EARLY CELTICITY IN SLOVENIA AND AT RHAETIC MAGRÈ (SCHIO)

From the area around lakes Maggiore and Como in the west clear across the northern alpine crest of the Italian peninsula to the Balkans (albeit primarily in Slovenia) in the east we find the following varieties of early Continental Celtic: Golaseccan /Lepontic (with highly archaic features by virtue of dramatically early attestation, ca. 550-350 BC); Camunic (meagerly recorded, etymologically opaque, but, if anything, probably mainly Celtic) in Valcamonica north of Lago d’Iseo, also beginning about 550 BC; Rhaeto-Celtic (also but fragmentarily recorded, ca. 450-40 BC) from various sites such as Vadenà (Pfatten) south of Bolzano (Bozen) in the Fritzens Sanseno and Magrè Horizons; Carnian (northward from Udine, evidenced chiefly by onomastics, e.g. present-day Cadore < *Catubrigum ‘battle-mount’) and East Celtic in southwestern Austria and the Balkans (again but fragmentarily retrievable from, for example, Magdalensberg and the onomastics retrievable from Roman necropoli such as that at Ig south of the Ljubljana marshes; see Hamp [1976, 1978]).

Although not generally recognized as such by Celticists, a carpenter’s chance find in November of 1912 of what became known as the Magrè staghorn votives remains the single most dramatic heuristic event for mapping early Celticity in northeastern Italy; cf. Solinas (1992-1994), who omits Magrè from her otherwise exhaustive survey of Celtic materials.

The initial discovery of these Rhaetic votives was made below the Collina del Castello (acropolis) escarpment at Magrè, a town in the Leogra Valley near Schio in the Veneto, some twenty miles northwest of Vicenza. Previously, however, Vicenza and its environs had been portrayed archaeologically as Venetic, rather than Rhaetic; see Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:1.380-381). The Magrè find thus proved surprising in every way, and it soon became known to two prominent local authorities, Giuseppe Pellegrini (1866-1918) and A lfonso Alfonsi (? – 1922). Pellegrini was a distinguished archaeologist and an accomplished art historian who had been active at Etruscan Pitigliano at the end of the 19th century. This native of the Marche had, moreover, been a research assistant at the archaeological museums of Bologna, Florence, Naples and Ancona before obtaining a professorship and museum

---

1 While Whatmough’s (1921:245) comment that Pellegrini “... died of fatigue during the war ...” may strike the casual reader as an authentic crumb of sophisticated insider information, this is actually but one in a series of infelicities in his Magrè report. During the summer and autumn of 1918, Giuseppe Pellegrini was, in fact, working in the museum at Este and supervising the excavation of a Bronze Age lake dwelling site at Palude di Feniletto near Padua. It was there that he contracted typhoid fever, from which he died on December 2nd, 1918. We are grateful to Bolzano’s Lorenzo Dal Ri, who introduced the author to the region’s archaeology in
directorship at Padua in 1907; see Pellegrini (1914). At the time of the discovery, Alfonso Alfonsi was acting curator of the National Museum in Este (Museo Nazionale Atestino) and *de facto* successor of the pioneering archaeologist Alessandro Prosdocimi (1843-1911). Alfonsi had conducted numerous excavations throughout il Veneto. Pellegrini and Alfonsi quickly collaborated to conduct a more systematic investigation of the Magrè site. Eventually, a total of twenty-two staghorn votives with well-defined and professionally authenticated provenance histories made their way from Magrè to the National Museum in Este (Inv. Nos. 58808-58817, 58819 are still recorded), where they presumably remain yet today.

Conversely, however, in *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy (PID)* Whatmough (1933:33-48) presented the Magrè votives as if they were twenty-three items, numbered 221 through 243, but items 222 and 230 are actually three fragments of the same horn: *PID 222][230 RITAMNELKA][TURIEP (with nm as a probable scribal inversion of a *dificillior mn*) = Ritamnel Katuriepfor *Reitiannel Catu-ritos / -retos = N (dedicatory Etruscan dative Genitive II) + N (Rhaeticization of a Celtic nominative: Catu-ritos / -retos); cf. RITAMNE in PID 221 and see the research concordance in Table 1 and our discussion below.

The twenty-two Magrè votives conserved at Este were inscribed in a North Etruscan alphabet and were presumably dedicated, so the majority of scholars now believe, primarily to Reitia (probably a Veneticization of *ρθείας* [dialectal ρεθείας] nominative singular feminine of the aorist passive participle of *εἴρω* ‘to say, to tell, typically through a divine intermediary’, medio-passive ‘to ask’; derivationally and functionally akin to *Ilithyia* = Juno Lucina, who, like Reitia, presided over the travails of women, from *εληλυθω* to *έρχομαι* ‘to come’). For discussions of Reitia, the Venetic Artemis (Orthia) or Athena who was possibly represented in plastic art only on Venetic coins (cf. similarly the role of coins in the veneration of Juno Lucina), as the primary recipient of the Magrè votives and on Magrè as a possible sister foundation of the women’s Baratella sanctuary-scriptorium at Venetic Este, see Kretschmer (1949), Mastrocinque (1987:97-128), Pascal (1964:113-114) and Whatmough (1922).

The first publication of the Magrè find was prepared by Giuseppe Pellegrini as a survey that appeared posthumously in 1918, a work that many authorities, such as Alberto Mancini (1973:365), still consider a remarkable piece of analysis. On March 31st, 1922, just two months after the death of Este’s Alfonso Alfonsi and nearly a decade after the initial find, Joshua Whatmough (1897-1964), then barely twenty-five, read the Magrè inscriptions at Este; see Whatmough (1921, 1923, 1933:33-48). Whatmough autopsied the Magrè inscriptions at the request of his mentor, the University of Manchester’s Robert Seymour Conway (1864-1933), with whom he

---

the autumn of 1998, for kindly supplying biographical information on Pellegrini, an outstanding student of the justly celebrated Eduardo Brizio at Bologna. Incidentally, as the DAI’s Horst Blanck kindly informs us, Alessandro Prosdocimi was director of the Este museum from 1887 until 1909, when he retired, whereupon administration of the museum was entrusted to Alfonso Alfonsi, but who was formally appointed director as late as 1921, just one year before his death.
would collaborate in publishing the monumental three volume *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* (= *PID*) eleven years later.

Since Whatmough’s survey --- and unfortunately many of his readings have by now been deemed both imprecise and questionable, the Magrè votives have been addressed numerous times, most notably by Alberto Mancini (1975), Maria Grazia Tibiletti Bruno (1978), Stefan Schumacher (1992) and Alessandro Morandi (1999); see the concordance in Table 1. In our discussion below, the Magrè and other Rhaetic inscriptions are referenced by their *PID* numbers, where available, optionally followed by the corresponding siglum in Schumacher’s (1992) *CIRCE* (= *Corpus inscriptionum rhaeticarum completum et emendatum*) and a reference to Morandi (1999) = MOR + number. Venetic inscriptions are referenced by the sigla (e.g. Es 1 = Este 1) in Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967). The writer examined the Magrè votives at the Museo Nazionale in Este on October 19th, 1998.²

Relative, much less absolute, chronologies for the Magrè staghorns remain elusive. As an initial working hypothesis, however, it seems only reasonable to assume a relatively broad time span for a collection of votives that probably represents but a fraction of the *ex voto* remains that presumably accumulated in *favissae* over some three or four centuries during the sanctuary’s putative existence. Even from the scant, regrettably largely decontextualized, archaeological evidence that has come down to us, it appears likely that votives were still being inscribed at Magrè during the final decades (ca. 70-50 BC) prior to its destruction as a sanctuary-*scriptorium*, a result of the Roman conquest, and ensuing imposition of Roman construction on its surface.

In his contribution to *Italia omnium terrarum alumna* (1988:121), Raffaele Carlo De Marinis, the authoritative and widely published Milan archaeologist, dated the

---

² The following conventions have been adopted here: so-called “Etruscan t” with an angled bar at its head = t, St. Andrew’s Cross t = x, arrowhead tau = †, so-called “Magrè thorn” = p, presumably the ultimate source of runic thorn. Sav is indicated by $. Gk. φ is retained for *phi*, while so-called “red” *chi* is represented by χ, rather than ψ (psī) which, with regional variants with and without the handle (so-called “crowfoot *chi*”), Lejeune’s [1974] g, was the actual morphology of *chi* in Etruscan, Rhaetic, Messapic, Venetic, Golaseccan / Lepontic and at Castaneda (crowfoot *chi* in two attestations to date); see Markey and Mees (2004). In passing, we note that *phi* is lacking in Golaseccan / Lepontic and that both *phi* and *chi* are absent at Tortorta, at Novilara, in Oscan, Umbrian, Faliscan, Sicel and South Picene. In our transliterations here, syllabic punctuation is indicated by periods. Where indicated by puncts (typically three or six) in the inscriptions themselves, such “word” division is here indicated by a colon. We have inserted spaces to indicate “word” divisions, and these divisions often result from “etymological” interpretation of a *scriptio continua* text, while forward slashes (/) indicate actual line breaks in the originals. The smooth undersides — the horns were sawed in halves, of *PID* 221-233, 236-240, 242-243 bear graffiti that sometimes resemble Roman numerals (e.g. *PID* 227 V //, *PID* 238 III XI, *PID* 239 XI); that is, X, D, V, I, N, W, //, but also crowfoot *chi* and decorative arrowhead zeta-like x’s. In fact, of the twenty-two votives, only four (*PID* 220-230 = a composite, 234, 235 and 241) lack such graffiti; see Whatmough (1933: 33-48). These graffiti are similar and sometimes identical to those found at Padua, Monte Pore, on the Vadena stele, the votive alphabet pins from the Baratella sanctuary-*scriptorium* at Venetic Este, the Negau B helmet and the various Sanzeno-Casalini votives and castings; see fn. 7.

Five of the horns have “partials”: *PID* 226 ([E[MANIS]], *PID* 235 ([I]6)), *PID* 240 ([IXINAVIXA]), *PID* 241 (AX[ ]) and *PID* 242 (AX[ ]). These inscriptive fragments have been omitted by Morandi (1999) and Tibiletti Bruno (1978), and, in so far as “readings” are possible at all, have so far never been provided with “explanations”; see Table 1.
related Vadena stele inscription \((PID\ 196 = BZ-10)\) to the 5th century BC \((ca.\ 450-400?)\). He mistransliterates the stele’s inscription, however, as \textit{pnake vitamu laze}, apparently confusing Rhaetic arrowhead \textit{tau} \([\text{p}, \text{t}]\) with Camunic arrowhead \textit{zeta} \([\text{s}]\). He offers no further interpretation, but then abruptly proceeds to assign the Magrè inscriptions, which he also neglects to interpret, to the same century \((ca.\ 450-400?)\). Pauli \((1885:17 [\text{Nr. 36}], \text{107})\), Markey \((2000)\) and numerous others have repeatedly interpreted Vadena’s \textit{pnake} as a Rhaeticized \((\text{Etruscoid-syncopated})\) Celtic \textit{Ben(n)acos}, a reading with which Whatmough \((1934:31)\) eventually agreed, although he abstained from interpretive translation at \(PID\ 196\); see also Pellegrini’s \((1985:108-109, \text{fn. 50})\) abortive attempt.

