

Effects of Language Contact on Roman and Gaulish Personal Names

Karin Stüber
(University of Zurich)

1. Introduction

The Roman conquest of what was to become the province of Gallia Narbonensis in the second and then of the whole of Transalpine Gaul in the first century B.C. led to the incorporation into the Roman empire of a large part of the territory in which Gaulish was then spoken.¹ In consequence, the vernacular rapidly lost its footing at least in public life and was soon replaced by Latin, the language of the new masters, which enjoyed higher prestige (cf. e.g. Meid 1980: 7-8).

On the other hand, Gaulish continued to be written for some three centuries and was probably used in speech even longer, especially in rural areas. We must therefore posit a prolonged period of bilingualism. The effects of this situation on the Latin spoken in the provinces of Gaul seem to have been rather limited. A number of lexical items, mostly from the field of everyday life, and some phonetic characteristics are the sole testimonies of a Gaulish substratum in the variety of Latin that was later to develop into the Romance dialects of France (cf. Meid 1980: 38, fn. 77).

Given the political and social circumstances, it is to be expected that the impact of Latin onto Gaulish was considerably more significant. Unfortunately, due to the scantiness of written material in the vernacular, little is known about the exact mechanics of the Gaulish language's decline and about the extent to which it was subjected to Latin influence before eventually disappearing.

A few late Gaulish texts at least provide us with some clues. On the inscription on the plate of Lezoux (RIG I.2, L-66) for instance we read in line 8 *vero*, undoubtedly a loan from Latin *vērō*, either as an adverb meaning "really" or as a

¹ Language contact between Gaulish and Latin had started earlier in the Gaulish speaking regions of Northern Italy known as Cisalpine Gaul. However, since there is very little text material written in the vernacular from that area, the following thoughts will confine themselves to the situation in Transalpine Gaul.

conjunction “but”. Further on in the same line another obvious loan occurs, the verbal form *curri*, to be interpreted as an imperative “run!” corresponding to Lat. *curre* (on the hypercorrect spelling *-i* instead of *-e*, see McCone 1996: 112).

A veritable mixture of Gaulish and Latin can be found on inscriptions on spindle whorls (on which in detail Meid 1980). Thus, *ave vimpi* (RIG II.2, L-122) combines the Latin greeting *ave* with a Gaulish term often found in this genre and meaning “pretty one, pretty girl, pretty woman” or the like (cf. Lejeune 1977). Sometimes the texts seem to be Latin with Gaulish words rather than the other way round. Thus, in *geneta vis cara* (RIG II.2, L-114) “dear girl, do you want?”, only *geneta* “girl” is a Gaulish term, whereas the adjective *cāra* “dear” and the verbal form *vis* “you want” are Latin in origin. Similarly, *nata vimpi pota vi(nu)m* (RIG II.2, L-121) “girl, pretty one, drink wine” contains the Gaulish noun *vimpi* already mentioned next to the Latin accusative *vinum* and the Latin imperative *pota* “drink”. Significant in both examples is the Latin morphology: the 2nd singular *vis* and the accusative *vinum* can hardly be considered as Gaulish, and therefore the texts as a whole should rather be classified as ‘gaulicized’ Latin than as latinized Gaulish.

An interesting question is the status of *nata*. This could be interpreted either as Latin (*nāta* “daughter”) or as Gaulish (earlier *gnātā* “daughter, girl”). The two words are not only homophones, but also share their etymology, both going back to IE **ǵnh₁tah₂-* fem. “born” (**ǵenh₁* “to give birth, to beget”). As Meid (1980: 16-17) reminds us, this is one of the points in the lexical system where the two languages communicated naturally.

The present paper deals with one specific area in which effects of language contact can be observed, the personal names. The changes to be noted in this field are of course not purely linguistic in nature, but are to a large extent culturally motivated. If parents give their child a Latin name this does not necessarily imply that they make no longer use of the Gaulish language. On the other hand, even after the transition from Gaulish to Latin had been completed some Gaulish personal names might have remained in use. They might then have to be interpreted as an ethnic rather than a linguistic mark (cf. Meid 1980: 8).

