Bleary eyes and ladles of clay: Two liquid Sabellicisms in Latin*
Benjamin W Fortson IV
Glotta; Zeitschrift für Griechische und Lateinische Sprache...; 2008; 84, Humanities Module
pg. 52

Bleary eyes and ladles of clay: Two liquid Sabellicisms in Latin*

By BENJAMIN W. FORTSON IV, Ann Arbor

1. lippus

The Latin adjective *lippus* 'bleary-eyed, having inflamed eyes' is universally understood to come from the Indo-European root **leip-*, reflected in a number of words having to do with fat, oil, or other sticky substances, including Skt. *limpáti* 'smears, bedaubs', Gk. λίπος 'fat', and Lith. *lìpti* 'to stick'.[1] For the semantic connection between 'fat, oily, sticky' and 'bleary-eyed, having inflamed eyes', researchers may have had in mind bacterial conjunctivitis, which produces a gritty mucopurulent discharge causing the eyelids to stick together;[2] or the connection may have been imputed from those not uncommon passages where a person described as *lippus* applies a salve or ointment to

---

Bibliographical abbreviations: Ernout-Meillet = A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*[4] (Paris, 1979); Leumann = M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (München, 1977); *LIV* = H. Rix (ed.), *LIV: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*[2] (Wiesbaden, 2001); Mayrhofer = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg, 1986–2001); Pokorny = J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern, 1959–69); *RE* = *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (München, 1980); Sommer-Pfister = F. Sommer and R. Pfister, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*[4] (Heidelberg, 1977); Untermann = J. Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg, 2000); Walde-Hofmann = A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1938–56).

[1] So Walde-Hofmann, *s.v. lippus*; Pokorny, *s.v.* 1. *leip-*; Ernout-Meillet *s.v. lippus*.

[2] *Lippus* could ultimately refer to any ocular malady, conjunctivitis being only one. Cf. A. R. Birley, "A case of eye-disease (lippitudo) on the Roman frontier in Britain," *Documenta Ophthalmologica* 81 (1992) 111–9. (I am indebted to S. Häusler for reminding me of the sticky exudate that is pathognomonic of bacterial conjunctivitis.)

their eyes – a much more incidental connection at best (e.g. Horace, *Sat.* 1.3.25 *cum tua peruideas oculis mala lippus inunctis* "when you, bleary-eyed, look over your sins with your eyes rubbed with ointment"; sim. id. 1.5.30–1, Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 16.180.5). Whatever the reasoning, it encounters a serious difficulty: an examination of *lippus* and especially its derivatives in early Latin shows the core meaning to have been 'watery' or 'flowing with water' rather than 'sticky'.

Consider first the denominative *lippīre*,[3] which in its earliest attestation (Plautus *Curc.* 318) clearly refers to the 'watering' of one's mouth from hunger:

> Perii, prospicio parum,
> gramarum habeo dentes plenos, **lippiunt** fauces fame,
> ita cibi uaciuitate uenio lassis lactibus.

> I'm done for, I can barely see, my teeth are filled with rheum, my gullet **is watering** from hunger, to such a state I've come from vacuity of victuals, from intestinal fatigue. (tr. Nixon)

Another derivative, *lippitūdō*, occurs unambiguously in the meaning 'wetness/bleariness of the eyes', as it is opposed to *siccitās* 'dryness, drought'; note the characteristically Plautine circumlocution *ab lippitudine usque siccitas ut sit tibi*, essentially 'may you not be bleary-eyed', in the following passage from the *Rudens*:

> Teque oro et quaeso, si speras tibi
> 630 hoc anno multum futurum sirpe et laserpicium,
>   eamque euenturam exagogam Capuam saluam et sospitem,
> 632 atque ab **lippitudine** usque <u>siccitas</u> ut sit tibi,
> 634[4] ut te ne pigeat dare operam mihi quod te orabo, senex.

> I beg and entreat you, if you hope to have a good supply of silphium and silphium juice this year and to ensure its exportation

---

[3] With the suffix *-īre* in its specialized use of referring to bodily functions and ailments, as also *tussīre* 'cough', *prūrīre* 'itch', etc.
[4] 633 *om.* Leo.

safe and sound to Capua, and that you may enjoy a perpetual
<u>drouth</u> in respect to **bleary eyes,** that you will not be loath to do me
the service which I am about to ask of you, old gentleman! (tr.
Nixon)

As for *lippus* itself, 'bleary-eyed' is the only possible sense at
Mil. 292 (double colons indicate changes of speaker):

290 Profecto uidi. :: Tutin? :: Egomet duobus his oculis meis. ::
     Abi, non uerisimile dicis, neque uidisti. :: Num tibi
     lippus uideor?

"I certainly did see her." "You yourself?" "I myself, with these two
eyes of mine." "Oh, get out! A likely story! You saw no such
thing!" "I don't seem **bleary-eyed** to you, do I?" (tr. Nixon)

The use of *lippus* and derivatives to refer to soreness of the eyes
is simply a metonymic extension of ocular wateriness; it is at
least as old as Plautus too. A stock joke was comparing a person
(especially a slave) that one could not keep one's hands off of to
a *lippus oculus*, a 'sore eye'. Compare, again from Plautus (*Bac.*
913f.):

Lippi illic oculi seruos est simillimus:
si non est, nolis esse neque desideres;
si est, apstinere quin attingas non queas.

That servant of mine is very much like a **sore** eye: if you haven't
got one, you don't want one and don't miss it; if you have, you
can't keep your hands off it. (tr. Nixon)

Similarly *Persa* 11 *sed quasi **lippo** oculo me erus meus manum
apstinere hau quit tamen* "But yet, just as if I was a **sore** eye,
my master can't keep his hands off of me." The only other two
attestations of the word in Archaic Latin could mean either
'bleary-eyed' or 'having sore eyes': *cubare in naui **lippam** atque
oculis turgidis/ nauclerus dixit* "the skipper said that she's in
bed on the ship, *lippa* and with swollen eyes" (Plt. *Mil.* 1108),
***lippus** edenda acri assiduo ceparius cepa* "an onion-eater who is

lippus from constantly eating the pungent onion" (Lucilius *Sat.* 195 M.).

