
Pavel Serafimov, Giancarlo Tomezzoli

SLAVIC INFLUENCES IN THE ANCIENT GAUL

Povzetek

SLOVANSKI VPLIV V KLASIČNI GALIJI

V prispevku avtorja z analitičnim pristopom pokažeta, da se s pomočjo ruščine in drugih slovanskih jezikov da razložiti imena galskih plemen in bogov ter toponime in to kljub temu, da so tradicionalna poselitvena področja Slovanov znatno oddaljena od Galije. Študija se dotakne tudi konstrukcije svetišč, opisuje obrede pokopov, umetnost in tudi verski in običajni življenski vsakdan. Zgodovinski viri in arheološki dokazi kažejo na to, da Slovani niso samo poseljevali področij, kot jih poseljujejo dandanes, ampak da je njihov vpliv segal preko Srednje in Zahodne Evrope vse do Atlantika.

Introduction

It is common opinion between the scholars and the people that the ancient Gauls formed a compact set of Celtic tribes speaking the Gaulish language or similar varieties of the same one [1]. The Gaulish language also called Classical Celtic had practically nothing in common with Insular Celtic; it was very close to the Italic group of tongues and had grammatical forms similar to those of the Proto-Indo-European model [1]. However, the publication in a recent past of relevant works has animated the debate about the Slavic cultural and religious influences and about the Slavic presence in the ancient Gaul. With this paper, after having reviewed said relevant works, we analyze in more details some origins of these influences and presence so as to introduce some more arguments and evidences into the debate.

Past relevant works

In a first book, Ambrozic [2] provides, on the basis of Slavic similarities and correspondences, the deciphering of forty-three inscriptions in Greek and Latin characters discovered in France, as well as a list of more than three-hundred toponyms of Brittany having Slavic roots. He states that the defeat of the Veneti by Caesar ended their hegemony in Armorica, but the people and their language lived on in Armorica and elsewhere for centuries to come.

In his fundamental book, Ambrozic [3], starting from the Old Map from the Atlas Historique de la France (A. Longon), the Peutinger Table and the Antonine Itinerary recognized Slavic roots in many Gaulish toponyms like Balatedo, Bigorra, Blavia, ..., Rodium, Senabo, Belca, ..., Jader, Blavia, Garumna, Then, he considered 19 Gaulish

tribes, arriving to explain the meaning of their names, the toponyms of their settlement areas and their inscriptions by means of similarities with the Slavic languages. He considered first the Germanic tribe of the Nemetes (Generally Slavic – G. Sl. - NEM “dumb, mute”, i.e. speaking a mumbling, incomprehensible language), and then the Gaulish tribes of: the Saluvii (SLAVUJ, cf. the inscriptions in Greek characters and the toponyms, pp. 15-31), the Velavii (VELAVJI “the valued ones, the worthy ones”, main occupations: farming, haulage and trade, cf. the toponyms, pp. 31-38), the Segusiavi (SEKATI “to cut”, SEJATI “to sow”, main preoccupation: agriculture, cf. the toponyms, pp. 38-50), the Mandubii (MAN “less”, DUB “the oak three”, possible boat-builders, cf. the inscriptions in Greek and Latin characters and the toponyms, pp. 50-57), the Volcae Arecomici (VOLCJE, peaceful preoccupations: agriculture, animal husbandry, cf. the inscriptions in Greek characters and the toponyms, pp. 57-78), the Volcae Tectosages (VUK “wolf”, cf. the toponyms, pp. 79-94), the Ruteni (cf. the inscriptions in Latin characters and the toponyms, pp. 94-110), the Cadurci (cf. the toponyms, pp. 110-126), the Cabales (KOVALI “smiths”, occupations: smiths, boat builders, miners, beekeepers, dairymen, cf. inscription in Latin characters, toponyms, pp. 126-134), the Petrogorii (VETROGORJI hills “exposed to the blast prevailing westerly off the Atlantic”, cf. toponyms, pp. 134-152), the Vasates (VES, VAS “village”, cf. the toponyms, pp. 152-157), the Bituriges Cubi (G. Sl. - BI, VI “at, with, in”, G. Sl. TURG, TERG, TRG “market”, G. Sl. - KUPITI “to buy”, cf. the toponyms, pp. 158-172), the Bituriges Vivisci (VISETI “to hang, to be suspended”, cf. the toponyms, pp. 172-179), the Meduli (main activities: beekeeping, production of honey, fermentation of mead, cf. the toponyms, pp. 179-182), the Loire Boii (cf. the toponyms, pp. 182-189), the Bay of Biscay Boii (cf. the toponyms, pp. 190-194), the Santones (cf. the toponyms, pp. 194-202), the Veneti, the Volcae Tectosages in Anatolia (cf. the toponyms, pp. 204-206), the Bellovaci (G. Sl. - BEL “white” and VEL, VAS, “White Villages”, cf. the toponyms, pp. 206-214).

