;
Sacciar(us); Secco; Senius; Sublo (izpričano
kot Sublo(a)ni);
Talsus; Tetiu; Tetta;
Uss...;
Veitro; Venixama (z varianto Venixema);
Vibunn(i) a (+ nomen gentile Vibunnius); Volta
~ Volitia ~ Volt-an(Ṿ) ~ Voltielus ~ Voltaro ~
Voltaronti ali Voltarontis; Voltognas; Volturex
(z variantama *Volte-reg- in *Volte-reg-) ~ Voltuparis.

Šmarata:

a – osebna imena:
Feuconts; Feval[; Planius; Pletor; Tatsoria;
Volta; Volta...;
b – gentilna imena:
Lassonius/-a; Potetius; Turoius (?).²

V skladu s čedalje bolj izostremlen vzpogledom
v imensko gradivo in poglubljenim 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 “ižansčine”,
v katerem je bil tvorjen tisti del imenskega fonda,
az 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, sosejdskih 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 stičišcu
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
začinosti 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 pod sistemov severnojadranskega kroga, predstavlja njegov periferni
(obrobniki) 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
se skladu s čedalje bolj izostrenim vpogledom
oblikotvorni

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

² 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 posloštvje o značilnostih jezika, ki
mu lastna imena pripadajo.

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 posloštvje 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 pod sistema do izraza prihaja na štirih ravneh:

a – zelo malo je imen, ki so na Ižansko zašla iz drugih pod sistemov severnojadranskega kroga (npr. Hostius, Pletor, verjetno tudi Laeplius, 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 pod sistemov 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 za Ižansko;

d – jedrni, torej avtohtoni del ižanskih imen poleg inovacij izsaki tudi številne arhaične poteze, en sicer tako v sklopu oblikovnih, oblikovnih kot tudi obestotvornih značilnosti.4

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

a – severnojadranski sistem ohranja praindovropski (pide.) *a (npr. Buctor – Fuctor, Hosti), medtem ko ima panonski sistem na vseh mestih *a (npr. panonsko Teutanas, (Aqua) Iasae);

b – kjer fonetika avtohtonih imen severnojadranskega sistema izkazuje or, ol ter an, am (*mortyo = lat. mortuus, Volti, *donasgan, Venimama), ima panonska vselej ur, ul, un, um (Acumincum, Pultia, Teutoburgium, Uli西亚);

c – za praindovropske pridihnjene zveneče soglasnike tipa *ḅh, *ḍh se vsaj na začetku beseved v okviru imen severnojadranskega kroga pojavlja odraz *f (frater – *brat’ < *hbṛa-ter-, Fuctor < *hbṛug-tor-, *hukst’ je napravil’ < *ḍhak), medtem ko panonska ohranja b, d (Teutoburgium, Andgautonia).

Ravno v okviru zadnje glasovne značilnosti se ižanski prostor dodatno potrjuje kot obrobe severnojadranske ploskev, saj ga opisana glasovna sprememba, ki se je iz italjskega prostora širila v vzhodni smeri, ni več dosegla, medtem ko je šmaratski pod sistem še prizadela, prim. šmaratsko Šeunonti- in Šeua (identično z venetskim *Eugont- – *Eugont- in *Eugou-) ob ižanskem Buctor (= venetsko *Fuctor) in Bugia (= venetsko *Fugia).

Na dejstvo, je to bilo središče severnojadranske ploskev, od koder so se proti vzhodu širile inovacije, ravno venetski prostor, dodatno opozarja odraz podedovanega indovropskog dvoglasnika *ey. Ta je v središču že zgodaj prestrel v *oy, 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 pod sistemov severnojadranskega areala, vključno z šmaratskim in ižanskim (prim. že nakazano razliko med šmaratskim *Feuont-, *Feua in osrednjim venetskim *Fouont, *Fouo), in ga proti jugu povezuje z italjskim.