In Classical Latin, both the senses 'bleary-eyed' and 'having inflamed eyes' are about equally frequent. In several satirical passages *lippus* is a stock term used in mocking descriptions of physically unsavory or down-and-out characters, where the more visual 'bleary-eyed' is surely the sense. Elsewhere, the word is often a general term for 'dripping, oozing', as in Martial 7.20.12 *et lippa ficus debilisque boletus* "an **oozy** fig and a crippled mushroom" and 8.59.1–2 *Aspicis hunc uno contentum lumine, cuius/ lippa sub attrita fronte lacuna patet* "Do you see him here, making as with a single eye, beneath whose brazen brow a **dripping** socket gapes?" (tr. Shackleton Bailey).

All of the facts marshalled so far are sufficient to cast grave doubts on the traditional derivation of *lippus* from **leip-* 'fat(ty), oil(y)'. A far better semantic match, I suggest, is the root **u̯leik^w-*[5] 'liquid, flowing' that is the source of the family of Latin *liquēscere* 'become liquid', *liquēns* 'liquid, flowing', *liquāre* 'make liquid, melt, dissolve', *līquī* 'become liquid, flow', and so forth. The *p*-consonantism is straightforwardly accounted for if the word was borrowed from a neighboring Sabellic language, where **k^w* regularly became *p*.[6] Consistent with *lippus* being a loanword is its referring specifically to 'watery of the eyes' rather than 'watery' in general; cp. the loanword *rūfus*, which meant 'red-haired' in the first instance rather than 'reddish', as G. Meiser reminds me. Outside Italic, the root formed a *u*-stem adjective **u̯lik^(w)-u-*[7] continued in Celtic (Irish *fliuch* 'wet'), thematized to **u̯lik^(w)-u-o-* in British Celtic[8] (Welsh *gwlyb*, Old Breton *gulip*,[9] Cornish and Modern

---

[5] Sometimes reconstructed as **u̯leik-*; see further below.

[6] As e.g. in the Sabellic source of Lat. *popīna* next to native Latin *co-quīna*, both < **k^w ek^w-*.

[7] On the parenthesized *w* see further below.

[8] Thematization was regular for inherited *u*-stem adjectives in British Celtic; see H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1913), 116–17.

Breton *gleb*), as well as a *ti*-abstract *$\ast ulik^w$-ti-* in W. *gwlith* 'dew' (MidBret. *gluiz*, modern *gliz*, *glih*) and an *s*-extended form *$\ast ulik^w$-s(o)-* in W. *gwlych* 'liquid, moisture', Bret. *glec'h* 'soaking, infusion'.

It remains to provide a precise formal account of *lippus*, which turns out to be more involved a task than at first appears. The double *p* is normally[10] taken as an example of the "expressive gemination" familiar from other Latin adjectives denoting physical oddities, mannerisms, or ills, like *gibber* 'hunch-backed', *crassus* 'fat', *cuppēs* 'greedy-guts' (: *cupere*), and incidentally also the virtual opposite of *lippus*, namely *siccus* in the meaning 'not wet with tears'. If we follow this view, *lippus* could derive from a zero-grade thematic adjective *$\ast ulik^w$-o-*. But since the Celtic forms do not require us to suppose that the root ended in a labiovelar, some scholars have reconstructed the root as *$\ast uleik$-*, take Irish *fliuch* and the Brittonic forms accordingly back to *$\ast ulik$-u-* and *$\ast uliku$-o-*, respectively, and argue that *liquāre*, *liquēre*, etc. are derived from the same thematized *$\ast uliku$-o-* as in Brittonic.[11] Under this view, this thematization could then also be the preform for *lippus*.

But aside from the fact that deriving *lippus* from either *$\ast ulik^w$-o-* or *$\ast uliku$-o-* necessitates waving the unconstrained "expressive gemination" wand, there are more serious problems too that render both these preforms unsatisfactory. Let us take the second one first, as it also requires resolving the debate over the shape of our root.[12] That *liquāre*, *liquēre*, and the other forms in *līqu-* could be built to what was once a *u*-stem *$\ast ulik$-u-*

----

9 Also in the denominative 3 sg. perfective *s*-preterite glossatorial form *rogulipias* 'has wetted' (corrected from *rogulibias*; see K. H. Jackson, *A Historical Phonology of Breton* [Dublin, 1967], 479).

10 As e.g. in Sommer-Pfister 155.

11 This analysis is forwarded by C. Watkins, "Hittite and Indo-European studies: The denominative statives *in -ē-*," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1971 [1973], 61. In his view, *liquēre* is an old denominative stative like *clārēre* 'shine brightly' from *clārus* 'loud, bright'.

12 In favor of *$\ast uleik^w$-* are e.g. Walde-Hofmann, *loc. cit.*, and *LIV s.v.* *$\ast uleik^u$-*; in favor of *$\ast uleik$-* is C. Watkins, *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*[2] (Boston, 2000), *s.v.* *wleik-*.

is of course possible in principle; compare *grauidus grauēscere grauēdō grauāre* built to *grau-*, abstracted from the *u*-stem adjective $*g^w rh_2-u-$ 'heavy' (: Skt. *gurú-*, Gk. βαρύς). However, this scenario entails at least two problems. The first is that a root without final labiovelar would force us to derive *līquī* 'to dissolve, flow' from a preform $*uleiku-e-$ (as opposed to $*uleik^w-e-$), which would be extremely difficult to motivate (its full grade would have to be either analogical to some unknown model or the result of some otherwise unexampled derivational process whereby from a thematized zero-grade adjective $*C\theta C-u-o-$ a full-grade thematic [denominative?] verb $*CeC-u-e-$ could be built). The second problem is that the thematization of a *u*-stem ($*ulik-u- > *uliku-o-$) in Italic is very unlikely in the first place because in that branch all other inherited *u*-stem adjectives were converted to *i*-stems, not *o*-stems, as shown by Lat. *grauis*, *mollis*, *breuis*, *tenuis*, and *suāuis*, ultimately from $*g^w rh_2-u-$, $*mld-u-$, $*mr\hat{g}h-u-$, $*tn(n)-u-$, and $*suād-u-$. And if one wishes instead to argue that the thematization was of PIE date, then it remains mysterious why original $*uliku-$ would have continued to exist alongside its thematized renewal $*uliku-o-$ all the way down into Celtic with no difference in meaning from the latter.[13]

For all these reasons, $*uleik^w-$ is the correct reconstruction of our root; Celtic $*ulik-u-$ is simply delabialized from earlier $*ulik^w-u-$ by the "βουκόλος rule"[14] and forms part of the Caland family whose other members are Latin $*ulik^w-\bar{e}-$ and $*ulik^w-os-$.[15]

---

[13] That is to say, one would ordinarily expect that if a $*uliku-$ were renewed by $*uliku-o-$, the former either would not have survived at all, or would have survived only in some originally marginal secondary meaning, rather than in the primary meaning 'wet' (Kuryłowicz's Fourth Law).

