

| | | | |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------------|
| <i>ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.</i> | <i>LV.</i> | <i>2019.</i> | <i>pp. 59–73.</i> |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------------|

**THE ENDOVELLICUS SANCTUARY IN PORTUGAL:
AN EXAMPLE OF LANGUAGE VARIATION
THROUGHOUT VOTIVE INSCRIPTIONS IN LATIN***

BY CATARINA GASPAR

Abstract: This paper offers a linguistic analysis of epigraphic texts originating in the *Endovellicus* sanctuary, with particular reference to their use of and variation in Latin. As this sanctuary was visited by mostly local pilgrims from Roman times to late antiquity, the aim of the linguistic analysis is to identify linguistic variation in the sanctuary's votive texts. The paper also demonstrates that differences in the spellings of the name of the god worshipped in the sanctuary may show characteristics of Vulgar Latin. The epigraphic corpus under study shows various Vulgar Latin traits common to other epigraphic texts known in Lusitania in the same period, with examples of the literary influence and high-level use of the Latin language, which may be related to the high social and cultural status of certain worshippers.

Keywords: *Endovellicus*, votive inscriptions, language variation, Vulgar Latin, Lusitania

1. Introduction

The *Endovellicus* sanctuary in S. Miguel da Mota, Terena, Alandroal, in southern Portugal, provides a corpus of 92¹ Latin votive inscriptions. Archaeological excavations and study of the epigraphic materials in the sanctuary reveal a lengthy duration of activity, from the early Roman Empire to late antiquity.²

* This paper was prepared within the framework of the project 'Nueva edición de CIL II: - 1. Inscripciones del extremo occidental del conventus Gaditanus (CIL II(2)/6).- 2. Inscripciones de los municipios antiguos en territorio portugués al este del Guadiana' do Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad del Gobierno Español (FFI2016-77528-P. IP).

¹ The corpus can be seen in the collections formed by Lambrino 1951; Lambrino 1967; Encarnação 1984; Maciel, Maciel 1985; Carbonell, Gimeno, Vargas 1992; *Religiões* 2002; Guerra, Schattner, Fabião, Almeida 2002; and Schattner, Fabião, Guerra 2013. Images of the inscriptions are available at <http://www.matriznet.dgpc.pt/> (accessed 04.06.2018).

² Guerra, Schattner, Fabião 2002; Gimeno 2002; Ribeiro 2002; Encarnação 1995-2007; Schattner, Fabião, Guerra 2013.

The sanctuary has unusual characteristics: for example, it contains a large number of inscriptions worshipping just one god in the same cult place³, which is uncommon in the specific context of *Hispania*. Few other sanctuaries on the Iberian Peninsula contain so many inscriptions about the worship a single indigenous god over such a long period. The sanctuary of the *Deus Lar Berus Breus* cult in Monte do Facho, Cangas, Spain offers the closest example. More than 100 inscriptions were found in the cult's sanctuary: some were *in situ*, whereas others had been reused and were subsequently found in museums and epigraphic collections in the area.⁴ Most of the inscriptions and archaeological materials found there show that the cult of *Deus Lar Berus Breus* emerged in a pre-Roman setting and flourished from 2 AD to 4 AD.⁵ However, we must be cautious when comparing this cult place with the *Endovellicus* sanctuary, because the two show significant differences; in the *Deus Lar Berus Breus* sanctuary, votive texts are shorter, the same text structure is always repeated, the theonym recorded has no significant variation, the first-person singular is recurrently used and the worshipper's name is absent from most of the inscriptions.

Also noteworthy is the veneration of an indigenous God with a Celtic root theonym in an undeniably Roman social and cultural context⁶. Thus, the corpus of votive inscriptions related to the *Endovellicus* sanctuary is exceptional in the context of the Iberian Peninsula, and has been the focus of many studies and archaeological explorations since the 16th century.

Endovellicus and his sanctuary have been analysed and alluded to by Portuguese and other European authors since the Renaissance. Inscriptions concerning *Endovellicus* were collected in works published in Portugal and other countries, such as the following: André de Resende, *De antiquitatibus Lusitaniae*, 1593; Bernardo de Brito, *Monarchia Lusitana*, I, 1597; Thomas Reinesius, *De deo Endovellico ex inscriptionibus in Lusitania repertis*, 1637; Antonio Martinez

³ This paper addressed only the inscriptions dedicated to Endovellicus found in S. Miguel da Mota, Terena, Alandroal. For methodological reasons concerning the identification of the god, I have decided to exclude the inscriptions worshipping Vellicus in Postloboso (Ávila, Spain) and Andobellicus in Cerro de Andévalo (Huelva, Spain). For discussion of these places and the god Endovellicus, see Ribeiro 2005, 724.

⁴ Koch, Suárez Otero, Schattner 2005; Koch 2005.

⁵ Koch 2005, 823-824.

⁶ According to Edmondson 2013: "The view that Endovellicus was a Romanized Lusitanian divinity has recently been challenged, not least because there is no evidence for pre-Roman activity on the site and because of the distinctly Greco-Roman nature of the iconography and cultic activities attested." Moreover, the maintenance of indigenous names, both for men and gods represents a very remarkable characteristic of *Hispania*, and particularly of Lusitania. See Alves Dias, Gaspar 2008; Vallejo Ruiz 2010.

Quesada, *Dissertatio de Endovellico et Neto Hispanorum diis*, saec. XVIII;⁷ Miguel Perez Pastor, *Disertación sobre el dios Endovellico y noticia de outras deidades gentílicas de la España Antigua*, 1760; and José Cornide Saavedra, *Dioses de la provincial lusitana. Inscripciones del Dios Endovellico*, 1798.⁸ Several other authors mentioned the god and his cult,⁹ but the sanctuary received little archaeological attention until the end of the 19th century, when an excavation in the chapel of S. Miguel da Mota revealed several reused inscriptions. J. J. Espanca,¹⁰ Gabriel Pereira¹¹ and subsequently J. Leite de Vasconcellos¹² conducted archaeological work to identify the sanctuary's structures and found more epigraphic monuments.

