

# Keltische Forschungen

Herausgegeben im Auftrag von  
*Brennos – Verein für Keltologie*  
von David Stifter  
unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit  
von Hannes Tauber



prae  
sens

**Keltische Forschungen 4 · 2009**



## Inhalt

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Alderik H. BLOM<br><i>lingua gallica, lingua celtica</i> : Gaulish, Gallo-Latin, or Gallo-Romance?   | 7   |
| Benjamin BRUCH<br>Medieval Cornish Versification: An Overview  | 55  |
| Lukas J. DORFBAUER<br>Trunksucht in Blütenlesen: Die beiden Sprüche<br>' <i>Ebrietas abluit memoriam... Sobrietas salvat memoriam...</i> ' | 127 |
| Alexander FALILEYEV<br>'New' Gaulish Personal Names  | 163 |
| Aaron GRIFFITH<br>The Old Irish Deponent Suffixless Preterite  | 169 |
| Anders Richardt JØRGENSEN<br>Irish <i>báeth, báes, bés, ammaid</i> and Breton <i>boaz, amoed</i>   | 189 |
| Ranko MATASOVIĆ<br>Adjective Phrases in Old Irish  | 195 |
| Dagmar SCHLÜTER<br>Zwischen Göttinnen und Verliererinnen. Gender als Kategorie<br>in der Keltologie: eine erste Bestandsaufnahme           | 211 |
| David STIFTER<br>Notes on Châteaubleau (L-93)  | 229 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Rezensionen  | 245 |
| Wolfgang Meid und Peter Anreiter, <i>Heilpflanzen und Heilsprüche. Zeugnisse gallischer Sprache bei Marcellus von Bordeaux. Linguistische und pharmakologische Aspekte</i> . <i>Studia Interdisciplinaria Aenipontana</i> 4, Wien: Edition Praesens 2005 (Alderik H. Blom)   | 245 |
| Andrew Carnie, <i>Irish Nouns: a reference guide</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press 2008 (Theresa-Susanna Illés)  | 248 |
| Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, <i>Neuirisches Lesebuch. Texte aus Cois Fhairrge und von den Blasket Inseln</i> . Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2008 (Theresa-Susanna Illés)   | 254 |
| Gérard Cornillet, <i>Wörterbuch Bretonisch-Deutsch. Deutsch-Bretonisch</i> . Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag 32006 (Patrick J. Zecher)  | 258 |
| Patrice Lajoie, <i>Des dieux gaulois. Petits essais de mythologie</i> [= <i>Archaeolingua Series Minor</i> 26], Budapest: Archaeolingua 2008 (Andreas Hofeneder)   | 261 |
| Iwan Wmffre, <i>Breton Orthographies and Dialects. The Twentieth-Century Orthography War in Brittany</i> . <i>Contemporary Studies in Descriptive Linguistics</i> 18 and 19, Oxford – Bern – Berlin – Bruxelles – Frankfurt am Main – New York – Wien: Peter Lang 2007 (Albert Bock)                                       | 269 |
| John Carey, <i>Ireland and the Grail</i> . <i>Celtic Studies Publications</i> 11. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications 2007 (David Stifter)  | 276 |
| Nora White, <i>Compert Mongáin and Three Other Early Mongán Tales. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Textual Notes, Bibliography and Vocabulary</i> . <i>Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts</i> 5, Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth 2006 (David Stifter) | 281 |
| <i>Law, Literature and Society. CSANA Yearbook</i> 7. Joseph F. Eska Editor. Dublin – Portland Or.: Four Courts Press 2008 (David Stifter)   | 287 |
| <i>Studies on the Book of Deer</i> . Katherine Forsyth Editor, Dublin: Four Courts Press 2008 (David Stifter)  | 290 |
| Abstracts  | 297 |



## *lingua gallica, lingua celtica:* Gaulish, Gallo-Latin, or Gallo-Romance?

Alderik H. BLOM

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Weisgerber observed that “man weithin geneigt [ist], dort, wo unsere Quellen von *Celtae* oder *lingua Celtica* reden, an Kelten und keltische Sprachen in unserem heutigen Sinne zu denken. Das gilt aber bereits vom Beginn unserer Belege an nur in eingeschränktem Sinne und ist seit dem 4. Jahrhundert kaum mehr zutreffend.” (WEISGERBER 1969: 152). Indeed, this important observation holds true for the term *lingua gallica* as well. In fact, Weisgerber suggested that, when referring to language, in late Antiquity the adjective *gallica* could indicate three distinct phenomena (WEISGERBER 1969: 152; SOFER 1941: 110): 1. the Continental Celtic language known to modern scholarship as Gaulish, or 2. the Gallic variety of Latin (Gallo-Latin), or 3. a specific rhetorical style in Latin, the Gallic *eloquentia*, also called the Gallic *cot(h)urnus*.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the writings of early authors such as Pliny and Dioscurides already contain various terms identified as *κελτικός* and *gallicus* which are in fact Latin or Greek (WEISGERBER 1969: 152 fn. 4),<sup>2</sup> so that Weisgerber concluded that there was confusion about identifying the language even at an early stage. While we may wonder whether these wrongly identified items simply represent mistakes on the part of these early authors, it is clear that in late antique texts the exact meaning of *gallica* and *celtica* had become ambiguous. Considering the vital importance of the meaning of the word *gallica* for the interpretation of loose

1 See NORDEN 1958: II 631–642 for a discussion of this style and its reception.

2 For examples, see DOTTIN 1920: 32.

words indicated as such in many texts, especially in Endlicher's Glossary and Marcellus Empiricus' *De Medicamentis*, it is clear that the development of words for 'Gaulish' demands our attention.<sup>3</sup>

The present discussion mainly concerns Latin sources; the Greek sources have not been culled exhaustively for reasons of time and space.<sup>4</sup> My discussion further develops the seminal work done by Wilmotte and Weisgerber, who attempted to sketch out the chronological development of the usage of these two terms through the analysis of a limited number of examples from different periods. Wilmotte's tentative contribution mainly concerned the meaning of *celticus* over time, concluding that its perceived meaning 'Gallo-Latin turning into Gallo-Romance' had not changed from the fourth to the fifteenth century (WILMOTTE 1927: 229–230). Weisgerber, on the other hand, concentrated on the term *gallicus* within the context of his study of the 'Hieronymuszeugnis': St Jerome's claim that the language of the *Galatae* closely resembled that of the *Treveri* (WEISGERBER 1969: 151–154). Their comments on individual texts are, where relevant, discussed in sections 2 and 3. By contrast to this somewhat piecemeal approach my account endeavours to be as comprehensive as possible, bringing a considerable number of new texts into the discussion. It analyses the attestations one by one, discussing text, context, and relevant lexical items, thereby presenting the widest-ranging discussion of the material to date. I also include various other matters which Wilmotte and Weisgerber overlooked, such as matters of chronology, matters of register and style, the role of genre, and the sources of the individual texts.

For example, it should be realised that the terms *celtica* and *gallica(na)* occur in combination with various terms for 'speech', namely *sermo* and *lingua*. These terms do not necessarily indicate sharply defined languages only, or even dialects. Especially *sermo* tends to be used for more informal speech, a conversational style, sometimes even amounting to 'chat', or 'gossip'. Furthermore, the adverbial use of the terms, for example *gallice*, understood as 'in a Gallic manner', could also indicate accent or style. The terms under scrutiny here could therefore indicate 'Gallic' peculiarities in accent and dialect, as well as a separate language. They may also indicate peculiar differences in style or register, for example the distinction between 'high, rhetorical' versus 'low, rustic'. Generally the sources do not allow us to recover these nuances, but

3 I have discussed the (perceived) Gaulish elements in these two texts elsewhere. For Endlicher's Glossary see BLOM *forthc.* a; for Marcellus, see BLOM *forthc.* b and BLOM *forthc.* c.

4 Many Gaulish words in Greek texts actually derive from Latin, see SOFER 1936: 87–89.

these considerations do show that it cannot be assumed that the terms always necessarily indicate a separate language ('Gaulish' or 'Latin'). Various levels of integration also have to be taken into account; in some cases the term was still regarded as a foreign word, whereas in other cases it had more or less become integrated into (a variety of) Latin (SCHMIDT 1967: 167; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 114–116). Another factor that complicates a straightforward chronological model of development is that authors operating in different genres may use the terms with a different meaning. Thus, a ninth-century compiler of glossaries, extracting rare terms from a late antique grammatical treatise, may use the term *lingua gallica* or *gallice* to identify (perhaps unknowingly) an actual Celtic word which could eventually derive from an early Roman author. At the same time, a contemporary chronicler may use the same term *lingua gallica* to refer to the non-Latin vernacular ('French') of his own period. Because the terms *celtica* and *gallic(an)a* developed differently, I will discuss them separately in the following sections, starting with *celtica*.

## 2. CELTICA

The semantic development of *celtica* is rather difficult to trace because the word is not very frequently attested. In Latin it tends to be used in a geographically restricted sense. Weisgerber and Sofer established that the terms *Celtae* and *celtica* refer specifically to central Gaul, and are therefore more geographically specific than *Galli* and *gallica*, which tend to refer to the entirety of Gaul (SOFER 1941: 110):<sup>5</sup>

Denn es ist zu beachten, daß die Römer die Ausdrücke *Celtae*, *Celticus* nur in beschränktem Maße verwenden, und daß schon allein dadurch ein Abstand von *Galli*, *Gallicus* geschaffen wird. Dieser Abstand zeigt sich bereits darin, daß trotz der Gleichsetzung Caesars (*ipsorum lingua Celtae, nostra Galli appellantur*) *Celtae* häufiger (im Gegensatz zu dem geläufigen griech. Κελτοί, aber entsprechend der Umgrenzung bei Caesar) auf die Bewohner des Mittelgebietes Galliens als einer *Gallia Celtica* im Gegensatz zur *Belgica* und *Aquitania* bezogen wird; damit ist *Celticus* landschaftlich begrenzter als *Gallicus*, und das wirkt sich auch dort aus, wo von der *lingua Celtica* die Rede ist.<sup>6</sup>

5 This in contrast to WILMOTTE 1927: 224–225 who held that *gallica* and *celtica* were synonymous.

6 WEISGERBER 1969: 153

This use of the term (*Gallia*) *Celtica* to indicate the central part of Gaul survived into the Middle Ages, where it is frequently attested in the works of, for example, Richer of St. Rémy (late tenth century), Otto of Freising (twelfth century), and many others.<sup>7</sup>

For our purposes, the earliest attestations of the Latin term *celtica* referring to language are found in the work of Pliny, for example in *Nat. Hist.* XXXIII, 39: *armillae uiriolae celtice dicuntur*.<sup>8</sup> These doubtlessly indicate the Celtic language of Gaul in the modern sense (WEISGERBER 1969: 153). We may wonder whether Pliny's sparing use of the term is influenced by his Greek sources,<sup>9</sup> because he generally preferred a form of *gallica* to indicate Gaulish lexical items. Furthermore, it is debatable whether the term gained full currency, since there is a gap of several centuries before *celt(ic)a* is attested once more applied to language. Ausonius (c. A.D. 310–c. 395) uses the term *lingua Celtarum* in his poem *Ordo urbium nobilium*, ll. 160–163 when speaking about a particular fountain in Burdigala (Bordeaux):

salue, fons ignote ortu, sacer alme perennis  
uitree glauce profunde sonore illimis opace  
salue, urbis genius, medico potabilis haustu  
Diuona Celtarum lingua fons addite diuis.<sup>10</sup>

‘Hail fountain of a source unknown, holy, kindly, unailing,  
transparent, azure, deep, murmurous, clear, and shady.  
Hail, guardian deity of the city, drinkable at a healing draught,  
Divona in the language of the *Celtae* – O fountain given to the gods.’

Here again it seems to indicate the Celtic language of Gaul (although it is impossible to say whether *Celtae* is used here in a geographically restricted sense), even if we cannot infer anything about the continuous survival of the language on the basis of this passage.<sup>11</sup> Still, we cannot assume that the term

7 For antique examples see TLL Onomasticon II 310–311; note that the adjective *celticus* can also pertain to Spain and Galatia. For mediaeval examples, see for example Richer of St. Rémy, *Historia* I, 21; I, 28; II, 1; II, 40; Otto of Freising, *Chronica* VI, 17; VI, 18; VII, 12; that the terminology is taken over from ancient writers is shown in VI, 30.

8 For a list of all the attestations of *celt(ic)a* in Pliny, see ACS I 923–924.

9 For a list of all antique attestations (predominantly Greek) of *celt(ic)a*, κελτική vel sim., see ACS I 888–956.

10 EVELYN WHITE 1967–68: I 284.

11 Because of this passage and Ausonius' description of his father in *Epicedion in patrem*, ll. 9–10: *sermone impromptus Latio, uerum Attica lingua suffecit culti uocibus eloquii* ‘For Latin I never had a ready tongue; but the speech of Athens supplied my need with words of choice eloquence’ (in EVELYN WHITE 1967–68: I 42–43), it has been suggested that Ausonius’

*lingua celtica/Celtarum* was commonly used to indicate Gaulish in the centuries between Pliny and Ausonius. An erudite writer such as Ausonius may have used this phrase as a learned expression, which does not necessarily imply any knowledge about the linguistic affiliation of this *lingua Celtarum*. Furthermore, the passage in *Ordo urbium nobilium* may be explained in terms of a *figura etymologica* explaining a local name by a Latin phrase, as often used by Virgil (GREEN 1991: 582–583; BARTELINK 1965: 35–60). Wilmotte argued that this passage “paraît démontrer que *celtica lingua*, au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, peut encore avoir le sens attardé que je lui dénie dans Sulpice Sévère” (WILMOTTE 1927: 224).

Wilmotte referred to a passage from Ausonius’ near contemporary Sulpicius Severus’ (c. A.D. 363–c. 420) *Dialogi de uita Martini* I, 27, where the term *celtice* appears to have a different connotation. The dialogue takes place between two men from Aquitaine and a certain Gallus, who is a disciple of St Martin. The Aquitanians implore Gallus to speak of the saint, but he is disinclined to do so because of his ‘bad Latin’ (I have printed in bold the terms relevant for the following discussion):

ego plane, licet imparsum tanto oneri, tamen relatis superius a Postumiano obedientiae cogor exemplis, ut munus istud, quod imponitis, non recusem. sed dum cogito me **hominem Gallum inter Aquitanos** uerba facturum, uereor ne offendat uestras nimium urbanas aures **sermo rusticior**. audietis me tamen ut **gurdonicum hominem**, nihil cum fucō aut **cothurno** loquentem. nam si mihi tribuistis Martini me esse discipulum, illud etiam concedite, ut mihi liceat exemplo illius inanes sermonum faleras et uerborum ornamenta contemnere. tu uero, inquit Postumianus, uel **celtice** aut, si mauis, **gallice** loquere, dummodo Martinum loquaris. ego autem credo, quia, etiamsi mutus esses, non defutura tibi uerba, quibus Martinum facundo ore loquereris, sicut Zachariae in Iohannis nomine lingua resoluta est. ceterum cum sis **scholasticus**, hoc ipsum quasi **scholasticus artificiose** facis, ut excuses inperitiam, **quia exuberans eloquentia**. sed neque monachum tam astutum neque Gallum decet esse tam callidum.<sup>12</sup>

“I certainly, although unequal to such a burden, am compelled by the examples of obedience related above by Postumianus not to refuse that duty which you impose [upon me]. But while I know myself [to be] a man of Gaul about to speak in the presence of Aquitanians, I fear lest my rustic speech should offend your refined ears. You will, then, listen to me as

father spoke Gaulish as his first language, see SOFER 1941: 113. GREEN 1991: 276 suggests more cautiously that Ausonius’ father had not acquired the degree of eloquence and articulacy in Latin that was required by the protocol and that it is possible that his native language was not Latin. However, on the basis of the passage alone I see no reason why this should be the case – it seems more likely that Ausonius speaks about his father’s lack of proficiency in rhetorical language.

12 HALM 1866: 179–180.

[to] a *homo gurdonicus*, who says nothing with affectation or artificiality. For if you have conceded to me to be a disciple of Martin, grant this also, that by his example I may despise the empty trappings of speech and the ornaments of words.” “Please,” said Postumianus, “speak either *celtice*, or if you prefer, *gallice*, as long as you speak of Martin. However, I believe that, even if you might be dumb, words will not be lacking to you by which you would speak of Martin with eloquent lips, [just] as the tongue of Zacharias was loosed at the mere name of John. Moreover, as you are a rhetorician, this itself you do like an orator, that you apologise for [your] ignorance, because you [really] excel in eloquence. But it is fitting neither for a monk to be so cunning, nor for a Gaul to be so skilful.”