[14] Labiovelars became plain velars in PIE when next to *u*.

[15] $*ulik^w-os-$ might also underlie the $*ulik^w-s(o)-$ of W. *gwlych*. Walde-Hofmann, *loc. cit.*, compare $*ulik^w-so-$ to Lat. *lixa*, but the latter is surely just the feminine of *lixus*, ultimately a past participle of the *flūxus* or *lāpsus* type.

The Latin derivatives of this root that have *-c-* instead of *-qu-*, or where spelling fluctuates, such as *ēlicēs* 'furrows for draining off water from a field', *colliciae/colliquiae* 'gutter at the juncture of two roofs', are mostly too scantily attested to be of much use, and can owe their *c* in any case to later sound

The other possibility, that *lippus* continues **u̯likʷ-o-*, is diffi-
cult because zero-grade thematic adjectives are uncommon. To
be sure, a few are known, e.g. the **h₁rudh-o-* 'red' underlying
Lat. *rubus* 'blackberry' and Old English *rudu* 'redness' (< Ger-
manic **rudō*), but it would be preferable not to add *lippus* to
their number without additional supporting evidence. The only
forms that, on paper at least, could also point to an earlier
*u̯likʷo- are the Brittonic words discussed above, as well as
liquēre and *liquāre*, which, following Watkins's analysis (n. 11
above) but modifying his reconstruction, could be (respectively)
a denominative stative and a factitive to **u̯likʷ-o-*. But taking the
Brittonic forms from **u̯likʷ-o-* would uncomfortably separate
them from the Irish *u*-stem, so the standard reconstruction as
*u̯lik⁽ʷ⁾-u̯-o- is preferable on this count as well. As for Watkins's
idea that *liquēre* and *liquāre* (as well as *liquēscere*) are deno-
minatives, it is not as straightforward a situation as he presents
in his table, p. 67, where he lines up *liquāre/liquēre/liquēscere*
as being exactly parallel to the denominatives *clārāre/clārēre/*
clārēscere, *-albāre/albēre/albēscere*, and *-nigrāre/nigrēre/*
nigrēscere. For while each of the other three pairs consists of
forms that go together semantically without difficulty, *liquāre*
'make liquid' and *liquēscere* 'become liquid' do not so easily
match *liquēre*, which means 'be clear', not 'be liquid'.[16]
Furthermore, *liquāre* 'make liquid' is only attested from the
time of Cicero,[17] and is thus probably an oppositional transitive
to *liquēscere* 'become liquid' (Plt.+) formed on the model of
pairs like *grauāre* 'make heavy, weigh down' alongside

---

change, analogical extensions, and/or contaminations. For some discussion
see Ernout-Meillet *s.v. liquō.*

[16] This fact could mean that we are dealing with two separate roots that
have merged, as mooted in Ernout-Meillet, *loc.cit.* I am not convinced that
this is the case, but a full discussion of the issue would involve us in
complexities too far afield. In any event, the root etymology of *lippus* is not
affected one way or another by this problem.

[17] *Liquāre* also means 'make clear', used once of the voice (Hostius, 2nd
cent. B.C.) and otherwise of liquids (late 1st cent. B.C.+). Whether this is
actually the same verb is uncertain.

grauēscere 'become weighed down'.[18] Even if the semantics were not a problem, as seen above the evidence does not support the prior existence of a thematic **ulikʷ-o-* in Italic from which *liquēre* could have been derived. In *liquēre* we are therefore surely dealing with a deverbative stative of the *tacēre* type.

Without any comparative support for a zero-grade thematic adjective **ulikʷ-o-* or an extended Italic **uliku-o-*, *lippus* can only come from a full-grade Sabellic **leipos* (< **(u)leikʷo-*), with secondary gemination and vowel shortening by the "*littera* rule" whereby a sequence of long vowel plus single consonant was sometimes realized as short vowel plus geminate, as in the pairs *lītera/littera* and *Iūpiter/Iuppiter*. This **(u)leikʷo-* was an *e*-grade thematic adjective of the common type seen also in **h₁reudh-o-* 'red' (> Lat. *rūfus* 'red'), **leuk-o-* 'shining, white' (> Gk. λευκός), etc., and fits perfectly with the primary thematic verb **uleikʷ-e-* that became Lat. (deponent) *līquī* 'dissolve, become liquid, flow'. The phonology of **leipos > lippus* is identical to *ceipos*[19] *> cippus* 'standing stone' (cp. Skt. *śépa-* 'penis', PIE **ḱeipos*[20]). Under this hypothesis, the word was borrowed from Sabellic before the Latin monophthongization of *ei* to *ī*, meaning the adjective would have still been **leipus* in Plautus's day.[21]

---

[18] This account is also preferable to lumping *liquāre* in with the "*ā*-intensives", as done e.g. by Leumann 550, with references to earlier literature. On these verbs, see D. H. Steinbauer, *Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei Plautus belegten Verben der lateinischen ersten Konjugation. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Denominative* (Inaugural-Dissertation Regensburg, 1989) 136ff., and A. Bammesberger, "Die maskulinen *a*-Stämme und der Verbaltyp *occupāre*," *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, ed. A. Bammesberger and F. Heberlein (Heidelberg, 1996) 50–60 (for the second reference I am indebted to Michael Weiss).

[19] CIL I² 5 *ceip[* is surely this word and not, as sometimes thought, a proper name.

[20] I depart here from Mayrhofer *s.v. śépa-*, who considers the Sanskrit word to be without etymology.

