IV. GAULISH

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Gaulish is that Old Celtic language about which we are best informed – still it cannot be called a well-attested language. Gaulish in the strict sense is the Old Celtic language that was spoken in the area of modern France, ancient Gaul. An exception is Aquitain (= South-West France) where a separate language called Aquitanian (sometimes also called ‘Sorothaptic’), an early relative of Basque, is attested. In a wider sense all those Old Celtic parts of the European Continent may be said to belong to the Gaulish language area which do not belong to the Celtiberian or Lepontic language areas. This takes in a far stretch of lands from Gaul across Central Europe (Switzerland, South Germany, Bohemia, Austria), partly across Pannonia and the Balkans until Asia Minor (Galatia). Old British is usually included as well, and for some scholars Lepontic is only an archaic dialect of Gaulish. The linguistic remains of these areas, mainly placenames and personal names, very rarely non-onomastic material, do not exhibit differences from Gaulish beyond the trivial (e.g. Galat. PN Δειόταρος/Deiotarus = Gaul. *Dēotaros ‘bull of heaven’; ō, for which there was no letter in the classical Greek script, is either not written or has disappeared in front of o). Thus it seems appropriate to use the term ‘Gaulish’ in this broad sense. On the other hand, it should come as no surprise if new finds of texts outside of Gaul would reveal more decisive linguistics differences from Gaulish in the narrow sense, going beyond the mere ‘dialectal’. Perhaps one day we will have to speak of languages like Helvetian, Noric, Boïc, Galatian etc. Even in Gaul itself the numerous linguistic testimonies do not form a coherent picture, but display peculiarities that may reflect dialectal divisions.

Gaulish probably has the longest period of attestation of all Old Celtic languages. The first documents start to appear in the late 3rd c. BC. The lower end can not be determined precisely; for this question, see chapter 2.1. below.
Gaulish texts are attested for more than half a millennium, maybe even three quarters of a millennium. To better describe the blatant chronological differences in these texts it is necessary to divide the language into periods. The epigraphic, phonological, morphological and social criteria applied here allow a division into three periods (Early Gaulish, Middle Gaulish and Late Gaulish). The middle period is one of transition. Since most Gaulish texts can be dated only very roughly, by necessity all chronological statements must remain vague. Pierre-Yves LAMBERT ('Gaulois tardif et latin vulgaire', ZCP 49/50 (1997), 396–413) divides the language into two periods, Old Gaulish (gaulois ancien) and Late Gaulish (gaulois tardif). Despite the fragmentary attestation of Gaulish, enough material is known today to support the periodisation with sufficient examples, even though by necessity questions of dialectal subdivision or of absolute dates can only be tackled provisionally. Linguistic developments may have proceeded in different speeds at different places.
1. **Early Gaulish** covers the Gaulish inscriptions in the Greek and Lepontic alphabets, i.e. the Gallo-Greek and the Gallo-Etruscan texts, the earliest texts in the Roman alphabet, and Gaulish coinage. These texts have been edited mainly in RIG I, RIG II-1 and RIG IV. To this must be added material from the classical *Nebenüberlieferung* (transmission of Gaulish language material by Greek and Latin authors) in the pre-Christian period. In absolute dates this period runs from the 3rd to the 1st centuries B.C. and may have extended a little further into the first decades of the Christian era. This stage of the language is distinguished by archaisms in the vowel system and by fully fledged and intact inflectional endings. The main morphological archaisms are the gen. sg. of the ā-stems in -as, and the ā-stem acc. sg. in -an (-am). Occasionally, the loss of -s in word-final position can be observed, a feature that becomes much more prominent later. Sociolinguistically this period is distinguished by the fact that Gaulish is the primary means of communication in Gaul, being used – as far as we can tell – in all communicative situations.

