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This thesis offers a reappraisal of the Sabine glosses through the analysis of thirty-nine words, all glossed explicitly as Sabine in ancient sources ranging from the first century BCE to the sixth century CE.

The study of the Sabine glosses found in ancient grammarians and antiquarians goes back to the beginnings of Italic scholarship. Over time, two positions on the Sabine glosses have crystallised: (a) the Sabine glosses are evidence of a personal obsession of the Republican author Varro, in whose work many Sabine glosses survive, and (b) the Sabine glosses are true remnants of a single language of which little or no epigraphic evidence has survived.

By using the neogrammarian observation that sound-change is regular and exceptionless, it is possible to ascertain whether or not the Sabine glosses are likely to be from the same language. This thesis finds that the sound-changes undergone by the Sabine glosses show no broad agreement. The developments are characteristic of different languages – Latin, Faliscan and various Sabellic languages – and many changes are mutually exclusive. This consequently throws doubt on the assertion that the Sabine glosses are all taken from one language. Instead, the glosses should be seen as part of a discourse of the relationships between Romans, Sabines and Sabellic-speaking peoples.

During the Republic, Sabines were central to Roman myth, historiography and political rhetoric. As the Sabines were a distinct people in the Roman foundation myths, but were largely Romanised in the Republican present, they became a convenient bridge between Rome and the Sabellic-speaking peoples of Central and Southern Italy, to whom Greek and Roman writers ascribed myths tracing origin back to the Sabines. This continued into the Empire, when emperors such as Claudius and Vespasian utilised their (supposed) Sabine heritage to gain ideological capital. In light of this, the phenomenon of Sabine glosses cannot be seen as one man’s interest, but as a means of reflecting on Rome’s relations with Sabellic-speaking Italy.
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Chapter One
The Sabine Language in Ancient Narratives and Modern Scholarship

The Sabine glosses have been discussed and analysed since the early days of Italic linguistics. Mommsen included a list of the glosses, a practice continued by von Planta, Conway and Vetter. Sabine glosses were also a common feature in comparative study of Italic for much of the twentieth century. During the last few decades of the century, much of the interest in linguistic evidence of the Sabines was turned instead to the newly deciphered South Picene inscriptions. Nevertheless, from the 1990s onwards, the study of ancient glosses, in particular those labelled as Sabine, has seen a renaissance.

In much of the scholarship on Sabine, the glosses are approached in a vacuum, without their textual, intellectual, historical and linguistic context. This thesis will offer a reevaluation of the Sabine glosses. My approach will be philological, using the concept of regular and exceptionless sound-change as described in the neogrammarian regularity hypothesis in order to answer the question of whether the Sabine glosses are in fact the remnants of a lost Italic language. I will place the glosses in their ideological and historical context by considering the development of Rome’s relationship with the peoples of Central Italy from the late Republic onwards, a discourse perpetuated in everything from foundation myths to antiquarianism. By studying this ideological discourse and the position which the Sabine glosses hold therein, we will be able to account for the biases of our sources.

---

1.1 The nature of glosses

In philology, a gloss denotes a lexical item, cited by an ancient author as an example of old or foreign language.\(^3\) In corpus languages, they make up the linguistic information that has usually survived in second-hand accounts transmitted through a literary manuscript tradition rather than through epigraphy.\(^4\) This definition differs from that used in the study of ancient literature, particularly epic, where ‘gloss’ refers to a dialectal, archaic or rare word used for effect.\(^5\) A philological gloss is not necessarily part of a glossary, but may be found in antiquarian and grammatical works, historical accounts or scholia. I will use the philological meaning of ‘gloss’ throughout. In the context of glossaries, where ‘gloss’ is usually used to denote the explanation, while the word itself is referred to as a lemma, I will refer to the explanation as ‘definition’ or ‘glossing’, and only use the term ‘lemma’ when referring specifically to the index word.\(^6\) I will also use the word ‘gloss’ as a verb, meaning ‘to assign a certain word to a language’.

Glosses are secondary in two ways. First of all, they have been found by the ancient author, whether in a written account, through general cultural knowledge or by oral inquiry, and subsequently written into the work.\(^7\) Secondly, the textual transmission has removed them another step from the source. This means that there are two events where corruption may occur. The gloss may be misheard or misspelled by the author, a scribe or a previous source, as well as in manuscript transmission. Unfamiliar words are more susceptible to corruption than others. Indeed, copyists may take liberties with such words in order to make them more understandable. When a gloss is corrupt, it may be virtually impossible to reverse the damage, as we have little knowledge of what the gloss might originally have looked like. Other forms of subjective criteria also play a role. For instance, we are at the mercy of the ancient author’s decisions of the inclusion and exclusion of words. Thus our sample is already skewed.

Due to these concerns, glosses cannot be approached in the same way as epigraphic

---


\(^4\) The textual transmission is a common feature of glosses, but not a defining one. Words cited as linguistic curiosities in works surviving on papyrus or in inscriptions (e.g. fasti) are still glosses, as they have been taken out of their ‘native’ context and been put into the context of scholarly writing.


sources, where our material is first-hand. However, the history of transmission and possible corruption does not make glosses unusable. Some epigraphically attested words, such as Paelignian casnar (II Corfinium 11/ST Pg 10) also appear as glosses (Varro LL VII.29; Paulus ex F. 41L). Other glosses provide comparative data, e.g. terenus (see §5.4.1). If we keep the varying historical contexts of the writers and the history of transmission in mind, there is valuable evidence – linguistic, historical and cultural – to unearth in these words.

This thesis will discuss words explicitly glossed as Sabine by ancient sources (see §1.4 on the criteria used, and Appendix I for a list of the words discussed). In order to approach these glosses, we must first consider issues of geography, epigraphy and history of ideas relating to the Sabines and the Sabine territory.

1.2. The Sabine mirage

1.2.1 The Sabines and the foundation of Rome

In order to discuss ‘Sabine’, we must first discuss the Sabines. Generally, the term Sabini recalls the early mythohistory of Rome, in particular the rape of the Sabine women and the incorporation of the Sabines into the Roman people. This narrative is set in the mists of the past, mid-way between myth and history.

It is common for any discussion of myth to attempt to date the emergence of a certain narrative. Some scholars have argued that the Roman foundation myth must be contemporary with the Capitoline She-Wolf, the famous bronze statue kept at the Palazzo dei Conservatori at Rome traditionally dated to the sixth century BCE. However, the existence of a depiction of a she-wolf does not necessarily prove the existence of the Roman foundation myth and the dating of the sculpture has recently been called into question after new scientific tests. We must therefore rely on clear mentions in our extant texts to date the myths.

The first mention of the Sabine part of the foundation of Rome comes in the form of a title of one of Ennius’ lost plays, Sabinae ‘Sabine women’. Only two lines remain, seemingly from a speech by Hersilia, who led the abducted Sabine women onto the battle-field and intervened to stop the fighting.

---

8 e.g. Bickerman 1952:67; Cornell 1995:61.
Cum spolia generis detraxeritis, quam inscriptionem dabitis?

Now that you have dragged us as spoils from our bridegrooms, what inscriptions will you cut upon us? ¹⁰

Julius Victor *Rhét. Lat. Min.* 402H = FP *Ennius Sabinæ 1*

Our knowledge of the myth depends primarily on four sources: Cicero’s *Re Publica* (44 BCE), Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita* (20s BCE), Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities* (7 BCE) and Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus* (after 96 CE).¹¹ They tell essentially the same story. After having been refused permission to marry women from the neighbouring towns, the Romans invited their neighbours to a festival, the Consualia. At a given signal, the Roman men abducted the visiting maidens. Their families were outraged, and the cities started waging war against Rome, but were defeated. Eventually, the Sabines, whom the others had accused of procrastinating, launched their attack. They occupied the Capitol after having been helped by the Roman maiden Tarpeia, whom they then killed. The battle that ensued came to an end only through the intervention of the Sabine women, who persuaded their fathers and husbands to instead make peace. As a result, the Sabines and the Romans united, and the Sabine king Titus Tatius ruled alongside Romulus.

While the narratives all follow this general path, there are differences between them. Livy and Plutarch include the dramatic intervention of the Sabine women on the battlefield (Liv. I.13.1-3; Plut. *Rom.* XIX.1-5). Dionysius instead describes the women submitting a resolution to the senate which leads to the truce (*Ant. Rom.* II.45.2). In Livy’s account, the truce and the treaty that made the two enemies one people occurs at once, right after the intervention (Liv. I.13.4-5). Plutarch and Dionysius describe the events happening far more slowly (Plut. *Rom.* XIX.5, 7; Dion. *Ant. Rom.* II.46.1-2). Cicero’s account (*Rep.* II.7-8) is so brief that it is not possible to tell which version he favoured.

Another aspect, seldom discussed in the scholarship, is that despite the fact that the myth is often called “the rape of the Sabine women” in modern parlance, in several accounts, the Sabines are only one group among many to come to the Consualia. Dionysius, Livy and Plutarch all specify that some guests were from Antemae and Crustumærium. Plutarch also mentions Fidenæ, while Dionysius and Livy mention Caenina (Dion. *Ant. Rom.* II.32.1; Liv. I.9.8; Plut. *Rom.* XVII.1). These towns appear to all be in Latium.¹² Even if women were

¹⁰ Warmington 1961:360-361, who adds the explanation: “as though we were dedicated spoils of war”. See also Manuwald 2001:172.


¹² Purcell et al. 2012; Quilici et al. 2015a; Quilici et al. 2015b; Quilici et al. 2017.
taken from the populations of these cities, the wars and the subsequent conquests of the towns are only mentioned as an aside. The strongest aetiological connection is that it leads to the first triumph (Liv. I.10; Plut. Rom. XVI.6). Dionysius’ account indicated that the women from Antemnae and Caenina were sent back to their hometowns along with their new husbands as Roman colonists (Ant. Rom. II.35). This would make most (if not all) of the wives remaining in Rome Sabine. It is possible that this was a common version of the story that has only survived in this retelling, but it is also possible that it is an attempt to explain why the Sabines are ultimately at the centre of the story. One reason for this is the fact that the Sabine occupation of the Capitol and the interrupted battle at Rome are far more dramatic than the swiftly retold battles with the Latian cities. Similarly, Strabo gives the Sabines a prominent position:

συνελθόντων δὲ πολλῶν, πλείστων δὲ Σαβίνων

numerous people, but mostly Sabini, had assembled

Strabo V.3.2

Furthermore, it appears as if Plutarch sees at least Caenina as a Sabine city (Plut. Rom. XVII. 1-2). The Sabines become a shorthand for the Romans’ neighbours through the memorability of their storyline.