[21] An alternative scenario, as A. J. Nussbaum points out (p.c.), is to start with an *o*-grade **uloikʷos* > Sabellic **loipos*, borrowed into Latin and undergoing the change **oi > ei* before labial as in *līmus* 'loam' from **loimos*. The drawback, as he notes, is the extra step of **oi > ei*.

2. simpulum, simpu(u)ium

Two variants of a Latin word for a type of ladle used for pouring wine in rituals are attested, *simpulum* and *simpuium* (or *simpuuium*). The word is normally derived from **sem(H)-* 'draw water', seen in Lith. *sémti* 'to draw water', Celtic **sem-* 'pour' (in e.g. OIr. *do·essim* 'pours out'), and Gk. ἄμη[22] 'shovel, pail'. Though semantically in perfect order, this etymology has several formal problems. For it to work, *simpulum* would have to be the older form, because unless one wanted to take the *-p-* as an *ad*

The fact that no spelling **leipos* is attested in the Ambrosian Palimpsest is not significant, for that manuscript's spellings are no earlier than the time of Varro and it only sometimes (and indeed sometimes falsely) writes *ei* for *ī*. On the use of *ei* for *ī* in this manuscript see J. Marouzeau, "La graphie *ei = i* dans le palimpseste de Plaute," *Mélanges offerts à Émile Chatelain* (Paris, 1910; reprinted Genève, 1976) 150–54. As it happens, most of the Plautine attestations of *lippus* and derivatives are missing from the palimpsest anyway (*Bac.* 913, *Curc.* 318, *Mil.* 292, 1108, and *Rud.* 632); at *Persa* 11 and *Poen.* 394 it reads *lipp-*. The Palatine tradition transmits *leppitudo* at *Poen.* 394 (mss. B and D), which is likewise not significant, given the plethora of erroneous readings in these mss.

In light of my analysis of *lippus*, it is interesting to recall the possibility that *limpidus* is a nasal-infixed Sabellic equivalent of *liquidus* (so A. Ernout, *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin* [Paris, 1909], 191–2, and in much greater detail, G. R. Solta, "Lat. *limpidus* und seine Verwandten," *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie: Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. W. Meid [Innsbruck, 1967], 93ff.). If this etymology is correct, I do not believe the morphological details have been fully cleared up, but that is also another topic that cannot be gone into here.

South Picene **vepses** (TE 2) has recently been derived from **u̯leik^ʷ-* by Vincent Martzloff, "Le mot long en latin: l'exemple de *polli(n)ctor*," paper given at the colloquium "Procédés synchroniques de la langue poétique" (Rouen, 2005). (I am indebted to O. Hackstein for providing me with a copy of the handout; I have not seen the published version.) If he is right – the formulaic arguments are very intriguing – and if its putative cognate Lat. *pollingere* 'prepare a corpse for burial' comes from **u̯leik^ʷ-* (which is not altogether certain), this would be yet another Sabellic avatar of our root. The meaning of U. **vepurus** is uncertain, but one possibility is 'liquids' < **u̯leik^ʷ-ōs-*.

[22] So cited e.g. in *LIV s.v. sem(H)-*, though it is far better attested as ἄμη with smooth breathing. The Latin loan *hama* (Cato+) is at least moderate support for the rough breathing.

Walde-Hofmann are a bit unclear as to which etymology of *simpulum* they prefer out of the several they cite, but appear to have nothing against taking *simpulum* as a loan from Gk. σιπύη 'container for grain or bread'. Neither the semantic nor the phonologic match is adequate, however.

hoc root extension,[23] that consonant can only be explained as having arisen epenthetically from an earlier **sem-lo-*, cp. *templum* < **tem-lo-*, *ex-emplum* < **-em-lo-*. But there is every reason to suspect that *simpu(u)ium* is older, and that *simpulum* arose by misreading (SIMPVLVM looks virtually the same as SIMPVIVM, especially in those types of book hand or rustic capitals where the lower horizontal stroke of the L was barely longer than the lower serif of the I). Indeed, *simpu(u)ium* is the only form metrically guaranteed: it appears at the start of a hexameter at Juv. 6.343.[24] *Simpu(u)ium*, with its unusual morphology, is additionally the *lectio difficilior*.[25]

Even if *simpulum* were the inherited form (or a genuine old variant rather than a miscopying), it could not actually come phonologically from either **sem-lo-* or set **semH-lo-*.[26] The

---

[23] E. Lidén, *Studien zur altindischen und vergleichenden Sprachgeschich-te* (Uppsala, 1897), 92, follows K. Brugmann's claim that the *-p-* was a root extension in *Berichte über die Abhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Klasse* 49 (1897), 24 (currrently unavailable to me).

[24] Note that even the metrics did not prevent some scribes from writing *simpulum* here (mss. P, R). The lone inscriptional attestation of the word is *sumpuis* CIL VI 2104.26, the celebrated *Acta Arvalia* from 218 A.D. Unfortunately, this inscription has numerous errors, including not only confusion of I and L but also the otherwise unexampled *u* in the first syllable of this form. See on the errors e.g. A. E. Gordon, "Seven Latin inscriptions in Rome," *Greece and Rome* 20 (1951) 88.

[25] All these arguments, plus evidence from the manuscripts, were pre-sented as long ago as 1908 by A. Brinkmann ("Simpuvium – simpulum," *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 15:139–43), but hand-books as late as Walde-Hofmann still present the outdated equation of *simpulum* with Umbrian **seples** (Tab. Ig. III 27), a word that cannot be related anyway because we now know it referred to nails or similar fasteners rather than to pouring utensils (see Untermann *s.v.*) Older reference works separate the two words, defining *simpulum* as a ladle and *simpuuium* as a bowl, for which distinction there is no good ancient authority.