2. **Middle Gaulish** is the Gaulish language approximately from the beginning of the Christian era until the 2nd c. A.D. Both the upper and the lower ends are vague. Typical for the Middle Gaulish period is the almost exclusive use of the Roman alphabet, frequently in its cursive variant. That a consciousness for a national Gaulish script did exist at the time can be gleaned from the use of peculiar letters (χ, ð, θ), inherited from earlier Gallo-Greek writing and used to represent sounds for which no letters existed in the Roman script. The language still resembles Early Gaulish to a large extent, only a few morphological changes have taken place. The gen. sg. of the ā-stems has become -ias instead of -as, the acc. sg. -in (-im) instead of -an (-am). The longish inscriptions from Chamalières and Larzac, the potters’ graffiti from La Graufesence, the calendars and numerous ‘private texts’ (legends on pottery, etc.) can be ascribed to this period. The lead-plate from Chartres (found 2011), which belongs to the earliest part of this period, shows considerable loss of final -s and perhaps (although very uncertain) of final -n. This indicates that the apparent retention of final nasals and sibilant in Chamalières and Larzac could be due to Latinate school influence. The texts have been edited mainly in RIG II-2 and RIG III. A sociolinguistic change has taken place. During the 1st c. A.D. a process of urbanisation and Romanisation sets in, that slowly transforms Gaulish society and consequently the sociolinguistic situation. The primary language of administration and perhaps also of long-distance trade is now Latin. Gaulish is no longer used in all communicative situations, but is slowly receding to private and to rural environments. As with Middle Irish, Middle Gaulish displays no features that would make it tangible as such, but it is better conceived of a transition from one state (Early Gaulish) to another (Late Gaulish).

3. **Late Gaulish** refers to the final period of Gaulish until its death at an indetermined date around or after the middle of the 1st mill. A.D. The most important phonological innovation observable in the inscriptions is the general loss of all final s and n (m), even though there are cases of the loss (or non-spelling) of s already earlier in Gaulish. Some evidence points to phonetic lenition word-internally. Texts from this period are rarer than from the preceding one. The most important documents are the tile from Châteaubleau (found 1997), the lead-plate from Rezé (found 2009) and, with some reservation, Endlicher’s Glossary. The texts have been edited mainly in RIG II-2. Those documents that have come down to us do not give the impression of a language spoken by half-competent speakers, but of a language that is still undergoing its own developments, even though under strong influence from the Latin-Romance superstrate. Sociolinguistically we have to reckon with a further pull-back of the language from the urban centres into rural retreats, accompanied by a loss of social prestige of its speakers.
2.1. EXTERNAL TESTIMONEYS FOR GAULISH IN LATE ANTIQUITY

The most important extra-linguistic pieces of evidence for the survival of Gaulish in the middle of
the 1st mill. A.D. are passing remarks by late-antique authors. Unfortunately, these testimonies are
mostly ambiguous and vague.

1. Irenaeus of Lugdunum (2nd c.) says in his introduction to Adversus Haereses I, praef. 3: Non autem
exquirets a nobis, qui apud Celtas commoramus et in barbarum sermonem plerumque uacamus, orationis artem […] (Οὐκ ἐπικήνησας δὲ παρ’ ἡμᾶς, τῶν ἐν Κέλτοις διωτριβήντων καὶ περὶ βάρβα-
ρον διάλεκτον τὸ πλέστον ἀγχολουμένον, λόγον τέχνην […] ‘Do not expect rhetorical art from
us, who live with the Celts and usually conduct our businesses in the barbarian tongue (?)’, […]’

2. Aulus Gellius (born between 110 and 130 A.D.) relates the following episode in his collection Noctes Atticae (composed ca. 180):

uelti Romae nobis praesentibus uetus celebratursque homo in causis, sed repentina et quasi
tumultuaria doctrina praeditus, cum apud praefectum urbi uerba facerit et dicere uellet inopi
quendam miseroque uiuere et furfurium panem esitare uinumque erit. ‘hic’, inquit, ‘eques Romanus apludam edit et flocces bibit’, aspexerunt omnes qui aderant alius
alium, primo tristiores turbato et requirenti uoltu quidnam utriusque uerbi foret: post deinde,
quasi nescio quid Tusce aut Gallice dixisset, uniuersi riserunt.

‘For instance in Rome in our presence, a man experienced and celebrated as a pleader, but furnish-
ed with a sudden and, as it were, hasty education, was speaking to the Prefect of the City, and
wished to say that a certain man with a poor and wretched way of life ate bread from bran and
drank bad and spoiled wine. ‘This Roman knight’, he said, ‘eats apluda and drinks flocces.’ All
who were present looked at each other, first seriously and with an inquiring expression, wondering
what the two words meant; thereupon, as if he might have said something in, I don’t know, Gaulish
or Etruscan, all of them burst out laughing.’ (after BLOM 2007: 183)

It is unclear whether this episode truly relates to Gellius’ own time or is a literary anecdote from an
earlier period.