The conclusions of the book are:

- in the entire gamut of names considered no one appears to be of Celtic origin,
- there seems to be no Celtic influence whatsoever within the structure of the Slavic forms,
- the Roman contacts with Slavs in the South of Gaul preceded those with the Germanic tribes,
- the initial Roman interaction with the Slavs in the South of Gaul became overshadowed by the struggles that ensued,
- Caesar considered as Gaulish (i.e. Celtic) all the Gaul tribes, regardless of their ethnicity, so that the tribes in the South of Gaul, though containing a tangible Slavic substratum, became tarnished with a Celtic imprint.

In a further paper, Ambrozic [4] analyzed thirteen Gaulish inscriptions, some Gaulish tribe names and word compounds. The fact that said inscriptions, tribe names and word compounds can be deciphered on the basis of similarities with Slavic words confirms the presence of Slavic tribes or communities in the ancient Gaul.

In a third book, Ambrozic [5], Appendix E, in addition to the thirteen inscriptions,

tribe names and word compounds already analyzed in [4] provided the deciphering of the inscription of Plumergat near Vannes (Brittany) still on the basis of similarities with Slavic words.

Grohar [6] documented the existence in France during the kingdom of Charles the Great in the year 771 A.D. of the Slavic toponyms PETRAGORA, RUTENICA and BIGORRA, of the people of the LEMOVICI, of the town of Vannes named after the Venedi, and of the town of Brest, also named times ago Bresta, in Brittany, which has a corresponding town Brest in Belarus.

In an extended study, Serafimov [7] dealt with different subjects, and documented close Gaul / Slavic similarities in the language (cf. Table 6: 98 words; Table 7: 15 words), in the names of the deities (cf. pp. 98-100: 21 names), in the religion (holy forests), in the burial types (burial with sacrificed horses, burial in underground wooden chambers) and in the architecture (temples, murus gallicus, roads). Although avoiding a precise conclusion, the paper indicates that a part of the Gauls, called also Celts, was in fact a Western Slavic branch consisting of different tribes responsible for the spread of iron in Central and Western Europe and inhabited not only Eastern, but also Central and Western Europe and the British Islands in the deep antiquity.

Vodopivec [8] analyzed twenty-three further Gaulish, pre-Roman (pre-Latin) inscriptions. The fact, also in this case, that said inscriptions can be deciphered by using Slavic templates is a further confirmation of the presence of Slavic communities in the ancient Gaul before the Roman occupation.

Kebe [9] observed that the Roman attack against the ancient Veneti took place at the French gulf of MORBIHAN. The name of this gulf can be explained by the composition of the correspondent Slov. subst. MOR = sea, and adj. VIHAN, betatism of BIHAN = internal, i.e. MORJE UVIHANO = internal sea, sea surrounded by earths. The same name of the land of the Veneti: AREMORICA can be explained by the composition of the Slov. subst. ARE = land and MOR = sea, i.e. land of the sea or land near the sea. The above mentioned toponyms indicated that the ancient Veneti were deeply engaged on the sea and distinguished from the other Gaulish tribes.

In a further paper, Kebe [10] analyzed the map drawn in oval form by the Spanish monk Beatus in 776 A.D., of which the best preserved copy was drawn in 1050 A.D. in the monastery of St. Sever (Gascogne-Toulouse, France). Very interesting in his paper is the description of the present French town of St. Etienne (Terrenoire), which is noticed on the map of 776 A.D. as CERNA STENA. This name corresponds to the G. Sl and Slov. ČRNA STENA = black rock and refers to a local geological characteristic.

For the sake of completeness, we have to mention that PETRAGORA corresponds well to the Slov. expression PET-GORA - the five mountains, RUTENICA to the Slov. subst. RUT - cleared land and BIGORRA, in the Pyrenean region, to the G.Sl. subst. GORA - mountain, or the Bask adv. GORA = up, upward [11], p. 152, also Slov. GOR - up, upwards. The origin of the LEMOVICI will be dealt below. We have also to mention that MORBIHAN can be explained also by the composition of the correspondent Breton subst.