Ižanska imena v odnosu do imen drugih pod sistemov severnojadranskega kroga loči tudi vrsta pomembnih arhaičnih potez in hkrati tudi nekaj inovacij v sklopu oblikotvorja in besedotvorja. Najpomembnejši arhaihazem je ohranitev ženskih osnov na *-onti (prim. starogrške deležnike na *-ovsa < *-o-nti tipa φέρονως ‘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 izprčani le v dajalniški funkciji Devontiae oz. Lasc(i)ontiae). V imenovalniku se pripona *-onti lahko potrjuje v zapisu Voltaronti na nagrobnem 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) ustrezneje prezaposnati latinsko adaptacijo izvorne dajalniške oblike. Če je interpretacija imenovalniškega zapisa Voltaronti = *Voltaronti (CIL III 3877) pravilna in ne gre za kratko i- osnovo, tj. Voltaronti(s) z neizpisanim izglasnim -s, se v imenu potrjuje izjemen arhaihazem, 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 ižanskem naravno niso deležniki tipa strg. φέρονως, kjer ima pripona *-onti tudi svoj najverjetnejši izvor. Temveč ženska imena, ki so bila tvorjena na podlagi moških imen na -on-, Slednje je jasno razvidno iz razmerja Voltaro = *Voltarón (m.) proti Voltaronti (ž.) = *Voltaronti. Pripona *-onti, ki sicer služi za tvorbo tvorovesedanjih deležnikov ženskega spola (tip sln. nesoča), izvorno predstavlja integralni del glagolskega sistema, vendar se jasno iz 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 kontinua, kakršan ji 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, Cetetiu (?), Manu in Tetiu. Ker so tovrstna imena pogosta tudi zunaj ižanskega prostora, in sicer primarno na območju južnega Norika, kjer se pripona pojavlja tudi pri značilnih galskih osebnih imenih (Caletiu, Suadrus, morda Caru, Aiut), 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 *-ūn pričakovali ravno *-ūn- (prim. galsko gentilino ime turtouva < *Toutōn-). Tak pogled pa se vendarle zdi preokez, saj posega po najpočetnejši razlagi, pri tem pa ne upošteva pomembnega dejstva, da do medistsemske izposoje običajno ne prihaja na ravni besedotvornih sredstev. Poleg tega cela vrsta tako tvorjenih noriških imen ni enoznačno in zagotovo galskih (Attu, Materiu, Mottu, Sucedu), zaporejda *ān-/ān-, 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 razpoložljive oblikotvorja (prim. venetsko pripono *-unko-) verjetno je namreč, da je *-ūn- pričakovalo ravnem *-ūn-. Poleg tega tudi še porednost v istem jezikovnem sistemu *-ūn-,*-ūn- v imenu, tj. portus 'prehod' < *ptu-, bi se namreč v primeru, da je avtohtona, v jezikovnem sistemu, ki je lahko hkratni vir ižanskih osebnih imen oz. je s tem jezikovnim sistemom soroden, glasil enako kot v latinskih.5

Starejše obravnave ižanskega imenskega fonda so poleg dominantne in jasno razvidne plasti imen, ki primarno sodijo 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 plastih keltskih imen na Ižanskem temeljti na napačni interpretaciji jezikovnih dejstev in je ne podpirajo niti zunajjezikovni, torej zgodovinska in arheološka dejstva, ki skupaj z jezikovnimi (razporeditev galskih osebnih in zemljepisnih imen v Evropi) zasirujo dokaj jasno sliko o galskih migracijah in s tem širjenju galskega jezika zunaj osrednjega galskega prostora. Za celotni fond keltskih imen je mogoče enako rjavna jezikovna reč, da je primarno rezultat galske kolonizacije, razpoložljivo jevno imen oz. je s tem jezikovnim sistemom soroden, glasil enako kot v latinskih.5

Kot zelo pomembno je treba omeniti tudi Stifterjevo ugotovitev (2012a), da fond ižanskih imen med leksikalnimi posebnostmi ohranja edinstveni imenski element *yl-tu- ‘volja, želja’ (< *yl-*tu-), karkršen je na primer izpričan v moških imenih Volto-paris in Volto-rex. Ta se na Ižanskem pojavlja poleg istopomenskega elementa *vol-tu- (Volto-rex, Volto-gnas) in predstavlja besedotvorno različico k varianti *yl-tu- < *yl-tu-, ki je močno razširjena v drugih severnojadranskih imenskih tradicijah,6 med avtohtonimi ižanskimi imeni pa je ni najti. To hkrati pomeni, da je *yl-tu- na Ižanskem avtohtona, t.i. pa se za ižanski pod sistem severnojadranske ploskve tudi neposredno potrjuje odraz ol za praindoevropski (pide.) *f. Iz tega je mogoče sklepati, da je bil vzporedno odraz ol odraz pide. *f v istem jezikovnem sistemu *or. Ta ugotovitev med drugim odpira zanimivo možnost, da se v naselbiskem 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. *ptu-, bi se namreč v primeru, da je avtohtona, v jezikovnem sistemu, ki je lahko hkratni vir ižanskih osebnih imen oz. je s tem jezikovnim sistemom soroden, glasil enako kot v latinskih.6

