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 (re-established) ·*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.

and by Shakespeare), goes back to 491 B.C. But it took the Romans until 338 to subdue this fierce nation.

Very little is known of the Volscian dialect, the evidence consisting of the one inscription under discussion here, and possibly one other brief inscription which is by some assignated to the Marsians (whose territory lay to the north and east of the Volscians'). The reason for this scarcity of texts is no doubt the illiteracy of the Volscians prior to contact with the Romans (from whom they acquired the Latin alphabet). Thereafter, however, the Volscians wrote Latin rather than their native idiom, especially since their use of Latin in speech also must have been fostered by the establishment of numerous Roman colonies in their land at an early date, beginning in 503: Cora, Pometia, Signia, Velitrae, Norba, Antium, Circeii, Satricum, Setia, Tarracina, Fregellae, Interamna Lirinas, Sora—a catalogue evoking Rome's early history and conquests. It is certain, however, that the Volscians, like other tribes in the Abruzzi, like the Oscans and Umbrians, spoke a language of the Italic type.[1])

The inscription I shall cite comes from *Velitrae*, modern Velletri, only 40 km southeast of Rome, at the southern end of the Alban Hills, slightly east of the Via Appia. It is on a bronze tablet measuring 23 by 3,5 cm, written in four long lines, in an archaic form of the Latin alphabet, hence dated as of the early 3rd century. It can easily be deciphered, but the interpretation has proved difficult and produced a variety of translations.[2])

I shall now cite the original text, and below it, line by line, three recent translations into Latin: by Vetter 1953, 156, Bottiglioni 1954, 338, and Pisani 1964, 123. These will be followed by an English translation of my own, and a commentary on the words and phrases where my interpretation differs materially from that of earlier students.[3]) (No attempt will be made, beyond some details

---

[1]) The term 'Italic' occurs unfortunately in two senses: from the Indo-Europeanist's point of view it designates the Italic (as opposed to Keltic, Hellenic, Germanic etc.) type of Indo-European languages, including Latin, whereas from the Italicist's or Latinist's point of view it refers to various idioms of Italy (especially Oscan, Umbrian, and less-known dialects of central Italy) other than Latin. Volscian, then, is 'Italic' under both meanings.

[2]) For a list of proposed translations, all of which have been called provisional, see Bottiglioni 1954, 338. For the older bibliography see von Planta 1897, II. 651–2.

[3]) It has been my uncomfortable experience that occasionally a modern Latin translation, by observing the word order of the original and by em-

necessary to explain my views, to render an account of Volscian grammar. The handbooks I cited, also Buck 1904, must be consulted for that.)

deue : declune : statom : sepis : atahus : pis : uelestrom

Ve: Divae *Declonae statutum. Siquis attigerit, qui arbitrarium

Bo: diuae Declunae *statum siquis attigerit quis Veliternorum

Pi: Divae Declonae statutum. Siquis imprudens pius voluntarium

façia :[4]) esaristrom : se : bim : asif : uesclis : uinu : arpatitu

Ve: faciat, piaculum sit: bovem, asses (cum) vasculis, vino conferto.

Bo: faciat sacrificium. Si bouem aras uasculis uino aspergito

Pi: faciat sacrificium, si bovem assibus vasculis vino adsperso,

sepis : toticu : couehriu : sepu : ferom : pihom : estu

Ve: Siquis publico conventu sciente, asportare pium esto.

Bo: siquis, publica curia sciente, ferre, pium esto

Pi: siquis publica curia sciente, ferre pium esto.

ec : se : cosuties : ma : ca : tafanies : medix : sistiatiens

Ve: Eg(natius) Cossutius Se. (f.), Ma(raeus) Tafanius C. (f.) meddices statuerunt.

Bo: Ec. Se. (f.) Cossutius, Ma. Ca. (f.) Tafanius *meddices statuerunt.

Pi: Ec. Se. f. Cossutius, Ma. Ca. f. Tafanius meddices statuerunt.