The other important Sabine presence in Roman myth is Numa, the second king, who founded the Roman religious institutions. His story serves as an excellent illustration of the Sabines’ status as both alien and familiar. It is emphasised in several sources that the senate overlooks its own citizens and brings in someone from outside (Liv. I.18.1; Cic. Rep. II.13.1; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.58.3); despite the merger of Sabines and Romans, the Sabine territory is still not in itself Roman. However, Numa’s Italian origin is strongly emphasised by both Cicero and Livy. When Dionysius addresses the common misconception in antiquity that Numa was a pupil of Pythagoras, he refutes it only on the basis of chronology – Pythagoras lived over a hundred years after Numa supposedly did (Ant. Rom. II.59.1-4). Plutarch is aware of these arguments, but still appears ambivalent (Num. XXII.4). The denial of Numa’s Pythagoreanism in Cicero and Livy is far more emphatic. Not only does chronology speak against the Pythagorean connection, it undermines the fact that Numa’s wisdom was native to Italy. One of Cicero’s interlocutors admits:

13 Jones 1923:385.
Yet I am not sorry that we Romans got our culture, not from the arts imported from overseas, but from the native excellence of our own people.\textsuperscript{14}
\begin{center}
\textit{Cic. Rep. II.15}
\end{center}

After posing the questions such as how Pythagoras would have been able to get to the Sabine territory and which language he and Numa would have used, Livy gives his own opinion:

\begin{center}
suopte igitur ingenuo temperatum animum uirtutibus fuisse opinor magis instructumque non tam peregrinis artibus quam disciplina tetrica ac tristi ueterum Sabinorum, quo genere nullum quondam incorruptius fuit.
\end{center}

It was Numa’s native disposition, then, as I incline to believe, that tempered his soul with noble qualities, and his training was not in foreign studies, but in the stern and austere discipline of the ancient Sabines, a race incorruptible as any race of the olden time.\textsuperscript{15}
\begin{center}
\textit{Liv. I.18.4}
\end{center}

Both Roman writers clearly take comfort in the fact that Numa’s wisdom is Italian, not Greek. Livy’s mention of \textit{disciplina tetrica ac tristi ueterum Sabinorum} evokes the dichotomy between the austere and culturally pure peoples and the luxurious, effeminate Easterners. There is a clear ambivalence among Roman writers against the constant indebtedness to the Greeks. However, this position is seldom as simple as being “nativist”.\textsuperscript{16} Just as Greece serves as both antagonist and role-model for Rome, the peoples of Italy can be given positive or negative connotations, positions which are not mutually exclusive. In the \textit{Aeneid}, the enemy Italians are depicted as primitive and vicious, yet there is genuine sadness at the fact that their culture will be lost.\textsuperscript{17}

An Italic origin does not exclude a Greek one, but provides a counterbalance.

This ambiguous position may also be seen in the stereotypes held of the Sabines. The most common is without a doubt that they are austere, like the region they inhabit.\textsuperscript{18} It can be seen in Cato’s description of his childhood:

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{14}Keyes [1928] 1977:137, 139
\textsuperscript{15}Foster [1919] 1967:65.
\textsuperscript{16}Bloomer 1997:40; cf. Musti 1985:85, who claims that Cato purposefully ignored Hellenising legends and inflated Italic stories, a view criticised by Cornell et al. 2013a:210-211. See Gitner 2015:34 on Varro’s ambivalent relationship to Greek.
\textsuperscript{17}See Parry 1963:68-69.
\textsuperscript{18}The ancient notion that peoples were shaped by the land they inhabited (e.g. Hdt. IX.122.3) likely shaped some of the Sabine stereotypes. It was picked up by nineteenth-century scholars (e.g. Smith 1857:868; Seeley 1871:71), fuelled by ideas of the existence of a racial character formed by climate.
Ego iam a principio in parsimonia, atque in duritia, atque industria omnem adulscentiam meam abstinui agro colendo, saxis Sabinis, silicibus repasinandis, atque conserendis.

From my earliest days I kept myself away for the whole of my youth in frugality, hardship and hard work, by tending the land, the Sabine rocks, digging up the flints and planting.\textsuperscript{19}  

\textit{Festus 350L = ORF Cato F128}

Some scholars have attempted to trace the stories of the austere Sabines back to one source. Farney suggests that Cato himself “more or less invented” this aspect of the Sabines. The Catonian fragments are the earliest surviving attestations of this stereotype, but that does not mean that Cato invented it, just as the first author to use a word in writing did not necessarily coin it themselves. Smith adds the general M’. Curius Dentatus’ austere character as another contributing factor.\textsuperscript{20} However, Dentatus’ reputation may have been influenced by the Sabine stereotype, or for that matter be a coincidence.

Whatever its origin, the stereotype of the austere Sabines was clearly widespread (Plut. \textit{Rom. XVI.1}; cf. Cic. \textit{Vat. 15, Lig. 11}; Hor. \textit{Epist. II.1.25}, Ov. \textit{Met. XIV.797}; Verg. \textit{Aen. VIII.638}; Mart. \textit{Spect. X.33.1, XI.15.2}). This aspect is the reason why several ancient scholars claimed the Sabines were in fact Lacedaemonian colonists (\textit{DS ad Aen. VIII.638 = FRH Cato 5 F51}, Cn. Gellius 14 F20, Hyginus 63 F9; Plut. \textit{Rom. XVI.1}; Plut. \textit{Num. I.3}; Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom. II.49.4-5 = FRH Cato 5 F50}; Ov. \textit{Fast. I.260}). They were also known as deeply pious, enough that the ethnic \textit{Sabini} was proposed to be derived from Greek σέβεσθαι ‘worship’ (Festus 464L, Paulus ex F. 465L), which shows that there is not a clear division between the native Italians and the foreign Greeks. In their restraint, austerity and piety, the Sabines are what their urban neighbours once were, and wish to be again. The Sabines are not Roman, but yet are more Roman than the Romans themselves.

The image of the austere Sabines has been challenged, indirectly by Dionysius and more directly by many modern scholars, due to the story of Tarpeia’s betrayal.\textsuperscript{21} The narrative turns on her request to receive what the Sabines wear on their left arms. In the most common version, she is referring to the golden bracelets and rings the warriors wear (Liv. I. 11.8; Plut. \textit{Rom. XVII.2}; Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom. II.40.2}). When the time comes to repay her for

\textsuperscript{19} Translation by Dench 1995:85. The phrase \textit{saxis Sabinis} has been taken as a toponym, e.g. “the stones in Sabine territories” (Reeve 2012:134) or “the rocky Sabina” (Farrell 2014:94), but this is clearly the adjective \textit{Sabinus}.

\textsuperscript{20} Farney 2007:108; Smith 2014b:132.

her actions, the Sabines throw not only the jewellery but also their shields on her, crushing her
to death. Dionysius appears confused by the contradiction between the bejewelled Sabines of
the early war and the austerity of the subsequent Sabines, and suggests that τότε, ‘at that
time’, the Sabines were as luxurious as the Etruscans (Ant. Rom. II.38.3), implying that this has
changed. A fragment from Fabius Pictor found in Strabo has also been taken as an
indication of the Sabines’ wealth:

φησὶ δ’ ὁ συγγράφεις Φάβιος Ῥωμαίους αἰσθέσθαι τοῦ πλούτου τότε πρῶτον, ὅτε τοῦ ἔθνους τούτου κατέστησαν κύριοι.

Fabius the historian says that Romans first perceived wealth at the time when they
became masters of this people. Strabo V.3.1 = FRH Fabius Pictor 1 F24

While it is possible that this means that the Romans encountered Sabine wealth, it may also
mean that they were unaware of their own wealth until the conquest of their poorer
neighbours.

It is a common accusation levelled against enemies of Rome that they are too
luxurious and effeminate. The mention of the bejewelled Sabines has led many modern
scholars to pit them against the stereotype of the austere Sabines, as if they are equally
common, but the former is only supported by some retellings of the Tarpeia story. In an
alternative version of this myth, originally from L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and related by Livy
and Dionysius (Liv. I.11.9; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.38-39 = FRH Piso Frugi 9 F7), Tarpeia does
not ask euphemistically for whatever the warriors wear on their left arms. Instead, she
demands their shields in an attempt to make them more vulnerable later in the battle. This
makes the story of a treachery driven by greed instead a narrative of a calculated double-
cross. However, ancient myths are plagued by stories of treacherous women being punished.
Thus the bracelets may have been introduced to give Tarpeia something to covet.

It is also possible that we are overinterpreting this one story. The Sabines are never
described with the whole range of characteristics of the effeminate enemy, who are not only
decked out in jewellery and fine fabrics, but also lazy, decadent and promiscuous. The
bracelets are the only part of this that appear in the myths. When Tacitus speaks of the

---

22 Cornell et al. 2013c:25 observe that it is unclear whether this is an opinion taken from Fabius Pictor
or Cincius (FRH Fabius Pictor 1 F7, Cincius 2 F3), or Dionysius’ own.


Cornell et al. 2013c:40-41; Smith 2014b:131 interpret this sentence as a reference to the wealth that
the Romans acquired through the conquest, not the wealth the Sabines possessed.
Germans’ appreciation of gifts of torcs (Germ. 15), it does not imply that the Germans are decadent. Instead, their interest in jewellery is primitive; according to the same passage, the Germans have only recently started understanding money. Equally, Celtic torcs were not seen as a sign of decadence. Just like the Sabine bracelets, they were heavy gold items, worn primarily by warriors. During the Empire, both torcs and bracelets were worn by German auxiliaries in the Roman army as a sign of honourable service. It is also not unheard of for warriors from militaristic cultures to consider their appearance in preparation for battle, such as the Spartans soldiers arranging their hair before Thermopylae (Hdt. VII.209.3). It is possible that the jewellery is a way of communicating not the luxury of the Sabines, but their fondness of war.

When we discuss the Sabines, what comes to mind are the stories of the neighbouring people of early Rome that made up part of its population. The conquest of the Sabine territory by M. Curius Dentatus in 290 BCE is given far less attention. A possible reason for this is the fact that the history of the conquest contradicts the mythohistorical narrative. In the myth, the Sabines become one with the Romans, and although some stayed in their own territory, there was enough contact that Rome’s second king was picked from the Sabine town of Cures. However, by the third century BCE, the Sabines are conquered. Roman historiography does not provide any explanation of this change in Roman-Sabine relations. Instead, the two stories are disconnected. The Sabine presence during the Roman monarchy is foundational and ideologically important. The conquest of 290 BCE is probably historical, but it lacks the ideological impact of the myth.

1.2.2 The Ager Sabinus and its people

The historical Sabines are primarily defined by geography. However, the ager Sabinus, Sabine territory, was never a political unit, and was not well-defined geographically. Its borders were vague, and different ancient authors include different cities when discussing the Sabine territory. Although Cures, Reate and Amiternum are always seen as Sabine (Strabo V.3,

26 On Dentatus, see Torelli 1987; Dench 1995:89; Oakley 2005a:213; Smith 2014b:132. Forsythe 2005:335 observes that the Roman sources “fail to mention them [the Sabines] for the century and a half preceding Dentatus' conquest”.
27 Serv. ad Aen. VII.709 presents two versions, one where the Sabines were made citizens and one where they were not given suffrage. This is the closest to an ancient admission of this discontinuity between the myth and the third century history.
28 cf. OCD s.v. Sabini; DNP s.v. Sabini.
Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II.49.2-3), other places are only identified as Sabine in isolated cases (e.g. Tibur in Pliny *HN* III.107).