od 3. st. pr. n. št.), in sicer iz vzhodne, panonske smeri, kamor se je val razširil navzdol ob reki Donavi. Protor 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 kletizacija, 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 vidi, medtem ko je vpliv galske onomastične tradicije na emonski prostor izrazito omejen. Imena, kot je Exouña iz Male Žalne (CIL III 13403 = AJI 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 je razvidno, da je imen v Evropi. Tovršni 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 njun 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 *yolto- 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 prevodnost. Poleg tega je znano, da lahko osebna imena prebivajo 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.

Izjemo delikaten je prav tako kriterij, ki omogoča posplošitve o izvoru imena na podlagi imenskega konteksta, v katerem se na konkretnih napisih obravnavano imeno pojavijo. Če gre v takšnih primerih za večinsko galski imenski kontekst, se običajno 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 razkrive 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. Tovršni 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), vselej z 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 njun 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 *yolto- 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 prevodnost. Poleg tega je znano, da lahko osebna imena prebivajo 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.

Izjemo delikaten je prav tako kriterij, ki omogoča posplošitve o izvoru imena na podlagi imenskega konteksta, v katerem se na konkretnih napisih obravnavano imeno pojavijo. Če gre v takšnih primerih za večinsko galski imenski kontekst, se običajno...
tudi za ime, ki nima poznanega izvora in je etimološko nepregledno, posredno sklea 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. Tovrstni pristop je neustrezen, saj je slep ravno za pravkar omenjeno dejstvo o pruhajanju imen med onomastičnimi tradicijami, na kar med drugim opozarja primer Adnomatus, ki bi ga morali na podlagi zgolj zgolj tega kriterija označiti za avtohtono ižansko ime.7 Kriterij je zelo dovoljen tudi za krožno argumentacijo in argumentacijo e silentio, ki pa je z metodološkega gledeša brez vsakršne informativne vrednosti. Če namreč za imena, ki tvorijo neposredni kontekst, v katerem se obravnavano problematično ime pojavi, ni mogoče v celoti in enopačno 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 omogoča, da se v prvem prepozna pomembno razliko v interpretaciji obeh zaporedij elementa *-panonskem arealu. Enako velja za distribucijo elementa Voltu proti Volfi, ki v kombinaciji z pravilno etimološko interpretacijo obeh zaporedij omogoča, da se v prvem prepozna pomembno inovacijo, ki ižansko skupino imen nadalje loči od drugih onomastičnih podsystemov severnoja-dranskega kompleksa (gl. zgoraj).

Povsem neustrezen pa je v nasprotju s kontekstualnim in distribucijskim kriterijem pristop, ki jezikovnogenetski izvor imena ugotavlja na podlagi etimološke analize. V starejših obravnavah so v pod-

7 V obravnavah ižanskih imen so starejši raziskovalci kontekstualnih kriterij posodoba omenjavali na distribucijski kriterij, s čimer je bilo ime, kot je npr. Elia, označeno za galsko zgolj na podlagi kolokacije z imenom Buiio (Elia Buit 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 nadzadnje lahko privede celo do izkrivitve interpretacijske slike celotne zgodovinske situacije na ižanskem prostoru.

poro ugotovitvam tovrstnemu kriteriju pogosto dodajali navedbo obravnavanega problematičnega imena v korpusih, kakršen je Holderjev tezaver Alt-celtischer Sprachschutz (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 vpisalje.