MOR = sea, and adj. BIHAN = little, i.e. MORBIHAN = little sea, and that AREMORICA or ARMORICA can be explained by the composition of the Breton article AR = the and MOR = sea, i.e. the sea or land on the sea.

In any case, Gaulish names and words arrived to us not in their original form but in their Latinized or Graecized or corrupted form and therefore, mainly their roots, and not their prefixes or suffixes, should be considered as original and should be analyzed.

In our opinion, the existence of tribes' inscriptions deciphered by means of Slavic similarities proves that the corresponding tribes had spoken a Proto-Slavic or Slavic language and thus they were surely Slavic. The presence of Slavic roots in the tribe names and in the toponyms indicates that the corresponding tribes were either of Slavic origin, or were influenced by Slavic tribes or peoples, or that their ruler class was of Slavic origin.

Gaulish-Slavic Interrelations

As it is known, the Gaulish tribes inhabited the European area comprising the actual North Italy, France, Belgium and Great Britain. According to the Paleolithic Continuity Theory (PCT) [12] p. 7, "The totally absurd fairy-tale thesis of the so called 'late arrival' of the Slavs in Europe must be replaced by the scenario of Slavic continuity from Paleolithic, and the demographic growth of the Slavs explained by the extraordinary success, continuity and stability of the Neolithic cultures of South-Eastern Europe (the only one in Europe that caused the formation of *tells*)". Therefore, according to the scenario provided by the PCT, interrelations between Gauls and Slavs in the past were largely possible.

To improve our knowledge about the interrelations between Gauls and Slavs it is necessary to search deep into the historical sources. But the main problem in this search resides in the name of the Slavic ethnos, because the Slavs had several main branches and their names also changed during the ages. The actual name Slavs is a modern invention; while in ancient and medieval times were used different names. The many time used name Sclavs has not the same meaning of the present name Slavs.

According to [12] pp. 36-37, Herodotus described the Thracians as the most numerous people after the Indians. Because the demographic explosion of the Slavs must be placed in the Neolithic, it is possible that Thracians was the name that Herodotus gave to the Slavs, owing to the fact that the Thracians were one of the most powerful and representative elites of the Slavic speaking Eastern Europe. In the first approximation, then, the Thracians would appear to be a Southern Slavic geo-variation group, out of which came the Bronze Age elite, first dominating then extinguished.

The Greek historian Simokkates, who wrote in early 7th century AD, i.e. during the period in which the ethnonym Sclavs began to emerge, witnessed events, which he described in several books. According to Simokkates (cited by Tsenov [13] pp. 14-15), Sclavs were nothing else than the Old Thracians, who occupied Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, Ukraine and some parts of Asia Minor. Simokkates [13] pp. 14-15, about them wrote: **Sclavos sive Getas hoc enim nomine antiquitis appellati sunt** - *Sclavs or Getae, because that was their*

name in the antiquity [13] pp. 14-15. Another evidence that Old Thracians were Slavs is the decipherment made by Serafimov [14], of the Thracian inscription of Sitovo and the decipherments made separately by Ambrozic [5] pp. 58-64, and Serafimov [15] of the Thracian inscription of Ezerovo, on the basis of similarities between the words in the inscriptions and corresponding words in the Slavic languages. The last and decisive evidence of the Slavic identity of the Thracians is genetic. Tsvetkov [16] does not mention the authors of the genetic researches, and actually, he tried in some way to put in doubt the results of the genetic researches, using questionable arguments. He claimed that the Thracian genes of the Bulgarians are not caused by common origin, but instead by the settlement of 80,000 Thracians in Bactria. However, there is no evidence of neither Thracians' settlement in Bactria, nor that their number left there by Alexander the Great army, was 80,000. The total amount of Thracian warriors in said army was probably not more than 5000 and many of them died before reaching Bactria, because they repulsed the attack of the Persian cavalry at the battle of Gavgamela. The total amount of Alexander's soldiers at Gavgamela was about 35,000, so it is not possible that the Thracian contingent was formed by 80,000 soldiers. In any case, Tsvetkov [16] does not put in doubt that in the veins of the Slavic Bulgarians flows Thracian blood, i.e. the same Bulgarians which were defined as belonging to the Slavic root by the anthropologist M. Popov in [17] p. 170, in the 30-ties of the 20th century.