Pu: 'A decree concerning the goddess Declona. If anyone will have laid hands on [something, whatever was in the container or behind the door to which the bronze plate itself was attached], anyone of the inhabitants of Velitrae, let him make an expiatory sacrifice — a pig, an ox—let him sprinkle (them) with wine out of *asif* jars. If anyone (will have done it), there shall be, with the knowledge

---

ploying available cognate words, does not clarify what is obscure in the original. One may of course assert that a translation need not, indeed cannot, be clearer than the original; but since, on the other hand, one must assume that the ancient native speaker made sense out of what he read, possibly with the aid of circumstantial evidence wherever the text failed him, the modern interpreter must attempt to provide the same understanding for the modern reader, with parenthetical exegesis where necessary.

[4]) The middle consonant of this verb is rendered by a modified letter *C*, transliterated ç, which, as it does in other Italic dialects, seems to signal the palatalization of the normal [k] before [i̯], pronounced [ts] or [tš] or [š] or the like. This foreshadows, of course, the Romance developments, as in Italian *faccia*, French *fasse* (but Spanish *haga* must be derived from *facat*). This palatalization existed no doubt also in Spoken Latin, whereas Written and Classical Latin exhibit, as usually, the more conservative forms.

(or consent) of the public assembly, an expiatory purification. Ec. Cosuties, son of Se., Ma. Tafanies, son of Ca., *meddices*, set up (this plaque).'

There is common agreement on the meaning of the first three words: 'A decree, or statute, for the goddess Declona.' I should specify, however, that the name of the divinity here stands for her temple, which is not unusual, or for the temple and whatever belongs to it, including the treasure. Also *sepis* is unanimously interpreted as *si quis* (Volscian having, like Oscan and Umbrian, *p-* for Proto-Indo-European $*q^u$, whereas Latin has *qu-*).

Unlike Pisani, but in agreement with Vetter and Bottiglioni, I take *atahus* to be a future perfect (so also in Oscan and Umbrian) without the 3rd pers. sing. *-t* (so also in Umbrian, though not in Oscan). It is cognate with Lat. *tangere*, which has an infixed *-n-* to signal the present stem, absent in the perfect *tetigi*, as it is in *atahus*. The future perfect and the perfect are quite common in legal texts, according to the formula: 'If he will have committed the crime, he will be punished . . .'

The second *pis*, without the *se*, means 'anyone'. The construction is syntactically inelegant, but such stylistic shortcomings are frequent in inscriptions composed by inexpert writers, especially in the records of a society that has not devised a unique and prestigious standard dialect which must be employed by all who aspire to proper linguistic manners. Thus the phrase *pis uelestrom* specifies what the more general *sepis* omitted, namely, that the culprit was an inhabitant of Velitrae.

The next two words are also unanimously agreed upon to mean *faciat* and *sacrificium*, but not always in the same syntactic structure. The word *esaristrom* is usually connected with a root *ais-* or *es-*, which appears in various Italic dialects and its probably borrowed from the ritual language of the Etruscans; the formant *-ari-* is probably identical with Lat. *-arius*, and *-stro-* is the same ending as in *uelestrom* (unless that word has a stem *ueles-* rather than *uele-*, in which case the suffix is *-tro-*).

It was suggested a long time ago that the next three words refer to sacrificial animals, a pig, an ox, and a sheep, in the manner of the Latin *suouetaurilia* (*sus*, *ouis*, *taurus*), a triple sacrifice that was offered especially at lustrations. But recent interpreters have given up this notion, mainly on linguistic grounds, since they did not discern the cognates of the Latin animal names in the Volscian words.

All readers, however, are agreed that the middle word *bim* is the equivalent of Latin *bouem*, derived from an earlier **bum*, Proto-Indo-European **gᵘom*. (Actually, this form would have resulted in Latin **uom* since **gᵘ-* becomes regularly *u-* in Latin; but since the Italic result is indeed *b-*, one must assume that Latin *bouem* is a loan from Italic.) The *-i-* in *bim* is no obstacle to this etymology: in Umbrian monosyllabic words, and in Oscan and Umbrian final syllables, an *i* may be derived from an original long *u*, perhaps by way of a front rounded vowel [y] as in German *für*, French *du* (cf. Umbrian acc. pl. *frif* < **frug-f*, cognate with Latin *fruges*, Umbrian abl. sg. *trefi* for Latin *tribu*, *mani* for *manu*, etc.); in other words, Volscian here exhibits a normal Italic non-Latin vocalism.

