Volscian *sistiatiens* *)

By Rex Wallace, Amherst (USA)

o. *Introduction*

One of the major morphological differences between Oscan and Umbrian concerns the formation of the perfect by means of the morpheme -$t(t)$-[1]. In Oscan, and in related languages, a number of verbs, particularly first-conjugation verbs in -a, form the perfect by the addition of -$t(t)$- to the present stem, e.g. Oscan *prúfatted* (Ve 11) 3 sg pf 'approve', *d]uunated* (Ve 149) 3 sg pf 'give', Paelignian *coisatens* (Ve 216) 3 pl pf 'supervise', Marrucinian *amatens* (Ve 218) 3 pl pf 'take', etc.; this formation is not attested in Umbrian[2]). In this respect, the Volscian verb *sistiatiens* (Ve 222) 3 pl pf 'set up, dedicate' is of great interest, because Volscian is generally considered to align itself rather closely with Umbrian (see Poultney 1951; Durante 1978: 812–13) and because a number of scholars–for example Pisani (1964: 123) and Pulgram (1978: 156)–have suggested that this verb is a -$t(t)$- perfect. At this time, however, the status of *sistiatiens* is unclear; there are a number of authorities (see below) who disagree with the analysis of *sistiatiens* as a -$t(t)$- perfect. As a result, a reexamination and reevaluation of the possible morphological analyses of *sistiatiens* is in order.

1. *The analyses of sistiatiens*

All authorities agree that *sistiatiens* is a third person plural perfect active verb built from the Indo-European (IE) root *$steH_2$- 'put, place' (Pokorny *IEW*: 1004) and that it means 'set up, dedicate'[3]). Further, all authorities agree that *si-* is a reduplicated syllable and that *stiati-* is the basic stem. Disagreements arise in the attempt to

---

[1]) In this paper, -$t(t)$- is used as a cover symbol for the morpheme which appears in Oscan as -*tt*- or -*t*-, in Paelignian as -*t*-, in Marrucinian as -*t*-, and perhaps in Volscian as -*ti*-.

[2]) The perfect formations attested in Umbrian are discussed by Poultney (1959: 133–36).

[3]) For the *Tabula Veliterna* and translation, the reader is referred to Pulgram (1978: 151–57) or to any of the numerous handbooks on Oscan-Umbrian.

94   Rex Wallace

determine whether *stiati-* is segmentable into one or two morphemes, i.e. *stiati-* present stem vs. *stia-* present stem + *-ti-* perfect morpheme. Analyses of *sistiatiens* can be organized into a four-way classification [4]):

a) a denominative formation from a *-ti-* stem noun **stati-*. On this view, the perfect consists of a reduplicated stem **sistati-*, to which the inflectional endings are added, i.e. **sistati-ens* > *sistiatiens* (see Mommsen 1850: 325; Bücheler 1883: 89; and also the discussion in von Planta 1897: 274).

b) a denominative formation from a *-tū-* stem noun **statū-*. On this related view, the perfect consists of a reduplicated stem **sistatū-*, to which the inflectional endings are added, i.e. **sistatū-ens* > *sistiatiens* (see Durante 1978: 812; see also the discussion in von Planta 1897: 274)[5]). The shift of **ū* to *i* in Volscian may be supported by the noun *bim* (Ve 222) accsg 'cow', which is probably to be derived from IE **gʷōm* (nomsg **gʷōus*) via an intermediate stage **būm*; cf. Umbrian *mani* ablsg 'hand' > **manūd* (Poultney 1959: 37)[6]).

c) a perfect stem composed of the full-grade form of the reduplicated athematic stem **sistā-* (**sisteH₂-*, which has been reanalyzed as a long *-ā* stem, plus the sign of the perfect *-t(t)-*, i.e. as **sistā-t(t)ens* > *sistiatiens* (see Bottiglioni 1954: 430; Pisani 1964: 123)[7]).

d) a perfect stem composed of a reduplicated stem **sistā-*, which is a deverbative formation in **-ā* (**sist(e/o)-* ⇒ **sistā-*), plus the sign of the perfect *-t(t)-*, i.e. as **sistā-t(t)-ens* > *sistiatiens* (see Brugmann 1892 II: 967; see also the discussion in von Planta 1897: 247)[8]).