The difficulty in defining the Sabine territory is best illustrated by the fact that there is no Latin toponym related to the ethnic *Sabini*, unlike the pairs *Samnites – Samnium, Latini – Latium*. Strabo V.2.1 uses ἡ Σαβίνη, a direct translation of *ager Sabinus* with γῆ omitted.30 Despite this, many modern scholars use one-word terminology. Some use the toponym Sabinum without reflecting on the fact that the word never occurs in any ancient sources.31 Others use Sabina, the modern name of a larger geographical district which encompasses areas within the regions of Lazio, Umbria and Abruzzo.32 Sabina is also a latinised version of the Greek adjectival phrase.33 Having a one-word term for the concept of the Sabine territory is useful, but terms such as ‘Sabinum’ or ‘the Sabina’ in reference to the ancient region give a false sense of unity. The only watertight definition of the Sabine territory is that it is where the Sabines live. Equally, the Sabines are the people who live in the Sabine territory.34 That leads us to a question similar to that first posed by Sir John Myres in 1927 of the Greeks: who were the Sabines? An ethnic group cannot be objectively defined from the outside. Instead, ethnicity is about self-definition, primarily relating to ideas of perceived common descent.35 Our only sources regarding the Sabines are Greek or Roman, meaning that our only perspectives are from outsiders.36 It is clear that the Romans would sometimes group peoples together, and this has led to some concern that the Romans are simplifying matters when speaking of a monolithic *Sabini*. Some scholars have attempted to differentiate

---

30 This is common practice; see *LSJ* s.v. γῆ II.
34 This may be seen in the term *in Sabinis* “among the Sabines”, which is used to mean “in the Sabine territory”; see Bradshaw 1989:170, 172; Bourdin 2012:426.
36 A mention in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II.49.4 of ἱστορίαι ἐπιχωρίοι has led some to argue that there was a Sabine historiographical tradition (Salmon 1967:122 n.3; Bourdin 2012:24). The story Dionysius ascribes to these histories is one of Spartan immigration into the Sabine territory. Such a myth is likely to be Greek in origin, but it happened that non-Greek peoples embraced these genealogies (cf. Bickerman 1952:74; Hall 2005:260; Gruen 2013:4). We must ask ourselves how local the histories described as ἐπιχωρίοι are. It is possible that it refers to Italy in general, although possibly not Rome, as Cato is cited earlier in the same chapter (see Cornell et al. 2013c:97). Furthermore, if this was a truly local written source, it is curious that it is never mentioned by anyone else, especially as Dionysius was not a native speaker of Latin (see *Ant. Rom.* I.7.2-3).
between Tiberine and inland Sabines. The generalising exonym *Sabelli* further shows this blurring of ethnic groups, in this case Sabines and Samnites (see below). Unfortunately, these attempts to diversify the discussion of the Sabines tend instead to lead to the strengthening of Sabine stereotypes, as when opposing stereotypes are assigned to Tiberine and inland Sabines respectively. When ‘Sabine’ characteristics are assigned to the Samnites, some scholars argue that instead of analysing this and find a reason, we should emend the text.

---


39 e.g. Ferriss-Hill 2011:266 n.2, who claims that ancient sources use *Sabini* “indiscriminately to mean non-Latin Italics”. Her example of this is Serv. ad *Aen*. VII.517, where she argues *Sabini* must be understood to mean Umbrians (see §5.2.1). The same idea of ‘Sabine’ as potentially meaning ‘Samnite’ can be seen in suggestions of assigning *hirtus* (Serv. ad *Aen*. XI.785) to Oscan instead of Sabine (see §5.2.3); cf. Bickerman 1952:74; Collart 1954b:239-240; Taylor 1960:61; Christol 2003:376; Spadoni 2004:398; Pocci, Poli and Santini 2001:52. The idea of Roman confusion between Samnites and Sabines appears to have started with Beloch 1904-1905 (non uidi) and Beloch 1926:434. It has been criticised by Oakley 2005b:329; Bourdin 2012:734; Smith 2014b:131.
The known history of the Sabine territory allows us some insights into the make-up of the population by the late Republic. Both ancient writers and modern scholars treat the Sabine territory as the amber in which old customs have been caught. It is a time-capsule, a living museum where the Sabellic past has survived, protected from Roman innovation and Greek decadence. This idea is exoticising, and brings to mind early modern European notions of the noble savage. Furthermore, it is unrealistic. Even before Dentatus’ conquest in 290 BCE, the Sabine territory was closely connected with the rest of Italy. The Tiber and its tributaries provided the means for trade, and the Via Salaria, named after the salt deposits at the mouth of the Tiber, also promoted mobility. Transhumance, the practice of moving flocks between different pastures in summer and winter, often over mountains, connected the Sabine territory to Etruria, Umbria, Latium and the Faliscan territory. Seasonal labourers would also move in and out of the region (cf. Suet. Vesp. 1.4).

With the Roman conquest in the early third century BCE, the Sabine territory was reshaped in terms of both demographics and geography. On Dentatus’ orders, Lacus Velinus was drained into the Nar. As a result, the area around Reate, which had previously been under water, was now fertile land, likely leading to more farming and trade. However, the draining of Lacus Velinus had consequences for the people living on the Nar.

In all probability, the Roman policy of resettlement had as much of an impact as the engineering works. Parts of the Sabine territory were claimed as ager publicus, and settlements, particularly for veterans and their dependants, were founded. As is clear from the better-documented settlings of veterans during the first century BCE, settlement of a new population equals displacement of the earlier inhabitants. Taylor suggests that the Sabines who were displaced moved (or were moved) into the mountains, an area which would be far less attractive to settlers. This does not mean that all Sabines were forcibly moved. The new and old populations probably had dealings, and at length became indistinguishable. The displaced communities in the mountains, where life was far harsher than in the fertile lowlands, may provide a real-world parallel to the austere, pious Sabines of myth. To a visiting outsider, their lifestyle may seem like the continuation of a long, proud tradition.

---

A commonly repeated claim about Varro, who provides a comparatively large number of Sabine glosses, is that he had unique insight into the Sabine territory, as he was ‘Sabine’ or ‘a native of Reate’ himself (see §2.5). This evokes the idea of the Sabine territory as a museum rather than a living, breathing place. These arguments lead us to imagine Varro being raised by the austere, god-fearing Sabines of myth. The reality must have been different. Varro was from an equestrian family, a status that sets him apart from the surrounding people. The elite villa would be staffed with slaves, who may have been from anywhere around the Mediterranean. If we imagine the child Marcus venturing outside his home, he would still not meet the Sabines of the past. He would meet people whose ancestors had lived in the Sabine territory for many centuries, and people descended from the veterans who had settled there 150 years earlier. It is possible that these groups were indistinguishable — the descendants of the original Sabine population may have become more Roman, while the descendants of the Roman settlers may have adopted a more ‘Sabine’ identity, just like colonies in Umbria did. Furthermore, he would meet traders, travellers and workers from surrounding areas and beyond. Despite its rural setting, the Sabine territory was no more a living museum than any other part of ancient Italy.

Despite this, the Sabines have often been presented as an unsolved problem. For instance, South Picene, a language of twenty-three inscriptions found in ancient Picenum and (in the case of one) the Sabine city of Cures, has been suggested to really be Sabine, due to the occurrence of an ethnic with the stem safin-. This implies that the Sabines’ real identity is a mystery that requires explaining. The sense of mystery is reminiscent of that often associated with, but fortunately, through access to material culture and epigraphy as well as a large scholarly effort, also averted from, the Etruscans.

The subjectivity of our sources and the dearth of inside perspectives makes this issue reminiscent of the study of Sparta, where most evidence is Athenian. As in the case of the Sabines, we are presented with an idealised and thus archetypal view of the Spartans. We may

46 Bradley 2000:245.
47 The identity of the Sabines as the speakers of South Picene has been argued by Prosdocimi 1978:551; Adiego Lajara 1992:21; Rix 2002:6, Spadoni 2004:389; Riva 2007:87; Crawford 2011:12; Bourdin 2012:264, 730; Martzloff 2013:146-147; Smith 2014b:134, and it is common to translate the South Picene word safinûm (II Interamnia Praetuttorum 1/ST TE 5) safínûs (II Interamnia Praetuttorum 2/ST TE 6), safína (II Interamnia Praetuttorum 3/ST TE 7) as ‘Sabine’ (Adiego Lajara 1992:22; Stuart-Smith 2000:95; Crawford et al. 2011:197, 199, 201; Bourdin 2012:251; Clackson 2015b:10). I disagree with the identification of South Picene as Sabine as it fails to consider issues of geography and the interaction between mythological and historical evidence, and thus infers a perceptual bias on the epigraphic material. Due to space constraints, I will not discuss this theory further; see Burman in preparation a for the full argument.
borrow the famous term from Ollier’s 1933 work, and call the issues of sources regarding the Sabines and the way those sources are treated a ‘Sabine mirage’.\textsuperscript{49} In order to put the Sabine mirage in its context, we must turn to Rome’s relations with the rest of Italy.

\subsection*{1.2.3 Using Sabine myths to approach Sabellic Italy}

Roman influence over the rest of Italy had been expanding steadily during the Republic through a combination of conquest, alliances and treaties. The crucial turning-point in Rome’s relations with Italy was the Social War (91-88 BCE), which followed demands for voting rights and citizenship from Rome’s allies in Central and Southern Italy.\textsuperscript{50} Citizenship was eventually extended to most Italians through the \textit{Lex Iulia} and other citizenship laws, but not before this three-year conflict which devastated large parts of Italy and claimed between 150 000 and 300 000 lives.\textsuperscript{51} Additionally, Samnites were targeted by Sulla with proscriptions and massacres, and many who fought on the side of the insurgents suffered political repercussions that continued until the reign of Augustus.\textsuperscript{52}

It is in the interests of any conquering power after a revolt to give a semblance of order and, if at all possible, healing. Military force was by no means frowned upon in antiquity, but it is always preferable to present a picture of harmony and well-being, both to the outside world and to oneself. The Social War was particularly worrying as it was in essence a civil war, only the first of many in the following decades.\textsuperscript{53} In such a situation, narratives appear in the cultural consciousness, seldom intentionally created but rather amalgamated over time into a coherent discourse. When defending Balbus’ right to citizenship in 56 BCE, only a generation after the Social War, Cicero provides a glimpse of this discourse:\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnoteref{footnote1}
\footnoteref{footnote2}
\footnoteref{footnote3}
\footnoteref{footnote4}
\end{footnotes}
But what undoubtedly has done most to establish our Empire and to increase the renown of the Roman People, is that Romulus, that first founder of this city, taught us by the treaty which he made with the Sabines, that this State ought to be enlarged by the admission even of enemies as citizens. Through his authority and example our forefathers never ceased to grant and to bestow citizenship.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Cic. Balk XIII.31}

This narrative of Roman generosity is found throughout late Republican and early Imperial thought, and the Sabines are at the centre of it. In Livy, the tribune of the plebs Canuleius argues in favour of allowing plebeians to be consuls, and mentions Numa Pompilius, the first Sabine king of Rome, and the Etruscan Tarquinii in order to illustrate how the openness has strengthened Rome:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ergo dum nullum fastiditur genus, in quoentrée uirtus, creuit imperium Romanum.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Liv. IV.3.13}