Later, in the 1990s, an archaeological charter of the Alandroal area¹³ revealed that the *Endovellicus* sanctuary had begun to flourish with a decline in the activity of the nearby Rocha da Mina sanctuary,¹⁴ from roughly 1 AD. In 2002, new archaeological work was carried out in the hills of S. Miguel da Mota and in the remains of the chapel, and more inscriptions devoted to *Endovellicus* and other materials, most notably sculptures, were found.¹⁵ These findings enlarged the collection of decorative elements, small votive objects (such as a *signum argenteum*), coins and ceramics related to this cult place. Archaeological evidence allows us to date the inscriptions and other materials to the period from 1 AD to 3-4 AD. It also supports the hypothesis that this pagan cult gradually transformed into an early Christian one,¹⁶ despite a lack of evidence of early Christian epigraphic texts to date.

⁷ Abascal Palazón, Cebrián Fernández 2005, 345.

⁸ Vasconcellos 1905, 116; Gimeno 2002; Ribeiro 2002.

⁹ Espanca 1882; Ribeiro 2002; Encarnação 1995-2007.

¹⁰ Espanca 1882.

¹¹ Pereira 1878; see also Pereira 1889 for a more detailed account of the building of the S. Miguel da Mota church.

¹² Vasconcellos 1905. In 1890, Vasconcellos went to Alandroal to visit the sanctuary, and obtained permission from its owner to carry out archaeological work in S. Miguel da Mota church. During this first campaign and on a later visit in 1905/1907, he found several inscriptions that he brought to Lisboa, first to the National Library and afterwards to the National Archaeological Museum, where they remain. Other inscriptions had been offered to the museum from other collections; some were bought by Vasconcellos. Due to these efforts, the National Archaeological Museum today has the world's largest collection of Endovellicus inscriptions.

¹³ Calado 1996.

¹⁴ Correia Santos 2013.

¹⁵ Matos 1995; Guerra, Schattner, Fabião 2002; 2013, 85. See also Guerra, Schattner, Fabião, Almeida 2003.

¹⁶ Almeida 1962, 252, figures n. 77, 202, 192-193.

2. The corpus of Latin votive inscriptions found in the Sanctuary

The corpus of votive inscriptions related to the *Endovellicus* cult comprises inscriptions with varied votive textual content. One text is challenging: the so-called *Endovellicus* hymn, a group of fragments traditionally accepted as part of the same text.¹⁷

This corpus contains various types of votive monuments,¹⁸ of which *arae* (30) and *arulae* (25) are the most common, followed by *tabulae* (13) and *basis staturae* (10), as well as sculptural elements (3) and one column (1). One piece of text is recorded in a ceramic piece.¹⁹

Of the total inscriptions in the corpus, only 15²⁰ have been collected in the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of the Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age (LLDB)²¹ and have undergone linguistic analysis.²² Therefore, few of the inscriptions record relevant Vulgar Latin features, and most of the votive texts worshipping *Endovellicus* show a consistent command of Latin. Like the statues and decorative pieces found, some of the votive formulae and the lexicon used clearly reveal a Roman cult in which a single indigenous god was venerated in Latin. Only the theonym, which has a Celtic root, and some personal names remind us that we are dealing with an indigenous substratum.

3. Latin language variation in the corpus

3.1. Diastratic variation: worshippers' socio-economic profiles

Most of the worshippers and other persons mentioned in these inscriptions can be recognised as Romans of different social strata. Alves Dias, Coelho²³ demonstrated that the *nomina* attested are in line with the Roman families of *Lusitania* and western *Baetica*. The authors also concluded that these families

¹⁷ Alves Dias 2002. Interestingly, no reference to *Endovellicus* is made in any of these fragments, although they have all been accepted as part of a text related to the sanctuary and to the religious cult in question. This is believed to be a late epigraphic text, probably dating to 4-5 AD.

¹⁸ In this corpus, many inscriptions are available only in very small pieces, and others have disappeared. Today, we have only information collected in the past on inscriptions that have disappeared, and such sources are not always explicit about the typologies of the monuments or the text they contain.

¹⁹ Schattner, Fabião, Guerra 2013, 82.

²⁰ These inscriptions are transcribed below, in Table 2.

²¹ For more information on this project, see <http://lldb.elte.hu/en/database/> (accessed 26.05.2018).

²² Tantimonaco 2017, with reference to a prior bibliography.

²³ Alves Dias, Coelho 1995-1997.

were probably related to the marble industry in the region,²⁴ such as Hermes, who claimed to be *seruus marmorarius* to Aurelia Vibia Sabina.²⁵ Also remarkable is the presence of an *eques romanus*, Sextus Cocceius Craterus Honorinus,²⁶ and one citizen from Emerita, given the *tribus*, Q(uintus) Saeuius Q. f. Pap(iria) Firmanus.²⁷ Most of the social profiles found in the corpus are related to the Roman communities of that area: Roman citizens and their slaves, such as the slave Blandus from Caeliae Rufinae;²⁸ the above-mentioned Hermes, *seruus marmorarius* to Aurelia Vibia Sabina; Vernacla Treb(ia?) Musa;²⁹ and Vitalis Messi Sympaerontis.³⁰ The types of marble used for the epigraphic monuments and sculptures were all from the local area: Vila Viçosa, Trigaches, Pardais.³¹ This is consistent with the presence of *officinae* in the sanctuary and its surroundings. Even if the pilgrims came from far away, the monuments were made locally.

²⁴ Alves Dias, Coelho 1995-1997, 252.

²⁵ *Deo • Endovellico / Hermes • Aureliae / Vibiae • Sab[is]nae • ser(uus) / marmorarius / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • p(osuit)* – CIL II 133, XXVIII; Vasconcellos 1905, 138; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 200; Encarnação 1984, n. 497.