3. The Greek satirist Lucian (ca. 120 – after 180) informs us in his pamphlet against the pseudo-
prophet Alexandros (around 180) about the use of interpreters in Paphlagonia (northeast of Galatia):
ἀλλὰ καὶ βαρβάρους πολλάκις ἔρχεσθε, εἰ τῆς τῆς πατρίος ἔροιτο φονή, Συριστὶ ἡ Κέλπτστι, ῥαδίος
ἐξερήσκοι τών ἑπιήμονών ὁμοθέτως τοῖς δεδοκόσιν. ‘He gave oracles to barbarians many
times, given that if someone asked a question in his native language, in Syrian or in Celtic, he
easily found residents of the same people as the questioners’ (after Eugenio Luján, ‘The Galatian
Place Names in Ptolemy’, in: Javier de Hoz, Eugenio R. Luján, Patrick Sims-Williams (eds.), New
Approaches to Celtic Place-Names in Ptolemy’s Geography, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 2005,
263). Lucian writes about a current situation encountered by himself; the case for a living Celtic
language in 2nd-century Galatia is quite good.

4. In the Digesta XXXII, 11 of Ulpian (222–228) it is decreed that fideicommissa (testamentary pro-
visions) may also be composed in Gaulish: Fideicommissa quocumque sermone relinqui possunt, non solum Latina uel Graeca, sed etiam Punic a Gallicana uel alterius cuiscumque gentis
‘Fideicommissa may be left in any language, not only in Latin or Greek, but also in Punic or Gal-
licanian or of whatever other people.’

5. The best known piece of evidence for Late Gaulish is found in St. Jerome’s (331–420) commentary
on St. Paul’s letter to the Galatians, written in the year 386/7. In it he says that the language of the
Treveri in the Belgica is similar to that of the Galatians: Galatas excepto sermone Graeco, quo
omnis orien loquitur, propriam linguam eandem paene habere quam Treuiores ‘Apart from the
Greek language, which is spoken throughout the entire East, the Galatians have their own language,
almost the same as the Treveri’ (Commentarii in Epistulam ad Galatas II, 3 = Patrologia Latina
26, 357). Even though St. Jerome spent some time both with the Treveri (370) and with the Galat-
ians (373/4), this statement need not be based on his personal experience, but could reflect a liter-
ary commonplace taken from a now lost work of an author like Varro.
6. An episode of the *Historia Augusta* (dated around the turn of the 5th c., A.D.), ascribed to the historian Lampridius, tells about a druidess who prophesies to emperor Alexander Severus (222–235) in Gaulish: *mulier Druias eunti exclamavit Gallico sermone* (*Historia Augusta, Alexander Severus* LX, 6). The *Historia Augusta*, however, is a notoriously fictitious work of history, as are its alleged authors. The episode has not the slightest evidential value (see Andreas Hofeneder, ‘Die ‘Druidinnen’ der *Historia Augusta*, Keltische Forschungen 3 (2008)).

7. In the *Dialogi de Vita Martini* I, 26 by Sulpicius Severus (363–425), one of the partners in the dialogue utters the rhetorical commonplace that his deficient Latin might insult the ears of his partners. One of them answers: *vel Celtice aut si mauis Gallice loquire dummodo Martinum loquis* ‘speak Celtic or, if you prefer, Gaulish, as long as you speak about Martin’. The context, however, does not allow to decide if the Gaulish language, as we understand it, is meant, or perhaps a vulgar pronunciation of Latin in Gaul.

8. In his book on magical medicine *De Medicamentis*, Marcellus, usually called ‘of Burdigala’ (4th/5th c.) cites a few spells and charms that traditionally have been ascribed to Gaulish (edited in Wolfgang Meid, *Heilpflanzen und Heilsprüche. Zeugnisse galischer Sprache bei Marcellus von Bordeaux [= Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 63], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft 1996). But Marcellus makes nowhere the statement that those charms are Gaulish. Indeed, most of them rather conform to standard types of ‘magical language’ in the ancient world, that is, they are not taken from an actual language, but they vaguely resemble exotic words. BLOM (2007: 58–102) has argued convincingly that these spells have no evidential value for Gaulish. On the other hand, a few plant names transmitted by Marcellus probably are of Gaulish origin, but they need not be taken from the living language.

9. Sidonius Appollinaris of Lugdunum writes after 471 in a letter to his relative Ecdicius (*Epistulae* III, 3, 2): *sermonis Celtici squamam depositura nobilitas nunc oratorio stilo, nunc etiam Camenalius modis imbuebatur* ‘the (Arvernian) nobility, wishing to cast off the scales of Celtic speech, will now be imbued (by him = Ecdicius) with oratorical style, even with tunes of the Muses’. This is a highly rhetorical, clichéd statement, which does not allow any inferences about the state of the language.