For De Marinis \((1988:121)\), the chronologically diagnostic benchmark for dating Magrè’s votives is the ousting of closed \textit{alpha} \((=\text{Latin A})\) by so-called “open \textit{alpha}” \((\text{an A on which the central crossbar parallels, rather than horizontally joins, one of its sides, thereby forming a letter shape that approximates and can sometimes be confused with that of F-shaped digamma})\). For De Marinis, the benchmark rule is: closed \textit{alpha} until the end of the 5th century, but open \textit{alpha} thereafter; see our discussion below and Markey \((2001a:99-102)\).

Conversely, in view of its two versions of closed \textit{alpha}, the second putatively earlier than the other, Morandi \((1999:78)\) dates Magrè \(PID\ 221 = MA-1\) to the IIIrd century \((ca.\ 250-200?)\). He then \((1999:78)\) proceeds to date Magrè \(PID\ 222 = MA-2\), the final portion of which both he and Giuseppe Pellegrini convincingly reconstruct as a Celtic \textit{KA[TURIEI>]U} \((=\text{Caturito for Caturitos})\), to the IIIrd century as well; see Schmidt \((1957:259)\) on -rito. In view, however, of the Celticity of its onomastics and the fact that its closed \textit{alpha} is matched by Negau B from about 55 BC, Morandi’s 3rd century date seems far too early. Morandi \((1999:79)\) concludes his Magrè chronologies by dating \(PID\ 231 = MA-11\) to the 4th century \((ca.\ 350-300?)\), though this is the only Magrè inscription with two contrasting \textit{alpha}’s, the first of which is closed, and the second of which is open.

Finally, in the \(PID\), for reasons that are rather imperiously evasive \((\text{undefined “epigraphical evidence”})\), Whatmough \((1933:34)\) categorically assigned the Magrè votives to about the middle of the 3rd century; that is, within Este IV as he knew it, a period now generally considered roughly contemporaneous with La Tène B2 through C1 \((\text{ca.}\ 300-175\ \text{BC in Padania})\); see De Marinis \((1986)\), Riemer \((1998)\). Earlier, Giuseppe Pellegrini \((1918:176)\) had dated the stratum in which the Magrè votives were found to the closing phase of the pre-Roman Venetic period; that is, sometime just prior to about 150-100 BC.

The fact is that, while contrasting \textit{alpha}’s such as those on \(PID\ 231 = MA-11\) afford little or no uncontroversial evidence for dating the Magrè inscriptions, they certainly do evidence the contemporaneous or near contemporaneous performance of different epigraphic disciplines at Magrè. In reality, introduction of open \textit{alpha} in the various North Italian epichoric systems must have varied widely, certainly earlier in Lepontic than Rhaetic, prospects De Marinis \((1988:121)\) fails to entertain. In fact, the demonstrably late \((ca.\ 55\ \text{BC or shortly before})\) Negau B inscription, epigraphically
influenced as it clearly is by Magrè, and the late Venetic Isonzo inscriptions (Is 1 and Is 2, ca. 100-50 BC) all have closed alpha; see Markey (2001a:124, 130). Subsequently, De Marinis (1990-1991:216) suggested that the appearance of open alpha was contingent upon the disappearance of digamma, a contingency that seems indicated by the history of Golaseccan / Lepontic alphabetism with its closed alpha and digamma in inscriptions from the 6th through the 5th century vs. its open alpha and conspicuous absence of digamma in inscriptions from some two centuries later. Indeed, we find closed alpha beside upsilon but no digamma at Lepontic Banco (PID 273), Tesserete (PID 268/II) and Vergiate (PID 300), but this is presumably indicative of digamma’s marginalization as a semivowel. Cf. Magrè’s (PID 237 = MA 17) asua, possibly for *ASVA, but VALT- and not *UALT- in the same inscription, and on upsilon vs. a marginalized digamma at Prestino (ca. 480-450 BC), see Markey and Mees (2003). Nevertheless, as we (2001:99-101) have demonstrated elsewhere, the universality of De Marinis’s contingency hypothesis is vitiated by, inter alia, Camunic which deftly avoided the prospect of pernicious homographic confusion between open alpha, digamma and possibly even epsilon, as seems to have been the case on the late 6th century Providence Situla (RISD Museum, Providence, Rhode Island, Inv. No. 32.245); see our discussion below and fn. 6.

In contradistinction to its two-pronged open alpha, Camunic introduced a four-pronged digamma that is unique among North Italian alphabets, whereupon Camunic continued both digamma and open alpha. Then, too, despite their virtual homography, open alpha and canonical digamma simply co-existed at, for example, Monte Pore and Serso and in the discipline that produced the remarkable Sanzeno-Casalini votives (SZ 1-15, ca. 420-380 BC). Open alpha and digamma also coexist on the late Vth century (ca. 525 BC) Providence Situla (MOR 27), reputedly from Certosa, but here a two-pronged epsilon has been aligned with a two-pronged digamma. Interestingly enough, at Etruscan Balone (Rovigo) about 450 BC, we find closed alpha, while digamma has but one downward prong, though it cannot be confused with L-shaped lambda nor with V-shaped upsilon, while epsilon has three horizontal, rather than angled, prongs; see Marinetti (1994).

Within the allegedly talismanic alphabetic disciplinae of northern Italy (with evident echoes throughout the eastern Mediterranean), alpha and digamma must have been open to persistent reciprocal morphological influence. In this tradition’s Phase Two abecedaria, they would have been equipollent initials (a-e ... [full, unabbreviated consonant and vowel alphabet] / v-z = /v-d/ ... [abbreviated consonant only alphabet of Reitia veneration at Este]); see below for further definition of Phase Two alphabets.

Identification of the language and ethnicity of the Magrè inscriptions long remained as controversial as determination of their chronologies and epigraphic elucidation. Whatmough repeatedly (1923:69-72, 1933:4, 34) categorized their dialect as “Kelt(o)-Illyrian”, a vacuously hypothetical branch of Indo-European that embraced an equally fictive and now generally discredited Illyrian. In comparison with Whatmough’s categorization, we may cite Massimo Pallottino’s (1963:77-78) rather evasive, prejudicial and hardly more informative assessment some forty years later, an
evaluation embraced by the venerable Giovan Battista Pellegrini (1985:122), that the
“Liguri e Reti” as “nuclei tribali” were “culturalmente arretrati e privi di autentiche
tradizioni storiche. La penetrazione etrusca da sud e le invasioni celtiche da nord
debbono aver alterato profondamente i caratteri di queste genti …”

Despite Whatmough’s (1934) resistance to Thumesen’s (1932) stunning equation
of Magrè pinake with Etruscan zinace ‘made, made for’ (as an artistic signature) and
thereby the insight that Rhaetic was necessarily Etruscan (or genetically Etruscoid or
at the very least heavily influenced by Etruscan) and Kretschmer’s (1932) impression
that Rhaetic was a mixture of Indo-European and Etruscan, we now consider Rhaetic
typologically Etruscoid, although it sometimes incorporated Indo-European elements,
preaminently so with respect to (Celtic) onomastic items; see the relevant discussion
and bibliographical references in Markey (2001a:135, 137). Further to the detriment of
Whatmough’s position, more than fifty years earlier, despite initial reservations
(1885:101, 109), Carl Eugen Pauli (1839-1901) had been essentially correct in his
contention that Rhaetic was probably Etruscan.

Albeit clearly influenced by both Venetic and North Etruscan, the East Rhaetic
alphabet that emerged at Magrè was a distinctly independent epichoric
accomplishment. It descended from a so-called (Etruscoid) Phase Two aev-Alphabet,
that is, from an ancestral North Etruscan alphabet in which the first three letters were
aev, not abg (abc); see Pandolfini and Prosdocimi (1990:13). Such alphabets evolved
after implementation of an Etruscan (Vulci?) reform that dictated elimination of beta,
gamma (c), delta, s⁺, omicron and s’. The precise date of this early reform is unknown,
but a best guess estimate is about 600 BC, though certainly prior to a later reform (ca.
570-560 BC) that ushered in so-called “Phase Three Alphabets” signaled by
introduction, typically in alphabet final position (after chi), of an hour glass figure (8)
to express /f/. Datable Phase Two Alphabets are evidenced as follows in northern Italy:
Spina (from ca. 580-480), San Martino in Gattara (ca. 400), San Polo d’Enza near
Reggio Emilia (Golasecca III A 3, ca. 400-375) and at Roncoferraro near Mantua (ca.
390); see Pandolfini’s convenient catalogue in Pandolfini and Prosdocimi (1990:19-
94). Note that both the San Martino in Gattara and San Polo d’Enza sites are in Celtic
horizons; see Bermond Montanari (1969:218-224, 226-228), Colonna (1974:4-5, 11-
19) and de Marinis (1977:27b and Figure 3:1).

Here we should underscore the fact that the role of Etruscan Mantua as a center for
the spread of Etruscoid alphabetism in northern Italy, particularly to Golaseccan / Lepontic horizons, but probably also to Rhaetic sectors as well, should not be underestimated. Contrary to earlier impressions, the Mantua area must have hosted imposing and long-standing Etruscan enclaves, points of convergence for Greek, Celtic, Venetic and, of course, Etruscan trade and exchange; see the comprehensive state-of-the-art report and copious bibliographical documentation by De Marinis (1986), a survey now somewhat dated by continuing (at Ca’ dei Monti in 2002) work at Etrusco-Celtic Monte Bibele (at Monterenzio south of Bologna, ca. 400-200 BC) and by De Marinis’s own ongoing excavations at the Etruscan settlement at Forcello di Bagnolo S. Vito (southeast of Mantua on the triangle between the Mincio and the Po).

In the absence, as demonstrated below, of an indigenous zeta (= /d/) and in contrast
to Atestian $v$-$z = /v$-$d/$ (the abbreviated consonant only alphabet of Reitia veneration at Este), the Magrè alphabet’s initial consonants would have been $v$-$h$.