In the retellings of the truce between Titus Tatius and Romulus, the merging of the Sabines and Romans (or rather, the incorporation of the Sabines into Rome) is constantly emphasised as a positive thing (Liv. I.13.4-5; Plut. \textit{Rom. XIX.7}).\textsuperscript{57} Plutarch even states that new blood was a reason for the rape of the Sabine women:

\begin{quote}
\begin{greek}
ὅ μέγιστον ἦν ἀπολόγημα τῷ Ῥωμόλῳ· γυναῖκα γὰρ οὐ λαβεῖν ἀλλὰ ἱμαν Ἂρσελίαν, διαλαθοῦσαν αὐτοῖς, ὅτε δὲ μὴ μεθ' ἐβρεως μηδ' ἀδικίας ἐλθόντας ἐπὶ τὴν ἄρσαμχν, ἀλλὰ συμμεῖζαι καὶ συναγαγεῖν εἰς ταὐτὸ τὰ γένη ταῖς μεγίσταις ἀνάγκαις διανοηθέντας.
\end{greek}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{56} Foster [1919] 1967:267.
\textsuperscript{57} Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom.} II.46.2 deemphasises the mixing of peoples, and instead says that while any Sabine who wishes is allowed to go live in Rome, only Tatius and three other Sabines took up the offer. This may be due to Dionysius’ agenda to portray Rome as a Greek city and the Greek opinions of intermarriage (Cornell et al. 2013a:61).
this is the strongest defence which Romulus could make, namely, that they took only one married woman, Hersilia, and her by mistake, since they did not commit the rape out of wantonness, nor even with a desire to do mischief, but with the fixed purpose of uniting and blending the two peoples in the strongest bonds.38

Plut. Rom. XIV.6-7

In modern terms, Rome is presented as multiethnic rather than multicultural, where a uniform culture is shared by people from different ethnic groups. In Caesar’s speech in Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae, Rome is portrayed as a meritocratic magpie that incorporates peoples, customs and objects that are useful – “imitari quam inuidere bonis malebant”, “they preferred to imitate rather than envy good practices” (Sall. Cat. I.I.39).59

While many peoples appear in the rhetoric of Roman diversity, the Sabines are ever-present. They become a convenient tool as they were likely no longer culturally distinct. Stereotypes could be made truths, far more than is possible with peoples with contemporarily distinct identities.60 With the exception of one passage of Strabo (V.3.1), the Sabines are always either the originators of another people, or as Rome’s antagonists.61 By the second book of Livy, this latter role is generally the only one the Sabines play. After book three, most references to the Sabines are to the past (e.g. Liv. VII.32.9; VIII.24.2).

Notably, when the Sabines disappear from the central stage, the Samnites enter it. The first mentions of Samnites are in the fourth book (e.g. Liv. IV.37.1, 52.6); by the seventh book they play a central role (Liv. VII.29). This leads us to the myth of migration through the so-called Sacred Springs, and the role of the Sabines among peoples other than the Romans.

The bare bones of the Sacred Springs myths are usually the same. A people send out colonisers who are led to their new home by an animal guide, which sometimes becomes a symbol of that new people. The precise nature of the Sacred Springs narrative found in Strabo, Pliny and Festus (whose source is Alfius) has been contested. Dench argues convincingly that these are genuine local myths, rather than Roman antiquarian fabrications.62 These origin myths are unlike the Graeco-Roman stories of wandering heroes and eponymous founders.63 They are also a departure from the hellenocentric tradition where

59 Rolfe and Ramsey 2013:117.
60 Strabo V.3.1 portrays the Sabines as an ancient people who has survived, but the reasons he gives are their bravery and resilience, the very characteristics ascribed to the mythical Sabines.
61 When waging war against Rome, the Sabines are often mentioned together with tribes such as the Volsci and the Aequi (e.g. Liv. II.30.3; II.63.7); cf. Smith 2007:172.
non-Greek peoples are explained as descended from Greek heroes or colonists.\textsuperscript{64} There has been some debate whether these myths are really ‘authentic’, as they have been retold in Greek and Roman sources.\textsuperscript{65} However, this view fails to take into account the complexities of cultural interaction which includes negotiation and hybridity. The outside influence does not make these myths less local or genuine.\textsuperscript{66}

In two surviving Sacred Springs narratives, it is the Sabines who send out expeditions. These eventually become the Samnites and the Piceni (Strabo V.3.1, V.4.12). Another narrative names the Samnites as the originators of the Hirpini (Strabo V.4.12). The Lucani are also said to be descended from the Samnites, although there is no surviving Sacred Springs narrative (V.3.1). The Sacred Springs reads like a genealogy of peoples, which explain similar customs and languages. The ancestor in this genealogy is the Sabines, directly or indirectly. Some scholars have taken these myths as a sign of ancient interconnectedness or even unity.

The fact that several Italic ethnics, e.g. Latin Sabinus, Sabellus, South Picene safinús (\textit{II Interamnia Praetuttorium} 2/\textit{ST} TE 6), Latin Samnites – Greek Σαυνίται, and toponyms, Latin Samnium – Greek Σαύνιον – Oscar safinim (\textit{II Italia} 1 No. 409/\textit{ST} nPg 2; \textit{II Terventum} 8/\textit{ST} Sa 4) share the root *sab\textsuperscript{h}- has been treated as further proof.\textsuperscript{67} Although the linguistic connection between the ethnics is undeniable, it does not follow that these peoples were once the same.

The late Republican interest among Roman scholars in the connection between the Sabines and Samnites is evident.\textsuperscript{68} The ethnic Sabellus, first attested in a Varronian fragment (Serv. ad G. II.168 = \textit{Sat. Men.} F17 Astbury), is the clearest illustration of the amalgamation of these two peoples. Strabo weaves the ethnic, which he sees as an endonym, into his Sacred Springs narrative, stating that the Samnites use it ὑποκοριστικῶς (Strabo V.4.12), ‘as a nickname/diminutive’. However, in the extant sources, Sabellus is never used as a self-identifier, only as an exonym. Dench argues that the way Samnites and Sabines are lumped together

\textsuperscript{64} Cornell 1995:39.
\textsuperscript{65} e.g. Tagliamonte 1994; see Lomas 1995:277.
\textsuperscript{67} See Rix [1957] 2001:109 for the full reconstruction of *sab\textsuperscript{h}-. de Simone 1992:231 and Bourdin 2012:729 suggest that the ethnic is originally derived from PIE *śye- ‘ourselves’; cf. Solmsen 1901:202. While such ethnocentrism is common in ethnics, I do not believe the ultimate etymology is possible to ascertain. When pushed to its limit, the *sab\textsuperscript{h}- group is presented as centralised and monolingual, e.g. Marinetti 1985:43; Negri 1986-1989:140; Spadoni 2004:393; Riva 2007:87; Bispham 2007:181; Bradley 2007:297; Bourdin 2012:729.
\textsuperscript{68} Dench 1995:105 argues that there was no interest for the relationship between Sabines and Samnites until after the Social War. While this may well be true, we do not have enough literature from before the Social War to be certain.
served to exoticise the more and more integrated Sabines.\textsuperscript{69} This assumes that the Romans equated the modern inhabitants of the Sabine territory with the Sabines of myth, which does not seem to be the case. Instead, the Sabines are a crucial link between the Romans and the Samnites, used as a tool with which to tame them. The association between the Sabines and the Samnites continues into the Empire, when the territories of these peoples is united in \textit{Regio IV} in Augustus’ division of Italy into regions (Plin. \textit{HN} III.12.106).\textsuperscript{70}

The suggestion that the Samnites, who had so recently rebelled against Rome, were descended from the Sabines was clearly an attractive one to the Romans, who themselves claimed to have Sabine ancestry. By concentrating not on the recent past (the Social War) but on the distant ‘past’ (in the form of myths), the differences between the two peoples could be diminished. As the ancestors of both Romans and Samnites, the Sabines allow Romans to relate to the Samnites through them. The many wars and aggressions can be forgotten, and emphasis can instead be placed on Roman generosity. The Sabines become a stand-in for both Romans and other peoples in relation to Romans, where the place made for the Sabines in Roman society is replicated. This idea continues to be used well into the Empire, as in Claudius’ speech on Gaulish senators.\textsuperscript{71}

\begin{quote}

\emph{maiores mei, quorum antiquissimus Clausus origine Sabina simul in ciuitatem Romanam et in familias patriciorum adscitus est, hortantur uti paribus consiliis in re publica capessenda, transferendo huc quod usquam egregium fuerit.}

\end{quote}

In my own ancestors, the eldest of whom, Clausus, a Sabine by extraction, was made simultaneously a citizen and the head of a patrician house, I found encouragement to employ the same policy in my administration, by transferring hither all true excellence, let it be found where it will.\textsuperscript{72}

\textit{Tac. Ann. XI.24.1}

The Claudian connection to the Sabines was also utilised in 23 CE at the funeral of Drusus, when \textit{imagines} of the Sabine ancestors of the Claudii were used (Tac. \textit{Ann.} IV.9.2). The invocation of supposed Sabine ancestry occurs during the Republic also in other families, such as the patrician Valerii, Aemilii, Marcii Reges and Pinari, and the plebeian Marcii, Pomponii

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{69} Dench 1995:105; Oakley 1998:399.

\textsuperscript{70} Dench 1995:2; Mansuelli 1996:24. On the overlap of \textit{regiones} and the concept of pre-Roman cultures, see Riva 2007:83.

\textsuperscript{71} This speech is also preserved on the so-called Lyons Tablet (\textit{ILS} 212), but unfortunately the beginning has been lost. Griffin 1982:409 has suggested that the mention of Attus Clausus may be Tacitus’ addition, but also admits that there may be precedents, e.g. in the speech on Nero’s adoption (Suet. \textit{Claud.} XXXIX; Tac. \textit{Ann.} XII.25).

\textsuperscript{72} Jackson 1970:287, 289.

\end{footnotes}
Moneyers who claimed Numa as their ancestor, e.g. L. Pomponius Molo (c. 97 BCE) or C. Marcius Censorinus (c. 88 BCE), would stamp coinage with his likeness. The coinage of L. Titurius Sabinus (c. 89 BCE) is probably the most famous, with the head of Titus Tatius on the obverse and scenes from the myths of the Sabines, such as the rape of the Sabine women and the death of Tarpeia, on the reverse.

The cognomen Sabinus has been presented as the best proof of Sabines in Rome. Before 450 BCE, there are four instances of the cognomen Sabinus in the Fasti Consulares. Three of them belong to Claudii, and also bear the names Appius, the praenomen of the founder of the gens, and t Inrigillensis, referring to Inregellum, the hometown of Appius Claudius. After the mid-fifth century, the cognomen disappears for several centuries before reappearing in the Fasti in the first century BCE. Using Fasti as an onomastic resource is not without its problems. Firstly, we are only accessing material from the most elite members of Roman society. Secondly, it is not an unbiased document, as it is influenced by myths. The very first name in the Fasti Triumphales Capitolini is “Romulus f. Martis Rex” (InscrIt. XIII Fasti Triumph. Capit. 1.753). The authenticity of the fifth century list of consuls has been questioned. The close association between the Claudii, the most famous Sabine family in Rome, and the cognomen Sabinus should throw suspicion on its inclusion. Doubt has also been cast on the reliability of cognomina in the Fasti, as cognomina appear not to have been in general use until the second century BCE.