---

[4]) According to Radke (1962: 795), Volscian *sistiatiens* is a denominative verb from a noun **sistiātiō*. He distinguishes four layers of derivation: (1) deverbal noun **sistiā-* (< **sistəyā-*), (2) denominative verb **sistiāye/o-*, (3) deverbal noun **sistiā-ti-*, and (4) denominative verb **sistiātiye/o-*. This analysis does not seem, in my opinion, to be even remotely possible. As a result, I have not included it in the following discussion.

[5]) Szemerényi (1980) offers an extended discussion of the length of the stem vowel in Latin denominative formations in *-uō, -uere*.

[6]) Volscian *bim* and the various problems with its phonological development are discussed in Wallace (1984: 47–50).

[7]) It is not possible to determine whether Bréal (1876: 242), Buck (1904: 172), Grienberger (1928: 34–35), Morandi (1982: 153), Pulgram (1978: 156), Untermann (1956: 124), and Whatmough (1955: 341) interpret *sistiatiens* in the same manner as Bottiglioni and Pisani. They note that the verb is a *-t(t)-* perfect built from a stem *sistia-* but do not discuss the formation of the stem.

[8]) For discussion of this formation, see section 3 and the references cited there.

2. *Epigraphical considerations*

The contribution of epigraphical considerations to the analysis of *sistiatiens* has been a rather insignificant one[9]). This is rather surprising in light of the fact that any analysis which connects this verb with the IE root $*steH_2$- is obliged to offer some discussion of the "intrusive" *i* in the root syllable. Moreover, for those who wish to analyze *sistiatiens* as a -*t*(*t*)- perfect, i.e. as **sistatens* or **sistattens*, there is the additional complication of a second ("intrusive") *i*. Despite the fact that next to nothing is known about Volscian epigraphy, it seems unreasonable to avoid discussion of these problems entirely.

A relatively straightforward explanation for the "intrusive" *i* of the root syllable exists if **sistatiens* was the intended form. Since the sequence -*ti*- occurs later in the word, one might suppose that the first -*ti*- sequence was written in anticipation of the second. Similar tele-dittographic errors are found on other O-U and Latin inscriptions. For example, on the archaic Latin inscription from Madonetta, *podlouqueique* is written for **podloukeique*, with the first *qu* sequence written in anticipation of the second (see Gordon 1983: 77)[10]).

If, however, the engraver intended to write **sistatens* it is difficult, if not impossible, to suggest some reasonable motivation for the writing *sistiatiens*. One could appeal to the fact that both -*ti*- and -*ie*- sequences are frequent in the last line of the inscription, occurring, for example, in the proper names *cosuties* and *tafanies*. But it seems unlikely that both -*ti*- sequences in *sistiatiens* could have their source there. Similarly, even if one were to admit the possibility, albeit unlikely, that the intended form was **sistattens* and that the engraver forgot the horizontal stroke of the second *t*, no natural explanation for the first "intrusive" *i* suggests itself[11]). Thus, those who argue

---

[9]) Some epigraphical discussion can be found in Grienberger (1928), Radke (1962), and von Planta (1897). Surprisingly, there is no mention of the problem of "intrusive" *i* in Morandi's *Epigrafia Italica* (1982: 152–53).

[10]) For additional tele-dittographic errors, the reader is referred to Kent (1926).

