"Umbrian *pisher*"

By Alan J. Nussbaum, Cambridge

The interpretation of U. *pisher* as '*quiuis*' or '*qui uult*' is unsatisfactory because of phonological and/or morphological factors. Moreover, this interpretation makes little sense in the actual context. A fresh approach is required. The available comparative evidence suggests that the various-*yo*-presents formed on this root are recharacterizations of an earlier radical athematic paradigm. Furthermore, Oscan and Umbrian themselves preserve indirect continuations of this athematic present. It is therefore suggested that *pisher* ultimately reflects *pis* plus *her-er*, the medio-passive 3rd singular of the old root present, and that it means not '*quiuis*' or '*qui uult*', but rather '*quem oportet*'.

It is generally thought that Umbrian *pisher* comes either from *pis herit*[1] ("*qui uult*") or from *pis heris*[2] (cf. L. *quiuis*) and that the loss of the final syllable is to be attributed to the assumed enclisis of the verb form *-herit* or *-heris*. However, neither explanation will stand up under somewhat closer observation, for,

---

[1] V. Pisani, *Manuale storico della lingua latina*, Vol. IV: *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltro il Latino* (Turin: 1953), *ad loc. Tab. Ig.* VIb41, p. 170 ("forma con *ĭ* alternantesi con *ī*").

J. W. Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (Baltimore: 1959), § 4.

C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston: 1928), §§ 90.2, 216.

Neither Bottiglioni (*Manuale dei dialetti italici*, Bologna: 1954) nor Vetter (*Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg: 1953) offers any view of the history of the *-her* form. Von Planta (*Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, 2 vols., Strassbourg: 1892) is undecided. Derivation of *-her* from *-herĭs*, *-herĕs*, *-herĭt*, and *-herĕt* are all suggested as possibilities (§ 304. 2–3, II. 289), but it is also thought possible that athematic forms (*-her-s*, *-her-t*) may be involved (§ 292, II. 244 and § 306, II. 298–99). Unlike the assumption of the stems *her-ĭ-* (which, as we shall see, is directly contradicted by the evidence) or *her-ĕ-* (which is entirely gratuitous), the reconstruction *-her-s/-t* is, in and of itself, unimpeachable. It must, however, be rejected on semantic grounds. So also, I think, must the suggestion made in passing by Lejeune ("Vénus romaine et Vénus osque," *Hommages à Jean Bayet* [Collection Latomus LXX], ed. M. Renard et R. Schilling, Bruxelles-Berchem: 1964, p. 399) that the *-her* of *pisher* is originally an (athematic?) imperative second sg. (the idea being, I suppose, that *pisher comoltu* indirectly reflects a diction like "Let choose-anyone-at-all grind [it]"). As will be argued below, *pisher* is unlikely to be an indefinite of this sort in the first place, no matter how analyzed from a historical point of view. These questions will be discussed later on.

[2] H. Benediktsson, "The Vowel Syncope in Oscan-Umbrian," *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 19 (1960), pp. 157–295), note 5 (to § 9).

in the first place, they require one either to begin with unlikely pre-forms or to assume phonological developments which cannot have occurred. But the greatest obstacle to interpreting *pisher* as the outcome of *pis-herit or *-*heris* is the simple fact that neither reconstruction will yield a form which will mean what *pisher* is likely to mean in its actual context in the Iguvine Tables.

Beginning with the preform *pis-herit, which is even less likely than *pis heris, to say that *-*herit* is 'enclitic" to *pis* in *pisher* means nothing more than that the two-word sequence *pis herit at some stage comes to be treated as a unit for purposes of accentuation: thus *písherit. And although there has been some discussion of whether a short or long *i* is to be assumed for *pisherĭt, it is easy to show that neither will give the desired result.

If one insists upon *pisherĭt*, which is, however, almost surely an untenable assumption (see below), it must simply be stated that there is no Umbrian rule which will even syncopate the *ĭ*, not to speak of apocopate the entire final syllable. Rather, we know that in forms of this syllabic structure[3]) either there is no syncope at all in O-U (e.g. O. *kúmbened, αv(α)Ϝαχετ*) or else it is the second syllable that undergoes syncope (e.g. O. *prúffed* < *prŏfefed). In no case is there syncope in the final syllable.[4])

On the other hand, one may suppose that the preform of *pis-her* was *pis herĭt. Here again analogous sequences fail to establish the required elimination of -*ĭt*. From Oscan come the examples *sakruvit* (< **sakru-yo-*, realized perfectly regularly as /*sakruw-iyo-*/) and *fefacid* (/*fefakēd*/), and within Umbrian we may point to *mersei*/ *mersi* (/*meřsi(t)*/< *medossīt), itself interpreted as including an "enclitic" -*sīt*, but which, it will be noted, is not lacking its final syllable.[5])

___

[3]) I.e. ‿⌣⌣ (after final-syllable syncope—see Benediktsson §§ 82ff. and §§ 99–100) in which the penultimate syllable is open. There seems to be no clear explanation for *prúffed* with syncope vs. *kúmbened, αv(α)Ϝαχετ* without.