Gaulish personal names have come to us mainly through three types of sources. Longest known have been names recorded by classical authors such as Caesar or Tacitus. However, they will not be taken into consideration here, since they are in general names of historically important and socially high ranked persons that can tell us little about the naming habits of the ordinary population.

More promising in this regard are names on inscriptions, especially epitaphs. Two kinds of these have to be distinguished: those written in the vernacular and those written in Latin. The latter are on the whole more recent, and they adapt Gaulish names to Latin morphology, e.g. by replacing the Gaulish nominative singular *-os* of masculine *o*-stems by Latin *-us*. The names themselves, however, can be trusted to be recorded quite faithfully, since the documents are contemporary.

The Gaulish inscriptions found in Transalpine Gaul fall themselves into two categories. During the early period, starting in the late 3rd century B.C., a variant of the Eastern Greek alphabet was used, which the Gauls had taken over from the Greek colonies on the Mediterranean coast and which then spread northward along the Rhone. After the Roman conquest, it is replaced by the Latin alphabet, which implies that Gaulish inscriptions in Latin script are in general later than those in Greek script.

The following investigation will be divided into two sections, the first one looking at personal names attested on inscriptions written in the vernacular, the second one looking at those attested in Latin texts.

2. Personal Names on Gaulish Inscriptions

It seems safe to assume that Gaulish inscriptions using the Greek alphabet in the main were written before the Roman conquests, and therefore their scrutiny must be considered our best chance of establishing the genuine Gaulish naming formula. Personal names are found in considerable number on epitaphs and votive inscriptions, and their testimony is unanimous: a person carries a single name, and filiation, if stated at all, is expressed by a patronymic adjective. A number of suffixes are used to form such adjectives, the most common being **-ιος/-ια** (e.g. Ατεσθας Σμερτουρειγιος RIG I, G-3; Ουριττακος Ηλουσκιονιος RIG I, G-68; dat. Εσκεγγαι Βλανδοουικουνιαι RIG I, G-146), **-ιακος** (e.g. πορειξ Ιουγιλλιακος RIG I, G-28; Καβιρος Ουινδιακος RIG I, G-118), **-ικνος** (e.g. Κασσιταλος Ουερσικνος RIG I, G-206) and **-εος/-εα** (e. g. Βιμμος Λιτουμαρεος RIG I, G-69; Κιντουμα Κασσικεα RIG I, G-211).

The same formula is also found on the inscriptions in Latin script, examples being *Boudilatis Lemisunia* (RIG II.1, L-2) or *Andecamulos Toutissicnos* (RIG II.1, L-11). In this corpus, however, some instances occur in which filiation is expressed by the genitive of the father's name rather than by a patronymic adjective. Thus, a potter's signature from Toulon-sur-Allier reads *Sacrillos Carati* (RIG II.2, L-23.2), where *Carati* is to be interpreted as genitive of the masculine name **Karātos*, amply attested in Latin inscriptions as *Caratus* (cf. OPEL II: 36). Similarly, the votive inscription on the handle of a pot offers *Doiros Segomari* as name of the donator (RIG II.2, L-133), again with the genitive of the father's name (cf. nom. Σεγομαρος RIG I, G-153).

There can hardly be any doubt that this phenomenon is due to Latin influence. Within the Roman naming formula, filiation is indicated by the genitive of the father's *praenomen*, generally abbreviated and optionally followed by *f(ilius)* "son" or *f(ilia)* "daughter" respectively. This method was apparently adapted by the Gauls, though not precisely copied, since there is no instance of a word for "son" or "daughter" following the genitive.

Confirmation that we are not dealing with an independent Gaulish development is provided by the fact that – with the exception of the two examples given

above – those texts that do offer a genitive instead of a patronymic adjective also show some other kind of Latin influence. This is very evident in the case of an inscription on a finger ring reading *Divixta Argentias Litta Celori ddllm* (RIG II.2, L-130). The votive formula *ddllm = dederunt libentes merito* “they gave (it) willingly, deservedly” is clearly Latin, not Gaulish.