[26] *LIV* sets up a set root, but the daughter forms are somewhat ambiguous. The acute accent of the Lith. infinitive *sémti* is of course consistent with root-final laryngeal, but it could also reflect prehistoric secondary lengthening (**sem-tei* → **sēmtei*) analogical to the aorist (**sēm- > sémė*, the long vowel here itself ultimately analogical to root aorists of set roots), as happened in a number of roots of similar shape, e.g. *vérti* 'open', *nérti* 'thread; immerse', and *skélti* 'split'; see E. Sandbach, *Die indogermanischen zweisilbigen schweren Basen und das baltische (litauische) Präteritum* (Heidelberg, 1930),

latter would have developed first into *semalom and later *semulum; the former should have developed into *semplum rather than simp(u)lum because (a) the raising of e to i before mp preceded the anaptyxis of p in *-ml- clusters, as witnessed by both templum and exemplum above (contrast simplex, where the p is inherited from *sem-plek-),[27] and (b) -pl- did not normally develop to -pul-, as shown by templum and exemplum again,[28] as well as amplus, ampla 'handle', simplex, duplus, and numerous other forms. I know of only two reasonably secure examples of epenthesis in a pl-cluster that became part of the standard language: populus 'people' and manipulus 'handful'. Populus alternates with poplus in Plautus and early inscriptions, but the name POPLIOSIO on the Lapis Satricanus, assuming this is a straightforward derivative of poplus, indicates that the latter is the older form. In manipulus, the second compound member is a thematic derivative of *pelh₁- 'fill', usually reconstructed as *-plh₁-o-, with subsequent loss of the laryngeal in a second

---

passim. Note also dialectal variation of the type (standard Lith.) reṁti 'support' ~ dial. rémti, beřti 'scatter' ~ dial. bérti; cf. D. Petit, Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques (Leuven-Paris, 2004), 319. (The accentuation of the derived noun sámtis 'ladle' probably tells us nothing, since ti-derivatives usually have the same accentuation as the infinitive of the verb from which they are derived, even those whose vocalism is different, e.g. dañgtis ~ deñgti 'cover', sprą́stis ~ sprę́sti 'decide, judge'.) The Irish forms point in the other direction from the Lithuanian, but are in the end inconclusive as well: the t-preterite -sat, -set (e.g. do·rósat) < unaccented *-sét continues *(-)sem-s-t, which is most easily accounted for if the root was aniṭ; but it could also be an analogical replacement of an earlier form with laryngeal, compare ·melt 'ground', ·sert 'arrayed', and other forms where pre-Irish *CeRast or *CēRast (< *CēRH-s-t) was replaced by *CeRst under the influence of the present *CeR-e- < *CerH-e- (for the process, see K. McCone, The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish Nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures [Innsbruck, 1991], 106). Latin sentīna 'bilge-water', if it belongs here, shows no evidence of a laryngeal; Gk. ἄμη 'shovel, pail' is inconclusive.

[27] Sommer-Pfister, 54, have a different view of simplus and simplex and attribute the i in these forms not to sound change but to influence from singulus, a view that I find implausible. In a similar vein, F. Solmsen, "Beiträge zur geschichte der lateinischen sprache," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft 34 (1897), 11, claimed that simpulum should have been *semplom but was influenced by simplex and simplus.

[28] Rare inscriptional tempulum is late (see Sommer-Pfister, loc.cit., 113).

compound member to *-plo-. Assuming both these analyses are correct, note that in both forms the syllable preceding the cluster is light; the only example that is sometimes adduced of epenthesis of a *pl*-cluster following a heavy syllable is far more problematic, Plautine *extempulō*, a variant of *extemplō* 'right away'. This word is etymologically still not fully cleared up, but there is no good evidence that the longer form is an epenthesized variant of the shorter. The standard explanation of it as a hypostasis of a phrase *ex templō* 'from the augural space' is unsatisfactory. A much more promising starting-point for an analysis would clearly be *tempus* 'time', cp. the nearly synonymous idiom *ex tempore* 'on the spot, on the spur of the moment'. Nothing stands in the way of taking *extempulō* as the older form,[29] built from a noun *temp-e/olo-* that perhaps meant 'point in time' or the like and that stood alongside the *s*-stem *temp-o/es-* just as PIE *nebh-eleh₂* 'cloud, sky' (Lat. *nebula*, Gk. νεφέλη, OHG *nebul*) stood alongside *nebh-o/es-* 'id.' (Hitt.

---

[29] *Extempulō* is restricted to line-final position in Plautus. This immediately calls to mind the frequent (not to say exclusive) line-final placement of such forms as *siem* (*-s -t* etc.), *fuam*, *(-)duim*, and infinitives in *-(r)ier*. Their line-final placement has normally been taken as evidence that they were archaic in Plautus's day; see for example H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin, 1934), 115ff. It would be convenient for my argument, to say the least, if the line-final positioning of *extempulō* also meant that it was archaic vis-à-vis the commoner *extemplō*. But I do not believe that the line-final positioning of any of these forms is a trustworthy diagnostic for archaism. If *Cap.* 740 is any guide (*periclum uitae meae tuo stat periculo*; cited in Sommer and Pfister, *loc. cit.*), the distribution of such variants was conditioned purely by metrical considerations; *periculo* is the newer form, but stands at line-end because it provides an iambic cadence. In the case of the verb forms *siem*, *duim*, etc., at least four independent facts together conspired to cause them to fall typically at the end of an iambotrochaic verse-line: (1) verbs are normally clause-final; (2) clause-end typically corresponds with verse-end; (3) a senarius or septenarius must end in an iamb or pyrrhic; (4) the verb-forms in question are iambic and therefore convenient for use line-finally. A. Foucher, "*Siem, sies, siet*, dans les vers de Plaute et de Térence: Quelques remarques de prosodie, de métrique et de stylistique" (*Revista de estudios latinos* 3, 2003), 25ff., notes that the typical placement of idioms before hemistich boundaries was also a conditioning factor in the positioning of *siem* etc. I hope to treat this topic in more detail elsewhere.

nepiš-, Gk. νέφος, etc.).[30] Regardless of the etymology, *extempulō* is not an assured example of epenthesis in a *pl*-cluster.

For all these manifold reasons and in spite of the semantic arguments in its favor, the derivation of *simpulum/simpu(u)ium* from **sem(H)-* must be abandoned, and we have to understand the *-p-* as part of the root. Luckily, a convincing alternative derivation is readily found, whose semantic fit is just as good, if not better, and which is devoid of phonological problems.