Like all North Etruscan systems and in contrast to the five vowel systems (with $o$) of Venetic and Golaseccan / Lepontic, Magrè had but four vowels: $a$, $e$, $i$, $u$. Vocalic length was left unindicated (not by $V + h$, gemination, macrons, or any other diacritic device), nor, in the same vein, was consonant gemination indicated. Magrè’s upsilon assumed both inverted ($\Lambda$) and non-inverted $V$-shapes. With but one dramatic exception, discussed below, its epsilon was the cardinal angled three (never four!) pronged epsilon ($E$) found in virtually all North Italian systems. It had the conventional single-stroke vertical iota. As pointed out above, it had both open and closed alpha, though the latter shape was dominant. Explicit diagnostic arguments and evidential details need not detain us here, but it appears that, as was certainly the case in contemporaneous Etruscan, Rhaetic vowel systems, including that at Magrè, were asymmetrical with a non velar $[a]$:

$$\begin{align*}
  & i \\
  & u \\
  & e \\
  & a \\
\end{align*}$$

and therefore $/u/$, but not $/a/$, could approach backward $c$; see Agostiniani (2000:495) and note Magrè’s ($PID$ 239 = MA-19) $\Phi U T I$, not $\Phi A U T I$- or archaic $\Phi A V T I$-, for Celtic $bou_{d}i$- ‘victory’ as in British $Boudicca$ ($sic$, Tacitus, Agr. 16.1). Accordingly, if etymologically equivalent, then one would expect Venetic volti- (Es 1, 8) to have been reflected at Magrè as $*vuli$-, rather than Magrè’s ($PID$ 237 = MA 17) putatively equivalent $valti$-; see, however, our discussion below and recall the structuralists’ graphemic / phonemic contingency ruling that, the fewer the vowel phonemes, the more room (phonological space) for non-distinctive variation on the part of each phoneme.

With respect to diphthongs, we emphasize at the outset that Magrè reflects Neo-Etruscan ei ($e < ai$ (attested since the beginning of the 5th century); see our discussion of Rhaeticizaton of theonymic Reitia below. As at other Rhaetic sites, we find $ei \sim i \sim e$ oscillation; see Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:2.146-147) for the comparable Venetic situation. Cf. reite ($PID$ 227 = MA-8) and ritie ($PID$ 224 = MA-5) and note $eluku$ (WE-3, SZ-14, SZ-30) vs. fragmentarily preserved $elluke$ (possibly $[RITI]EILUKE = ritie iluке < *reitiae ilukai$) at Magrè ($PID$ 223 = MA-4): Etr. $ilucу$ ‘(destined) ritual offering’ (Tegola di Capua) / $eluсе$ ‘destined for’; see Rix (1985:23-24) and Zavaroni (1996:282-284, with an extensive research history) for discussions of Etr. $ilucу$, $ilucve$. As for rising diphthongs, we detect a general Etruscid tendency toward their elimination, so, for example, $ZIUMOE < ZIUMIOE$ (and not $*\\\Omega U MIOE$ or $*TUMITE$ with regular source to target devoicing) for $D\nu\mu\nu\delta h\nu s$ on the Zinthrepus mirror from Talamone ($ES$ V 121); see Van der Meer (1999), cf. Helbig (1880:260-264), ignored by Van de Meer (1999). As indicated by $ZIUMIOE$, rather than $*\\\Omega U MIOE$ or $*TUMITE$, the initial palatal of rising diphthongs tended to be absorbed by the preceding consonant; cf. Etr. Arxaze (not $*Aрxатиe$) to $Арха\delta ioс$, Etr. $\Theta ezi$ to $Т\nu\theta \varsigma$: Lat. Tetys.
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We note Magrè’s RITIE (PID 224 = MA-5) and RIDE (PID 229 = MA-10) vs. REITE (PID 227 = MA-8); see our discussion of Magrè thorn (β) below. On the other hand, the vocalic nucleus was eliminated after the glide in Negau B’s HARIXASTI, the Rhaeticization of a Germanic nom. sg. i-stem *Harjagastiz; see infra.

As for its consonants, Magrè presents surd shapes and only surd shapes.

For tau, Magrè used both the cross-barred, so-called “Etruscan τ” and the St. Andrew’s Cross τ = <χ>, historically the x extruded from crossed θeta, an innovation apparently spawned at Chiusi that spread northward. Indeed, Central Etruscan ZILAØ (with crossed θeta) appears instead as ZILAX, that is, with St. Andrew’s Cross τau, on the so-called “Second Rubiera Stele” (from about 640 BC), which was found as recently as 1984 in a riparian setting near Rubiera (Emilia); see De Simone (1992:10).

Magrè obviously eschewed scrittura fonetica (cf. fn. 4) and utilized both k and its aspirated counterpart χ (chi) to the exclusion of c and/or qoppa, but, as pointed out by Whatmough (1933:36) and numerous others, while Magrè attests φ, it lacked p; see our discussion below of ear-shaped vs. handled ρho (not pι). Magrè apparently merged p and φ as <Δ>, which seems to have been a general tendency in Rhaetic systems. As evidence of this merger, compare, for example, upiku (Siebeneich / Settequerce, PID 191 = BZ-3, MOR 10; Castelgrifo PID 192 = BZ-4, MOR 11) and upiku (Verona, PID 247 = VR-3, MOR 51) vs. uiiku (lx: Meclo, PID 210 = NO-3, MOR 13) as a facilior rendering of upiku with “unmarked” iota for π; see fn. 6. Further to Rhaetic upiku ~ upiku ‘to place, position (an object, institutionally, not physically)?’ with the locative or pertinentivo, compare fragmentarily attested South Picene upēke[— at Crecchio (CH 1), on which see Marinetti (1985:113-117), who was apparently oblivious of the possible Rhaetic analogue, and Untermann’s (2000:801) laconic entry.

As a recap, then, while Magrè merged p and φ as φ, it retained both k and χ, albeit sometimes in free variation (-ke ~ -χe), but did not merge them as χ in a symmetrical structural correlate to its merger of p and φ as φ.

Observers of early northern Italian epigraphy have long realized that, while letters (P T, K) that stood for plain stops in an Etruscan alfabeto princeps may represent fortis

---

3 Together with Adolfo Zavaroni, to whom many thanks for numerous kindnesses and instructive conversations are due, the author examined the Rubiera steleae at the Museo Civico di Reggio Emilia on September 14th, 2002. In contrast to Stele 2’s nascent St. Andrew’s Cross τau, Stele 1 has dotted θeta throughout. As evidenced by Stele 2, which attests k exclusively, it is clear that so-called “scrittura fonetica” (k before a, c before e / i, and q = qoppa before u) was no longer practised; so KUVEI, presumably the first member of a binomial onomastic formula. Both “cippi” present aev-alphabets as regional systems that persisted locally well into the 5th century; witness the ABVZ-shard from neighboring San Polo d’Enza, ca. 410-400 (Inv. No. S37/67, Museo di Reggio Emilia), a Celtic signature site; see Colonna (1974:4-5), de Marinis (1977:27b and Figure 3:1), Pandolfini and Prosdocimi (1990:73-74). Stele 1 attests handled ρho (2x) exclusively, and ear-shaped ρho was apparently a later introduction in North Etruscan alphabetism, so, for example, in KRALNS from Villa Coviolo, division of San Rigo, ca. 440 (Inv. No. S96/1, Vetrina 96, Museo di Reggio Emilia) and exclusively so in the pitifully few epigraphic remnants retrieved from Marzabotto; see Colonna (loc. cit.). It seems likely that ear-shaped ρho (along with crow-foot χi) was introduced to the Italian peninsula via the san-less “red” χi alphabetism of the Locrian colonies (chronologically: Epizephyrii, Hipponium, Nicotera and then, finally, Medma), probably about 540-490 BC; see Guarducci (1995:302-306), cf. Markey and Mees (2004:99-101).
or lenis / voiceless or voiced stops indiscriminately in North Etruscan systems that portray Indo-European dialects, characters that represented aspirates (Φ, θ, χ) in early Etruscan models were typically employed to disambiguate fortition / voice in such dialects, particularly Celtic and secondarily Germanic (Negau B). Thus it is that Negau B’s *Harigastiz* with “red” *chi* (ψ), the Rhaeticization of a Germanic nom. sg. *i*-stem *Harjagastiz,* is unambiguously *Harigasti,* not an ambiguous *Harikasti* if spelled with kappa; see Markey (2001a:121-124). Alternatively, in Rhaetic systems that merged *p* and *φ* as *p,* *p* was deployed to represent /b/ in Indo-European dialects; hence *pnake* = Celtic *Ben(n)acos* at Vadena. Recall the absence of *phi* (merger with *pi?*), but retention of *kappa* vs. *chi* in Lepontic (Golaseccan).

Many investigators, among them Maria Grazia Tibilleti Bruno and the late Ernst Risch (1911-1988), who introduced the author to Rhaetic in July of 1972, considered Magrè’s handled *rho* a *pi.* Seemingly, however, this identification is the result of some misguided attempt to align Magrè’s handled *rho* with the closest matching letter shape in Venetic, namely Venetic’s hooked shepherd’s crook *pi;* cf. Tibilleti Bruno (1987:237) and Pellegrini (1985:109-110). In fact, a fully-fledged Roman *P*-shaped *pi* is attested but once in Rhaetic, namely at Lothen (PU-1) in the cluster *pd* = /pr/, that

4 The following vastly simplified tabular surveys of comparative consonantisms are presented here for ready reference; Indo-European, Greek, Latin, Osco-Umbrian, Venetic and Messapic vs. Etruscan. Nasals, resonants, laterals and spirants are basically the same among systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondences</th>
<th>Indo-European - Greek - Etruscan</th>
<th>Indo-European - (Selected) Italic - Messapic and Etruscan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1:</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Etr.</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan</td>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Osc.</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messapic</td>
<td>Ven.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is, Roman P-shaped pi plus triangular, ear-shaped, delta-like rho. Although ear-shaped rho (D) and handled (P-shaped) rho certainly co-existed in numerous Greek and Etruscan (e.g. Cerveteri, Vulci) systems, as well as in some (e.g. Sicel) Italic systems, ear-shaped rho and only ear-shaped rho is found in Oscan, Umbrian, Venetic, Lepontic, Camunic, at Novilara, at Monte Pore, in Rhaetic at Sanzeno and in North Etruscan at Mantua, Spina, Adria, Marzabotto and Villa Coviolo (Reggio Emilia), while handled rho and/or R (and only these shapes) are found in South Picene (only handled rho, both angular and rounded), Faliscan (also R), Messapic (also R) and at Tortora (only handled rho, 7x); see Guarducci (1995:99). A Magrè type handled rho also occurs (1x) on the Castelrotto bone votive (VR-4) discussed below. Moreover, the Rhaetic inscription (PID 208 = NO-10) at Tavon near Sanzeno apparently also attests handled rho, probably IREKE, although this has been read by some as ILEKE, cf. Schumacher's (1992:152) ?]rileke:sa?]. Paradoxically, Tibilleti Bruno (1978:222) reads rho at Tavon, presumably because the “knob” of its handled rho is rounded rather than angular like the Magrè handled rho’s, which, however, she seemingly prefers to read as pi’s. Were she consistent, then she would surely have read Tavon as IPEKE with pi. Such speculation aside, the fact is that, at Magrè, ear-shaped rho and handled rho were presumably in free (allographic) variation, not only initially, but also medially and finally: e.g. #ri- in PID 225 vs. #Pi- in PID 221, 222, 228, 229), cf. #Pi-vs. -uri- in PID 222, and note keP = [ker] in PID 229; see McLaughlin (1963:56-133) on the phonological significance of such graphemic orchestrations. Finally, we note that, with the exception of Camunic and its innovative paper-clip pi (a probable precursor of which is the North Etruscan humped or camelback pi on Stele 2 at Rubiera), presumably the progenitor of runic <p>, pi was one of the more immutable letter shapes of early northern Italian alphabetism.5