Thracians and Scythians were closely related people. Material culture, weaponry, art style, burial rites were similar. Strabo [18] I.1.2, observed that in the deep past the Greeks used to name all the people, who lived northwards of them, Scythians, which probably means that they recognized also the Thracians to belong to the same ethnic group as the Scythians. The fact that the Scythians were Slavs too was confirmed at the beginning of the 20th century [19] but the conclusion, that Scythians were Slavs and forefathers of the of the Eastern Slavs, remained inexplicably hidden.

Strabo [18] I, 1.2, stated that the ethnonym Scythians can be translated as Nomads: **Σκυθῶι και Νομάδας** (Scythians as Nomads) and in matter of fact the O. Ch. Sl. verb СКИТАТИ СЕ = *to wander, to roam* is a perfect match. Other related word is the O. Ch. Sl. subst. СКИТАЛЕЦЪ = *wanderer*. In the past the Scythian language was defined as Iranian, but nobody made any valuable comparison between the Scythian language and the Slavic languages. However, a preliminary comparison between Gaulish, Thracian, Scythian and Slavic languages (cf. Tables 1, 2 below) [19], [20] shows significant matches. Sanskrit too offers a significant amount of matches, but not as much as the Slavic languages.

It has to be clarified also that the migration in historical times documented by Herodotus and Strabo does not mean that the Scythians originated in Asia and migrated in Eastern Europe exactly at that time. In fact, since the taming of the horse and the development of the cattle breeding, Scythians were migrating, perhaps already from the Neolithic times. They had to change their settlements in order to find new pastures for their cattle and horses, so in the course of time these early Slavs could have migrated in Europe and Asia many times. Herodotus just described the migration which was known at his time.

The identification of some ancient Slavs with the Scythians and the Thracians could complete the interrelations between Gauls and Slavs started probably from the Neolithic. In addition, as mentioned in [7] p. 100, there is at least one documented direct relation between Thracians and Gauls. In fact, according to Herodotus [21] IV–94, Zalmoxis was a Thracian priest of the tribe of Getae and Hyppolytus in [22] p. 90, testified that his teaching was the basis of the Gaulish druidism.

It is also possible that Slavic tribes settled in the Gaul or that Slavs formed the aristocracy of some Gaulish tribe. An indication of this is the mention by Diodorus Siculus [23] V-32, that the most powerful Gaulish tribe was named Cimmerici, and that they roamed from Asia till the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean. Procopius [24] p. 187, wrote several times that the Bulgarian tribe Utigurs, which created the ancient Danubian Bulgaria, were called Cimmericians. According to A. Fol [25] p. 135, the Cimmericians were a branch of the Thracians and proposed the term: Thracio-Cimmericians.

However, although said past works already indicate interrelation between Slavs and Gauls, we want now to put forward some new evidences contributing to identify the kind of said interrelations.

Gaulish-Slavic Tribes

In addition to the information about the Gaulish tribes of the Saluvii, Velavii, Segusiavi, Mandubii, Volcae Arecomici, Volcae Tectosages, Ruteni, Cadurci, Kabales, Petrogorii, Vasates, Bituriges Cubi, Bituriges Vivisci, Meduli, Loire Boii, Bay of Biscay Boii, Santones, Veneti, Bellovaci by Ambrozić [3], we can now identify specific Slavic tribes, who migrated to Western Europe in or before the 1st millennium BC:

Veneti - probably a branch of the Adriatic Veneti as testified by Strabo [18] IV. 4.1, or an escaped tribe of the Lusatia culture of the Baltic Sea, assailed by the Scythians as set out by Ambrozić [2] p. iv. The Adriatic Veneti were recognized as Slavs by St. Columban – **Veneti qui et Sclavi dicuntur** [26] p. 464. Venetic toponyms are also spread in the whole Europe [26] p. 22-23 and Veneti were also present in Central Anatolia.

Andi – corresponding well to the possible Slavic tribe of the **Anti**.

Ruteni – for this tribe Ambrozić gives no information about its origin, but we think that it corresponds well to the Slavic tribe of the Ruteni, called also Russini.

Lemovici - corresponding to the Slavic tribe of the **Lemko**.

Belgae – corresponding to the Slavic tribe of Fir **Bholg** [27].

Aedui - corresponding well to the Thracian tribe of the **Aedii**.

