Brigetionem, $B\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\tau\iota\omega\nu$

The soil of Hungary never fails to bring us linguistic originality and fresh lessons, just as the perceptive originality of Robert Austerlitz always pushes us to peer critically into the non-obvious. Before the coming of the Magyars Hungary formed a portion of the wide linguistic domain of the Celts. It turns out, as I hope to show, that on Pannonian terrain the Celts produced at least one original formation not paralleled elsewhere.

When we read Ptolemy's Geography cap. 14 $(K \epsilon \Phi I \Delta)$, we sense immediately that we are in Celtic territory: $\Pi \alpha \nu \nu o \nu i \alpha \varsigma \tau \nu \varsigma$ $\check{\alpha} \nu \omega$ $\Theta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \iota \varsigma \ldots$ 3. $\Pi \dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \iota \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\nu}$ ' $\pi \dot{\delta}$ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu$ $\Delta \alpha \nu o \dot{\nu} \beta \iota o \nu$ $\pi o \tau \alpha \mu \dot{\delta} \nu^1$ and then we find $O \dot{\upsilon} \iota \nu \delta \dot{\delta} \beta o \nu \alpha^2 \ldots K \alpha \varrho \nu o \dot{\varrho}$ 'Carnuntum'...³ The name $Noov \dot{\iota} \delta o v \nu o \nu \sim Noov \dot{\iota} \delta o v \nu o \nu$ as well as $K \alpha \varrho \varrho \dot{\delta} \delta o v \nu o \nu$ could not be more obviously Celtic.⁴ $O \lambda \dot{\iota} \mu \alpha \kappa o \nu$ could easily have the suffix $-\bar{a} c u m$ marking a substantial property (a villa) such as we see in Villach/Beljak, and $\Sigma \iota \delta \kappa \dot{\iota} \alpha$ (Sziszek) must be compared with sisciacus (Limousin) found in Holder, as well as with Sissy (Aisne) < Sissi 1157, Succieu (Isère) < Siciaco 9^{th} cent., Sissiaco 10^{th} cent., de Sussiaco 13^{th} cent., formed from a Gaulish personal name Siscius + the suffix $-\bar{a} cum$. These are all substantial and easily paralleled Celtic elements.

It is therefore of considerable interest when we find a new Celtic formation.

 $^{^{}m l}$ I have set forth my view of the name of the Danube as Iranian (Hamp 1977).

The elements of Vindòbona (see Hamp 1976) are patently Celtic, although the exact analysis of -bona (cf. Augustobona, the ancient name of Troyes < Tricasses) still remains obscure. The indubitably Celtic lexeme uindo- (Hamp 1979) 'white' also denotes in early Insular Celtic 'supernatural, of the otherworld' — and this Celtic possibility should not be lost sight of — but the Central European semantics of Belgrad must certainly be kept in mind here.

It is not certain here whether one has to do with Celtic karn- 'a pile of stones' or karn- 'a horned animal' seen in the name of the Carnutes of Chartres.

⁴ For recent remarks bearing on the chronology of Nevio- > Noviodūnum see Hamp 1986. For the writing of Noimagos (2nd century) for what patently must have been *Noiomagos consider the modern form of Nyons [niɔ̃s] (Drôme) < *Noioms < *Noioms < *Noiom(a)os.

In Ptolemy's list we find a place identified with ruins near "Soezny 55 m. from Flexum" (Holder 540–1) Alt-Ó-Szöny. The text prints $B\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota o\nu$ 'Brigetium,' and the following variants are recorded: $B\varrho\iota\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota o\nu$ (in MS X), $B\varrho\alpha\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota o\nu$ (FN $\Sigma\Phi\Psi$), $B\varrho\alpha\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota o\nu$ (C), $B\varrho\alpha\iota\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota o\nu$ (ABDEGL SZ $\Delta\Xi\Omega$), $B\varrho\epsilon\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota o\nu$ (ceteri). If we regard C as perhaphs a lapse omitting an iota, these reduce to [Bregétion] beside [Brigétion]. In inscription Bregetio is reported, Brigetionem ceteri, while the itinerary, Not. Dign. and Ammian. testimony yields Bregetionem and Bregitionem. There is other evidence for e in the first syllable in some manuscript testimony (e. g. Victor Ep.), but without a complete textual criticism it would not profit us at present to rehearse these facts further in detail. This is because there are two considerations that might vitiate the Celtic significance of this variation in any case, as we shall see.