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

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


Buga (v glavnem besedilu gl. pod Bucco) se etimološko neutemeljeno povezuje z galskim elementom *bugiā, ki se pojavlja v letoilih imenih tipa Ad-bugissa, Ad-bugi-ouāna, 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(1)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(t)ib e(t) Tetiu (CIL III 3861 = 10758; za Tetiu prim. CIL III 3814 = 10734), bi ne mogli zanesljivo ovreči morebitne galske etimologije imena (h gal. *kaito- ‘silva’) niti z uporabo strogih kriterijev etimološke analize. O pravilnosti tovrstne interpretacije pa je mogoče dvomiti iz drugačnih

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 vzporednice.¹⁰

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


Žensko osebno ime Devontia oz. Devontia so starejši avtorji¹¹ za galsko ime brez nadaljnega razglasili na podlagi domneve, da se v zaporedju Devo- ohranja pide. *dejɨ̃u- ‘bog’, in sicer v prvi vrsti zato, ker bi po pravilih glasovnega razvoja ravno v galščini (oz. prakeltščini nasploh), ko govorimo o nekdanjem besednem zlogu) pričakovali razvoj *dejiu-< *dejɨ̃u- ‘bog’. To etimološko interpretacijo moti zlasti dejstvo, da imen tovrstne strukture keltski jezik je vključno z galščino ne poznajo,¹² medtem ko je bilo ob primerjavi z imenom Voltarontia jasno prikazano, da model, po katerem se ženska imena tvorijo k moškim s pomočjo pripone *-(on)ti in kamor z veliko verjetnostjo sodo tudi obravnavano ime, dobro zasiran glasovno v okviru avtohtonega avtohtonega imenotvorja. Poleg tega ni nujno, da se v imenu Devontia ohranja prainvovočski etimom *dei̯u-, razvoj *ei v *e pa tudi ni samo keltski, temveč je dovolj splošen, da bi ga bilo mogoče teoretično predvideti tudi za ženski prostor, prim. latinsko

deus < *dēi̯u- < *dei̯u- (toda prim. ime Veji̯tro, ki morda vendarle kaže na ohranitev dvoglasnika *ei).

Ime Galunus je za nekelsko dediščino označil že Katičič (1968, 82), vendar ga kot verjetno galskega zpopet uvajata Hamp (1978, 60) in Meid (2005, 196),¹³ ki primerjata latinsko gentilno ime Gallonius in osebeni 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-<a>ä-<a> (ta se v galščini ohranja le v samostalniku *gal-atii-, k čemu prim. etnolod *Γαλάρτος) niti ni povezana. Poleg tega Galunus v nasprotju z Gallo-, Gallonius, Gallius ipd. izkazuje enojni -i-, ki zagotovo ni le grafične narave; izkazuje pa tudi zaporedje un-–namesto on-, ki ga kljub Meidu nikakor ni mogoče pojasniti na podlagi domnevnega galskega *Gallôn-.

Manu, gl. zgoraj pri omembi ženskih imen na -un-.

Nammo je običajno opredeljeno kot galsko ime¹⁴ na podlagi domneve, da gre za kratko, hipokoristično varianco (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 izanske imenske sfere in s tem tudi Nammo v primeru etimološke povezanosti obeh imen izanska in ne galska varianta daljšega imena.

Uccio (?), gl. spodaj.

Usu... nastopa v vlogi patronimika v filiaciji (Vibunnnja 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

¹¹ Katičič 1968, 75; Hamp 1978, 60; Meid 2005, 194.
¹² Kljub Hamp l.c.
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”.

Žensko osebno ime Venixama je na prvi pogled primerljivo z nedvomno galskim moškim imenom Venixamus ~ Venixamus, trikrat izpričanim na osrednjem galskem območju. V obek primerih gre za ime, osnovano na prezežniku (superlativu), ki je bil s pripomo *-isamo- < pide. *-is-Ho- tvorjen k pridevniku *yeni-ko- ‘prijateljski’, torej *yenik-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 galsčino kot v jezikovni sistem, ki je vir ižanskih imen, podedovana iz indoevropskega prajezika in poleg tega tudi razširjena v galščino, (-isso-), je AIJ, se gnā-s (~ < xs), k čemur med drugim prim. galsko žensko osebno ime Uxela (CIL III 13406).

Podoben in pomemben primer enakovzvočnih zaporadij, 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 AIJ, medtem ko za galščino ta (-isso-) razširjena tudi v galščini, (-isso-), je AIJ, se gnā-s (~ < xs), k čemur med drugim prim. galsko žensko osebno ime Uxela (CIL III 13406).

