

CELTIBERIAN *TUATERES*, *TUATEROS* 'DAUGHTER'

The discovery (1992) of the second great bronze table at Botorrita and its publication by Beltrán - de Hoz - Untermann (1996)¹ have brought to light for us two forms of the word for "daughter" which are of great importance for Celtic studies and of cardinal suggestiveness for our understanding of this difficult and unsolved IE word.

The nominative pl. *Tuateres* K. 1.3. II 40 cannot plausibly be read /duatres/ (cf. Lat. *patrēs*, departing from Greek πατέρες), since the genitive sg. *Tuateros-Kue* K. 1.3. III 24 can be only /duateros/ (against Lat. *patris*, Greek πατρός). We will therefore use *Tuateres* as our citation form.

The middle syllable of the IE form of the stem offers notorious difficulty. This difficulty does not arise with the North European IE branches because of their well known regular syncope of medial IE schwa. Therefore Baltic, with Lithuanian *dukė* *dukė* and Old Prussian *dukti*,² Slavic, with OCS *dŭšti* *dŭštere*, OCzech *dcí*, Czech *dcera*, Serbo-Croatian *kćī* *kćēre*, Resian *x̣ṭm*, and Germanic, with Goth. *daubtar*, ONorse *dōttir*, OHG *tohter*, all from apparent **dbukē* *dbukter*, offer no problem.

Likewise Tocharian A *ckācar*, B *tkācer*, which otherwise seem as a branch to be closely associated with West (and North) European IE, offer no problem with **dbug(h)ater*. And Luwian and Lycian (*tbatra*)³ present no anomaly by losing their medial velar (aspirate), hence **dbu()atr*.

Iranian forms such as Avestan *duḡadar-* *duγdar-*, Persian *duxtar* /*dux* can be viewed as **dbugdber-* < **dbugh-ter-* and explained as losing **Ḥ* when **g* and **gh* merged in Iranian; in this way the separate Iranian development would be easily understood, but that would still not remove the Indic problem, with which any Iranian reflex must share a close relation.

The balance of the attested forms raises problems, but separate and idiosyncratic problems. Our essential task must be to unite these problems. I have pointed out⁴ that Indic, with *dubitar*, offers a double problem of showing the laryngeal twice (**g* with **Ḥ* as though **gh*, and *d* < **db* by Grassmann's Law, while the reflex of **Ḥ* is seen as schwa > *ṛ*) and of appearing to reflect palatalization of **gh* to *h*, unexpected before *i* from schwa; that Nuristani confirms the palatalization in Prasun *lušt* with *š*; and Armenian evidences unexpected syncope of medial schwa in *dustr* *dster*. We therefore tentatively reconstruct Indic as **dbugh'atér*, Nuristani as **d(h)ug'()t*, and Armenian as **dbug(h)ter*.

Greek departs radically from these with θυγάτηρ θυγατέρα reflecting **dbugā'tér*, and Tsakonian *sáti* confirms this.⁵

¹ *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum* IV.

² See E. P. Hamp, «Old Prussian *brāti*, *brote*, *dukti*», in *Colloquium Pruthenicum Primum*, Warszawa (1992) 13-4.

³ E. P. Hamp, «Lycian *χabba*», *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 39, 1980, 215-6.

⁴ «Sanskrit *dubitā*, Armenian *dustrā*, and IE internal schwa», *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90, 1970, 228-31.

⁵ A. von Blumenthal in his article on Messapic inscriptions in *IF* 54, 1936, pp. 81-113, interpreted (112-3)

do in inscription 409 from Caelia as perhaps standing for **dog(a)tér*.

This followed upon his speculation that in inscription 525 from Aletium *so* stood for Messapic **sonos* "filius".

Since I am now convinced that the Messapic word for daughter was *bili(v)a* (and *filius* somewhat similar) this ingenious suggestion of von Blumenthal now falls away.

Now, contrasting strongly with Celtiberian, somewhat as the North European, Iranian, Nuristani, and Armenian do with Anatolian, Tocharian, and Greek, the Gaulish (nominative sg.) Larzac *duxtir*⁶ and the Old Irish *Der*⁷ give us a surprising **dbuktēr*.

In order to account for the above facts we need as a starting set of reconstructions:

Anatolian	* <i>dbug_hH₁atr-</i>
Indic	* <i>dbug_hH₂ter-</i>
Nuristani	* <i>dbug()₂t-</i>
Iranian	* <i>dbug_hH₂er-</i>
Armenian	* <i>dbug_hH₂er-</i>
Greek	* <i>dbug_hH_a[?]ter-</i>
No. European	* <i>dbug_hH₂er-</i>
Tocharian	* <i>dbug(h)₂H₂er-</i>
Gaulish, Irish	* <i>dbug_hH₂er-</i>

It may be presumed phonetically that **H* above imparted aspiration to the velar obstruent (stop), while *[?] (the first laryngeal) gave a palatalizing (fronting?) effect to the velar.

The result, then, in Indic *dubitar-* was the same as that observed in Vedic *mahás*, to *mábi* : μέγα, άγα-.