5 Basic pi shapes on the Italian peninsula fall into two major typological categories: (1) humped/semicircular, sometimes postulated as Proto-Italic (Sicel, Messapic, South Picene, Oscan), but presumably an outgrowth of (2), the shepherd’s crook pi, a perpendicular stave with an oblique descender from its top, either to the left or the right (Etruscan, Umbrian, Golaseccan / Lepontic, Rhaetic at Sanzeno, and in the Novilara inscription). The shepherd’s crook pi was sometimes hooked at the end, as in early Venetic, Messapic and at Tortora. Naturally, the unhooked shepherd’s crook pi was sometimes easily confused with lambda’s that had their oblique descender attached to the head, rather than the foot, of the perpendicular stave; see Mancini (1975:303-305) for an enlightening discussion of this problem. In Rhaetic, and to some extent in Venetic as well, maintenance of a clear distinction between lambda, pi and even asymmetrical upsilon’s must have been problematic. This problem was solved in Camunic by introduction of the M-shaped so-called “paper-clip” pi, probably a fusion of a right-facing shepherd’s crook pi (or lambda) and a left-facing shepherd’s crook pi (or lambda), a combination that may well have served as the model for runic <p>; see Marstrander (1928:104). While alignment of the paper-clip /l/ of Tortora (vs. arrowhead tau as /f/ in Faliscan and hour glass 8, simplified as a colon in South Picene, as /f/ in Oscan, Umbrian and South Picene) with the paper-clip digamma of South Picene may be a productive line of inquiry for mapping the transmission of alphabetism on the Italian peninsula, alignment of paper-clip digamma with runic <p> while omitting discussion of the Camunic paper-clip pi leads but to genetic confusion; pace the under-informed discussion in Letizia Lazzarini and Poccetti (2001:41-42), cf. Markey (2001a:95, 103). It was, of course, the humped/semicircular “Asiatic” pi that engendered “modern” Greek pi. It appears that one Rhaetic solution for maintaining a distinction between upsilon, lambda and pi was a cop-out, namely selection of iota as an “unmarked” neutral substitution for lambda or pi, particularly between upsilons. This was presumably a serviceable solution given the redundancy of votive “texts”. Note UJIKI for UPIKU at Meclo (PID 210 = NO-3, MOR 13), as pointed out above. Consider, moreover, Magrè’s PID 227 = MA-8 (right-reading scriptio continua) REITEXMUJ INA E = Reite muliu ina e (with muliu ina e inverted, upside-down) for “Reite muliu zina e ‘dedicated, offered to (and) made for Reitia’, with passive verbs in asyndetic
Magrè lacked the Sanzeno-Bolzano/Vadena and Negau (A [Ia]) arrowhead *tau* (or *sampi*) = ↑. Like Camunic, however, Magrè presents a saw-toothed thorn (←) with either two or three teeth, probably historically a digraph, *t* + *s*. Indeed, in view of Magrè (*PID 228 = MA-9*) *pinaxe* : Etr. *zinace* [tsinake] ‘made, elaboravit’, one necessarily infers that Magrè ← represented [ts]. However, Magrè also records *xinaxe* (*PID 231 = MA-11*), with St. Andrew’s Cross *tau*, which patterns with ↑*inaxe* (SZ-1) at Sanzeno-Casalini, a site in proximity to Revo’s ↑*erisna* = Vače’s ↑*erisna*. We thus retrieve *<b> : x : ↑ : ↑* as an etymologically braided chain of divergent graphemes that could represent surficial [ts]; see Markey (2001a:142-143).

In contrast to Magrè (and Rhaetic alphabets generally), we recall that Prestino rendered [ts] with *zeta*: *kozis* = Celtic gotis < IE *ghosti-s* (*IEW* 453).6 At Padua

...tandem, indeed the same ‘dedicated’ + ‘made’ formulaic sequencing as in Greek votives (ἀνεθηκε + πεποίηκε); see Rouse (1902) for examples. If this interpretation is correct, then this is the only attestation of *mulu* in Rhaetic, but note North Etruscan *mvlnainice* on the Providence Situla (ca. 525 BC). Alternatives are bleak: there is no comparable Etruscan *mulu* or Celtic *moio, mojo, muio*, etc. Moreover, selection of iota (*MVY*) instead of L-shaped *lambda* (*MVLY*) avoided possible misinterpretation as (numerical?!) *MVW*.

6 *Zeta* charts a checkered history in the early alphabetism of the Italian peninsula. In most Italic settings, as noted below, it denoted [ts], its value in Etruscan, which is the source of, for example, Faliscan’s I-shaped *zeta* (at Narce). In other epigraphic settings, however, *zeta* is absent, lacking at Italian Tortora and in the cryptic Novilara inscription.

While *zeta* makes single appearances at Prestino and Casate, it is otherwise absent in Lepontic. In the 2nd BC century Casate inscription, we have: *Zβ OSORIS = dv Ordorix ‘dv prince of maces’, in which dv plausibly represents a reversal of wd, the initials of a consonant only Phase Two *abecedarium*; see Schmidt (1957:252) on *ordo- and Solinas (1995:341) on Casate. On deployment of *san* for dentals (*r* / *d*) and clusters with dentals in the Celtic alphabetism of northern Italy, see Markey and Mees (2004).

In South Picene, which has ear-shaped *delta*, I-shaped *zeta* was apparently relegated to the *tau* slot to represent /s/. The top and bottom crossbars of I-shaped Picene *zeta* for *tau* were retooled as globes (dots), yielding a dumbbell-shaped letter that represents /d/ in the Celtic Ic-inscription on Negau A: TUBNI gen. sg. of *Dunbo*; see Markey (2001a:105, 113-116). In Rhaetic, in addition to Magrè and Castelrotto (VR-4) as detailed below, we find *zeta* shapes only at Lothen, Steinberg and Sanzeno-Casalini (1x). On the Lothen (PU-1, MOR 7) belt buckle (later half of the 5th century) from St. Lorenzo di Sebato, Valle Pusteria (Pusterthal), *BELZURIE* (with a *zeta* often misread as *sigma*) presumably corresponds to Etruscan *VELDUR*; that is, (early) Rhaetic *z*: Etr. *theta* in an “inverse spelling”; for a classic restatement of the orthographic / phonological mechanics, see Hoenigswald (1960:9-10). In passing, we should point out that the buckle’s deer motif is foreshadowed by comparable arrangements in the late VIIth century style of the “*Maestro delle Spine di Pesce*” at Cerveteri (cf., for example, Inv. No. 50364, Collezione Augusto Castellani, Villa Giulia) and in heavily Etruscan-influenced Faliscan venues (*e.g.* VIIth century Etrusco-geometric amphorae, particularly from Narce’s necropolis of Contrada Morgi). Moreover, execution of the Lothen graphics finds a near match on the celebrated and contemporaneous Celtic terracotta from Matzhausen (Oberpfalz, Bavaria; Inv. No. 11c1244, Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Berlin). As Mitja Guštin has repeatedly informed us (p.c.), art forms that emerged in Etruria were quickly picked up in Celtic settings, either as imports or as skillful copies.

Cross of Lorraine shaped *zeta*s (*Τ*), conventionally transliterated as *ς*, have crossbars in immediate parallel proximity to each other across the middle of a central perpendicular stave. In Rhaetic, they are found only at Steinberg (ST-2, ST-3: *kasτri* = kasstri : Etr. *Castr* : Καστρονύπα ?); see Schumacher (1992:223).

Finally, concluding our inventory of Rhaetic *zeta*s, we note that a “Camunic-style” (Castaneda, Montagna, Tresivio, Valcamonica - Cimbergo, Voltino) arrowhead *zeta* has so far been attested just once in a Rhaetic inscription, namely, as an isolated grafito on the “belly” of a votive from Sanzeno-Casalini (SZ-11, MOR 18; Inv. No. 7668, ‘Castello del Buonconsiglio’ [Monumente e collezioni provencialii], Trent); see Pellegrini (1951:313, Fig. 11). In Camunic, however, arrowhead *zeta* represents /s/. On arrowhead *zeta* in Castaneda’s demonstrably Celtic inscription; see Markey and Mees (2004). However, the Sanzeno-Casalini arrowhead *zeta* may well be a smith’s mark, as it also occurs elsewhere at Sanzeno on castings; see Nothdurfter (1979:101, 103, Taf. 24-25) and de Marinis’s (1986:107) enlightened and well documented commentary on this early practice for talismanic or apotropaic purposes and recall the grafitti on Negau B, Vadena and the undersides of the Magrè votives.
(PID 244 = PA-1, MOR 52), however, we find Etsuale (a possible Celticity?) vs. Magrè’s Estuale (PID 232 = MA-12), [E]stuva (PID 231 = MA-11) and Es.suatet (PID 233 = MA-13). As a further possible, albeit remote, scribal Celticity in the Paduan inscription, note, if etymologically related, suspension of the nasal in Padua’s utiku past passive participle ‘brought’ vs. utince ‘led forth’ in the Liber Linteus; see Facchetti (2002:11-12), who justifiably segments utince as ut-in- like alpn-in-, rep-in-. Suspension of nasals is, however, also periodically noted in Etruria, e.g. Atiuce = Avtiọxọ : Lat. Antiochus.

Given the morphosyntactic comparability of Padua’s kaian (ca. 500-480) and kaianin (with deictic, pronominal acc. -in ‘this’) on the Providence Situla (Certosa, ca. 525 BC), the Paduan ember palette would seem to share not only the same lexical, but also the same dialectal tradition. By the early fifth century, except in the dialects of the northwest, intervocalic -y- had been lost (cf. Kae < *Kaie : Lat. Caius), particularly between equal vowels: kaian > *kan, whence Etrurian cana, can(-l) ‘gift, image, stele’ vs. chanu at Sanzeno-Casalini (SZ-1, ca. 420-380 BC) and Lothen (PU-1, ca. 450 BC). On the problematic semantic range and definitional complexity of cana; see the ample documentation and discussions by Agostiniani (1982:179, 189-190).

While I-shaped zeta rendered [tʰ] at Prestino (and in Oscan, Umbrian, Faliscan, Sicel and Messapic), it represented /d/ at Este, where Etruscoid I-shaped zeta assumed a Cross of Lorraine format with two slanted bars across the midpoint of its perpendicular stave. Significantly, Magrè attests this latter-day Este-shaped zeta just twice in a single inscription (PID 243 = MA-23: ustipu / zezeve) that we now consider East Celtic rather than Rhaetic. In that inscription, detailed below, zeta represents /d/: zeze- = dede ‘gave, dedit’.