But since that is so, I feel free to identify *se* with the acc. sg. *sim* 'pig', which, though not attested in Volscian, exists in Umbrian (together with the acc. pl. *sif* < **sins*); it is cognate with Greek ὗς and Latin **sum*, which surely must have been used beside the regular *suem*, as indeed nom. sg. *sus* and dat.-abl. pl. *subus* are alternates of less frequent *suis* and more frequent *suibus*, respectively. The Volscian spelling *e* beside Umbrian *i* is no cause for worry: both letters probably represent a low open *i*-sound [I] as in English *bit*, which in native Oscan orthography is represented by a modified letter *I*, generally transliterated as *í*. Perhaps the lack of final *-m*, which does occur in *bim*, caused scholars not to regard *se* as a legitimate acc. sg. This declensional *-m*, however, is lacking in all Italic texts and also in Spoken ("Vulgar") Latin; but forms with and without *-m* may be found concurrently in the same document. (For example, the oldest of the Scipio inscriptions—CIL 1²6–7—has the acc. sg. *Taurasia, Cisauna, Samnio*, and *omne Loucanam*; another Scipio inscription—CIL 1²9—has the acc. sg. *optumo*, *uiro, Corsica, Aleria, urbe*, but also *Luciom*; etc.) Written and Classical Latin resuscitated *-m* before it had fallen into complete oblivion.[5] It is possible also that, like Latin *suouetaurilia*, *sebim* was considered a compound (I am omitting *asif* as a third member for reasons to be stated presently) in which word-medial *-m-* dropped

---

[5] On the relationship between Spoken Latin, Written Latin, and Classical Latin see Pulgram 1950, and Pulgram 1958, 311–62; on phonological details, especially such as support the thesis that Written (Classical) Latin preserves or resuscitates features that were about to disappear in the course of the uninterrupted evolution of Spoken Latin, together with the linguistic and cultural causes of this phenomenon, see Pulgram 1975.

17*

258   Ernst Pulgram

before the next syllable beginning with a consonant: *sebim* <
*sembim.

Unfortunately, there is no reasonable way of connecting phono-
logically *asif* with *oues*; hence a triple compound corresponding to
suouetaurilia can scarcely be advocated. Nor can one discover any
other animal name in Latin or elsewhere in Italy cognate with
asif. And even if one assumed it to be an acc. pl. in -*f*, which is the
regular inflexional ending in Umbrian (while Oscan, resembling
Latin, has -*ss* or -*s*; all forms are derived from original -*ns*), one is
left to wonder about Umbrian influence in Latium, and also why
this third animal has to be sacrificed in the plural, together with
but one pig and one ox. Phonologically, in any event, *asif* could
be a dat-abl. pl. in -*if(s)* < **-ibhos* (whence Latin -*ibus*, with -*b*- where
Italic has -*f*-, both from Proto-Indo-European -*bh*-); this inter-
pretation is indeed suggested by Pisani. But I cannot follow him,
in view of my divergent treatment of the preceding phrases, in
his translation *assibus*. I rather suspect that *asif* is a third-declen-
sion adjective (albeit with an ad hoc -*if* in the place of -*ifs*, which
is attested in Oscan) that modifies the next word, *uasclis*, which by
common agreement is *uasculis*. Given the religious context, it
could mean something like 'sacred' or 'ritual'; but no cognate is
available to confirm this. (Could it have to do with the stem *ais*-,
as in *esaristrom*? But monophthongization *ai* > *a* is difficult, at
least in the stem; it has taken place in the Latin dat. sg. ending
-*ae*, which appears sometimes as -*a*: *Menerua sacrum* for *Mineruae
sacrum* in CIL 1²365 from Falerii; *Diana dedit* for *Dianae dedit* in
CIL 1²41 from Nemi; both of the early second century B.C.) I
leave the word untranslated.