Brunot suggested that this passage cannot refer to a living Gaulish language, which the Aquitanian speakers would not have understood (BRUNOT 1966: 21 fn. 1). Rather, what is meant is the Gallo-Latin dialect or accent of central Gaul (*Gallia Celtica* as opposed to *Belgica* and *Aquitania*) (WILMOTTE 1927: 226), which may have appeared *rusticior* in comparison to the speech of Aquitaine. Weisgerber concluded that both terms in *celtice aut si mauis gallice* indicate a specific form of Latin, though not necessarily the same (WEISGERBER 1969: 153). Indeed, *gallice* may have been felt as less geographically confined and slightly more prestigious. In addition to this I take *celtice* (and *gallice*) to refer to a specific style of speech, borne out especially by Gallus’ remark that he will speak *nihil cum fuco aut cothurno*. A closer study of the relevant terms used in this passage to describe the language of Gallus may illustrate this.

Apart from being described as *gallice* and *celtice*, Gallus’ language is also contrasted with that of his Aquitanian friends: *sed dum cogito me hominem Gallum inter Aquitanos uerba facturum* (AUGELLO 1969: 132 fn. 52). A perceived difference in prestige is evident in Gallus’ suggestion that *offendat uestras nimium urbanas aures sermo rusticior*. The phrase *audietis me tamen ut gurdonicem hominem* may echo the phrase *sermo rusticior*, even if the term *gurdonicus* remains problematic. Bradley, preferring the reading *gorthonicum* which occurs in some manuscripts, drew attention to a similar word from the *Hodoeporicon Sancti Willibaldi* (c. A.D. 785) as well as the form *chorthonicum* from a Latin-Old High German vocabulary of names, where it denotes a synonym of *Gallia*: *Gallia uualho lant* and *chorthonicum aut uualho lant* (BRADLEY 1904: 281–282). He suggested to read *gorthonicum hominem* as ‘a (person from) Gaul’. Babut suggested therefore that the word *gorthonicum* constituted an equivalent or near-equivalent of the personal name *Gallus* (BABUT 1910: 291–292). By contrast Grosjean read *turonicum* ‘of Tours’, claiming that the form was corroborated by various glossary forms (GROSJEAN 1954: 116–126). Antin, on the other hand, preferred the reading *gortonicus* or *gurdonicus* and thought of it as a proper name meaning ‘of *Gortona*, \**Gordona* (modern Sancerre)’. He suggested an association with *gurdus* ‘stolidus; a blockhead,

dolt' so that the form might be understood as "Sancerrois sans cervelle" (ANTIN 1959: 111–112). However, the most convincing interpretation to date has been provided by Evans, who argued that the preferred reading supported by the manuscript evidence is *gurdonicus*. Furthermore, he listed possible Middle Welsh derivatives of *gurdonicus* ((g)w(y)rddonig, etc.), which he interpreted as 'unrefined, rough, rustic, boorish', which fits the context of Sulpicius' dialogue particularly well. He argued that 'the etymology of *gurdonicus* is dubious although there seems to be no valid objection to treating it as a derivative of Latin *gurdus*.' (EVANS 1966: 27–31). The speech of a *gurdonicus homo* 'a rustic' thus appears to be essentially the same as the *sermo rusticior* mentioned in the same passage.

However, the main reason for taking *gallice* and *celtice* to indicate a particular style of speech rather than an altogether different language is the use of the word *cothurnus* in Gallus' remark that he will speak *nihil cum fuco aut cothurno*. Lat *cothurnus* 'solemnity of expression' < Grk κόθουρος, is a term often used to describe the tragedy-like pathos and mannerism of a specifically Gallic style of rhetoric.<sup>13</sup> For example in St Jerome (c. A.D. 345–420), *Epistolae* XXXVII, 3, commenting unfavourably on the style of Rheticius, bishop of Autun: *innumerabilia sunt, quae in illius mihi commentariis sordere uisa sunt. est sermo quidem conpositus et Gallicano coturno fluens*<sup>14</sup> 'Innumerable are the things, which seem to me to be of no account in the commentaries of this man. Indeed, the language is artificial, and fluent with the *coturnus gallicus* [Gallic pathos]'. Similarly in St Jerome, *Epistolae* LVIII, 10, discussing the style of various patristic writers: *sanctus Hilarius Gallicano coturno attollitur et, cum Graeciae floribus adornetur, longis interdum periodis inuoluitur et a lectione simpliciorum fratrum procul est* (HILBERG 1996: I 539). 'That reverend man Hilary gains in height from his Gallic buskin; yet, adorned as he is with the flowers of Greek rhetoric, he sometimes entangles himself in long periods and offers by no means easy reading to the less learned brethren' (FREMANTLE ET AL. 1893: 122).

Similarly, Ennodius (from Provence, A.D. 473–521), *Epistolae* I, 15 mentions *coturnus in eloquentia* (HARTEL 1882: 26). This specific Gallic style (*cothurnus*) of Latin is thought by Norden to be visible in later writers also, such as Sidonius and Gregory of Tours, whose prose is "oft zur völligen Unver-

13 Cf. St Jerome, *Epistolae* CXXV, 6.

14 HILBERG 1996: I 288.

ständlichkeit verzerrt” (NORDEN 1958: II 639).<sup>15</sup> Other terms in Sulpicius’ dialogue, such as *artificiose*, *eloquentia*, etc., also refer to a specific style or register in Latin. Instead, Gallus intends to speak in the manner of St Martin himself: *nam si mihi tribuistis Martini me esse discipulum, illud etiam concedite, ut mihi liceat exemplo illius inanes sermonum faleras et uerborum ornamenta contemnere* (HALM 1866: 179). In fact, Sulpicius comments specifically on St Martin’s manner of speaking in *Vita Sancti Martini* XXV, 6: *iam uero in uerbis et confabulatione eius quanta grauitas, quanta dignitas erat! quam acer, quam efficax erat, quam [...] promptus et facilis* ‘what seriousness, what dignity there was in his words and conversation! How vigorous, how effective he was, how [...] clear and easy’ (HALM 1866: 135).

All of the terms discussed above refer to the style or register of language which Gallus employs. Nothing in these suggests that they indicate any other language than Latin. If we surmise that *gallice* and *celtice* refer to the same use of language (namely, that of Gallus) then it seems justifiable to interpret these terms as indicating a ‘rustic, provincial, unpolished, simple’ use of Latin. This is further corroborated by a passage in *Dialogi* II, 1, 4, where Sulpicius Severus, in the words of Gallus, contrasts a word *tripetias* (*sic*) supposedly used by *nos rustici Galli*,<sup>16</sup> with its learned counterpart *tripodas*:

nam in ecclesia nemo unquam illum sedere conspexit, sicut quendam nuper, testor Deum, non sine pudore uidi sublimi solio et quasi regio tribunali celsa sede residentem, sedentem uero Martinum in sellula rusticana, ut sunt istae in usibus seruulorum, quas nos rustici Galli tripetias, uos scholastici aut certe tu, qui de Graecia uenis, tripodas nuncupatis.<sup>17</sup>

‘For example nobody ever observed him sitting in church like a certain person I saw lately (God is my witness), not without a sense of shame, sitting on a high seat and as if on a royal tribunal in a lofty place; but Martin [was seen] sitting on a simple stool, like those in use among lowly servants, which we Gallic country-people call *tripetias*, [but which] you rhetoricians, and certainly you, who comes from Greece, call *tripodas*.’

In this case Sulpicius Severus clearly means the (vulgar) Latin word *tripedia* or *tripetia* ‘three-legged stool’ (NIEMEYER 2002: 1346; GMIL VIII 85). Gallus here shows the same awareness of his uneducated speech as in *Dialogi* I, and this passage hints at the same difference between educated and uneducated style. It is tempting to equate the terms *sermo rusticior*, *gallice*, and *celtice*

15 Gregory of Tours also uses the word himself, for example in *Historia Francorum* IV, 6.

16 Note that Sulpicius Severus also uses the word *rusticus* in the sense of ‘pagan’, for example in *Vita Sancti Martini* XIII and XV, alternating with *gentiles*. However, it is clear from the context that it does not have that meaning here.

17 HALM 1866: 180–181.

with the language of the *rustici Galli* and the *homo gurdonicus*.

The term *celticus* also occurs, with similar connotations, in the letters of Sidonius Apollinaris (c. A.D. 430–after 480), a leading political and literary figure in fifth-century Gaul (STEVENS 1933: 211). In his *Epistolae* III, 3 (the first seven books were collected around A.D. 477) he addressed his brother-in-law Ecdicius as follows:

mitto istic ob gratiam pueritiae tuae undique gentium fluxisse studia litterarum tuaeque personae quondam debitum, quod sermonis celtici squamam depositura nobilitas nunc oratorio stilo, nunc etiam Camenalibus modis imbuebatur. illud in te adfectum principaliter uniuersitatis accendit, quod, quos olim Latinos fieri exegeras, barbaros deinceps esse uetuisti.

‘I make no mention of the congregation of learning assembled from all parts of the world for the benefit of your youthful years, and that at one time it was due to you personally that the leading families, in their efforts to throw the scurf of Celtic speech, were initiated now into oratorical style and now again into the measures of the muses. What chiefly kindles the devotion of the whole community to you is that after first requiring them to become Latins you next prevented them from becoming barbarians.’<sup>18</sup>

Again *sermo celticus* appears to mean ‘(Gallo-Latin) of the central region, *Gallia Celtica*’. Wilmotte commented on the word *celta*: “il continue à désigner, dans la sphère érudite, l’habitant de la Gaule centrale, par opposition à l’Aquitain et au Belge, pour autant que celui-ci parle un dialecte germanique et celui-là un dialecte distinct du roman septentrional” (WILMOTTE 1927: 226). Thus, Sidonius is congratulating Ecdicius for introducing a ‘purer’ Latin among the nobles of Auvergne.<sup>19</sup> This interpretation is corroborated by another of Sidonius’ letters (*Epistolae* II, 10), where he is deploring the standards of Latin:

illud appone, quod tantum increbuit multitudo desidiosorum ut, nisi uel paucissimi quique meram linguae Latiaris proprietatem de triualium barbarismorum robigine uindicaueritis, eam breui abolitam defleamus interemptaque: sic omnes nobilium sermonum purpurae per incuriam uulgi decolorabantur.

‘Consider too, that the mob of the sluggards has so grown in numbers that unless there are at least a modest few like yourself to defend the exact use of the language of Latium from the rust of vulgar barbarisms, we shall in a short time be lamenting its extinction and annihilation, so sadly will all the bright ornaments of noble expression be dulled by the slovenliness of the mob.’<sup>20</sup>

18 ANDERSON 1936: II 12–15.

19 Also suggested by STEVENS 1933: 82 and FOURNIER 1955: 449.

20 ANDERSON 1936: I 462–463.

According to Wilmotte “c’est bien la même préoccupation qui a, chez ce puriste attardé, inspiré les deux passages, également élogieux pour ses correspondants; l’expression imagée a seule varié” (WILMOTTE 1927: 226 fn. 18). Indeed, many of Sidonius’ letters betray this concern for the survival of erudition, for the standards of classical Latin, in fact for a specific style and register. He complains how the town councillors of Clermont are for the most part men of exceeding illiteracy (*Epistolae* IV, 3.10: *turba numerosior illitteratissimis litteris uacant*) if not to speak about the language of the lower classes, as in *Epistolae* IV, 7, 2 and IV, 17, 2:

quocirca sermonis pompa Romani, si qua adhuc uspiam est, Belgicis olim siue Rhenanis abolita terris in te resedit, quo uel incolumni uel perorante, etsi apud limitem [ipsum] Latina iura ceciderunt, uerba non titubant. quapropter alternum salue rependens granditer laetor saltim in illustri pectore tuo uanescentium litterarum remansisse uestigia, quae si frequenti lectione continuas, experiere per dies, quanto antecellunt beluis homines, tanto anteferri rusticis institutos.

‘Thus the splendour of the Roman speech, if it still exists anywhere, has survived in you, though it has long been wiped out from the Belgian and Rhenic lands: with you and your eloquence surviving, even though Roman law has ceased at our border, the Roman speech does not falter. For this reason I reciprocate your greeting, I rejoice greatly that at any rate in your illustrious breast there have remained traces of our vanishing culture. If you extend these by constant reading you will discover for yourself as each day passes, that the educated are no less superior to the unlettered than men are to beasts.’<sup>21</sup>

A similar preoccupation with the standards of Latin is visible in various other letters.<sup>22</sup> Therefore it is unlikely that Sidonius used the term *sermo celticus* for anything other than uneducated and unpolished Latin.

The next attestation of the term *lingua celtica* occurs in the works of the ninth-century writer Heiric of Auxerre (A.D. 841–877), who used it in his poem on the life of St Germanus:

urbs quoque prouectum meritisque et nomine sumpsit  
Augustidunum demum concepta uocari  
Augusti montem quod transfert celtica lingua.<sup>23</sup>

‘The city also, took [the name] Augustodunum elevated in merit and in name, having finally undertaken to be called the mountain of Augustus, which the *lingua celtica* translates.’

Vendryes argued that Heiric was merely speculating about the origin of the name *Augustodunum* (Autun) (VENDRYES 1955: 644). However, I discussed

21 ANDERSON 1936: II 126–129.

22 Cf. *Epistolae* III, 14, 2; VIII, 2.1; V, 10, 4; IX, 11, 7.

23 TRAUBE 1896: 448.

the etymology of *dūnum* elsewhere (BLOM forthc. a), and notwithstanding the difficulties surrounding this word it seems unlikely that Heiric is referring to anything else but the indigenous language of Gaul. This probably does not mean that he knew anything specific about the nature of this language; indeed his etymology may reflect Germanic-influenced mediaeval Latin *dūnum* ‘hill’ rather than latinised Gaulish *dūnum* ‘fortress’. Even so, knowledge of the (perceived) meaning of certain non-Latin place-names may still have been around. While Heiric’s usage may refer to the pre-Latin language of Gaul, the tenth-century poem *Waltharius* appears to use the term *lingua celtica* in a different manner. Here it is used to describe the language of Ekiurid, one of the heroes’ opponents:

celtica lingua probat te ex illa gente creatum  
cui natura dedit reliquos ludendo praeire  
at si te propius uenientem dextera nostra  
attingat, post Saxonibus memorare ualebis,  
te nunc in Vosago fauni fantasma uidere.<sup>24</sup>

‘[Your/the] *celtica lingua* shows that you are born from that race  
to which nature granted to excel the others in deceiving.  
But if our right hand would attack you when you come nearer  
you would be able to relate to the Saxons  
that you at this moment saw the apparition of a forest god in the Vosges.’

According to Wilmotte and Weisgerber, *celtica lingua* should be interpreted as ‘Gallo-Romance’ (WILMOTTE 1918: 28–29; WILMOTTE 1927: 228–229; WEISGERBER 1969: 154). By contrast, Dumville suggests that, if *Saxonica ore* (the term employed to describe the homeland of Ekiurid: *a Saxonis [...] oris generatus*) is identified as the old *litus Saxonicus* (the coastline of Brittany and Normandy) instead of ‘Saxony’, the *lingua celtica* spoken by its inhabitants may be seen as either Gaulish (presuming that the language survived in this area up to this time) or Breton – in which case *lingua celtica* would be used specifically for what modern scholarship understands as a ‘Celtic’ language (DUMVILLE 1983: 87–93). The latter option seems most unlikely, since the Insular Celtic languages were never referred to as *linguae celticae* (vel sim.) before well into the Early Modern period (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1998: 347).<sup>25</sup> The former option suggested by Dumville would imply that at least a memory of

24 STRECKER 1951: 55.

25 See furthermore SIMS-WILLIAMS 2005: 5–7. More elaborate and historical are TOURNEUR 1905: 190–206 and DROIXHE 1996.

Gaulish had survived up to the ninth or even tenth century. We saw that Heiric of Auxerre may have used the term with this meaning, so this would not be impossible. However, an awareness of the existence of a pre-Latin language in Gaul (probably derived from study of the classical authors) and some erudite place-name etymologies in Heiric's work should not be confused with a knowledge of that language or its classification in the modern sense. In fact, I will suggest below that the modern separation of the two concepts 'Celtic language of Gaul' and 'Romance vernacular of Gaul' is very unlikely to have been valid for early mediaeval scholars. They probably regarded them as one and the same, which continued to be a respectable idea well into the Early Modern period (see TOURNEUR 1905: 191–192). In my opinion, therefore, the most likely scenario is that the passage in *Waltharius* refers to Gallo-Romance. This interpretation may be corroborated by a much later text written by the chronicler Sigebert of Gembloux (c. A.D. 1030–1112), who notes in his *Vita Deoderici* (GEORGE 1995: 1879–1880):

nec sine quodam presagio tibi accidisse credas, quod praeter haec usitata uocabula Diuidunum tradit uocitatam antiquitas. gallica lingua montem uocari dunum, studiosis non est incognitum.