[4]) I.e. in a final syllable of the shape -(C)v̆T # (T = stop).

[5]) It should be pointed out, however, that it is quite possible that *mersei*/ *mersi* does not really continue an actual *medos-sit at all since it is far from clear (despite Benediktsson, *op.cit.*, § 159 and elsewhere) that -*ŏ*- in an interior *closed* syllable (before --*ssĭt*, that is) would be subject to the required syncope. It might be preferable to regard *mersei*/*mersi* as a mechanical "subjunctivization" of *mersest* (< **med(o)s-est*) if, indeed, it is permissible to assume in turn that this set phrase predates the advent of syncope. Simplest of all, perhaps, would be the view that both *mersest* (VIIb55) / *mers est* (VIb31) and *mersei* (VIa28) / *mersi* (VIa38, 48) represent relatively recent juxtapositions of *est* and *sit* respectively with *mers* (< **med(o)s* in one way or

We should now take up the question of whether *her-ī- or *her-ĭ-
is to be assumed for the Umbrian present stem, for this question
becomes relevant as we move on to examine the assumption of
*pis-herĭs as the preform of *pisher*. A brief review of the evidence
should be sufficient to show that there really is no alternative to
proceeding on the assumption that, especially as far as Umbrian
itself is concerned, the present stem is *her-ī- (< *her-iyo-) and
not *her-ĭ- (< *her-yo-).[6] Providing clear evidence of *her-ī- are
the perfect forms (derived from the present stem) *heritu, hereitu,
eretu* (reflecting /her-ī-to-/, and *herifi* (/herī-f-ēr/), as well as *heris
... heris, heri ... heri*, etc. (/herīs/ itself second person singular)
if this is a present indicative, as is assumed almost universally.[7]
Also suggesting a reconstruction *her-iyo- (and thus *her-ī-) are
the perfect subjunctive (also containing the stem formant of the
present) *heriiei* (/heriyēr/), and, in Oscan, the present subjunctive
heriiad (/heriyād/). In face of these indications of a present stem
*her-ī-, there is no unambiguous evidence for *her-ĭ- anywhere in
Italic. U. third singular indicative *heri* (IV 26) is indeterminate

---

another). For a discussion of the various problems connected with the relative
chronology of syncope and Umbrian -*d*- > -*ř*- in *meřs, mersto*, etc. see Bene-
diktsson, *op.cit.*, index *sub vv.* for references.

Benediktsson follows Vetter (*op.cit.*, 244) and others in concluding, on
very slender grounds, that syncope *follows* the Umbrian -*d*- > -*ř*- treatment,
at least in some formations. But for a *secondary* (*pace* Benediktsson, *op.cit.*,
§§ 54, 57) generalization of the stem form *meř*- to all Umbrian formations
made on this root, however, might one suggest that for *mersest* (perhaps as
opposed to *mers est* and certainly as opposed to *meřs est*) one should assume
not *med(o)s-est, but rather simply *med-est (> meř-est) with the (neuter)
root noun *mĕd/mĕd-ós reflected on the one hand by Oscan *med-diks* (*meddíss*)
and on the other (in recharacterized form) by Greek μῆδος, Arm. *mit*? (On
the semantics, Benveniste, *Vocabulaire* II, 123ff.)

[6]) I am encouraged to find that this is also the view of Lejeune (*op.cit.*,
p. 397, note 67). Von Planta (§ 295, II. 250) is a veritable grab-bag of
unnecessary and unmotivated assumptions, complete with five different
O-U present stems (*her-ī-, her-ĭ-, her-ē-, her-e/o-, her-*), from which more recent
commentators have generally retained *her-ī- beside *her-ĭ- (citations in
notes 1 and 2 above). The assumption that *her-ĭ- is to be assumed for Italic
always rests upon just those forms from which nothing can legitimately be
concluded (see below).

[7]) But see von Planta § 306, II. 298–99. That *herifi* is a perfect has, of
course, been questioned. So Olzscha, "Das *f*-Perfektum im Oskisch-Umbri-
schen," *Glotta* 41 (1963), 290ff.; cf., however, Gusmani, "Umbrisch *pihafi* und
Verwandtes," *Idg. Forschungen* 71 (1966), 64ff. But whatever the inter-
pretation of the -*fi* of such forms, it would seem all but certain that a *heri*-
identifiable with the present stem is to be assumed in any case.