Thus we can only be certain of the appearance of the cognomen Sabinus around the time of the Social War when it was a common cognomen among free Romans. Farney

---


74 See Farney 2007:84-85.


77 Broughton and Patterson 1951:13, 19, 30, 37, 45.

78 The bearers of the cognomen are the moneyer P. Sabinus (supposedly the same as L. Titurius Sabinus) and the legate lieutenant Q. Titurius Sabinus (58 BCE). The next consul with this cognomen is C. Calvisius Sabinus, who did not hold the position until 39 BCE. Broughton 1952:199, 386, 451; Dench 2005b:343-344.

79 See Smith 2006:42. Broughton and Patterson 1951:xi are “inclined to accept the entire list” on the basis of names of extinct patrician families, while OCD s.v. Fasti calls the fifth century lists “necessarily speculative, perhaps politically tendentious, and [it] has both omissions and interpolations”.

80 Drummond 1990:628; Ogilvie and Drummond 1990:14 n.22.

argues that many bearers of the cognomen were “frauds” or “senatorial ‘wanna-be’s” like the politician Sabinus mentioned by Cicero:

oratorem meum – sic enim inscripsi – Sabino tuo commendavi: natio me hominis impulit, ut ei recte putarem; nisi forte candidatorum licentia hic quoque usus hoc subito cognomen [i.e. Sabinum] arripuit; etsi modestus eius uultus sermoque constans habere quiddam a Curibus uidebatur.[]

I have entrusted my Orator (for I have so entitled it) to your [friend] Sabinus. Considering the man’s nationality, I could not help thinking that I was right in doing so; unless, of course, he too has availed himself of the licence given to candidates, and suddenly seized upon this particular surname [Sabinus]; and yet his modest expression of face and the calmness of his speech seems to have something derived from Cures in it. Cic. Fam. XV.20.1

This is also touched upon in a poem from the same time, sometimes ascribed to Vergil:

iste post Sabinus ante Quinctio

he who was Sabinus, but ere that Quinctio

App. Verg. Catal. X.8

These sources indicate that social climbers would take this cognomen as a means of gaining prestige. However, the cognomen Sabinus is not necessarily a straightforward claim to a Sabine identity or origin. It could refer to the Sabine archetype of piety and frugality, much like T. Pomponius Atticus, who was Athenian only through his love for all things Greek, or some other connection to the Sabine territory, like Scipio Africanus, who gained his agnomen by defeating Hannibal.

Despite the prestige of the Sabine connection and the possibility that some tried to emulate it, Roman generosity, towards both Sabines and later peoples, was primarily an elite issue. In Canuleius’ speech in Livy, an ambivalence towards the custom of giving well-off strangers more privileges than ‘actual’ Romans can be noticed:

82 Farney 2007:91.
83 Williams 1960:309. I have substituted Williams’ “your servant” with “your friend” for clarity. Tilly 1973a:7 incorrectly renders Sabino tuo as “your Sabine”, rather than as a proper name.
84 Fairclough and Goold 2000:499.
ex peregrinone patricius, deinde consul fiat, ciuis Romanus si sit ex plebe, praecisa consulatus spes erit?

Shall the son of a stranger become patrician and then consul, but a Roman citizen, if plebeian, be cut off from all hope of a consulship?

Liv. IV.3.15

Despite the image of the austere and coarse Sabine, the Sabines we meet in Roman myths are kings and noblemen, not peasants and shepherds. Cato describes his Sabine childhood as down-to-earth and frugal, and speaks of being dressed in simple clothes and riding without a saddle (Festus 350L = ORF Cato F128), but this tells us more of the Sabine mirage than the Sabine reality. The gap between members of the senatorial class and agricultural workers in the Sabine territory must have been as large as anywhere. Our perspective is not that of an ordinary Sabine, but of the Roman elite man who visits his Sabine villa. This can be seen in particular in Hor. Ep. I.14.19-21, which may not reflect an actual event but gives us some insight into a mindset. Horace criticises his bailiff, by all accounts local, for not appreciating the beauty of the Sabine landscape, but wanting to move to the city.

The Sabines in Roman thought are not the real people of the Sabine territory, but a construct of archetypes and myths. Like the Spartan mirage, its Sabine cousin functions as a mirror. Roman ideas concerning Sabines tell us more of the Romans than the Sabines. They represent the uncorrupted, if slightly primitive, character that Rome strives for. The connection to the Sabines provides an explanation of Rome’s customs, cults and language, but also of Rome’s relationship with large parts of Central and Southern Italy. The fact that the Romans and Sabines became one people in the distant past provides an explanation of the antiquarian oddities of Rome, and through that merger, Rome has a claim to rule other descendants of the Sabines. Through this, the discourse of the Sabine mirage becomes a way to relate to both the Roman past, and the Italic, still alien, present.

1.3 Sabines in epigraphy, archaeology and linguistics

1.3.1 Finding Sabine inscriptions
The topic of this thesis is Sabine glosses, not inscriptions, but as epigraphy has sometimes been presented as material that substitutes the glosses as evidence for Sabine, it must be

---

Table 1. Inscriptions classified as Sabine in the corpora Crawford et al. 2011, Rix 2002, Pisani 1953 and Vetter 1953. References where the inscriptions were classified as Sabine are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pisani 1953</th>
<th>Vetter 1953</th>
<th>Rix 2002</th>
<th>Crawford et al. 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pisani 59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Um 3</td>
<td>Forum Novum 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ve 362</td>
<td>Um 2</td>
<td>Forum Novum 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Forum Novum 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Um 40</td>
<td>Sabini (?) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ve 513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sabini (?) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sp RI 1</td>
<td>Cures 1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pisani 54   | Ve 227      | VM 9     | Aveia 1             |

addressed. There is no text that all four identify as Sabine. It is not uncommon for scholars to state that there are no Sabine inscriptions at all, or that, though they exist, they provide no information. The closest to a consensus among the corpora is the classification by two (Pisani and Rix) of the so-called Flusare inscription (II Aveia 1/ST VM 9) as Sabine. Furthermore, Rix groups three of the inscriptions glossed as Sabine by Crawford (ST Um 2, Um 3, Um 40) together as ‘archaic Umbrian’, among them the Poggio Sommavilla inscription (II Forum Novum 2/ST Um 2).

---


90 I use the term Sabellic to refer to the branch of Italic consisting of Oscan, Umbrian and South Picene and their more fragmentary sisters.

91 II does not explicitly state the language of inscriptions, but the inscriptions underlined in Table 1 are all marked with the ethnic Sabini, an implicit classification.

92 Pisani 59, which does not occur in any of the other corpora, is the Tibur altar pedestal (CIL I.2.265) which is generally considered early Latin. See Whatmough 1953:128, Adiego 1997:60 criticising the Sabine identification.


Some scholars consider there to be a specific “Sabine alphabet”, used in this inscription.96

Our knowledge of the ethnography of Italy is late Republican at its oldest. By attaching an ethnic from this time to an inscription from centuries earlier, it implies – wrongly – that the ethnic landscape of Italy cannot have changed during the centuries in-between.97 It also disregards the fact that our knowledge of ethnic groups derive overwhelmingly from Roman sources, and may well be imperfect. Neither does this practice take into account that the find-spot may not tell us the language of an inscription. It is a fact that peoples in Italy interacted, traded and mingled, and material culture moved. Most inscriptions found in the Sabine territory are written on pottery.98 For instance, the flask bearing the Poggio Sommavilla inscription measures only 5.7 by 2.5 cm.99 The place these objects were smashed or placed in graves does not necessarily reflect where they were made and inscribed.100

Assigning inscriptions which do not include ethnics to a certain people is, though not always ill-advised, a leap of faith. The extrapolation of a language to go with every people carries with it the idea, found in nineteenth and twentieth century nationalism, that one language equals one people, and vice versa.101 This fails to account for the possibility of travellers setting up inscriptions, and the existence of bilingual or multilingual communities (or any number of bi- or multilingual individuals within a community). We might imagine an extreme thought-experiment, and ask what conclusions we would draw if the only surviving inscription from ancient Britain was the Latin-Palmyrene bilingual Regina inscription in South Shields, or if the runic graffiti in Hagia Sophia was the only writing to be found in

---


97 The same problem of assuming that the distribution ethnic groups remained unchanged can be seen in the constantly reproduced maps of the languages of Italy (Pisani 1953:cart. i; Palmer 1954:iv; Rix 2002:3; Baldi 2002:113; Poceti, Poli and Santini 2005:493; Wallace 2007:x; Wallace 2008:xxii; Marchesini 2009:tab. x; Bourdin 2012:map 2), some of which give ethnics rather than names of languages. Although these maps are useful for students encountering the material for the first time, they present the languages of Italy as constant and unchanging, until Latin comes to dominate them completely. Not only are they seldom given a rough date (only Baldi 2002:113 and Bourdain 2012:map 2 do) – they might even show different parts of Italy at different times, making the map an amalgamation of the eras. The only redeemable feature of such maps are that they tend not to box in the languages, but give the suggestion of language contact and possibly even language continuum (although Coleman 1986:101 and Bourdin 2012:map 2 do include borders). A more accurate type of map is McDonald 2017, an interactive map which plots the find-spots of inscriptions, and therefore avoids extrapolating beyond the evidence.

98 The exceptions are the Cures cippus (II Cures 1-2/ST Sp RI 1) and II Forum Novum 3.


100 A possible example of a linguistically displaced inscription is II Capua 35/ST Ps 3, a vessel found in Campania, but bearing an inscription in an unidentified language.

101 On the connection between archaeological cultures and languages, see Jones 1997:41-42; Mullen 2012:4-6; Clackson 2015a:27.
Istanbul. What assumptions would we make about the language(s) of the ancient Britons or the Byzantine Greeks and Ottoman Turks? Although this mindset has lost ground since the nineteenth century, when Mommsen described Sabine as a “Nationalsprache”, the tendency continues, sometimes using the same wording, e.g. calling the Oscan alphabet the “national Oscan alphabet”, even if there was never a unified Oscan-speaking geopolitical entity.

By applying an ethnic (often an exonym) from ancient literature, historiography or myth, to a material artefact, the lines between concrete materials and modern scholarly theories on the one hand, and ancient concepts and preconceptions on the other are blurred. More neutral names, relating to geography rather than ethnics (e.g. South Picene), are not without their problems, in particular as they may be unknown to scholars of other disciplines, but the issues with ancient terminology is often more far-reaching. The term ‘Sabine’ is not just a geographical term meaning ‘found in what was the Sabine territory in antiquity’. Crucially, we are not always clear on what the Sabine territory was. The assumption that any artefact found in the Sabine territory must be Sabine places too much trust in our sources. The most important reason why this is inadvisable is because Sabine is not simply a descriptive term, but a word that carries with it mythological and historiographical assumptions.

1.3.2 Approaching and classifying Sabine glosses

Much work has been done on Sabine glosses, particularly their classification. The Sabine glosses are approached either as remnants of an otherwise unattested Italic language, or as dialectal words from Sabine Latin or Latinised Sabine.