The meaning of *uinu* is agreed on by all. But while it is generally
regarded as an abl. sg., it could be an acc. sg. without the -*m*.
(On such forms, and on their occurrence together with forms that
have -*m*, see my remarks above on *se*.) The ending -*u(m)* instead
of -*o(m)* that appears elsewhere in this inscription (*esaristrom*,
pihom), can be explained by the fact that the vowel was probably
a low open *u*-sound [U] as in English *book*, which in native Oscan
orthography was rendered by a modified letter *V*, generally trans-
literated as *ú*. (This phenomenon parallels that of *e* and *i* mentioned
in the discussion of *se*, above. Note that Oscan writing does, but
Latin writing does not, introduce special letters for these sounds.)

Hence no soundchange is involved in converting archaic Latin
-*os* and -*om* into classical -*us* and -*um*, but merely an orthographic

convention. But in any event, the case of *uinu* does not matter greatly for the translation and the sense of the passage. For if *arpatitu* is an imperative (like the Latin imperative in *-to*, but with *-u* for *-o* for the same reason as in *uinu*), one could translate either 'sprinkle the wine (over the sacrificial animals)' or 'sprinkle them (the animals) with wine'.

The verb *arpatitu* consists of a prefix *ar-*, which stands for *ad-* (cf. Old Latin *arf.*, that is, *adfuerunt*, in the introductory sentence of the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus, and *aruorsu* for *aduersum* in the same text, line 24, and in an inscription from Luceria, CIL 1^{2}401),[6]) a stem *pat-* (as in Oscan *patensíns* 'they opened' on the Cippus Abellanus , B line 24, related to Latin *pateo*, although the meaning requires a transitive verb in Volscian, like Latin *pandere*, which has, like *tangere*—see above, under *atahus*—an infixed present-stem *-n-* and which may be related to *patere*, although the alternation *d*—*t* is difficult to explain), and a suffix *-itu* (which I, and most others, prefer to regard as an imperative rather than a past participle).

The next three words, *toticu couehriu sepu*, form an ablative absolute, 'the public assembly knowing', that is, 'with the knowledge, or consent, of the public assembly'. There is complete agreement on the etymology and the phonological and morphological appearance of these words.

The word *ferom* I take to be a present infinitive (*-om, -um* is the regular Italic infinitival ending, rather than *-se* or, intervocalically after rhotacism, *-re*, as in Latin). It is employed here as a noun, 'the carrying', modified by the following *pihom*, Latin *pium*, which I translate as 'cleansing, expiatory'. Thus *ferom* has the same meaning as Latin *circumferre* 'to carry around (for purposes of purification)', or simply 'to purify', and it occurs in connection with a rite of lustration. Indeed Umbrian uses a cognate of *ferre* with a prefix *an-* or *a-* (which is the same as the Greek ἀμφί 'around') in the sense of 'to carry in a procession of lustration' (in particular, of the town of Iguuium). Probably it was an effigy of the divinity, or some other ritual object, that was thus carried around—the

---

[6]) The letter *r* probably stands, not for a tongue-trilled but for a single-flap [r], which articulatorily and acoustically is close to, even identical with, [d]: both are produced by a single closure and release of the tongue against the upper teeth. In British English, one may find the pseudo-phonetic spelling *veddy* for *very*; and in Spanish, the non-trilled [r], as in *toro*, has a [d]-like quality, while the voiced dental stop has moved toward [ð] as in *todo*, or toward zero, as in *hablado*.

260   Ernst Pulgram

city (as in the case of Iguuium), or the temple, or whatever was to be purified.[7])

The remainder of the inscription, the naming of the magistrates who set up the tablet (and under whose magistracy the decree itself was perhaps promulgated), offers no difficulties.[8])

I see, then, in this inscription (more in agreement, though not in detail, with Vetter than with Pisani and Bottiglioni and most earlier scholars) a decree concerning the goddess Declona, or rather her sanctuary, possibly including in particular its treasury. A person who has fraudulently laid hands on what belongs to the goddess, especially her treasure, shall offer sacrifices in private expiation of the crime. In addition, there shall take place, with the consent of the popular assembly (however it was constituted in Velitrae) a public expiatory procession, a lustration. In other words, both the culprit and the community must seek to placate the offended goddess. The offence, expressed by the verb *atahus*, must be a grave one, possibly a theft from the temple, or some other desecration, a 'laying hands upon' of a particularly reprehensible and heinous sort. Apart from the elaborateness of the atonement and the purification, with involvement of the popular assembly and the two meddices, the fact that the inscription is on bronze (small though the tablet be) rather than on much cheaper stone or wood, testifies to its importance.