Moreover, other Gaulish tribe names have Slavic etymology:

Vocontii - they lived in Southern Gaul near the Roman border. Their name fits perfectly with the Slavic expression VO KONCE = *at the end*, after all **Vocontii** they were living at the Southern end of Gaul.

Ostimii - called also Osimii, they lived at the Western end of Gaul, on the coast of the Atlantic Ocean. Their name fits perfectly the G. Sl. adj. OSTATNII = *last one* and with the O. Ch. Sl. verb OCTATI = *to remain, to stay*.

Rauraci - they lived in Southern Gaul, Their name can be connected with the Slavic god **Rarog**, so **Rauraci** would mean – *worshippers of Rarog*.

Gaulish-Slavic Deities

In addition to the information about the deities by Serafimov [7], we can now add the following:

BACO was a Gallic god revered in the vicinity of Chalon-sur-Saone. Green [28] p. 38, suggests that he was a boar-god, but most probably he was giver-god, having name related to Indo-Aryan BHAGA = god-dispenser of goods, which name corresponds also to G. Sl. subst. BOG = *god*, and Slov. BACEK = *lambkin*.

BRICTA [28] p. 50, means *the high one* and corresponds to the G. Sl. BREG = hill, high place and Slov. BRIHTA = *bright*.

GOVANON [28] p. 106, was the smith-god revered by the tribes of Southern Brittany, his name corresponds to the G. Sl. verb **KOVATI** = *to forge*.

IALONUS [28] p. 124, was a earth-god, his name is connected with Old Ch. Sl. subst. ИЛЪ = *earth, mud* and Slov. ILO = *clay*.

MEDUNA [29] was goddess of mead and honey, which name corresponds perfectly to the G. Sl. subst. **MED** = *honey*, **MEDOVINA** = *mead*, **MEDNA** = *made of honey*.

MOGON [28] pp. 152, 153, was leader god, his name is connected with the O. Ch. Sl. adj. МОГОЩЪ = *mighty one* and Slov. MOGOČEN = *mighty*.

OCELUS [28] p. 164, was healer-god, his name is connected with O. Ch. Sl. verb ЦЕЛИТИ = *to heal*, and also with Blg. ОЦЕЛЯВАМ and Russ. verb ОЦЕЛЕТЬ = *to survive*.

Gaulish-Slavic Basic Dictionaries

In addition to the comparison between Gaulish, Slavic and French words by Serafimov [7] Table 6, Table 7, showing closer matches between Gaulish and Slavic words than to French words the following small Basic Dictionaries show that some more Gaulish words from [30], [31], [32], covering many life aspects, have corresponding Slavic, Thracian and Scythian counterparts and no corresponding French counterparts. Despite of the poorly documented Thracian and Scythian languages, the Dictionaries confirm that they could influence the Gaulish language.

Concerning the subst. TEUTO and its G. Sl. equivalent LJUDE = *people*, it is observed that apparently in old Slavic languages sometime T and L were interchangeable as can be seen from Blg. subst. TETA = *aunt*, having also the variant ЛЕЛА = *aunt*, Blg. verbs ТУПАМ = *to hit* having variant ЛУПАМ = *to hit*, ТОЧА = *to suck, to drink* having variant ЛОЧА = *to suck, to drink*. So it would not be surprising if LJUDE have had the older variant TJUDE and not surprising to find in the Graecized Thracian ethnonyms Dente**leti**, Sia**leti**, Coela**leti** the suffix LETI which is clearly a corruption of LJUDI, LJUDE = *people*.