[...]

Celtica Roma dehinc uoluit cepitque uocari  
Augustidunum demum concepta uocari  
Augusti montem quod transfert celtica lingua.<sup>26</sup>

'You may believe without a certain presentiment to have happened to you, that beside these familiar words ancient times relate that it was called Diuidunum. It is not unknown to the learned that a mountain is called *dunum* in the *gallica lingua*.

[...]

(Gallia) Celtica from then on wished to be and began to be called Rome;  
Augustidunum finally came to be called  
the mountain of Augustus which the *celtica lingua* translates.'

The lines of verse are obviously derived from Heiric of Auxerre's poem on the life of St Germanus, which uses the term *celtica lingua* in ll. 349 and 352–353 (WILMOTTE 1927: 228). According to Wilmotte and Weisgerber the word *lingua celtica* at this stage meant the '(Gallo-Romance) vernacular', so that the word *lingua gallica* was here inserted to mean the 'Celtic language of Gaul' (WILMOTTE 1918: 28–29 fn. 1). This is unacceptable, since obviously the two terms are both used to explain the meaning of *dūnum*; it is clear that the terms are used as synonyms. As we will see, by the twelfth century *lingua gallica* had

26 MGHSS IV 477.

certainly come to mean ‘Gallo-Romance, Old French’, so Sigibert’s equation of the two terms indicates that he did not see *lingua celtica* as any different from *lingua gallica*. The confusion and ignorance about the meaning of *celtica* is further borne out by some mediaeval glossaries, where *uel celtice* is erroneously rendered as *uelteltice*, for example in CGL V 518.15: *uelteltice gentis cuiusdam loquela*.<sup>27</sup> Finally, the term *celtice* also occurs in the thirteenth-century *Translatio Dionysii Areopagitae*. However, since it is used in combination with *gallice*, I will discuss this text in more detail in section 3.

The development of the meaning of *lingua celtica* is thus rather difficult to trace. Its infrequent attestation furthermore suggests that the term never gained common currency, and after Pliny (who may have derived his sparing use of the term from his Greek sources) only enjoyed a rather peripheral existence in Antiquity as an erudite derivation from *Gallia Celtica*, possibly indicating the indigenous language of the area (Ausonius) as well as the local, rustic style of Latin (Sulpicius Severus and Sidonius Apollinaris). In mediaeval usage, perhaps by the time of the *Waltharius*, it seems to have fallen together with *lingua gallica* to indicate ‘Gallo-Romance, French’. It is also in this erudite sense that the humanist Jean Dorat (1508–1588) congratulated his pupil, the poet Joachim Du Bellay (1522–1560), in Greek distichs on his pamphlet *La deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), through which he had honoured his maternal language – κελτική γλῶσσα.<sup>28</sup>

27 WEISGERBER 1969: 153–154. Further attested in CGL V 582.33: *uelteltiga genus cuiusdam loquelle*; CGL V 488.45: *uelteltire gentis cuiusdam loquella*. The original gloss may have been retained in CGL V 527.16: *uel celtice genus cuiusdam loquelle*. LANDGRAF 1894: 368–369 suggested that this gloss had been taken from Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogi* I, 27, 4, discussed above. One other gloss mentions *celticus*: CGL III 541.7 [Glossae Cassinenses]: *nardoceltice idest fascisgallicos*. Also in CGL III 563.12 [Vat reg. 1260]: *nardoceltica id est fasce galicus*; CGL III 539.21 [Glossae Cassinenses]: *fasseas callicos id est nardo celtici*; CGL III 570.2 [Vat reg. 1260]: *nardoceltica id est fudegallius siue celtica*. See furthermore CGL III 593.13; CGL III 544.35; CGL III 556.59; CGL III 621.25, etc. Perhaps derived from Isidore, *Etym.* XVII, 9, 3 (about the plant ‘nard’): *quod si multum in ore tardauerit, linguam siccat, nardum celticum a regione Galliae nomen traxit*, which may in turn go back to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XII, 26, 46: *cum Gallico nardo semper nascitur herba quae hirculus uocatur a grauitate odoris*.

28 WILMOTTE 1927: 223.

## 3. GALLICA(NA)

The term *gallica* is much more frequently attested referring to language and I will discuss the attestations in chronological order. These include combinations of *gallica* with the nouns *lingua* and *sermo*, but also with *uox*, *uerbum* vel sim.<sup>29</sup> My survey commences at a time when it without doubt indicated the Celtic language of Gaul in the modern sense – with the work of the Roman biographer C. Suetonius Tranquillus (c. A.D. 70–after 130). He is the author of *De uita Caesarum*, a set of twelve imperial biographies from Caesar to Domitian, composed in the early second century. In his book on *Diuus Iulius* XXIV, 2 we read:

qua fiducia ad legiones, quas a re publica acceperat, alias priuato sumptu addidit, unum etiam ex transalpinis conscriptam, uocabulo quoque gallico, alauda enim appellabatur, quam disciplina cultuque romano institutam et ornatam postea uniuersam ciuitate donauit.<sup>30</sup>

‘Encouraged by this, he added to the legions which he had received from the state others at his own cost, one actually composed of men of Transalpine Gaul and bearing a Gaulish name too, for it was called *alauda*, which he trained in the Roman tactics and equipped with Roman arms; and later on he gave every man of it citizenship.’

The noun *alauda* ‘lark’ is a well-known Gaulish word and is used by various other ancient writers, for example Cicero, *Ad Atticum* XVI, 8, 2, and Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XI, 121 from which the passage in Suetonius is likely to have been derived. It further occurs in the works of much later authors such as Marcellus Empiricus, *De Medicamentis* XXVIII, 50: *auis galerita, quae gallice alauda dicitur*; XXIX, 30: *corydalis auis id est quae alauda uocatur* (NIEDERMANN & LIECHTENHAN 1968: II 67 and 84). Furthermore in Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* IV, 31: *aues coredalus quam alaudam uocamus*, where the word is used to explain a learned Greek word and seems to be regarded as Latin (BONNET 1890: 25). This could well be the case, as it was certainly borrowed into Gallo-Latin, and is attested as OFr *aloue* and Fr *alouette*.<sup>31</sup>

More material occurs in *De uerborum significatu* by Sextus Pompeius Festus, a grammatical scholar from the late second century A.D. His work constitutes an abridgement of Verrius Flaccus’ (c. 55 B.C.–c. A.D. 20) work of the same title

29 This excludes terms of the type *Galli ... dicunt* vel sim.

30 IHM 1958: 11.

31 LAMBERT 1995: 186; DLG 31–2. PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 102–103 suggests that the word remained part of ‘una tradizione linguistica alloglotta’ and was restricted to military language. However, the passage in Gregory and the Romance reflexes suggest otherwise.

(KASTER 2003: 1589). Only the first half of Festus' abridgement now survives, and the work was itself epitomised by Paulus Diaconus in the eighth century (MATTHEWS 2003: 1215). It contains the following references relevant for our purposes: *ambactus apud Ennium lingua gallica seruus appellatur*.<sup>32</sup> The text suggests that the term stems from Ennius (a Latin poet and chronicler, 239–169 B.C.), but this cannot be verified on the basis of the remaining fragments of Ennius' work. The noun *ambactus* has a convincing Celtic etymology and can be analysed as a compound *\*ambi-aktos* with prefix *\*ambi-* 'around' and *\*ak-to*, a participle of the verb *\*ag-* (< PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eg-*) 'to drive'.<sup>33</sup>

Secondly, *benna lingua gallica genus uehiculi appellatur, unde uocantur con-bennones in eadem benna sedentes* (LINDSAY 1913a: 29). The word *benna* is of unclear derivation and is a *hapax*.<sup>34</sup> In fact it may only be a learned back-formation from *con-bennones* 'fellow travellers in a *\*benna*' (cf. SCHMIDT 1967: 164). The text further mentions *bardus gallice cantor appellatur, qui uirorum fortium laudes canit, a gente Bardorum, de quibus Lucanus 'plurima securi fudistis carmina Bardi'* (LINDSAY 1913a: 31). This passage clearly refers to Marcus Annaeus Lucanus' (A.D. 39–65) *Pharsalia* I, 449–451:

uos quoque, qui fortes animas belloque peremptas  
laudibus in longum uates dimittitis aeuum,  
plurima securi fudistis carmina, Bardi.

'The Bards also, who by the praise of their verse  
transmit to distant ages the fame of the heroes slain  
in battle, poured forth at ease their lays in abundance.'<sup>35</sup>

32 LINDSAY 1913a: 4. Not present in any extant passage from Ennius' *Annales*. The word *ambactus* occurs further only in Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* VI, 15, 2 describing the social structure of Gaul. We may guess that Ennius used the word in a similar context, see SKUTSCH 1985: 739. SCHMIDT 1957: 122 notes that the word also occurs as a personal name on coins. For a full list of attestations (also in mediaeval glossaries) see TLL I 1833.

33 DLG 35 mentions similar compounds in OW *amaeth* 'seruus arans, serf' and OB *ambaith*; cf. also Lat *anculus* 'man-servant', Grk ἀμφίπολος 'attendant', Skr *abhicarah* 'servant' < *\*amb<sup>h</sup>i-k<sup>w</sup>olo-* from PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>-* 'to turn, circulate', see LEW I 36–37; DELL 26; LIV<sup>2</sup> 386–387.

34 TLL II 1907; DOTTIN 1920: 233 related it to W *benn* 'chariot', Fr *banne* 'canopy, wicker basket'; BOLELLI 1942: 153 compared Ζεὺς βέννος (*recte*: βέννιος). However, recent scholarship has identified βέννιος as a Phrygian rather than a Galatian name, see SCHWABL 1999: 345–354. SCHMIDT 1967: 157–158 suggests a Celtic etymology *\*b<sup>h</sup>end<sup>h</sup>-na*; see also PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 104–105.

35 DUFF 1962: 36–37.

The word *bardus* (latinised from *\*bardos*) is attested by earlier and later authors (TLL II 1751; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 104), and has various cognates in Insular Celtic, such as OI *bard* ‘poet’, W *bardd* ‘poet’, OC *barth* ‘mime, jester’, MB *barz* ‘fiddler’ < *\*bardos* < *\*g<sup>u</sup>l-do-* from PIE *\*g<sup>u</sup>erH-* + *d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘to put praise’; cf. Lat *grātus* ‘deserving thanks’, Skr *gṛnāti* ‘he praises’, etc. (IEW 478; SCHRIJVER 1995: 143–144; LIV<sup>2</sup> 210–211; DLG 57–58). Furthermore, *cimbri lingua gallica latrones dicuntur* (LINDSAY 1913a: 37). Note that Plutarch, *Caius Marius* XI attributes the same meaning ‘robber, bandit’ to this word, but regards it as Germanic. When speculating about the origins of the Cimbri, he notes:

καὶ μάλιστα μὲν εικάζοντο Γερμανικὰ γένη τῶν καθηκόντων ἐπὶ τὸν βόρειον ὠκεανὸν εἶναι τοῖς μεγέθεσι τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τῇ χαροπότῃ τῶν ὀμμάτων, καὶ ὅτι Κίμβρουσ ἐπονομάζουσι Γερμανοὶ τοὺς ληστάς.

‘The most prevalent conjecture was that they were some of the German peoples which extended as far as the northern ocean, a conjecture based on their great stature, their light-blue eyes, and the fact that the Germans call robbers Cimbri.’<sup>36</sup>

The word is not otherwise attested as Celtic. A further term discussed by Festus is:

petoriturum et gallicum uehiculum esse, et nomen eius dictum [esse] existimant a numero quattuor rotarum. alii osce, quod i quoque pitora quattuor uocent, alii graece, sed αἰολικῶς dictum.

‘A *petoriturum* is a Gallic vehicle, and they think its name is called after the number of four wheels. Others [think] it is Oscan, because these also call ‘four’ *pitora*; others [think it is] Greek, and even Aeolic’.<sup>37</sup>

It is given another explanation elsewhere in the text:

petoriturum uehiculum gallicum. Alii osce putant dictum, quod hi pitora quattuor appellant; quattuor enim habent rotas.

‘*petoriturum*; a Gallic vehicle. Others consider it Oscan, because these call ‘four’ *pitora*, since they have four wheels.’<sup>38</sup>

The word *petoriturum* occurs elsewhere (see TLL X.13 1976–1977), but this etymology occurs in Varro’s *Antiquitates rerum diuinum* only, namely in Book XIV, 203. It is unclear, however, whether Festus derived his passage directly

36 PERRIN 1920: 488–499.

37 LINDSAY 1913a: 226. Festus’ allusion to Aeolic possibly refers to the treatment of /k<sup>u</sup>/ > /p/ in Aeolic dialects (in other Greek dialects > /t/), for example in πέμπτε instead of πέντε and πέτταρες instead of τέσσαρες; see BUCK 1976: 129.

38 LINDSAY 1913a: 227.

from Varro (as Aulus Gellius certainly did, see below), who wrote: *petorritum non est ex Graecia dimidiatum, sed totum <ortum> trans Alpes; nam est vox gallica* ‘the *petorritum* is not in part from Greece, but completely sprung from across the Alps; for it is a Gallic word’ (CARDAUNS 1978: 86). The word *petorritum* seems to have been etymologised correctly here despite the Latin sound changes (metathesis of *petor* < \**petru-* and vocal weakening of *rito* < \**roto-*) (TLLX.13 1976; SCHMIDT 1967: 169; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 112), because a Gaulish form \**petru-roton* or \**petuor-roton*, with *petru-* ‘four’ and *roto-* ‘wheel’ could well be envisaged (DLG 211). Festus’ suggestion (not present in Varro) that the word could also be Oscan has to be taken seriously, as Oscan *pettiur-* < \**k<sup>u</sup>etur-* could also explain the first element (UNTERMANN 2000: 550), even if it leaves the second element unaccounted for.

The word *petorritum* is also etymologised in the *Noctes Atticae* (composed c. A.D. 180) of Aulus Gellius (born c. A.D. 130), a collection of short chapters, based on notes and excerpts Gellius had made in reading on a great variety of topics in philosophy, history, law, but above all grammar in the ancient sense, including literary and textual criticism (HOLFORD-STREVENs 2003a: 627–628). His information comes mostly from Varro (as in case of the example below) (HOLFORD-STREVENs 2003b: 322), and Gellius’ interest in languages other than Latin and Greek is slight and purely etymological.<sup>39</sup> The relevant passage occurs in *Noctes Atticae* XV, 30, 5–7 entitled ‘uehiculum quod *petorritum* appellatur, cuiatis linguae uocabulum sit, Graecae an Gallicae’:<sup>40</sup>

ego, cum Probi multos admodum commentationum libros adquisierim, neque scriptum in his inueni nec usquam alioqui Probum scripsisse credo. ‘petorritum’ enim non ex Graecia dimidiatum, sed totum transalpiibus; nam est uox gallica. id scriptum est in libro Varronis quarto decimo ‘rerum diuinarum’, quo in loco Varro, cum de petorrito dixisset esse id uerbum gallicum.

‘When I had got together many copies of the *Commentaries* of Probus, I did not find that spelling in them, and I do not believe that Probus used it anywhere else. For *petorritum* is not a hybrid word derived in part from the Greek, but the entire word belongs to the people across the Alps; for it is a Gallic word. It is found in the fourteenth book of Marcus Varro’s *Divine Antiquities*, where Varro, speaking of *petorritum*, says that it is a Gallic term.’<sup>41</sup>

39 See in general CAVAZZA 2004: 65–104.

40 ACS I 1936.

41 ROLFE 1948: III 124–125.

Another interesting (possible) reference to Gaulish occurs in *Noctes Atticae* XI, 7, 3–4, in which Gellius implores the reader not to use uncommon words, arguing that these generally betray ‘lately acquired learning’, illustrating this point with the following anecdote:

ueluti Romae nobis praesentibus uetus celebratusque homo in causis, sed repentina et quasi tumultuaria doctrina praeditus, cum apud praefectum urbi uerba faceret et dicere uellet inopi quendam miseroque uictu uiuere et furfureum panem esitare uinumque eructum et feditum potare. hic, inquit, eques romanus apludam edit et flocces bibit. aspexerunt omnes, qui aderant, alius alium, primo tristiores turbato et requirente uoltu, quidnam illud utriusque uerbi foret: post deinde, quasi nescio quid tusce aut gallice dixisset, uniuersi riserunt.<sup>42</sup>

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

Sofer thought that this remark indicated that Gaulish was still a known spoken language at this time (SOFER 1941: 102), which could be the case, but Brunot argued that this type of anecdote used by Gellius need not pertain to his own period (BRUNOT 1966: 33 fn. 1). A second difficulty is whether *gallice* should be understood as ‘in a Gallic manner, with a Gallic accent’ or ‘in Gaulish’.