Before we get to this alternative etymology, let us take a brief look at the *simpuuium* in its cultural context. The word is not common in our extant corpus; except for its earliest attestations (both in Varro)[31] it is found literarily only as something of a clichéed icon for the old Roman religion of Numa and for proper ritual action.[32] But this clichéed use would not have arisen

---

[30] I have not found other exactly parallel examples in Latin. *Modulus* 'unit of measurement' alongside the **mod-o/es-* that underlies *modestus* 'moderate, measured' and *moder-āre* 'control the measure of' is secondary, since **mod-o/es-* is likely an innovation, being a remaking (under the influence of the inherited *o*-stem *modus* 'measurement') of the **med-es-* that underlies Umbrian *mersto-*. *Vitulus* 'calf' alongside *uetus* (**'year'* >) 'old' is somewhat closer, but the former is apparently not, as usually assumed, from the **u̯et-o/es-* of Gk. ἔτος 'year', but rather from **u̯et-u-s-*, whence *uetustās* (over against *modestās*, *honestās*, etc.); cp. Lith. *větušas* 'old', OCS *vetŭxŭ* 'id.' For the formation and adjectival semantics, cp. Skt. *táp-u-s-* 'hot; heat' (A. Nussbaum, *Head and Horn in Indo-European* [Berlin, 1986], 145 with n. 15).

After coming up with this analysis of *extemplō* I noticed that O. Szemerényi, "Principles of etymological research in the Indo-European languages," in *Vorträge und Veranstaltungen: Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, ed. J. Knobloch (Innsbruck, 1962), 52–53, made largely the same claim, with some differences in argumentation and other detail.

[31] At *LL* 5.124 it is defined as a ladle used to draw out wine (similarly Paul. *ex Festo* 337.11), and at *Sat. men.* 115 its role in ritual is referred to (*Non uides ipsos deos, si quando uolunt gustare uinum, derepere ad hominum fana, et temetum* [*tamen tum* codd.] *ipsi illi Libero simpuio ministrari?*).

[32] Note *si aedilis uerbo aut simpuio aberrauit* Cic. *De haruspicum responsis* 23, echoed in Arnobius 4.31. It is described as being made of clay (*fictilis*) at Apuleius *Apol.* 18 and Pliny *N.H.* 35.46.158 and is associated with Numa and proper ritual action at Juvenal 6.343 and, much later, Prudentius *Perist.* 2.514. An apparently proverbial expression was *excitare fluctus in simpulo* 'make a tempest in a teapot' at Cic. *Leg.* 3.36. For more detail on the implement, see *RE s.v. simpuvium* and the references given there, as well as E. Zwierlein-Diehl's article cited in the next note.

without some basis in fact. Not long ago, E. Zwierlein-Diehl[33] marshalled numerous pieces of evidence to show that the *simpuuium* was of great antiquity and of central importance to certain sacrifices. In common with some other ancient ritual implements, for example, it continued to be made of earthenware well into Imperial times. Archaeological remains of *simpuuia* or very similar implements have been found at Rome dating as far back as the seventh century B.C. (Zwierlein-Diehl 416).

The Romans ascribed the establishment of Roman religious law and practice to their second king, Numa Pompilius. The name is partly Etruscan (Numa) and partly Sabellic (Pompilius); Roman authors call him a Sabine. As with all the features of legendary Roman history, we are dealing with a marriage of fact and myth; and it is a matter of enormous contention just how much is fact and how much is myth.[34] Whether there was a real Sabine king Numa who established the cultural institutions later ascribed to him will likely never be answered, but it is intriguing that the *simpuuium* was an *insigne* of the *pontifices* and was used by the Vestals[35] and the Arval Brethren: tradition ascribes the establishment of the *pontifices* as well as the Vestals to Numa, and Juvenal's phrase *simpuuium Numae* may, as Zwierlein-Diehl suggests (p. 419 et passim), be more than just a literary way of endowing the implement with the hoary weight of pious eld. To be sure, there was a tendency among some Roman authors to affix the label "Sabine" to all manner of ancient words and customs, and there is still no certain evidence of a formative presence of Sabine culture in early Rome. But

---

[33] "Simpuvium Numae," in H. A. Cahn and E. Simon (edd.), *Tainia: Roland Hampe zum 70. Geburtstag am 2. Dezember 1978* (Mainz, 1980) 405–22.

[34] See the treatment by J. Poucet, "Les Sabins aux origines de Rome: Orientations et problèmes," in H. Temporini, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, vol. 1: *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang der Republik* (Berlin, 1972), 48–135 (especially 101–7 on Sabine elements in Roman religion).

[35] These may be the female officiants referred to in Festus's note *unde* [i.e., *a simpulo*] *et mulieres rebus diuinis deditae simpulatrices*, probably drawn from the same source used by the scholiast on Juv. 6.343 ... *unde simpuuiatrix illa dicitur, quae porrigit poculum ipsum.*

absence of evidence neither proves that there was no such presence, nor that all relevant claims by Roman authors are pure fabrication, and the possibility that some items of Roman ritual paraphernalia could have been taken over from the Sabines should be left open. The fundamental question to be asked of any Sabine etymology of a Latin word is, Does that etymology help to explain its phonology, morphology, and even cultural role better than the alternatives?

In my view, the answer is in the affirmative regarding *simpuuium*. The first point to be made is that *-uuium*, which we established above as being the older and historically genuine suffix, is not Latin. It looks superficially like the *-ouio-*, *-uuio-* that appears especially in Sabellic placenames (Osc. **Kalúvieis**, U. *Fisouie*, the mountain-name *Vesuuius*, the gentilicium *Pacuuius*, among others), with which it may or may not be identical. It is interestingly found also in the name of another ancient earthen container used in rituals, *athanu(u)ium*,[36] whose origin, unfortunately, is entirely opaque, but which has a some-what Oscan feel to it with the possible anaptyctic vowel in the second syllable.[37] Be that as it may, the suffix of *simpuuium* strongly suggests a non-native origin of the word, even if it tells us little more.

Viewing *simpuuium* as non-native and possibly Sabellic opens up a new and better possibility for identifying the root. The *simpulum/simpu(u)ium* was used for transferring wine out of a larger container and pouring it into the shallow dish from which the libation was offered;[38] it could thus just as easily be 'the pourer' as 'the scooper'. Taking it as the latter does not lead to a satisfying analysis, as we have seen, but if we take it as the former, we are quickly led to the well-represented root *$*seik^w$-*

---

[36] And variants in *at(t)-*, which have less ms. support. Note, though, the one glossatorial variant *atanulum*.

