Asterisking Ennius: The *Annales* of Quintus Ennius and the Indo-European Tradition

Jay Fisher
Department of Classics
Yale University
john.fisher@yale.edu

The fragments of the *Annales* of Quintus Ennius are rarely examined for evidence of Indo-European textual reconstructions. Although the poem was modeled on Greek epic, it is logical that some of the language of the *Annales* would reflect the practice of native Italic verbal art and, therefore, retain vestiges of Indo-European verbal art. In the fragment describing the dream of Ilia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, there are two phrases which bear a striking resemblance to two traditional collocations previously hypothesized to be of Indo-European date. The collocation *voce vocabam* appears to be a reflex of the well known reconstructed sequence $*wek^w$- wek^w- 'utter an utterance'. In addition, the phrase *tendebam … manus* bears at least a superficial resemblance to a ritual utterance reconstructed by George Dunkel as RAISE + $*\hat{g}hes$-. Furthermore, if *tendere manus* is genetically related to RAISE + $*\hat{g}hes$-, this phrase suggests that the original sequence was $*ten(d)$- + $*\hat{g}hes$-. The presence of two collocations of Indo-European date in close proximity to one another in this fragment of the *Annales* simultaneously invites a reevaluation of the value of its fragments as evidence for Indo-European sequential reconstruction and the compositional technique of the poem on a synchronic level.

Despite its archaic character, the *Annales* of Quintus Ennius are not often cited as evidence for Indo-European textual reconstruction.[1] In his study of comparative Indo-

---

[1] Calvert Watkins (1995: 12-16) terms the inquiry into the reconstruction of sequences 'formulaics' but the work of Milman Parry (1971) has forever tied the concept of the formula to stichic metrical texts like the Homeric poems and the oral compositions of the South Slavic *guslari*. Although the term 'sequential reconstruction' is perhaps more accurate, I will employ Ranko Matasovic's (1996) term 'textual reconstruction' for this inquiry into reconstructed sequences. I have eschewed the word 'formula' in favor of the term 'traditional collocation', which I define as a sequence of two or more lexemes inherited from an ancestral tradition.

European poetics, Calvert Watkins discusses the Indo-European background of documents written in Latin and other Italic languages such as Cato's Prayer to Mars in Latin and The Iguvine Tables in Umbrian, to which he devotes entire chapters, but he only mentions four lines of the *Annales* on five occasions.[2] Schmitt cites only one line of the *Annales* in his extensive survey of Proto-Indo-European *Dichtersprache,* which he dismisses as "Wohl einer griechischen Quelle entsprungen."[3]

There are several good reasons why the *Annales* is not an obvious choice for anyone wishing to reconstruct a traditional collocation of Indo-European date. The meter of the poem is the dactylic hexameter borrowed from the Greek Homeric poems. Ennius not only marks his poetry with a non-native meter, he also contemptuously dismisses his Latin predecessors who composed their epics in the Saturnian meter, which may or may not be native to Italy,[4] as *faunei vatesque* 'forest creatures and oracle mongers' (*Ann.* 206).[5] The diction of the *Annales* bears a heavy Homeric influence even on the level of the single

---

[2]Watkins (1995: 155-156) draws a parallel between *Annales* 38 and an Oscan Curse (Rix Cm 13). He cites *Annales* 32 as a "Latin Formula" in his discussion of the reciprocality of the root **beidh-* (1995: 83). He raises the possibility of a genetic relationship between the phrase *lumina lucent* in *Annales* 156 and *Rig Veda* 9.9.8 but then dismisses the possibility by claiming they "are best regarded as parallel but independent creations" (1995: 132). He also remarks on the "blatant iconicity" of *Annales* 609 which he connects with an Old Irish poetic device known as *dichned* 'beheading' and a vaguely parallel iconic distraction in *Beowulf* 1420-21 (1995: 184)

[3]Schmitt (1967: 153) suspects that *o pater o genitor* in *Annales* 108 is a borrowing from Greek rather than an expression genetically related to the various Vedic collocations of *pita* and *janita*. Especially since the Greek parallel is from the *Ion* of Euripides a poet to whom Ennius elsewhere seems to have alluded in the *Annales.*

[4]The controversy over how Saturnians actually worked is far beyond the scope of this paper but it needs to be acknowledged. The only thing that is universally agreed upon is that each line has a caesura dividing it into two parts. A variety of suggestions have been made concerning how the lines were actually scanned but the amount of lines written in Saturnians is simply too meager to determine conclusively. There is even little agreement as to which putative Saturnians constitute "true Saturnians." Freeman (1998: 61-90) gives a good overview of conflicting points of view but adds little himself to the subject. Cole (1969: 3-73) is the classic exposition of the quantitative-syllabic argument. Parsons (1993: 117-137) argues the Saturnian is based on the grouping of syllables and Mercado (2003: 188-208) adjusts Parsons' model to work as a quantitative-syllabic meter.

[5]Skutsch (1985: 371) believes that Ennius is only referring to Naevius, who composed the Saturnian epic, the *Bellum Poenicum.*

word, producing forms such as *do* for *domus* (*Ann.* 587) and *cael* for *caelum* (*Ann.* 586), which are very unlikely to be anything but inventions of the poet on analogy with Homeric δῶ (Skutsch 1985: 726-729).

Nevertheless, Ennius is a native of ancient Italy composing a text for speakers of an Italic language who had their own forms of verbal art. His epic displays many of the markers of verbal art recognized as native to the Italic languages and inherited from the Indo-European tradition. Like many of the earlier Italic texts, the *Annales* is marked by *figurae etymologicae* and alliterative doubling figures,[6] suggesting that Ennius did not completely abandon his Italic roots.

Although the Homeric poems also employ these poetic devices, they are found in the earliest texts written in the Italic languages, such as South Picene and Umbrian.[7] The presence of these markers in texts, which are written in alphabets derived from Etruscan and not Greek, suggest that etymological figures and alliterative doubling figures are characteristic of native Italic verbal art, and that Ennius expanded on two aspects of Homeric poetry to which he was already accustomed to consider markers of verbal art from the native Italic tradition. The diction of the *Annales* must owe something to the traditional verbal art which was already centuries old by the time of Ennius and ultimately a continuation of the Indo-European tradition.