Table 1: Basic Dictionary – *Gaulish compared with Thracian and Slavic*

	GAULISH	THRACIAN	SLAVIC
1	ACAMNO rock	ACMON stone	KAMEN <i>stone</i> G. Sl.
2	AMBI around, both	ABI both	ОБА <i>both</i> O. Ch. Sl. ОБА <i>both</i> Slov.
3	BRIGA hill	BERG hill	BEREG <i>hill</i> Russ. BREG <i>slope, hill</i> Slov.
4	CAMBOS hill, slope	KAPA hill, slope	КОПА <i>heap</i> Gen. Sl. КОПА <i>hill</i> Slov.
5	CATUS family	KENTAS child	ЧЯНДО <i>child</i> O. Ch. Sl.
6	DERVO tree	DARU tree	DEREVO <i>tree</i> Russ. DREVO <i>tree</i> Slov.
7	DUMNO dark	TIMA dark DUMAS dark	ТМА <i>darkness</i> Russ. ДЫМ <i>smoke</i> Russ. ТЕМНО <i>dark</i> Slov.
8	DUNO dune, hill	DUN dune	DJUNA <i>dune</i> Blg.
9	MAROS great	MAROS great	МЕРЪ <i>great</i> O. Ch. Sl.
10	MORE sea	MAR sea	MORE <i>sea</i> G. Sl. MORJE <i>sea</i> Slov.
11	NERTOS power, strength	ANER man	НЕРЕЗ <i>male animal</i> Blg. НЕСТИНАР <i>male ritual dancer</i> Blg. NERESEC <i>wild boar</i> Slov.
12	TEUTO people	TIUDE people	LJUDE <i>people</i> G. Sl. LJUDJE <i>people</i> Slov.
13	VALO master	BALEN master	БЫЛИА <i>master</i> O. Blg. VELJAK <i>master</i> Slov.
14	VID to see	VID to see	ВИДЕТЬ <i>to see</i> Russ. VID <i>sight</i> VIDETI <i>to see</i> Slov.

Table 2: Basic Dictionary – *Gaulish compared with Scythian and Slavic*

	GAULISH	SCYTHIAN	SLAVIC
1	ARATRON plough	AREI ploughmen	ОРАТИ <i>to plough</i> O. Ch. Sl. ORATI <i>to plough</i> Slov.
2	BATU to fight	PATA, BITI to hit	БИТИ <i>to hit</i> G. Sl., ПАТЯ <i>I suffer</i> Blg.
3	BACO god	BAGO god	BOG <i>God</i>
4	DEA woman	DA mother	DOIKA <i>wet-nurse</i> G. Sl. DEVA <i>girl</i> Slov.
5	DUMNO dark	TEM dark	ТМА <i>darkness</i> Russ. ДЫМ <i>smoke</i> Russ. ТЕМНО <i>dark</i> Slov.
6	MORE sea	MORI sea	MORE <i>sea</i> G. Sl.
7	NERTOS power, strength	NARA male	НЕРЕЗ <i>male animal</i> Blg. НЕСТИНАР <i>male ritual dancer</i> Blg., NERESEC <i>wild boar</i> Slov.
8	OUIRO man	OIOR man	ФЪРТЪ <i>man</i> O. Ch. Sl.
9	SECO to cut	SAGARIS axe	SEKIRA <i>axe</i> G. Sl.
10	SULI sun	SAUL sun	SOLNCE <i>sun</i> G. Sl.
11	UERAMUS first, supreme	ARIMA one	АЛЕМЪ <i>first</i> O. Blg.
12	(P)RITU ford	BURT ford	BROD <i>ford</i> G.Sl., PLITEV <i>ford</i> Slov.

Table 3: Abbreviations

Blg.: Bulgarian	O. Blg.: Old Bulgarian	G. Sl.: Generally Slavic
Slov.: Slovenian	O. Ch. Sl.: Old Church Slavonic	Russ.: Russian
subst.: substantive	adj.: adjective	adv.: adverb

Forging, Breeding and Art style

According to the PCT [12] p. 48, the substantive RUDA = *metallic mineral*, present practically in all the Slavic languages and also as loanword in Latin as RUDE = *raw copper*, represents an exclusively Slavic semantic development from the PIE word for “red” and must be associated to the earliest metallurgy, which developed in the Slavic area. It is possible that some tribes that in the 8th -7th century BC settled the Gaul were tribes bearing the knowledge of the forging of iron, and they introduced in Gaul also the breed of horses and a new art style. These tribes could be of Thraco-Cimmerian origin [33] and their homeland from Neolithic times was Eastern Europe. According to Pyankov [34] one of the first who developed the forge of iron was the **Halybi** tribe, a Thracian tribe who settled in Central Bulgaria and Asia Minor. Evidently, the **Halybi** transferred their knowledge to many other people, and also to those who moved for settling the Gaul.

Moreover, Thraco-Cimmerians and Scythians were famous horsemen, and they could have contributed to introduce the breed of horses in Western Europe. The Gaulish word for horse is MARCA, which corresponds perfectly to Thracian word MARCA = *horse*. This word has a Slavic etymology, MARCA means simply *red one* – probably referred to the colour of the animals and it is related to the Blg. verb MORAVEYA = *I become red*, Blg. adj. MORAV = *red*. Further related words are the G. Sl. subst. MRAZ/MOROZ = *frost*, having original meaning = *redness*, and the Slov. subst. MRHA = *bad or wild horse*.