244   Alan J. Nussbaum

(/herĭt/ or /herĭt/), as are *heries, heriest*, etc.[8]) On *herter* (which does *not* reflect *heriter*) see below. In Oscan the often-cited *h]errins* at Cippus Abellanus 54 is at least as likely to be read *f]errins*[9]) (regularly < *fer-(e)-sē-*), and *herest* can carry no great weight because it occurs in the Tabula Bantina and the one outstanding feature of the Bantine dialect is its aberrant treatment of clusters of the type *C(i)y-.[10]) On the Latin side the Ennian hapax *horĭtur* (on which more later) must surely be compared first and foremost to classical *orĭtur* and *morĭtur* for which *orī-* and *morī-* are also attested, especially in the more archaic texts (*morīmur* in Ennius, *morīri* in Plautus, *orīri* in later texts as well), and thus can scarcely be adduced

---

[8]) The orthographical rule -*ii-* = -*iy-*, but -*i-* = -*y-* (Buck, *op.cit.*, § 31a; Poultney, *op.cit.*, § 2.h) is only half right. One may indeed assume that -*ii-* spells -*iy-* on the grounds of consistent spellings such as *triia* (9×) "tria", *Atiieriur* (17×), etc. But it is simply a *non sequitur* to conclude, with Buck, that "Since *ii* is so evidently the normal spelling in the case of the vowel *i*, there is the strongest presumption that, where the spelling in the native alphabets is simply *i*, this must represent something different, namely the consonantal *i*." For there is every reason to believe that while -*ii-* almost always (O. *fakiiad*—Vetter no. 88A—is surely just dittography) spells -*iy-*, -*i-* can spell both -*y-* and -*i(y)-*; i.e. the evidence suggests that, in cases of -*i-* alternating with -*ii-* or -*i-* in place of expected -*ii-*, we may be dealing merely with the omission of the *y*-glide (an omission which is almost always made in the inscriptions written in the Latin alphabet) rather than with inexplicable -*y-*. Buck himself gives several examples of such instances (O. *dekkviarim*—Vetter no. 8, U. *tekvias*—*Tab. Ig.* IIb 1, O. *iúviass*—Vetter no. 86—beside *iúviia*—Vetter no. 8, O. *viú*—Vetter no. 1B—, and U. *via*, *Tab. Ig.* III 11. The preceding -*v-* is not a factor to judge from O. *siviiú*—Vetter no. 162). Scarcely anyone, moreover, will belive that O. *biass* (Vetter no. 3) is monosyllabic. Nor is nom. sg. fem. *magiú* (Vetter no. 162) likely to reflect anything other than /*magiyā*/ beside the masc. dat. sg. *maiiúí* (/*mayyoi*/ < *magyŏi*), whatever the origin of the doublets *mag-yo-* vs. *mag-iyo-*. Cf. also *santia* (Vetter no. 122) = Ξανθίας. Thus *heries* (and cf. *purtuvies* beside *purtuvitu*—/*por-duwitō*/ -) can hardly be said to argue for /*heryes*/ or /*heriyes*/ in and of itself.

[9]) E.g. Vetter, *op.cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 12. The insistence that "*her-* bedeutet nur 'wollen', nicht 'nehmen', 'bekommen'," is a bit too dogmatic, however.

   Lejeune too considers [*f]errins* "plus plausible" than [*h]errins* (*op.cit.*, 398, note 69. See also note 76).

[10]) See Buck, *op.cit.*, § 100.3.c with note. As Buck points out, an instance of -*riyā-* > -*ryā-* > -*rā-* is clearly presented by Bantine *petiropert/petirupert* (Vetter no. 2, lines 14, 15) "quater". The anaptyctic -*i-* shows that the preform must have been *petriyā* (< *kwetriyā-*), which wolud have become *petiriyā-* in most Oscan locales (perhaps not in Capua—see Buck, *op.cit.*, § 81); cf. *púterei* and *pútúrús* from *potrei*, *potrōs*. But in Bantia this *petiriyā* developed further to *petiryā* and finally /*petirā/-*.

as evidence of a stem **hor-ĭ-* in Italic. In short, the unambiguous evidence suggests **her-ī*, and therefore one may assume **her-ĭ-* 1) only on the basis of evidence which is also consistent with the assumption of **her-ī-* (e.g. *heries*) and 2) only on the condition that **her-ĭ-* be present as well in any case, most particularly in the second singular itself, as *heris* (many occurrences) proves. The reconstruction **pisherĭs*, against which no purely phonological objections can be raised, is thus excluded because it involves an implausible preform. Finally, **pisherīs* may be dismissed on the grounds that it will not yield *pisher*.

Pisher, then cannot have come from **pis-herit/-heris*. But neither would we expect it to have, for **pis-herit/-heris* would have to mean "who(ever) wishes, wants"/"who(mever) you want", as indeed Umbrian *pisi heriest* (VII a 52) does mean:

> *Hondra furo sehemeniar hatuto totar pisi heriest*
> Infra forum sementiuom capiunto ciuitatis quisquis uolet

The context here is the conclusion of the long ritual described in VI–VII a. The *prinuatos* and the holder of the *perca arsmatia* apparently chase heifers into the town and any citizen can participate in the ritual by catching one. The three caught first are then sacrificed. The context of *pisher*, however, is entirely different. It occurs at VI b 41 in a series of instructions given in the greatest detail for a ritual which is being performed by a single officiant (presumably the *adfertor*)—this part of the ritual is *not* public:

> *anderuomu sersitu arnipo comatir pesnis fust. serse*
> *anderuomu* sedeto donicum commolitis precatus erit. Sedens
> *pisher comoltu. serse comatir persnimu. purdito fust*
> *pisher* commolito. Sedens commolitis precator. porrectum erit

Is it really credible that in the midst of all these specific and detailed indications of what the offerant is to do the instructions would direct either "anyone who feels like it" or "anyone you like" to do the prescribed crushing? Not even on the face of it. But what really shows that *pisher* does not mean "whoever wants to"/"whomever you want" is the fact that the direction translated *commolito* is given eight other times and invariably it is simply one in a series of instructions directed toward the one single performer of the ritual: e.g.