In his *De divinatione*, Cicero preserves a long fragment from the *Annales* that treats the dream of Ilia, the daughter of Aeneas and the mother of Romulus and Remus (*div.* 1.40-41). Two sequences occur in close proximity in the vivid account of the dream that appear to be reflexes of two traditional

---

[6]Watkins (1995: 197-225) discusses these features in the Iguvine Tables and the prayer to Mars in Cato's *de Agricultura* 141.

[7]Watkins (1995: 131-134 and 214-225) treats these features in South Picene and Umbrian extensively. Eichner (1988: 200-01) suggests a six-line arrangement ordered by a quantitative analysis based on Greek models but he assumes a knowledge of syllable length in South Picene which I am hesitant to accept. The mixture of iambic, dactylic, and spondaic elements appear random for an inscription that antedates the Greek lyric innovators like Timotheus of Miletus by a century if not more. The proposed arrangement of cola is not especially divergent from the basic iambic and spondaic rhythms expected of an Italic language. Eichner's point that some Greek influence must be present in South Picene is well taken, but in this case, such influence appears to be minimal. At any rate, Eichner's analysis is rejected by Watkins (1995: 131 n. 9).

collocations inherited from the Italic and, ultimately, the Indo-European tradition. One of these collocations, *voce vocabam* reflects an inherited *figura etymologica* reconstructed as **wekʷ-wekʷ-* 'utter an utterance', a traditional Indo-European collocation identified by Schmitt (1967: -265).[8] The phrase *tendebam … manus* bears at least a superficial resemblance to a ritual utterance reconstructed by George Dunkel as RAISE + **ĝhes-* (1993: 111-14). Furthermore, if *tendere manus* is genetically related to RAISE + **ĝhes-*, this phrase suggests that the original sequence was **ten(d)- + ĝhes-*.

The fragment appears to be part of the narrative of the rape of Ilia at the hands of Mars and the subsequent birth of Romulus and Remus. In the course of her dream Ilia is snatched away by a beautiful stranger, finds herself alone, meets her father, the now deified Aeneas, loses sight of him, tries to find him, and then awakens. Ennius details the last part of the dream in the following manner:

> *Haec ecfatus pater, germana, repente recessit*
> *Nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus,*
> *Quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa*
> *Tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam.*
> *Vix aegro cum corde meo me somnus reliquit.*'
>
> <div align="right">(Ann. 46-50)</div>

Father having said such things, sister, suddenly went away and did not show himself although I desired him in my heart, although I raised my hands to the blue spaces of the sky weeping and I called him with a winning call. Sleep reluctantly left me with my heavy heart.

The coupling of *voce* and *vocabam* in line 49 creates a *figura etymologica*, marking the narrative as Italic verbal art as well as Greek poetry.

---

[8]Schmitt does not adduce any Latin parallels for this traditional collocation, perhaps viewing them as borrowings from Homer. Matasovic (1996:114) notes the absence of Latin in Schmitt suggesting that expressions such as *voce vocans* in Aeneid 6.247 are different enough in "syntax of the cases and the meaning." He does not mention the Ennian expression, which Vergil may have borrowed, or the Umbrian *subocau suboco*.

However, the possibility of Greek influence looms over any attempt to triangulate any parallels between Latin and Greek back to Proto-Indo-European. Homer often couples ἔπος and εἰπεῖν and therefore, the general idea of expressing speech with a *figura etymologica* could have been the inspiration for *voce vocabam*. Nevertheless, Ennius chooses to express a Homeric idea with a phrase that is only opaquely etymologically related to the Greek examples while a phrase like *dicto dixi* would have been metrically acceptable and a more accurate translation, as Latin *voco* describes a much narrower field of verbal expression than Greek εἰπεῖν. On the other hand, *voce vocabam* is a transparent etymological and semantic match for the Umbrian ritual formula *suboco subocau*. The Ennian fragment may be problematic as primary evidence for a traditional collocation of Indo-European date but it deploys a striking parallel to an Umbrian formula. This parallel suggests that *voce vocabam* is a reflex of the traditional phraseology of Italic ritual and ultimately Indo-European.

On nine separate occasions, the Iguvine Tables deploy the phrase *subocau suboco,* 'I invoke an invoking,' all of which occur in the sixth tablet.[9] For example, the prayer to Jupiter Grabovius on the obverse of the sixth tablet begins with the following invocation:

> *Teio subocau suboco dei graboui*

> I invoke you an invoking Jupiter Grabovius
>
>   (*IT* VIa 22-23).

---

[9]The nine occurrences of *suboco subocau* are found in IT VIa 22, 24, 25, VIb 6, 8, 8, 26, 27, and 27. Schirmer (1998: 255-272) gives a detailed discussion of the various interpretations of the phrase that have identified *suboco* as an adverb and an infinitive. She identifies the phrase as a formula. The double accusative *teio suboco* "(I invoke) you an invoking" is mildly surprising and led Poultney (1959: 325) to suggest the meaning of *suboco* to be 'the one invoked (?)'. Untermann *s.v. suboco* interprets *suboco* as a cognate accusative and provides a parallel example of a double accusative in which one accusative forms an etymological figure with the verb and the other accusative is the second person pronoun in Cato's prayer: *te bonas preces precor* (*de Agricultura* 134 and 139). Watkins (1995: 214-225) devotes an entire chapter to the language of the prayer to Jupiter Grabovius and its traditional nature. He also notes that the phrase is part of a loose ring composition framing the prayer in *IT* VIa 22-34, beginning with *teio subocau suboco dei grabovi* (*IT* VIa 22), and ending with *di grabovie tio subocau* (*IT* VIa 34).

The phrase is indubitably a formula of Umbrian ritual. The ritual connotations of the Ennian narrative that depicts Ilia addressing her father Aenas who has become a god, further suggest that Ennius co-opted the phrase from Osco-Umbrian or Latin ritual.

A number of correspondences with Osco-Umbrian ritual language have been identified in other Latin texts including the fragments of the *Annales*, suggesting that this parallel is not accidental.[10] The weight of evidence suggests the phrase is a reflex from the traditional language of a common Italic verbal art. Given the preponderance of other parallels among the Italic languages, the actual phrase is likely to be a traditional Italic collocation even if it has been appropriated to express a Homeric idea.

The correspondence between *voce vocabam* and *suboco subocau* are not exact but very close. Unlike the Umbrian, Ennius does not add any preverbs to *voce* or *vocabam*, although there are no instances of *subvoco* or *subvox* in the extant remains of Classical or Pre-Classical Latin.[11] The word order in Ennius is noun verb, which is the reverse of the Umbrian cognate phrase, and *suboco* is an accusative not an ablative like *voce*. Given the metrical constraints of the hexameter and general weakness of final *-m* in Latin, these objections are weak at best.