10. In the *Vita Sancti Symphoriani*, supposedly not older than the middle of the 5th c., it is told that when the Christian martyr Symphorianus of Augustodunum (165–180) was being led to the execution stand, *venerabilis mater sua de muro sedula et nota illum uoce Gallica monuit dicens: ‘nate, nate Symporiante, mentobeto to diuo* ‘his venerable mother admonished him from the wall eagerly and notably to all (?), saying in the Gaulish speech: “Son, son, Symphorianus, think of your God!”’ (Rudolf Thurneyssen, *Irisches und Gallicas*, ZCPH 14 (1923), 10–11). The Gaulish sentence has been transmitted in a very corrupt state in the various manuscripts; as it stands, it has been reconstructed by Thurneyssen. *mentobeto* looks like a Proto-Romance verb derived from *Latin mens, mentis* ‘mind’ and habere ‘to have’, and it cannot be excluded that the whole utterance is an early variant of Romance, or a mixture of Gaulish and Romance, instead of being an instance of pure Gaulish.

11. Cassiodorus (ca. 490–585 A.D.) cites in his book *Variae* VIII, 12, 7 (dated 526 A.D.) from a letter to king Athalaric: *Romanum denique eloquium non suis regionibus inuenisti et ibi te Tulliana lectio dissertum reddidit, ubi quondam Gallica lingua resonauit* ‘Finally you found Roman eloquence in regions that were not originally its own; and there the reading of Cicero rendered you eloquent where once the Gaulish language resounded’ (after BLOM 2007: 188). Again, this is purely rhetorical piece of prose without much value as evidence.

12. *Endlicher’s Glossary* is a short Gaulish-Latin vocabulary, preserved in a manuscript of the 9th c. (Öst. Nationalbibliothek, MS 89 fol. 189v). In my opinion, some of the words are taken from Gregory of Tours’ *Historia Francorum* (nr. 9 above) and must therefore logically be subsequent to that. Other words give an indication that the wordlist was compiled in Germanic environments in Gaul. But it is not certain if *Endlicher’s Glossary* reflects the state of a still living language or was compiled out of merely antiquarian interest in a dead language.
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13. In the 6th century Cyril of Scythopolis tells a story about a Galatian monk who was possessed by an evil spirit and was unable to speak, but if forced to, could only speak in Galatian: εἰ δὲ πάνυ ἕβη-
ἀξίζο, Γαλατιστὶ ἐψῆγγεν. ‘If he was forced to, he spoke in Galatian’ (Vita S. Euthymii 55; after Eugenio Luján, ‘The Galatian Place Names in Ptolemy’, in: Javier de Hoz, Eugenio R. Luján, Patrick Sims-Williams (eds.), New Approaches to Celtic Place-Names in Ptolemy’s Geography, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 2005, 264). In view of the isolated and late reference, it may not be excluded that it refers to a particularly incomprehensible dialect or accent of Greek.

14. Numerous authors throughout the imperial period made references to the meanings of Gaulish words (see Blom 2007: 166–201), but usually no inferences on the contemporary state of the Gaulish language can be made. For example, in Gregory of Tours’ Historia Francorum I, 32 and Venantius Fortunatus’ Carmina I, 9, 9 f. – both Merovingian authors of the 6th c. – Gaulish words are mentioned and translated. This does not mean that the language was still living at the time. Knowledge of isolated words may have been independently transmitted in learned circles.

3. THE WRITING OF GAULISH

At least three different writing systems were used in the course of history to write Gaulish. The Gauls invading Northern Italy in the 4th/3rd cs. BC took over the local variant of the North Etruscan script from the Lepontians in order to write their own language, Cisalpine Gaulish (‘Gallo-Etruscan inscriptions’; see chap. II.8–10).

In Transalpine Gaul, the Greek alphabet was used from the late 3rd c. B.C. (after the 2nd Punic War). The height of the production of ‘Gallo-Greek inscriptions’ was in the century after the Roman conquest of southern Gaul (Gallia Narbonensis), i.e. from 125–25 B.C. This orthographic tradition was largely limited to the delta of the Rhône, i.e. the hinterland of the Greek city-state Massalia, which served as the starting point for the slowly spreading alphabetisation of the Gauls. Maybe the Greek alphabet was used beyond this rather small area, although the archaeological support for this is weak.