In addition to zeta as /d/ at Magrè, there is, in the entire Rhaetic sector, but one other probable occurrence of I-shaped zeta representing /d/; namely in VR-4 from Castelrotto (Comune di San Pietro di Cariano, Valpolicella, Verona). This epigraphically difficult left-reading inscription is in a Magrè-derived font on a pig bone (votive?). Castelrotto’s M-shaped san, inverted upsilon (Λ), handled rho (P) and handled “red” chi (Ψ) are all uniquely matched at Magrè. As is the case with PID 243 = MA-23, the Castelrotto inscription is presumably also Celtic. It possibly reads as follows: ružinešxan = rudinešgan, in which at least ruž is epigraphically unmistakable, probably rudi- for Celtic roudi- ‘red’; cf. Schumacher (1992:207 and Tafel 2.3), see Schmidt 1957:262) and revisit fn. 5 below.

Although scribal practice and disciplinae scriptori at Magrè apparently recognized graphemic <x : p : z> as /t/ - /tʰ/ - /d/ respectively, <x> and <p> were obviously the indigenous graphemes most actively utilized to represent dentals to the general exclusion of zeta. Nonetheless, we contend that, in addition to its recognition of Atestine use of zeta as /d/, Magrè alphabetism deployed its thorn in the same discretionary manner as theta was deployed in comparable North Italian Etruscoid systems, namely, as a “wild card” to render /d/ unambiguously in Indo-European, particularly Celtic, dialects. Just as discretionary theta was marked, so too was discretionary thorn. It was these marked, sometimes virtually moribund, graphemes that served as discretionary disambiguators in
polyvalent systems in which, for example, St. Andrew’s Cross \( \text{tau} \) could represent both \( /t/ \) and \( /d/ \). Consequently, arrowhead \( \text{tau} \), a regional innovation, was deployed in the Vadena Stele inscription as a discretionary marked \( \text{tau} \) to represent \( /d/ \) unambiguously, while bivalent St. Andrew’s Cross \( \text{tau} \) (tor\( d \)) was deployed to represent \( \text{I} \). Consequently, arrowhead \( \text{tau} \), a regional innovation, was deployed in the Vadena Stele inscription as a discretionary marked \( \text{tau} \) to represent \( \text{I} \) unambiguously, while bivalent St. Andrew’s Cross \( \text{tau} \) (tor\( d \)) was deployed to represent \( \text{I} \).

\[ \text{LA} \hat{\tau} \text{E} = \text{Celtic windamolatos} \text{ having most conspicuous warriors}. \] This is obviously an archaic (bipartite) superlative bahuvrīhi immediately comparable to Prestino’s \( \text{UVAMOKOZIS} \text{ having supreme guests}. \] Vadena’s final, after \( \text{LA} \hat{\tau} \text{E} \), highly suspect san-like figure is most credibly interpreted as a decorative graffito akin to the terminal decorative graffiti on Negau B and on the underside of many of the Magrè votives; see Markley (2000) and fn. 2.

In line with these interpretations, we derive Magrè’s \( \text{UST} \hat{\tau} \text{U} \) (PID 243 = MA-23) from an underlying Celtic anthroponym *\( \text{Ostedō(n)} \). Cf. Osti-names (Vi 2, Es 6, Es 133, Ts 1, Tr 1, Tr 3) in Venetic settings at both Este and Làgole (Calalzo); see Morandi (1999:84), Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:2.148-150), and RIG 4.4, 102, 103, 314. As a product of Thurneysen’s Law (1946:Art. 75), Magrè’s cognominalizing \( -\text{i} \) \( \hat{\tau} \text{u} = -\text{idū} \) necessarily derives from -\( \text{edu} < *\text{-edo(n)}. \] We may therefore compare a Pre-Celtic *-\( \text{edō(n)}, \) segmentable as *-\( \text{ed-ō(n)}, \) with the Oscan and Umbrian patronymic forms -\( \text{id}-\) (~ -\( \text{edio} ), a thematic composite of -\( \text{id}- + \text{-yo-}, \) Messapic patronymic -\( \text{id}-\), and Greek -\( \text{idā}, \) which formed anthroponyms, gentilicia and patronyms, e.g. Πριημίδης; cf. the abbreviated account by Thurneysen (1946:58-59) and the uninformed discussion by Prosdocimi in Pandolfini and Prosdocimi (1990:292-295).

Having identified \( \text{UST} \hat{\tau} \text{U} \) (PID 243 = MA-23) as \( \text{Ostidū} < *\text{Ostedū}, \) Prestino’s \( \text{PLIALEOU} \) (ca. 480-450 BC) = \( \text{Plialedū}, \) Salassian (Lepontic) numismatic \( \text{SEXEOU} \) (ca. 400 - 377 BC) = \( \text{Segedu}, \) Verona’s \( \text{KULITE} \hat{\tau} \text{EU} \) or, better, \( \text{KAITLETU} \) (PID 248 = VR-5) = \( \text{Caletiedū} \) : Lingones numismatic \( \text{KULITE} \hat{\tau} \text{E} \hat{\tau} \text{EU} \) (RIG 4.91, 92, ca. 148 BC) = \( \text{Caletedū}, \) Ornavasso’s \( \text{OLETU} \) (PID 307, corrected reading, ca. 190-75 BC) = \( \text{Olledū}, \) Cenomanian \( \text{KELEŠU} \) (ca. 100-50 BC) = \( \text{Celedū} \) at Isola Rizza in Casalandri (Verona), built to *\( \text{kel} - \) ‘to strike’ (IEW 545-546); see Colbert de Beaulieu (1966), Solinas (1995:376, 1998:148), Schmidt (1957:160, 170, 186, 250-251, 265-266). On deployment of \( \text{san} \) for dentals \( (t \) / \( d) \) and dental clusters in early Celtic alphabetism; see Markley and Mees (2004) and fn. 6.

With respect to -\( \text{idū} / -\text{edu} \), then, Magrè lines up securely with Lepontic and Gaulish (including Cenomanian) onomastic practice recorded both long before and long after the Celtic onslaught of 388 BC. Moreover, as Magrè’s -\( \text{idū} \) evidences Thurneysen’s Law and contrasts with -\( \text{edu} \) elsewhere in northern Italy, one might infer a comparatively late (ca. 70-50 BC?) date for \( \text{PID} 243 = \text{MA-23} \); see our account further below. For now, however, compare Magrè’s -\( \text{idu} < -\text{edu} \) and Cembra’s (PID 215 = CE-1) \( \text{vino-} < *\text{veno- in \text{VINUTALINA} < *Venō-tal-inā}, \) a situla inscription traditionally dated to between 390 and 350 BC whose OSV-syntax and dedicatory intent are highly reminiscent of the celebrated second century BC Briona (Novara) inscription; see Solinas (1995:379-381) for a convenient survey of the latter. Cf., further, Cembra’s \( \text{VINUTALINA < *Venō-tal-inā}, \) nom. sg. fem., as a hypocoristic
diminutive, lit. ‘the little one having the clan’s brow, forehead, face,’ and Briona’s patronymic TANOTALIKNOI, nom. pl. masc. of a sg. *TANOTALIKNOS = Dan(n)o-tal-iknos-s ‘son of one having a judge’s brow, forehead, face’ : (Briona) TANOTALOS = Danno-tal-o-s. We recall Latin Fronto, -onis, Celtized as Frontu, Frontunis, a calque on Celtic talo- ‘forehead, brow, face’ (Olr. taul < *talu-), along the peripheries of Romania, particularly in Romanized Noricum, but also in post-conquest (after ca. 15 BC) Valcamonica; see Falkner (1948), Markey (2001a:103), Schmidt (1957:91, 274, 289).7

Magrè’s sigma consistently has but three strokes, as opposed to excessively multistroked serpentine sigma’s in early Lepontic systems vs. three or four-stroked sigma’s (consistently) in later Lepontic systems. Magrè apparently never evolved or adopted a butterfly or a Lâgone san, and here one recalls that san = /s/ designated palatal s, while sigma = /s/ designated apical s. Palatalization of s before /i/, /y/ or consonants was putatively a northern, rather than southern (Etrurian), phenomenon: so North Etruscan spur- ‘city’ vs. Etrurian spur-, like German šp- vs. English sp-.

Magrè inscriptions attest h, indeed a 3-runged ladder h, but /h/ is generally absent in Rhaetic, and it is distributionally rare (regularly only word initially) in Etruscan. In fact, h is a beacon for word boundaries in deciphering Etruscan scriptio continua. At Magrè, it is found in but two inscriptions: PID 221 = MA-1 (HELANU) and PID 225 = MA-6 (TRIAHLS). Otherwise in Rhaetic, h is found twice (also 3-runged) at Lothen (PU-1), twice (three-runged) in the Ca’ dei Cavri inscription (PID 247 = VR-3) and, finally, possibly three times (SR-1, 2, 7) at Serso (Pergine, Trent) as follows: -VITAHUR (SR-1), -VITAHU.R (SR-7) and, possibly, as a two-runged variant in HETINU or HETINA (SR-2). We approach the matter of h’s representational status indirectly.

PID 229 = MA-10 (right reading, scriptio continua) RIJEKERRINAKE = Ritie ker rinake for *Rietie(i) ker tinaxe. Having emended the putatively erroneous scribal dittography of RR by substituting rt and having etymologized rinake as tinaxe to fit the etymologically inferred semantactic requirements, this inscription seems transparent enough except for ker as an apparently problematic hapax. There is no comparable onomastic Ker in any probable donor language. We compare Ritie ker tinaxe ‘(it) was made as a ker for Reitia’ and mi titasi ever menaxe (TLE 282, Bomarzo, a 3rd-2nd century mirror inscription) ‘I was made as a kver for Tita’. We have seemingly comparable common denominator configurations and therefore equatable morphosyntactic constructions: (it) / I + N(dative / pertinentivo) + kver + Vxe; see Agostiniani (1982:106, 219-220). We therefore equate Magrè ker and Etr. kver, whatever its precise semantic value, but presumably ‘gift, offering,’ its long-standing traditional gloss supported in part by combinatory equation of kver turce and alpan turce. Moreover, in the majority of its occurrences, kver follows a theonym in the datival / pertinentivo case; see Zavaroni’s (1996:324-325, fns. 97 & 98) thorough research history. On ES 398, kver is personified as Cvera ‘Grace, Benevolence’. Finally, we

7 Segmentation of Cembra’s VINUTALINA as VINU TALINA and interpretation of VINU as an abbreviated (why?) vinum and TALINA as an otherwise unattested Etruscoïd gentilicium in -lina (cf. TAU RILNA on SZ-9 = MOR 20 at Sanzeno-Casalini, Etr. PUPLINA, etc.) is counterproductive, raising, rather than solving, a multitude of epigraphic, syntactic and etymological problems.
note that gradual elimination of labial closure and regression of aspiration are clearly observable in Etruscan from the early 4th century onward: \(*xvestna- \rightarrow *xestna- \rightarrow cestna- (cestna); San Manno, Pe 5.2, TLE 619, 3rd/2nd century).