---


103 Mommsen 1850:348; Wallace 2007:xi.

104 A similar example is Samaritan, originally an ethnic that due to the parable in Luke 10.33 has become a term for a helpful or charitable person. This has led to the use of the alternative ethnics when referring to the people, e.g. German Samaritan but Samariter in Luther’s Bible, Swedish samarier in the most recent Bible translation (<http://www.bibeln.se/las/2k/luk?q=Luk+10%3A33> [accessed 22 December 2017]) but samarit in older translations and in speech (SAOB s.v. samarit).

hesitant whether to classify Sabine as Latino-Faliscan or Osco-Umbrian/Sabellic. Palmer is only convinced of its Osco-Umbrian status by the names Pompilius and Clausus, while von Planta brands it a “Zwischendialekt”. Buck, Baldi, Stuart-Smith and Wallace mention Sabine among the “minor” dialects/languages. Some scholars have argued that Sabine was close to Umbrian, while others argue that the Sabines spoke something akin to Oscan. Negri argues that Sabine shares features of both Sabellic and Latin, and is its own branch of Italic (see §3.2.1).

In all these discussions, there is an assumption of unity. Often, glosses are listed with little or no context. No regard is paid to the textual environment of the glosses or the historical conditions of the sources, both of which can include crucial information. If we assume that all Sabine glosses are from one language, simply on the grounds that they are glossed that way, we are also assuming that every single ancient author who glosses a term as Sabine, from Varro in the first century BCE to Ioannes Lydus in the sixth century CE, means the same thing with ‘Sabine’. It is evident that later ancient scholars read their predecessors, but this does not mean that they knew their mind. It is also clear that we are not dealing with self-effacing copying of older sources. The same word is sometimes glossed differently by different authors – *fedus* is Sabine in Varro but old Latin in Festus and Scaurus, *hirpus* is Oscan in Strabo but Sabine in Servius (see §§2.2.3, 5.2.3). We cannot assume consensus on what ‘Sabine’ is across a time-period of over 600 years.

This assumption that the Sabine glosses are from a single language will on occasion lead scholars to posit sound-changes specific to Sabine, e.g. /f/ for Latin /h/, or /l/ for Latin /d/ (see §§2.2.2, 2.2.6). Calling these changes sound-laws would be a gross exaggeration – they are at most tendencies. Most are not even that, but features attested only in one or two words. This is not enough material for positing a sound-law. Another, related issue is the arbitrary inclusion and exclusion of words. Tilly sees the dialectal form *horda* (*RR* II.5.6) as

---

106 Most authors writing before the decipherment of South Picene (see Marinetti 1985:199-121) use the term ‘Osco-Umbrian’ for this branch, rather than the current ‘Sabellic’ or ‘Sabellian’ (see above). The only difference between the terms is that ‘Sabellic’ includes South Picene as well as Oscan and Umbrian. For a comprehensive discussion on the changing terminology of these language branches, see Rix 2002:1-2.


110 Often this is only implicit, but e.g. Negri 1986-1989:138 states it explicitly.
Sabine, as \( f/h \) variation occurs in some Sabine glosses.\(^{111}\) Conway identified a startling number of basic Latin words, such as \( olere, \ lingua \) and \( mulier, \) as Sabine after positing a Sabine sound-change \( \ast d > l. \)^\(^{112}\) A change \( \text{-d\text{-}} > /s/ \) has been suggested based on the supposedly Sabine \( Clausus \) (Latin \( Claudius \)) and the gloss \( basus \) (\( \text{CGL V.170.28} \)) (never glossed as Sabine), interpreted as cognate with \( badius \) ‘reddish-brown’ (see \( \S 5.5.1 \)).\(^{113}\) However, this change cannot be seen in the Sabine gloss \( trimodia, \) which does not prevent Negri from treating \( \text{-d\text{-}} > /s/ \) in Sabine as fact (see \( \S 5.5.1 \)).\(^{114}\) If any gloss of any language can be used to prove a Sabine sound-law, and Sabine glosses can be excluded if they do not adhere to such a sound-law, Sabine becomes a useless term.

The Sabine language has been used as a way of dealing with phonetic inconsistencies within Latin, such as the early Sabellic loans \( bufo, \ rufus, \ scrofa, \ bos \) and \( lupus, \) and Conway’s ‘Sabine \( l \)’ words.\(^{115}\) In such cases, the Sabine assignation is nothing more than an convenient explanation.\(^{116}\) Sabine becomes a dust-bin language, where Sabellic features of Latin can be stowed away, making Latin a neat, regular language. Palmer even describes the Latin outcome of the medial aspirate as “purely Roman”, using a word signifying geography and ethnicity rather than language.\(^{117}\) Although recent scholarship has left this mentality of language purity behind, the Latin words with Sabellic features are often approached as a problem to be solved.

Something that all Sabine glosses do share is Latin terminations. This had led scholars to argue that by the time of Varro, the Sabines spoke Latin, or Sabine had been sufficiently latinised to essentially be Latin).\(^{118}\) However, the existence of Latin terminations in manuscripts does not necessarily mean that these appeared in the original (now long-lost) versions of the texts. The terminations may have been added by a scribe to make the text more comprehensible. Scribes evidently struggled with unfamiliar case forms, as in the Celtic forms at \( LL \) VIII.64, read as \( alacco, \) \( alaucus \) by Goetz and Schoell, \( Alacco, \) \( Alaccus \) by Dahlmann

---

\(^{111}\) Conway 1893:165, 167; Conway 1897:361.


\(^{113}\) Mommsen 1850:348; Conway 1897:351; Buck 1906:100; Schrijnen 1922:227; Evans 1939:16-17.

\(^{115}\) Tilly 1973b:253.

\(^{116}\) See Baldi 2002:182-183 for an exhaustive list of Sabellic-looking words in Latin.

\(^{117}\) Palmer 1954:37. The term \( lingua \) \( Roma \) occurs occasionally in Imperial literature, but it denotes a widening of the term rather than a specification compared to \( lingua \) \( Latin \); see Adams 2003b:194-196.
and Weisgerber, *alauda, alaudas* by Kent and *alauda, alausa* by Ernout. At the same time we should keep in mind that there is no positive evidence to suggest that the terminations of Sabine glosses were added by later scribes rather than the authors. Some glosses are undoubtedly corrupt, such as the Sabine etymologies for *porcus* (*LL* V.97) and *sol* (*LL* V.68), but attempts to reconstruct them often become an exercise in excavating the text for ‘authentic’ Sabine forms, free from corrupting Latin influence (see §2.2.1).

### 1.3.3 Mythical influences on the study of Sabine

It is an indisputable fact that Rome was a diverse city. Migration and intermarriage were important aspects of Roman culture. This historical reality is clearly attested in epigraphy, historical accounts and material culture. Roman diversity is also a common theme of myth, and one central in the myth of the Sabines in Rome.

The truthfulness of the stories of an early Sabine presence has been a topic of discussion for over a century. The foundation myths were largely seen as fictional and aetiological until the finding of the Lapis Niger in 1899 reinstated Livy’s first book as a credible source. This had considerable influence on the interpretations of graves of different types found in the Roman Forum. Cremated remains were identified as Latins and inhumed remains as Sabines, occasionally using now outdated racial theories. Although the close adherence to the foundation myths and uncorroborated historiographic accounts has largely gone out of fashion in Anglophone scholarship, Italian scholars often broadly accept them.

The sceptics are not united under one banner. A theory that is still widespread, enough to be mentioned prominently in the fourth edition of *OCD*, is Dumézil’s theory that

---

121 See Burman in preparation b. Hall 2002:23 rejects Romanness as an ethnic identity due to the diversity of origins, but this definition of an ethnic identity is unworkable. See van der Vliet 2003:269 and Adams 2003b:184-185; Dench 2005a:206; Gruen 2013:8 on the additional complexities of Romanness during the early Empire.
the rape of the Sabine women is a Romanised version of a Proto-Indo-European myth.\textsuperscript{125} This leads to a complete rejection of any material relating to the myth as true or culturally important.\textsuperscript{126} As a result, Dumézil and his followers such as Poucet, who believes the myth is Indo-European with details transposed from Roman Republican history, deny the cultural importance of these myths to the Romans, and reduce Roman mythology to a mere vessel for Indo-European relics.\textsuperscript{127} Many recent Anglophone scholars take a more pragmatic view. Cornell points out that there is no evidence to support or to refute the Sabine myths, while Oakley states his position clearly: “it needs no argument that the whole Sabine War of Romulus is bogus.”\textsuperscript{128}

Identifying ethnic groups through archaeology is notoriously difficult. The ethnic identity of the people whose bones we find and whose houses we excavate is generally lost to us.\textsuperscript{129} There is no positive archaeological proof of Sabine presence in archaic Rome. Neither is there any proof of their absence. In Momigliano’s words, “I do not know what, archaeologically, makes a Sabine in Rome.”\textsuperscript{130} Even in the Sabine territory, specifically Sabine features are difficult to identify, due to how little archaeological work has been done in this area.\textsuperscript{131}

Despite the ambiguity of the evidence, the myth of a Sabine presence in Rome has influenced the study of Sabine. The Sabellic loan-words in Latin core vocabulary are often identified as Sabine due to the myths, but they also serve as proof that the mythical accounts are true, a classic circular argument.\textsuperscript{132} Conway identifies the supposed $d/l$ variation


\textsuperscript{126} e.g. Poucet 1967:428; Poucet 1985:213-214.


\textsuperscript{129} See Jones 1997:15-26; Bradley 2000:231-232; Wallace-Hadrill 2008:8-9, 15 on the issue of archaeology and ethnicity. Genetic markers do little to clarify the situation in Italy. Studies such as Fiazza, Capello, Olivetti and Rendine 1988 rely on modern samples and do not take post-classical population movements into account. Becker 1996, who tries to ascertain the ethnic borders of the Sabine territory through the study of skulls, comes up empty-handed.

\textsuperscript{130} Momigliano 1966:562 n.40. See also Poucet 1985:143; Momigliano 1990:86.

\textsuperscript{131} Cornell 1995:76; Becker 1996:349; Patterson and Millett 1998:11; Gaffney, Patterson, Roberts and Watters 2004:239; Di Giuseppe 2008:435; Benelli 2014:137. Recent projects such as the Tiber Valley Project (Patterson and Millett 1998; Patterson 2004a) and collaborative efforts (Coarelli and Patterson 2008b) have sought to redeem the lack of archaeological scholarship on this area.

\textsuperscript{132} e.g. Palmer 1954:38; Cornell 1995:76.
phenomenon as Sabine, because they lived close to Rome and were in contact with them during the founding of the city (see §2.2.6). Sabine archetypes also influence linguistic research. For instance, religious words are overrepresented because of Sabines’ alleged piety and Numa’s influence on Roman cults. Motivated by the myth of the frugal Sabines, Devoto accepts only the ‘rustic’ Sabellic words as Sabine, and identifies the ‘urban’ group as later loans from Oscan.

When proposing that the language of the South Picene inscriptions was spoken by the Sabines, Crawford suggests that the memory of South Picene conquests led to the Roman foundation myth. To explain the end of the South Picene/Sabine epigraphic tradition, Crawford refers directly to the early history of Rome:

We were initially tempted to down-date Romulus by three centuries or so, and say that they had of course to go and try to get their women back from the Romans. But perhaps they just saw that the line taken by Appius Claudius promised, to borrow a phrase from John North, more and better dinners.

Appius Claudius, the mythohistorical founder of the Claudii, was a Sabine nobleman who defected to the Roman side during one of the Roman-Sabine wars (Liv. II.16). Although this passage is playful, its use of stories of Roman mythohistory becomes a way of justifying explanations of material culture that can easily be taken too far.