There are a few literary accounts. Poseidonius (transmitted in Diodorus’ Βιβλιοθήκη V 28,6) arguably writes about the situation in the Provincia Narbonensis: διὸ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν τετελευτηκό-
tων ἕνιος ἐπιστολὰς γεγραμμένας τοῖς οἰκείοις τετελευτηκόσιν ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τὴν πυρὰν, ὡς τῶν τετε-
λευτηκότων ἀναγνωσομένους ταύτας. ‘At the funerals of their deceased some therefore throw letters into the fire; they write them because they think that the deceased will read them.’ Caesar in the Commentarii de Bello Gallico talks about Gaulish tribes outside the Narbonensis, on the one hand concerning the Helvetii: in castris Helvetiorum tabulae repertae sunt litteris Graecis confectae [...] quibus in tabulis nominatin ratio confecta erat, qui numeros domo exisset, qui arma ferre posset, et item separatim pueri, senes mulieresque ‘in the camp of the Helvetic tablets in Greek script were found [...] on these tablets lists by names had been made as to how many had left their homes, who were capable of bearing arms, and separately boys, old men and women’ (BG I 29,1); on the other hand concerning the Gauls in general: neque fas esse existimant eas litteris mandare, cum in reliquis fere rebus, publicis priusque rationibus, Graecis litteris utantur ‘they [= the druids] consider it a sacrilege to give it [= their sacred knowledge] over to letters, while they use the Greek script for all other matters, public and private’ (BG VI 14,3). In Switzerland two short inscriptions in Greek letters were found, one of which apparently stems from the period of Roman provincial rule. In the oppidum of Manching, Bavaria, two short inscriptions in Greek letters from the 1st c. B.C. (La Tène D) were found.

After the Roman conquest of Gaul the Roman alphabet seems to have replaced the Greek script rather soon. Only in isolated pockets like the oppidum of Alesia the Greek script remained in use for another century until the period of Nero. The Gaurs retained two or three letters of the Greek alphabet in order to render specifically Gaulish sounds for which no letters existed in the Latin script (‘Gallo-Latin inscriptions’).

3.1. GAULISH IN ETRUSCAN SCRIPT

See the chapter about Cisalpine Gaulish II.8–10.
3.2. GAULISH IN GREEK SCRIPT

1. On stone inscriptions, only capital letters (‘majuscules’) were used. For the purpose of transcription, today mainly lower-case letters (‘minuscules’) are being used. Because of the relatively small number of texts, some of the orthographic conventions are not totally clear.

2. In Galatian names in the Greek script, ει apparently can stand for εj or ē (e.g. Δείταρος = *dēotaros or deiotaros), v for *ū (e.g. δρονέμετον < *drū).
The Greek alphabet used for Gaulish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>stands for Gaul.</th>
<th>notes</th>
<th>also Lat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Α α</td>
<td>alpha</td>
<td>a, ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β β</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ γ</td>
<td>gamma</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>= n before γ and κ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ δ</td>
<td>delta</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε ε</td>
<td>epsilon</td>
<td>e, ē</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζ ζ</td>
<td>zeta</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Η η</td>
<td>eta</td>
<td>e, (ē ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Θ θ  | theta | tau gallicum | usually double θθ | ✓
| Ι ι  | iota | i, ï, ï | | |
| Κ κ  | kappa | k | | |
| Λ λ  | lambda | l | | |
| Μ μ  | my | m | | |
| Ν ν  | ny | n | also before γ and κ! | |
| Ξ ξ  | xi | χs | | |
| Ο ο  | omikron | o | | |
| Π π  | pi | p | | |
| Ρ ρ  | rho | r | | |
| Σ σς | sigma | s | | |
| Τ τ  | tau | t | | |
| Υ υ  | ypsilon | – | only together with o | |
| Φ φ  | phi | – | not used | ✓
| Χ χ  | chi | χ | | ✓
| Ψ ψ  | psi | – | not used | |
| Ω ω  | omega | o, (ō, ou ?) | usually in the form ω | |
| ΑΥ αυ | – | au | | |
| ΕΙ ει | – | i, (i) | also ei ? | |
| ΟΥ OY | – | u, ū, y | ουυ = ωυ, #ουρ/λ = υρ/λ | |
| ΩΥ ου | – | ou ? | | |
| Αδ | – | tau gallicum | only in Lat. texts? | ✓

Ill. 3.2.: The Greek alphabet used for Gaulish.
3.3. GAULISH IN LATIN SCRIPT

Inscriptions in the Roman alphabet can be found on the entire territory of ancient Gaul and beyond its borders. Monumental stone inscriptions from Gaul in the imperial period use Roman capital letters, which are identical to our modern scripts. Differences from our modern usage are the use of an over-long I (I longa) (for ?) and the occasional use of two parallel hastae II for E.