If we now assume (other than in Tocharian) that **H* (or **H_a*) was **f* (the second laryngeal) we see that the above reconstructions can be reduced to:

Anatolian, Indic-Nuristani, Greek, Tocharian	* <i>dbug_f[?]ter-</i>
Iranian, Armenian, No. European, Gaulish-Irish	* <i>dbug_hH₂er-</i>

It now becomes apparent that Celtiberian *Tuateres*, which from the conjoined locution *Kentisum. Tuateros-Kue* K. 1.3. III 24 (cf. *Kimbiria. Kentis-Kue* K. 1.3. III 4) seems surely to mean "(of the sons and of the) daughter", must somehow be a reflex of the first of the above: **dbug_f[?]ter-*. Since we find that the closely related Indic-Nuristani and Iranian, as well as Greek and Armenian, diverge in their reflexes we need not be troubled by the hypothesis that Celtiberian differs in its development from Gaulish and Irish. In fact, we may have here a significant innovation shared by Gaulish and Irish against Celtiberian.

The question of the phonetic development of **dbug_f[?]ter-* to /duater-/ must now be posed, since we would not normally expect **g* to vanish in early Celtic or Celtiberian; cf. *Brigantes*, Celtiberian *sekotiad* = /segontiad/. It is proposed that the cluster **-g_f* underwent spreading of the probably continuant articulation of *f*, thereby giving [y_f], in which it was easy for [f] to dominate, masking the audible character of [y]. The result of this masking would be **d(h)ug_f[?]ter-* > **duy_f[?]ter-* > **du_fater-*; then the loss of nonsyllabic intervocalic laryngeal led to **duater-* > *duater-*.

This finding now leads us to reconsider the background of the troublesome Oscan *futír*, dat. *fu(u)trei*,⁸ which appears to be **puHt(e):r-* or **puyt(e):r-*. When we consult M. Leumann, *Lateinische*

⁶ M. Lejeune, L. Fleuriot, P.-Y. Lambert, R. Marichal, and A. Vernhet, «Le plomb magique du Larzac et les sorcières gauloises», *Études celtiques* 22, 1985, 88-177, esp. 131 f.

⁷ M. A. O'Brien, «*Der, Dar, Derb-* in female names», *Celtica* 3, 1956, 178-9; E. P. Hamp, «*dbug_hH₂er* in Irish», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33, 1975, 39-40.

⁸ E. P. Hamp, «'Fils' et 'fille' en italique», *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 66, 1971, 213-27.

Because of the authority carried by the name of Rudolf Thurneysen it is worth citing from his note in *Glotta* 21, 1933, 1-8, pp. 7-8 «Italisches II Oskisch *futír* Tochten» = *Gesammelte Schriften* I 1991, issued by Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel and Rolf Ködderitzsch pp. 329-30: "... denkbar scheint mir z.B. **mätír mätir* 'Mutter' for which he posits **fug'tír fug'tir-* as having been simplified to yield *futír futir-*.

Thurneysen does not, however, tell us how the claimed simplification came about or was actuated nor

Laut- und Formenlehre (1963) 136 (after sifting variant views), we find a proposed sequence which may be summarized $*g^w b$ and $*gbu > \chi u > \mathfrak{z}u > gu > v$. This is posited to explain $*u\alpha\chi^{\#}itos > v\acute{o}tus$ (as well as *nivem*, *brevis* and *levis*, with zeroing of $*g$ too late to yield *ov* from *eu*). In any case I would modify this series to eliminate $*gu$, since $*\mathfrak{z}u$ (= [γu]) will best give *u* and original $*gu$ could have already become $*\mathfrak{z}u$. Moreover I would also eliminate the interstage $*\chi u$, since it is better to trace the IE aspirates through spirants which medially stayed voiced.⁹ Now we know that while Latin devoiced initially Oscan-Umbrian devoiced also medially. But we will here assume that our relevant changes occurred before the Oscan-Umbrian devoicing.

With all of this in mind we have no problem with a form of the type Umbr. *vufetes*, particularly if the anterior segment was not intervocalic. The above sequence then becomes $*g^w b$ and $*gbu > \mathfrak{z}u$ (= γu) $> u$.

Now if we assume $*dbug^w htr-$ with assimilatory rounding of $*g$ next to *u*, we arrive at $*dbug^w htr- > *pu\mathfrak{z}^{\#}tr- > *puu\mathfrak{z}tr- > \text{Osc. } fu(u)tr-$.

We thus find IE $*dbug^w t^{\#}tr-$, simplified independently in later dialects to $*dbug^w tr-$.

ERIC P. HAMP
Chicago

what the apparent omission symbolized by the apostrophe actually meant.

We cannot therefore regard Thurneysen's explanation as complete by current standards.

⁹ E. P. Hamp, «On medial *s* in Italic», *Glotta* 50, 1972, 290-1, and J. Untermann, *Word* 24, 1968, 479-90, there acknowledged; also G. Meiser, *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*, Innsbruck 1986, p. 75.