The art style of Thraco-Cimmerians and Scythians was called animal style, because in all the depicted scenes, fighting or running animals were represented. One of the first examples of such style has been found in the Maikop burial from 3rd millennium B.C. – Russia. That is about 2000 years before this style was established in Western Europe.

Genetic data

Recent genetic studies [35], [36] reject massive migrations in Europe in directions East – West and vice versa, but rather indicate spread of populations in directions South – North and vice versa, caused by the warming period after the last Ice Age and the cooling period in the 2nd millennium BC. This is in agreement with the PCT [12] and with the spread of agriculture settlements in Europe [37]. In the Alps region from the Bronze Age came only 7 % of new genes. Such small genetic change in this region [38] is in agreement with said spread of the agriculture settlements [39].

Special studies of ancient human bones show a high genetic connection between Etruscan, Veneti and present Slovenians, especially in bones 2400 years old from the North Adriatic Sea [39]. A similar connection also in bones from ancient Gaul remains to be investigated. At the moment, there is also no evidence of a genetic connection between

Old Thracian, Scythians and Gauls, although Slavic cultural and religious influences in the ancient Gaul are evident.

Conclusion

Our analysis confirms that many elements of the Gaulish culture, before the Roman conquest, could originate in Eastern Europe. Especially meaningful are in this respect the matches between Slavic words and Gaulish toponyms, tribe and deities names. The scenario of the Gaulish-Slavic interrelations did not emerge till now because of the absurd assumption that Slavs were late incomers into Europe and, consequently, it was unnecessary to look for Gaulish-Slavic interrelations. We hope that the present work could initiate new researches on further different aspects of the interrelations between Gauls and Slavs.

Acknowledgement

We want to thank prof. dr. A. Perdih and msc. V. Vodopivec for their pertinent comments and suggestions during the development of this paper.

Bibliography

1. *Gaulish language*, <http://indoeuro.bizland.com/tree/celt/gaulish.html>.
2. A. Ambrozic, *Adieu to Brittany*, Cythera Press, Toronto **1999**.
3. A. Ambrozic, *Journey back to the Garumna*, Cythera Press, Toronto **2000**.
4. A. Ambrozic, *Etymological Parallelism in Inscriptions, Tribal Names, Toponyms, Hydronyms, and Word Compounding from Ancient Gaul*, Proceedings of the 1st International Topical Conference, The Veneti within the ethno-genesis of the central-European population, Jutro, Ljubljana **2001**, pp. 131-149.
5. A. Ambrozic, *Gordian Knot Unbound*, Cythera Press, Toronto **2002**.
6. T. Grohar, *Sledovi Slovenščine v Franciji*, Proceedings of the 1st International Topical Conference, The Veneti within the ethno-genesis of the central-European population, Jutro, Ljubljana **2001**, p. 150.
7. P. Serafimov, *Celto-Slavic Similarities*, Proceedings of the 4th International Topical Conference, Ancient inhabitants of Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2006**, pp. 82-116.
8. V. Vodopivec, *Nekaj Galskih Napisov*, Proceedings of the 5th International Topical Conference, Origin of Europeans, Jutro, Ljubljana **2007**, pp. 155-175.
9. D. Kebe, *Zemljevidi antične Galije*, Proceedings of the International Workshop, Traces of European past, Jutro, Ljubljana **2003**, pp. 200-202.
10. D. Kebe, *Zemljevid iz VIII stoletja*, Vojno zgodovinski zbornik, **2008**, 31, p. 18.
11. P. Jandacek, L. Arko, *Linguistic connections between Basques and Slavs (Veneti) in Antiquity*, Proceedings of the 1st International Topical Conference The Veneti within the ethno-genesis of the central-European population, Jutro, Ljubljana **2001**, pp. 151-166.
12. M. Alinei, *Interdisciplinary and linguistic evidence for Palaeolithic continuity of Indo-European, Uralic and Altaic populations in Eurasia, with an excursus on Slavic ethno-genesis*, Expanded version of a paper read at the Conference Ancient Settlers in Europe, Kobarid 29-30 May **2003** – Forthcoming in "Quaderni di Semantica", 26, <http://www.continuitas.com/intro.html>.
13. G. Tsenov, *Praotechestvoto I praezika na Bulgarite*, Heliopol, Sofia **2005**, Г. Ценов, *Праотечеството и праезика на българите*, Хелиопол, София **2005**.
14. P. Serafimov, *Sitovo Inscription*, Proceedings of the 4th International Topical Conference, Ancient inhabitant of Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2008**, pp. 196-202.