Most Gaulish texts on other materials are written in the Roman cursive script, a shorthand variant of the Roman alphabet employed for everyday purposes. The reduced shapes of its letters, often taking on a very linear appearance, is due to the material written upon (lead, pottery, wax, etc.). The Roman cursive script is very difficult to read. Not infrequently this has consequences for the interpretation of Gaulish texts. The tables following below will provide a survey of the formal variation of cursive letters. The examples are taken from an extensive body of Gaulish texts, but note that some of the best known lead tablets have not been taken into account (Chamalières, Rom). Note also:

1. the typical cursive letters for e and f, consisting of two strokes; two-stroked e is sometimes even used in inscriptions in capital script.
2. long i (i longa) (for ?) beside i with normal height.
3. x as a sign for Lat. x to represent /ks/ and Vulgar Latin /s/, and as the Greek letter chi to represent /χ/.
4. barred Gr. delta and theta as signs for tau Gallicum.
5. for tau Gallicum, barred double ss is also used (e.g. Châteaubleau), this is missing in the tables.

|   | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | i | l | m | n | o | p | r | s | t | u | x,
| M.1 | A | B | C | D | U | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.4 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.14 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.23 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.30 | A | B | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.32 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.34 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.46 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.47 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.49 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.66 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.74 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.76 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.85 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.88 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.90 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |
| M.94 | A | B | B | C | D | I | L | M | N | P | A | S | T | S | T | X | B | Θ |

III. 3.3.: Latin cursive script on pottery from La Graufesenque (from: RIG II-2, 370).
|   | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | l | m | n | o | p | q | r | s | t | u | x |
| 23.5.a |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 27 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30a |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30b |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30d |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30e |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30f |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30g |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30h |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30i |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30j |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30k |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 30l |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 33-34 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.4 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.5 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.6 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 35.7 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

III. 3.4.: Latin cursive script (from: RIG II-2, 376).
Ill. 3.5.: Latin cursive script (from: RIG II-2, 377).
III. 3.6.: Latin cursive script (from: RIG II-2, 378).
Ill. 3.7.: Sites of Gallo-Latin inscriptions (from: RIG II-2, 11).
4. A THORNY PROBLEM OF GAULISH PHONOLOGY

The phonological system of Gaulish, possibly also of Lepontic, contains a specific sound that is traditionally called *tau Gallicum* after a passage in Vergil’s *Catalepton* 2, 4:

Corinthiorum amator iste uerborum,
iste iste rhetor, namque quatenus totus
Thucydides, tyrannus Atticae febris:
tau Gallicum, min et sphin ut male illsit,
ita omnia ista uerba miscuit fratri.

That lover of Corinthian words,
that… that rhetor! Even though being a complete
Thucydides, he is a tyrant of the Attic fever:
how he badly belched (?) the *tau Gallicum*, the
min and sphin,
thus he mixed all those words for his brother.

It is uncertain if the sound *tau Gallicum* that Vergil mentions is the same sound as the one for which the term is used today. Today it denotes a phoneme of only roughly known value that is represented by a great number of different spellings in Gaulish and possibly also Lepontic inscriptions:

Roman: t, tt, th, d, dd, d, dd, ts, ds, s, ss, sc, sd, st
Greek: θ, θθ, σ, σσ, σθ, τ, ττ
Lepontic script: san, zeta, sigma

E.g.: *medddu-, messu-, μισσου-, medi-, μεθθυ-, μεθ-, medsi-, medi- < PIE *medtu-i-

Wherever etymological speculations are possible, this phoneme, if it is one, goes back to earlier *Ds, *st and *Dt (D = any dental obstruent). Etymologically, it clearly corresponds to Insular Celtic s < *ss in word-initial and -internal position (against *s that first became *h, then Ø in Insular Celtic word-internally); e.g.:

PIE *med-tu- ‘judgement’: Gaul. *mediu- etc., OIr. *mess
PIE *melit-to- ‘sweet’: Gaul. *melikiyo- etc., OIr. *milis, Cym. *melys
PIE *tud-to- ‘pushed’: Gaul. *tuθθus ‘loads’
PIE *g′osti- ‘guest, stranger’: Lep. *uvamokozis, *gosiosio (?)
Pre-Celt. *is-to- ‘this’: Lep. *išos

Sometimes *tau Gallicum* can also stand for strong, intensified (?) s:

PIE *mεh,ns ‘month’, Gaul. *mε̂d, OIr. *mis-
also in acc. pl. Lep. *siTeš, Cisalpine Gaul. *artuaš?

and perhaps also for analogically re-introduced, strongly pronounced word-internal s, in opposition to regularly weakened (lenited?) intervocalic s:

Pre-Celt. *byšje ‘to want to become’, Gaul. *bissiet ‘will be’, *bissiete ‘you will be’ (?)