If construed as a datival recipient, then Ritie in PID 229 = MA-10 presumably calques Ven. REI.TI.IA.I (dat. sg. -i-stem). A Neo-Etruscoit (after ca. 375) Ritie could be legitimately derived from Venetic *Reitiai, albeit without remarking with -i. As argued by Agostiniani (2000:495), *Riti-e-i would derive from *Riti-ai + -i to yield a late Neo-Etruscan feminine “absolute” singular in -ei. Etruscan “absolutes”, we recall, functioned as morphologically undifferentiated nominatives or accusatives; see Facchetti (2002:fn. 38). In fact, such late 4th century Neo-Etruscan remarking is apparently recorded by Magrè’s RITIEI (PID 224 = MA-6). The argument here, then, is that Ven. dat. Reiti is was rephonologized (nativized) as a Rhaetic Ritie(i), a feminine “absolute”, but that the thus nativized Ritie(i) retained its original Venetic datival (pertinentivo) morpho-syntactic functions within Magrè’s highly proscriptive votive setting. This argument seems validated by what may be presumed to be later replacement of Ritie(i) as an early nativized approximation of Venetic datival grammaticality by a fully Rhaeticized Ritale in PID 228 = MA-9 with the (later) datival (Pertinentivo II) desinence -ale common to both Rhaetic and Etruscan.

PID 228 = MA-9 (1 line: right-reading scriptio continua) reads as follows: RITALELEMAISJ:jINAKE = Ritale Lemais jJinake (N-ale = Pertinentivo II (recipient) + N-is = Ablativo I (agent) + Vke) ‘Made for Reitia by Lema’, where Lema is perhaps akin to Ven. Lemtor-; see Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:2.129-130). This interpretation avoids positing dittography (-le-le-) and then presuming Mais to be an (otherwise unknown) idiomym.

Returning to PID 229 = MA-10, we contend that, if Magrè ker = Etr. cer, then kw- > k- in Rhaetic (or at least at Magrè). By extension, one could assume that, in a structurally parallel rephonemicization and / or regraphemicization strategy upon general loss of labialization, hv- > h-. Recall that both k- and kW-(qu-) in Latin loans were represented by χ- in Etruria. In both Etruscan and Atestine Venetic orthography, however, graphemic VH / HV = /f/, the digamma of which yielded Lat. f.\(^8\) Alternatively, Venetic at Lágole (Cadore) and Würmłach opted for H, rather than VH / HV, to represent /f/: HA.R.TO (Gt 14) = Harto. In Etruria, h- = Lat. f, e.g. Etr. Herme = Lat. Firmus, Etr. Hapre = Lat. Faber and revisit fn. 4.

Reiterating and hopefully refining arguments presented in Markey (2001a:95), we accept the convention that archaic Etruscan <v / u> (digamma / upsilon) represented semivocalic w, but suggest that w later emerged as a labiodental [v] upon acquisition of stridency. Phonologically, then, Proto-Etruscan *w later emerged as v as a result of

---

\(^8\) Incidentally, the late Arthur Gordon (1975:52-57) presented the fullest research history to date on recognition of the digraphs VH / HV as /f/, first by Wilhelm Deecke (1831-1897) in print in 1888 (if not in conversation before) and again three years later by Carl Pauli (1839-1901), then 52; cf. Hamp (1981:152-153). Unfortunately, both Deecke and Pauli found confirmation in Wolfgang Helbig’s (1839-1915) “Manios hoax” of 1887, a masterful collaborative forgery that took epigraphers and classicists nearly a century to discredit. The list of worthies, in addition to Deecke and Pauli — Holger Pedersen, Carl Darling Buck, Ernst Pulgram and numerous others, even yet today, “sucked in” by Helbig et Cie. is no less than stunning.
articulatory simplification (bilabial being arguably more marked than labiodental), while \( v \) subsequently gave rise to \( f \) upon acquisition of tenseness; that is: \( *w \) (digamma) > \( v \) (digamma) > \( f \) (VH/HV and later \( \delta \)). Just so, as Cortsen (1935:178) pointed out, while \( p > p^h \) (\( \phi \)) > \( f \) in Etruscan, \( f \) never becomes \( p \); cf. Breyer (1993:21). Note, further, Nevtlane on ES 231 for \( νοπτόλεμος \), \( νεφις \): OLat. neptis, \( Νεπτούς \) with cluster simplification in Etruscan. We may therefore infer that, upon acquisition of stridency, an affricated Rhaetic \( \phi \) was variously (dialectally) identified with \( /v/ \) or \( /f/ \). This inference accounts for \( \phiEL- \) (\( \phiELZURIE- \)) at Lothen (PU-1) = Etruscan \( vel- \) (\( VELθUR \)) < \( *wel- \). Note, too, affrication of \( \theta \) [\( t \)] > \( z \) [\( t^\delta \)] in the non-aryological orthography of Lothen’s \( \phiELZURIE- \) vs. Etr. \( VELθUR \). Moreover, \( φRIMA \) (SZ-2) at Sanzeno-Casalini, presumably a nom sg. fem. idonym or epithet, the putatively syncopated counterpart of Sanzeno-Casalini’s \( φIRIMA \) (SZ-1), is traditionally compared with Venetic \( Freme \) (\( VHREMA.1- \)).

We conclude as follows. On the basis of etymological correlations, as selectively demonstrated below, we contend that, when confronted with possible representational ambiguities between \( digamma \) / \( upsilon \) and affricated \( \phi \), Rhaetic, specifically at Magrè, optionally deployed <\( h \) = \( /f/ \) (reminiscent of Etr. \( h- = \) Lat. \( f- \)) to represent aspirated Celtic \( w <\nu> = [w^h] \); on which see now De Bernardo Stempel (1990). In PID 221 = MA-1, as detailed below, \( h- \) in Helanu was presumably selected to represent Celtic \( Vellaunos \) (in which \( \nu- = [w^h] \)), thereby avoiding confusion with, for example, an Etruscoid \( Velna \) (in which \( \nu- = [w] \)). One is reminded of \( ulatucia \sim flatucias \) at Larzac.

We may categorize Magrè’s consonant inventory as follows where graphemic realizations are presented in angled brackets beside presumed phonetic values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Labials</th>
<th>Apicals</th>
<th>Gutturals</th>
<th>Sibilants</th>
<th>Laterals</th>
<th>Resonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full expir</td>
<td>( \phi &lt;\phi&gt; )</td>
<td>( \theta &lt;\Theta&gt; )</td>
<td>( \chi &lt;\psi&gt; )</td>
<td>( ts &lt;Z&gt; )</td>
<td>( \times' &lt;\Delta&gt; )</td>
<td>( r &lt;\Phi, \Delta&gt; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>( p &lt;\phi&gt; )</td>
<td>( t &lt;\chi&gt; )</td>
<td>( k &lt;\kappa&gt; )</td>
<td>( ts' &lt;\beta&gt; )</td>
<td>( \times' &lt;\Delta&gt; )</td>
<td>( l &lt;\Lambda&gt; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>( f &lt;\mathcal{H}&gt; )</td>
<td>( s &lt;\mathcal{S}&gt; )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{S} &lt;\mathcal{M}&gt; )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>( m )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td>( w &lt;\mathcal{F}&gt; &lt;\Lambda&gt; )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. The Rhaeto-Etruscoid Consonant System at Magrè**

**Commentary:** There appears to have been a general tendency toward a regression of aspiration just as there was in Central Etruscan. However, only the \( k \) vs. \( \chi \) contrast is diagnostic, as \( p \) is lacking and all instances of \( \phi \) are etymologically /\( b/ \) at Magrè. Nevertheless, a combination push and drag-chain movement in the direction of more restricted expiration is clear in the case of apicals and sibilants, whereby \( \Theta \) and \( Z \) were eliminated in favor of \( T \) and \( \Phi \) respectively. The same progression is seemingly evidenced by \( \mathcal{P} \) [\( ts' \) > \( M \) (\( san \) [\( s \])); we have -\( ibu \) at Magrè vs. comparable -\( esu \) at Isola Rizza, perhaps a window on linguistic competencies in a contact situation: \( ts \) (\( Z \)) > \( ts' \) (\( \Phi \)) > \( s \) (\( M \)). There was also an apparent tendency toward lenition whereby plosives were weakened to fricatives (\( p > f \)) along a strength hierarchy. Lack of a voiced / voiceless contrast may have mattered less to speakers of Continental Celtic who may
have been more concerned with contrasts in fortition than voice, than to speakers of other languages, such as Venetic, with a critical need for this contrast; see Watkins (1955), Evans (1967:403), Jackson (1953:545-548). Observe what are necessarily fortition distinctions between the two '<t>'s of Rhoeto-Celtic at Sanzeno / Vadena: fortis arrowhead tau for Celtic /t/ vs. lenis St. Andrew’s Cross tau (x) for Celtic /d/.

The paroxytonality of Celtic onomastic items embedded in Rhaetic inscriptions is reflected by accent-conditioned reduction (Etruscoid syncope) / assimilation; see De Bernardo Stempel (1994) and recall Celtic ben(n)ákos > pnáke at Vadena.

Celtic onomastic desinences were optionally subject to Rhaeticization, e.g. Celtic nom. sg. masc. -os could be Rhaeticized as -e, that is, as an Etruscan and Rhaetic absolute desinence (vs. Celtic andItalic voc. sg. -e), perhaps as part of a facultative interlingual discourse strategy, a quasi-pidginization process seeking common ground. Alternatively, it seems, Celtic -os could also be Rhaeticized as -u, rather than -us, thereby avoiding confusion with Rhaetic’s sigmatic genitive (Genitive I). The flexible rule-of-thumb for Rhaeticization of non-native onomastic desinences seems to have been as follows: forms with Italian (particularly Latin) analogues were Rhaeticized in the same manner as Italian (particularly Latin) forms were Etruscanized: e.g. Lat. -us (-os) -ius (-ios) > Etruscan and Rhaetic -e, -ie respectively. Forms without Italian analogues were, however, optionally grammaticalized / nativized (Celtic -os > Rhaetic -u) as if Rhaetic (Etruscoid).

With the above survey in mind, we now proceed to comment further on Celticity in a selection of Magrè votives.

(1). PID 243 = MA-23: uṣṭiṣu / zezev = Ostidā dedeve < *Ostedō(n) dedhē(i)-we ‘Ostido dedicated (me, this) emphatically’.

Cf. Gaulish dede ‘posuit, placed’ (with the sense of avéθηke) < *de-dhē-t, and for the enclitic emphatic -we ~ -wē (> -wī), hereby corroborated as the initial morpheme of the Castaneda inscription, see, further, Markey and Mees (2004). Cf. Latin vē-cors ‘mad’ = Old Welsh gui-cr ‘brave’, lit. ‘(too) much heart.’ Bernard Mees (p.c.) points out that *co(m)wē ‘emphatically, utterly’ underlies the coui of secoui at Chamalières in the figura etymologica of li. 7-8 (etic secoui toncnaman / toncsiontio ‘as well as they who may prosper that prosperity utterly’) with etic reflecting formulaic utique and tonic- ‘to prosper’: OIr. tocad ‘luck, fortune, prosperity’ < *tonketo- vs. e-grade OIr. técht(a)e ‘proper’ < *tenk-tyo-; pace Lambert (1997:156). For the mechanics, cf. OIr. co(a)ir ‘proper, fitting’ < *com-wari-; see Thurneysen (1946:503).