²⁶ *Deo • Endovellico • praestan/tissimi • et • praesen/tissimi • numinis / Sextus Cocceius / Craterus • Honori/nus • eques • roma/nus • ex voto* – CIL II 131; Lambrino 1951, 98; Lambrino 1967, 183-184; Encarnação 1984, n. 492; *Religiões* 2002, 392, n. 53.

²⁷ *Q(uintus) • Seuius • Q(uinti) • f(ilius) / Pap(iria tribu) • Firmanus / votum Deo / Endovellico / s(olvit) • l(ibens) • m(erito)* – CIL II 139; Lambrino 1951, 100, 139; Encarnação 1984, n. 526.

²⁸ *Deo Endovellico • sacrum / Blandus Cae/liae • Rufinae / servus / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • v(otum) • s(olvit)* – CIL II 130; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 164-165; Encarnação 1984, n. 489; *Religiões* 2002, 394, n. 59.

²⁹ *End(ovellico) • sacr(um) / pro Vern/aclam / Treb(iae) Mus(a)e / ser(vam) • Q(uintus) • L(icinius?) • Ca/tullus / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • v(otum) • s(olvit) • -* CIL II 6267a; Vasconcellos 1905, 132-134; Lambrino 1951, 102; Lambrino 1967, 170-171; Encarnação 1984, n. 515; *Religiões* 2002, 393-394, n. 57.

³⁰ *Endovell/ico Vitalis / Messi • Sim/paerontis • f(ilius) / et • servus / a(nimo) • l(ibentes) • p(osuerunt)* – Vasconcellos 1905, 133 e 135; Lambrino 1951, 101; Lambrino 1967, 172-173; Encarnação 1984, n. 536; *Religiões* 2002, 394, n. 58.

³¹ Encarnação 1984; Alves-Dias, Coelho 1994-1997; Fabião, Schattner, Guerra 2008.

The indigenous population is almost absent;³² the corpus contains just a few probable indigenous names, such as Antubelliscus Priscus,³³ Conicodius,³⁴ Dobetianus,³⁵ Mogolius³⁶ and Paesicus.³⁷

The formulae in some of the inscriptions also mention that the *Endovellicus* cult was transmitted within families, from the *maiores*.³⁸ In addition, formulae, unusual lexicon and literary echoes in the votive inscriptions indicate a local community with a very good command of Latin, as said above – not only worshippers but perhaps also those working in the epigraphic *officinae*. The following examples are illustrative: *ex responsu*³⁹, *ex responsum (!)*,⁴⁰ *ex iussu numinis*,⁴¹ *iussu ipsius numinis*,⁴² *ex relegione (!) iussu numinis*,⁴³ *merito hunc deum*

³² Alves Dias, Coelho 1995-1997, 248; Encarnação 2008, 63.

³³ *Endovellico / aram / Antubelliscus / Priscus • iussu / ipsius • lhybens (sic) / animo • ponendam / curavit* – CIL II 5202; Lambrino 1951, 98; Lambrino 1967, 168-169; Encarnação 1984, n. 487; *Religiões* 2002, 392-393, n. 54.

³⁴ *Idovellico vo/to quo / fe(cit) Co/nicodi/us* – CIL II 6330; Encarnação 1984, n. 493; Marques 2011, 508-510. Marques 2011, 517-518 proposed *G(aius) O(ctavius?) Nicodius* instead of *Conicodius*.

³⁵ *[Endovelli/co sa]crum / [--- C]alpurnius / Dobetianus* – Lambrino 1967, 193-194; Encarnação 1984, n. 491.

³⁶ *M(arcus) • Mogolius / C[ar?]us • End/ovellico / v(otum) • a(nimo) • l(ibens) • s(olvit)* – CIL II 6267b; Lambrino 1967, 179; Encarnação 1984, n. 518.

³⁷ *[Endo]volico / [sacru]m • L(ucius) • Iuliu/[s] • P[aesicus] / [v(otum) • l(ibens) •] a(nimo) • s(olvit)* – Encarnação 1984, n. 509.

³⁸ *[End]ovollico Iul/ia • Anus / relictum / a maio/ribus / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • p(osuit)* – Vasconcellos 1905, 134-135; Lambrino 1951, 101; Lambrino 1967, 174; Encarnação 1984, n. 499; *Religiões* 2002, 391, n. 50. According to Encarnação 2008, 67: ‘d’une façon générale, nous pouvons dire, tout de suite, qu’il y a là toute une culture religieuse bien assimilée’.

³⁹ *Deo Sancto / Endovellico / Ann(ia) Q(uinti) f(ilia) Mariana / pro Pompeia • Prisca / ex responsu / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • p(osuit)* – CIL II 6265; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 187-188; Encarnação 1984, n. 484; *Religiões* 2002, 391, n. 51.

⁴⁰ *Deo Indovelli/co sacrum ex / responsum • / [---]E • Caius Iu/[lius Se]ptimi/[nus anim]o • le/[ben]s • feci<t>* – CIL II 6331 + 6334; Vasconcellos 1905, 142; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 184-185; Encarnação 1984, n. 513; *Religiões* 2002, 395-396, n. 62.

⁴¹ *D(eo) • Endovellico • sa[cr(um)] / ad • relicticum [?] • ex / i(ussu) numin(is) • Arrius • Ba/diolus • a(nimo) • l(ibens) • f(ecit)* – CIL II 129; Vasconcellos 1905, 142; Lambrino 1951, 100; Encarnação 1984, n. 488.

⁴² See note 27.