---

[10]Some of the better know examples are *impetritum, inauguratumst: quouis admittunt aves picus et cornix ab laeva, corvos, parra ab dexter consuadent* from Plautus (*As*. 259-261) and *Stiplo aseriaia parfa dersua curnaco dersua peico mersto peica mersta Mersta auuei mersta angla* from the Iguvine Tables (VIa as noted by Poultney 1959: 228-229). Benveniste (1970: 309) notes the parallel between *pastores pecuaque salva servassis* from Cato (*de Agr,* 141) and *viro pequo … salva seritu* (*IT* VIa 32-33). Brent Vine (1996: 111-127) demonstrates that the Umbrian collocation *struśla ficla,* which occurs nine times in the Iguvine Tables, bears a striking similarity to a pairing of similar terms in Latin: *strue atque ferto* (Gell. 10.15.14), *struem et fertum* in Cato (*De Agr*. 141), and *struibus fertisque* (which appears several times throughout the *Acta fratrum Arvalium,* CIL 6.2104. These phrases appear to be of Proto-Italic date and suggest a genetic relationship between the Umbrian asyndetic collocation and the Latin collocation bound by the single particle *-que*. Finally. Watkins (1995: 155) notes suggests that *vires vitaque,* perhaps not incidentally from the same fragment of Ennius under discussion, bears a strong semantic resemblance to an Oscan doubling figure **biass biitam** in an Oscan curse tablet from Cumae (Rix Cm13).

[11]No entry can be found for either in the *OLD.*

The broader Indo-European context suggests that *subocau suboco* is not only of Common Italic date but also of Indo-European date. Both the Vedic and Greek epic traditions employ *figurae etymologicae* generated from a verbal and a nominal reflex of the Proto-Indo-European root **wek^w-* , the same root from which *subocau* and *suboco* and *vox* and *voco* are derived. In addition, the Vedic examples occur in a ritual context and there may be some traces of such a context in Greek. The etymological and contextual correspondences between the Greek, Vedic, and Umbrian phrases render it difficult to dismiss them as accidental.

The *Iliad* abounds with collocations that pair some form of the noun ἔπος and its verbal counterpart εἰπεῖν.[12] Unlike the Umbrian examples, which consistently conform to the same pattern of *subocau suboco*, Homer makes use of several combinations of ἔπος and εἰπεῖν. The Greek etymological figures fluctuate in word order and verbal tense but these roots are consistently collocated throughout the *Iliad*. In a manner analogous to the variations in word order and verbal tense, there is no single context in which this etymological figure is deployed.

In the heated dispute over what to do when the plague of Apollo strikes the Achaeans, Agamemnon reacts to Calchas' suggestion that he give up the daughter of Chryses with an invective against the priest in which he claims:

> ἐσθλὸν δ' οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ' ἐτέλεσσας (*Il.* 1.108)

> You have never spoken a good word nor accomplished (anything good).[13]

The neuter accusative of ἔπος immediately follows the aorist second person form of εἰπεῖν. It is perhaps significant

---

[12]Schmitt (1968: 265) does not discuss these collocations but notes they are 'legion." He lists ten examples in the *Iliad* (1.108, 543, 3.204, 5.683, 7. 394 (to which we may add 7.375), 15.206, 20.250, 23.102, 24.75,744), eleven in the *Odyssey* (8.397, 16.69, 469, 18.166, 19.98, 362, 21.248, 278, 22.392, 23.183, 342) and three in Hesiod (*Works and Days* 453 and 710 and *fr.* 211.6 in Merkelbach and West's edition) in his footnote to the comment above.

[13]Kirk (1985: 65) discusses the variant reading of οὐδὲ ... οὐδ' for οὔτε ... οὔτ' and mentions there was "much ancient discussion about Agememnon's motives for blackguarding Kalkhas" but he does not discuss the figura etymologica formed by εἶπας ἔπος.

that Agamemnon uses this particular phrase to describe Calchas' prophecies, which may be an indication that the phrase in this particular line has retained some vestige of the ritual context in which Calchas would have pronounced his readings of omens or oracles.

There are other examples of phrases which combine ἔπος and εἰπεῖν throughout the *Iliad*, including some which are deployed in the normal object verb word order and with distension. Antenor confirms that Helen has spoken the truth when she identifies Odysseus in the *Teichoskopeia* with the following phrase:

ὦ γύναι ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος νημερτὲς ἔειπες (*Il.* 3.204)

You spoke this speech very unerringly woman.[14]

Other configurations of ἔπος and εἰπεῖν employ the same word order and distend the collocation with an adjective modifying ἔπος. For example, Sarpedon speaks a tearful word, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπες, to Hector after the Trojan hero has come to the rescue of a contingent of Lycians (*Il.* 5.683).[15] The etymological figure may also be employed in a distension in the reverse word order, as when Andromache bewails that Hector did not speak some meaningful word to her, οὐδέ τί μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, before he died, which she could remember as she mourns him (*Il.* 24.744).[16]

The number of examples in the *Iliad* alone suggests that

---

[14]Kirk (1985: 294) argues that Antenor's agreement is "useful" because Helen may not have known Odysseus well and is "further motivated by his obvious excitement." It may be an overstatement to imply that the Trojans within the epic or the audience of the epic, who already know that Helen has identified Odysseus correctly, will find Antenor's confirmation helpful.

[15]Kirk (1990: 127) notes that this expression is a formula that occurs in *Il.* 23.102 and *Od.* 19.362.

[16]Richardson (1993: 355) claims that the epithet πυκινὸν "has a particular force here 'a word full of meaning'." Martin (1991: 35-36) argues that the four occurrences of πυκινὸν ἔπος in the *Iliad* (7.375, 11.788, 24.75, and 24.744) carry " a sense of language dense with meaning and filled with urgency," and cites this particular use of the phrase as evidence for the "special quality of speech" of πυκινὸν ἔπος. While this phrase may do exactly as Martin suggests, the contexts of all four examples of the phrase are so different that some skepticism is warranted concerning the semantics of πυκινὸν ἔπος.

there was a template for the collocation on which Homer based the variants deployed in the *Iliad*. However the variety of word and context in the *Iliad* makes it difficult to determine the inherited context. The phrases combining ἔπος and forms of εἰπεῖν may have simply been a pleonastic way to express the idea of speaking with no extra connotations, either because the *figura etymologica* is an innovation or because the phrase had become so much a part of the epic diction that it was bleached of any inherited ritual associations.