Magrè’s syntagmatic dedeve is, presumably, a regional calque on formulaic avéθηke-epi, exemplified by SOANΕΘΕΚΕĐT = σω(ξ)-avéθηκε-epi on a votive at Adria (Cabinet 7, Museo archeologico di Adria, autopsied by the author on October 25th, 1998) ‘in good cause (salvus) - dedicated - emphatically’ with formulaic suffixation of the intensive prefix epi- to the perennial Greek votive operator avéθηκε; pace Dubois (1995:177-178).

A photograph of PID 243 = MA-23 is displayed on Adolfo Zavaroni’s admirable website, and the inscription has been accurately reproduced by Morandi (1999:Fig. 29, No. 48). The orthography of uṣṭiṣu (Asxǐpv) with both inverted and uninverted
upsilons, St. Andrew’s Cross tau and a thorn with three teeth is consistent with Magrè fonts. While the zeta’s of zeez e are generic Venetoid zeta’s, the epsilon’s are uniquely diagnostic. They find their closest match in the epsilon of the late Negau A (II) Celtic inscription KERUP = Ker[u]gos [‘he who harvests deer’]; see Markey (2001a:116-118). This was probably the helmet’s final inscription, plausibly engraved in Noricum, if not on the Magdalensberg, toward the middle of the first century BC; that is, just prior to its deposit at Ženjak (Negova / Negau).

(2) PID 237 = MA-17: (right-reading scriptio continua) Klevieva.L.Xikinuaasua = Klewio Valtikino ASUA < *Klewios Waletikenos ASUA (ASVA) ‘Clevios Valeticenos LIBENS MERITO’; that is, a binomial (Celtic or Venetoid) idiom + patronym configuration naming a (votive) dedicator followed by what we presume to be the abbreviation of an Etruscoid formula for dedicatory motivation, so DEDICATOR + (RECIPIENT) + DEDICATION MOTIVATION FORMULA. This presumed mixture of Celtic + a non-native votive formula, here Etruscoid, is echoed by Latin VSLM appended to the Gaulish votive from Sazeirat (Arrenes), on which see Lambert (1994:95).

Compare the inferred DEDICATION MOTIVATION-positioning of ASUA with the positioning of Etr. alpan turce ‘gave the gift’ in TLE 64 and the positioning of frequently abbreviated Latin motivation formulas such as v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(ermo) d(onum) d(edit) l(ibens); e.g. C. Aemilius / Felix / Aecur(nae) / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(ermo), CIL 3.3831 (Emona) = DEDICATOR + RECIPIENT + DEDICATION MOTIVATION FORMULA. Etr. alpan is, moreover, probably best glossed ‘offering, gift’ and not libens or libenter as traditionally proposed: alpan turce equates with domum dedit, not libens dedit. A plausible resolution of ASUA (= ASVA ?) might well be: a(lpan) s(acni-) v(acl) a(ra ‘perform(s) the sacred offering in praise (of X)’; see Facchetti (2002:34, 61-63).

The -ie outcome of *-ios in an underlying *Klewios (IEW 605-607) ‘the renowned one’ (uel sim.) is a Rheticization: cf. Etr. -ie for Lat. -ius (-ios) beside Gaul. -ios : OIr. -e < *-e(s) < *-yos vs. Ven., Osc. and South Picene -is ( -es), Goth. -jis (after a short stem syllable as in harjis) and, finally, Lith. -ys/-is. Cf. unrelated Etr. cleva ‘offering’, conceivably as a collective in -va and thus possibly related to the -va- in the non-human (inanimate) plural marker -(y/c)va-; see our discussion of estua- / estva- / etsua- below.

The patronym (or gentilicium) Valtikino has traditionally been paired with Ven. Voltigeriese (Es 1) = Voltigenes, Vol.ti[ry][N]i.o.s (Es 8) = Voltignos and similar Venetic names with Volti--; see the history of early research in Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:2.205-206). Untermann (1961:1.17, 89-90, 92-93, 170) has devoted the fullest discussion to date to this matter, but then waffled in conclusion by asserting that, if the names are related at all, then it is only their initial components, volti- resp. valti-, either by remote genetic relationship or by borrowing from Venetic. He presumed (1961:1.92) that the suffixes -genei / -gnos and -kinu were but coincidental resemblances; cf. Lejeune (1974:42, 44, 47-48, 52-53), who derives Ven. volti- ‘of desired (birth)’ from IE *wl-ti- : Goth wulpus, but fails to address Magrè’s Valtikino.

Finally, we note that, in his recent research history of the Valtikino problem, Schumacher (1992:66) chides Untermann’s conclusions, but then offers nothing

As pointed out above, if Rhaetic had borrowed *volt- from Venetic, then we would expect *vult-, not valt-, at Magrè; cf. Lat. Clovatius and Osc. Kuwatiis as examples of formations recorded in systems with and without omicron respectively. Conversely, if Venetic *volt- were ultimately Etruscoid, then one might well expect the underlying form to have been *velt-; cf., for example, Etr. Veltòrnum vs. QELZURIE (= Etr. *Velòurie) at Lothen : Lat. Volturnus; see fn. 7. Having identified Rhaetic as genetically Etruscoid, one would then expect *velt-, not valt, at Magrè; We thus infer that valt- is neither Etruscan nor Etruscoid and neither Venetic nor Italic, and, by a further process of elimination, having also discounted Illyrian, Ligurian, or some other nebulous non-Indo-European (Mediterranean) speech community as entirely specious possible sources, we necessarily infer that valt- is ultimately Celtic: valtī- < valeti-, cf. OIr. failte ‘gladness’, Caesar’s Valetiacus (BG.VII.32) : Lat. Laetus. If, however, Valtikīno = Valtikīna (Etr. *Valtici-na) were from Italian, then we clearly lack an underlying Italic *Valtikio-; cf. Etr. Melacina < Ital. *Melakio- as conjectured by Prosdocimi (1986:88-89). On the syncopation (valeti- > valt-) assumed here, cf. Breton Verlamio < *Verolámion and see De Bernardo Stempel (1994).

We conclude that Valtikīnu represents Rheticization of a Celtic *Valetikenos, a patronym in *ken- (-keno- ~ -kno-) ‘son of the prosperous, propitious one’ (uel sim.); see Lejeune (1974:Art. 38), Schmidt (1957:100, 216-218) and note derivationally similar Celtic Enicēnius (CIL 5.2620) from the Roman period at Este.

(3). PID 236 = MA-16: (right-reading) VAL.TEΦNU = Valtebnu < *Valetibenu of the two Valeti Women (suppliants) < Pre-Celtic *wH2eleti-gWn-ou ‘of the two joyous, pleasing, propitious women’ (uel sim.) gen. dual : *wH2eleti-gWn-en-eH2 nom. sg. (IEW 473-474, 1111-1112); cf. Mandubenos and OIr. gen. dual ban < *gWHzH2n-ou and see Thurneyse’s (1946:Art. 287) prophetic hypothesis on a possible fem. gen. dual in -ou and Schmidt (1957:147-148) on names with benos / bena, which are never fronted as initial components. Cf. *Valetibena and Etr. Alpan : Lat. Laetitia, and consider possible reference to members of a college of sibyls.

This is a “possession inscription” comprised of the genitive of a syncopated compound feminine idionym with lowering of its composition vowel: -i- > -e- before b as in Prestino’s ARIUONEPOS = Ariwonebos < *Ariwonibhos, on which see Markey and Mees (2004). Syncopation of a gen. dual *-benou (< *gWHzHn-ou) > -bnu = -ΦNU is reminiscent of Vadena’s *ben(n)ákos > PNAKE, but here we presumably have elimination of a weakly articulated vocoid before a nasal. Except for its lowered composition vowel, the first member of our compound here is identical with the Valtī- in PID 237 = MA-17.

(4). PID 239 = MA-19: (left-reading scriptio continua) LASEXEOUXXIINU = Late Boudigino for *Lastos Boudigos; once again a binomial (Celtic, Venetoid) idionym + patronym configuration naming a (votive) dedicator. Boudigos contains boudi- (OIr. buaid, W budd) ‘victory’, as in British Boudicca, while -ginu corresponds to -kinu in PID 237 = MA-17 (Valtikīnu); see Schmidt (1957:100, 152, 154). Cf.
UXIIAKOS. (Ca 17) = Boudiakos at Venetic Lągole within the context of a well documented Celticity; e.g. Lągole’s PRIŚ (Ca 3) with butterfly (Lepontic) san for Briś- = PRIŚ[--- (late VIIth /early VIth century Hallstatt vase fragment from Montmorot, Jura) for Brixios or Brixia : BRI (Es 103 bis); see the sketchy treatments in Pellegrini and Prosdocimi (1967:1.220, 463-464) and the insightful recovery report by Kaenel (2000:151,153) on this recent Jura find. Laste = Lat. Lastus (Lastuca, etc.).

With respect to Magrè Boudiginos vs. British Boudicca it is interesting to note that, similarly, the Celtic names attested in the Ig inscriptions (from the Roman necropolis south of the Ljubljana marshes) are more closely related to insular Celtic onomastics than to the Celtic names retrieved from neighboring Noricum or Pannonia; see Hamp (1976, 1978), Kos (1999:53 with copious references). From this, we concur with Kos (loc. cit.) that at least some of the Celts at both Magrè and Ig must have belonged to an early branch of immigrants, perhaps one related to the tribes of the Carni known to have settled in Venetic territory at an early date; see Šašel (1992:539). We recall that a Magrè - East Celtic (Slovene) connection is also reflected by the Celtic inscriptions on Negau (A) and the epigraphy of Negau (B).

(5). PID 221 = MA-1: (left-reading scriptio continua) RIXAMNEHELANU = Ritamne Helanu for *Reitiamne Vellaunos ‘Vellaunos to Reitia (at the Reitialia)’.

As argued above, Ritamne is necessarily datival from *Reitiamnai; cf. RITAMN.U (WE-3) at Brixen and RITAME (PID 195 = BZ-9) at Moritzing and see Laroche (1966:255-263) for a discussion and citation of the then current literature on Hitt. -umna-, IE non-participial onomastic -mnos / -mna and Etr. -mne(i) / -mna as manifestations of “Mediterranean” onomasticization. In some Rhaetic dialects -mn-presumably became -m(m)- (Moritzing) or -n(n-) (Sanzeno-Casalini), much as -mn- > -nmn- in Venetic; cf. Lejeune (1971:420-412, n. 220; 1974:128-129, 138), Schumacher (1998:95-96).