I a 33–34:

> *api suruf purti(t)ius, enuk hapinaru erus titu. zeřef kumultu. zeřef*
> *kumates pesnimu*

246   Alan J. Nussbaum

II a 9:

ape purtiius, suřu erus tetu. enu kumaltu. kumate pesnimu.
II a 40–41:
vinu pune tertu. struhçlas fiklas sufafias kumaltu
IV 27–28:
inumk erus taçez tertu. inumek kumaltu ařkani kanetu
VI b 16–17:
*ape eam purdinsust proseseto. erus ditu. eno scalseto. uestisiar erus
conegos dirstu. eno mefa uestisia sopa purome efurfatu. subra
spahmu. eno serse comoltu. comatir persnimu*

Certainly it is clear that *kumaltu kumates pesnimu* is in the nature
of a formula and that the same person who is doing all the other
things is also doing the crushing. It therefore seems unreasonable
to think that this is not the case where *pisher* is directed to do so.
Consequently *pisher* is much more reasonably taken not as *quilibet*
or *quiuis*, "anyone at all", but rather as *quem oportet*, "he who is
appropriate": i.e. *pisher* is equivalent to *pis herter*. In support of
this suggestion, furthermore, we may quote, as an example of an
exactly parallel reference to a participant in the ritual as "he who
is appropriate" II a 40, *esuf pusme herter erus kuveitu teřtu*, "Let
him bring (*kuveitu*) the *erus* himself (*esuf*) to him who is appro-
priate (*pusme herter*) and give it (to him)," on the assumption that
"*X herter*" simply means " X is appropriate," a perfectly reasonable
thing for the medio-passive of *her-* "want, choose" to mean. One
may compare further *emantur herte⟨r⟩*, "it is appropriate (that)
they be accepted" (V a 8, 10).

As to the actual pre-form, then, we require a reconstruction
which will, if at all possible, account for *-her* and *-herter* simultane-
ously, since it now seems likely that they are isofunctional. Con-
sequently, it becomes less probable than ever that *herter* reflects a
-yo- formation at all, for even if one could somehow ignore the
serious difficulties involved in justifying *herter* rather than **heriter*
as the third singular medio-passive of **her-iyo-*, there is simply no
way to derive *-her* from a similar form. Clearly more information
is required.

The comparative evidence relevant to the problem is not extensive
and is well-known. Within Italic, the standard comparison is Latin
horior and family (a small one). These forms will be discussed below.
Elsewhere, Vedic *háryati* and Greek χαίρω figure in the familiar
equations. The comparison between the O-U verb and its Vedic

counterpart is actually a better one than one would gather from
the glosses of *háryati* to be found in the etymological dictionaries.[11])
A survey of the occurrences in the RV reveals that the verb has a
certain semantic range:

índra kratuvídaṃ sutáṃ sómaṃ harya . . . (3, 40, 2)

Indra! Nimm den ausgepreßten Soma, der (guten) Rat schafft[12])

idáṃ sú me maruto haryatā váco . . . (5, 54, 15)

Nehmet diese Rede von mir doch ja gut auf, ihr Marut . . .

. . . *yádi tán ná iva haryatha* . . . (1, 161, 8)

. . . wenn ihr das nicht recht möget . . .

. . . *tá juṣāṇó haryati jātávedāḥ* (4, 58, 8)

Gern begehrt Jatavedas nach ihnen.

. . . *asmákaṃ te madhumattamāni imá bhuvant sávanā téṣu harya*

(10, 112, 7)

Unsere Trankopfer hier sollen dir die süßesten sein; an diesen
erfreue dich!

The verb *can* mean "rejoices (in)", but there are only two passages
in RV where this translation seems called for and both are in the
10th Book (one passage is above, the other is 10, 70, 1). This leads
one to suspect that intransitive "rejoices" is an independent seman-
tic development of Greek and Sanskrit. However this may be, it
seems worthwhile to note that in the earlier books the range of
meanings is "takes, receives, chooses, likes, desires," a nearly
perfect match for O-U *herio-* (considering the comparatively
limited number of texts) which, basically, means "wants" but also
something very close to "chooses, takes."[13])

Formally, the pattern χαίρω/*horior* < *ghṛ-yo-* vs. *her-iyo-*/*háryati*
< *gher-yo-* is most simply interpreted as implying the renewal
by *-yo-* of a single paradigm with root apophony—that is to say an
athematic paradigm with suffix zero.