There are some differences in ablaut between the Greek and Italic examples, but these divergent outcomes are not especially difficult to explain. In spite of the difference in vowel grade, *vox* and ἔπος ultimately stem from the same root and because there appear to be no survivals of the e-grade of Indo-European *wekʷ- in Umbrian, the replacement would naturally be the o-grade of the same root. The reduplicated zero grade aorist reflected in the Greek form εἰπεῖν was not productive in Latin if it ever existed.[17]

Any argument based solely on the Umbrian evidence that asserts the Indo-European phrase was deployed in the language of ritual can only be circular, but instances of cognate *figurae etymlogicae* occurring in the *Rig Veda* and in Old Avestan suggest that the phrase was a ritual utterance. The Indo-Iranian examples also provide evidence from the crucial third branch of the Indo-European family, which is usually considered necessary in order to identify a linguistic phenomenon as an inheritance.[18]

---

[17]The exact form is subject to question. The generally accepted form is a denominative form from Latin *vox*. The derivation from *vox* would explain why the Latin verb is *voco* not *voquo and the o-grade. However the vowel is long in *vox* but short in *voco* and there are several cases of PIE *-*we*-> Latin -*vo*-. This sound change and the "the appeal to leveling – from a single form" has prompted Sihler (1995: 118 and 165) to suggest that *voco* is actually an e-grade whose labiovelar underwent dissimulation with the "phonologically regular" *vox* "playing only a supporting role." Nevertheless, *vocare* is a first conjugation verb, which suggests the verb is a denominative form like *iudicare* < *iudex*. On balance, it is better to accept the usual derivation of *vocare* from *vox*. In any case, the underlying form of *voco* is not relevant to my argument.

[18]Schmitt (1967: 264-65) identifies five examples of this *figurae etymologicae* in Vedic (*RV* 1.78ab, 1.114.6a, 5.1.12ab, 6.52.14c, and 8.24.20bc). He does not discuss these examples in any detail but he does list them and provide Geldner's translation of all five lines.

In a hymn addressed to all the gods of the Vedic pantheon, the composer asks that his word will not fall upon deaf ears:

Mấ vo vacāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocaṃ   (*RV* 6.52.14c)

Let me not speak a speech to you that will be unnoticed.[19]

The word order of the request shows a remarkable resemblance to the class of collocation of ἔπος and εἰπεῖν in Homer marked by distension and object verb word order:

ἔπος νημερτὲς ἔειπες

vacāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocaṃ.

Both phrases are marked by the insertion of an adjective between nominal and verbal reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *wekʷ-, and both end a line. The multiple examples of this type of εἰπεῖν ἔπος phrase in Greek may indicate this particular configuration is of Indo-European date.

---

[19]The translation is my own, loosely based on Geldner's (1951b: 156) rendering of the line: "Die Worte, die ich zu euch sage, sollen nicht unbeachtet." Oldenberg (1909: 403) reads the meter of the line as hypersyllabic. Arnold (1905: 208) identifies the meter as a hypersyllabic tristubh with an extra two syllables added to the eleven-syllable line. Arnold considers the hypersyllabic meter to be an extension of the general trochaic pattern of the meter. He also suggests that these extensions may be an archaic practice but that the practice does not disappear in hymns to which he assigns a later date. The archaic character of the meter may or may not be related to the age of the *figura etymologica* itself.

Holland and Van Nooten (1994: 272) identify the meter of the line as Jagati presumably by resolving the word *paricákṣyāni* as a five-syllable word rather than a six-syllable word. Although -ya- is usually read as -iya- after a heavy syllable this rule is not unbreakable. Such a reading removes the need to read line 14a as a Tristubh by means of a syncopation of a syllable in the written text and reinserting an extra syllable in 14b to make the line a hypersyllabic Tristubh instead of a Jagati, but 14d is eleven syllables long and therefore, looks like a Tristubh. It may be best to take the entire stanza as a hybrid, a solution also suggested by Arnold (1905: 209). In principle, reading the stanza as a hybrid is unobjectionable, but reading line 14 as the insertion of a single Jagati or hybrid stanza between a single Tristubh stanza in 13 and three other Tristubh stanzas in 15-17 destroys the symmetry of a poem that otherwise consists of six Gayatri stanzas preceded by six Tristubhs and followed by five Tristubhs.

The Vedic does differ from the Greek in some respects. The Vedic and the Greek phrases employ an e-grade noun but differ in the ablaut of the verb. The Vedic aorist injunctive *vocaṃ* is a zero-grade reduplicated aorist which is a contraction of **a-va-uc-am.* The root of *vacāṃsi* is etymologically equivalent to Greek ἔπος and also a neuter -*s* stem, presumably with the same vowel grade, but it is plural rather than singular.

In a hymn addressed to Rudra, the Vedic forerunner of the Hindu god Shiva, the composer reflexively notes that his hymn is recited in honor of the Vedic god:

> *Idám pitré marútām <u>ucyate vácaḥ</u>*   (*RV* 1.114.6a)

> This invocation is invoked to the father of the Maruts.[20]

This particular *figura etymologica* bears the closest resemblence of all the Vedic examples to its one congener in Old Avestan, *uxδā vacå* 'spoken speech' (*Yasna* 35.9).

Like the Italic examples, neither Vedic phrase is an exact match for the various types of Greek εἰπεῖν ἔπος collocations. Both verbal forms are the reduplicated zero-grade but one is in the passive, which is never deployed in the Greek or Italic examples. On the other hand, the word order of both Vedic reflexes mirrors that of the two types of the analogous Greek phrase. Moreover, the nominal element in all instances in Greek and Vedic is a neuter -*s* stem. The most significant difference between the two traditions is the context of the phrases. The variety of context in the *Iliad* stands in stark contrast with the Vedas.

When the changes of language that are liable to occur over the thousands of years are taken into consideration, it is the similarities that are surprising rather than the differences. The most important feature in this inherited *figura etymologica* is the consistent pairing of a noun and verb deriving from the same root regardless of its vowel grade. Often, traditional collocations of Indo-European date survive into a daughter language by replacing lexemes rather than changing the vowel grade of the same root.

