

Διανεῖς

Alexander FALILEYEV

Keltische Forschungen 8 (2019), 23–29

DOI: 10.25365/kf-8-2019-23-29



The ethnic name Διανεῖς is preserved only by Stephen of Byzantium, who considers the tribe to be Galatian. Although it is not necessary at all that the ethnic name must be linguistically Celtic, it should be nevertheless admitted that a Celtic etymology is applicable to it. The paper considers various approaches to explain this name attested in Greek morphological guise, but all conclusions are doomed to be tentative by default.



This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



Keltische Forschungen is published by
Brennos – Verein für Keltologie



Διανεῖς

Alexander FALILEYEV

We owe the single attestation of this ethnic name¹ to Eratosthenes of Cyrene, and it was preserved by Stephen of Byzantium, Διανεῖς ἔθνος Γαλατικόν, Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν δὲ Γαλατικῶν (FGrHist 745 F 3), see recently Billerbeck and Zubler 2011: 40. The quotation straightforwardly considers the tribe to be Galatian. Although it is not necessary at all that the ethnic name must be Celtic in origin, too, it should be nevertheless admitted that a Celtic etymology is applicable to it. Taking into consideration that this is a sole and indeed secondary attestation, several etymologies may be applied to it. It should also be allowed that the only testimony as preserved by Stephen of Byzantium may be corrupt, therefore any judgment on the linguistic Celticity of the ethnic name cannot by default be final.

It is notable that this ethnonym is essentially neglected in ‘Celtic’ linguistic studies. Holder’s monumental compendium of Celtic *Sprachschatz* does not list this form, although we find in it *Diana*, erroneously labelled as Celtic, see HOLDER 1896: 1279–1280. Similarly, we do not come across it in P. Freeman’s handbook of Galatian (FREEMAN 2001), and in subsequent reviews of this volume, cf. also ESKA 2013. Likewise, historians of ‘Celtic’ Asia Minor, to my knowledge, do not discuss the item, and its only attestation does not allow for any consequential argument. The sole reference to Διανεῖς in a Celtic linguistic context is in the *Additions to Alfred Holder’s Celtic Thesaurus* by Georges Cousin published in 1906, which until recently (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2006: 395) has on the whole been uncared for in Celtic studies. Unfortunately, Cousin provides us with no (linguistic)

¹ I am grateful to Professor Oleg Gabelko for drawing my attention to this piece of evidence, and to Dr Sergej Tokhtasev for some fruitful discussions of these and related matters. Sergei Tokhtasev tragically died on the 23rd of February 2018, and this publication is dedicated to his memory.

comments in this entry and even references to the sources are missing: we just learn from it that Διανεῖς is a “peuple en Galatie”. The *comparanda* offered in this work are not really helpful – other similar-looking geographical names which Cousin lists there are certainly Latin; e.g., Διάνιον in Hispania (Tarraconense), see GARCÍA ALONSO 2003: 171–172.

There are no doubts that the morphological guise of Διανεῖς is Greek,² and the formations in -εύς are certainly well attested in this language, see an excellent brief survey in BALLE 2008: 209–210 which provides further references. Moreover, ethnic names in -εύς are also known, and have been studied by several scholars, and particularly by Jean-Louis Perpillou in his 1973 monograph dedicated to the analysis of this type of word-formation in Greek. The author carefully examines the data and offers several explanations of the surveyed coinages. It is important that quite a few of these ethnic names attested in Greek sources are in fact Greek only insofar as the model of their word formation is concerned. PERPILLOU (1973: 334) notes the abundance of data stemming particularly from Asia Minor (although he does not quote Διανεῖς in this publication), and refers to the collection provided by Mihail Petruševski (1963). What is interesting in the list of examples from Caria, Lycia and Phrygia compiled by PETRUŠEVSKI (1963: 44), is that they all denote the inhabitants of corresponding settlements, as e.g., Μέδμασσα and Μεδμασεύς, or Βουβών and Βουβωνεύς. However, as PERPILLOU (1973: 334–345) has shown, Greek *ethnicae* in -εύς are basically detoponymic in a wider sense of this term, and do not go back exclusively to place-names only, consider here Βαλιαρεῖς or Δελματεῖς as illustrations. The number of examples may easily be multiplied, and the detoponymic aspect of this derivation is certainly evident and conspicuously wide, cf. here the ethnic name Θατεῖς in Bosphorus which goes back to the hydronym Θάτες. The nuances of meanings of these derivatives in -εύς studied by the French scholar (see also LEUKART 1994: 253) are mostly irrelevant for the present study, while its detoponymic essence is of major importance.