Still, the notion that we could at Gellius’ time still interpret *gallice* or *lingua gallica* to denote the Celtic language of Gaul is supported by a passage from the *Digesta* of Domitius Ulpianus (A.D. 170–223 or 224). This scholar of the law was instrumental in the codification of the Roman legal code, and his *Digesta* contain extracts of legal texts with the aim of providing a revised law syllabus to be used in law schools. Book XXXII discusses *fideicommissa*, charges in a will imposed on an heir or legatee to transfer property to someone else (MOMMSEN ET AL. 1985: IV xv), and in *Digesta* XXXII, 11 (dated around c. A.D. 215) it is stated:

ULPIANUS libro secundo fideicommissorum. fideicommissa quocumque sermone relinqui possunt, non solum latina uel graeca, sed etiam punica uel gallicana uel alterius cuiuscumque gentis.<sup>43</sup>

‘Ulpian, *Fideicommissa*, Book 2: *Fideicommissa* can be left in any language, not only the Latin or Greek but also the Punic, *gallicana*, or the language of any other nation.’

42 ROLFE 1948: II 316.

43 MOMMSEN ET AL. 1985: III 73.

We only know Ulpian's extracts through the later codification of the *Digesta* under Emperor Justinian (A.D. 527–565), but there are no reasons to assume that this passage does not date from Ulpian's period.<sup>44</sup> Note that, to the best of my knowledge, this is the only occasion where the adjective *gallicana* is used with reference to language instead of *gallica*.<sup>45</sup> It seems more than plausible in the context that Ulpian refers to the Celtic language of Gaul.

The next attestation of *lingua gallica* occurs in the work of the fourth-century grammarian (Maurus or Marius) Servius,<sup>46</sup> namely in his celebrated commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*, which explains a passage from Book VIII, 660, *uirgatis lucent sagulis* 'they glitterd in their striped cloaks', as follows:

quae habebant in uirgarum modum deductas uias, et bene adlusit ad gallicam linguam per quam uirga purpura dicitur, 'uirgatis' ergo, ac si diceret 'uirga tinctis', id est purpuratis.<sup>47</sup>

'These have a style [of clothing] spun out in stripes, and it plays well with the *lingua gallica* in which purple cloth is called *uirgatis*; therefore, [so] when it said *uirga tinctis* it means 'clad in purple'.'

Weisgerber took this to indicate that already at an early stage many Roman authors confused the different meanings (that is 'Celtic' or 'Gallo-Latin') of *gallica* (*lingua*). Weisgerber thought that Servius' erroneous commentary is the sole reason why *uirga* has hitherto been interpreted as a Gaulish word,<sup>48</sup> and suggested:

da es aber keine Anknüpfung anderwärts hat, wird man eher an provinziell-gallische Verwendung von lat. *uirga* 'Rute, Streifen' als 'Purpurstreifen' denken; der Gebrauch ist in den Belegen, die wir für lat. *uirga* und *uirgatus* haben, deutlich angelegt, und die Verbreitung der romanischen Fortsetzer von lat. *uirgātus* würde nicht gegen eine speziellere Verwendung des Wortes in Gallien sprechen (MEYER-LÜBKE 1935: 782). Hier gehen also noch die beiden Verwendungen 1) und 2) durcheinander; es ist die Ansatz der Entwicklung, die später gelegentlich dazu zwingt, das wirklich keltische Gallisch mit *priscus* herauszuheben.<sup>49</sup>

Servius also attributes the name of the Alps to the 'language of the Gauls' in his commentary on Virgil's *Georgica* III, 474: *nam Gallorum lingua alti montes Alpes uocantur* (THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: I 313), and in his commentary on *Aeneid* IV, 442: *flantes de Alpibus, quae Gallorum lingua alti montes uocantur*

44 MACMULLEN 1966: 14–17 claimed a third-century revival of Gaulish on the basis of this passage.

45 Note that *gallicana* is often used with *eloquentia* and *cothurnus*.

46 MATTHEWS ET AL. 2003: 1395; see also KASTER 1988: 169–197.

47 THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: II 295.

48 For example in DOTTIN 1920: 299; not in DLG.

49 WEISGERBER 1969: 152 fn. 4; also PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 102.

(THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: I 543). However, the name of the Alps is almost certainly pre-Indo-European (LEW I 32; MESSING 1954: 496). Elsewhere in the commentary Servius gives a ‘Gaulish’ etymology which Weisgerber seems to have overlooked, namely *uol(a)ema*, in the commentary on *Georgica* II, 88: *uolema autem gallica lingua bona et grandia dicuntur* (THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: III 226). This element \**uoli-* ‘modest, honest’ or ‘better’ has been related to OI *féle* ‘modesty’ < \**uēli-* (DOTTIN 1920: 296; TERRACINI 1921: 412; LEW II 826), or perhaps more likely to W *gwell* ‘better’ < \**ueljo-*.<sup>50</sup> However, this does not explain the different vocalism. It is therefore more likely to be identified as Oscan *valaemon* ‘optimum’, *valaimas* ‘optimus’ (UNTERMANN 2000: 821–822).<sup>51</sup> Generally, then, Servius’ use of *lingua gallica* is confused and includes non-Celtic terms.

An equally problematic use of the term occurs in Aelius Lampridius’ biography of Severus Alexander (Roman Emperor A.D. 222–235) in *Historia Augusta* LX, 6, which relates how, as Severus Alexander went to war, a *mulier dryas* calls out at Severus *gallico sermone*:

mulier dryas eunti exclamauit gallico sermone: uadas nec uictoriam speres ne[c] te militi tuo credas.<sup>52</sup>

‘A prophetess cried out in the *sermo gallicus* to him as he was marching out: “May you go, but not hope for victory nor put your trust in your soldiers.”’

*Historia Augusta* is the modern name of a collection of thirty biographies of Roman emperors from Hadrian (A.D. 117–138) to Numerianus and Carinus (A.D. 284–285). Aelius Lampridius is named as one of its six otherwise unknown authors. The authorship of this collection is therefore somewhat problematic, but it is now generally accepted that it was written entirely by one person. Most scholars agree on a date of around A.D. 400 (JOHNE 2005: 406–409). As the text does not include any lexical items or phrases, this passage is of little assistance in establishing what is meant exactly by *sermo gallicus*.<sup>53</sup> Theoretically it could even mean that the words were exclaimed with a Gallic accent.

50 DLG 261; in which case it may be attested in names such as *Uelio-casses*, *Ceno-uelii*, *Uelenius*, see EVANS 1967: 273–277.

51 Also suggested by ANDRÉ 1981: 132–133 fn. 326. Likewise not Celtic according to PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 101. It also occurs in Cato, *De agri cultura* VII and Columella V, 10, 18 as (*pira*) *uolaema* ‘large pear’.

52 HOHL 1971: I, 299. See SOFER 1941: 112.

53 Note that recently HOFENEDER 2008: 63–87 argued that the term *sermo gallicus* in this passage denotes Gaulish.

Unfortunately, the same problems of ambiguity occur with the interpretation of the *uerba gallica* mentioned in Claudian's (born c. A.D. 370) poem *De mulabus gallicis* (ll. 19–20), where it could mean 'Gallic words' as well as 'the words of a Gaul':

miraris, si uoce feras pacauerit Orpheus  
cum pronas pecudes gallica uerba regant.<sup>54</sup>

'Are you surprised that Orpheus had tamed the wild beasts  
with his voice when *gallica uerba* can control swift cattle?'

Easier to account for are the terms which occur in the *Passio Agaunensium martyrum* written by Eucherius, bishop of Lyon (A.D. 380–449). This is the oldest known account of the martyrdom of the legendary Theban legion (HEINZELMANN 1989: 70–71), which refused to do homage to Emperor Maximian at *Agaunum* (now St. Maurice d'Agaune in the South-Western Swiss canton of Valais) and was slaughtered to the last man for that reason (KRÜGER 1997: 611). Book I, 3 of the *Passio* gives the etymology of the place-name *Agaunum*: *accolae, interpretatione gallici sermonis, saxum dicunt* (AS Septembris VI 345). This interpretation seems to be correct. It is further attested in a Gaulish word cited in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XVII, 44, namely *acaunomarga* 'stone marl' (TLL I 250; LEW I 5), and in various place- and personal names, *Acaunus*, *Acaunissa*, etc. The form with *-c-* is older and allows for the reconstruction of Gaulish *\*acaunon* < *\*akamnon* 'stone', with suffix *-auno-* < *\*-amno-* added to a root for 'stone' well known from other IE languages, compare Skr *ásman-*, Lithuanian *akmuõ* 'stone', and Grk *ἄκμων* 'anvil < meteoric stone' (DLG 26–27). There are no Insular Celtic cognates. Another *uox gallica* occurs in the work of Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius' *Saturnalia*. These are set in the form of dialogues on the evening before the feast of Saturnalia (16<sup>th</sup> December) of A.D. 383 and during the holiday proper (HOLFORD-STREUVENS 2003c: 906–907). They include legal and grammatical discussions, but the following passage in Book VI, 4, 23 is part of a long discussion of Virgil's language. Macrobius notes that Virgil had been sparing in his use of Greek words, even though old writers had indulged in them rather freely. Furthermore,

nec non et punicis oscisque uerbis usi sunt ueteres, quorum imitatione Vergilius peregrina uerba non respuit ut in illo, siluestres uri absidue, [...] uri enim gallica uox est, qua feri boues significantur.<sup>55</sup>

54 PLATNAUER 1972: II 192.

55 WILLIS 1970: I 374.

‘They [i.e. the old writers] also made use of Punic and Oscan words, and it was in imitation of them that Virgil did not reject words of foreign origin in such lines as:

Buffaloes (*uri*) of the forest ever make sport therein [*Georgics* II, 374]  
(for *urus* is a Gallic word meaning wild ox).<sup>56</sup>

Macrobius’ (and Virgil’s) *urus* could well reflect a Gaulish noun *\*uros* ‘aurochs’, which is attested as a name-element only, for example in the personal names *Uro-genius* ‘son of Urogenus, descendant of the Aurochs’, *Uro-generntus* ‘who has the force of a young aurochs’, etc. Absence of reflexes of this word in Insular Celtic prompted Delamarre to suggest that it may have been borrowed from Germanic, compare ON *úrr*, OHG *úr* > Ger *Auer(ochs)*, Du *oer(os)* (DLG 276; SOFER 1936: 74). The word also occurs (without being explicitly identified as a foreign word) in Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* VI, 28, 1 describing the various animal species that inhabit the Hercynian forest; similarly in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* VIII, 15 and Tacitus, *Annales* IV, 72.

A further possible ‘Gallic term’ (λέξις Γαλλική) occurs in the work of Lydus, that is, John the Lydian (A.D. 490–c. 560), a civil servant and author at Constantinople. His three extant works all have antiquarian leanings, one of which, *Περὶ ἀρχῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας*, or *De magistratibus* ‘charts the history of Roman administrative offices with particular attention to the praetorian prefecture.’ (WHITBY 2003: 899; TINNEFELD 1999: 550–551). In Book II, 13, treating the insignia of the prefecture of the *praetoria*, he describes the pin which is part of the uniform, and elaborates as follows:

φίβουλαν αὐτὴν πατρίως οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ βάλτεον τὸν ζωστῆρα λέγουσιν, τὴν δὲ ὄλην κατασκευὴν τοῦ περιζώματος οἱ Γάλλοι καρταμέραν, ἣν τὸ πλῆθος καρτάλαμον ἐξ ἰδιοτείας ὀνομάζει. ὅτι δε οὐ Ῥωμαϊκὸν τοῦτι τὸ ῥημάτιον, μάρτυς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρρων ἐν βιβλίῳ πέμτῳ Περὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς Διαλέκτου, ἐν ᾧ διαρθροῦται ποῖα μὲν τις λέξις ἐστὶν Αἰολικὴ, ποῖα δὲ Γαλλικὴ.

‘The Romans call the pin *fibula* in their native language and the belt *balteus*, but the Gauls call the entire girdle outfit *cartamera*, which the common people call *cartalamum* out of ignorance. That this particular word is not Roman, the Roman Varro attests in his work *On the Roman Language*, in which it is precisely defined what sort of word is Aeolic and what sort is Gallic.’<sup>57</sup>

However, Varro’s *De lingua latina* V, 116 does not mention the words *cartamera* and *cartalamum*, and discusses *balteum* only. Furthermore, the word *cartamera* is not otherwise attested and has also been left out of Delamarre’s

56 DAVIES 1969: 415. Cf. Isidore, *Etym.* XII, 1, 34: *Uri agrestes boues sunt in Germania.*

57 BANDY 1983: 104–105.

*Dictionnaire*. Thus, further information cannot be extracted from this passage.

Another possible, but rather vague, reference to Gaulish occurs in the work of the politician, writer, and monk Cassiodorus (c. A.D. 490–c. 585). In his *Variae* he collected twelve books of state papers (edited around A.D. 537), and in *Variae* VIII, 12, 7, citing a letter (dated A.D. 526) he drafted for king Athalaric, he remarks:

Romanum denique eloquium non suis regionibus invenisti et ibi te Tulliana lectio disertum reddidit, ubi quondam gallica lingua resonavit.<sup>58</sup>

‘Finally you discovered Roman eloquence in the regions not its own; and there the reading of Cicero rendered you eloquent, where once the *gallica lingua* resounded.’

This passage does not seem to reflect more than erudite knowledge, a learned reference to the former vernacular of Gaul, note especially the words *quondam* ‘once’ and *resonavit* ‘resounded’. Again, further information cannot be extracted from this passage.

More can be gained from the poetry of Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus (c. A.D. 540–c. 600), who gives a plausible Celtic etymology of the word *nemetum* in *Carmina* I, 9, 9:

nomine Vernemetis uoluit uocitare uetustas  
quod quasi fanum ingens gallica lingua refert.<sup>59</sup>

‘By the name *Vernemetis* ancient times wished to call [that place] which [in] the *gallica lingua* translates “mighty temple”.’

This is the latinised version of *\*nemeton* ‘sanctuary < sacred wood’, which is also known from Gaulish inscriptions, personal and place-names; it is comparable to OI *nemed* ‘sanctuary, holy place’ (DLG 197–198). The prefix *uer(o)-* ‘on, above’ is also genuinely Celtic, often occurring in nominal compounds and corresponding to OI *for-*, OW *guor*, etc. (DLG 264). While Fleuriot suggested that the present tense in *refert* implies that the poet speaks of the Gaulish language as if surviving into his own time (FLEURIOT 1980: 56), I agree with Weisgerber, who thought that *gallica lingua* certainly indicated Celtic here, but suggested that this passage could not be used as evidence for the survival of Gaulish – rather more likely it represents the erudite learning of the author (WEISGERBER 1969: 153; BIRKHAN 1997: 304).

58 FRIDH & HALPORN 973: 314–315.

59 LEO 1881: 12.

As with Ausonius, this passage rather represents a *figura etymologica* in the Virgilian mode.

Gregory of Tours (A.D. 539–594) presents a similar erudite etymology in *Historia Francorum* I, 32: *ueniens uero Aruernos, delybrium illud, quod gallica lingua Uasso Galatae uocant, incendit, diruit atque subuertit* ‘When he [i.e. Chroc, king of the Alamanni] came to Auvergne, he set fire to the sanctuary which they call *Vasso Galatae* in the *lingua gallica*, [and] he demolished and destroyed it’ (ARNDT & KRUSCH 1884: 49). Gregory does not explain the meaning of the name, which does however have a plausible Celtic etymology. The first element *\*uasso-* ‘servant, submissive’ (whence mediaeval Latin *uassus* > *uasallus*) is supported by onomastic evidence, namely (Mercurio) *Vasso-caleti* ‘severe on the subdued’ or ‘hard vassal’, furthermore personal names such as *Vasso-rix*, *Vasso*, etc. It corresponds to OI *foss* ‘servant’, W *gwas* ‘servant, lad’, OB *-uuas*, *-guas* ‘vassal, servant’ > B *gwaz* ‘man, husband’ (DLG 258–259; POLOMÉ 1983: 530 fn. 65). The second element can be identified as *\*kaletō-* ‘hard’, attested in onomastic evidence and cognate with OI *calad* ‘hard, cruel’, W *caled*, B *kaled* ‘hard’ (DLG 83). Again, Fleuriot regarded this passage as evidence for the continued existence of Gaulish (FLEURIOT 1980: 56–57), but as in the case of Venantius Fortunatus this does not necessarily follow.