---

[20]The translation is my own and I have deliberately distorted the meaning of *ucyate vácaḥ* for emphasis. Geldner (1951a: 151) does not emphasize the *figura etymologica* in his translation, but he is more faithful to the word order of the phrase: "Diese Rede wird für den Vater der Marut gesprochen."

Some of these differences must be the result of language change. The passive construction in the one Vedic example is not only a very small minority, it also deploys a passive verb, which is not a development of the Proto-Indo-European medio-passive form, and therefore cannot be of Indo-European date. The zero-grade of the Vedic verb is exactly that of the Greek verb but not the Umbrian or Latin. Similarly, the Vedic and Greek evidence agree against the Italic that the vowel grade of the nominal root was also -*e*-.

The strong parallels between the Greek and Indic examples suggest that there were two variants of word order in these expressions at an early date and the Umbrian evidence appears to fall into the category of the simpler class. The combined evidence suggests the following shapes for the two variants of this phrase:

$$*wek^w\text{-} \text{ (or } *we\text{-}wk^w\text{-) (V) } *wek^w\text{- (N)}$$
$$\text{and}$$
$$*wek^w\text{- (N) [ADJECTIVE] } *wek^w\text{- (or } *we\text{-}wk^w\text{-) (V).}$$

The nominal element is always in the accusative with the exception of the Latin *voce vocabam* and Vedic *ucyate vácaḥ*, suggesting that this was the case in the original formulations and the fluctuation of form in the verbal elements implies that there was some freedom concerning the verb.

The Indo-European context of this phrase may also be narrowed down by the same comparative process. The Greek evidence is the most abundant but it shows no association with a particular context. As noted above, at least one example in the *Iliad* refers to the words of the prophet Calchas, which may refer to the ritual speech spoken as a *mantis.* There may have been Greek prayers no longer extant which deployed the traditional collocation. The Vedic and Umbrian evidence points towards a ritual address to the gods and it is likely to be the original context of Ennius' *voce vocabam.*

The immediate Ennian context of *voce vocabam* retains another possible vestige of ritual language inherited from Proto-Indo-European. Ilia not only calls out to her father, but also raises her hands up to the sky:

> *Quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa*
> *Tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam*   (*Ann.* 48-49).

The raising of the hands to the sky is a posture of prayer that can be found in several traditions of the daughter languages of the Indo-European family. There is a number of expressions of the hands raised upwards in prayer, in which a reflex of the Indo-European root *ĝhes-*, 'hand' is deployed with a verb that means 'to raise'.[21] These expressions culled from the Greek, Indo-Iranian and Anatolian branches suggest that *manus …tendebam* not only reflected a particularly Indo-European attitude of prayer but also may be a reflex of a traditional Proto-Indo-European collocation.

George Dunkel has collected several examples of expressions of the hands stretched up in prayer that he believes are reflexes of a traditional collocation of Indo-European date.[22] He lists no less than eight examples of the collocation χεῖρας ἀνέσχον in the Homeric poems, which accompany an act of prayer or stand for prayer metonymically.[23] He identifies four instances of the Vedic compound *uttānáhasta-*, which combines the Vedic reflexes of the roots *ten-* 'stretch out' and *ĝhes-* 'hand',[24] and one example of *uttānazastō* the Old Avestan congener of the Vedic compound in the *Gāthās* (*Yasna* 28.1a). In addition, he cites another passage from the *Gāthās* in which the Old Avestan reflex of *ĝhes-* is modified by that of *ten-*:

---

[21]Dunkel (1993: 114) believes that the lack of a reconstructable phrase is due to lexical variation in Proto-Indo-European. While I believe Dunkel is right in essentials, I am inclined to believe the variation is due to poetic transformations of what may be hypothetically reconstructed as a 'zero-phrase'.

[22]As M. L. West (1997: 42-43) has noted, the posture of prayer is not exclusively Indo-European but it is not the posture of prayer I am seeking to identify but rather the expression of this practice in Proto-Indo-European as Watkins (1995: 297) seeks to find the "Indo-European touch" or the formula "which will allow us to assert that it [an Indo-European version] existed." Whether this ritual gesture originated with the speakers of Proto-Indo-European or was borrowed from another culture before the break up the proto-language is irrelevant to question of its existence in Indo-European culture.

[23]Dunkel (1993: 111) lists several variants of the phrase that occur in *Il.* 3.318, 6.301, 1.450, 8.347, 5.174, 24.301 and *Od.* 9.249 and 20.97.

[24]These instances may be found in *RV* 3.14.5b, 6.16.46d, 6.63.3c, and 10.79.2d. As Dunkel (1993: 112) notes, all occur line initially. More importantly, as Dunkel notes, the posture is obsolete. Vedic prayer is normally conducted on a bent knee.

aṭ uā ustānāiš ahuuā zastāiš

but I called you with hands upraised (Y. 29.5a).[25]

Finally, there are two occurrences of an expression of the hands raised in prayer in Hittite ritual texts, but the word for hand is written with an akkadogram: SU-*an šarā eppun.*[26]

As Dunkel himself states, the phrase cannot be reduced to a "comparative reconstruction in the technical sense" (1993:114). Two of the three traditions explicitly employ the root **ĝhes-* and there is no reason to believe that anything underlies the akkadogram in Hittite other than *kiššar,* the Hittite cognate of *hasta-* and χείρ. However, there is no agreement on a root that will allow a reconstruction of the verbal component of the phrase. Therefore, the evidence outside the Italic languages points toward a phrase that can be reconstructed as:

RAISE + **ĝhes-.*

The Latin phrase may be the clue needed to reconstruct the verbal element of the phrase. Although Latin *manus* must be a lexical replacement, this is to be expected because the root **ĝhes-* survives in Latin only in fossilized forms such as *praesto* from **prai-ĝhes-to-.* On the other hand, the verb *tendebam,* which derives from the Proto-Indo-European root **ten-,* 'to stretch', matches the verbal roots of the Vedic compound *uttānahasta-* and the Old Avestan verb *ustānazastō,* both of which are used to express the act of raising the hands and can be derived from the suffixed root **ud-ten-* and **ĝhes-to-.* The correspondence suggests that Proto-Indo-European phrase should be reconstructed as:

*ten- + *ĝhes-

suggesting that *manus … tendebam* is a reflex of an extremely ancient expression.