⁴³ *Endovellico sacrum / ex relegione (sic) / iussu numinis / Pomponia / Marcella / a(nimo) • l(ibens) p(osuit)* – CIL II 138; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 196-197; Encarnação 1984, n. 522; *Religiões* 2002, 390, n. 48.

sibi propitiatum,⁴⁴ *ex imperato Averno*,⁴⁵ *relictum a maioribus*,⁴⁶ *ad relicticium (!)*,⁴⁷ and *voto succpto* and *votum succptum* recorded in the same text⁴⁸. Also significant is the usage of syntactic structures rare in epigraphic texts, such as the genitive of quality⁴⁹ in the text made by Sextus Cocceius Craterus Honorinus, the above-mentioned *eques romanus*.⁵⁰

3.2. Diachronic variation: Vulgar Latin

Due to the late dating of most of the texts, common features of Vulgar Latin can be found within the corpus, providing evidence of diachronic variation. As noted above, however, only 15 of the 92 texts in the corpus show linguistic features of Vulgar Latin, as shown below.

| | Text | Linguistic commentary | LLDB |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | <i>Deo Endovellico • sac(rum) / Iunia • Eliana • voto • succpto / Elvia • Ybas • mater • filie / sue • votum • succptum / animo • libens • posuit</i> | <i>Assimilatio: succpto, succptum</i> <i>E pro AE: Eliana, filie sue</i> <i>ø⁵¹ pro H: Ybas</i> | 16414; 16415; 16416; 29880; 29881; 29882; 29883 |
| 2 | <i>Deo • Endoveli/co sacrum aedeolu / C(aius) • S • Q • pro • v<o>tum fecit</i> | <i>-m pro ø: aedeolu</i> <i>E pro Í: (graecismus): aedeolu</i> <i>acc. pro abl.: pro v<o>tum</i> | 17562; 17563; 29884; 29885; 29886; 29887 |
| 3 | <i>Deo / Endovellico / sacrum / • M(arcus) • Fannius / Augurinus /</i> | <i>acc. pro dat.</i> <i>or accusatiuus absolutus pro ablatiuo absoluto:</i> | 29878 |

⁴⁴ *Deo / Endovellico / sacrum / • M(arcus) • Fannius / Augurinus / merito • hun[c] / Deum • sibi / propitiatum* – CIL II 6266; Vasconcellos 1905, 126-128; Lambrino 1951, 97; Lambrino 1967, 165-166; Encarnação 1984, n. 495; *Religiões* 2002, 389, n. 46.

⁴⁵ *Endovellico / sacrum • L(ucius) • T(erentius?) • M(aximus) / et • T(erentia?) • Max(ima) • ex imperato Aver/no • a(nimo) • l(ibens) f(ecerunt)* – Vasconcellos 1905, 130-131; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 170; Encarnação 1984, n. 528; *Religiões* 2002, 390-391, n. 49.

⁴⁶ See note 38.

⁴⁷ See note 41.

⁴⁸ *Deo Endovellico • sac(rum) / Iunia • Eliana • voto • succpto / Elvia • Ybas • mater • fili(a)e / su(a)e • votum • succptum / animo • libens • posuit* – CIL II 136; Vasconcellos 1905, 122; Lambrino 1951, 99; Lambrino 1967, 186-187; Encarnação 1984, n. 514; *Religiões* 2002, 381, n. 32.

⁴⁹ Tantimonaco 2017, 345.

⁵⁰ See note 26.

⁵¹ Väänänen 2003, 99-100.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | <i>merito</i> • <i>hun[c]</i> / <i>Deum</i> • <i>sibi</i> / <i>propitiatum</i> | • <i>hun[c]</i> / <i>Deum</i> • <i>sibi</i> / <i>propitiatum</i> | |
| 4 | <i>M(arcus)</i> • <i>L(icinius)</i> • <i>Ni/gellio</i> / <i>Deo</i> <i>Endo/vellico</i> / <i>sacrum</i> <i>pr[o]</i> / <i>salutem</i> / <i>L(icinia?)</i> <i>Marcian[(a)e]</i> / <i>filiae</i> <i>sue</i> / <i>v(otum)</i> • <i>a(nimo)</i> • <i>l(ibens)</i> • <i>s(olvit)</i> | <i>acc. pro abl.: pro salutem</i> <i>E pro AE: sue</i> | 16993; 16994 |
| 5 | <i>Endovellico sacrum</i> / <i>ex</i> <i>relegione (sic)</i> / <i>iussu</i> <i>numinis</i> / <i>Pomponia</i> / <i>Marcella</i> / <i>a(nimo)</i> • <i>l(ibens)</i> <i>p(osuit)</i> | <i>E pro F²: relegione</i> | 16417 |
| 6 | <i>Deo Sancto</i> / <i>Endovellico</i> / <i>Ann(ia) Q(uinti) f(ilia)</i> <i>Mariana</i> / <i>pro Pompeia</i> • <i>Prisca</i> / <i>ex rensponu</i> / <i>a(nimo)</i> • <i>l(ibens)</i> • <i>p(osuit)</i> • | <i>NS pro S: rensponu</i> <i>V pro O:</i> <i>decl. IV pro II: ex rensponu</i> | 16998; 29561 |
| 7 | <i>Endovellico</i> / <i>aram</i> / <i>Antubellicus</i> / <i>Priscus</i> • <i>iussu</i> / <i>ipsius</i> • <i>lhybens</i> <i>(sic)</i> / <i>animo</i> • <i>ponendam</i> / <i>curavit</i> | <i>aspiratio vitiosa: lhybens</i> <i>Y pro I⁵³: lhybens</i> | 16991; 16992 |
| 8 | <i>End(ovellico)</i> • <i>sacr(um)</i> / <i>pro Vern/aclam</i> / <i>Treb(iae) Muse</i> / <i>ser(vam)</i> • <i>Q(uintus)</i> • <i>L(icinius?)</i> • <i>Ca/tullus</i> / <i>a(nimo)</i> • <i>l(ibens)</i> • <i>v(otum)</i> • <i>s(olvit)</i> • | <i>E pro AE: Muse</i> <i>acc. pro abl.</i> or <i>M pro ∅: pro Vernaclam</i> <i>syncope posttonica: Vernaclam</i> | 17084; 29676; 29677 |
| 9 | <i>Endovell/ico Vitalis</i> / <i>Messi</i> • <i>Sim/paerontis</i> • <i>f(ilius)</i> / <i>et</i> • <i>servus</i> / | <i>p pro ph: Simpaerontis</i> <i>AE pro E: Simpaerontis</i> | 42668; 42669 |

⁵² According to Cardim Ribeiro 2002, 390, this may also be seen as the result of an erudite hypercorrection due to literary references, *recompositio*, such is the case of Cicero *De natura deorum* II 28, 72, that related *religio* with the verb *relegere* in the sense of ‘to send away’.