This is possibly a local hypocoristic form of Ven. Reitia, but, more likely, an interlingual (Rhaetic / Celtic) abstraction for epiclesis. We note Celtic abstracts with -mn- such as OIr. flaithemna < *vlati-mn-ad-tu-s ‘lordship’ and the epiclesis implied by Rhaetic theonyms: Magrè’s ESÍUM.NÍNŠU.R (PID 234 = MA-14) with Esíumnii ‘(for) Esia’, Steinberg’s ESÍMNESEI (ST-3) = Esi(a)mnesi < *Esíamnai-si ‘for or on behalf of Esia’ and Sanzeno’s ESÍUNNE = Esiunne < *Esíamnai; see Morandi (1999:48, 63-64, 81). On Etruscoïd alternation of a and u, particularly before velar nasals; cf., for example, Velianas [Pyrgi A] ~ Velíiumus [Pyrgi B], Priumne [ES V 118] : Priamus, Pííakóç, and see Morandi (1991:119-120). Pace Helmut Rix’s myopic insistence (p.c. Sept. 21st, 2001, at the Gubbio convegno) that the Sanzeno-Casalini votives fail to attest theonyms.

Our suggestion, then, is that Rhetic regularly suffixed -mne(i) < -mna-i to names of (ethnonymic) goddesses, pre-eminently Reitia at Magrè, but also Esia at Magrè, Steinberg and Sanzeno-Casalini, as deities venerated by state cults. With respect to this suggestion, cf. the analogous deployment of -ál- in Latin: Saturnus (theonym) vs. Saturnālia (veneration). Note, further, Central Etruscan Velba (Veltune) : Lat. Voltumnāia :: Veltūrna : Lat. Volturnālia; see Varro (L.L. 6.21, 7.45) on Volturnālia and Bader (1991) on -ál-, a provocative evaluation, whether one ultimately subscribes to her conclusions or not.
We note, moreover, what appear to be reflexes of *Esia-* in Valtellina and Valcamonica: Montagna (Sondrio) *PID 252 esiau*, Tresivio (Sondrio) *PID 253 esiau* (for *Esio?*?) and Piancogno (Valcamonica) Rock 25 h 37 esiu(u?)*msz*. On the other hand, Valcamonica presents items that appear comparable to *esiu-* at Magrè and *etsiu-* at Padua: Camunic (Berzo Demo 3 c) *etsiu* and the recently (2001) discovered Camunic *espiau* or *estiua* (Campanine di Cimbergo); see Tibiletti Bruno (1990:38-40, 92-93), Gavaldo and Solano (2001), Morandi (1998:109, 124) and our discussion below of Magrè *est*-forms.

Interestingly enough, *Esia* is otherwise known only from the South. She was apparently an (archaic) Etruscan Ariadne / Persephone / Core and, as such, quite possibly the counterpart of an Italic (Oscan, Umbrian, Volscian, Marsian) *Vesuna*. An Etruscan *Esia* is, in fact, identified but twice, on two Praenestine mirrors that are reverses of each other; Brussels (Inv. No. R 1260 [818]) and Bologna (Inv. No. It. 746). For accounts of these important mirrors, see Colonna (1975:216), Lambrechts (1978: No. 10, pp. 67-73), Sassatelli (1981:No. 10, pp. 27-30, Figs. 10a-f) and Van der Meer (1995:51-54). Dating the mirrors is complicated, but is discussed by all four authors. On both mirrors, *Esia* is depicted as a shade brought by Artemis to Fufluns (functionally Bacchus / Dionysus / Liber) in the company of Minerva. The legends on the mirrors, inscribed by what are clearly different hands at widely different times, read as follows (letters within square brackets are missing; those in italics barely legible):

---

9 The *Esia-Vesuna* constellation is the primary focus of an ongoing study being conducted together with Fausto Orioli, a portion of which was presented by the author on September 21st, 2001, at the Gubbio conference: "L'umbro e le altre lingue dell'Italia mediana antica", hosted by IRDAU (Istituto di ricercete documentazione sugli antichi umbri). Vesuna is apparently attested but once in an Etruscan context, namely on the so-called "Vesuna Mirror" (Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Maryland, Inv. No. WAG 54.85). The mirror portrays the goddess in an Ariadne-like setting, thereby permitting an equation: *Ariadne (Etr. Areođa, Ara a) = Esia = Vesuna*; see the discussion and documentation by Zavarone (1996:331-332). While our study discusses a possible Rhaetic Vesuna at Sanzeno-Casalini, it also presents evidence to show that the Vesuna Mirror, which mystically vanished to scholarship in 1884 only to resurface on a somewhat clandestine private art market some forty-two years later in 1926, is implicated as yet another Helbig hoax. The mirror's identity as a probative integer of Vesuna veneration appears to have been compromised as part of a rather elaborate 19th century gallery scam. Details are by now elusive, but the scam seems to have involved the avaricious Count Biagio Bucciosanti of Orvieto (d. 1889) as a rather reprobate property owner of the discovery site: one of eight Etruscan tombs said to have been located about three meters from the ancient Via Cassia at a place known locally as Fattoraccio ("the evil bailiff") in Comune di Castel Giorgio, sometime between October 14th and 20th, 1877. The archaeologist who made the discovery was Riccardo Mancini (1843-1915), who emerges as a rather venal Helbig sycophant, while the overly ambitious Helbig probably orchestrated the scam. Alessandro Castellani (1824-1883) seems to have been the prospective fencer, possibly aided by the notorious Francesco "Checco" Martinetti (1833-1895) as the forger, and these two surely played major roles in the subsequent "Manios hoax" (fabricated sometime between 1880 and 1887); see the tantalizing hints of foul play in the confiscated (upon Helbig's dismissal) Mancini - Helbig dossier (Archiv Nr. M 571) at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (DAI) in Rome. Torquato Castellani, Alessandro's son, is known to have been active ca. 1877-1879 as an unusually skillful ceramic ware (maiolica) copyist in Orvieto; see Savage (1963:135).

10 We are grateful to Richard Daniel De Puma (p.c.) for these initial references. Dating the mirrors is difficult, but an Etruscan *Esia*-mythology was probably in place well before production of the Sanzeno-Casalini votives (ca. 420-380 BC). Recently (September 5th, 2001), Roger Lambrechts kindly informed us (p.c.) as follows: "Le miroir Esia de Bologne est certainement le plus ancien. Sassatelli l'a daté du deuxième quart du Ve siècle. Il a certainement raison. Celui de Bruxelles est mieux conservé et plus beau. Dans *Miroirs étrusques et prénestins des Musées Royaux*, je l'ai daté de la seconde moitié du Ve siècle. C'est certainement
Minerva  Fufluns  Artemis  Esia
Brussels (ca. 330-300 BC): menarea  fuflunus  artc[me]ns  esia

At Magrè, then, we seem to glimpse a triad of Rhaetic lararian guardians of communal munificence and fertility: Estia - Esia (Ariadne / Vesuna) - Retitia (Artemis / Athena), perhaps in this order, cf. Pausanias 5.14.4. One recalls the mid-5th century (Eleusinian?) choral prayer in The Suppliant Maidens (li. 674-677): “And that other guardians be always renewed (τίκτοςθαυ), we pray; and that Artemis-Hecate watch over the child-bed (λόγοντες) of their women.” (Loeb Library, Smyth translation). The ordering, τίκτω ‘to bring forth (as a mother)’ followed by λοχειω ‘to give birth to’, is surely intentional, probably formulaic and quite possibly an expression of wish and fulfillment excerpted from a cult song.

(6) PID 234 = MA-14 (1 line: right-reading scriptio continua) ESIU.MNINUŠ.R = Esiumni Inušur for *Esiumnei Inosurix ‘Inosurix for Esia (at the Esialia)’ with *Esiumnei ultimately from *Esiamnai as discussed above. Pace Morandi’s (1999:81) reading Esiu.mni Nušur and contention that Nušur is an otherwise unknown idionym.

The final iota of the first term (Esiu.mni) is “re-used” as the initial iota of the second term (Inušur). Note the syllabic punctuation. The major epigraphic advantages of syllabic punctuation, made scrupulously regular to the point of becoming otiose in Venetic, are as follows. It aids “word / morph” identification in scriptio continua by:

1. revealing syllable boundaries and
2. blocking “the re-use option”. The re-use option was exercised in scriptio continua whenever the final vowel or consonant of a foregoing word was “re-used” as the initial vowel or consonant of a following word. This practice was wide-spread, and it is also found in (early) Runic inscriptions. For example, the heroic Möjbro Stone (ca. 480-500 AD, Hagby Parish, just southwest of Uppsala in the heart of the ancient realm of the Svear), presents ISLAGINAR for IS#SLAGINAR ‘was slain’.

In the Inosurix retrieved here, we posit ino < eno; cf. Cembra’s (PID 215 = CE-1) vino- < *veno- in VINUTALINA as discussed above. We thus have Inosurix from Enosurix ‘the grand (good) king of the Inn’; see Schmidt (1957:91, 206, 226) on eno- and note that the majority of eno- / ino-names are concentrated in neighboring Noricum.

Even from this rather cursory presentation we can firmly posit an East Celtic presence at Rhaetic Magrè and point to Celtic as an essential component of the diverse mixture that has enriched Slovenia’s cultural heritage.

une erreur de ma part. Je me suis basé uniquement sur des critères stylistiques, qui effectivement nous portent au Ve siècle. Mais j’aurais dû accorder plus d’attention à la typologie (prénestine) de l’objet, qui n’apparaît qu’à partir du dernier tiers du IVe siècle. Toutefois ce désaccord entre le style de la gravure et le type du miroir crée un gros problème. La seule explication (provisoire) de ce mystère semble être celle proposée par Sassatelli: un artiste du IVe s. aurait repris une composition plus vieille d’un siècle. Beaucoup d’auteurs éliminent le problème en déclarant (toujours sans l’avoir vu!) que le miroir de Bruxelles est un faux. C’est une solution de facilité. J’ai eu ce miroir assez d’heures, et de jours, sous les yeux et dans les mains pour affirmer avec force qu’il est authentique. Je maintiens aujourd’hui encore cette position, même si l’explication de Sassatelli n’est pas entièrement convaincante.”
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Table 1: Concordance of Presentations of the Magrè Votives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>MA-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>MA-2</td>
<td>58811</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>MA-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>MA-5</td>
<td>58813</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>MA-6</td>
<td>58812</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>MA-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>MA-8</td>
<td>58808</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>MA-9</td>
<td>58810</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>MA-10</td>
<td>58809</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>MA-3</td>
<td>58811</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>MA-11</td>
<td>58816</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>MA-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 232</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>MA-13</td>
<td>58815</td>
<td>p. 234</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>MA-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>MA-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>MA-16</td>
<td>58819</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>MA-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>MA-18</td>
<td>58814</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>MA-19</td>
<td>58814</td>
<td>p. 237</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>MA-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>MA-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>MA-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>MA-23</td>
<td>58817</td>
<td>p. 238</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>