

A Note on the Duenos Inscription

Brent Vine

0. *Introductory*

The well-known Archaic Latin “Duenos Inscription”,¹ conventionally dated to the 6th or early 5th c. B.C.E.,² requires no detailed introduction; nor is there any question of surveying the immense bibliography devoted to the many enigmas — archeological, cultural, epigraphical, linguistic — surrounding this celebrated and frustrating text and the unique object on which it is inscribed.³ It will be helpful for present purposes, however, to provide several preliminary remarks by way of orientation.

Apart from one or two unresolved paleographical indeterminacies (such as the interpretation of the vertical stroke between IOVE and SAT in the initial sequence), it is generally agreed that the text consists of three units (here referred to, for convenience, as “lines”), to be read as follows:

- 1 IOVESATDEIVOSQOIMEDMITATNEITEDENDOCOSMISVIRCOSIED
- 2 ASTEDNOISIOPETOITESIAIPACARIVOIS
- 3 DVENOSMEDFECEDENMANOMEINOMDVENOINEMEDMALOSTATOD

Whereas the word-division and (partly in consequence) the interpretation of most of line 2 remain opaque, lines 1 and 3 are composed almost entirely of recognizable Latin vocabulary, and now yield more or less acceptable sense. Thus for lines 1 and 3, roughly:

¹ CIL I² 4 = Ernout *Recueil* 3, ILLRP 2, Gordon *Intro.* 3, Wachter 1987: §§27-8, Pisani *Testi* A4.

² See e.g. Solin (1969: 252-3).

³ The most recent detailed study known to me is that of G. Pennisi (1992), which, however, is highly problematic in a number of respects.

- [1 beg.] IOVESAT()DEIVOS()QOI()MED()MITAT
iurat deos qui me 'mittit'
 "The person who 'sends' (?) me swears by the gods: ..."
- [1 concl.] NEI()TED()ENDO()COSMIS()VIRCO()SIED
ni in te [= erga te] comis virgo sit
 "... if the / a 'girl' is not kind / friendly towards you, ..."
- [3 beg.] DVENOS()MED()FECED()EN()MANOMEINOM()DVENOI
Bonus/bonus me fecit in MANOMEINOM bono
 "Mr. Good / A good man made me EN()MANOMEINOM for a good man;"
- [3 concl.] NE()MED()MALOS()TATOD or NE()MED()MALO(S)()STATOD
ne me malus [tollito, clepito]⁴
 "... Let an evil person not steal me."

The purpose of this paper is to explore the two remaining problems in lines 1 and 3, namely MITAT (1 beg.) and EN()MANOMEINOM (3 beg.). I will suggest, moreover, that these two portions of the text may in fact be related to each other.

1. MITAT

1.1. Despite, for example, the arguments of H. B. Rosén (1957: 244), which ignore the evidence of KAPIAD in the Forum Inscription (CIL I² 2), it now seems fairly clear that MITAT is indicative and not subjunctive, and that it must mean something like 'gives' or 'offers'. This emerges with particular clarity from the use of the same form near the beginning of the (probably slightly later) "Tibur Pedestal Inscription" (CIL, I² 2658; HOI()MED()MITAT...), as discussed in detail by A.

⁴ TATOD or STATOD: cf. Hitt. *tāyezzi* 'steals', Ved. *stená-/stāyú-* 'thief', etc.; H. Rix (1985: 193ff.), H. Eichner (1988-90: 216).