⁵³ Väänänen 2003, 73.

| | | | |
|----|--|---|------------------------|
| | <i>a(nimo) • l(ibentes) • p(osuerunt)</i> | | |
| 10 | <i>Deo Indovelli/co sacrum ex / responsum • / [---]E • Caius Iu/[lius Se]ptumi/[nus anim]o • le/[ben]s • feci<t></i> | <i>acc. pro abl.</i> <i>or M pro ∅: ex responsum</i> <i>∅ pro -t: feci</i> <i>V pro I archaismus: Septiminus</i> <i>E pro I: lebens</i> | 17089; 17091; 60191 |
| 11 | <i>D(eo) • Endovellico • sa[cr(um)] / ad • relic-ticium [?] • ex / i(ussu) numin(is) • Arrius • Ba/diolus • a(nimo) • l(ibens) • f(ecit)</i> | <i>lexica: relicticium</i> | 29679 |
| 12 | <i>Idove/lico vo/to quo / fe(cit) Co/nicodi/us</i> | <i>dat./abl. pro acc.</i> <i>or praep. > casus sine praep.</i> | 60348 |
| 13 | <i>Iullia (sic) • C(aii) • f(ilia) / Modesta / Endovellico / votum • l(ibens) • <a(nimo)> • s(olvit)</i> | <i>-ll- pro -l-: Iullia</i> | 17557 |
| 14 | <i>D(eo) d(omino) Ennov(olico) / votu s(olvit) / Sestio/nis [---] / -----</i> | <i>∅ pro -m: votu</i> | 29557 |
| 15 | <i>Endovellico Sancto Eutichius posuit / v(otum) • s(olvit) • l(ibens) • a(nimo)</i> | <i>I pro Y: Eutichius</i> | 29721 |

Table 1: Endovellicus inscriptions in LLDB

The examples quoted above show common Vulgar Latin characteristics, especially phonological processes affecting vowels, diphthongs and consonants, as well as less common features potentially related to erudite hypercorrections (n. 5) or erudite orthographic changes (n. 7). The table above provides examples of such processes affecting vowels, diphthongs,⁵⁴ and affecting consonants.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Herman 2000, 31.

⁵⁵ Herman 2000, 39-41, 41-42; Väänänen 2003, 117-118; Herman 2000, 47; Väänänen 2003, 109-110.

Some examples reflect syntactic changes and increasing confusion between the case system and the use of prepositions:⁵⁶ *accusatiuus pro datiuo* (n. 3⁵⁷); *accusatiuus pro ablatiuus* with the preposition *ex* (n. 10); and *pro* with *accusatiuus* (n. 4, 8).

We also highlight the presence of unusual lexical elements, such as *relictium* (n. 11), which, as Tantimonaco pointed out, may be the vulgar form of *relictum* ('the action of giving up or abandoning').⁵⁸

Many researchers conducting linguistic analysis of the *Endovellicus* inscriptions have focused on the name of the god, namely his origin, root, function and attributes. Despite previous discussion on this subject,⁵⁹ I propose that the attested orthographic forms of the name of the god reflect the usage of native speakers of Latin.⁶⁰ Measurement of the frequency of each orthographic form of the theonym reveals that most of the inscriptions (49)⁶¹ register *Endovellicus*. Alternative forms of the theonym are as follows: *Endovellicus*,⁶² *Endovollicus*,⁶³

⁵⁶ Herman 2000, 53-54.

⁵⁷ Tantimonaco 2017, 354.

⁵⁸ Tantimonaco 2017, 376, who argued that 'en efecto, el ara en cuestión fue realizada por orden divina, *ex i(ussu) num(inis)*, y no lleva indicación de *solutio* (del tipo *votum solvit*); por tanto, es posible que se realizara no como gesto de agradecimiento sino como acto propiciatorio hacia la divinidad. De esta manera, la construcción *ad* + acusativo expresaría la finalidad de la dedicatoria (y no su causa, como la construcción opuesta, *ex* + ablativo)'.
⁵⁹ This argument has been made by several authors; for more information, see Ribeiro 2005; Marques 2011.

⁶⁰ Considering the methodological cautions that arise when dealing with theonyms, I have decided to include the different spellings of the god's name in this linguistic analysis because they can be linked to Vulgar Latin phenomena, namely those related to the interference of oral transmission in writing. The different spellings concerning the name of the God *Endovellicus* have not been recorded in LLDB, for their explanation as Vulgar Latin phenomena was not clear.

⁶¹ When calculating this number, we decided to include and accept corrections made by the editors of the inscriptions.

⁶² The corpus provides five examples: *Deo • Endoveli/co sacrum aedeolu / C(aius) • S • Q • pro • v<o>tum fecit* – Vasconcellos 1905, 128, 138; Lambrino 1951, 102, 117-120; Lambrino 1967, 163-164; Encarnação 1984, n. 523; Dias, Coelho 1995-1997, 250-251; *Religiões* 2002, 385, n. 39. *Endovel/ico Iulia / Maxum/a* – Vasconcellos 1905, 134; Lambrino 1951, 101; Lambrino 1967, 169; Encarnação 1984, n. 500; *Religiões* 2002, 393, n. 55. *Endovelico / Critonia / Maxuma / ex • voto • pro / Critonia • C(ait) • f(ilia) / [-----]* – CIL II 132, XXXVIII; Lambrino 1951, 101; Encarnação 1984, n. 494. *Endovelico Sancto Eutichius posuit / v(otum) • s(olvit) • l(ibens) • a(nimo)* – Gimeno, Garcia, Vargas 1993, Carbonell, Gimeno, Vargas 1992, 190.