Bibliography

Bottiglioni, Gino. 1954. *Manuale dei dialetti italici*: *osco, umbro e dialetti minori* (Bologna).

Buck, Carl D. 1904. *A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston). Reprinted, with additions and corrections, 1928.

---

[7]) Presumably the yearly carrying in procession of the *ceri* (etymology unknown) in modern Gubbio, which is the Umbrian Iguuium, is a direct continuation of the lustration of the city described in the Iguvine Tablets. The German word for such a procession, in particular the one that takes place at the Catholic feast of Corpus Christi, is *Umgang*, literally 'a going around': the cross and the monstrance are then carried in solemn procession through the streets around the church, with stops at altars or under flowery arches set up along the way for the occasion.

[8]) The two *medix* of Velitrae were perhaps the heads of the city council or the popular assembly, possibly mayor and vice-mayor, possibly also the counterparts of the Roman consuls (who were, however, equals). These are Italic rather than Latin or Roman offices, the title *meddix tuticus* occurring repeatedly in Oscan texts: see Buck 1904, 319, under *meddikkiai* and the following four lemmata. The etymological basis is no doubt **med-dic-* 'the middle-sayer', that is, the arbiter between two contesting parties, the judge;

Pisani, Vittore. 1964. *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino* (2nd ed., Turin).

Planta, Robert von. 1892–97. *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte* (Straßburg).

Pulgram, Ernst. 1950. Spoken and written Latin, *Language* 26. 458–66.

— 1958. *The tongues of Italy: prehistory and history* (Cambridge, Mass.). Reprinted, New York 1969.

— 1975. *Latin-Romance phonology: prosodics and metrics* (Munich).

Vetter, Emil. 1953. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* I. (Heidelberg).

On *HRC-* in Latin

By Eric P. Hamp, University of Chicago

John A. C. Greppin has given us an imaginative discussion of this question in *Glotta* 51, 1973, 112–16; his point of departure was the stimulating article by H. Rix, *MSS* 27, 1969, 79–111. The following comments are intended to enrich the evidence and discussion, and by no means to detract the positive aspects of the question opened.

Greppin doubts (112–13) that there is evidence for an *e*-colouring (or non-colouring) laryngeal for the etyma of *edō* 'eat' or *est* 'is'. Apart from the possible contribution of Hittite, of which I am still myself persuaded and which I discussed in *TPS* 1952 (1953) 110–13, it seems to me that Greek νῆστις settles this question clearly at least for *$H_e$ed-*. By such an assumption, and only so, we can make perfectly good morphological and semantic sense of νῆσ-τι-ς < *$ṇH_e(t)s$-ti- < *n-H_ed-ti-, a privative expression with *$H_e$ed-* in zero-grade.

Both, Greppin and Rix, in my opinion, attend too little to the Albanian evidence in analyzing *orǵh-* or *H_orǵh-* 'testicle(s)'. Without entering into the entire question here, I would simply point out that, although Avest. ərəzi reflects a zero-grade *ṛǵh-, it is quite possible (and, I think correct) to posit for ὄρχεις, Arm. orjikʿ, and even Lith. (dialect) aržilas[1] an *o*-grade *orǵh. However, in my view, Alb. *herdhe* f. additionally continues the *a*-colouring

---

cf. Umbrian *mers* 'law, justice', also from a stem *med-*; cf. also Greek μεδίτης, post-classical Latin *mediator*, German *Vermittler*, all from stems meaning 'middle'.

[1] Because of recent developments in the correlation of palatalization an apparent *a-* or *e-* is not dependable in Lithuanian in any case. However, the productivity of ablaut in Baltic could easily explain such forms as Lith. eřžilas, Latv. ę̃rzelis.