Dvodelna galska imena z elementom *-gno- se pojavljajo izključno v Galiji (deloma tudi Galiji cisalpini), medtem ko sta istopomska in neprimerno bolj pogosta elementa *-geno- in *-gnāo- razširjena po celotnem nekdanj galsko govorečem ozemlju. Tretja varianta, *-gento-, je drugim pozna venetština (prim. vo.l.tigno.s., Es 8). Imenski element *-g'nh₁(o) - s pomenom ‘(ki je) rojen’ je namereč kot drugi člen v dvodelnih osebnih imenih podedovan že iz prajezika in je zato v konkretnem primeru povsem trivijal indic za določanje izvora imena. Poleg tega gre lahko v primeru ižanskega elementa -gnus tudi zgolj za latinizirano varianto avtohtonega -gnus, 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 *(C_j)V C C_j(l)on- (m.) oz. *(C_j)VC C_j(j)ā (ž.), 17 ki v okviru ižanskih imen predstavljajo najpovečljivejšo imensko kategorijo, prim. *Aicco, *Amma, Buccus ~ Bucco ~ Bucca ~ Buccio, Buio, Butto, *Emmo, Enno ~ Enna ~ Emnia, 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 hipokoriščne pripone. Nabor teh pripom se razlikuje iz sistema v sistem; medtem ko je za galsčino značilen restrejši nabor pripom tipa -illo-, -ullo-, -isso- (gl. zgoraj), se za tvorbo tvorvstvih imen na Ižanskem potrjuje zlatja pripomona *-on-oz. *-jon- 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 povzeto z panonskim hipokoristikom Aicca (RIU 769), medtem ko so nekatere vzporednica z bolj oddaljenimi območji, zlasti pa z osrednjim galskim prostorom, neprepirčljive, saj so v metodološkem smislu povsem brez informativne vrednosti. Morfoška 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 enakovzvočna imena večinoma niso povezana na oz. vsaj ne morejo predstavljati kriterija, na podlagi katerega bi bilo metodološko upravičeno delati posplošitve o izvoru nekega imenskega fonda naslobo. 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 istopomska in neprimerno bolj pogosta elementa *-geno- in *-gnāo- 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 prepozna tudi na osrednjem galskem prostoru, njihovo prisotnost na Ižanskem pa razložil kot posledico starejših 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 (*Nanno, 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 se jih ižanski prostor deli z južnim Norikom, prim. *lasti *Butto, *Otto, *Petto, *Ucco (*,).19 Trenutno je gradivo preskopo, da bi bil mogoče bolj izostren vpogled v naravo razmerja med ižansko in južnorimsko imeno dediščino, vsekakor pa se zdi verjetno, da je ta povezava med ižanskim prostorom in severnojadranskem 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 -ius, kakor bi morda pričakovali, ponuja vpogled v avtohtono oblikotvorje osnov na *-jo- s soglasnikom pred pripono (v konkretnem primeru torej -n-jo-). Imena s tako strukturo so namreč dislocel in *končajem *Q(u)iemoni(s), 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 *-jos (→ latinizirano -ius), kar ga v sklopu drugih pod sistemov severnogalštanske ploskve druži vsaj z venetščino (prim. karinjsko-venetski patronimik *)Kayaron-jo-s *> *Kayaron-is, izpričano kot *kavaron:s ob številnih drugih zgledih tovrstnega razvoja izglašnega zaporedja *-jo-s v venetščini).

Ime *Q(u)iemoni(s) se na nagrobniku sicer pojavlja brez filiacije, kar je v primeru, da gre dejansko za osebno ime, za ižansko imeno 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 izjemo redka. Ižanska onomastika v večini primerov izkazuje enoimenski sistem z dvodelno filiacijo, kar pomeni, da osebnemu imenu sledi očetovo ime v obliki filiacije – ta vsebuje osebno ime očeta v rodilniku ednine in oznako *filius / filia, kar natančno ustreza latinijšemu zaporedju kognomen + filiacija, npr. *Venixema Pettonis filia) (CIL III 3820). Ta formula je značilna za celoten

Sklep

Na podlagi formalnih meril (glasoslovje, obliktorje, besedotvorje, skladnja), ki predstavljajo edini zanesljivi in metodološko neoporečni pristop k analizi imenskega fonda, lahko sklenemo, da v edini zanesljivi in metodološko neoporečni pristop namreč do nekaterih uspešnih primerov izkazuje enoimenski sistem z dvodelno filiacijo, kar pomeni, da osebnemu imenu sledi očetovo ime v obliki filiacije – ta vsebuje osebno ime očeta v rodilniku ednine in oznako *filius / filia, kar natančno ustreza latinijšemu zaporedju kognomen + filiacija, npr. *Venixema Pettonis filia) (CIL III 3820). Ta formula je značilna za celoten

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 okraševana, temveč polno funkcionalna imena.