⁶³ *P(ublius) • Sempronius • Celer • / • Endovollico • v(otum) / • s(olvit) • l(ibens) • a(nimo) • – CIL II 6269; Lambrino 1951, 99; Lambrino 1967, 199-200; Encarnação 1984, n. 525; *Religiões* 2002, 382, n. 33. *Endovollico • / sacrum • / M(arcus) • Vibius • Bassus • / et • M(arcus) • Vibius • Avitus • f(ecerunt)* – CIL II 5208; Lambrino 1951, 98; Lambrino 1967, 175-176; Encarnação 1984, n. 535; *Religiões* 2002, 382, n. 34. *[End]ovol/lico Iul/ia • Anus / relictum / a maio/ribus / a(nimo) • l(ibens) • p(osuit)* – Vasconcellos 1905, 134-135; Lambrino 1951, 101; Lambrino 1967, 174;*

Endovolicus,⁶⁴ *Indovellicus*,⁶⁵ *Idovellicus*,⁶⁶ *Enobolicus*,⁶⁷ *Ennovolicus*⁶⁸ and *Endovelecus*.⁶⁹ This oscillation in the recording of the God's name can be also seen in the inscriptions devoted to *Ataecina*,⁷⁰ in the province of Cáceres, also in Lusitania. This suggests that indigenous names were more suitable for linguistic variation than Roman names.

These forms allow us to explore the processes affecting both vowels and consonants. Analysis of the *vocalismus* reveals an unusual change, *O pro E*, in the middle position, as in *Endovellicus/Endovollicus*, which can be explained as a progressive assimilation. Another change in the middle position is *E pro I*,⁷¹ as evident in *Endovelecus*. The change *I pro E* can also be found at the beginning of the word,⁷² as in *Indovellicus* and *Idovellicus*. In this last example, the nasal may be lost,⁷³ as at the beginning of the line there appears to be space for only

Encarnação 1984, n. 499; *Religiões* 2002, 391, n. 50. *Endovollico / sacrum • Mar/cus • Iulius / Proculus / animo • li/bens • votum / solvit* – CIL II 135, XXXVIII; Encarnação 1984, n. 510. *Endovollico / sacrum pos(uit) / T(itus) Annus / [---]VS[---]R[-] PATRV[---] / [-----]* – Maciel – Maciel 1985.

⁶⁴ *Endovoli/co • sacrum / Helvia • Avita / v(otum) a(nimo) l(ibens) s(olvit)* – CIL II 6267; Lambrino 1951, 101-102; Lambrino 1967, 174-175; Encarnação 1984, n. 496; *Religiões* 2002, 397, n. 65. *[Endo]volico / [sacru]m • L(ucius) • Iuliu/[s] • P]aesticus / [v(otum) • l(ibens) •] a(nimo) • s(olvit)* – Encarnação 1984, n. 509. *Endovo/lico ex / v(oto) • M(arcus) Livius / Severus / a(nimo) l(ibens) • [p(osuit)]* – Vasconcellos 1905, 132; Lambrino 1951, 101; Lambrino 1967, 173; Encarnação 1984, n. 517. *Q(uintus) • Sevius • Q(uinti) • f(ilius) / Pap(iria tribu) • Firmanus / votum Deo / Endovolico / s(olvit) • l(ibens) • m(erito)* – CIL II 139; Lambrino 1951, p. 100, 139; Encarnação 1984, n. 526. *[-----] / [En]dovoli[co] ---] / [-----]* – Encarnação 1984, n. 551.

⁶⁵ *Deo Indovelli/co sacrum ex / responsum • / [---]E • Caius Iu/[lius] Se]ptimi/[nus anim]o • le/[ben]s • feci<t>* – CIL II 6331, 6334; Vasconcellos 1905, 142; Lambrino 1951, 100; Lambrino 1967, 184-185; Encarnação 1984, n. 513; *Religiões* 2002, 395-396, n. 62. *Deo Indo/vellico / votum / Petroni/a Albilla SE/[-----]* – Lambrino 1967, 167; Encarnação 1984, n. 520; *Religiões* 2002, 396, n. 63. *Deo Indovel[lico] Iu[lianus] / pro Iul(iam) • Mar/cellam • fili([am] suam?) / [-----]* – CIL II 5204; Lambrino 1951, 123; Lambrino 1967, 161-162; Encarnação 1984, n. 504. *Deo San/cto Ind/ovellico / [---] Iu[liu]s Iu[lianus] / v(otum) [-----]* – CIL II 6269b; Lambrino 1967, 188-189; Encarnação 1984, n. 507. *[De]o Indovel[lico] sacrum ---]* – Encarnação 1984, n. 541.

⁶⁶ *Idove/lico vo/to quo / fe(cit) Co/nicodi/us* – CIL II 6330; Encarnação 1984, n. 493; Marques 2011, 508-510.

⁶⁷ *Enobolico / Tusca / Olia / Tauri • f(ilia) / pro • Quinto / Statorio / Tauro / v(otum) • a(nimo) • l(ibens) • s(olvit)* – CIL II 142; Lambrino 1951, 99; Lambrino 1967, 176-177; Encarnação 1984, n. 519; *Religiões* 2002, 398, n. 66.

⁶⁸ *D(eo) d(omino) Ennov(olico) / votus / Sestio/nis [---] / [-----]* – Guerra – Schattner – Fabião – Almeida 2002, 459.

⁶⁹ *Endove[l]eco d(eo) s(acrum) Tu/rrecia IEA / + a(nimo) l(ibens) v(otum) s(olvit) / f(aciendum) c(uravit)* – Guerra, Shattner, Fabião, Almeida 2002, 460-461.