In fact, the only form to be considered undoubtedly Gaulish is *Argentias*, apparently the genitive singular of an *ā*-stem **Argentā* or possibly **Argentiā*. This could be interpreted as the mother’s name,² or alternatively as a masculine *ā*-stem. The name itself must be influenced by Lat. *argentum* “silver,” since the correct Gaulish form should have been **Argant(i)ā* (cf. RIG II.2: p. 346). The second genitive, *Celori*, is perhaps rather a form of the gentile name *Celorius* (CIL XIII.7937) than of an otherwise unattested **Celorus*. The genitive in *-ī* of *o*-stems is of course common to Latin and Gaulish. On the whole, then, this inscription is a fine example of language mix, rather like the spindle whorl inscriptions described earlier, displaying a Gaulish genitive in *-iās* next to a Latin votive formula.

Another example of a genitive in place of a patronymic adjective is found on the well known monumental votive inscription from Alisia, which records the donator as *Martialis Dannotali* (RIG II.1, L-13). Here again, Latin influence cannot be doubted, since *Martialis* is itself a Roman name. It is well attested as a *cognomen* on Latin inscriptions (cf. OPEL III: 60) but is not used as such here. Rather it takes the place of a Gaulish individual name. This is an early instance, then, of indigenous Gaulish names being replaced by Latin ones.

It is worth noting that apparently it was the Roman *cognomen* that was felt to correspond most closely to the Gaulish individual name, not the *praenomen* or the *nomen gentile*. This is no doubt due to the collapse of the traditional Roman naming system during the imperial period, which was caused on the one hand by frequent adoptions, on the other hand by the mass manumission of slaves and the granting of Roman citizenship to the population of the provinces, whereby the manumitted slaves received *praenomen* and *nomen* of their former patron, the new citizens those of the emperor. These practices caused *praenomen* and *nomen gentile* to lose all distinctive value and consequently made *cognomina* indispensable (cf. Rix 1995: 726 f.).

Coming back to *Martialis Donnatali*, it is significant that the father carries a traditional Gaulish name: *Dannotalos* is attested on the Cisalpine Gaulish inscription from San Bernardino di Briona in the form *Tanotalos* (RIG II.1, E-1) and is to be interpreted as a compound name consisting of **danno-* “a kind of magistrate” and **talu-* “forehead,” cognate with OIr. *taul* “forehead” (cf. Delamarre 2001: 113; 244). This is an example, then, of a Gaul choosing for his son a Roman name while still speaking Gaulish and even passing on this language to the next generation.

² For possible explanations why the mother should be named instead of the father, see RIG II.2: p. 346 and Stüber (2005: 53).

A similar case is found on another votive inscription, which names a *Frontu Tarbetis[o]nios* (RIG II.1, L-3). *Frontu*, here used as individual name exactly like *Martialis* above, is a Gaulish adaptation of the well attested Latin *cognomen* *Frontō* (cf. OPEL II: 153), inflected as an *n*-stem and apparently incorporated as such into Gaulish (Stüber 1998: 108). *Tarbetisonios*, on the other hand, is a patronymic adjective, not a genitive like *Dannotali*. Thus despite the Latin origin of *Frontu* the naming formula is still Gaulish in this instance.

Two interesting cases of the adaptation of Roman names into the Gaulish formula, consisting of individual name and patronymic, can be found on the well known magic inscription from Larzac (RIG II.2, L-98). The text names a number of women, most of which only bear a single name, be it Gaulish like *Adiega* (on which Stüber 2005: 110) or Latin like *Paulla*.³ There are two exceptions, however. One is *Severa Tertionicna*, attested several times in the nominative and in the accusative *Severim Tertionicnim*, the woman making up one of the two opposing parties recorded in the text. *Severa* is clearly a Roman *cognomen* (cf. OPEL IV: 76ff.). Interesting is *Tertionicna*, morphologically a patronymic adjective formed with the Gaulish suffix **-ikno-*, yet derived not from a Gaulish name, but from the Latin *n*-stem *Tertio* attested as a *cognomen* elsewhere (cf. OPEL IV: 114; on *Tertionicna* Neumann 1993: 341). Thus, not only *Severa* herself, but already her father carried a Roman name; they might well have been Romans by descent.