15. P. Serafimov, *New Reading of the Thracian Inscription on the Golden Ring from Ezerovo*, Proceedings of the 5th International Topical Conference, Origins of Europeans, Jutro, Ljubljana **2008**, pp. 176-183.
16. P. Tsvetkov, *Slavyani li sa Prbulgarite*, Tangra, TanNaKpa, Sofia 1998, П.Цветков, *Славяни ли са Прабългарите*, Тангра, ТанНаКра, София **1998**, pp. 54-55.
17. G. Tsenov, *Krovatova Bulgaria i pokrastvaneto na bulgarite*, Zlaten Luv, Plovdiv 1998, Г.Ценов, *Крватова България и покръстването на българите*, Златен Лъв, Пловдив **1998**.
18. Strabo, Harward University Press, London **1999**.
19. Visigothic Code, Preface, <http://libro.uca.edu/vcode/visigoths.htm>.
20. P. Serafimov - G. Tomazzoli unpublished correspondence: Oct. **2008**.
21. Herodotus, *Het verslag van mijn onderzoek*, translated into Dutch by H. L. van Dolen, Sun, Nijmegen **1995**.
22. P. Berresford Ellis, *Celtic Empire*, Constable and Company Limited, London **1992**.
23. Diodorus Siculus, *Books IV-VIII*, Harward University Press, London **2000**.
24. Procopius, *History of the Wars, IV-5*, cited in G. Tsenov, *Krovatova Bulgaria i pokrastvaneto na bulgarite*, Zlaten Luv, Plovdiv **1998**.
25. A. Fol, *Ancient Thrace*, International Foundation Europa Antiqua, Sofia **2000**.
26. J. Šavli, M. Bor, I. Tomažič, *Veneti First Builders of European Community*, Editiones Veneti, Wien **1996**.
27. <http://www.triskelle.eu/history/firbolgs.php?index=060.015.010.050>.
28. M. J. Green, *Dictionary of Celtic Myth and Legend*, Thames and Hudson, London **1992**.
29. http://www.celtnet.org.uk/gods_m/meduna.html.
30. *Gaulish-French dictionary*, <http://www.melegnano.net/celti/vocfrancel00.htm>.
31. *Gaulish-Norwegian dictionary*, <http://home.ringnett.no/lars.finsen/keltgallisk.htm>.
32. *Gaulish-English dictionary*, <http://indoeuro.bizland.com/project/glossary/gaul.html>.
33. *Thraco-Cimmerian dictionary*, <http://www.google.nl/search?hl=nl&q=thraco-cimmerian&meta=>.
34. http://www.acnet.ge/catastrophes/III_2.htm.
35. Z. H. Rosser et al., Y chromosomal diversity in Europe is clinal and influenced primarily by geography, rather than language, *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 67: 1526-1543, December **2000**.
36. V. Vodopivec, *Korenine zahodnih in južnih slovanov*, Proceedings of the International Workshop, Traces of European past, Jutro, Ljubljana **2004**, pp. 203-223.
37. J. Škulj, *Genetske raziskave in njihov pomen za preučevanje Venetov*, Proceedings of the Conference Ancient settlers of central Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2003**, pp. 31-39.
38. J. Škulj, *Etruscan, Veneti and Slovenian - A genetic perspective*, Proceedings of the 3rd International Topical Conference, Ancient settlers of Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2005**, pp. 20-30.
39. M. Budja, *Who are the Europeans?* Proceedings of the 5th International Topical Conference, Origin of Europeans, Jutro, Ljubljana **2007**, pp. 7-26.

Abstract

The analysis conducted in this paper shows that despite far from the traditional Slavic lands the Gaulish tribes, the gods and the toponyms have names explainable by means of the Russian and other Slavic languages. The analysis goes further, covering temple constructions, burial rites, art, and even religious and every day-terms. The historical sources and the archaeological evidences show that Slavs not only inhabited the lands they occupy today, but had very large sphere of influence spreading through Middle and Western Europe till the coast of the Atlantic Ocean.