⁷⁰ Abascal Palazón 2002.

⁷¹ Herman 2000, 34.

⁷² Väänänen 2003, 68ss.

⁷³ Väänänen 2003, 111-117.

one letter.⁷⁴ Analysis of *consonantismus* reveals even more interesting changes, which are common to oral transmission. The assimilation *-NN-/-N- pro -ND-*⁷⁵ is shown in *Ennouolico* and *Enobolico*. These two forms also show the common oscillation *V ~ B*⁷⁶.

However, the regular form of the theonym, *Endovellicus*, clearly prevails in comparison with the irregular forms engraved in some monuments. Most of these forms, as analysed above, share linguistic traits with the other epigraphic texts.

4. Conclusions

The results of linguistic analysis of the corpus are perfectly consistent with the presumed socio-economic and cultural profile of worshippers of *Endovellicus*. Insights into the worshippers' social and cultural profile are offered by their use of Latin in the texts, which show few hints of Vulgar Latin, combined with erudite and sometimes literary allusions. These characteristics are also consistent with the formal quality of the epigraphic monuments and some of the sculptures found in the sanctuary.

The oscillation found in the name of the god is related to changes affecting vowels and consonants that were quite common in Lusitania, similar to the linguistic phenomena found in the texts quoted above in Table 1. This allows us to conclude that the sanctuary's pilgrims lived nearby: they were from *Lusitania* and western *Baetica*, as the sanctuary was located at the intersection of routes, notably the Silver Route, that connected important cities, not far from the Guadiana river.⁷⁷ As said above, the monuments were made locally and this may explain why differences in the geographical origins of pilgrims do not explain the linguistic and orthographic differences in the theonym as suggested by Vasconcellos, Lambrino and later by Encarnação.⁷⁸ Furthermore, social analysis of the worshippers links them with families and communities in the surrounding areas.⁷⁹ Of course, we only know the god's indigenous name (*Endovellicus*) from Roman epigraphic texts, so we cannot accurately evaluate the different ortho-

⁷⁴ Although this form can also be interpreted as having an abbreviated *-n-*, as stated by Marques 2011, 509-510, I suggest that here we have the entire text, on the grounds that this small *tabula* was probably prepared for attachment to a monument. As evident from the back and side sections, the stone is complete, and the text is surrounded by a small frame, suggesting that the unabbreviated form *Idovelico* was the orthographic option chosen for carving into the stone.

⁷⁵ Väänänen 2003, 112.

⁷⁶ Herman 2000, 39; Adamik 2017; Tantimonaco 2017, 314-315, 422.

⁷⁷ Schattner, Fabião, Guerra 2013, 78-79.

⁷⁸ Vasconcellos 1938, 202; Lambrino 1951, 107-109; Encarnação 1995-2007, 160.

⁷⁹ Alves-Dias, Coelho 1994-1997, 237-238.

graphic options, because we do not know the word in its native language; however, the orthographic variation in a small group of inscriptions is in line with linguistic phenomena characteristic of Vulgar Latin seen in other words in this corpus. Linguistic analysis offers a new perspective on this indigenous theonym, indicating that it integrates the Latin language and is not merely a loan word from the Celtic substratum.

The diachronic variation evident in this epigraphic corpus relates to the sanctuary's duration of activity; as noted above, many of the texts can be dated as far back as to 2-3 AD. Unsurprisingly, as votive texts tended to be very formulaic and conservative, only few inscriptions in this corpus show relevant linguistic features. Nevertheless, the use of language in the religious context combines formulaic traits with more unusual erudite and even literary echoes, consistent with the presumed social and cultural profile of the worshippers.

Bibliography

- Abascal Palazón 2002 = Abascal Palazón, M.: Ataecina. In: Ribeiro, J. C. (ed.): *Religiões da Lusitânia*. Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. Lisboa, 53-60.
- Abascal Palazón, Cebrián Fernández 2005 = Abascal Palazón, M., Cebrián Fernández, R.: *Manuscritos sobre Antigüedades de la Real Academia de la Historia*. Madrid.
- Adamik 2017 = Adamik, B.: On the Vulgar Latin merger of /b/ and /w/ and its correlation with the loss of intervocalic /w/: Dialectological evidence from inscriptions. *Pallas* 103, 25-36.
- Almeida 1962 = Almeida, F.: A arte visigótica em Portugal. *O Arqueólogo Português* s. 2, 4, 5-278.
- Alves Dias 2002 = Alves Dias, M. M.: O chamado 'hino a Endovélico'. In: Ribeiro, J. C. (ed.): *Religiões da Lusitânia*. Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. Lisboa, 91-92, 399-400.
- Alves Dias, Coelho 1995-97 = Alves Dias, M. M., Coelho, L.: Endovélico: caracterização social da romanidade dos cultuantes e do seu santuário. *O Arqueólogo Português* 13-15, 233-265.
- Alves Dias, Gaspar 2008 = Alves Dias, M. M., Gaspar, C.: Romans or the Indigenous. Some methodological aspects in assessing worshippers. In: Sartori, A. (ed.): *Dedicanti e Cultores nelle religioni celtiche*. Quaderni Acme, Cisalpino Istituto Editoriale Universitario. Milano, 1-8.
- Calado 1996 = Calado, M.: Endovélico e Rocha da Mina: o contexto arqueológico. *Ophiussa* 1, 97-108.
- Carbonell, Gimeno, Vargas 1992 = Carbonell, J., Gimeno, H., Garcia Vargas, G.: Las inscripciones de los "Adversaria" de Antonio Agustín del Ms. 5781 (= Q 87) de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. *Epigraphica* 54, 167-190.
- Correia Santos 2013 = Correia Santos, M. J.: A Rocha da Mina e as terras de Endovélico: conceito ou preconceito de paisagem sagrada? *Cadernos do Endovélico* 1, 107-112.
- Edmondson 2013 = Edmondson, J.: Endovellicus. In: Bagnall, R. S., Brodersen, K., Champion, C. B., Erskine, A., Huebner, S. R. (eds.): *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Oxford, 2406-2407. DOI: 10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah17137.
- Encarnação 1984 = Encarnação, J. D.: *Inscrições romanas do conventus Pacensis*. Coimbra.
- Encarnação 1995-2007 = Encarnação, J. D.: Endovélico – 400 anos depois. *Sintria* III-IV, 149-163.