---

[11]) E.g. Ernout-Meillet[4]; "il prend plaisir *à*"; Walde-Hofmann: "findet
Gefallen, begehrt"; Frisk: "Gefallen finden, sich ergötzen, sich freuen, gern
haben"; Pokorny: "findet Gefallen, begehrt".

[12]) Geldner's translations.

[13]) Note O. *heriiad* (Vetter no. 4). The traditional translation was "*capiat*"
(Buck, *op.cit.*, pp. 246, 317; von Planta, *op.cit.*, ad loc., II 517, II 685 (but
under the impression that *úlam* means "*ollam*"), but more recently (first
Vetter, apparently) one finds "*uelit*". Something in between would do quite
nicely—e.g. a translation of *nep úlam sifei heriiad* as "let him not lay claim
to it" (i.e. the (good)will—*velliam*—of the *Nouellōs*). It is thus unnecessary
to assume two separate but homonymous roots *gher* underlying U. *heris*,
heries, etc. on the one hand and O. *heriiad* on the other, as is done by Pokorny,
IEW (440, 442), in which he is followed by Lejeune (*op.cit.*, 398).

248   Alan J. Nussbaum

In Vedic and later, *har-* forms the present *har-ya-* only.[14]) This suggests that the root athematic paradigm inferable from **gher-yo-* vs. **ghr̥-yo-* was itself already inherited as a present, for the assumption of such an inherited root present (**ghérti/ghrénti*[15])) would explain simultaneously the apophonic variation between **gher-yo-* and **ghr̥-yo-* and the disappearance of the inferable athematic paradigm in Vedic. One could reasonably suppose that it was simply replaced by its renewed successor. As parallels for such renewal within Vedic itself one may point to *kṣéti* vs. *kṣiyáti*, *dắti* vs. *dyáti*, and *trā́sva* vs. *trā́yate* (cf. also Av. *ϑrāyeiti*).

The Greek situation will straightforwardly admit of the same assumed starting point. The Homeric forms are a well-attested present stem in χαιρο/ε-, a future stem χαιρησο/ε- (1 form), a thematic reduplicated aorist in κεχαρο/ε- (6 forms), perfect κεχαρη-

---

[14]) W. D. Whitney, *The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language* (Leipzig: 1885), p. 203.

[15]) It is to be doubted that the root present in question has anything to do with *hárati* and the hapax *hármi* (RV 1, 61, 1). In the first place, there are certain semantic considerations in the way. But even more serious is the suspicious history of this verb in Sanskrit (see Whitney, *op.cit.*, *sub hr̥*). It arises, as it were, *ex nihilo* with only three finite forms (all presents) in all the early books of the RV (*harante* 7, 104, 9; *hara* 8, 33, 19; causative—but with root shape *har·*—*harayanta* 4, 37, 2). The evidently athematic *harmi* and one more thematic form (imv. *hara*) appear in Book 1 (1, 61, 1 and 1, 162, 12 respectively). The Tenth Book has nine forms of *hr̥* (vs. five only for the rest of RV put together), including four more thematic present forms (10, 16, 10; 10, 85, 37; 10, 162, 4; 10, 161, 2), a future form *hr̥ṣyati* (10, 86, 7) and four *s*- aorist forms—of no great antiquity in any case: see J. Narten, *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda* (Wiesbaden: 1964), pp. 289–90—(*ahārṣam* 3 ×: 10, 161, 3; 10, 161, 5; 10, 173, 1; *ahr̥ṣata* 10, 155, 5). In AV are added more *s*-aorist forms (*ahār*, *ahārṣīt*), a perfect (*jahāra*) and the passive *hriyáte*. The Brahmanas attest still more *s*-aorist forms as well as a root aorist ((*a*)*hr̥thās*, which I really cannot believe has much chance of being very old, *pace* Narten, *loc.cit.*, and see further down in this note), an *-iṣya-* future, and a causative in *hāraya-*. Sutric is the hapax third class present *jiharti*. Finally, in Classical Skt., the verb is very common and has a fully elaborated paradigm. In all of this it is striking that, by and large, the forms acquired by *hr̥* are parallel to those of *bhr̥*, which is a virtual synonym: *hárati/bhárati*, *harmi/bhárti*, *jiharti/bibharti*, *ahārṣam/abhārṣam*, *ahr̥thās/bhr̥tám* (Br.), and—perhaps most significantly—*jahāra/jabhāra*; cf. the remarks of E. P. Hamp in *Journal of I-E Studies* Vol. I, no. 3 (1973) (Poultney Festschrift), p. 321.

Add to this the fact that *hr̥* really has no etymology (the connection with L. *hortus*, *cohors*, Gr. χόρτος, etc. has nothing to recommend it) and the suggestion is clear that *hr̥* is best taken as an Indic creation whose motivation remains somewhat obscure.