Very similar is the case of *Ruficna Casta*, mentioned once as a member of the opposing party. Again, *Casta* is a well attested Roman *cognomen* (cf. OPEL II: 42f.), and the patronymic adjective *Ruficna* can be interpreted as deriving from the *cognomen* *Rufus* (cf. OPEL IV: 35f.). Why the patronymic in this case is placed before the individual name remains unclear; no other instance of this word order is found in Gaulish inscriptions.

As in the case of *Martialis* and *Frontu*, it is the Roman *cognomina* that are used in the place of Gaulish individual names on the inscription of Larzac. There are, however, also attestations of Roman gentile names found in Gaulish inscriptions. An early instance is Κορνηλια on a votive inscription in Greek script (RIG I, G-65). The female donator is here referred to only by her *nomen*, which reflects the Roman custom that women carried no *praenomen* (cf. e.g. Kajanto 1977: 148-149). Κορνηλια could well have been simply a Roman woman ordering an inscription in Gaulish, for reasons unknown to us.

More significant is the case of Ουενιτουουτα Κουαδρουνια (RIG I, G-106). At first glance, this looks exactly like the genuine Gaulish naming formula of individual name and patronymic adjective. While Κουαδρουνια cannot derive from a genuine Gaulish name because of the initial κου-, which must represent a labiovelar, a phoneme not found in Gaulish, one might still be tempted to posit

³ On the interpretation of the terms *matir* “mother”, *duxtir* “daughter” and *dona* “?”, which so far are not attested outside the inscription of Larzac, see Stüber (2005: 56-57) with further references.

an adjective based on a Roman name in the manner of *Tertionicna* or *Ruficna* discussed earlier. However, a Roman *cognomen* **Quadrō* is not found. For this reason it seems preferable to see in Κουαδρουβια a rendering of the actually attested Latin gentile name *Quadrōnius* (cf. OPEL IV, 15), with substitution of /ō/ by /ū/ (written <ου>), since /ō/ was not part of the Gaulish phonemic system (Stüber 2005: 54).

Ουενιτοουτα Κουαδρουβια, then, is to be considered an instance of the Roman naming formula, with the Gaulish individual name here being used in the place of the Roman *praenomen*, as it sometimes is on Latin inscriptions (see below). The reason it was tolerated in a Gaulish text could precisely be that it looked identical to the genuine Gaulish formula.

There is one other Gaulish text that uses the Roman naming formula: the famous magical inscription on the lead tablet from Chamalières (RIG II.2, L-100), which records a group of six men. Their names are all Latin, but inflected according to Gaulish morphology and thus showing an accusative in *-on*. Contrary to the findings in Larzac, the naming formula used in Chamalières is in no way adapted to Gaulish. Two of the persons listed, *Caelion* and *Claudio(n)*, carry only a *nomen* and are characterized by the appellative *pelign(on)*, the meaning of which is uncertain (cf. Delamarre 2001: 209). Two others, *Aemilion Paterin(on)* and *Claudion Legitumon*, are called by their *nomen* and *cognomen*. The full formula consisting of *praenomen*, *nomen*, and two *cognomina*⁴ is used in the case of *C. Lucion Floron Nigrinon*.

The last person mentioned is *Marcion Victorin(on) Asiaticon Aððedilli*, who also carries two *cognomina*, but no *praenomen*. He is the only one whose father is mentioned, in the genitive as is to be expected in the Latin formula. It can hardly be a coincidence that this is the only name of Gaulish origin on the whole inscription, recognizable as such already by the orthography (ðð; for an etymology, see Delamarre 2001: 29). The situation is thus very clear cut: the one person belonging to the older generation has a Gaulish name, whereas all those belonging to the younger generation have Latin names.