- Encarnação 2008 = Encarnação, J. D.: *Dédicants et cultores: quelques aspects ... dans la Lusitanie romaine*. In: Sartori, A. (ed.): *Dedicanti e Cultores nelle religioni celtiche*. Università degli Studi di Milano – Cisalpino. Milano, 61-71.
- Espanca 1882 = Espanca, J. J.: O deus Endovellico dos Celtas do Alemtejo. *Boletim da Sociedade de Geographia de Lisboa* 4-5, 253-256, 274-296.
- Fabião, Schattner, Guerra, 2008 = Fabião, C., Schattner, Th., Guerra, A.: El mármol en el Santuario de Endovellicus. In: Nogales Basarrate, T., Beltrán Fortes, J. (eds.): *Marmora Hispana: Exploración y uso de los materiales pétreos en la Hispania romana*. “L’Erma” di Bretschneider. Roma, 395-405.
- Gimeno, Garcia Vargas 1993 = Gimeno, H., Garcia Vargas: Inscrición inédita dedicada a Endovélico. *FE* 42, n. 188.
- Gimeno 2002 = Gimeno, H.: A historiografia das religiões antigas do ocidente hispânico. In: Ribeiro, J. C. (ed.): *Religiões da Lusitânia*. Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. Lisboa, 333-340.
- Guerra 2008 = Guerra, A.: La documentation épigraphique sur *Endouellicus* et les nouvelles recherches dans son sanctuaire à S. Miguel da Mota. In: Haeussler, R., King, A. C. (eds.): *Continuity and Innovation in Religion in the Roman West, volume 2. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supp. Series 67*. Portsmouth, Rhode Island, 159-167.
- Guerra, Schattner, Fabião 2002 = Guerra, A., Schattner Th., Fabião, C.: As recentes descobertas em S. Miguel da Mota (Alandroal) nas imediações do santuário de Endovélico. *Conimbriga* 41, 295-297.
- Guerra, Schattner, Fabião, Almeida 2003 = Guerra, A., Schattner Th., Fabião, C., Almeida, R.: Novas investigações no santuário de Endovélico (S. Miguel da Mota, Alandroal): a campanha de 2002. *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia* 6, 2, 415-479.
- Herman, J. 2000 = Herman, J.: *Vulgar Latin*. Pennsylvania.
- Koch 2005 = Koch, M.: El santuario dedicado a Berobreo em el Monte do Facho (Cangas, Galicia). *Acta Paleohispanica* IX, 5, 823-836.
- Koch, Suárez Otero, Schattner 2005 = Koch, M., Suárez Otero, J. Schattner Th.: Monte do Facho 2003. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen im Heiligtum des Berobreus. *Madridrer Mitteilungen* 46, 135-183.
- Lambrino 1951 = Lambrino, S.: Le Dieu Lusitanien Endovellicus. *Bulletin des Études Portugaises* 15, 93-147.
- Lambrino 1967 = Lambrino, S.: Catalogue des inscriptions romaines du Musée Leite de Vasconcelos. *O Arqueólogo Português* 1, 123-217.
- Maciel, Maciel 1985 = Maciel, J. J. P., Maciel, T. D. P.: Fragmento de ara a Endovélico, de Juro-menha (Conventus Pacensis). *FE* 15, n. 64.
- Marques 2011 = Marques, P.: *Endouoleicus/Endoueleucus/Indouelleucus*: Releitura de algumas formas do Teónimo. *O Arqueólogo Português* 1, 505-524.
- Matos 1995 = Matos, J. L.: *Inventário do Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. Coleção de Escultura Romana*. Lisboa.
- Pereira = Pereira, G.: Mythologia iberica – inscrições endovellicas de Villa Viçosa. *Renascença* 1878.
- Pereira 1889 = Pereira, G.: As inscrições de Endovellico. *Revista Archeologica*, 145-149.
- Religiões 2002 = Ribeiro, J. C. (ed.): *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquntur saxa*. Lisboa.
- Ribeiro 2002 = Ribeiro, J. C.: Endovellicus. In: *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquntur saxa*. Lisboa, 79-90.
- Ribeiro 2005 = Ribeiro, J. C.: O deus sanctus *Endovellicus* durante a romanidadeiuma *interpretatio* local de *Faunus/Silvanus*? *Acta Palaeohispanica* IX, 721-766.
- Schattner, Fabião, Guerra 2013 = Schattner Th., Fabião, C., Guerra, A.: A investigação em torno do santuário de S. Miguel da Mota: o ponto da situação. *Cadernos de Endovélico* 1, 65-98.

- Tantimonaco 2017 = Tantimonaco, S.: *El Latín de hispania a través de las inscripciones. La provincia de Lusitania*. Tesis doctoral. Barcelona.
- Vallejo Ruiz 2010 = Vallejo Ruiz, J. M.: Los Celtas y la onomástica. El caso hispano. *Serta Palaeohispanica J. de Hoz. Palaeohispanica* 10, 629-647.
- Vasconcellos 1905 = Vasconcellos, J. L.: *Religiões da Lusitânia. Volume II*. Lisboa.
- Vasconcellos 1938 = Vasconcellos, J. L.: O Deus lusitano Endovelico. In: *Opúsculos* 5. Lisboa, 197-206.
- Väänänen 2003 = Väänänen, V.: *Introducción al Latín Vulgar*. Madrid.

(ISSN 0418-453X)