[11]) That the intended form could have been **sistattens*, with double writing of the *t*, is unlikely for a number of reasons. There are, first of all, no other double writings in this inscription; **meddiks* < **med(o)-dik-es* is written *medix* (Ve 222) nom pl, without double writing of the medial dentals, cf. Oscan *meddiss* (Ve 115). Moreover, since this inscription was written in a Latin alphabet, it is reasonable to suppose that Latin writing-conventions were also adopted. Double writing on Latin inscriptions does not occur until the beginning of the second

that *sistiatiens* is a lapsus for *sistatens* or *sistattens* can offer very little in terms of real motivation for the form which exists on the inscription. It is, as it were, an unexplained or, perhaps better, unexplainable lapsus.

The writing *sistiatiens* can be motivated on reasonable grounds if *sistatiens* is assumed to be the intended form. As a result, morphological analyses which correspond to this "underlying" form are to be preferred over other analyses. In terms of the morphological analyses presented in section 1, analyses a) and b) correspond straightforwardly to *sistatiens*. However, analyses c) and d) correspond to "underlying" *sistatiens* only if it is assumed that the sign of the perfect in Volscian is -*ti*-, and that this corresponds to Oscan -*tt*- or -*t*-, Paelignian -*t*-, and Marrucinian -*t*-. This is a move which few scholars have been willing to make (but see Untermann 1956: 125), even though the origins of this morpheme are as yet without convincing explanation[12]).

Epigraphical considerations, then, point to *sistatiens* as the intended form. Since the interpretation of *sistiatiens* as a -$t(t)$- perfect does not match up sufficiently well with the Oscan, Paelignian, and Marrucinian forms, it seems best to accept analysis a) or b)—provided, of course, that one of these analyses turns out to be acceptable from a morphological point of view.

3. *Morphological considerations*

On morphological grounds, the analysis of *sistiatiens* as a -$t(t)$-perfect is to be preferred to a denominative analysis. A denominative analysis presents two serious problems, neither of which can be adequately countered. The first problem concerns the complete absence of a sign for the perfect. In the Italic languages, denominative formations generally show some overt marker in the perfect; cf. the *u*-perfect in Latin, the -$t(t)$- perfect in Oscan, the -*nçi*- perfect in Umbrian, etc. As a result, it is very surprising to find a denominative perfect without some overt morphological marker. Moreover, even though the perfect formation of the verb (Oscan) *upsed*

---

century B.C., i.e. approximately 50 years after the *Tabula Veliterna* was inscribed (see Conway 1897: 268 for discussion).

[12]) The origin of this formation is very controversial. Some discussion can be found in Buck (1904), Danielsson (1885), St. John (1973a and b), and von Planta (1897).

(Ve 142)/ *uupsens* (Ve 8) 3 sg/pl pf 'construct' appears at first glance to provide a needed parallel to that of Volscian *sistiatiens,* the similarities between the two formations are illusory. *uupsens* is formed by truncating the stem, i. e. by eliminating the theme vowel of the present (pres stem **opsā-, úpsannam* (Ve 11) acc sg), and by lengthening the stem vowel, neither of which occurs in the case of the Volscian verb. The second problem with a denominative analysis has to do with the fact that the root shows a reduplicated syllable. This is quite uncharacteristic of denominative formations. Durante's (1978: 795) defense of a denominative interpretation of *sistiatiens* on the grounds that the reduplicated syllable is the result of contamination with forms of the same root in which reduplication is to be expected on etymological grounds, e. g. the present formations in Latin and Umbrian, *sistō* and *sestu* (Tab. Ig. 11 b 22) respectively, is likewise not very compelling.