3. Personal Names on Latin Inscriptions

The simplest way of referring to a person in Gaulish was to use just their individual name with no indication of filiation. This is occasionally also found on Latin inscriptions, examples being *Cintua* (CIL XIII.690), *Toutilla* (CIL XIII.1296) or gen. *Cintonis* (CIL XIII.688). The genitive in *-is* in the last instance clearly indicates that the inscription is to be classified as Latin, not as Gaulish. Where filiation is indicated, it is expressed invariably by the genitive of the father's name, often followed by *f(i)lius* or *f(i)lia*: *Escencolatis Venimari f.* (CIL

⁴ When Romans had two *cognomina*, the first one was usually an inherited family *cognomen*, the second one the individual *cognomen* (e.g. Rix 1995: 725).

XII.602), *Celtilla Attonis f.* (CIL XII.646), *Cintugena Solimari filia* (CIL XIII.693).

The examples just given show little Latin influence: it is confined to the replacement of the patronymic adjective by the genitive of the father's name, which sometimes also occurs in Gaulish texts, as shown above. An innovation that had a much greater impact was the introduction of gentile names. Though it did not imply the immediate abandoning of indigenous names, the latter had to be incorporated into the Roman formula. There were two ways of doing so: Gaulish names could either be used in place of the *praenomen* or in place of the *cognomen*.

The first solution we have already encountered in a Gaulish text: in Ουεντιτοουτα Κουαδρουνια (RIG I, G-106), Κουαδρουνια corresponds to the Roman *nomen Quadronia*, and Ουεντιτοουτα is therefore to be considered as a *praenomen*. Examples of the same phenomenon on Latin inscriptions are *Nitiogenna Tullia* (CIL XII.162) or dat. *Boudo Valerio Vrittonis f.* (CIL XII.3478). They are, however, rare on the whole, the main reason being that from the late Republic onwards, the inventory of Latin *praenomina* was limited to 18 names (cf. Rix 1995: 725) and considered as fixed. The carrying of a genuine Roman *praenomen* was regarded as a sign of Roman citizenship (ibid., 726) and for that reason foreign *praenomina* such as *Nitiogenna* or *Boudus* must have been undesirable.

Much more common was therefore the use of Gaulish names in the place of the Roman *cognomen*. This corresponds exactly to the reverse phenomenon already described, namely the use of Latin *cognomina* as individual names on Gaulish inscriptions. In such cases, men usually take on one of the traditional *praenomina* like gen. *Sex(ti) Iu(v)enti(i) Senoviri Dubnotali f.*, but women, in accordance with the Roman practice, do not. Their naming formula, therefore, consists of only *nomen* and *cognomen* as in *Livia Divogena* (CIL XIII.571), *Iulia Bellorix Abrextubogi f.* (CIL XIII.5665) or *Iul(ia) Litumara Litavicci f.* (CIL XIII.4711).

Where the father is recorded, his name is very often of Gaulish origin, as well, like *Dubnotalus*, *Abrextubogus* and *Litaviccus* above. The same goes for *Vritto*, the father of *Boudus Valerius* mentioned earlier. In the classical Roman formula, filiation is expressed by the genitive of the father's *praenomen*, usually in abbreviated form. It seems hardly likely, however, that the Gaulish names recorded here were all used as true *praenomina* a generation back; rather it is to be assumed that the fathers still bore a single individual name.

In the case of *Iulia Bellorix Abrextubogi f.* (CIL XIII.5665), of *Sex(ti) Iu(v)enti(i) Senoviri Dubnotali f.* (CIL XIII.4711), and of *Iul(ia) Litumara Litavicci f.* (both CIL XIII.4711, mother and son) the naming formula differs with regard to the order of the elements, as well: the father's name is here given after the *cognomen*, while in the Roman formula it stands between *nomen* and *cognomen*. The transition to the Roman system is thus not yet completed in these examples.