(1 form) future perfect κεχαρησο/ε- (2 forms), a sigmatic aorist (1 form) χήρατο (< χαρ-σ-), and a well-attested aorist "passive" (ἐ)χαρη-. The entire system is thus built on an invariant χαρ- which is secondary in the sigmatic aorist χήρατο, where a form of real antiquity would, of course, have e-grade and result in *χείρατο. It is also secondary in the thematic reduplicated aorist κεχαρο/ε- where *κεχρο/ε- is expected (cf., e.g., ἔπεφνον) and in all the forms in -η- (future, future perfect, perfect, aorist "passive") where *χρη- is theoretically called for. The required χαρ- < *ghr̥- is therefore perfectly reasonably taken as having first arisen in the present formation *ghr̥-yo- itself and ultimately, therefore, in the root-present paradigm inferable from *hárya-* and *herio-* vs. χαίρω and *horitur*—i.e. the paradigm which *gh(e)r-yo- replaced.

In short, then, the comparative evidence inclines one to think that the root *gher- formed, in Indo-European, an athematic root present which was renewed in Italic, Greek, and Indic by -yo-. Thus *ghérti/ghrénti ⇒ *gher-yo- or *ghr̥-yo-.

Turning to the question of *gher in Italic itself, one finds that forms of *gher- run remarkably parallel to forms of *wel-. On the Latin side, *wel- fills the central functions attaching to a verb of wishing, willing, choosing and forms of *gher- are found in more marginal functions. In O-U, however, the reverse seems to be the case so that there is an entire series of forms in which *wel- and *her- in Latin correspond to *her- and *wel- respectively in O-U. In the verbal system, the most obvious case is *uult = herit* (e.g. svae pis heri⟨t⟩ = si quis uult). But in secondary function, the verb meaning to "wish for, want" in Italic apparently could mean "instruct, direct, command". Nor is it difficult to see why this should be so (cf. Engl. "The boss wants you—i.e. directs you— to come to his office"). In any case an exact parallel (and involving one of these very roots) in provided by OCS *veljǫ*, glossed both "will" and "befehle". In this light we may take *eh-veltu* at Tab. Ig. VIa2 in the sense best suited to the context:[16] *eso tremnu serse*

---

[16] As is sometimes done in any case, purely on grounds of sense: Buck, *ad loc.*, p. 262; Ernout, *Le dialecte ombrien* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1961), *ad loc.*, p. 31. The translations "*rogato*" (Pisani *ad loc.*; G. Devoto, *Tabulae Iguvinae* (Rome: 1940), *ad loc.*) and "*interrogato*" (Bottiglioni, Vetter) are the result of the purely etymological reasoning made explicit by Poultney, *ad loc.*, p. 231, col. 2. Poultney's "shall call out" (*loc.cit.*, p. 230) does not actually translate the verb at all, of course.

Ehvelklu is a derivative of this verb with the suffix of instrument *-tlo- and means perhaps not so much "expression of opinion" (Poultney, *s.v.*),

250   Alan J. Nussbaum

arsferture ehueltu. Thus, "Sitting in the **tremnum* let him instruct
the *adfertor*." The exact wording of the instructions he is to give
follows. The semantics of *horitur* (and its frequentative *hortatur*
which replaces it) now present no problem: **ghṛ-yo-* "wish for,
want, choose",[17]) survives in Latin only in its secondary function,
"direct, instruct, command," which is what the hapax *horitur*
clearly means at Enn. *Ann.* 432: . . . *prandere iubet horiturque*.

The case of the isolated and probably archaic noun *heriēs* is
instructive in several respects. [4]Ernout - Meillet[18]) present the best
discussion of this word which is apparently attested in only three
passages. It would be worthwhile to reproduce this short E-M
article almost in its entirety:

"**heriēs*, -ēī f.?: volonté. Figure dans une sorte de litanie que nous a trans-
mise Aulu-Gelle 13, 23, 2, *Luam Saturni, Salaciam Neptuni, Horam Quirini,*
†*Virites Quirini, Maiam Volcani, Heriem Iunonis, Moles Martis Nerienem-
que Martis*, où *Heriem Iunonis* semble équivaloir à *numen Iunonis*. A rappro-
cher peut-etre la fin de vers d'Ennius A. 104, *Nerienem Mavortis et Herem*
(*Herem* coni. Meursius: *herclem, erdem* codd.), où il faut sans doute lire *heriem*
dissyllabique avec première syllable longue 'par position' (du reste, toute la
prosodie de ce passage est très troublé; cf. les réflexions d'Aulu-Gelle sur la
scansion de Nerienem). Cf. aussi la glose de P.F. 89, 6, *herem Marteam antiqui*

---

but "expression of authority", since in the context (Vb 23) the vote of the
members is in effect a collective *imprimatur*. But naturally the two come
to very much the same thing. *Veltu* (IV 21) is less clear. Does it mean "choose"
or something like "order, requisition"?