[37] I do not want to press this, since *-tn-* was dissimilated to *-kn-* in the Sabellic word for 'year' (**atno-* > **akno-* > Osc. loc. **akeneí**, U. acc. *acnu*) and Oscan anaptyxis should have produced **atunu-* rather than **atanu-*, but in a loanword such details could be modified.

[38] See Zwierlein-Diehl, *op.cit.* 420.

'pour', reflected in Skt. *siñcáti* 'pours out', Av. *us...haēcaiiāt̯* 'will empty out', OHG *sīhan* 'pour through a strainer, strain', Toch. A *sikaṃtär* 'they are flooded', and OCS *sīcati* 'to urinate'.[39] The nasal present *$*si-n(e)-k^{w}$-[40] would have been regularly leveled to *$*si-n-k^{w}$- in Italic and become *$*simp$- in Sabellic, accidentally unattested in our limited corpus[41] but preserved in a nominal derivative that was borrowed into Latin as *simpu(u)ium*.

There is at least one other tantalizing piece of evidence for the survival of *$*seik^{w}$- into Sabellic. Michael Weiss (p.c.) calls my attention to the (Via) *Sēplāsia*, a street in Capua where ointments and perfumes were sold. The location (Capua) and morphology (*-āsia* for Latin *-āria*) are both Oscan. One of the uses of the suffix of appurtenance *-ārius* was to build adjectives and nouns referring to occupations,[42] with the suffix added to the name of the article sold; thus we can posit for *Sēplāsia* an underlying (Latinized) *$*sēpl(o/ā)$- 'perfume, unguent' vel sim.

---

[39] The zero-grade intransitive middle reflected by Slavic and Tocharian probably belongs to a rather old layer of the proto-language (see J. H. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb* [Oxford, 2003], 159 and 163), and thus predates the diverse set of transitive formations in Indo-Iranian (nasal-infix, causative) and Germanic (full-grade thematic). However, any of these could also date back to PIE.

[40] The nasal present was thematized in Skt. (and Av. *hiṇcaiti*). On the participle *siñcatíh* (RV 10.21.3b), see the references in Mayrhofer *s.v. SEC*.

[41] For another possible descendant of the root *$*seik^{w}$- in Sabellic, see the next paragraph.

[42] We do not happen to have that exact usage attested for any of the Oscan examples of *-asios*, but from the Latin text CIL I^2 585 comes the Oscan-looking [VI]ASIEIS 'tenants of road-side properties', as Weiss reminds me, which comes very close. Note also the name *Vitulasius/-a* alongside the *Via Vitularia* 'calf-sellers' road' mentioned by Cicero (*ad Fam. fr.* 3.1.3). C. de Simone, "Latino *Mercurius* < *$*Mercu-sio-s$* e gli aggettivi di classificazione in *-(ā)rius* < *$*-(ā)sio-s$*," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 127 (1999) 389–406, lists and discusses the *-asio*-words, though he does not mention *Seplasia*. On the suffix see also F. Heidermanns, *Sabellische Nominalbildung: Untersuchungen zur nominalen Wortbildung im Oskisch-Umbrischen* (diss. Köln, 1996), 303–5.

Could this be the rendering of another Sabellic derivative of
*seik^w-, a full-grade *seip-(e)lo-, literally 'stuff for pouring'?[43]
The only question that needs to be addressed is whether the
diphthong *ei,* which would have been inherited unchanged into
Oscan, could have been borrowed into Latin as *ē*. This is only a
problem if the borrowing occurred before the inner-Latin change
of *ei* to [e:],[44] which later became [i:]. The initial monophthong-
ization to [e:] had probably already taken place by or during the
third century B.C.;[45] but chances are that the borrowing under
discussion would have occurred later, during the period when
Latin-Oscan bilingualism was at its height (second and first
centuries B.C.).[46] And already by the earlier part of this period
(mid-second century or before) the raising of [e:] to [i:] had run
its course as well. In other words, a Roman living in Capua in
the mid-second century and hearing the Oscan diphthong *ei*
would have surely picked *ē* [ɛ:] as his closest equivalent of the
Oscan diphthong.[47] The fact that Greek ɛι was rendered in Latin
as *ī* (or *ĕ* before vowels) is not significant, for ɛι was no longer
a diphthong by the time of Classical Greek either, being also
pronounced [e:]; and by Hellenistic times, i.e. before most
tokens of ɛι had made their way into Latin, this [e:] had been
raised – exactly as later and independently in Latin – to [i:].[48]

But there is a distinct possibility that this is all a non-
problem, for the Oscan of Capua may itself have monophthong-
ized *ei* to *ē*, if the final syllable of the genitive singular **minies**
'Minii' Ve 96 (from Capua) is to be taken at face value, and is

---

[43] For the semantic connection between pouring and perfumes, Weiss
notes Hor. *Od.* 1.5 *perfusus liquidis odoribus.* The suffix *-elo-* is preferable
to *-lo-,* as the latter was unproductive in Sabellic (Heidermanns, *op. cit.* 103,
104ff.); the syncope was presumably Latin.

[44] Written <ei> or sometimes <e>; Leumann 62, 63–4. This sound was
distinct from inherited [ɛ:], i.e. *ē*.

[45] Leumann 63–4; W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina*[2] (Cambridge, 2001) 53–4.

[46] See J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge,
2003), 112ff., for a detailed treatment.

[47] Note, in reverse, Oscan *ceus* 'citizen' as a borrowing of Old Latin
ceiuis ([ke:wis]; Untermann *s.v. ceus*).

[48] Leumann 78.

not simply a mistake for what is otherwise spelled **minieís, miínieis,** or **minnieís.**[49] Since Sabellic short *e,* alone and in diphthongs, was a lax [ɛ],[50] a Capuan monophthongization of [eʲ] would very likely have been [ɛ:] (as also in Umbrian), matching Latin *ē* [ɛ:] exactly. Even if Capuan Oscan preserved the diphthong, the widespread monophthongization of *ei* to *ē* throughout Italic suggests that the *e*-element of the diphthong was considerably more robust than the following high vocoid, leading to the latter's disappearance time and again.[51] So a Capuan *e*-heavy diphthong [ɛ(:)ʲ] would also have been perceived by a Roman as [ɛ:].