Mancini (1981).⁵ There is less agreement, however, as to the precise formal and semantic interpretation of MITAT. According to the majority view, the form is related to Class. Lat. *mittere*: thus recently Eichner (1988-90: 223n33, cf. his initial gloss “übersendet (zur Aufstellung)”, followed by “präsentiert, widmet, dediziert”), as well as Mancini, who suggests that MITAT reflects a zero-grade “intensive” or “durative” **mitāre* (beside *mittere* < **meitere*), of the type *occupāre* (: *capere*), *ēducāre* (: *dūcere*), etc. Even though these intensives normally appear with “perfectivizing” preverb, the existence of archaic uncompounded intensives of the type *dicāre* ‘consecrate’ (beside *dēdicāre*, *praedicāre* etc.) renders such an account for MITAT not only possible, but even attractive, if not for two further considerations (apart from the suspicious absence of forms like ***praemitāre*, ***ēmitāre*, etc.). First, there is the problem of how to interpret MITAT semantically according to this theory: it is exceedingly difficult to envision how an intensive of *mittere* could yield the semantics required for MITAT in both the Duenos Inscription and (still more clearly) the Tibur Pedestal Inscription, even granting for *mittere* an Urbedeutung along the lines of ‘let go, release’ (see e.g. Ernout-Meillet s.v.). Secondly, the comparison of MITAT with *mittere* involves a somewhat troubling phonological indeterminacy, as noted by Eichner (1988-90: 223n33): “Ein Problem, aber sicherlich kein unüberwindliches, stellt lediglich der Anlaut von MITAT bei etymologischer Verknüpfung mit *mittere* dar (vgl. *cosmittere* bei Paulus ex Festo). Die betreffende Wurzel hat anscheinend *s mobile*, weswegen die Frage der Datierung des Anlautwandels *sm* zu *m* hier nicht virulent ist.” But to dismiss the testimony of *cosmittere* in Festus by appealing to *s-mobile* is neither methodologically nor theoretically satisfactory, even if the sole extra-Latin comparandum (Av. *maēθ-* ‘werfen’, cf. *hamista-* ‘niedergeworfen’, allegedly < **ham-[h]mista-*) is itself phonologically ambiguous on this point. For medial *-sm-/-sn-* clusters, the material preserved in “Festus” is otherwise generally accurate (e.g. *cesna*, *cesnas* ‘cena’ 222.26L, 228.10L, cf. Osc. **kersnu**, Umbr. *ṣesna*), and COSMIS itself, in our text, urges caution.

⁵ Note also Mancini’s discussion (1981: 367n7) of *praeciamitatores* (Festus 292.3L; P.F. 293.1L), which may also point to an *ā*-verb “*mitāre*”.

1.2. The above considerations lead to the following preliminary conclusions about MITAT: it is a 3sg. pres. indic. form of a “first conjugation” verb, meaning roughly ‘gives’; and it is at least as likely to have initial **m-* (as opposed to **sm-*), therefore deriving from a stem **mitā-* or **mitā-*. These features converge on an alternative root etymology, which (like almost every idea one might raise in connection with this text) has already been proposed on occasion, i.e. comparing the familiar IE root “**meǵ-*” (IEW 2. *mei-*, 710; cf. LIV 383), with meanings centering on the notion of ‘exchange’ (thus e.g. S. Ferri, 1965: 46; Pisani *Testi* p. 7; P. Flobert 1991: 529). The formal and semantic details of this suggestion, however, have never been satisfactorily elucidated, and so the remainder of this section is devoted to that task.

There are, to begin with, two phonological indeterminacies surrounding the structure of the root traditionally notated “**meǵ-*”, although neither crucially affects the interpretation of MITAT here proposed. If the root actually began with a laryngeal (thus “**h₂mei-*”), as some data suggest (cf. Mayrhofer *EWAia* Lief. 14 [1993], II.315 and LIV loc. cit.: Ved. *apāmítya-* ‘loan, debt’, Gk. ἀμείβω ‘exchange’), a laryngeal in this position would not in any case vocalize in Latin (i.e. **h₂m-* > Lat. *m-*, cf. [from the same root] Lat. *meāre/-mētāre* ‘go back and forth’ and *migrāre* ~ ἀμείβω, with non-vocalization as in *Nerō* < **h₂n-*, etc.). And if the root ended with a laryngeal, as other data may suggest (e.g. Pāli *-mināti*, Latv. *mīt*; see Mayrhofer loc. cit.), MITAT in my view derives from a zero grade (see next paragraph), in which case <MIT-> is ambiguous between anit̥ **mi-t-* (> MIT-) and set̥ **miH-t-* > **mīt-* (> MIT-).

The somewhat fanciful interpretation of Ferri (loc. cit.) — “Si impegna dinanzi agli dei chi mi cambia’ (con un altro oggetto)” — operates with a form *mitat* that is “una parola in veste sicula”, adducing the well-known Sicilian material provided by Varro (“si datum quod reddatur, mutuum, quod Siculi *moeton*”, *L.L.* V.179) and Hesychius (μοῖτον ἀντὶ μοίτου παροιμία Σικελοῖς); and for the morphology, Ferri does no more than comment (46n8), somewhat confusingly, on the “interessante ..., del resto regolarissima” vowel gradation in “*mitat* — *moetat* — *mutat*” (sic; a *moetā-* is nowhere attested [except for the obscure *moetas/motas* in Cato’s incantation, *Ag.* 160], although this would be the regular precursor of *mūtā-*, on which further below). Pisani merely offers the descriptive observation that “[q]uesto *mitāre* è forma in *-ā-* con vocalismo radicale 0 (cfr.