[17]) The explanation offered by Ernout-Meillet[4] (p. 299) is that *horitur*
is an *o*-grade causative in *-yo-* (rather than the more normal **-eyo-* of *monere*,
etc.), which means "order, urge" by way of "cause (X) to wish (to do some-
thing)". The trouble with this, of course, is that there is no such thing as a
Latin causative in *-yo-*. The category was invented to account for *sōpīre*,
"put to sleep". But *sopire* is not a causative. It is simply a denominative to
the quasi-agential root noun **swŏp-s/swep-ós* (for the lengthened grade, cf.,
e.g., the type Gr. κλώψ; for **swep-*, cf. ON *svefn* < **swep-no-*, for **swop-*,
Arm. *kʿun* < **swop-no-*) with the meaning "anaesthetizer"—i.e. sleep
conceived of as an animate active force, a concept continued in Latin by
sopor, probably a renewal of this root noun. Thus the denominative verb
*swŏp-iyo- "to have the effect of **swŏps*" has a superficially "causative"
function. See Watkins, *Indo-European Studies* (Special Report to the National
Science Roundation, Report HARV-LING-01-72), pp. 62–79, especially on
IE **sup-ṛ*, "dream" (a probable *r/n* stem reflected by Gr. ὕπαρ, Hitt. *šuppar-
iya-*), which is opposed to 1) derivatives for "sleep" as inactive—i.e. as a
state: **swo/ep-no-*, **sup-n-o-* (my segmentation), and 2) the quasi-agential
root noun **swŏps* which accounts for the force of *sopire*. Cf. also Watkin's
references to H. Frisk, *Eranos* 48 (1950), 131–35; E. Hamp, *Glotta* 48 (1970),
143; and J. Schindler, *Die Sprache* 12 (1966).
[18]) p. 292.

accepta hereditate colebant, quae a nomine appellatur heredum, ut esse una ex Martis comitibus putabatur, où *herem Marteam* est comparable à *Heriem Iunonis* et identique à l'expression rétablie par conjecture dans le fragment d'Ennius et où, par conséquent, il faut peut-etre lire *her⟨i⟩em*."

There are several points to be made about *heriēs*. In the first place, it clearly belongs to the deverbative series *specio: speciēs, facio: faciēs*. But the vocalism of *heriēs* agrees not with *horitur* but with O-U *herio-*. In addition (and this is the only case in which any form of **gher* or **wel* appears both in Latin and in O-U) *heriēs* is matched by Oscan *heria*. These facts taken together suggest that *heriēs* is probably a term of dialectal origin[19]) in which *-ia* was replaced by the (specifically Latin) *-iēs* which came to be favored over *-ia* in both denominative and deverbative abstracts. This view in turn suggests an interpretation for Oscan *heria* itself. The form occurs in the curse of Vibia:

keri arent[ikai ma]nafum pai puipui heriam suvam legin[um
Cereri Ultrici mandavi quae cuicumque heriem suam legionem
suvam afl]akad[20])
suam immittat

Many editors have translated heriam *"uim"*,[21]) and this is probably basically right. But if we are right in interpreting L. *heriēs* as an actual loanword from an O-U dialect, then it becomes thinkable that *heriam* means specifically the *numen* or divine power of the goddess called upon in this curse: in other words the *heriēs*. Thus there is no Latin **uelies* which we might expect as the correspondent of O-U *heria*. Oscan *vellia*, "(good) will, beneficence",[22]) does not seem to have an exact parallel in Latin at all.[23])

But the series continues with Latin *uoluntas*, a unique formation apparently derived from the athematic present participle of *uolo*. That is, it reflects **wel-ont-ā-*.[24]) The **-ont-* form of the participial

---

[19]) As suggested, anyway, by Ernout-Meillet[4], *s.v.* and Pisani *ad loc.*, p. 88.

[20]) The usual restoration (Buck, Pisani, Bottiglioni editions), based upon *leginum aflukat* and *aflakus* in same inscription.

[21]) E.g. Buck, Pisani, Bottiglioni (all *ad loc.*). Vetter, p. 41, proposes the curious translation "ihre Wahl" or "ihre Kerntruppe" adducing the English expression "the pick (of)". This is surely a little forced.

[22]) Vetter no. 4, and see p. 33.

[23]) Volscian *uelestrom* (Vetter no. 222), which probably also belongs here by root etymology, is of unclear formation and only partially claer meaning.

[24]) It is entirely unnecessary to assume **-ont-tā-* and, in any case, the question is only academic. The assumption of **uelontĭ-tāt-* is supported by nothing. See Lejeune, *op.cit.*, 397, note 66.

252   Alan J. Nussbaum

suffix is sufficient to demonstrate the archaic character of the
formation. The Oscan correspondent, as it happens, furnishes us
with all the information which is really necessary for the solution
of our original problem—the analysis of *-her/-herter*. Oscan has
(several times)[25] *Herentas* (a divinized abstract identified with
Venus), which cannot reflect **her-(i)yo-* at all. Instaed it must go
back to **her-ṇt-ā-*, a derivative of the participle of an *athematic*
verbal paradigm parallel to **wel-ont-ā-* in Latin. Indirect confir-
mation comes from Umbrian, for *herinties* (abl. pl.) in Umbrian[26])
can reflect neither **her-ie-nt-* nor **her-ṇt-*. Its origin is, however,
quite obvious. *Herent-* was remade to *herint-* probably within the
history of Umbrian, and the model for its remaking is not hard to
find—

$$\text{-}āt\text{: -}ant\text{-} \ = \ \text{-}ĕt\text{: -}ent\text{-} \ = \ \text{-}ĭt\text{: X} \ = \ \text{-}int\text{-.}$$

The fact that this refashioning took place means that *herint-*
replaced a more anomalous participle and that surely must have
been **her-ṇt-*.[27]) In short we now have direct evidence within Italic
of the athematic paradigm suggested by the comparative evidence.