Negri does not stop at tongue-in-cheek references to the myths, but adds an additional classification in Sabine, Sabini intra moenia (Sabines who live in Rome with Titus Tatius) and Sabini extra moenia (who do not). In his opinion, the Sabine language is its own branch of Italic, which changes PIE *bʰ to /p/, as opposed to Latino-Faliscan /b/ and Sabellic /f/ (see §3.2.1). The Sabini intra moenia, who merged with the Romans, kept the /p/ outcome. By contrast, the Sabini extra moenia remained Rome’s enemies and, according to Negri, ‘Sabellified’ their language by adopting the Sabellic outcome of PIE voiced aspirates to distinguish themselves from the Romans, thus changing their ethnic from *Sapini to *Safini.

---

133 Conway 1893:158-160.
134 e.g. Della Corte 1991:22. Similarly, Bakkum 2009:37 ascribes Sabellic influence on Faliscan to Sabine based on myths of early Sabine invasions.
136 Crawford 2011:12.
argument is untenable, as it assumes the undoing of a phonetic merger, with only the instances of /p/ derived from *bh. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the form *Sapini.\textsuperscript{139}

The mythological standing of the Sabines dominates the discussion of the glosses, even shaping the evidence itself by the inclusion of words glossed as old or connected to e.g. Numa. Names of supposed Sabines, such as Numa’s gentiliciurn Pompilius and Attus Clausus and its variants, ‘Sabine’ forms of Appius Claudius (Liv. II.16), are often included in the corpus.\textsuperscript{140} When Negri gave his 1992 article on Sabine the title “La lingua di Numa”, a phrase that appears in his 1993 article as well, he is forcing the glosses into a specific mythological frame, making it impossible to disentangle the mythical and the real-world Sabines.\textsuperscript{141}

The use of mythology as a source stems from the idea that myths contain a kernel of truth. This is a flawed position – as Wiseman observes, “we should think not of nuts but of omelettes”.\textsuperscript{142} Even if there were some truth in myths, it is not perfectly preserved inside the shell of the story. Instead, it is mixed with fiction, and it is impossible to pick the truth out of that mix. Our only guidance would be our own assumptions of what the truth is.

Whatever their authenticity, these myths were important in Roman thought and ideology. ‘Myth’, although it has colloquially come to imply falsehood, primarily denotes “a story that matters to a community, one that is told and retold because it has a significance for one generation after another.”\textsuperscript{143} Therefore, I will not use Poucet’s term ‘pseudohistory’ in relation to the Sabine myths, as it implies a consciously told lie.\textsuperscript{144} In antiquity, myths were seen as an extension of the past, forming a second temporal layer beyond the attested past. The foundation myths of Rome were viewed as ambiguously historical. I will call this layer between clearly defined myths, dealing with gods and the distant ‘age of heroes’, and securely attested history mythohistory. Mythohistory may feature supernatural or divine elements, which may or may not be rationalised (e.g. Liv. I.3.2, 7). The extent to which people believed these

\textsuperscript{139} Livy mentions the 	extit{tribus Sapinia} (XXXI.22), but it is clearly stated that this tribe is found in the Umbrian territory, and it is no more than a coincidence. See de Ligt 2012:65.


\textsuperscript{141} See Negri 1993:301.

\textsuperscript{142} Wiseman 2000:211; see also Dench 1997a:270 and Bispham 2007:181.

\textsuperscript{143} Wiseman 2004:10-11. See also Mayor 1997:71; Gruen 2013:4.

\textsuperscript{144} Poucet 1967:413; Poucet 1985:213-214, 291. Poucet, who sees Roman claims of Sabine presence in the city before the arrival of Attus Clausus as some form of perjury (cf. Poucet 1985:214) also uses the equally problematic term “pseudo-étymologies” of ancient glossings of Sabine (see Poucet 1967:431; Poucet 1985:204). This type of terminology has its uses elsewhere; see Cunliffe 2011:198 on the “pseudohistorical clutter” of the Celts and the Celtic language-family.
myths varied (Liv. pr.6-7; Rom. Thes. I.3), but they were nevertheless central to the construction of Roman identity.

In this thesis, I propose that instead of attempting to use Sabine glosses and the Roman myths about Sabines to test their respective authenticity, we should see the myths and the glosses as part of the same process, where the mythical Sabine heritage of Rome becomes a way to approach and interact with the contemporary Sabellic-speaking Italy.

1.4 Scope and methodology
In light of the ideological baggage of the Sabines and, by extension, of the Sabine glosses, we must ask whether it is necessarily the case that the Sabine glosses make up a linguistic unity. If not, we cannot speak of a ‘Sabine language’.

In order to ascertain whether or not the Sabine glosses show such unity that may indicate the possibility that they are from the same language, I will use the idea of linguistic compatibility throughout my discussions. The neo-grammarian regularity hypothesis states that sound-change is regular and exceptionless. When a word does not show such a sound-change, we may be dealing with one of the phenomena not included in the regularity hypothesis, e.g. metathesis or analogy, or the word may not have been in the language in question at the time of the change. On the face of it, lupus < PIE *lukw-os ‘wolf’ and quis < PIE *kwas ‘who’ are not linguistically compatible, as they show different treatments of PIE *kw.

This is resolved when we take into account that lupus shows the Sabellic treatment of *kw, and is clearly a Sabellic loan.

Nevertheless, they are both Latin words, as they are both used in Latin. We know the retention of *kw (and *kw > k / _ u, o) is a Latin change as, in Latin, it is far more common than the /p/ outcome. When it comes to glosses, we do not have such a criterion to use. In the absence of attestations in reliable epigraphy, the only thing that says that the Sabine glosses are Sabine is their glossings. By identifying what sound-changes the glosses have undergone, and whether there are any inconsistencies between them, we will be able to create a baseline which we can then apply to the glosses. In this way we can answer the question whether these words are linguistically compatible, and thus possibly from the same language. Only after this can we analyse the material for classification.

In order to keep the subjectivity of our material in mind, I will concentrate on two issues in particular. The first is the context of the glosses. Rather than only analysing the gloss itself or the sentence where it is given, I will consider its role in the author’s argument as well as considering alternative textual readings and editorial emendations. The second issue is the historical and ideological context in which these glosses were committed to paper. This gives
us an insight into any biases held by the author and his time. It will also allow us to factor in the relationship between Rome and the rest of Italy, and possible routes of linguistic information.

For this study, our sample should be as controlled as possible. Therefore I will only discuss words explicitly glossed as Sabine through the use of an ethnic (Sabini dicunt, in Sabinis), an adverb (sabine), a reference to language (e.g. lingua sabina) or a specific reference to geography (ager Sabinus). I will exclude vaguer references, such as words with associations to mythohistorical Sabine individuals, e.g. Titus Tatius and Numa, or words connected to geographical places smaller than the territory, such as cities and the area around them. I will also exclude words with only tangential connection to the Sabines (e.g. eloqui and reloqui, Varro LL VI.57) and words of uncertain provenance, such as uefere and trefere found in Apuleius Minutianus (a Renaissance forgery or, according to Jocelyn, an attempt at a practical joke in manuscript form), τέστις ‘witness’ (glossed in a glossary of legal terms printed in 1606), or stolones ‘shoots’ (CGL V.515.64, a tenth century glossary). I will not discuss any Latin words identified by modern scholars as Sabine on formal grounds, e.g. lupus and lingua. I will not discuss names of any kind, regardless of their glossing, unless they are directly connected to a glossed common noun. This is both due to restrictions of space and the fact that onomastic material is not ideal for the study of sound-changes and classification, as archaisms and loans are common. The Sabellic, Roman and Etruscan onomastic systems were in constant contact and have therefore influenced each other considerably.

This narrow scope leaves us with thirty-nine words, which are presented in Appendix I for reference. As these glosses are securely attested as Sabine by the ancients, we may avoid circular arguments and cherry-picked material. It also avoids the methodological problems of
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145 Examples of glosses listed as Sabine due to connection with mythical Sabines are τραβαία (Latin trabea, a robe of state) (Lyd. Mens. I.19) (von Planta 1897:594; Conway 1897:36) and uerna ‘house-slab’ (Festus 510L) (von Planta 1897:594; Bruno 1961:538).
146 Eloqui and reloqui are treated as Sabine glosses in Mommsen 1850:351; von Planta 1897:591; Conway 1897:355; Collart 1954b:237. However, while they are used in fanis Sabinis (LL VI.57), Varro clearly thinks of these words as Latin, as they are part of a longer discussion of the verb loquor. Similarly, aggeres (Varro RR I.14.3), included by Negri 1992:253, is not strictly a gloss, but part of an explanation of the use of the word muri. Vefere and trefere are included in the list of Sabine glosses in von Planta 1897, and are cited as credible by Pocetti, Poli and Santini 2001:402, but already Mommsen 1850:358 saw them as suspicious. For the early recognition of Apuleius Minutianus as a forgery, see Jocelyn 1990:213-214. For the theory that the manuscript was never meant to be passed off as ancient, but was instead a joke, see Jocelyn 1990:217. Τέστις (Labbaeus 1606:120) is included in Mommsen 1850:355 and von Planta 1897:594, but is absent in more recent scholarship.
148 This is a more constrained sample than the 112 glosses in Bruno 1961:544 and the 230 glosses mentioned (but never given) in Negri 1993:204-205.
relying on the truth of the stories of Sabines in early Rome by not including glosses associated with e.g. Numa or words glossed only as being used by the antiqui (as Negri does)\(^\text{149}\).

The glosses will be discussed in chronological order in chapters two to five, with a section dedicated to each gloss. Fragments and testimonia will be discussed in the section corresponding to the author in whose work the passage has survived, as we must keep in mind the possible skewing of the passage when it is related. For the sake of clarity, references to the discussion will be provided in the section of the original author. When a gloss occurs in several writers’ work, it will be discussed in the section corresponding to the earliest attestation.

Chapter two will discuss Sabine glosses found in Varro’s *De Lingua Latina* (*LL*) and *Res Rusticae* (*RR*).\(^\text{150}\) Chapter three is dedicated to the glosses found in Paulus-Festus, the amalgamation of Festus’ epitome of Verrius Flaccus’ *De Verborum Significatu* (*DVS*) and the epitome of this text by Paul the Deacon (see §3.1.2 on the placement of this discussion within the thesis).\(^\text{151}\) The next two chapters will deal with glosses from other authors. Chapter four will discuss glosses found in authors active during the Principate and the High Empire.\(^\text{152}\) Chapter five will discuss glosses found in authors active during late antiquity.\(^\text{153}\) Chapter six will place the Sabine glosses into a larger glossographic perspective and revisit the question of linguistic compatibility.

Throughout, I will give the glosses in the script in which they are printed. There is little reason to transcribe a supposedly Sabine word written in Greek script into Latin, as the Latin script is not more natural or native to the (presumed) language than the Greek.

---


\(^{150}\) The glosses attested in Varro are *sol* (*LL* V.68), *fucus* (‘hircus’, *LL* V.97), *febus* (‘haedus’, *LL* V.97), *†apruno porco por* (*LL* V.97), *lixula* (*LL* V.107), *similixula* (*LL* V.107), *lepesta* (*LL* V.123), *ciprus* (*LL* V.159), *creper* (*LL* VI.5), *crepusculum* (*LL* VI.5, VII.77), *februm* (*LL* VI.13), *idus* (*LL* VI.28), *cascus* (*LL* VII.28), *catus* (*LL* VIII.46) and *tebae* (*RR* III.1.6).