There are three possible objections against reading the collocation of *tendo* and *manus* in Ennius as an Italic reflex of

---

[25]The translation is Dunkel's (1993: 113)

[26]In addition to these phrases in *KBo* III 4 Vs. I.22ff. and VI 29 II 9ff., Dunkel (1993: 113) mentions a variant in *KBo* IV 9 I 39 and two possible Luvian examples.

RAISE + *ĝhes-*. *Manus tendebam,* like any other phrase in Ennius, could be an imitation of Homeric χεῖρας ἀνέσχον. This objection is the most salient and troubling for hypothesizing a native Italic and therefore Indo-European origin of *manus tendebam*. In addition, the verb *tendo* is not the exact expected outcome of Proto-Indo-European *ten-*. Moreover, there is no other collocation of *tendo* and *manus* in the fragments of the *Annales,* implying the phrase is not a traditional collocation in Latin and that collocations of *tendere* and *manus* in later Latin poetry may be literary allusions to Ennius.

A wider survey of Latin literature renders the last objection a moot point. Naevius deploys the phrase *manusque susum ad caelum sustulit suas* bears a close resemblance to Ennius' *manus ad caeli caerula templa/ tendebam* (*Bellum Poenicum* fr. 26B), but Naevius could be imitating Homer as well. There are various permutations of *manus ad cael*(*um*) *tendere* in Vergil and Ovid[27] which also may be nods to Homer or to Ennius. In addition, the Histories of Livy deploy four collocations of *manus* and *tendere* in ritual contexts, which may or may not be merely literary.

There is some dispute as to whether *tendere* is a direct reflex of PIE *ten-*, but this disagreement becomes more apparent than real upon closer examination. Although Pokorny (1959: 1065-1066), Watkins (2000: 90) and Meiser (1998: 193) identify *tendo* as an extension of the root *ten-*, Kümmel (2001: 626-628) is more cautious. He wavers between placing *tendo* under the entry for *ten-* or under the entry for a root he reconstructs as *tend-*. However, not only is Kümmel in the minority in his skepticism, he also tentatively suggests that *tend-* is an "Erweiterung von *ten-*," and thus, in Kümmel's view, there are two possible scenarios which derive *tend-* from *ten-*. Furthermore, the voiced dental extension of an Indo-European root in Latin is not an isolated phenomenon. Latin *offendo* and *defendo* are derived from *$g^{wh}en$-*, 'to kill', by Rix (2001: 218-19)[28] and *cudo* from *keh_2u-*, 'to beat' by Kümmel

---

[27]For the sake of space I have chosen not to discuss these examples. Vergil deploys variations on *manus tendere* in *Aeneid* 1.48, 3.177 and 10.667. Ovid makes use of variants of the same expression in the *Metamorphoses* 4.238, 4.382 and 10.415 and in *Fasti* 5.57. My list is not meant to be exhaustive but merely illustrative. Francis Sullivan 1968: 358-362 provides a survey of the permutations of *tendere manus* in the *Aeneid* and the semantic variations of the phrase.

[28]Rix (2001: 219) suggests that the *-d-* in *fendo* is the result of the imperative form *$fende$* from *$g^{wh}nd^hi$*. Such a reanalysis could potentially explain how

(2001: 345-346). *Pendo* and *fundo* may be extensions of the roots *$(s)penh_1$*, 'to draw, stretch'[29] and *$\hat{g}^h eu$-*, 'to pour'[30] respectively, and therefore somewhat analogous to *fendo*, although there is some disagreement on *pendo*. It is possible that *ten-* and *tend-* may be separate roots but the evidence suggests that this possibility is very unlikely.

The possibility of Homeric borrowing in Ennius can never be ruled out, but in order to claim that *manus tendebam* is merely a translation of χεῖρας ἀνέσχον a series of coincidences must be accepted. Roman ritual spontaneously adopted or borrowed a ritual posture with a perfectly good Indo-European pedigree independently confirmed by evidence outside of Italic. In describing this gesture, Ennius just happened to employ the same root that is used in the Vedic expression signifying the same practice when perfectly acceptable alternatives such as *tollebam* were at hand. A prose author such as Livy chose to quote repeatedly a single phrase from Ennius in ritual contexts. Moreover, Ennius fortuitously deployed this phrase in the immediate context of another phrase that is etymologically equivalent to a traditional collocation generally accepted to be of Indo-European date. Finally and perhaps least likely to be accidental, an etymologically equivalent collocation found its way into the Iguvine tables.

The act of raising the hands in Roman prayer can be found in a variety of sources. The most compelling evidence can be found in non-literary sources. In his *Saturnalia*, Macrobius, quotes an *evocatio* of the gods of Carthage. The wording of the *evocatio* itself is not important, but immediately following the prayer Macrobius describes different postures of prayer to be taken during the ceremony, among them: *cum Iovem dicit, manus ad caelum tollit*. In the Servius auctus commentary on the *Aeneid* the commentator asks *quis ad caelum manum tendens non aliud precatur quam dicit?* (*ad Aen.* 1.93).

---

tendo arose from *ten-*.

[29]True to form, Kümmel lists *$(s)pend$-* and $(s)penh_1$ under separate entries but Pokorny (1959: 988), Watkins (2000: 82-83), and Meiser (1998: 193) consider them to be derived from the same root. Meiser (also apparently views the *-d-* of *tendo*, *pendo* and *fendo* to be examples of a root extension *-d-*. He adds the verb *plaudere* to this list which he derives from the root *$pleh_2/pelh_2$* 'flat'.

[30]Kümmel (2001: 179-180) derives *fundo* from a root he reconstructs as *^heud-* rather than from *^heu-* but notes that he only has examples in Italic and Germanic and tentatively suggests that the former root is an extension of the latter.

Neither source is without its problems. The authenticity of the *evocatio* in Macrobius has been questioned[31] and the authorship of the Servius auctus commentary is unknown.[32] It is not impossible that both authors are taking their cues from literature rather than life. However, the widespread deployment of the motif without any qualification of *graeco ritu* suggests the practice was genuinely Roman and it is generally agreed to be so.[33]

In Book 35 of his Histories Livy describes the angry reaction of Titus Quinctius Flamininus to a remark made by the Magnetarch, the chief magistrate of the city of Demetrias:

> *Manus ad caelum tendens deos testes ingrati ac perfidi Magnetum invocaret*

> Raising his hands to the sky he called upon the gods as witnesses to the ingratitude and treachery of the magistrates   (Livy 35.31.13).