Of the two analyses of *stiati-* as a perfect stem, analysis d) is to be preferred to analysis c). The latter analysis forces one to suppose that **steH$_2$-* retained its athematic status in Volscian, while in Latin and Umbrian it was taken over into the thematic conjugation, cf., for example, Latin *sistō* and Umbrian *sestu.* Moreover, the fact that other original ablauting athematic verbs have shifted to the thematic conjugation in O-U, e. g. Vestinian *didet* (Ve 220) 3 sg pres 'give', provides additional evidence against the interpretation of *sistia-* as an athematic stem. As a result, analysis c) is quite unlikely. Analysis d), on the other hand – i. e. the remaking of the thematic stem **siste/o-* to **sistā-* by means of the addition of the affix **-ā* – can be supported by parallel formations elsewhere in Italic[13]). In Umbrian, for example, the original thematic formation of the verb 'give', attested in fact in the Vestinian form cited above, was remade into a 1st conjugation verb by the addition of the affix *-ā,* cf. Umbrian *andirsafust* (Tab. Ig. V 11 a 46) 3 sg fut pf 'pass around' < **andidā-.* A deverbative formation from a thematic verb **rege-* 'rule, govern' is implied by the agent noun *regaturei* (Ve 147) dat sg 'ruler' in Oscan, although the simplex itself is not attested; cf. Latin *regit* 3 sg pres. Similarly, in Faliscan, the verb *pipafo* (Ve 244 a) 1 sg fut 'gulp down' is best

---

[13]) In this paper, it is not possible to discuss the origins of the affix **-ā.* Some preliminary discussion can be found in Vendryes (1910), Meillet (1964), and Watkins (1956), all of whom compare the Italic deverbatives in **-ā* to Slavic infinitive- and preterite-forms of the *bьrati*-type. Jasanoff, however, who discusses the *ā*-preterites in IE in some depth, makes no mention of the **ā*-deverbatives in Italic.

98   Rex Wallace

derived from an earlier thematic formation by means of the suffix -*ā*, cf. *bibā- beside Latin *bibit* 3 sg pres 'drink' < *bibeti. In Latin *ā*-deverbatives are well-attested, some built from simple stems, e. g. *dīcere* 'say' beside *dicāre* 'proclaim', others built from verbs with pre-verb composition, e. g. *occupāre* 'grasp' beside *capere* 'seize'. At this point, the precise function of the *ā*-derivative beside the primary formation is difficult to determine. In Latin, for example, the affix must have had a variety of functions, e. g. iterative, intensive, etc. (see Ernout (1953: 141–42), Leumann - Hofmann - Szantyr (1977: 549), and Vendryes (1910) for discussion). In fact, the intensive function is perhaps to be recognized in Faliscan *pipafo,* where a meaning 'gulp down' seems preferable to that of 'drink'. At any rate, it does not seem possible to distinguish semantically between Volscian *sistiatiens* and the thematic formation *sistere.*

From a morphological point of view, then, the most reasonable analysis of *sistiatiens* is analysis d), where that verb is characterized as a -*ti*- perfect from a deverbative stem *sistā-.

4. *The dilemma*

In our attempt to decide among the possible analyses of *sistiatiens,* we have reached a dilemma of sorts. Epigraphical considerations favor an analysis which has *sistatiens as the intended form. This form matches up perfectly with denominative analyses a) and b). Morphological considerations favor the analysis of *sistiatiens* as a -*t* (*t*)- perfect. Unfortunately, the affix found here, -*ti*-, does not form an exact correspondence with the form of the affix in Oscan, etc. As a result, if we accept analysis d), we are forced to increase the number of existing correspondences for this morpheme.

At this point, I am inclined to favour analysis d), even though it has the undesirable consequence of adding an additional correspondence to the -*t*(*t*)- perfect morpheme, and one which does not match up phonologically with the others. I do this for two reasons. First, the denominative analysis involves the acceptance of two suspicious hypotheses, namely 1. reduplication via contamination and 2. lack of any sign of the perfect. Second, as I mentioned above, the prehistory of this morpheme is without a truly satisfactory explanation. There is, thus, no reason to rule out -*ti*- as a correspondence on phonological grounds. And it is conceivable, of course, that this additional correspondence may provide some insight into the origins of the morpheme itself.

5. *Implications of selecting analysis d)*

So much attention has been devoted here to the analysis of *sistiatiens* because, as is often the case in languages for which there are so few data, the analyses of individual lexical items have important consequences [14]). Volscian *sistiatiens* is a case in point.