§435) accanto a *mūtāre* da **moith-*”, while the cross-reference (to Pisani 1952: §435) specifies a zero-grade intensive (more on this point below); and as for the meaning, Pisani believes (also fancifully) that “il significato dev’esser ‘vendere’”. What remains is to provide a plausible morphological account for a verb *mitā-* meaning ‘give’ (vel sim.), and this can be accomplished quite straightforwardly. MITAT would be based, in the first instance, on a *tó*-participle **(h₂)mi(H)-tó-* (to **(h₂)mei(H)-* ‘exchange’), thus meaning ‘exchanged’, i.e. ‘given (in exchange)’; a participle of precisely this type is almost certainly attested in Av. *fra-mita-* ‘verwandelt’ (Yt. 19.29; see Mayrhofer *EWAia* loc. cit.). Indirect evidence for such a form in Latin comes from *mūtāre* ‘(ex)change’ and *mūtuus* ‘interchangeable’, which can most easily be taken as based on a substantivization **móǵ-to-* ‘something given in exchange, tit for tat’ (directly comparable to the Sicilian material, which may even be borrowed from Italic; see Solmsen 1894: 89n2), itself derived from a zero-grade ptcple. **mi-tó-*.⁶ It is also conceivable that at bottom, SPi. *meitimúm* ‘Dankesmal’ (AP. 2) and *meitims* ‘Dank’ (TE. 5) could show a parallel *e*-grade substantivization **méǵ-to-* (cf. the suggestively similar formation, though with *o*-grade, in Go. *maīþms* ‘Geschenk’; see on these forms Eichner 1988-90b: 200). The participle **mi-tó-*, at any rate, could have regularly produced a “frequentative” **mi-t-eh₂(ǵe/o)-* (> Lat. *-t-āre*), whence “*mitāre*” and 3sg. MITAT. As for the semantics, one must assume, as often, that the “frequentative” formation was in this case actually factitive; as is well known, the “frequentative” (based on verbal adjectives) partly incorporates formations built with the deadjectival factitive suffix **-eh₂-* otherwise seen in forms of the type *(re)nouāre* ‘make new’ (: *nouus* ‘new’); see Leumann 1977: 547, Christol 1991: 50. In this way, as a result of perfectly regular developments (partly based on material attested

⁶ According to this interpretation, Lat. *mūtāre* would be denominative to this **móǵ-to-* (via the productive type *dōno-/dōnā-*), and not, as the form is generally taken, characterized by the poorly-understood root enlargement in *-th-* (< *-t-h₂-* ?) otherwise seen in Indo-Iranian forms like Skt. *mith-*, cf. Mayrhofer *EWAia* Lief. 15 [1994], II.376 and Pisani’s “**moith-*”, cited above, as well as Meiser 1998: 8 and T. Zehnder, LIV 386f. (tellingly with query for the formation said to underly MITAT, and also acknowledging the possibility of a denominative source for *mūtāre*). Nor, pace Pisani, can a *mitāre* be a zero-grade intensive to an *o*-grade *ā*-verb like *mūtāre*.

in Latin: see above on *mūtāre*), one arrives at a verb *mitāre* that would mean precisely ‘cause to be given in exchange’, i.e. ‘give (in exchange)’, ‘give’.

1.3. For the sake of completeness, one may adduce the suggestive SPi. form *ṃitah*, at the beginning of text AQ. 1 ([--?]ṃitah : h[---?]lpa[...]), especially given the possibility that SPi. final *-h* could continue dental stops (G. Meiser, 1987: 104ff.).⁷ Nevertheless, the possibility of one or two missing letters before the M-renders this form more than usually precarious.