In Livy's account the ritual effect of the actions of the Roman envoy was not lost on the crowd who witnessed his invocation and subsequently became terrified. There are three more examples of *manus tendere* in a ritual context in Livy (40.4.13, 26.9.8 and 25.37.9).

The prepositional phrase *ad caelum* modifies *manus tendere* in all four examples and the word *deos* is always present as well, either yoked with *caelum* as in Livy 26.9.8:

> *Manus ad caelum ac deos tendentes.*

It can also be the object of an accompanying verb of speaking, as above. The consistent deployment of *manus ad caelum tendere*

---

[31]Rawson 1973:168-174 evaluates the evidence for and against the authenticity of the *evocatio* and concludes it is authentic. Courtney 1999:109 adduces a parallel *evocatio* from an inscription dated to 75 B. C. (*CIL* 1.2954) which also describes an *evocatio* and shares some its language with the evocatio in Macrobius.

[32]Fowler 1997: 73-78 discusses the relationship of the 7th or 8th century Servius Auctus or Servius Danielis commentary to that of the 4th century commentary by Maurus Servius Honoratus. The general consenus appears to be that the Servius auctus augments the original commentary by Servius with material from an earlier commentary by Aelius Donatus.

[33]Adkins and Adkins 1996 s.v. *Prayer* state without qualification that the normal attitude of Roman prayer was to extend the hands.

with *deos* suggests that *manus tendere* is part of a longer formula of Roman ritual:

> *Manus ad caelum tendere* + *deos* + PRAY.

This ritual pattern in Livy implies that instances of *manus tendere* without *ad caelum* such as *ad capitolium manus tendens* (Livy 6.20.10) are transformations of a ritual utterance or formula.

It is unlikely that Livy is alluding to Ennius. Livy does allude to Ennius in his Histories but he does not often shift the context of his allusions.[34] Furthermore, these allusions are deployed in a single instance. The reduction of Ennius' *ad caeli caerula templa* to *caelum* loses a great deal of its effect if it is simply a literary form. It is even less likely that Livy who often mistranslates his Greek historical sources[35] would have been referencing Homer. Given Livy's quotations of Roman prayers such as the Fetial prayer (Livy 1.32.6-13)[36] and the solemn ceremony for declaring war on Carthage (22.10.2-6)[37] and his use of Roman ritual phraseology in multiple situations such *foedus ferire*,[38] itself found in Ennius (*Ann.* 32), it seems more likely that Livy is deploying a recognizable ritual formula than a

---

[34]Skutsch 1985: 22-24 identifies and discusses possible allusions to Ennius in Livy. Whenever the context is known for the Ennian original Livy does not deviate from it. An allusion to Annales 494 in the *Praefatio* is likely an exception but the context of the Ennian source is completely obscure. Skutsch lists it among the *sedis incertae fragmenta*. If there is a shift in context, it appears to be the exception rather than the rule in Livy and perhaps not unexpected in the one place in the *Histories* that is ahistorical. On the other hand, it is not impossible the Ennian fragment is from the prologue of the *Annales* given Livy's consistent deployment of references to the *Annales* in the same historical contexts in his history.

[35]Walsh 1958: 83-88 identifies no less than six mistranslations in books 33 and 38 alone.

[36]Ogilvie 1965: 110 expresses some reservations concerning the authenticity of the language of the Fetiales, raising the possibility that Fetial prayer as Livy knew it, was an antiquarian reconstruction. Whatever his source may have been or however reliable, Livy is quoting the language of ritual.

[37]The formula for declaring war is marked by archaic forms such as *faxit* (22.10.6) and *duellum* (22.10.2). It also deploys the common Italic collocation *salva servata* discussed above in f.n. 9 (22.10.2). In addition, Livy denotes the prayer with the expression *in haec verba* 'according to the formula'.

[38]Livy employs variants of *foedus ferire* three times in his history in the context of the rites conducted by the Fetial priests (1.24.4, 30.43.9 *bis*). The Senate orders the College *in verba*, 'according to the formula', to ask the praetor for *sagmina* when he orders *ut foedus ferirent*. The presence of *foedus feriam* in Plautus (*Mostellaria* 1061) guarantees the phrase is not an invention of Ennius.

poetic one.

The presence of a phrase etymologically linked to *manus tendere* also suggests its genesis was in native Italic ritual and verbal art. In the description of the sacrifice to Tefer Iovius, there is an unusual injunction that is inserted among the more or less typical ritual actions. This phrase may indicate that a collocation of unextended **ten-* and HAND existed in Italic:

Eam mani nertru tenitu (IT VIb 24)

He shall hold it (a sacrificial bowl) in his left hand.

The Umbrian expression deploys a reflex of **ten-* with the expected Italic root **man-* for hand. Unlike the Latin examples, *mani* is an ablative not an accusative but this could have been the result of reinterpretation of 'extend this hand' to 'extend this in the hand.' The only surviving example of Italic **man-* in Oscan is an i-stem, which could suggest that *mani* is actually an accusative with *eam*, but *mani* appears to be a u-stem in Umbrian to judge from *manuv-e* elsewhere in the Iguvine Tables.

When considered on an individual basis, no one piece of evidence is especially compelling and it is perfectly reasonable to explain each individual coincidence without invoking an Indo-European origin. Accident could explain some of the parallels. Borrowing from literary sources could explain others. However, the total weight of the evidence suggests that there is a single underlying explanation rather than a series of accidents: *manus tendere* is the survival of a phrase, however altered, from Indo-European into Latin.

Ennius may well be writing an epic in imitation of Greek models but he was a speaker of Oscan and a native of Italy, a place that had its own native traditions of verbal art, some of which had to have been inherited from the Indo-European tradition in the same manner as in Homer and the *Rig Veda*. Although Ennius owes much to the Greek tradition for his compositional technique in the *Annales*, he also owes much to the Italic tradition. It is admittedly not an easy task to separate what Ennius has appropriated from Homer and what was native to his verbal art but the difficulty does not excuse anyone who seeks to engage in Indo-European textual reconstruction and dismisses his epic.