As mentioned above in the Introduction, most authorities align Volscian closely with Umbrian, based on such shared innovations as *ū* > *i*, palatalization of **k* before **i/y*, and word-final **-ns* > *f* (see, for example, Durante 1978: 812–13). However, if the verb *sistiatiens* is analyzed as a *-ti-* perfect corresponding to Oscan *-tt/t-* perfects, etc., then Volscian shares with the Oscan dialects, to the exclusion of Umbrian, a notable morphological innovation–the presence of a formative *-t-* in the perfect–and it also shares with Paelignian, whose *sest.a.plens* is probably to be read **sestattens*, an important lexical isogloss [15]). Thus, this analysis of the verb *sistiatiens* has important consequences for our view of the relationship of the Medio-Italic languages to Oscan and Umbrian. In particular, it calls into question the division of O-U into two subgroups, with the Medio-Italic languages aligned either with Oscan or with Umbrian à la Poultney (1959: 7) and Durante (1978), and suggests that these languages may well form a linguistic, as well as geographical, continuum between Umbrian and Oscan [16]).

---

[14]) The linguistic evidence for the Volscian language consists of one gloss, *sublicium* 'pile bridge', cited in Festus (293 M), and the *Tabula Veliterna*.

[15]) In the mid 19th century Theodor Mommsen found a copy of a Paelignian inscription (Ve 202) which had been added to a 17th century codex of inscriptions. In all probability, this inscription contains the same verb found on the Volscian *Tabula Veliterna*. The context, a dedicatory offering to the Dioscouroi, points to a verb with the meaning 'set up, dedicate'. Unfortunately, the form of the Paelignian verb, written *sest.a.plens,* is problematic because of the sequence *pl* which follows the root syllable. All authorities agree that *p*, written ⟨↑⟩, is an error for *t.* For the second letter, *l,* there are disagreements about what the reading should be. *t, i,* and *u* have all been suggested as emendations (see von Planta (1897: 274)). However, given the fact that (Ve 202) is a copy of an inscription which is apparently irretrievably lost, and that the copyist wrote some characters in cursive script and some in caps, it is unlikely that the Paelignian verb can be of any help in deciding the morphology of Volscian *sistiatiens.*

[16]) The evidence from Paelignian and Marrucinian, although meagre, appears to point in this direction also. Paelignian, for example, shares with Umbrian the development of secondary **-rs-* clusters to *-rf-* (Paelignian *cerfum* (Ve 213) gen pl 'of Ceres and Venus' < **keresom*). Among the Oscan features of Paelignian are a) epenthesis in RC clusters (*anaceta* (Ve 204) dat sg 'Angitia' < **an-*

100   Rex Wallace

The importance, then, of *sistiatiens* for our understanding of Volscian and its relationship to Oscan and Umbrian as well as to the other Medio-Italic langues should not be underestimated[17]). This is particularly true because the analysis which one accepts for this single form will strongly color one's view of the distribution of morphological innovations in O-U as a whole and hence the overall organization of the O-U dialects.

References

Bottiglioni, Gino. 1954. *Manuale dei dialetti italici.* Bologna.

Bréal, Michel. 1876. Trois inscriptions italiques. *Rev. Arch.* 10. 241–47.

Brugmann, Karl. 1892. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* II/I. K.J. Trübner: Straßburg.

Bücheler, Franz. 1883. *Umbrica.* Bonn.

Buck, Carl D. 1904. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian.* Ginn and Company: Boston.

Conway, R.S. 1897. *The Italic Dialects.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Danielsson, O.A. 1885. Zum altitalischen *t*-perfect. In Carl Pauli (ed.), *Altitalische Studien.* Hannover. pp.133–55.

Durante, Marcello. 1978. I dialetti medio-italici. In M. Cristofani (ed.), *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica* Vol. VI. pp.793–820.

Ernout, Alfred. 1953. *Morphologie historique du latin.* C. Klincksieck: Paris.