All this indicates that the people in question were of Gaulish descent and that their names were secondarily fitted into the Roman formula. In some cases, they

might have acquired their gentile name during their lifetime, as is certain in the case of dat. *Statae T. l(ibertae) Litugena* (CIL XII.5022). Here a woman by the Gaulish name of *Litugena* had apparently been the slave of *Titus Stadius* and had taken on his *nomen* when she was manumitted, as was customary. Note that in this case the order of the elements follows the Roman pattern, *T. l.* being inserted between *nomen* and *cognomen*.

Apart from the traditional Roman *nomina* like *Stadius*, *Iulius*, *Valerius*, etc., which the Gauls acquired by adoption, by being manumitted, or by being granted Roman citizenship by the emperor⁵ (cf. Rix 1995: 726), we find a second type of gentile names in Gaul: those derived from indigenous personal names. They are all formed with the suffix *-ius/-ia*, like the greater part of the genuinely Latin *nomina*. In origin, they are patronymic adjectives, as was recognized already by Schulze (1933: 20), who quoted some self-evident examples like *Comagia Comagi f. Severa* (CIL XII.2939).

It has been shown above that **-io-* was one of the most common suffixes forming patronymics in Gaulish. The Latin suffix *-ius/-ia* used in gentile names is etymologically identical; in fact, in origin the Latin gentile names are petrified patronymic adjectives themselves (Rix 1995: 728). The similarity between the two suffixes with regard to form and function apparently caused formations in *-ius/-ia* derived from Gaulish individual names to be used in place of the Roman gentile name.

In a few instances, the transition from patronymic to gentile name can be observed directly in the texts. In one example (CIL XIII.4159), *M. Ammutius Ollognatus* has a son called *Ollognatus Secundus*. Here the son does not carry the same *nomen* as the father, as should be the case according to Roman tradition. Rather the son's *nomen* *Ollognatus* is derived from the father's *cognomen* *Ollognatus* and thus is in reality a patronymic. Very similar is the case of *Meððillius Carantus* and his daughter *Carantia Aelia* (CIL XIII.6534; for *Aelia* as a *cognomen* cf. OPEL I: 32f.). Here again, *Carantia* is to be taken as a patronymic derived from *Carantus*. It seems likely that the apparent gentile names of the fathers, *Ammutius* and *Meððillius*, are in fact patronymics, as well, though we cannot be certain.

That such patronymics could develop into true gentile names can be demonstrated with the example of *Carantius*, used in such a way in cases like *Cn. Carantius Cn. f.* (CIL XIII.8649), *M. Carantius Macrinus centurio* (CIL XII.2602), or gen. *Luc. Caranti Cintonis* (CIL XIII.2525). *Carantius* as a gentile name was even passed on to manumitted slaves from a patron of this name, as testified by an inscription from Gallia Narbonensis: *T. Carantii Daphni ... Carantia Lais et Carantius Fortunatus patrono optumo* "... to (their) very good patron" (CIL XII.3208). Incidentally, the patron as well as the female slave mentioned both carry a *cognomen* of Greek origin.

⁵ The first Gaulish tribe granted citizenship was that of the Haedui in 69 A.D., cf. Meid (1980: 27, fn. 2).

Other clear cases of gentile names based on Gaulish individual names are *Matugenius* from *Matugenus* (CIL XII.2865; 2880; 4986; XIII.570), attested in *S. Matucenius Frontinus* and his daughter *Matucenia Placida* (CIL XII.3035),⁶ or *Lituccius* from *Lituccus* (CIL XII.1398; XIII.3452), attested in *Lituccius Secundus* and his sister *Lituccia Secundina* (CIL XII.2736). In the case of *Segolatus Primus* and his son *L. Segolatus Victorinus* (CIL XII.5127), the base **Segolatis* is not attested as such but can easily be postulated, both **sego-* “strength, might” and **lāti-* “hero” being common elements of Gaulish names (s. Delamarre 2001: 166 and 228). It is noteworthy that the wife of *Segolatus Primus* is called *Segolatia Victorina* and thus carries the same *nomen* as her husband. This could mean that they are both manumitted slaves with the same patron; but this must remain speculation.