We are now in a position to indicate a more satisfactory inter-
pretation of *pisher*. Given 1) that the form should be mediopassive
since it seems to be isofunctional with *herter*, but 2) that the *-yo-*
formation of *heris, heriest*, etc. is patently not involved and 3) that

---

[25]) Paelignian *herentas* (Vetter no. 213), Herculanean gen. *herentateis*,
dat. *herentatei* (Vetter no. 107), and (from the territory of the *Frentani*) a
gen. *herettates* (Vetter no. 172) —presumably = *herentates*—which is further
noteworthy as the only example of a genitive in *-es* for *-eis* in a consonant
stem (see Vetter, *ad loc.*, for references and cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, 395, note 56).

[26]) Vetter no. 229. *herinties* occurs on side A, *herintie* on side B, which
would seem to exclude the possibility of a mistake for *herent-*, especially
since *hurtentius* "Hortentii" occurs in the same inscription (side B).

[27]) Similarly some dialect(s) of Oscan must have remade *herent-* to a
synchronically better motivated form (with respect to the productive pre-
sent stem *herio-*), if the Hesychian gloss Ἐριέντης· ἐπώνυμον Ἀφροδίτης (pointed
out and evaluated by Lejeune, *op. cit.*, 397) is indeed ultimately Oscan and
can be thought to represent **herient-*. We see then that the two (doubtless
independent) refections of an anomalous *herent-* (itself < **her-ṇt-*) proceeded
along slightly different lines. In Oscan the model was evidently *-ant* (3 pl.):
-ant- (ptcpl.) = *-ient* (3 pl.—cf. *fiie⟨n⟩t* "*fiunt*"): X (ptcpl.) = *-ient-*. In the
case of Doric εντες (for expected οντες) the participle has been (re)made on
the model of the 3 pl. εντι in an exactly parallel manner. In the Umbrian
case, on the other hand, it is the predominant *-i-* vocalism of the present
paradigm (and in particular of the 3 sg., the "basic" member of that para-
digm) that served as the unmarked and therefore generalizable form of the
present stem (thus *-āt: -ant-* = *-it: -int-* as above).

we must count on the distinctly probable presence of an athematic formation, we should investigate the possibility that *-her* reflects an athematic mediopassive formation. As it happens we know that the ending of the third sg. mediopassive of athematic root presents in (O?)-U was *-er*. This can be concluded from U. *i-er*.[28]) Consequently we may assume that the third sg. medio-passive of athematic *her-ti* is to be reconstructed *her-er*. And it is this form which is probably reflected in *pisher*. So *pisherer* > *pishrer* (by the same rule of regular syncope that produces, e.g., O. *uincter* from *winketer*), and then *pishrer* > *pisher* with dissimilatory loss of the first *-r-*. Alternatively (and somewhat more probably) one might think of a rule analogous to the one which produced a form like O.Ir. conjunct passive (*do*)·*berr* (Thurneysen §§ 577–78) beside (reestablished) ·*berar* from *beror*,[29]) thus admitting a special treatment of the unstressed vowel of the final syllable in the unusual environment /r-r ‡. The possibility of a simple haplology of *pisherer* yielding *pisher* directly also comes to mind.

In this view, then, *herter* itself is the renewal of *herer*, showing the replacement of *-er* by *-ter*, while *-herer* escaped this morphological reformation either by virtue of isolated status, since it occurred only in the fixed expression *pisherer*, or because *pisherer* had perhaps already been reduced to *pisher*, thus losing all synchronic relation to *herer*, by the time *herer* was remade to *herter*.

The Volscian *Tabula Veliterna*: a new Interpretation

By Ernst Pulgram, Ann Arbor

Among the non-Latin tribes of central Italy, the Volscians(*Volsci*) were Rome's closest neighbors, living in southern Latium and the mountains adjacent to it, on both sides of the river Liri (*Liris*). Being in such proximity, they came early into contact and conflict with the Romans: the conquest of Corioli by C. Marcius, surnamed Coriolanus (whose heroic and moving story is told by Livy 2.40,

---

[28]) See Olzscha, *Glotta* 41 (1963), 117 and 293; Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Band III: *Formenlehre* (Heidelberg: 1969), § 170. The zero grade of U. *ier* vs. generalized full grade of Pael. *eite*, U. *etu*, etc. is a remarkable archaism.

[29]) This parallel was suggested to me by Calvert Watkins.