The tribal / ethnic name (in the linguistic sense of the term) expanded by Greek -εύς should be traced to **dian-*, which indeed may be of Celtic origin. There are several possible ways to explain it etymologically, although any analysis cannot be considered as final by default. If *dian-* is to be treated as a compounded form, it may contain the intensive or negative *di-* (i.e. *dī-*) which is well attested in Gaulish, see FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 17 and EVANS 1967: 193–194. It should be admitted though that its identification in

² The formally identical attestation of a different ethnic name as *Lougeis* in a Latin inscription from Hispania for which see UNTERMANN 2007: 68–69 and cf. FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 151 is certainly irrelevant to the present discussion.

Continental Celtic geographical names as opposed to the Insular medieval formations is somewhat controversial, see, e.g., the discussion of *Nouidounon Diablintum* in FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 171 where various opinions are cited, cf. also now DELAMARRE 2012: 136. Still, if **di-* is in fact attested in Gaulish toponymy, the second component may conceal the putative Gaulish **ano-*. The word seems to be attested in the Endlicher Glossary (*anam* (accusative) gl. Latin *paludem*), although the validity of this evidence is generally questioned, and denotes ‘marsh, still water’ (cf. M^{Ir}. *en* ‘water’, *an* ‘water, urine’), see references in FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 7 and for the PIE perspective cf. recently HAMP 2008: 66. Therefore, the semantic interpretation of **dian-* may thus be connected with ‘water’, either in a positive or in a negative vein.

From the point of view of word-formation, this **dian-* must refer to a geographical object which is impossible to identify with any degree of precision either linguistically or historically. It is clear, though, that the object may well be a territory or a settlement (located ‘by the water’ or known to be ‘without water’), a hydronym (‘very watery’ or ‘non-watery’), or an oronym with the same semantic motivation(s) behind it. The interrelation of **dian-* with the original geographical name may be also indirect; compare here the Celtic oikonym derived from a hydronym **ánapa* ‘Sumpfwasser’ and reflected in the modern Anif discussed by LINDNER (2014: 328). Typologically, this ‘watery’ association of the presumably Celtic (Galatian) ethnic name is unproblematic. We are aware of the ‘seaside-people’ (*Morini* and *Aremorici*) and cf. ‘the people of / near the marshes’ (*Arverni*), see DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2008: 106, and for other interpretations of the latter see references in FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 59. Any further discussion remains guesswork, as we have no idea about the geographical location of this group in antiquity, and hence both variants of the semantic interpretation – ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ – should be treated as mutually exclusive possibilities. Linguistically speaking, however, either variant concurs with the methodology applied to Celtic toponymic studies, and is phonetically, morphologically and semantically unproblematic.

At face value, the second component of this alleged compound may also be identified differently. Thus, one may speculate whether it is a hitherto unknown Gaulish reflex of PIE **h₂enh₁-* which is found in Vedic *aná-* and is also suspected to be present in Middle Welsh *kynnan* ‘ready, fluent’, see WODTKO ET AL. 2008: 308. Continuations of this PIE stem are certainly known in Celtic and particularly in Gaulish: for Common Celtic **anamon-* ‘soul’ and **anatlā* ‘breath’ belonging here see MATASOVIĆ 2009: 34–35 and cf. also the British personal name *Anate-mori* (gen. sg.).³ Alternatively, it

³ Cf. also STIFTER 2016: 41; I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for this reference.

may be identified with the unattested Gaulish cognate of Old Irish *áinne* ‘ring, circuit’, cf. Lat. *ānus*, see MATASOVIĆ 2009: 38–39, and there are perhaps other possible explanations of **dian-* if it is in fact a compound. Thus, a comparison with the Early Irish *doana* ‘without wealth or prosperity’ (Cormac’s Glossary), *dona* ‘unfortunate, unlucky’ with a negative prefix **di-* may in theory point to the (euphemistic) ‘bad’ territory, settlement or any other geographical object. All these suggestions are at least permissible semantically for the discussion of *Διανεῖς* as Celtic ethnic names display a great variety of semantic motivations (see DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2008), and the prefix *di-* may be identified both as intensive or negative in two former cases, and as negative in the latter.

The identification of the first component with the preverb *di-*, *de-* may in theory prompt a different analysis. This type of formation (cf. personal name *Divicianus* compared with Old Irish *do-fich* ‘avenges’ and Middle Welsh *difwyn* ‘correct’) was comprehensively discussed by WODTKO (2013: 225–226) who admitted that it is rarely attested in the Gaulish corpus. If this option is still to be considered it may be acknowledged that there is no doubt that **ana-* ‘to stay’ should be reconstructed for Common Celtic, and etymologically related forms with various preverbs (although excluding reflexes of **di-*) are certainly known in Early Irish, see MATASOVIĆ 2009: 34 with further references. To my knowledge, continuations of the Common Celtic verb are not securely identified in Gaulish, though. Thus, although De Bernardo Stempel (e.g., DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2008: 47) traced to it the ethnic name *Anauni* (‘the staying ones’), this suggestion was considered speculative e.g., by MATASOVIĆ (2009: 34) but seems to be accepted in DELAMARRE 2012: 50; for the ethnic name see also FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 47.