Gregory of Tours makes another reference to *lingua gallica* in *In gloriam confessorum* 72, a collection of miracle stories of (especially Gallic) saints: *Cimiterium igitur apud Augustidunensim urbem gallica lingua [lacuna] uocitauit, eo quod ibi fuerint multorum hominum cadauera funerata* ‘A graveyard near the city of Augustodunum, then, was called [...] in the *gallica lingua*, because there the corpses of many men were buried’ (ARNDT & KRUSCH 1884: 790). Unfortunately the name that Gregory meant to explain has been lost in the process of transmission. Still, the two examples from Gregory’s writings are clearly meant to clarify place-name etymologies (cf. FOURNIER 1955: 448–453). Thus, while we saw that in Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogi* I, 27 *gallice* is similar in meaning to *sermo rusticior*, indicating a style or register within Latin, this does not seem to be the case with Gregory’s use of *lingua gallica*. Although Gregory often mentions the language of the *rustici* (in the sense of the ‘ignorant, rude, illiterate’), for example in *Historia Francorum* IV, 5 (ARNDT & KRUSCH 1884: 145),<sup>60</sup> it seems that Gregory used the term *lingua gallica* exclusively for learned etymologies. The two examples do not allow us to draw any firmer

60 See BONNET 1890: 26–27 for more examples. See also HEINZELMANN 2001: 98–99.

conclusions, but they do show that Gregory meant ‘the ancient language of Gaul’.

Isidore of Seville’s (c. A.D. 600–636) *Etymologiae* also contain various terms which are identified as *gallica lingua*. I will list each of these with a discussion of their etymology and possible derivation.<sup>61</sup> *Etym.* XI, 1, 57: *toles gallica lingua dicuntur, quas uulgo per diminutionem tusi(l)las uocant, quae in faucibus turgescere solent* ‘In the *gallica lingua toles*, commonly called *tusilas* in the diminutive, are called [the things] which usually swell up in the throat’. Isidore’s *toles* is unlikely to be Celtic and most likely to be identified with Lat *toles* ‘goiter’ (BARNEY 2006: 234; LEW II 688). The passage is almost certainly derived from Festus: *toles tumor in faucibus, quae per diminutionem tonsillae dicuntur*, even if there it is not identified as *lingua gallica* vel sim. (LINDSAY 1913a: 490). Note that *tusila* is a vulgar form of Lat *tonsila* (SOFER 1930: 70; LEW II 688).

*Etym.* XVII, 7, 67: *quidam autem uolemum gallica lingua bonum et magnum intellegunt*. The passage is close to Servius’ *uolema autem gallica lingua bona et grandia dicuntur* discussed previously, which is likely to be its source.<sup>62</sup>

*Etym.* XIX, 24, 13: *sagum autem gallicum nomen est; dictum autem sagum quadrum eo, quod apud eos primum quadratus uel quadruplex erat* ‘*Sagum* is a Gallic term. It is called the *sagum quadrum* because first among the Gauls it used to be square or fourfold’ (BARNEY 2006: 387). This word *sagum* or *sagus* ‘a coarse woollen cloak or mantle’, borrowed via Latin into Greek as σάγος ‘idem’, is generally thought to derive from Gaulish \**sagon*, in which case Isidore’s interpretation *nomen gallicum* should be understood in the modern

61 I do not discuss the words of (probable) Gaulish/Celtic origin which Isidore does not identify as such, namely *Etym.* XIX, 31, 16 *uiriolae* (SOFER 1930: 81); *Etym.* XV, 15, 4 *arepennis* (SOFER 1930: 118; BOLELLI 1942: 141; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 103; DLG 46), plausibly *Etym.* XX 5, 4 *baccea* (SOFER 1930: 165 fn. 1), and *Etym.* XX 12, 3 *caracutum* (SOFER 1930: 165 fn. 2). Nor have I included references of the type *Galli ... appellant* vel sim., namely *linna* (supposedly derived from Plautus, cf. SOFER 1930: 75–76; DLG 171), *candetum* (derived from Columella V, 1, 6; cf. SOFER 1930: 165 fn. 3; SCHMIDT 1967: 158–159; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 107; DLG 88), *leuga* (derived from St Jerome, *Comm. in Ioel.* III, 18; cf. SOFER 1930: 165 fn. 3; BOLELLI 1942: 50; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 111; DLG 168–169), and *dusius* (derived from St Augustine, *Civ. Dei* XV, 23; cf. DLG 133).

62 ANDRÉ 1981: 132–133 suggests that Isidore’s text is even closer to the *scholia* of Berne: *uolemis* ‘*uolemae*’ uel ‘*uolemi*’, ‘*uolemae*’ ab eo quod uolam implent dictae, id est mediam manum, in which case ‘Isidore a pris pour un nom. sing. l’abl. *uolemis* de la glosse’. It is not evident to me why this should be preferred to Servius, who was a well known source for Isidore.

sense ('Celtic'), although it could simply mean 'a word from Gaul'. It was borrowed into Latin, and also appears as *sagulum* and later *saga* > Fr *saie*, and is comparable to Lithuanian *sagis* 'mantle for women', etc. (LEW II 464; DELL 589; DLG 224–225; SCHMIDT 1967: 172; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 112). Even if the word appears in the work of numerous authors (Ennius, Lucilius, Varro, Nonius, etc.) I have not been able to trace this particular passage.<sup>63</sup>

*Etym.* XX, 2, 24: *taxea lardus est gallice dictum. Vnde et Afranius in Rosa: gallum sagatum pingui pastum taxea* 'The Gaul in his mantle, fed with fat lard' (BARNEY 2006: 396). For the origins of the word *taxea* 'lard, the fat of bacon', Isidore is here referring to the work of Lucius Afranius, an early Roman playwright whose work is generally dated to the second half of the second century B.C. (STÄRK 2002: 290).<sup>64</sup> Since the play in question has not survived, the line given by Isidore cannot be verified. The word is unlikely to be Celtic and has been related to late Lat *taxus* 'badger', which is itself a loan from Germanic (LEW II 652–653).

*Etym.* XIV, 8, 18: *nam Gallorum lingua Alpes montes alti uocantur*. Almost certainly derived from Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Georgica* III, 474, or his commentaries on the *Aeneid* IV, 442 discussed above. So far as can be ascertained, therefore, most lexical items identified by Isidore as *lingua gallica* are derived from (much) earlier sources. Isidore's use of the term partly reflects these sources and also includes several non-Celtic terms. Indeed, Isidore's material suggests that he used *lingua gallica* to indicate 'the speech of the Gauls' in general, rather than 'Gaulish' in specific.

Older sources also reflect the use of the term in the *Ars grammatica poetica rhetorica* or *Grammatica* by Julian, archbishop of Toledo (c. A.D. 642–690), who is regarded as the greatest scholar of Visigothic Spain after Isidore (ALONSO-NÚÑEZ 1999: 802–803). In Book I, 1, 80 of this work, based on various predecessors (MAESTRE YENES 1973: xxix–xxlx), the author asks: *quid intelligitur 'ritus'? consuetudo; unde et dicit quidam: 'teutonico ritu soliti torquere cateias'* and he continues: *quid sunt cateias? astas lancearum lingua gallica* (MAESTRE YENES 1973: 23). This passage can be traced back, perhaps via Isi-

63 Attested in various other authors as well, for example Cato, Caesar, Horace, Livy, Pliny, etc. Tacitus, *Germania* XVII, 1 used it of the Germans. In Greek it is always used in a Gaulish context, for example Polybius II, 28, 7, see TGL VII 7.

64 A word *taxia* occurs as one of the variant readings in Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes* VI, 24, 13, see BERKOWITZ 1967: 694. If so, could Isidore have confused the names of Afranius and Arnobius Afer?

dore, *Etym.* XVIII, 7, 7, to Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* VII, 741 and thus back to Virgil. Similarly, in Book II, 14, 3 Julian explains:

barbarolexis autem dicitur, quando peregrina et barbara uerba latinis eloquiis inseruntur; ut si quis dicat *mastruca*, *cateia*, *magalia*. *mastruca* enim barbarum nomen est latinis eloquiis insertum, *cateiae* astae dicuntur in lingua gallica, *magalia* uero lingua punica casae pastores dicuntur.<sup>65</sup>

'It is called *barbarolexis* when foreign and strange words are inserted into Latin declarations; as if anyone would say *mastruca*, *cateia*, *magalia*. For *mastruca* is a foreign word inserted into Latin speech, in the *lingua gallica* spears are called *cateiae*, while in the Punic language shepherds' houses are called *magalia*.'

This passage may spring from Isidore, *Etym.* I, 32, 2, but the examples could also derive from Donatus, Pompeius, and Servius.<sup>66</sup> Again the material stems from much older sources.

However, whereas the previous authors used *lingua gallica* to (whether knowingly or not) sometimes identify words that can be classified as Celtic, the following passage from Bede's (c. A.D. 673–735) *Historia ecclesiastica* is the first where *lingua gallica* clearly does not denote the Celtic language of Gaul. In *Historia ecclesiastica* V, 11, relating the career of St Willibrord, Bede notes:

donauit autem ei Pippin locum cathedrae episcopalis in castello suo inlustri, quod antiquo gentium illarum uerbo *Wiltaburg*, id est oppidum *Viltorum*, lingua autem gallica *Traiectum* uocatur.<sup>67</sup>

'Pippin gave him [i.e. St Willibrord] a place for his episcopal see in his famous fortress, which with an ancient word of those peoples is called *Wiltaburg*, that is the town of the Wilti, but in the *lingua gallica* is called *Traiectum* [Utrecht].'

Here (Gallo-)Latin is meant, and we may wonder at Bede's surprising use of the term *lingua gallica*.<sup>68</sup> It may be that outside Gaul the term was used more indiscriminately.

The next text to be discussed is the *Vita sanctorum patrum Iurensium*, which contains three short lives of St Romanus, St Lupicinus, and St Eugendus. Although set in the fifth century and pretending to be a near eye-witness account, it cannot have been written before A.D. 800 (KRUSCH 1896: 127–128). Speaking of the birth-place of St Eugendus, the *Vita Sancti Eugendi* III, 2 notes:

65 MAESTRE YENES 1973: 179.

66 For *mastruca*, see TLL VIII 433–434; for *magalia*, see TLL VIII 50.

67 COLGRAVE & MYNORS 1969: 486–487.

68 It is not commented on in the relevant pages of WALLACE-HADRILL 1988: 184–185.

sanctus namque famulus Christi Eugendus, sicut beatorum patrum Romani ac Lupicini in religione discipulus, ita etiam natalibus hac prouincia extitit indigena atque conciuus. ortus nempe est haud longe a uico, cui uetusta paganitas, ob celebritatem clausuramque fortissimam superstitiosissimi templi, gallica lingua Isarnodori, id est ferrei ostii, indidit nomen.<sup>69</sup>

‘For indeed, Eugendus, the servant of Christ, as a disciple in religion of the blessed fathers Romanus and Lupicinus, thus sprang from that native province at birth as a native and fellow-citizen. He was surely born not far from the village, on which paganism in ancient times, for the sake of renown and the massive fort of a very superstitious temple, had put the name *Isarnodori* in the *lingua gallica*, which means ‘iron doors’.’

Krusch suggested that this was an ill-informed etymology of a Germanic compound (‘eisernes Thor’) (KRUSCH 1896: 127). He further demonstrated the author’s ignorance about Gaulish by pointing to misinterpretations elsewhere in the text; in *Vita Sancti Romani* I, 1 the author derives the Gaulish placename *Condadisco* (modern Saint-Claude, Jura) from Lat *condere* instead of Gaulish \**condate*- ‘confluence’ (KRUSCH 1896: 127; DLG 103). However, the name *isarno dori* has a good Gaulish etymology; the place-name *Isarnore* (Ain) is supposedly derived from exactly the same *Isarno-dori*, and the Gaulish element \**isarno*- ‘iron’ is attested in other place-names (e.g. *Isarno-dunum*) as well as supported by the cognates OI *iarnn*, W *haearn*, B *houarn* ‘iron’, etc. (EVANS 1981: 250; DLG 162). The second element is the common Gaulish place-name element \**duro*(n). For the change *u* > *o* compare the form *doro* in Endlicher’s Glossary (LAMBERT 1995: 203). This need not indicate, of course, that the author had any knowledge of Gaulish other than some place-name etymologies. In the *Prologus* to the same *Vita* we find another reference to *sermo gallicus*:

quamuis ergo Agaunus uester gallico priscoque sermone tam primitus per naturam quam nunc quoque per ecclesiam ueridica prefiguratione Petri petra esse di[g]noscitur.<sup>70</sup>

‘However, then, your *Agaunus* is known in the *gallico priscoque sermone*, originally for the sake of natural qualities, as now also for the sake of the church, to be a true rock through the prefigurement of Peter.’

Again a place-name is explained; it was mentioned earlier that *agaunus* ‘rock’ is a genuine Gaulish word (and place-name), and again this seems to refute Krusch’s claim concerning the author’s ignorance of Gaulish.

69 KRUSCH 1896: 154.

70 KRUSCH 1896: 131.

Weisgerber suggested that at this stage the use of the adjective *priscus* was introduced in order to avoid confusion with *sermo gallicus*, which by this time could mean Celtic as well as Gallo-Latin (WEISGERBER 1969: 152 fn. 4). This may well be the case, but the usage is unique in the *Vita* as well as in our corpus in general. It is dangerous to specify the chronology of the semantic development of *gallica (lingua)* on the basis of this passage alone. Note also that the phrase *gallico priscoque sermone* is ambiguous; it could in fact indicate two different *sermones*: ‘old Gallic speech’ or ‘old speech and Gallic speech’.

I will go on to discuss the material gleaned from the early mediaeval glossaries. These remain largely uncharted terrain, and my discussion is as exhaustive as the indices of CGL allow it to be.<sup>71</sup> The history of individual glosses is still difficult to trace with exactitude, but I will discuss the relevant lemmata with reference to the work of Goetz and Dionisotti, which has clarified the general picture (CGL I; DIONISOTTI 1996). The date of the various glossaries has been a matter of debate since the days of Goetz and Lindsay: were they compiled in Antiquity and copied and recopied like any other ancient text, or were they constantly combined, abridged, expanded and reshaped to serve different needs, and therefore even more difficult to date (DIONISOTTI 1996: 205 and 242–247)? More difficulties arise with regards to tracing the sources of the various glossaries. Even though Goetz remarked that the sources of the glossaries are manifold, it can be said that most material relevant for our purposes was generally culled directly from the works of antique writers such as Varro, Donatus, Servius, and Nonius, or else derived through such intermediary works as the *Etymologiae* of Isidore (HOLTZ 1996: 16). I will list the relevant glosses below, indicating the glossaries in which they occur, and discussing their possible sources.

CGL IV 597.13 [Abavus maior]:<sup>72</sup> *gessum hasta uel iaculum gallicae*. A very frequent gloss, which appears in various guises, for example CGL IV 595.37 [Abavus maior]: *ganeo golosus popinator tabernio hasta uel iaculum lingua gallica* with omission of *gaesum*; CGL V 297.55 [Amplonian II (Erfurt)]: *gesum hasta uel iaculum gallice*; CGL V 362, 49 [Amplonian II]: *gesa hasta Gallorum*; CGL V 297.55 [Amplonian II]: *gesum asta uel iaculum gallice*;

71 As an example of glosses not included by Goetz I cite from the northern Spanish *Vocabulario latino* the lemma *ganeo · golosus, popinator, taberno, asta uel iaculum, lingua gallica* in GARCÍA TURZA & GARCÍA TURZA 1997: 358, which is clearly related to (or taken from) CGL IV 595.37 [Abavus] discussed below.