2. EN()MANOMEINOM

2.1. H. Eichner, in his recent study of the Duenos Inscription (1988-90), has arrived at a highly original interpretation of the sequence DVENOSMEDFECED ENMANOMEINOMDVENOI (line 3), consequent on his assumptions about the nature of the text — namely, that it is an advertising jingle designed to promote the potential amatory benefits of some cosmetic substance stored in the three chambers of the vase. I remain highly skeptical of Eichner’s account of this sequence (summarized briefly below), for the following reasons:

(i) FECED()EN. Eichner, given his assumptions about the vase, its contents, and the text inscribed on it, takes FECED()EN to mean *infecit* ‘filled me up’ (with perfume, ointment, etc.), commenting (1988-90: 237n97) that anastrophe “ist im Altlatein anscheinend bereits geschwunden”; but such an anastrophe is questionable in the extreme.⁸

(ii) MANŌM()EINŌM. Eichner sets up for EINOM a noun *eino-* meaning ‘manner(s)’, to be extracted from *opīnor* ‘consider’; thus MANŌM()EINŌM are gen. pl. (of description), depending on the following dat. DVENOI, the whole phrase meaning ‘for a good man of fine manners’. But even if (as is perfectly possible) *opīnor* is to be interpreted as based ultimately on a lost noun *eino-* (presumably **h₁ei-no-*, lit. ‘(a) going’, to **h₁ei-* ‘go’; see in general W. Krogmann, 1936: 127ff.),

⁷ In theory, the directly following word *h[-* could be a demonstrative in **gho-*, cf. HOI()MED()MITAT of the Tibur Pedestal Inscription, 1.3. above.

⁸ Eichner’s citation of Lucr. 5.102 *iacere indu = inicere* lends little support.

the semantic interpretation of this noun as ‘manners’ (in the sense required) or ‘disposition’ (vel sim.) is open to serious doubt.⁹

(iii) More generally, Eichner’s complex interpretation (involving not only the anastrophe as in (i) above, but also inverted word order in the phrase directly following it) entails abandoning the otherwise straightforward sentence “X made me ... for Y”, which had seemed to be one of the clearest sequences to be found in the entire text.

2.2. One can, however, readily concur with Eichner’s assessment (1988-90: 237n99) of the two most plausible prior approaches to the sequence ENMANOMEINOM, namely those by R. Thurneysen and H. Rix (the latter following Krogmann and others): “Um ... nur die beiden autoritativsten Stellungnahmen zu berücksichtigen, führe ich an (1) *en mano(m) meinom* ‘zu guter absicht, zu gutem vorhaben’ (Thurneysen ...) und (2) *en manom einom* ‘zu gutem Zweck’ (Rix ..., nach Krogmann und anderen)”. Both of these are attractive in some respects, but at the same time they are open to certain objections, as follows.

According to Thurneysen (1897: 203ff.), the single spelling of geminates normal for the archaic period allows for a reading EN(M)ANO(M)()MEINOM; and the resulting *meinom* would belong with OHG *meinen* ‘meinen’, OIr. *míán* ‘(object of) desire’, etc. (IEW *mei-no-* ‘Meinung, Absicht’, 714). While Thurneysen’s phrase would produce more or less acceptable sense, the root in question is not otherwise found in Italic, nor is there any principled account as to why *meino-* would have been lost in Latin.¹⁰

⁹ For further arguments against Eichner’s interpretation of the phrase, see Petersmann 1996: 670f.; I cannot, however, follow Petersmann (and others) in taking EINOM as a conjunctive particle related to Lat. *enim*, Osc. *inim*, Umbr. *enem*, a view which requires too many unsupported assumptions in terms of both morphology and phonology/orthography.

¹⁰ For the latter point: contrast the verb for ‘steal’ identified by Rix (as TATOD), in the sequence NEMEDMALOSTATOD: Eichner (op. cit. 216) may be correct in preferring to take this as STATOD (the root has *s*-mobile, in IE terms), partly because its failure to survive into later Latin can be ascribed to a “homonymie fâcheuse” with the ordinary verb for ‘stand’.

The Rix/Krogmann version (see Rix, op. cit. 197) operates with *eino-* < **h₁ei-no-* ‘Gang’ (cf. 2.1.(ii) above), which again might yield plausible meanings like ‘zum Wohlergehen’, ‘zu einem guten Fortgang’, or the like. It nevertheless seems at least a little surprising that a simplex *eino-* ‘Gang’, entirely unqualified by preverb or other first compound member, could develop a meaning like ‘outcome’; in addition to Eng. *outcome*, cf. also (likewise based on verbs of motion) forms like Lat. *eventus/eventum*, or *consequentia*, among many other such items that could be cited.