No conclusive evidence for a comparable sound exists for Celtiberian. Inherited *st is retained in Celtiberian, e.g. *stena, boutom. Other combinations of dental sounds and s may already have been simplified to mere s(s). The many orthographic variants in Gaulish suggest that this sound had no direct equivalent in Latin and Greek, and that it featured a dental (because of the frequent spellings with d, t,…) and a fricative component (because of s, θ,…). The frequent double spellings and etymo-
logical considerations furthermore suggest gemination, i.e. prolonged pronunciation. Many phonetic suggestions for this sound have been proposed (see ESKA 1998: 116), but according to the 
communis opinio it probably was a geminate affricate [t']. On the basis of a few forms where tau Gallicum in Gaulish cannot be derived from dental clusters or from *st, i.e.:

eddic ‘and’ (cp. etic < *eti-k[e], unless it is *esti-k[e])
gnatha ‘girl’ (cp. nata < *ghy.to- ‘born’)
modiuro (cognate with Lat. maturus?)
[C]athuboduae (to Gaul. catu- ‘battle, war’)
buet ‘may be’ (cp. buet=id, deworbuet=id)

but where the sign perhaps represents lenited t, ESKA assumes that tau Gallicum may have stood for the so-called slit-t, a sound peculiar, for example, to Southern Hiberno-English.

Literature:

5. BASIC LITERATURE ABOUT GAULISH

Since Gaulish is by far the best researched Old Celtic language, the number of publications devoted to it is enormous compared to Lepontic and Celtiberian. This is especially true for specialised studies. Therefore I will restrict myself to the most important handbooks and introductions.
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6. GAULISH TEXTS

The material discussed here represents a collection of the more interesting texts. Short fragments and severely damaged pieces will be ignored.

6.1. GALLO-GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

For the greatest part, the Gallo-Greek inscriptions come from a small area at the mouth of the river Rhône, in the North-Western *hinterland* of the Greek city-state Massalia. Gallo-Greek inscriptions usually do not extend beyond half a dozen words. At the moment about 300 texts are known, most of them fragmentary, consisting of only a few letters. Gallo-Greek inscriptions are mostly written in *scriptura continua*; in the transcription, however, I will insert spaces at the probable word boundaries.

III. 6.1.: The area of distribution of Gallo-Greek inscriptions (from: RIG I, 2).
Ill. 6.2.: The central area of distribution of Gallo-Greek inscriptions (from: RIG I, 16).
6.1.1. GRAVE INSCRIPTIONS (STÈLES)

κογγενν
ολιτανο
ζ καρθυλίτα
νιος

6.1.1.2. G-3 (Coudoux, Bouches-du-Rhône):
[α]τεσθας
[σ]μερτου
[ρ]ειγιος

6.1.1.3. G-4 (Coudoux, Bouches-du-Rhône):
σεκειος
δουγύλιος

6.1.1.4. G-68 (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône)
(together with G-69):
ουριττα
κος ηλο
υσκονι
ος

6.1.1.5. G-69 (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône)
(together with G-68):
βιμμος
λιτουμ
αρεος
6.1.1.6. G-70 (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône):
εινο[υ]
tιορείς
esκαγγορ
[τ]ουι

6.1.1.7. G-71 (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône):
μεδουρείς
λι[του]μαρεος

oυεντοοουτα
cουαδρουνια

εκκαιος | ουμ[πι]
esκαγγο | ιλα · α
μαριος | διατους
| σια

6.1.1.10. G-118 (Cavaillon, Vaucluse):
καβιρος ουν
dιακος

6.1.1.11. G-119 (Cavaillon, Vaucluse):
μισσο
υκος
σιλου
κνος

6.1.1.12. G-120 (Cavaillon, Vaucluse):
βαλαυδο
υι μακκαριο
υι

6.1.1.13. G-121 (Cavaillon, Vaucluse):
ελουισσα
μαγουρει
γι αουα

ατες · ατ
 [ε]μαγου
 τι · οννα
 [κ]ουι

6.1.1.15. G-146 (Gargas, Vaucluse): εσκεγγαί βλανδοουικούνιαι


αδγεννορι[ι]οτερε[ι]ομαρε[ο]υι

6.1.1.17. G-152 (Saint-Saturnin-d’Apt, Vaucluse):

ουαλικκ
 ονερεστ[ι]
 οιουνια[ι]