72 On *Abavus* and *Abavus maior*, see DIONISOTTI 1996: 236.

CGL IV 604.28 [Abactor]: *giesum hasta uel iacula*. This gloss was probably derived from Nonius, *De compendiosa doctrina* XIX, 555, 9,<sup>73</sup> or from Servius' commentary on *Aeneid* VIII, 660: *gaesa hastas uiriles: nam etiam uiros fortes Galli gaesos uocant* (THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: II 295), or VII, 664: *pilum proprie est hasta Romana, ut gaesa Gallorum, sarissae Macedonum* (THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: II 179). From there it is traceable to Virgil and Varro. Note that Caesar already made use of this word (*Bellum Gallicum* III, 4, 1), which is further attested in various Greek authors as γαῖσος or γαῖσον 'javelin'.<sup>74</sup> Still, Nonius' (and Servius') gloss is probably derived from Virgil. While here the spear itself is identified as Gallic and not the word as such, it reflects a genuine Gaulish word reconstructed as \**gaiso-*, compare OI *gae*, MW *gwaew*, OB *guugoiuou* 'lance' < \**uo-gaiso-*; it is also attested in Germanic, compare ON *geirr*, OHG *gêr* 'spear', etc. (DLG 146; LEW I 575–576; DELL 256; PORZIO GERNIA 1981: 109–110; IEW 410).<sup>75</sup>

CGL IV 598.4 [Abavus maior]: *gnatus natus generatus filius creatus uel enixus lingua galica (sic)*. This possibly Gaulish word is glossed frequently (DLG 153), see for example CGL V 635.3 [Leiden BPL 67E]: *gnatus filius lingua gallica*; CGL V 600.35: *gnabat natus generatus filius creatus uel enixus lingua gallica*; CGL V 298.54 [Amplonian II]: *gnatus filius lingua gallica uel natus*; CGL IV 521.34 [Affatim]: *gratus filius galliciae lingae (sic)*.<sup>76</sup> We may compare Isidore, *Etym.* I, 26, 9: *gnatus quod est filius, per G scribendum, quia fecit generatus*, as well as *Etym.* IX, 5, 13: *gnatus dicitur quia generatus*. Note, however, that there the word is not identified as *lingua gallica* vel sim.

CGL V 214.26 [Liber Glossarum]:<sup>77</sup> *kateias gallica lingua dicimus lancias. unde et uirgilius teutonico ritu soliti torquere kategas (sic) et oratius acinaces posuit pro cladios Mediorum* (GL I 325), and also CGL V 214.27 [Liber Glossarum]: *katerua (sic) gallorum lingua dicitur quod apud nos legio uocatur*. Probably tracable via Isidore, *Etym.* XVIII, 7, 7: *claua haec et cateia, quam Horatius caiam dicit; est enim genus gallici teli*, or more likely via Servius'

73 LINDSAY 1913b: III, 891: *GAESA telum Galliarum tenerum. Vergilius lib VIII 'Alpina corruscat gaesa manu'; Varro de uita populi Romani lib. III: 'qui gladiis cincti sine scuto cum binis gaeis essent'*. See in general GATTI 1996: 79–91.

74 For example in the Septuagint: *Job* 8:18, *Judith* 9:7; also in Polybius VI, 39, 3; XVIII, 18, 4, etc., see TGL II 491–492 and DLG 146–147.

75 For a list of all attestations see TLL VI.2 1667–1668. Note that SCHRIJVER 1995: 384 reconstructs the Insular Celtic word as a *u*-stem.

76 On *Affatim*, see DIONISOTTI 1996: 227–228.

77 On the *Liber glossarum*, see GOETZ 1891 and CGL I 104–117.

commentary on *Aeneid* VII, 741: *cateias id est hastas, cateiae lingua theotisca hastae dicuntur* and especially *cateias tela gallica unde et teutonicum ritum dixit*, explaining Virgil's line *Campani Teutonico ritu soliti torquere cateias* (THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927: II 191). Even when the lance itself is here identified as Gallic (*tela gallica*) and the language identified as *theotisca*,<sup>78</sup> the word *cateia* may be Gaulish and has been related to OI *caithid* 'to cast, hurl' (DLG 94).

CGL V 560.32 [Cassinensis 90]: *alpes gallice alti montes*, also CGL V 560.41 [Cassinensis 90]: *alpes niues lingua gallica alti montes*. Either derived directly from Servius' commentary on *Georgica* III, 474 or his commentary on *Aeneid* IV, 442 or via Isidore, *Etym.* XIV, 8, 18 (for which see above).

CGL V 569.39 [Cassinensis 90]: *gessatus mercennarius excercitus gallica lingua*. Known also from CGL V 502.28 [Vatican 1468]: *gaesatus mercennarius uel excercitus*. Perhaps taken from Orosius, *Historiae* IV, 13, 5: *ex ulteriore Gallia ingens aduentare excercitus [...] maxime gaesatorum, quod nomen non gentis sed mercennariorum Gallorum est* 'from distant Gaul a vast army arrived [...] especially of *gaesati* (spearmen), which is not the name of a people, but that of the Gallic mercenaries' (TLL VI.2 1667).

CGL V 582.57 [Cassinensis 90]: *uiri soror gallice sororia dicitur, sororis uir a quibusdam sororius dicitur, mariti frater leuir dicitur*. The gloss is of unknown derivation. The term *sororia* is very unlikely to be Gaulish, where *suior-* < \**syesor-* would be expected.<sup>79</sup>

CGL V 634.58 [Leiden BPL 67E]: *gemnades mulieres lucedemonice lingua galica*. Further corrupted in CGL V 600.64 [Glossae Scaligeri]: *gemmades .i. mulieres lucae dominicae lingua gallica*. This clearly refers to Grk γυμνάδες 'trained, naked [ones]' so its attribution to *lingua gallica* is erroneous. Perhaps *graeca* was here miscopied as *gallica*. The gloss is of unknown derivation.

Most of this glossary-material derives from (much) earlier sources, and this is reflected by the use of the term *lingua gallica* even if the attribution is often erroneous. However, in the *Gesta Karoli Magni*, a series of moral tales about Charlemagne probably written by Notker Balbulus (c. A.D. 840–912) (HAEFELE & GSCHWIND 1993: 1289–1290), we find the first unambiguous example of the

78 Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* X, 25, 2 mentions the word but does not comment on its origin. Pompeius, *Grammatica* V, 284, 23 assigns it to *lingua Persarum*. The word is also mentioned in Donatus, *Grammatica* IV, 392, 7 as an example of a 'barbarism', see TLL III 602.

79 Cf. the form *suioerbe* in LEJEUNE 1988: 93–94 and LAMBERT 1995: 105–106.

term *gallica lingua* in the sense of ‘the contemporary Gallo-Romance vernacular’. *Gesta* I, 20 reads:

cum ergo de domo sua ad episcopum uenire disponeret, assumpsit duas caniculas in manu sua, quas gallica lingua ueltres nuncupant.<sup>80</sup>

‘Moreover, when he would set out from his house to go to the bishop, he took two little dogs in his hand, which in the *lingua gallica* are called *veltres*.’

Doubtless the author is here referring to OFr *veltre* ‘sorte de chien employé surtout pour la chasse’, cf. Fr *veutre*, *veautre* (GODEFROY 1964: 528). In this case *lingua gallica* certainly refers to Gallo-Romance; the Latin form is *uertragus* (or *uertrahus*; the Gallo-Romance showing dissimilation of *uertr-* > *ueltr-*) ‘greyhound’ (NIEMEYER 2002: 1394; GMIL VIII 289; EWFS 880; DIEZ 1887: 339; MEYER-LÜBKE 1935: 772).

This is very likely also the meaning of *lingua gallica* in the following passage from Widukind of Corvey’s (died after A.D. 973) *Rerum gestarum Saxoniarum*, composed around A.D. 967–968 (ALTHOFF 1998: 76–78). In Book II, 17, in a passage describing the battle of Birken (A.D. 939) between Otto I and his brother Henry, it is said that:

sed cum a fronte pariter et a tergo urgerentur, qua parte potissimum cauere debuissent, in promptu non erat. ex nostris etiam fuere qui gallica lingua ex parte loqui sciebant, qui clamore in altum gallice leuato exhortati sunt aduersarios ad fugam. illi socios huiusmodi clamasse arbitrati, fugam, ut clamatum est, inierunt.<sup>81</sup>

‘But when they were simultaneously pressed in the front and at the back, it was not clear on which side they might have had to guard themselves specifically. Also, among us there were some who knew how to speak some *gallica lingua*, who, having raised a loud cry [in] *gallice*, encouraged the enemies to flight. These, thinking that [their] comrades had called such, turned to flight, as had been shouted.’

This passage almost certainly refers to French, as in all likelihood does the use of *lingua gallica* in the *Acta concilii Mosomensis auctore Gerberto archiepiscopo*, documenting the proceedings of the Council of Mouzon which took place near Sedan on 2 June A.D. 995. During this council one bishop got up and delivered an address in what must be the Gallo-Romance vernacular:<sup>82</sup>

80 HAEFELE 1959: 26.

81 HIRSCH & LOHMANN 1935: 82.

82 Also suggested by WILMOTTE 1927: 225 fn. 14.

facto itaque silentio, cunctis residentibus qui aderant, Aymo episcopus surrexit et gallice concionatus est, domnum Iohannem papam episcopos Galliarum causa synodi ad Aquasgrani palatii inuitasse, et eos illo uenire noluisse.<sup>83</sup>

‘After silence was called accordingly, bishop Aymo arose from all the rest who were present and proclaimed [in] *gallice* that the Lord Pope John had invited the Gallic bishops to the palace of Aachen for the sake of the synod, and that they had not wanted to come.’

The late tenth-century historian Richer of St. Rémy (Reims) based his account of the Council of Mouzon in *Historiarum libri IV*, 100 on these *Acta*, and related the following (BUR 1995: 830–831):

quibus circumquaque silentibus, episcopus Virunensis eo quod linguam gallicam norat, causam sinodi prolaturus surrexit.<sup>84</sup>

‘When they were silent all around the bishop of Verdun arose, because he knew the *gallica lingua*, to explain the reason for the synod.’

Again, the term almost certainly refers to Gallo-Romance, as is also likely to be the case in the *Chronicon S. Michaelis monasterii in pago Viridunensi*, that is, the chronicle of Saint-Mihiel (Meuse) which was written by an anonymous author between A.D. 1021–1044. Under the year A.D. 984 it notes (POTTHAST 1970: 438):

denique dux Theodoricus, cuius ditone abbatia subdita erat, eum iam bene cognitum ad quoscumque regni principes derigebat legatum, et maxime ad consobrinum suum regem Francorum, quoniam nouerat eum in responsis acutissimum et linguae gallicae peritia facundissimum.<sup>85</sup>

‘At last duke Theodoric, in whose power the abbey was placed, directed the delegate; [because] he was already well known to all princes of the kingdom and especially to his cousin the king of the Franks, because he had known him most keen in replies and most eloquent in knowledge of the *lingua gallica*.’

Ademar of Chabannes’ (A.D. 989–1034) use of *antiquus sermo Gallorum* in his *libri historiarum III*, 40 demonstrably denotes Gallo-Romance also:

locus autem antiquo sermone Gallorum Carrofus uocitabatur propter carrorum confinia, id est ueicolorum publicorum, et deinceps pro reuerentia crucis Sanctum Carrofum appellari placuit.<sup>86</sup>

‘The place, then, which in the ancient language of the Gauls is called Carrofus, because of the nearness of the vehicles, that is of the public vehicles, and it is then that it was decided on account of a reverence for the Cross to be called Holy Carrofus.’

83 MGHSS III 690.

84 WAITZ 1877: 175.

85 MGHSS IV 82.

86 MGHSS IV 134.

Most likely the word indicated here is a corrupted version of OFr *quarefor*, *carrefour* ‘crossroads’, compare OProv *caireforc* ‘idem’ < Lat \**quadrifŭrcum* (EWFS 189; MEYER-LÜBKE 1935: 571; DIEZ 1887: 540), a meaning which is also borne out by the text (*carrorum confinia*).

Doubtless the *lingua gallica* referred to by Walther of St Victor (died after A.D. 1180) in his *Sermo de Purificatione* VI, 1, 5 also indicates Gallo-Romance/French:

*sint lumbi uestri praecincti, et lucernae ardentes, et uos similes hominibus expectantibus dominum suum, etc.* (Luc. 12: 35–36). festiua sollempnitas praesentis diei in tribus linguis nuncupatur uocabulis. latina enim lingua dicitur Purificatio, lingua gallica nomen habet a candelis, graece enim dicitur Ypapanti Domini, id est obuatio Domini.<sup>87</sup>

“‘May your loins be girt, and your lamps burning, and you [be] like people expecting their lord, etc.’ The gay solemnity of the present day is called with names in three languages; for in the Latin language it is called ‘Purificatio’, the *lingua gallica* has a word [derived] from candles, while in Greek it is called ‘Ypapanti Domini’, that is the Encounter of the Lord.’

This passage is based on Johannes Belethus’ (end of twelfth century) *Rationale diuinorum officiorum* LXXXI (‘de festis quae sunt in principio Septuagesimae, et primo de Purificatione B. Mariae’):

festum autem B. Mariae tribus nuncupatur nominibus. dicitur enim uel Purificatio B. Mariae, uel Candelaria, uel ὑπαντή Domini [...] quare autem Candelaria uocatur aliam auctoritatem non habet, sed potius fluxum est ab antiqua consuetudine ethnicorum siue gentilium [...] uel etiam appellata est Candelaria, propter multitudinem candelarum et significationem quae in eis est.<sup>88</sup>

‘Now the Feast of the Blessed Mary is called by three names, for it is called either the Purification of the Blessed Mary, or Candelaria, or the ὑπαντή (Encounter) of the Lord [...] why however it is called Candelaria has no other authority, but rather it has sprung from an ancient custom of heathens and foreigners [...] or it is even called Candelaria because of the large number of candles and the token which is in them.’

The name of the feast is therefore derived from Lat *candela*, and thus of solid Latin/Romance origin. Finally, in Gerald of Wales’ (A.D. 1146–1220) *Descriptio Cambriae* I, 12 the term *lingua gallica* also means ‘French’ (BONFANTE 1956: 19 fn. 2; PUTTER forthc.).

These final examples show that from the late ninth century onward *lingua gallica* had come to mean ‘Gallo-Romance, French’, that is, a term denoting the contemporary vernacular.<sup>89</sup> It would retain this meaning until the sixteenth

87 CHÂTILLON 1975: 47.

88 PL CCH 86.

89 A rather puzzling example of the contrastive use of *gallica* and *celtica* occurs in book I, 4 of the thirteenth-century *Translatio Dionysii Areopagitae* which is set during the siege of Paris

century, when scholars like Gessner started to make the distinction between French (*gallica lingua recentior*, regarded by Gessner as a mixture of Latin and German) and *gallica uetus*, which he used synonymously with *celtica* to denote the language “qua Helvetij & Galli Julij Caesaris tempore usi sunt” (GESSNER 1555: 17v; COLOMBAT 2005: 210).<sup>90</sup> The terms *celtica* and *gallica* are used by Gessner for the ancient language of central Europe (regarded as the predecessor of German), and this usage would remain current in (especially German) scholarship until the eighteenth century, even if various scholars used the term with different meanings (DOTTIN 1920: 3–11; BONFANTE 1956: 23–34; POPPE 1992: 246–247).<sup>91</sup> Even so, the term *Celtic* came to be preferred to *Gallic* as the term for the newly identified language family ‘because the term Gallic was too closely associated with French by Lhuyd’s day.’ (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1998: 16).

by the Vikings. It relates how Count Odo organises the defence and surprises a number of Viking scouts (see MGHSS XI 357):

[...] exploratores hostium incurrit, quos et agnitos secum in castra usque perduxit. Tum uero callide secretius exploratores conuenit, et non parua pecunia commissa, uti exercitum sibi proderent, persuasit. Demum celtice, ne hostibus consilium pateret, uotum suum innuit, palam gallice edicens nuntios e castris dirigit, duci suo imperans ut ad se in castra cum copiis Gallorum ipsa die maturaret.

‘He ran into scouts of the enemy, whom he recognised and brought with him to the camp. Then he cleverly assembled the scouts in secret, and bribed them with no small amount of money to betray the army to him. At last, he signalled his wish in *celtice*, so as not to reveal his plan to the enemies. He directed the scouts from the camp, announcing [it] openly in *gallice*, commanding his leader to make haste that same day with the supply of Franks to him in the camp.’

Here the two terms (*celtice* and *gallice*) are clearly distinguished. In this passage *gallice* seems to be understandable to the Vikings, whereas *celtice* is not. WILMOTTE 1927: 229 admitted that the meaning of the terms is difficult to explain here. For lack of a satisfying explanation it could be suggested that the contrastive use of *gallice* and *celtice* may amount to no more than the erroneous use of language terms taken from classical writers – the anonymous author of this text ostentatiously shows his classical learning, copiously citing Virgil, Sallust, and Horace. His use of the terms *gallice* and *celtice* (he consistently refers to the Franks as *Galli*) may be an ill-informed attempt at using classical terminology.