Not only was the naming formula gradually adapted to Roman usage, but also the Gaulish names themselves were eventually replaced by Latin ones. These two processes seem to have taken place quite independently: on inscriptions in the vernacular, Roman *cognomina* used as individual names are even found within the traditional Gaulish naming formula as shown by *Frontu Tarbetis[o]nios* (RIG II.1, L-3), whereas in the case of *Sacrillos Carati* (CIL II.2, L-23.2), both names are Gaulish, but the patronymic adjective is replaced by the genitive of the father’s name under Latin influence, as discussed above.

Examples of children with Roman names next to fathers with Gaulish ones are quite common on Latin inscriptions: *Silvanus Litumari f.* (CIL XII.5749), *Fronto Ateponis f.* (CIL XII.1127), *Albanus Excingi f.* (CIL XIII.2613), who has a brother called *Rufus, Tauricus Carati* (CIL XIII.5313), *Prisca Biturigis* (CIL XIII.5831), or *Desideratus Curmilli* (CIL XIII.8352). In all these cases, the Latin *cognomina* are not used as such but as individual names in the Gaulish tradition.

A particularly fine example is found on an inscription from Gallia Narbonensis (CIL XII.3944), which records three generations. The father is called *Cintullus Ateponis f.* and thus carries a Gaulish name, exactly like his own father. The switch to Latin names happens in the third generation, the son being named *Tertius Cintulli f.*, the daughter *Quinta Cintulli f.* Similarly, the son’s wife *Secunda Toutilli filia* bears a Latin name herself, while her father still bore a Gaulish one. On the other hand, in the mother’s family the introduction of Latin names occurred one generation earlier: she is called *Iulia Troucilli filia* (for *Iulia* as *cognomen* cf. OPEL II: 200f.).

The replacement of Gaulish by Latin names was, however, not irreversible. On the contrary, we find a surprising number of examples in which a father with a Latin name gives his son or daughter a Gaulish one: dat. *Matugeno Montani f.* (CIL XII.2865), *Divixtos⁷ Gemelli fil.* (CIL XIII.579), *Biturix Vitalis filia* (CIL

⁶ <c> for /g/ in Gaulish names is quite common in Latin inscriptions, cf. Stüber (2005: 62) with further references.

⁷ Remarkable is the Gaulish nominative in *-os* instead of expected Latin *-us*. The rest of the inscription is undoubtedly Latin, e.g. the dative *deae* “to the goddess,” the abbreviation *fil(ius)* “son,” etc.

XIII.2929), *Divixtille ... Macrini ... filie* (CIL XIII.3454), *Salicillae Venusti fil.* (CIL XIII.5442), or *Antullus Nigri f.* (CIL XIII.11874), to name but a few. For a period of time, then, names of Gaulish and of Latin origin seem to have been in use simultaneously and could be chosen according to personal taste. Whether the choice was in some cases consciously made and politically motivated is a matter for speculation.

Before concluding, one last aspect of the transition from Gaulish to Latin names has to be considered: the translation of indigenous names into Latin. It has been claimed (e.g. Delamarre 2003: 347) that a number of Latin names found on inscriptions from Gaul should be considered as calques. Indeed, Delamarre (ibid., 347-348) gives a long list of possible correspondences between Gaulish and Latin names. Unfortunately, while it seems quite likely that e. g. *Primus* and *Primullus* (Lat. *prīmus* “first”) were considered the equivalents of indigenous *Cintus* and *Cintullus* (Gaul. **kintu-* “first”), such claims are almost impossible to prove, and in many cases too little is known about the meaning of a Gaulish name to confidently identify its Latin counterpart.