2.3. The above reservations, while perhaps not fatal to either proposal, at least leave room for an alternative. If one begins from the same word-division EN()MANO(M)()MEINOM as in Thurneysen’s account, it is possible to argue for an entirely different interpretation for the word “MEINOM”, which (as will be seen directly) may be related in an interesting way to MITAT as interpreted above: a form (acc.) MEINOM could in principle reflect a (substantivized) **méǵ-no-*, meaning ‘something given in exchange, gift’, to the same root **meǵ-* ‘exchange’ already discussed in connection with MITAT. As for the formation of this **méǵ-no-*: this would be a form of the familiar type **sǔép-no-* ‘sleep’, **ǔés-no-* ‘price’, **ǔéǵ^h-no-* ‘conveyance’, **déh₃-no-* ‘gift’, etc. (on which see recently C. Barton, 1993: 554); it is important to note, moreover, that these forms generally have parallel *o*-grades (thus **sǔóp-no-*, **ǔós-no-*, **ǔóǵ^h-no-* etc.), and indeed a **móǵ-no-* is itself attested (Li. *maĩnas* ‘exchange’, OCS *měna* ‘change’, OIr. *maín* [*moín*, *muín*; f. *i*] ‘gift, counter-gift; treasure’), beside phonologically ambiguous forms (e.g. Ved. *menāmenam* ‘Tausch um Tausch’) and a possible *e*-grade **méǵ-no-* in MW *er mwyn* ‘for the sake of’. What is of particular importance, however, is that a form **méǵ-no-* may in fact be presupposed by Lat. *mūnus -eris* ‘duty, service, office, offering’, from an immediate antecedent **móǵ-n-es-*.

Lat. *mūnus* belongs with a well-known set of *s*-stem forms with complex suffix **-n-es-* in Latin and elsewhere, displaying certain intriguing semantic convergences: see e.g. Leumann 1977: 378 (with further references) on “[e]rerbt -nos in juristisch-sozialen Bereich”; in addition to *mūnus*, note also *fūnus* ‘burial’, *facinus* ‘deed, crime’, *fēnus* ‘interest, debt’, *pignus* ‘pledge, security’, as well as a series of Ir. terms for ‘wealth, property’ (Ved. *pāriṇas-* ‘abundance’, *āpnas-/Av. afnah-* ‘property’, etc.; here note also Gk. *ἄφενος* ‘wealth’ and the semantic

discussion of Lubotsky 1998 in connection with Av. *x^varənah-*). Within Latin, *mūnus* belongs most closely, in semantic terms, with *fēnus* and *pignus*, which probably show **-n-es-* as a secondary formation based on older thematic stems in **-no-*. Thus beside *fēnus* ‘interest’ (< **‘próduce’*), an *e*-grade thematic **-no-* is actually attested in *fēnum* ‘hay’ (< **‘próduce’*); and *pignus* is probably based, in the first instance, on a *“*pék/g-no-”* (replacing **pák/g-no-*, to **peh₂k/ĝ-* ‘fasten’), as shown by Sandoz 1986.¹¹ In a similar way, Lat. *vulnus* ‘wound’ can be based on a thematic **uélh₂-no-* (---> secondary “-nos” stem), to the root **uélh₂-* of Hitt. *walḫzi* ‘strikes’; cf. the parallel *o*-grade in Hom. *ὀλῆ* ‘wound, scar’ < **uol[h₂]-néh₂* (with regular laryngeal loss by Hirt’s-Saussure’s Law), and for **uélh₂-no-* : **uol[h₂]-néh₂* cf. **ués-no-* ‘price’ [Lat. *vēnum*] beside **uos-néh₂* (*ὠνή* ‘purchase’). Thus a **mėj-no-* ‘gift (rendered in exchange)’ (= Duenos MEINO-) can in principle underlie the **mój-n-es-* of Lat. *mūnus* ‘service, duty etc.’, provided that the *o*-grade of the latter (clearly secondary, in an *s*-stem) could be explained. For this, in fact, there are a number of possibilities. The simplest would be to assume that *o*-grade **mój-n-es-* is due to the influence of an old parallel **mój-no-* (of the type **sūóp-no-*, **uós-no-*, etc.) or **moj-nā* (cf. OIr. *maín*) beside **mėj-no-* (thus Sandoz 1986: 570), as has happened in secondarily *o*-grade *s*-stems like *pondus* ‘weight’ (cf. themat. *pondo-* in abl. *pondō* ‘by weight’) or *foedus* ‘treaty’ (themat. **foedo-* perhaps preserved in *foedi-fragus* ‘perfidious’); similarly *modes-(tus)* ‘moderate’ beside *modus* ‘measure’. Moreover, an *o*-grade **moj-ni-* is probably old within Latin itself (adj. *mūnis* ‘obliging’; Plt., Lucil., Fest.), and the same or a similar form is presupposed by material elsewhere in Italic (U. **muneklu** [**moj-ni-tlo-*] ‘donation’, Osc. **múíníkú** etc. ‘communis’); *o*-grade **-moj-ni-* is also available in compounds of the type *commūnis* (cf. Go. *gamains*).