A different morphological analysis may allow, at least in theory, to segment from **dian-* the Gaulish **dēuo-*, *dīuo-* ‘god’ (cf. OIr. *día* ‘id.’ or Lat. *deus*), see further FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 17. Formal difficulties pertaining to such an analysis are not insurmountable. The tendency in Gaulish to drop *-u-* intervocally has been noted (see EVANS 1967: 397 and most recently ESKA 2013: 55, for the set of Galatian examples cf. FREEMAN 2001: 40–50), therefore **dio-* may well be traced to the stem, and the derivations in *-n-* from it are perfectly attested in Celtic and have a solid PIE pedigree, cf. e.g., *Divona*, *Diona*, see further WODTKO ET AL. 2008: 73 and 81. It is also important that we have a coherent assemblage of Celtic ethnic names derived from Celtic theonyms, see the collection in DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2008: 103. As for the derivation of the ethnic name in *-εύς* from this stem, the corresponding geographical name, again, may be identified in various ways. The most obvious will be to refer here to ‘divine’ river-names and toponyms going to the same proto-form which are attested throughout the ancient Celtic-speaking world, see e.g., collections in EVANS 1967: 192 and DELAMARRE 2012: 135–136. This may help to explain the *a*-vocalism

and word formation of this **dian-*, and the immediate parallel which could be provided here is the river-name *Sequana* from which the ethnic name *Sequani* is derived, see FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 203 with further references. If the ancient name of the river Mayenne in modern France – *Meduana* – is Gaulish in origin, it shows the same pattern of derivation, see FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 160 and DELAMARRE 2012: 196, as well as *Reganus* (modern Regen in Germany), for which see FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 186. The *-an-* is attested in place-names as well, cf. e.g., *Davianum* (modern Veynes in France) discussed in FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 112 and DELAMARRE 2012: 134. *Caranicum* (Guitiriz in Spain) may belong here as well, although there could be other etymological solutions, see FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 90–91 and note DELAMARRE 2012: 105. *Deciana* (La Jonquera in Spain) is probably Latin (FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 113), although attempts to explain it as Celtic are known, see GARCÍA ALONSO 2003: 420. The morphological model is also found in other types of geographical names such as *Limane* (area south-east of Clermont-Ferrand in France), FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010: 148, DELAMARRE 2012: 177. Therefore, both formally and semantically such an interpretation is at least permissible and definitely unproblematic from a typological standpoint, and the suffix *-εύς* could have been used to produce the *ethnica* out of these alleged geographical names.

Still another possibility, at least superficially, will be to consider it along with DELAMARRE (2013: 21) alongside G. *diana*, a variant spelling of G. *dēna* ‘swift’ as attested in the personal names *Atediana*, *Condianus*, *Magudianus*, *Sudianus*. The author admits the Latin association of the names, and states that “ces noms, perçus comme des dérivés par un locuteur latin (*Cassidius* → *Cassidienus*, *Camidius* → *Camidienus*, **Magudius* → *Magudianus*, etc.) pouvaient assoner avec des composés (**Cassi-dēno-*, **Cami-dēno-*, **Magu-dēno-*), clairement analysables et perçus comme tels par un Gaulois parlant sa langue”. If Delamarre is correct⁴ in his identification of *diana* with Gaulish *dēno-* ‘swift’ (from Common Celtic **dēno-* ‘id.’, see MATASOVIĆ 2009: 95–96 and cf. Old Irish *dían* ‘id.’), the interpretation of **dian-* if indeed reflected in Διαवेῖς may point to a hitherto unknown hydronym. On balance, however, it is totally unlikely that *-ia-* may represent Galatian [ē], for which see comments in ESKA 2013: 53, and therefore this variant of analysis should most probably be neglected.

Therefore, if the ethnic name Διαवेῖς is in fact ultimately derived from Galatian **dian-*, the latter may be analysed as a compounded form which

⁴ To my knowledge, *Atediana*, *Magudianus* and *Sudianus* are attested only once and in Africa. As the anonymous reviewer of this paper noted, “[t]he most important reason to reject this hypothesis is that in *Magudianus* etc. the second element of the compound has been reinterpreted as a suffix (...) and has been reshaped accordingly. Such a misanalysis is not possible in the root syllable of a word”.