We note two further facts in particular regarding the variants. The CIL attestation of the name shows us nearly exclusively the spelling Brig. This is important in giving a strong indication of the local direct tradition. The further implication is that spellings with Breg- m a y indicate secondary actual phonetic lowering of this original Brig-. The second fact is that Socrates H. Eccl. attests for us $B\epsilon\varrho\gamma\iota\tau\iota\omega\nu$. This form is important not only in showing the stem termination $-\iota\omega\nu$ (which is morphologically, if not phonologically distinctive and relevant), but also in carrying the vocalization $B\epsilon\varrho\gamma$ -. We shall see shortly that this vocalism may well not stem from a simple error, but may reflect an old truth independently motivated. Therefore the e of our variants in Breg- could conceivably have arisen by conflation with Berg.

In this fashion we reach two irreducible possibilities for the first syllable: Brig- and Berg-. Both of these will be seen to belong to possible Celtic formations inherited from Indo-European. It has already been well recognized that Celtic attests reflexes of the Indo-European base *bhergh-; I have in fact recently (Hamp 1986) discussed the formations lying behind Celtic *brigantinos. As a matter of fact, this type of formation brings to mind the variant of our place-name which is found in the Peutinger Table, Brigantio, and the further variant Bregentionem Victor Ep., which must somehow depend on it. Holder properly brands the Peutinger variant "falsch"; we must view the forms in -et- and -it- which we have passed in review as variants of a lectio difficilior, and thus regard the Peutinger -ant- as an intrusion from the widely documented stem brigant- (Holder 535-9). We are therefore assured of Brig- or Berg- + -et- or -it-.

Besides Briantes (Indre), recorded in 1291, and Brianconnet (Alpes-Mar.), written in an inscription ordo Brig and in 997-1027 Brianzo, note especially Briancon (H.-Alpes), which Strabo had as Brigantion and the Vases apollinaires as Brigantium and the Peutinger Table itself knew as Brigantione.

It is instructive, moreover, on the Celtic side to observe the sparseness of formations registered by Holder: Brigantes (534–5), brigant- (535–9), $Brigia^6$ and $Brigi\bar{a}n\bar{\imath}$ (542), and scarcely any sure instances of Brigo-. Besides, I would not agree with Holder in positing (533) an erweiterter Stamm (-) $brig\bar{a}$; this is nothing other than the original feminine root-noun⁷ (< *nomen actionis) with the acc. sg. * $bhr\acute{g}h$ -m > brigan (and the plural) generalized.⁸

I have furthermore studied (Hamp 1972, 1985, in press) the attestation of the IE root *bherģh-, basically a verbal base, and its formations, and in addition to the above derivatives we can identify original formations which may be reconstructed *bhorģh-éie-ti (3 sg.), *bhr-N-ģh-é-ti, *bhrģh-tó- (\rightarrow - H_a - deadjectival verb), *bhrģh-uen-, *bhrģh-mó- (\rightarrow *bherģh-ies-, *bherģh-o-, *bhérģ-es-, *bhorģh-mó-s. We can now add to these the significant increment that our place-name brings.

We are also norr in a position to speak of the formation of our name. Holder leads us to analyze it among his adjectives and participles (somehow said to alternate with -ento-) in -ĕtŏ which get derived (1481) to yield -e-t-io-. But without going into the detail of the miscellaneous bases to which he attributes this formation, we must now see how this entire attribution neglects the very textual documentation on which our name rests.