90 For a detailed discussion see POPPE 1986: 22–46.

91 For the subsequent identification of the languages now known as Celtic, see SIMS-WILLIAMS 1998: 12–16.

## 4. GENERAL COMMENTS

4.1. *Chronology*

I will now consider the chronological development of the two terms in general, commencing with *gallica*. Weisgerber suggested that from the start there had been some confusion about attributing certain lexical items to Gaulish by Latin authors, and that by the fourth century at the latest *lingua gallica* could indicate Gallo-Latin as well as Gaulish (as well as a specific style of rhetoric) (WEISGERBER 1969: 152). Nonetheless, most authors writing before the third century (Suetonius, Festus, Aulus Gellius, Ulpianus, and Nonius Marcellus) seem, as far as can be ascertained, to use the term to indicate the indigenous Celtic language of Gaul. However, Servius' commentary on Virgil may serve as an example of the early puzzling use of the term (*lingua gallica*) (WEISGERBER 1969: 152 fn. 4). While this text may contain a Gaulish etymology, Servius' usage is undoubtedly confused and includes non-Celtic terms. It may be that here it has a more geographic than generic linguistic meaning. This could of course also be the case with the earlier sources, but this is difficult to establish as the few lexical items mentioned there are at least plausibly Celtic. It is uncertain, therefore, whether Servius' use of the term reflects the poor quality of his sources, or, as Weisgerber suspected, a more general shift in the meaning of *lingua gallica*.

Particularly interesting is the terminology in Sulpicius Severus' *Dialogi* I, 27. Here the adverbs *gallice* and *celtice* seem to refer to a specific (rustic, unpolished) *style* in Latin. By contrast, contemporary authors such as Eucherius, Macrobius (the cases of Claudian and Cassiodorus are ambiguous), and Lydus generally use the term, consciously or not, to identify Gaulish. So do Gregory of Tours and Julian of Toledo. Still, Isidore's use of the term appears confused and includes non-Celtic terms. Finally, Bede clearly does *not* use the term to refer to Gaulish.

From the later ninth century on several (Frankish) authors (both from West and East Francia) used the term for Gallo-Romance/French, for example Notker Balbulus of St. Gall, Widukind of Corvey, Richer of St. Rémy, Ademar of Chabannes, etc. Weisgerber suggested that after A.D. 800 (the approximate date of the *Vita sanctorum patrum Iurensium*) the use of the adjective *priscus* was introduced in order to avoid confusion with *lingua gallica* or *sermo gallicus*, which, as we have seen, tended to indicate Gallo-Latin/Gallo-Romance at that stage (WEISGERBER 1969: 152 fn. 4). This would fit into the scenario that I have

suggested above, but admittedly I only know of one instance of *priscus* used in this manner. Nonetheless, from the ninth century on *lingua gallica* tends to indicate Gallo-Romance/French, even if Sigibert of Gembloux could still use the term in the twelfth century to refer to a Gaulish place-name (*Augustodunum*) because he copied this information from Heiric of Auxerre. Generally, however, the term was used in the sense of ‘French’ well into the Early Modern period.

As for *celtica*, Weisgerber thought that the early attestations of *lingua celtica* (vel sim.) doubtless indicate the Celtic language of Gaul in the modern sense (WEISGERBER 1969: 153). However, to the best of my knowledge the only early attestations in Latin occur in the work of Pliny (and *gallica* is much better represented there).<sup>92</sup> Moreover, this author’s (sparing) use of *celtica* could well have been influenced by his Greek examples. The term is only used again by Ausonius writing several centuries later, where it may also indicate Gaulish, even if it could just mean ‘the speech of the inhabitants of (central) Gaul’. This would perhaps explain its use by Sulpicius Severus and Sidonius Apollinaris, who seem to use it to indicate a regional, rustic *style* of Latin.

I have discussed the specific geographical connotations (central Gaul) of *celtica*. It is unclear whether this connotation is already present in Pliny’s use of the term, or whether he uses the term in the Greek fashion, where it tends to indicate Gaul in its entirety. A further complicating factor is that from about the fourth century onward, for example in the *Historia Augusta*, Ammianus Marcellinus, and the *Notitia Dignitatum*, various *copiae auxiliares* located in northern Gaul are also indicated as *Celtae* (usually in combination with other groups (for example *Herulos et Batauos cumque Petulantibus Celtas*), especially the *Franci* (WEISGERBER 1969: 154). Weisgerber, therefore, suggested that by the eighth or ninth century the original sense of *celticus* as ‘Gaulish’ was forgotten completely and the term had come to indicate the Gallo-Romance vernacular: “die überhaupt vorkommenden Belege sind so stark auf die leb-

92 The terms do not seem to be used differently by Pliny, compare for example *Nat. Hist.* XX-XIII, 39: *habeant in lacertis quidem et uiri, quod ex Dardanis uenit – itaque et Dardanium uocabatur: uiriolae celtice dicuntur; uiriae celtiberice* ‘Let even men nowadays wear gold bracelets – called *Dardania* because the fashion came from the Dardani – the Celtic name for them is *uiriolae* and the Celtiberian *uiriae*’ with *Nat. Hist.* III, 122: *Metrodorus tamen Scepsius dicit, quoniam circa fontem arbor multa sit picea, quales gallice uocentur padi* [...] ‘Metrodorus of Scepsis says that the river has received the name of Padus because in the neighbourhood of its source there are a quantity of pine-trees of the kind called in the Gallic dialect *padi*’.

ende Volkssprache bezogen, daß es dort, wo wirklich die alte keltische Sprache gemeint ist, durch *gallicus* ersetzt wird" (WEISGERBER 1969: 154), as in Sigebert of Gembloux' *Vita Deoderici*. Thus I have argued that in *Waltharius* the term *lingua celtica* indicates Gallo-Romance (also in WILMOTTE 1918: 28–29 fn. 1). However, Weisgerber's suggestion that *gallica* replaces *celtica* to indicate the Celtic language is incorrect. I have shown that in the ninth-century sources *lingua gallica* indicates Gallo-Romance. Sigebert's cavalier use of the two terms rather indicates that by this time the words had become synonymous.

For both terms, then, the evidence is somewhat confusing and contradictory, and a clear picture of their semantic development does not emerge. In the following I will demonstrate that various other layers of interpretation have to be taken into account in order to clarify this confused picture.

#### 4.2. *Genre, Sources, and Provenance*

One complicating factor is that authors operating in different genres used the terminology in different ways through the use of different sources. This is most evident in the works of the grammatical authors. They use the term to identify the origins of separate lexical items. As far as I can surmise, these authors generally derived their material from (much) earlier sources (note also that they never use the term *lingua celtica*). It is therefore a mistake to attach too much value to their testimony in a chronological sense. Thus, Festus derives his Gaulish terms from Ennius, Lucanus, and Varro, all writing at a time when there was certainly a Celtic language spoken in Gaul, if not in Northern Italy. Aulus Gellius similarly derives his example from Varro, as did Lydus. Nonius, Servius, and Macrobius extracted their items from Virgil's poetry. Isidore derived his Gaulish lexical items from Plautus, Varro, Virgil, Columella, Servius, St Jerome, and St Augustine. Julian of Toledo, finally, also derived his examples from Virgil, and possibly Donatus and Servius. Still, my analysis shows that the lexical items assigned by these authors to *gallica lingua* frequently also include non-Celtic terms. Especially in the cases of Servius and Isidore, who provide more extensive evidence, the term may indicate 'the language of Gaul' in general rather than 'Gaulish' in specific. In the other cases this is difficult to establish because of the paucity of the evidence.

In narrative texts, be it hagiographical or historical, the terms are employed in a different context. In these cases the term is used by authors who are themselves of Gallic origin. There are but few examples, and one author, namely

Gregory of Tours, unfortunately does not explain the Gaulish place-names he mentions. Unlike the grammatical writers, these writers use the term to explain local (place-)names: Ausonius' *Diuona* in Bordeaux, Venantius Fortunatus' *Vernemetis*, Eucherius' *Agaunum*, *Isarno dori* in the ninth-century *Vita sanctorum patrum Iurensium*, and Heiric of Auxerre's *Augustodunum* and *Lugdunum*. Here modern etymology established that the explanations provided by these authors are generally correct. It can, however, not be inferred from this information (as Fleuriot did) that Gaulish was still a spoken language by this time. Erudite antiquarian knowledge of local names could have lingered on long after the language itself had disappeared. Furthermore, in Ausonius', Venantius Fortunatus', and Heiric's verse it may be regarded as a *figura etymologica* in the tradition of Virgil (the passage from Claudian cited above is far too general to fall within this category). Nonetheless, we saw that partly overlapping with this 'backward-looking', historicising use, other mediaeval writers such as Notker Balbulus, Widukind of Corvey, Richer of St. Rémy, and Ademar of Chabannes used the term to indicate Gallo-Romance.

This simultaneous use of the same term with different meanings may not be as contradictory as it seems. In fact, our confusion about the simultaneous use of the two meanings 'Celtic language of Gaul' and 'Gallo-Latin' or 'Gallo-Romance' stems from the modern separation of the two concepts. The ambiguous use of the term *lingua gallica* probably indicates that they were not regarded as two different languages. In fact, the (Celtic) placenames *Augustodunum* or *Agaunum* (Heiric, *Vita sanctorum Iurensium*) may have been regarded as springing from the same 'indigenous language of Gaul' as the (Old French) noun *veltre* (Notker). This need not be surprising – in fact, the idea that French sprang from Gaulish was still common enough in the Renaissance (TOURNEUR 1905: 191–192).

## 5. CONCLUSION

I have analysed the available evidence for the semantic development of the two Latin terms *gallica* and *celtica* as referring to language, both as adjectives and as adverbs. I have not been able to establish a clear difference between the adverbial (*gallice, celtice*) and adjectival (*lingua* vel sim. *gallic(an)a, celtica*) use of the terms. The adjective is always used to refer to either the language itself or a specific word in the language. The adverb is mostly used in the same vein (in Festus, Isidore, and the glossaries). However, in Aulus Gellius, *Noctes*

*Atticae* XI, 7 and Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogi* I, 27 (and possibly in *Historia Augusta* LX, 6) it may refer to a style or specific ‘Gallic’ register, or accent in Latin.

For the chronological development of *celtica* I established that, considering its sparse attestation, the word probably never gained wide currency. While it certainly indicated Gaulish in the works of Pliny, in late antique works it may refer either to the ‘language of central Gaul’, or to a rustic, geographically defined dialect, accent, or rustic style of Latin. However, the connotations of the term seem to be geographic rather than linguistic. Its meaning remains ambiguous in the early Middle Ages, but seems to have developed into a synonym for *gallica* (indicating Gallo-Romance) by the ninth-century even if Heiric of Auxerre (ninth-century) and Sigibert of Gembloux (eleventh century) still use it to refer to a genuine Gaulish place-name element. This may be explained by the fact that they may not have differentiated between the two modern concepts of Gaulish (the pre-Roman Celtic vernacular) and Gallo-Romance (the contemporary vernacular).

For the chronological development of *gallica*, for which there is much more evidence, I established that most authors writing before the third century used the term to indicate the indigenous language of Gaul, even if this may not always mean ‘Gaulish’. This also seems to be the case for late antique and early mediaeval authors up to c. A.D. 800, even though it has to be taken into account that these were generally recycling material from (much) earlier sources, and their usage probably reflects an earlier meaning of the term. From the ninth century the term demonstrably indicates the contemporary Romance vernacular of Gaul. This meaning was retained until well into the Early Modern period.

I have shown that this somewhat confused picture can be further clarified by taking into account various other layers of interpretation. First, different genres and different authors (from different places) used the terminology in different ways and derived their information from (very) different sources. Thus, a ninth-century epitomator extracting rare terms from a late antique grammatical treatise may have used the term *lingua gallica* (perhaps unknowingly) to identify a Celtic word which eventually could derive from an early Roman author. Simultaneously, a ninth-century chronicler may have used the same terminology to describe the Gallo-Romance speech of his own period (Notker). A second complicating factor is that this ambiguous use of the one term for what we conceive as two different concepts indicates that for many of the early mediaeval authors discussed above the ancient vernacular of Gaul was

not generically different from the contemporary vernacular of Gaul. Indeed, while the modern reader tends to interpret ancient language-names as generic linguistic terms, we often find that the terms may originally only have been used in a broad geographical sense: ‘the speech of Gaul, of the Gauls, etc.’. Thus, whether this be Gaulish, Gallo-Latin, or Gallo-Romance is difficult to establish if the source does not mention any lexical items. My analysis, then, shows that the terms *gallica* and *celtica* should never be uncritically translated as ‘Gaulish’ and ‘Celtic’ – which has too often been done in the past. In fact, the interpretation of the terminology is very complex and cannot be undertaken without taking into account the genre, date, and provenance of the text, a close reading of its context, and the linguistic analysis of the available lexis.

#### REFERENCES

- ACS Alfred Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, 3 vols, Leipzig 1891–1913.
- ALONSO-NÚÑEZ 1999 José M. Alonso-Núñez, ‘Julianus von Toledo, Erzbischof von Toledo’, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* V, Stuttgart – Weimar 1999, 802–803.
- ALTHOFF 1998 Gerd Althoff, ‘Widukind von Corvey’, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* IX, München 1998, 76–78.
- ANDERSON 1936 William Blair Anderson, *Sidonius. Poems and Letters*, 2 vols, Cambridge MA 1936.
- ANDRÉ 1981 Jacques André, *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies livre XVII de l’agriculture. Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, Paris 1981.
- ANTIN 1959 Paul Antin, ‘Gurdonicus (Sulp. Sev. Dial. I, 27, 2)’, *Revue des études latines* 37 (1959), 111–112.
- ARNDT & KRUSCH 1884 Wilhelm Arndt and Bruno Krusch, *Gregorii Turonensis opera* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum 1], Hannover 1884.
- AS *Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp 1643–1770; Brussels 1780–1786, 1845–1883 and 1894–; Tongerlo 1794; Paris 1875–1887.
- AUGELLO 1969 Giuseppe Augello, *Sulpici Severi Dialogi. Testo, traduzione, note*, Palermo 1969.
- BABUT 1910 Ernest Charles Babut, ‘Gorthonicus et le celtique en Gaule au début du Ve siècle’, *Revue historique* 104 (1910), 287–292.
- BANDY 1983 Anastasius C. Bandy, *Ioannes Lydus On Powers, or, The Magistracies of the Roman State. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Commentary, and Indices*, Philadelphia 1983.
- BARNEY 2006 Stephen A. Barney et al., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, Cambridge 2006.
- BARTELINK 1965 Gerhardus Johannes Marinus Bartelink, *Etymologiseren bij Vergilius* [= Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Academie der Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde 28.3], Amsterdam 1965.

- BERKOWITZ 1967  
Luci Berkowitz, *Index Arnobianus*, Hildesheim 1967.
- BIRKHAN 1997  
Helmut Birkhan, *Kelten. Versuch einer Gesamtdarstellung ihrer Kultur*, Vienna 1997.
- BLOM forthc. a  
Alderik H. Blom, 'Endlicher's Glossary', *Études celtiques* 37, forthcoming.
- BLOM forthc. b  
Alderik H. Blom, 'Gaulish in the Formulae of Marcellus of Bordeaux? Methodological Considerations', in: *Proceedings of the XIII. International Congress of Celtic Studies*, forthcoming.
- BLOM forthc. c  
Alderik H. Blom, 'The Plant Names in Marcellus Empiricus', [will appear in] *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 56, forthcoming.
- BOLELLI 1942  
Tristano Bolelli, 'Le voci di origine gallica del Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch di W. Meyer-Lübke', *L'Italia dialettale* 17 (1942), 133–194 and 18 (1942), 34–74.
- BONFANTE 1956  
Giuliano Bonfante, 'A Contribution to the History of Celtology', *Studia Celtica* 3 (1956), 17–34.
- BONNET 1890  
Max Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, Paris 1890.
- BRADLEY 1904  
Henry Bradley, 'Chortonicum', *English Historical Review* 19 (1904), 281–282.
- BRUNOT 1966  
Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours. Tome I. De l'époque latine à la Renaissance*, Paris 1966.
- BUCK 1976  
Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* 12, Chicago – London 1976.
- BUR 1995  
Michel Bur, 'Richer von Reims', in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VII, Munich 1995, 830–831.
- CARDAUNS 1978  
Burkhard Cardauns, *M. Terentius Varro Antiquitates rerum divinarum. Teil I: Die Fragmente*, Wiesbaden 1976.
- CAVAZZA 2004  
Franco Cavazza, 'Gellius the Etymologist. Gellius' Etymologies and Modern Etymology', in: *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Ed. Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel Vardi, Oxford 2004, 65–104.
- CGL  
Georg Goetz and Gustav Loewe, *Corpus Glossariorum Latino-rum*, 7 vols, Leipzig 1888–1923.
- CHÂTILLON 1975  
Jean Châtillon, *Galteri a Sancto Victore et quorundam aliorum sermones ineditos triginta sex* [= *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina Continuatio Mediaevalis* 30], Turnhout 1975.
- COLGRAVE & MYNORS 1969  
Bertram Colgrave and Roger A.B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Oxford 1969.
- COLOMBAT 2005  
Bernard Colombat, 'Vision de la langue et comparaison des langues dans le Mithridate de Conrad Gessner', in: *A Companion in Linguistics. A Festschrift for Anders Ahlqvist on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. Bernadette Smelik, Rijklof Hofman, Camiel Hermans, and David Cram, Nijmegen 2005, 202–218.
- DAVIES 1969  
Percival Vaughan Davies, *Macrobius. The Saturnalia. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, New York – London 1969.
- DELL  
Alfred Ernout and Antoine Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris 1939.
- DIEZ 1887  
Friedrich Diez, *Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*<sup>5</sup>, Bonn 1887.