6.1.1.18. G-163 (Beaucaire, Gard):

a: υεμουριοιτελλ
 b: [..]ειατεγλουςσι
 c: ουι τουτουνια
 d: ια[..]ιανττεουτο


εσκιγγο
 ρειξ κο
 νόύλλε
 ος

6.1.1.20. G-224 (Montagnac, Hérault):

αλλετ[ει]νος καρνονου αλ[ι]σο[ντ]εας
6.1.2. DEDICATORY INSCRIPTIONS, ESP. INSCRIPTIONS WITH THE FORMULA ΒΡΑΤΟΥ ΤΕΚΑΝΤΕΜ/Ν

ουηβρουμαρος
dede taranouν
βρατου δεκαντεμ


6.1.2.2. G-28 (Saint-Chamas, Bouches-du-Rhône):
πορειξ ιουγιλλιακος δεδε βελεινο ↑ βρατου

6.1.2.3. G-64 (Glanum = Saint-Rémy-en-Provence, Bouche-du-Rhône):
ματρε
βο γλα
νείκα
βο βρα
tου δε
καντεμ

III. 6.9.: G-64 (from MEID 1992: 26).

6.1.2.4. G-65 (Glanum = Saint-Rémy-en-Provence, Bouche-du-Rhône):
[κ]ορηνηλια ρο
[κ]λοισιαβο
βρατου δεκαντ

III. 6.10.: G-65 (from LAMBERT 2003: 89).

6.1.2.5. G-108 (Vitrolles, Bouches-du-Rhône):
πιουαλος αδρε[
]ς πραιτον σομα[
]αρρος αττονιο[ε]

6.1.2.6. G-151 (Robion-Saignon, Vaucluse):

6.1.2.7. G-153 (Vaison-la-Romaine, Vaucluse):
σεγομαρος ουιλλονεος τοουτιους ναμαυσατις ειωρου βηλη σαμι σοσιν νεμητον


6.1.2.8. G-154 (Villelaure, Vaucluse):
ουατιοουνουι σο νεμε τος κομμου εσκεγγιλου

6.1.2.9. G-183 (Collias, Gard):
ekιλιο 
ζ ρ·ου μαν[ι]
ος αν 
δουυ[ν] 
ναβο δ(ε)
δ(ε) βρατο 
[υ] δεκαν 
[τ]εν

6.1.2.10. G-203 (Nîmes, Gard):
[αρταρ[ος ι]λλανουιακος δεδε ματρεβο ναμαυσικαβο βρατο δε

6.1.2.11. G-206 (Nîmes, Gard):
κασσι – ταλος 
ουερσι – κνος δ 
eδε βρ – ατου δ 
ekαντ – εν αλα 
?εινο – υι
6.1.2.12. G-528 (Nîmes, Gard):

[v]ερτο[ – ]βοιον
[kv]ος [v] – μαρος
ανδους[ιτες – ] μαδερα
[.]εωραι [ – ]ικναι
[…]ε[…]ο[ – ]ικασι[…] 

6.1.3. Besitz-, Hersteller- und sonstige Inscriptionen


εσκεγγολατι ανια<τει>ος ιμμι


6.1.3.2. G-257 (Alise-Sainte-Reine, Centre-Est):

σαμ[ο]τα[λο][ζ] αυουωτ [ 
σες[.][λαμα][.] γαρμα[ 
βιρακοτωντι[.]ανο[ 
κοβριτουλω[.]β:ατ[ 
διο[ 

6.1.3.3. G-271 (Saint-Germain-Source-Seine, Centre-Est):

δαγολιτους · αυοωυ[τ] 

6.1.3.4. G-275 (Mailly-le-Camp, Aube), torques:

νιτοβρογειας 

6.1.3.5. G-279 (Vallauris, Alpes-Maritimes), becher:

ουενικοι μεδου 

6.1.3.6. G-280 (Port, Kn. Bern), schwert:

κορισιος
6.1.3.7. G-556 (Cavaillon, Vaucluse):
[ι]οοιγκορειξ
[ου]ελτουος
ηλιος
λερε
τ
[εκτου]
[οσσον]

6.1.3.8. oppidum of Manching, fragment of a bottle:
βοιος

Ill. 6.14.: Inscription from Manching (drawing after the photograph in Werner Krämer, ‘Graffiti auf Spätlaténeramik aus Manching’, Germania 60 (1982), 494).

6.1.3.9. L-106 (Bern, Thormebodenwald):
ΔΟΒΝΟΡΗΔΟ
ΓΟΒΑΝΟ
ΒΡΕΝΔΩΡ
ΝΑΝΤΑΡΩΡ

Ill. 6.15.: L-106 (handout STÜBER 2003).