Although Ptolemy seems to give us a form $Brig\'{e}ti\'{o}n$, we must heed carefully the other evidence for a stem $Brig\'{e}tion$ - and the Socrates H. Eccl. $B\epsilon\varrho\gamma\iota\tau\iota\'{\omega}\nu$. These, taken all together, point unmistakably to a nasal-stem. We must then have a verbal nounbrigetion- or bergetion-. Such a formation has an exact match in Latin and in the Insular Celtic that we know. This is the type of Lat. $menti\bar{o}$ -onis = OIr. toimtiu [toṽd'u] 'opinion' < *to-mɛddiū < *to-mn-tiū-tion-, or aicsiu 'seeing, sight' < * $ak^wk^wissiū$ < *ad- k^wis -tiū-tion-; these feminine verbal nouns are well described by Thurneysen §730. The basic rule of their formation is seen to be a zero-grade of the base + -tion-, which Pedersen 46 §392.1 analyzes as *-ti-+en-/on-. The fem. verbal noun in *-ti- in IE, it should be noted, also required zero-grade. Pedersen further notes that the suffix(es) normally follows immediately the verbal root, but that we also have such examples as $\'{aigthiu}$ 'fear' (: $\'{agur}$ 'I fear'), where the lenition of $\'{th}$ assures us of a vowel

Note Bray (S-et-L.), which is Brigia 930, and Brie (D-Sèvres) written Bria 1125.

⁷ Actually seen glossed in *Brimont* (Marne) < *Brimons* 1171. *Brion* (Isère) seems to have a stem-suffix -one(m).

Dauzat and Rostaing are quite mistaken or misleading s.v. Briançon in speaking "d'un them gaul. et pré-gaul. (ici ligure) briga hauteur et suff. -ant- (ligure), auquel s'est ajouté -onem." We have, of course, at bottom a pure Celtic participle.

which originally followed the root; hence $*\bar{a}g\text{-}e\text{-}tion\text{-}$. In the derived adjective, beside $cain\text{-}toimtenach < *kani+to\text{-}mn\text{-}ti(e)n\text{-}\bar{a}ko\text{-}$ and tuistenach ('genitive' $*t(o)\text{-}ud\text{-}sm\text{-}ti(e)n\text{-}\bar{a}ko\text{-}$, we find also Mid. Ir. carthanach 'loving' (: caraim 'I love') $< *kar\text{-}e\text{-}ti(e)n\text{-}\bar{a}ko\text{-}$ with an intervening vowel.

Thus from a base *bherýh- we would expect to form a noun *bhrýh-tion- with the concretized meaning 'height' > Celtic *brixtion-, in the zero-grade. But if the thematic vowel were interposed, perhaps to preserve the final consonant of the root from assimilating in voice, we might then also find the full-grade which the thematic present entails. This would produce a form *bherýh-e-tion- > Celtic *bergetion-. The zero-grade formation could then have been revised to *brigetion-, nom. *brigeti \bar{u} (Latinized Bregeti \bar{o}).

This place-name therefore gives us a hitherto undocumented verbal noun for Continental Celtic, and a specimen of a formation not otherwise attested for IE $*bher\acute{g}h$ -, with a rare interplay of productivity in IE verbal noun formation.

ERIC P. HAMP

References

DAUZAT, A. - CH. ROSTAING (1984), Dictionnaire étimologique des noms de lieux en France². Paris.

HAMP, E. (1972), Παρθένος and its cognates. Homenaje a Antonio Toyar. Madrid 177-80.

HAMP, E. (1977), Notulae Daco-Iranicae. Studia et Acta Orientalia 9: 79-83.

HAMP, E. (1976), On the Celtic Names of Ig. Acta Neophilologica 9: 3-8.

HAMP, E. (1979), Notulae etymologicae Cymricae. Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 28: 213-7.

HAMP, E. (1985), Albanian zbres 'descend.' In: H. M. Ölberg – G. Schmidt– H. Bothien (eds.), Festschrift für Johann Knobloch. Innsbruck. 145–6.

HAMP, E. (1986), Varia: XXIV ΡΟΚΛΟΙΣΙΑΒΟ; XXV Notes on word formation, 5.
*brigantīnos. Études celtiques 23.

HAMP, E. (in press), German Baum, English beam.

HOLDER, A. (1896), Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. Strassburg.

PEDERSEN, H. (1913), Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen II. Göttingen.

PTOLEMAEI, CL. Geographiae = Κλαυδίου Πτολεμαίου. 1883. Carolus Müllerus (ed.), Γεωγραφικης ΄ γφηγήδεως βιβλίου δεύτερου. Paris.

THURNEYSEN, R. (1946), A Grammar of Old Irish. Dublin.