- DIONISOTTI 1996 Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, 'On the Nature and Transmission of Latin Glossaries', in: *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Âge*. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse, Louvain 1996, 205–252.
- DLG Xavier Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*, Paris 2001.
- DOTTIN 1920 Georges Dottin, *La langue gauloise. Grammaire, textes et glossaire*, Paris 1920.
- DROIXHE 1996 Daniel Droixhe, 'Ossian, Hermann, and the Jew's Harp. Images of the Celtic Languages from 1600 to 1800', in: *Celticism*. Ed. Terence Brown, Amsterdam – Atlanta 1996, 21–33.
- DUFF 1962 James D. Duff, *Lucan. With an English Translation. The Civil War Books I–X (Pharsalia)*, Cambridge MA 1962.
- DUMVILLE 1983 David N. Dumville, 'Ekiurid's Celtica lingua: An Ethnological Difficulty in Waltharius', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 6 (1983), 87–93.
- EVANS 1966 David Ellis Evans, "'gurdonicus' Sulp. Sev. Dial. I.27.2", *Studia Celtica* 1 (1966), 27–31.
- EVANS 1967 David Ellis Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names. A Study in Some Continental Celtic Formations*, Oxford 1967.
- EVANS 1981 David Ellis Evans, 'Celts and Germans', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 29 (1981), 230–255.
- EVELYN WHITE 1967–68 Hugh G. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 2 vols, London – Cambridge MA 1967–1968.
- EWFS Ernst Gamillscheg, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache*, Heidelberg 1928.
- FLEURIOT 1980 Léon Fleuriot, *Les origines de la Bretagne*, Paris 1980.
- FOURNIER 1955 Pierre-François Fournier, 'La persistance du gaulois au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle d'après Grégoire de Tours', in: *Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel I*, Paris 1955, 448–453.
- FREMANTLE ET AL. 1893 W.H. Fremantle, G. Lewis and M.A. Martley, *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, Oxford – New York 1893.
- FRIDH & HALPORN 1973 Åke J. Fridh and James W. Halporn, *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Variarum libri XII* [= Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 96], Turnhout 1973.
- GARCÍA TURZA & GARCÍA TURZA 1997 Claudio García Turza and Javier García Turza, *Fuentes es pañoles altomedievales. El códice emilianense 46 de la Real Academia de la Historia, primer diccionario enciclopédico de la Península Iberica*, Logroño 1997.
- GATTI 1996 Paolo Gatti, 'Nonius', in: *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Âge*. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse, Louvain 1996, 79–91.
- GEORGE 1995 Philippe George, 'Sigebert von Gembloux', in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters VII*, Munich 1995, 1879–1880.
- GESSNER 1555 Conrad Gessner, *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie in usu sunt obseruationes*, Zürich 1555.
- GL *Glossaria latina iussu Academiae Britannicae edita* [...] Ed. Wallace M. Lindsay et al., 5 vols, Paris 1926–1931.

- GMIL *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis conditum a Carolo du Fresne Domino Du Cange auctum ...* Ed. Léopold Favre, 10 vols, London – Niort 1884–1887.
- GOETZ 1891 Georg Goetz, *Der Liber Glossarum*, Leipzig 1891.
- GODEFROY 1964 Frédéric Godefroy, *Lexique de l'ancien français*, Paris 1964.
- GREEN 1991 Roger P.H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1991.
- GROSJEAN 1954 Paul Grosjean, 'Gurdonicus, gort(h)onicus, un terme à rayer des dictionnaires gaulois et latins', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bull. du Cange)* 24 (1954), 117–126.
- HAEFELE 1959 Hans F. Haefele, *Notkeri Balbuli gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris. Notker der Stammler. Taten Kaiser Karl des Grossen* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum. Nova series 12], Berlin 1959.
- HAEFELE & GSCHWIND 1993 Hans F. Haefele and Charlotte Gschwind, 'Notker I. (Balbulus, 'der Stammler')', in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VI, Munich – Zürich 1993, 1289–1290.
- HALM 1866 Karl Halm, *Sulpicii Severi libri qui supersunt* [= Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 1], Vienna 1866.
- HARTEL 1882 Wilhelm August Hartel, *Magni Felicis Ennodii opera omnia* [= Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 6], Vienna 1882.
- HEINZELMANN 1989 Martin Heinzelmann, 'Eucherius', in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* IV, Munich – Zürich, 1989, 70–71.
- HEINZELMANN 2001 Martin Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours. History and Society in the Sixth Century*, Cambridge 2001.
- HILBERG 1996 Isidorus Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* [= Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 54–56], 3 vols, Vienna 1996.
- HIRSCH & LOHMANN 1935 Paul Hirsch and Hans-Eberhard Lohmann, *Widukindi monachi Corbeiensis rerum gestarum Saxoniarum libri tres. Die Sachsegeschichte des Widukind von Korvei* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum 60], Hannover 1935.
- HOFENEDER 2008 Andreas Hofeneder, 'Die 'Druidinnen' der Historia Augusta', *Keltische Forschungen* 3 (2008), 63–87.
- HOHL 1971 Ernst Heinrich Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 2 vols, Leipzig 1971.
- HOLFORD-STREVS 2003a Leofranc A. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford 2003.
- HOLFORD-STREVS 2003b Leofranc A. Holford-Strevens, 'Gellius, Aulus', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 627–628.
- HOLFORD-STREVS 2003c Leofranc A. Holford-Strevens, 'Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 906–907.
- HOLTZ 1996 Louis Holtz, 'Glossaire et grammaire dans l'antiquité', in: *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Age*. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse, Louvain 1996, 1–21.

- IEW Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols, Bern – Munich 1959–1969.
- IHM 1958 Maximilianus Ihm, *C. Suetoni Tranquili opera vol. I. De vita Caesarum libri VIII*, Stuttgart 1958.
- Isidore, *Etym.* Wallace M. Lindsay, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum siue originum libri XX*, 2 vols, Oxford 1911.
- JOHNE 2005 Klaus-Peter Johné, ‘Historia Augusta’, in: *Brill’s New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*. Volume 6. Ed. Christine Salazar, Leiden – Boston 2005, 406–409.
- KASTER 1988 Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1988.
- KASTER 2003 Robert A. Kaster, ‘Verrius Flaccus, Marcus’, in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 1589.
- KRÜGER 1997 Karl Heinrich Krüger, ‘Thebaische Legion’, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters VIII*, Munich 1997, 611.
- KRUSCH 1896 Bruno Krusch, *Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi merovingici et antiquiorum aliquot* [= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 3*], Hannover 1896.
- LAMBERT 1995 Pierre-Yves Lambert, *La langue gauloise. Description linguistique, commentaire d’inscriptions choisies*, Paris 1995.
- LANDGRAF 1894 Gustav Landgraf, ‘Glossographie und Wörterbuch’, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik 9* (1894), 355–446.
- LEJEUNE 1988 Michel Lejeune, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises. Volume II.1: Inscriptions gallo-étrusques; inscriptions gallo-latines sur pierre* [= XLVe supplément à Gallia], Paris 1988.
- LEO 1881 Friedrich Leo, *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati presbyteri italici opera poetica* [= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Auctorum antiquissimorum 4.1*], Berlin 1881.
- LEW Alois Walde and Johann B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols, Heidelberg 1938–1964.
- LINDSAY 1913a Wallace M. Lindsay, *Sexti Pompei Festi de uerborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, Leipzig 1913.
- LINDSAY 1913b Wallace M. Lindsay, *Nonii Marcelli de compendiosa doctrina libros XX*, 3 vols, Leipzig 1913.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> Helmut Rix, Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, and Brigitte Schirmer, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen<sup>2</sup>*, Wiesbaden 2001.
- MACMULLEN 1966 R. Macmullen, ‘Provincial Languages in the Roman Empire’, *American Journal of Philology 87* (1966), 1–17.
- MAESTRE YENES 1973 Maria A.H. Maestre Yenes, *Ars Iuliani Toletani episcopi. Una gramática latina de la España visigoda. Estudio y edición crítica*, Toledo 1973.
- MATTHEWS 2003 John Frederick Matthews, ‘Pompeius Festus, Sextus’, in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 1215.
- MATTHEWS ET AL. 2003 John Frederick Matthews, Peta Fowler, and Don Fowler, ‘Servius’, in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 1395–1396.

- MESSING 1954 Gordon M. Messing, review of: Johann U. Hubschmied, *Pyrenäenwörter vorromanischen Ursprungs und das vorromantische Substrat der Alpen*, in: *Language* 30 (1954), 494–497.
- MEYER-LÜBKE 1935 Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*<sup>3</sup>, Heidelberg 1935.
- MGHSS *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz et al., Hannover 1826–1934.
- MOMMSEN ET AL. 1985 Theodor Mommsen, Paul Krueger, and Alan Watson, *The Digest of Justinian*, 4 vols, Philadelphia 1985.
- NIEDERMANN & LIECHTENHAN 1968 Max Niedermann and Eduard Liechtenhan, *Marcelli de medicamentis liber: Marcellus über Heilmittel* [= *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum* 5], 2 vols, Berlin 1968.
- NIEMEYER 2002 Jan Frederik Niemeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*<sup>2</sup>, 2 vols, Leiden 2002.
- NORDEN 1958 Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols, Stuttgart 1958.
- PERRIN 1920 Bernadotte Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives*, 11 vols, London – New York 1920.
- PL *Patrologiae Latinae [...] cursus completus*. Ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 221 vols, Paris 1844–1864.
- PLATNAUER 1972 Maurice Platnauer, *Claudian*, 2 vols, Cambridge MA 1972.
- Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* Harris Rackham, William H.S. Jones, *Pliny. Natural History*, 10 vols, London – Cambridge MA 1940–1963.
- POLOMÉ 1983 Edgar Polomé, 'The Linguistic Situation in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire', in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2. *Principat* Bd 29.2 *Sprache und Literatur*. Ed. Wolfgang Haase, Berlin – New York 1983, 509–553.
- POPPE 1986 Erich Poppe, *Multiplex sane linguarum ac dialectorum uarietas. Zur Quellenrekonstruktion im 'Mithridates' (1555) des Konrad Gessner am Beispiel des Keltischen*, Münster 1986.
- POPPE 1992 Erich Poppe, 'The Celtic Languages in Conrad Gessner's Mithridates (1555)', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 45 (1992), 240–249.
- PORZIO GERNIA 1981 Maria Luisa Porzio Gernia, 'Gli elementi celtici del latino', in: *I Celti d'Italia*. Ed. Enrico Campanile, Pisa 1981, 97–122.
- POTTHAST 1970 August Potthast, *Repertorium fontium Historiae Medii Aevi* III, Rome 1970.
- PUTTER forthc. Ad Putter, 'Multilingualism in England and Wales, c. 1200: The Testimony of Gerald of Wales', forthcoming.
- ROLFE 1948 John C. Rolfe, *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, 3 vols, Cambridge MA 1948.
- SCHMIDT 1957 Karl Horst Schmidt, *Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen*, Tübingen 1957.
- SCHMIDT 1967 Karl Horst Schmidt, 'Keltisches Wortgut im Lateinischen', *Glotta* 44 (1967), 151–174.
- SCHRIJVER 1995 Peter Schrijver, *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam 1995.
- SCHWABL 1999 Hans Schwabl, 'Zum Kult des Zeus in Kleinasien (II). Der phrygische Zeus Bennisos und Verwandtes', *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 39 (1999), 345–354.

- SIMS-WILLIAMS 1998 Patrick Sims-Williams, 'The Celtic Languages', in: *The Indo-European Languages*. Ed. Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paolo Ramat, London 1998, 345–379.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS 2005 Patrick Sims-Williams, *Ancient Celtic Place-Names in Europa and Asia Minor*, Oxford – Boston 2005.
- SKUTSCH 1985 Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Ennius. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1985.
- SOFER 1930 Johann Sofer, *Lateinisches und Romanisches aus den Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen und romanischen Wortkunde*, Göttingen 1930.
- SOFER 1936 Johann Sofer, 'Das Keltische Wortgut in den klassischen Sprachen', *Commentationes Vindobonenses Bd. 2*, Vienna 1936, 70–92.
- SOFER 1941 Johann Sofer, 'Der Untergang der gallischen Landessprache und seine Nachwirkungen', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 22 (1941), 93–132.
- STÄRK 2002 Ekkehard Stärk, 'L. Afranius', in: *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*. Vol. I. Ed. Christine Salazar and David Orton, Leiden – Boston 2002, 290.
- STEVENS 1933 Courtenay Edward Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age*, Oxford 1933.
- STRECKER 1951 Karl Strecker, *Die lateinischen Dichter des deutschen Mittelalters* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aevi 6.1], Weimar 1951.
- TERRACINI 1921 Benvenuto A. Terracini, 'Gallico e latino. A proposito di un recente libro sulla lingua gallica', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 49 (1921), 401–430.
- TGL Karl-Benedict Hase, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae ab Henrico Stephano constructus*, 8 vols in 9, Paris 1831–1865.
- THILO & HAGEN 1923–1927 Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols, Berlin 1923–1927.
- TINNEFELD 1999 Franz Tinnefeld, 'Iohannes Lydos', in: *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Bd. 7. Ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, Stuttgart – Weimar 1999, 550–551.
- TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 14 vols in 39, Leipzig 1900–.
- TOURNEUR 1905 Victor Tourneur, *Esquisse d'une histoire des études celtiques*, Liège 1905.
- TRAUBE 1896 Ludwig Traube, *Poetae latini aevi Carolini* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aevi 3], Berlin 1896.
- UNTERMANN 2000 Jürgen Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg 2000.
- VENDRYES 1955 Joseph Vendryes, 'Note sur la toponymie celtique', in: *Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel II*, Paris 1955, 641–650.
- WAITZ 1877 Georg Waitz, *Richeri historiarum libri IV* [= Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum 70], Hannover 1877.
- WALLACE-HADRILL 1988 John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. A Historical Commentary*, Oxford 1988.

ALDERIK H. BLOM

WEISGERBER 1969

Leo Weisgerber, 'Zur Sprachenkarte Mitteleuropas im frühen Mittelalter', in: *Rhenania Germano-Celtica. Gesammelte Abhandlungen*. Ed. Johann Knobloch and Rudolf Schützeichel, Bonn 1969, 150–174.

WHITBY 2003

L. Michael Whitby, 'Lydus i.e. John the Lydian', in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and A. Spawforth, Oxford 2003, 899.

WILLIS 1970

James Willis, *Macrobius*, 2 vols, Leipzig 1970.

WILMOTTE 1918

Maurice Wilmotte, 'La patrie du Waltharius', *Revue historique* 127 (1918), 1–30.

WILMOTTE 1927

Maurice Wilmotte, 'Celtice loqui' in: *Mélanges publiés en l'honneur de M. le professeur Václav Tille à l'occasion de son 60ème Anniversaire*. Ed. Jiří Polívka et al., Prague 1927, 222–230.

Alderik H. Blom  
Katherine Jex-Blake Research  
Fellow in Celtic  
Girton College  
Cambridge CB3 0JG  
United Kingdom  
ahb26@cam.ac.uk