contains the Gaulish word for ‘water’ with ambivalent semantics, or as a derivative of Gaulish **dēuo-*, *dīuo-* ‘god’. Possibly, there are also other ways to interpret **dian-* on the wider basis of Celtic and indeed Indo-European comparative grammar. Similarly looking components or their combinations may be deduced from this vast data, and certain possibilities of such an analysis have been noted above. It is clear, though, that while the Greek morphological guise of Διανεύς is beyond any doubt, the Gaulish data may point to these two variant interpretations neither of which could be proved as final. One may also take into consideration that the difficult geographical name **dian-* in theory can also go back to a personal name (an approach favoured by Delamarre in his discussion of quite a few Continental Celtic toponyms, cf. DELAMARRE 2012: 17–11). This possibility could not of course be ruled out but such an assumption will immediately open Pandora’s box in view of the analysis of a great number of attestations of anthroponyms *Diana* vel sim. in ‘Celtic’ Europe. It should also be kept in mind that a non-Celtic origin of **dian-* always remains a possibility. To summarize, the linguistic Celticity of the Galatian Διανεύς is ultimately feasible, but until further evidence is brought into light for its discussion this data should be treated with extreme caution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BALLES 2008 Irene Balles, *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen*, Band 1: Latein. Altgriechisch, Hrsg. Rosemarie Lühr, Hamburg 2008.
- BILLERBECK, ZUBLER 2011 Margarethe Billerbeck, Christian Zubler (eds.), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, Volumen 2, Berlin & New York 2011.
- DE BERNARDO STEMPEL 2008 Patrizia De Bernardo Stempel, ‘Linguistically Celtic Ethnonyms: towards a classification’, in: *Celtic and other languages in Ancient Europe*, Salamanca 2008, 101–118.
- DELAMARRE 2012 Xavier Delamarre, *Noms de lieux celtiques de l’Europe ancienne*, Paris 2012.
- DELAMARRE 2013 Xavier Delamarre, ‘*Longidienus faber navalis* à Ravenne, le toponyme Lombard et le thème *longo-* “navire” en vieux-celtique’, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 60 (2013), 19–25.
- ESKA 2013 Joseph Eska, ‘A salvage grammar of Galatian’, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 60 (2013), 51–63.
- EVANS 1967 D. Ellis Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names*, Oxford 1967.
- FALILEYEV ET AL. 2010 Alexander Falileyev (in collaboration with Ashwin E. Gohil and Naomi Ward), *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names*, Aberystwyth 2010.

- FREEMAN 2001 Philip Freeman, *The Galatian language: a comprehensive survey of the language of the ancient Celts in Greco-Roman Asia Minor*, Lewiston–Queenston–Lampeter 2001.
- GARCÍA ALONSO 2003 Juan L. García Alonso, *La Península Ibérica en la Geografía de Claudio Ptolomeo*, Vitoria Gasteiz, 2003.
- HAMP 2008 Eric Hamp, ‘Notes on Continental Celtic and Indo-European’, *Études Celtiques* 36 (2008), 59–67.
- HOLDER 1896 Alfred Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz*, Band 1, Leipzig 1896.
- LEUKART 1994 Alex Leukart, *Die frühgriechische Nomina auf -tās und -ās*, Wien 1994.
- LINDNER 2014 Thomas Lindner, ‘Die Salzach und ihre Nebenflüsse aus namenkundlicher Sicht’, in: *In Fontibus Veritas (FS Peter Anreiter)*. Innsbruck 2014, 327–338.
- MATASOVIĆ 2009 Ranko Matasović, *Etymological dictionary of proto-Celtic*, Leiden & Boston 2009.
- PERPILLOU 1973 Jean-Louis Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*, Paris 1973.
- PETRUŠEVSKI 1963 Mihail D. Petruševski, ‘Die griechischen Nomina und die kleinasiatischen Ethnika auf -eus’, *Linguistique Balkanique* 6 (1963), 19–24.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS 2006 Patrick Sims-Williams (ed.), *Additions to Alfred Holder’s Celtic Thesaurus by Georges Cousin together with an electronically searchable version of Holder’s headwords by Llinos Dafis & Ashwin Gohil and indexes to Joshua Whatmough’s ‘The Dialects of Ancient Gaul’ by Xavier Delamarre & G. R. Isaac*, Aberystwyth 2006.
- STIFTER 2016 David Stifter, ‘Metrical systems of Celtic traditions’, *NOWELE* 69 (2016), 38–94.
- UNTERMANN 2007 Jürgen Untermann, ‘Topónimos y apelativos de la lengua lusitano-galaica’, in: *Onomástica galega. Con especial consideración da situación prerromana*, Santiago de Compostela 2007, 57–73.
- WODTKO 2013 Dagmar Wodtko, ‘Preverbs and personal names’, in: *Continental Celtic Word Formation. The Onomastic Data*, Salamanca 2013, 215–234.
- WODTKO ET AL. 2008 Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider, *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg 2008.

Alexander Falileyev
Institute for Linguistic Studies
Russian Academy of Sciences
St. Petersburg