In this light, an inscription from Trier (CIL XIII.3909) recording a woman called *Artula* and her daughter *Ursula* must be considered a true stroke of good luck. That *Ursula*, containing Latin *ursus* “bear”, is a translation of *Artula*, built on Gaulish **arto-* “bear” (cf. OIr. *art*, W. *arth*), could reasonably be postulated in any case (cf. Delamarre 2003: 347). The attestation of the pair *Artula* and *Ursula*, however, proves it beyond reasonable doubt: the daughter bears not just any Latin name, but she is named after her mother. Such a phenomenon, the naming of a child after mother or father, is well known in many cultures, examples from Gaul being *Divixta*, daughter of *Divixtus* (CIL XIII.1068) or *Blanda*, daughter of *Blandus* (CIL XIII.5500). In the case of *Artula*, the desire to follow this custom was combined with the one to give the daughter a Latin name, resulting in the compromise *Ursula*.

4. Conclusion

The present paper tried to follow the slow and by no means straightforward transition process from the Gaulish naming system to the Roman one with regard to the naming formula as well as to the names themselves. Some of the changes are linguistic in nature, like the replacement of patronymic adjectives by the genitive of the father’s name and the reverse process observed on the lead tablet from Larzac, or the translation of indigenous names into Latin. Others, like the development of patronymics in *-ius/-ia* into gentile names of the Roman type or the gradual replacement of Gaulish names by Latin ones, are caused not by language contact in the strict sense, but by the contact between the Gaulish and the Roman culture.

References

- CIL XII = Hirschfeld, O.**, ed., 1888, *Inscriptiones Galliae Narbonensis Latinae*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- CIL XIII = Hirschfeld, O. & K. Zangemeister**, eds., 1899-1916, *Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum Latinae*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- OPEL I = Lörincz, B., et al.**, eds., 1994, *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum I (a-c)*, Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.
- OPEL II = Lörincz, B., et al.**, eds., 1999, *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum II (c-i)*, Wien: Forschungsgesellschaft Wiener Stadtarchäologie.
- OPEL III = Lörincz, B., et al.**, eds., 2000, *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum III (l-p)*, Wien: Forschungsgesellschaft Wiener Stadtarchäologie.
- OPEL IV = Lörincz, B., et al.**, eds., 2002, *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum IV (q-z)*, Wien: Forschungsgesellschaft Wiener Stadtarchäologie.
- RIG I = Lejeune, M.**, ed., 1985, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises I. Textes gallo-grecs*, Paris: CNRS Editions.
- RIG II.1 = Lejeune, M.**, ed., 1988, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises II.1. Textes gallo-étrusques. Textes gallo-latins sur pierre*, Paris: CNRS Editions.
- RIG II.2 = Lambert, P.-Y.**, 2002, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises II.2. Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum*, Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Delamarre, X.**, 2001 [2003], *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris: Errance.
- Kajanto, I.**, 1977, "On the Peculiarities of Women's Nomenclature," in: *L'onomastique latine, Koll. Paris 1975*, Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Lejeune, M.**, 1976-77, "Notes d'étymologie gauloise," in: *Études Celtiques* 15: 95-104.
- McCone, K.**, 1996, "Der Teller von Lezoux," in: Meid, W. & P. Anreiter, eds., *Die grösseren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 107-117.
- Meid, W.**, 1980, *Gallisch oder Lateinisch? Soziolinguistische und andere Bemerkungen zu populären gallo-lateinischen Inschriften*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Neumann, G.**, 1993, "Lateinisches in der gallischen Inschrift von Larzac," in: Meiser, G., ed., *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 340-346.

Rix, H., 1995, "Römische Personennamen," in: Eichler, E., et al., eds., *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 724-32.

Schulze, W., 1933, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin: Weidmann.

Stüber, K., 1998, *The Historical Morphology of n-Stems in Celtic*, Maynooth: National University of Ireland.

Stüber, K., 2005, *Schmied und Frau. Studien zur gallischen Epigraphik und Onomastik*, Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.