19 Ime se na Ižanskem morda pojavlja enkrat, in sicer v obliki *Uccio (*AlJ 133), vendar branje ni zanesljivo. Za tekstnokritični komentar gl. glavno besedilo. Veranič, Repanšek 2016, 301–305), ki je bil kot izrazito nekelsko 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 možno 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 (*hapan legomenon) zaradi izrazito fragmentarne narave gradiha neposredna celotne problematike izvora ižanskih imen.
alpski prostor (zastopana je tudi na latiniziranih galskih napisih), medtem ko je za ostale pod sisteme severnojadranskega kroga, vključno s šmaratskim, že značilen prehod starih patronimikov v gentilna imena. Redkejši so primeri dvomenskega 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 = AJJ 142 = RINMS 88).

Edini jasni in dobro ohranjeni primer relatinskega gentilnega imena na Ižansku je ime Laepius (CIL III 3804 in 10731 = AJJ 134), ki pa po vsej verjetnosti ni avtohtono, na kar kaže tako njegova jasa povezava z jugoazahodnim predelom severnojadranskega kroga, prim. hristijsko Laep-oko-, liburnijsko Laep-iko- in venetsko Laep=on-jo- (vsaka gentilna imena), kot kolokacija z osebnim imenom Pletor, ki najverjetneje predstavlja imenski prehod. To pa ne etimološko povezuje na primer s *ē-map-, ter(H₁)lahko v zaporedju prepoznamo *ōnā, *Quiemonius ē-mon- (*kējē-), ki je bila latinski in s tem latinski grafiji tuja – v latinskih tovrstna podedovana enozložna zaporedja namreč regularno postanejo dvozložna (prim. quiē-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. funkcije enote, tj. morfeme, ki so razporejeni v logična zaporedja. To si 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 Quiemonis lahko v zaporedju prepoznamo tri morfeme: koren beseda *kējēH₁-, prvi sufiks *-mon- za tvorbo izglagolskega samostalnika *kējēH₁-mon- in drugi sufiks -jo-, ki je podstavni samostalnik *kējēH₁-mon- pretvoril v pridivek *kējēH₁=mon-jo-. Nemogoče bi bilo torej ime Quiemonis temeljeno naAlgorithmus izvemš, s čimer se bi prekršilo glavno pravilo, na katerem temelji celotno analitično jezikoslovje.

V pripomočni priponi *-jo- ohranja pridivek *kējē-mon-jo- > Quiemonis, ki bi pomensko, če je etimološka razlaga pravilna, še najbolje ustrezal latinskemu quiētus ‘miren’ oz. quiēscens ‘ki se umirja’. Strukturno vzporednico k pridiveku podstavi, na kateri temelji ime Quiemonis = *kējēmonis < *kējē-mon-jo-, je mogoče identificirati vsaj še v venetskem pridiveku *termon-jo- ‘končen, mejen’ (< *ki je v zvezi z mejo, mejnikom’) k pide. *ter(H₁,2)-mon-, kar se dalje ohranja v latinskem termō in starogrškim témpov ‘mejnik’.

V zapisu <QI-> (torej Qiemonis(s)) za pričakovano <QV1> bi se lahko prepoznalo redko napako (morda haplografskega izvora) ali namerno izpustitev elementa <V> v <QV> zaradi pomanjkanja prostora. Ni pa teoretično izključena možnost, da bi tak zapis utegnil odražati drugačno, enozložno izgovarjavo zaporedja *kējē-, ki je bila latinski in s tem latinski grafiji tuja – v latinskih tovrstna podedovana enozložna zaporedja namreč regularno postanejo dvozložna (prim. quiē-tus).

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