

BOTORRITA [U]ÉR TAUNEI... TAUNEI... TISAUNEI

The parallel syntax of

ne!iTom neCue [: u]eř Taunei : liTom :
 neCue : Taunei : li(.)Tom :
 neCue : másnai : Tisaunei : liTom :

suggests that we should see here a stable semantic relation running through these infinitival verbal nouns. However, because a model is found¹ in some *leges municipales* it is not necessary that that relation be one of (near) synonymy ('destruction'). It seems to me, too, in terms of discourse structure and rhetoric that an intensive ([u]eřTaunei) is less than likely in such a sequence as the element preceding the simplex (Eska p. 119). Moreover, the semantics of *deH_a- 'divide' (Eska pp. 104-5) seem to be rather too orderly and deliberate for 'destruction'. It is clear that Eska's determination (p. 112) of the base for *Tisaunei* is only tentative. I therefore propose a fresh attempt based upon lexicon which we know that Celtic inherited from IE.

Let us first accept Eska's phonological reconstruction for *Tisaunei* (helped now by Villar-Liébana's 1989 [Köln] definitive finding for the values of *s* and *š*), except for the ablaut grade, as being not *dī-sā-un-ey but *dī-sə-un-ei. We may then credit *sə- = *sH*- not to the roots of Lat. *sānus* or of OIr. *sáith* 'sufficiency', each of dubious relation, but to Welsh *asio*, *aseth*, and *ais*, Lat. *assis*². We then find ourselves in the presence of a Proto-Celtic semantic range of 'put' and 'bind, tie'. If the compound with *ad- meant 'put in place, tie together', the compound *dē-sə- meant 'put apart, dismantle, undo' *vel sim*.

We will now invoke a criterion which is not employed for reconstruction as it sometimes in strict method might well be. By this reasoning we do not appeal to translation or glosses, but to the continuity of suppletions or defective or skewed paradigms. We know that the IE paradigm of *dhe?- 'put, do' was basically aoristic, with suppletive presents depending on whether the verb was compounded or simple. This suppletion was continued as OIr. *do-cuirethar* 'puts' (to + *cuir*-), fut. *to* + (fo)cherr-, subj. and pret. (perf.) *to* + *ro-la*-; and a part of the suppletion (*dh?-) joined the preterite of 'give' (*dqw-)³. We should therefore not be surprised to find *sH- in suppletive relation to *dh?- in Botorrita.

Thus I take *Taunei* to be *də-un-ei < *dh?-un-ei and [u]eřTaunei to be **uer*-də-un-ei < **huper*-dh?-un-ei. All three verbal nouns carry the semantic features of *dhe?- > OIr. *cor*- 'put'.

¹ See Joseph, F. Eska, *Towards an Interpretation of the Hispano-Celtic Inscription of Botorrita* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 59), Innsbruck 1989, pp. 14-6.

² See my analyses, KZ 91, 1977, p. 240, and 97, 1984, p. 265.

³ See my discussion in *Festschrift for Henry Hoeningwald on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, edd. George Cardona and Norman H. Zide (Tübingen: Narr 1987), pp. 433-5.

I then equate *Ti-sa-unei* with OIr. *dī-chor* 'expelling, getting rid of' and Lat. *dē-si-nō dēsinerē* 'leave off, cease, come to an end'; *Taunei* with OIr. (*to +*)*cor-* and Lat. *pōnō po-situm*; and [*u*]ér-*Taunei* with OIr. *for.cuirethar* 'overpowers, violates' (: Lat. *superō -āre*), *for-cor* 'rape, violation'.

In light of these equations we may then attempt a tentative approximate translation: 'it is not permitted, neither to violate (or take possession?) nor to put(...) nor to dismantle by breaking', i.e. *ne quis uiolatod... neque; exferto...* (V. Eska p. 17).

In view of the allotment above of **sH-* (: OIr. *snī-* 'struggle' bind') and of the value of *ueŕ-* = OIr. *for-(cor)*, we may improve Eska's account (pp. 116-7) of the factitive *ueŕ-soniT* to 'inflict (carry out, work) a violation on'. I therefore translate (without understanding the internal analysis of *sTena*) *sTena : ueŕsoniT* : 'commits a violation on these things', i.e. (*si queis*) *aduersus ea faxit* (Lex Tarentina), (*qui*)*aduersus ea fecerit* (Lex Malacitana, Irnitana).

We see from the confirmations provided by the discourse structure of the Latin found in Roman *leges* that we reach a correct understanding of the Celtiberian text by observing closely the specifically Celtic idiomaticity of Old Irish.

Encouraged by this result we proceed to a more exact understanding of *Taunei*. OIr. *cor* (masc. *o*-stem), the verbal noun to *fo·ceird* (non-compound suppletive to *·cuirethar*, *·lā*), meant 'act of putting, throwing, discarding'. That the noun *cor* is a direct descendant of **dhe?*- is shown by its other meaning of 'contract' in legal contexts, where it has encroached on the recessive *deidmea* (gen. sg.) 'custom' = Welsh *deddf* 'law, custom, θέμις' = Attic θεσμός, Doric τεθμός 'law'; cf. my discussion of Gmc. 'doom', *Lingua Posnaniensis* 16, 1972, pp. 87-90. We are therefore justified in attributing to *Taunei* the semantics of 'throwing, discarding'.

This agrees well with the meanings found in the Latin formulation *in hoc loucarid stircus | ne [qu]is fundatid neue cadauer | proiecitad neue parentatid. |* (CIL P 401 IX 782, Diehl₃ 257, Luceria, lost) 'in this sacred grove let no one empty dung nor fling | dispose of a corpse (nor perform rites for the dead)'; *nei quis... ustrinam | fecisse uelit niue | stercus cadauer | iniecise uelit* (CIL P 838 f., Diehl₃ 259) 'let no one... try to create a site for the cremation of corpses nor to throw there (lit. *intra* inside) dung [or] a corpse'. The disposal of both dung and corpses is forbidden.

Thus we may revise our translation: *neCue : Taunei : lī(.)Tom* : 'nor is it permitted to dump'.

The Botorrita ordinance seems, then, to reflect in its language the concerns (violation, dumping, and dismantling) and phraseology of a *lex sacra*, yet no object is named that would be inappropriate to the category of *leges municipales*.

Department of Linguistics
University of Chicago

ERIC P. HAMP