The sentence resulting from the above suggestion, then, would read DVENOS()MED()FECED()EN()MANO(M)()MEINOM()DVENOI, and would mean something like “Mr. Good/A good man made me as a fine (exchange-)gift for a good man”. Indeed, an interpretation similar to that just proposed appeared in an all-but-forgotten footnote by R. Meringer (1905/6: 271n1), in connection with his discussion of Sic. *μολ̂τον*, Lat. *mūtāre*, OCS *měna*, among other forms of IE

¹¹ See now also Lamberterie 1996, with a somewhat different view of the root vocalism of *pignus*.

**mei-* cited above: “Damit ergäbe sich die Möglichkeit das *en manom(m)einom* der Duenos-Is. zu fassen als: ‘zu gutem Tausche, Geschäfte’”. Meringer’s semantic interpretation, to be sure, differs somewhat from mine, and he said nothing about the formation of this *meinom*, or its possible relationship with MITAT, to which I now turn in more detail.

3. **meinom mitō*

Although MITAT (in line 1) and MEINOM (in line 3) are not syntactically connected, they are linked by their semantic contiguity, which may involve, at least according to the above account, an etymological (as opposed to folk-etymological) connection. With all due reserve, it may be attractive to suggest that the associated pairing of MITAT and MEINOM (i.e. 1 QOI()MED()MITAT “He who gives me ...” // 3 EN()MANO(M)()MEINOM “... as a fine gift”) may imply a corresponding *figura etymologica* reconstructable as **meinom mitō*, with the same alliterating format, and with essentially the same meaning, as the standard OLat.+ phrase *dōnom dō* (Euler 1982; here note, incidentally, that *dōnum* [< **déh₃-no-*] is built with the same formation as that proposed above for **méi-no-*).

One could envision various scenarios in order to help account for the development between this conjectured “Archaic OLat.” **meinom mitō* and the later OLat. phrase. Although the later expression could simply have supplanted the earlier, one might more naturally assume that both existed earlier, referring to similar but culturally distinct behaviors (e.g. **meinom mitō* specifically involving exchange/reciprocity); and that eventually, the semantically marked member of the pair was eliminated in favor of the more general expression *dōnom dō*. The essential point here is that some such developments might help explain the loss or replacement in later Latin of both *mitō* [*mitāre*] and *meino-*.¹²

It seems interesting, finally, to observe that the Tibur Pedestal Inscription (probably slightly later than the Duenos inscription, cf. 1.1.) shows a combination of MITAT and DONOM: HOI()MED()MITAT ... D[O]NOM()PRO()FILEOD (see Wachter

¹² For *mitāre*, one could also imagine, as a complicating factor, the inconvenient homonymy with the regularly-formed intensive to **meitō* (Class. *mittō*): i.e., a *mitāre* ‘give [in exchange]’ would have been formally regular (as an intensive vis-à-vis **meitō* ‘release, let go, send’) but semantically anomalous, whence possibly some pressure to eliminate the form.