These two very ancient acts of prayer in Ilia's address to

Aeneas force the reader of the *Annales* to confront the inherent ambiguity in the language of family and ritual in Roman society and the reality Ilia faces as the daughter of a god. It may appear somewhat natural for a Vestal Virgin to use ritual figures of speech, especially when addressing a god, but Aeneas is still her father in the earthly sense. The ambiguity created by the language used to describe Ilia's address to her father dovetails with the repeated use of *pater* rather than the name Aeneas, which can be used to describe one's begetter but also one of several gods in the Latin pantheon. This ambiguity may itself be of an ancient date, as the head of the Indo-European pantheon was known as *$dy\bar{e}us$-$ph_2t\bar{e}r$*, 'father sky'. Therefore, Ennius employs the language of ritual not only for an effect of solemnity, but to explore the ambiguities of the Latin language and their repercussions when one's *pater* becomes *Pater Aeneas* and in the process, preserves valuable evidence for the language of Indo-European ritual.

References

Adkins, Lesley and Adkins, Roy A.
    1996   *Dictionary of Roman Religion*. New York: Facts on File.

Arnold, E. Vernon
    1905   *Vedic Metre in its Historical Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge
              University Press [1967 Reprint].

Benveniste, Émile
    1970   Les valeurs économiques dans le vocabulaire indo-européen. In
              Cardona, Cardona, George, Hoenigswald, Henry, and Senn, Alfred
              (eds.) *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: Papers Presented at the
              Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania.*
              Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bländsdorf, Jürgen
    1995   *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum Prater Ennium et
              Lucilium Post W. Morel.* Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.

Cole, Thomas
    1969   The Saturnian Verse. *Yale Classical Studies 21*: 3-73.

Courtney, Edward
  1999   *Archaic Latin Prose.* Atlanta: American Philological Association.

Dunkel, George
  1993   Periphrastica Homerohittitovedica. In Brogyani, Bela and Reiner
          Lipp (eds.) *Comparative-Historical Linguistics: Indo-European and
          Finno-Ugric Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi III*, 103-118.
          Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Eichner, Heiner
  1988   Pikenische Pietas: Das Zeugnis des südpikenischen Cippus von
          Castignano; ein Heldendenkmal der Sabiner mit trochäischem
          Epigramm eines pikenischen Plautus von des fünften Jahrhunderts
          v. Chr.: Reklameiamben aus Roms Königszeit. *Die Sprache* 34: 195-
          238.

Fowler, Don
  1997   The Virgil Commentary of Servius. In Martindale, Charles (ed.)
          The Cambridge Companion to Virgil. Cambridge/New York:
          Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, Phillip
  1998   Early Saturnian Verse and Latin Poetics. *JIES* 26: 61-90.

Geldner, Karl Friedrich
  1951   *Der Rig Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche Übersetzt und mit einem
          Laufenden Kommentar Versehen.* Cambridge: Harvard University
          Press [2003 Reprint].

Glare, Peter (ed.)
  1992   *Oxford Latin Dictionary.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University
          Press.

Hesiod (Reinhold Merkelbach and Martin West, eds.)
  1967   *Fragmenta Hesiodea.* Oxford: Clarendon Press [1999 Reprint].

Homer (David B. Munro et Thomas Allen, eds.)
  1902   *Homeri: Opera.* Oxford: Clarendon Press [1986 Reprint].

Insler, Stanley
  1975   *The Gāthās of Zarathustra.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Kirk, Geoffery S.
  1985   *The Iliad: A Commentary: Vol.* 1: *Books 1-4.* Cambridge/New York:
          Cambridge University Press.
  1990   *The Iliad: A Commentary: Vol.* 2: *Books 5-8.* Cambridge/New York:
          Cambridge University Press.

Martin, Richard P.
  1989   *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad.* Ithaca:
          Cornell University Press.

Matasovic, Ranko
    1997   *A Theory of Textual Reconstruction in Indo-European Linguistics.*
              Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.

Meiser, Gerhard
    1998   *Historiche Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinische Sprache.* Darmstadt:
              Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Mercado, Angelo
    2003   A New Approach to Old Latin and Umbrian Poetic Meter. In:
              Jones-Bley, Karlene, Martin Huld, Angela Della Volpe, and
              Miriam Robbins-Dexter (eds.) *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual
              UCLA Indo-European Conference,* 188-219. Washington DC: Institute
              for the Study of Man.

Nooten, Berend van and Gary Holland, eds.
    1994   *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes.*
              Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Oldenberg, Hermann
    1909   *Rg Veda: Textkritische und exegetische Noten.* Berlin: Weidmansche
              Buchhandlung.

Ogilvie, R. M.
    1965   *Commentary on Livy 1-5.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University
              Press.

Parry, Milman (Adam Parry, ed.)
    1971   *The Making of Homeric Verse* Oxford/New York: Oxford University
              Press.

Parsons, Jed
    1999   A New Approach to the Saturnian Verse and its Relation to Latin
              Prosody. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129:
              117-137.

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

Poultney, James
    1959   *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium.* American Philological Association
              Monograph 18.

Rawson, Elizabeth
    1973   Scipio, Laelius, Furius and the Ancestral Religion. *Journal of
              Roman Studies* 63: 161-174.

Richardson, Nicholas
   1993   *The Iliad: A Commentary: Vol.* 6: *Books 21-24.* Cambridge/New York:
             Cambridge University Press.

Rix, Helmut
   2002   *Sabellische Texte: die texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und*
             Südpikenischen. Heidelberg: Universitätverlag Carl Winter.

Rix, Helmut, Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp and Brigette
             Shirmer
   2001   *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre*
             Primärstammbildungen. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

Scmitt, Rüdiger
   1967   *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanische Zeit.* Wiesbaden:
             Harrasowitz.

Schirmer, Brigitte
   1998   *Studien zum Wortschatz der Iguvinischen Tafeln: Die Verben des Betens*
             und Sprechens. Frankfurt am Main/ New York: P. Lang.

Sihler, A. L.
   1993   *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* Oxford/New York:
             Oxford University Press.

Skutsch, Otto
   1985   *The* Annals *of Quintus Ennius.* Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press.

Sullivan, Francis
   1968   Tendere Manus: Gestures in the Aeneid. *The Classical Journal* 63:
             358-362.

Untermann, Jürgen
   1999   *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Vine, Brent
   1986   An Umbrian-Latin Correspondence. *Harvard Studies in Classical*
             Philology 90: 111-127.

Walsh, P. G.
   1958   The Negligent Historian: "Howlers" in Livy. *Greece & Rome* (2nd
             series) 5: 83-88

Watkins, Calvert
   1985   *American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots.* Boston:
             Houghton-Mifflin [2000 Reprint].
             How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics. Oxford/New
             York: Oxford University Press.

West, M. L.
   1997   *East Face of the Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.*
             Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.