Gordon, Arthur E. 1983. *Latin Epigraphy.* University of California: Berkeley.

Grienberger, Theodore. 1928. Italica 7. Die Bronzetafel von Velletri. *KZ* 56.26–28.

Jasanoff, Jay. 1983. The IE. "*ā*-Preterite" and Related Forms. *IF* 88.54–83.

Kent, Roland. 1926. *The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions.* Linguistic Society of America: Philadelphia.

Leumann, M., J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik.* Vol. I. C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung: München.

Meillet, A. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-europeennes.* University of Alabama Press.

---

get(*i*)*ā*), b) the extension of *o*-stem endings into C-stems (*aetatu* (Ve 213) abl sg 'life' ← *aetāte*), and c) first conjugation perfects in -*t*(*t*)- (*coisatens* (Ve 216) 3 pl perf 'supervise'), etc. Marrucinian shares with Umbrian the development of word-final *-ns* to -*f* (*iafc* (Ve 218) acc pl pron < *eans-ke*). The Oscan features found in Marrucinian are a) RC epenthesis (*salaus* (Po 205) nom sg 'well' < *salwos*) and b) first conjugation perfects in -*t*(*t*)- (*amatens* (Ve 218) 3 pl perf 'take').

[17]) And, as I have noted already in section 4, the analysis of Volscian *sistiatiens* as a -*ti*- perfect may contribute to our knowledge of the prehistory of this morpheme.

Mommsen, Theodor. 1850. *Die unteritalischen Dialekte.* Leipzig.

Morandi, Alessandro. 1982. *Epigrafia Italica.* Firenze.

Pisani, Vittore. 1964. *Manuale storica della lingua latina.* Vol. IV. Rosenberg and Seller: Torino.

Poccetti, Paolo. 1979. *Nuovi documenti italici.* Giardini: Pisa.

Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Francke: Bern.

Poultney, James. 1959. *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium.* Linguistic Society of America: Baltimore.

–. 1951. Volscians and Umbrians. *AJPh* 72.113–27.

Pulgram, Ernst. 1978. *Italic, Latin, Italian.* Carl Winter: Heidelberg.

Radke, Gerhard. 1962. *Volsci.* In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung* 2, Reihe 17, c. 773–827.

St. John, Jack. 1973a. The perfect in Oscan-Umbrian. *CJL* 18.1–6.

–. 1973b. The Oscan-Umbrian Future Perfect in *-us-*. *Orbis* 22.155–60.

Szemerényi, O. 1980. Latin verbs in *-uō, -uere*. In Izzo, H.J. (ed.), *Italic and Romance. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Ernst Pulgram.* pp.9–32. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Untermann, J. 1956. Die Bronzetafel von Velletri. *IF 62. 123–35.*

Vendryes, J. *1910. Sur quelques présents en -A-* du verbe italo-celtique. *MSL* 16.300–05.

Vetter, Emil. 1953. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte.* Carl Winter: Heidelberg.

Von Planta, Robert. 1897. *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte.* Vol. II. K.J. Trübner: Straßburg.

Wallace, Rex. 1984. *The Sabellian Languages.* Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Watkins, C. 1956. A preliminary study of the history of the Old Irish Primary A-verbs. In Halle, M., H. Lunt, H. McLean, and C.H. Van Schooneveld (eds.), *For Roman Jakobson.* pp.613–21. Mouton: The Hague.

Whatmough, J. 1955. Italic. *Orbis* 4.323–48.

Latin *altāria*

By Eric P. Hamp, Chicago

The well known debate on the origin and formation of this word goes back to the ancients; see the standard handbooks. The most plausible account certainly seems to be that which associates *adoleō adolēre* "burn", but in view of Umbrian *uřetu* this appears to introduce a vocalism **o* (so then for *adultum*) conflicting with the *a-* of *altāria,* dissimilated from **alt- + -āli-a.*