1987: §31g on the reading); it is conceivable that this text, with MITAT // DONOM, displays a “transitional” phase, between the MITAT // MEINOM of the Duenos Inscription and the standard OLat. DAT // DONOM that is well-established by the 3rd century. Indeed, other early texts point to a certain laxness in this phraseology (perhaps more marked in non-urban areas; e.g. CIL I² 5 [4th/3rd c.] DONOM.ATOLERE, I² 34 [3rd c.] DONOM PORT, etc.), before DONOM DARE becomes a cliché.¹³

References

- Barton, C. 1993. “Hittite *zinni-*, *tuwarni-*, *zig* and related matters”. *JAOS* 113.551-561.
- Christol, A. 1991. “Lexical consequences of a phonetic law (*eye > ē) in Latin verbs”, in *New Studies in Latin Linguistics: Selected papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* (ed. R. Coleman), 49-61. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Eichner, H. 1988-90. “Reklameiamben aus Roms Königszeit”. *Die Sprache* 34.207-238.
- 1988-90b. “Ein Heldendenkmal der Sabiner mit trochäischem Epigramm eines pikenischen Plautus des fünften Jahrhunderts v. Chr.”. *Die Sprache* 34.198-206.
- Ernout *Recueil*: A. E., *Recueil de textes latins archaïques*⁴. Paris, 1957.
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet. 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴. Paris.

¹³ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 11th International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (Rome, 18-24 September, 1997), and was published in the *Preatti* of that congress (pp. 133-139). Some of this material was also presented at the 9th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (14-18 April, 1997) and at the Workshop on Latin and the Languages of Ancient Italy (7 December, 1996; University of California, Berkeley, Department of Linguistics). To the participants of all of these gatherings, I am deeply grateful for helpful comments and suggestions.

- Euler, W. 1982. *dōnom dō — Eine figura etymologica der Sprachen Altitaliens*. Innsbruck (IBS-Votr. 29).
- Ferri, S. 1965. "Centuripe - Novilara - Duenos. Osservazioni di metodo archeologico". *PP* 20.39-47.
- Flobert, P. 1991. "L'apport des inscriptions archaïques à notre connaissance du latin pré-littéraire". *Latomus* 50.521-543.
- Gordon Intro.: A. E. G., *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1983.
- IEW: J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Tübingen/Basel, 1959/1994.
- ILLRP: A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae*, 2 vols. Florence, 1962, 1963.
- Krogmann, W. 1936. "Alat. einom". *KZ* 63.123-132.
- de Lamberterie, C. 1996. "Latin *pignus* et la théorie glottalique", in Rosén 1996: 135-152.
- Leumann, M. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich.
- LIV: H. Rix (ed.), *LIV: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden, 1998.
- Lubotsky, A. 1998. "Avestan *x^varənah-*: the etymology and concept", in *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen* (Akten der X. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, September 1996, ed. W. Meid), 479-488. Innsbruck: IBS 93.
- Mancini, A. 1981. "Latino *mitat*". *SE* 49.365-369.
- Mayrhofer *EWAia*: M. M., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg, 1986-.
- Meiser, G. 1987. "Pälignisch, Latein und Südpikenisch". *Glotta* 65.104-125.
- . 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
- Meringer, R. 1905/6. "Wörter und Sachen III". *IF* 18.204-296.
- Pennisi, G. 1992. "Il tri-vaso di 'Duenos'". *Studi latini e italiani* 6.7-44.
- Petersmann, H. 1996. "From concrete to abstract thinking: The development of moral concepts in Archaic Latin", in Rosén (ed.) 1996: 665-674.
- Pisani, V. 1952. *Grammatica latina storica e comparativa*². Turin.
- Pisani, *Testi*: V. P., *Testi latini arcaici e volgari*². Turin, 1960.
- Rix, H. 1985. "Das letzte Wort der Duenos-Inschrift". *MSS* 46.193-220.

- Rosén, H. B. 1957. "Notes on some Early Latin inscriptions, 3." *Mnemosyne* 10.244-246.
- Rosén, H[annah] (ed.). 1996. *Aspects of Latin: Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Innsbruck (IBS 86).
- Sandoz, C. 1986. "Lat. *pignus*: étymologie et formation du mot", in *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. A. Etter), 567-573. Berlin/New York, 1986.
- Solin, H. 1969. "Zur Datierung ältester lateinischer Inschriften". *Glotta* 47.248-253.
- Solmsen, F. 1894. *Studien zur lateinischen Lautgeschichte*. Strassburg.
- Thurneysen, R. 1897. "1. Die Duenos-Inschrift, 2. Siculisch, 3. Zur Umschreibung des Lykischen". *KZ* 35.193-226.
- Wachter, R. 1987. *Altlateinische Inschriften*. Bern/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Paris.