It is perhaps not coincidental that **seikʷ-* and **u̯leikʷ-* rhymed in PIE, as they are semantically related; cf. **u̯er-* and **gʷher-* 'to heat'. One group of words usually derived from **seikʷ-,* however, means something quite different from 'pour', namely 'dry': Av. *haēcah-* 'drought', *hiku-* 'dry', and Lat. *siccus* 'id.'[52] The semantic development typically envisaged is 'pour off/out' > 'dry'. Morphosemantically, though, it is diffi-

---

[49] Monophthongization in this ending is occasionally found in other Oscan texts as well (see J. F. Eska and R. E. Wallace, "Remarks on the genitive in Ancient Italy," *Incontri Linguistici* 24 [2001] 81–2 [n. 12]). For mono-phthongized *-es* in "pre-Samnite" and South Picene see A. L. Prosdocimi, "Il genitivo singolare dei temi in *-o-* nelle varietà italiche (osco, sannita, umbro, sudpiceno, etc.)," *Incontri Linguistici* 25 (2002) 65–76, recapitulating earlier works (though he has a very different view about the origin of the ending).

[50] G. Meiser, *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache* (Innsbruck, 1984) 39 and 66.

[51] Monophthongization of *ei* to *ē* is found across the board in Umbrian and Volscian and extensively in "pre-Samnite", South Picene, Paelignian, and Marrucinian, where both *ei* and monophthongized *e* cooccur; the same is true, outside Sabellic, of Faliscan.

[52] Other etymologies have been proposed for *siccus,* especially inner-Latin derivation from *sitis* 'thirst' via **sit-ko-* (first W. Meyer, "Kleine beiträge zur lateinischen grammatik," *KZ* 28 [1887] 172; F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*[2.3] [Heidelberg, 1914] 239) or syncopated **siti-ko-* (R. G. Kent, review of Ernout-Meillet[1] [1932], *Language* 8 [1932] 154; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* [München, 1977] 196). I cannot reject this etymology out of hand (as Walde-Hofmann try to do, *s.v.*, by stipulating that *sitis* cannot have meant 'dryness' in the first instance), but it is in any event more complicated than simple equation with a synonymous adjective elsewhere in the family (see below).

cult to see how this could be reflected in the material at hand;
one would have to assume that one of these adjectives meant 'in
a condition of having been poured out of' > 'emptied' or the
like, thence 'dry'. But Av. *hiku-* looks on the face of it like an
old zero-grade *u*-stem to an adjectival root, rather than a verbal
derivative. Additionally, the final labiovelar in the root should
have remained intact in Latin.[53]

It would be attractive, in spite of the attendant multiplication
of entities, to depart from the *communis opinio* and take both of
these words as reflecting an entirely different, nonlabiovelar root
*seik- '(be) dry' that formed a *u*-stem adjective **sik-u-* reflected
in Avestan and a full-grade thematic adjective **seik-o-* reflected
in Latin – showing the same morphology and (*mutatis mutandis*)
phonology as the pair **u̯likʷ-u-/*u̯leikʷ-o-* entertained earlier.
The full-grade Avestan *s*-stem noun *haēcah-* < **seik-o/es-* would
also be quite normal alongside a zero-grade *u*-stem adjective, as
paralleled by Skt. *urú-* 'wide' ~ *váras-* 'breadth', *ripú-* 'tricky,
treacherous' ~ *répas-* 'dirt', Gk. ϑαρσύς 'bold' ~ (Lesb.) ϑέρσος
'courage', among numerous other examples.[54]

Under my hypothesis, as already mentioned, *lippus* was still
*leipos in Plautus's day; we would then also expect that *siccus*
was **seikos* if my analysis of this word is correct. If so, *Rud.*
632 ... *ab lippitudine usque siccitas*...(quoted above) would
have been **... ab leipitudine usque seicitas ...*, with the two
contrasted roots phonologically similar then as later on in the
Classical period. The arbitrary "expressive gemination" usually
invoked to explain the double consonantism with which they

---

[53] *-qu-* became delabialized in certain environments, as before a round
vowel; this sometimes led to allomorphy (*ecus/equī, secūtus/sequor*), but the
delabialized allomorph was to my knowledge never generalized paradigma-
tically at the expense of the labiovelar in Latin.

[54] Whether my analysis separates Av. *us...haēcaiiāṯ* 'will empty out'
from *haēcah-* 'drought' depends on one's view of *us...haēcaiiāṯ*. The normal
(and most straightforward) analysis is to take the verb as a full-grade
thematic verb cognate with the Skt. nasal-infixed *siñcati* et al. One could,
however, entertain the possibility that the verb is ultimately a back-formation
from the noun (*haēcah-* → thematic verb **haēca-* 'dry', recharacterized as
haēcaiia-), if one is comfortable with the additional assumptions involved.

ultimately wound up may thus happily bow to a less *ad hoc* account for both words.[55]

---

[55] It was only after this paper was in proofs that I came across the discussion in Poucet (in n. 34 above) and his reference (102 n. 154) to an article by Emilio Peruzzi, "Sabinismi dell'età regia," *La Parola del Passato* 102 (1967):29–45, in which the same root etymology of *simpuuium* was arrived at (though differing in some details, as in his view that *simpulum* is the older form). Poucet dismisses Peruzzi's claim that this is a Sabine word: "A mon sens, on ne peut considérer le *simpulum* comme un récipient propre au culte sabin et voir en *simpulum* un mot sabin, en arguant du fait que ce vase était utilisé par les pontifes et que le pontificat était, selon la légende, une création du roi Numa." I must leave it to my readers to weigh the absence of direct evidence of Sabine influence on early Roman cult (together with the absence of evidence disproving the same) against the aggregate of (1) the archaeological evidence in support of the antiquity of the *simpuuium*; (2) the testimonial by Roman authors that it was ancient; (3) its attribution by Roman authors to a king with a part-Sabellic name; (4) the non-Latin morphology of *simpuuium*; (5) the linguistic problems with a native Latin derivation; (6) the advantages of a derivation from Sabellic; and (7) the additional evidence of the root **seik^w-* in Sabellic afforded by the *Via Seplasia*.