\(^{151}\) The glosses attested in Paulus-Festus are *alpus* (Paulus ex F. 4L), *ausum* (Paulus ex F. 8L), *curis* (Paulus ex F. 43L), *cumba* (Paulus ex F. 56L), *scensa* (Festus 465L, Paulus ex F. 457L) and *uesterna* (‘cena’, Paulus ex F. 457L).


Chapter Two

Sabine Glosses in the Works of Marcus Terentius Varro

2.1 Life, work and times of M. Terentius Varro

Born in 116 BCE and dead in 27 BCE, M. Terentius Varro lived through one of the most turbulent times of Roman history. He is primarily known for his productivity and knowledge – contemporaries and latter-day authors describe him with superlatives such as πολυγραφώτατος (Cic. Ad Att. 13.18), βιβλιακώτατος (Plut. Rom. XII), πολυπειρότατος (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.21.2), uir Romanorum eruditissimus (Quint. Inst. X.1.95), doctissimus Romanorum (Seneca Helv. VIII.1). Despite this scholarliness, Varro was active within politics and the military for much of his life. At Rome he held the offices of tribune of the people and praetor, and in Dalmatia and Spain he served as legate. He fought in the Civil War on the side of his former commander Pompey, and narrowly survived Antony’s proscriptions. He died at almost ninety, in the year when Octavian was given the name Augustus.

The late Republic was a tumultuous time, dominated by civil unrest and political turbulence, and the Civil War stalled Roman intellectualism through the deaths of highly educated elite men and the violence in Rome, which made many delay coming there for education. Nevertheless, it was also a time of intellectual flowering. During his lifetime, Varro wrote some 620 books, collected in 60 works. He was a driving force in the golden

---


age of antiquarianism, the study of the past, not from the chronological perspective of the historians and annalists, but with the focus on explanations of Rome’s customs and institutions.\textsuperscript{138} In Cicero’s words, he led home the Romans who had walked like strangers through their own city (Cic. Acad. I.3). It is possible that the political instability was one reason for the emergence of this genre, as it gave people somewhere to turn for examples of the \textit{maiores}.\textsuperscript{159} As Rawson observes, the Romans were “literally ancestor-worshippers”, and the \textit{mos maiorum} had a central role in Roman society, regardless of whether it was based on historical events or not.\textsuperscript{160} The answers may not always reaffirm the current status quo; for all its conservatism, antiquarianism had the potential to be subversive by highlighting the ways in which the \textit{mos maiorum} had been manipulated by those in power.\textsuperscript{161} The study of the past could also be utilised in an attempt to emphasise unity in a time of political splintering. In a society where one’s alliances could be the difference between life and death, the idea of a shared, united past may be strengthening.

### 2.2 De Lingua Latina

Of \textit{De Lingua Latina} (\textit{LL}), only six of twenty-five books survive. Books V-X, which deal with etymology and inflection, survive through a badly corrupt eleventh century manuscript, Codex Laurentianus (\textit{F}), and its copies.\textsuperscript{162} The dedication to Cicero enables us to date \textit{LL} to before Cicero’s death in 43 BCE. The date is usually set between 47 and 45 BCE.\textsuperscript{163}

#### 2.2.1 Sol, *ausel, *sauel

The name of Sol, included in the list of gods to which Titus Tatius dedicated his altars (\textit{LL} V. 74), is glossed as Sabine as part of a discussion of theonyms.

\begin{quote}
Sol[a] uel quod ita Sabini, uel <quod> solu<s> ita lucet, ut ex eo deo dies sit.
\end{quote}

\textit{Sol} ‘Sun’ is either named this because the Sabines call him that, or because he alone (\textit{solus}) shines just as daylight comes from this god[.]

\textit{LL} V.68

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{138} Momigliano 1950:288; Rawson 1972:35; Collart 1978:5; Ogilvie and Drummond 1990:10; Cornell 1995:20; Fantham 1996:54; Oakley 1997:33; Glinister 2007:12.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Rawson 1985:3.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Rawson 1985:322.
\item \textsuperscript{141} Wallace-Hadrill 1997:14; Wallace-Hadrill 2008:236.
\item \textsuperscript{142} Collart 1978:7; Taylor 1996:34.
\item \textsuperscript{143} Kent 1951:ax; Collart 1954b:24; Cardauns 2001:30-31.
\end{itemize}
All editions of *LL* to date change *Sola* to *Sol*, and emend the accusative *solum* to nominative *solus*. Despite this consensus among editors, this passage became part of an attempt to find the Sabellic word for ‘sun’ during the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. Two emendations of this passage have been suggested, turning the gloss into either *ausel* or *sauel*.

The reading *ausel* starts, not with Varro, but with Paul the Deacon’s epitome of Festus’ abbreviation of Verrius Flaccus’ *De Verborum Significatu*. The passage in question is about the proprietors of the Roman sun cult:

> Aureliam familiam ex Sabinis oriundam a Sole dictam putant, quod ei publice a populo Romano datus sit locus, in quo sacra faceret Soli, qui ex hoc Auseli dicebantur, ut Valesii, Papisii pro eo, quod est Valerii, Papirii.

They think that the family of the Aurelii, which has its origin among the Sabines, is named after the Sun, since the place where they made sacrifices to the Sun was given to the family by the Roman people at public expense. They used to be called Auseli because of this, just as the Valerii and Papirii used to be called Valesii and Papisii.

Paulus ex F. 22L

While this passage implies a relationship between *Aurelius* and the Sun, it does not specify it. Conway calls the passage “vexatiously abridged”.\(^{164}\) In order to find the word from which the name is derived, scholars stripped the pre-rhotacised form of its -io- suffix and ‘uncovered’ *ausel*. With this in mind, the Varronian passage can be emended from “sola uel” to “sol ausel”\(^{165}\). This unattested Sabine word became accepted enough to be included in lists of Sabine glosses and cited without the asterisk indicating its unattested status\(^{166}\).

Palaeographically, the emendation of *ausel* makes good sense, even if it removes the *uel* that introduces the first etymology\(^{167}\). Its appeal is strengthened by comparative material found both in epigraphy and glosses. *Ausel* is reminiscent of PIE *H₂eus-* and the related Latin *aurora* ‘dawn’, and shows the same unrhotacised form as the Sabine gloss *ausum* ‘gold’ (Paulus ex F. 8L; see §3.3.2).\(^{168}\) Some scholars cite Etruscan *usil* ‘sun’ (e.g. ET Ve S.21; AT S.4; *Liber Linteus* VII.11).\(^{169}\) A gloss from Hesychius has also caught scholars’ attention:

\(^{164}\) Conway 1897:352.
\(^{165}\) Wissowa 1912:315 n.3; Richard 1976:916.
\(^{167}\) Mommsen 1850:349; Conway 1897:352; Kretschmer 1923:111; Kretschmer 1925:310; Evans 1939:33.
\(^{168}\) Mommsen 1850:349; Conway 1897:352; Kretschmer 1923:111; Kretschmer 1925:310; Evans 1939:197.
αὐκήλως· ἐως, ὑπὸ Τυρρηνῶν

aukēlōs: dawn, from the Etruscans

Hesych. a.8283

Koch, Mommsen and Kretschmer all suggest that the <κ> should be read as <σ>, and that the -ως in αὐκήλως is a case of dittography from the following ἐως. This makes the gloss αὐσηλ. The meaning ‘dawn’ instead of ‘sun’ was waved away as trivial.

This evidence, which at first seems to point to a genuine word *ausel, is not without its problems. While Etruscan usil ‘sun’ and *ausel supposedly mean the same thing, the formal connection is unclear. As there is a likely IE etymology for *ausel, we would have to assume that usil is the loan. In northern Etruscan inscriptions, there are examples of originally Sabellic names containing diphthongs being spelled in a variety of ways, e.g. raufi (e.g. ET Pe 1.56), rufi (e.g. ET Pe 1.45), rafi (e.g. ET Pe 1.46), a variation that does not occur in native Etruscan lexemes. However, with the exception of the Piacenza liver, usil is only ever attested in the south. The only possible alternative form, asil (ET Vs 4.13), found on an altar close to Volsinii, also in the south does not appear to mean ‘sun’. The fact that the inscription contains a word derived from the name of Tin/Tinia, Jupiter’s Etruscan counterpart, makes it far more likely that this is the god to whom the altar is dedicated. Therefore it is highly unlikely that usil is a variant form of a borrowed *ausil. Furthermore, the difference in vowel in the second syllable cannot be explained. There is some alternation between /i/ and /e/ in Etruscan loans in Latin, but there is no evidence of this in loans in Etruscan.

The suffix -el in *ausel has sparked discussion. The only native Latin nouns ending thus are fel ‘bile’ and mel ‘honey’, both results of simplification of final geminates. Elsewhere, a coda /-l/ triggers backing in preceding vowels, e.g. *konsel > consul. *Ausel is more reminiscent of the Paelignian o-stem famel ‘slave’, cf. Latin famulus (II Sulmo 13/ST Pg 11), with loss of -os. The easiest solution for forming *ausel would be a Sabellic form with the root *aus-, which has not been rhotacised, and a diminutive suffix. This has not been presented by any of the proponents of *ausel. Kretschmer suggests that the puzzling -el ending is due to stem contamination between *aus-os ‘dawn’ and *sauel ‘sun’ (see below), something
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170 Mommsen 1850:349; Kretschmer 1925:310; Koch 1933:35; Blažek 2013:342.
171 Wallace 2008:36.
173 Breyer 1993:15-16.
174 EDLI:209, 370; Sen 2015:18. The etymology of mel is unclear, but whatever the original PIE stem, it appears that the Latin form passed through a stage *mell.
which would require some unlikely reanalysis.\(^{176}\)

Despite the possibility of a Sabellic formation, the simplest explanation of *ausel is still that there is no such word. Extracting a gloss from a personal name such as Aurelius is hardly methodologically sound, and neither is the emendation of a gloss from αὐσὴλ to αὐσήλ and the subsequent identification of it as usil. Hesychius’ knowledge of the languages of Italy is not always reliable – he glosses κάπρα (Latin capra ‘goat’) and δέα (Latin dea ‘goddess’) as Etruscan (Hesych. δ.342, κ.738). The extensive emendations required to get αὐσήλ would disrupt the alphabetical order, which is generally consistent up to the first three letters in Hesychius.\(^{177}\)

The fact that the word appears between αὐκήλως and αὐκηρεσίη speaks in favour of the form αὐκήλως.\(^{178}\)

As for Aurelius, it is far more plausible that it is derived from the *aus- stem, found in aurum and aurora (cf. §3.2.2), and the suffix -elius, which is common in personal names, cf. Cornelius. The proposed etymology of Auselius may be a reference not to any special word for ‘sun’, but instead a pun on a sole, much like “aqua a qua iuuamur” (Paulus ex F. 2L).\(^{178}\)

A less commonly repeated emendation, with the same goal as *ausel, is Blumenthal’s suggestion to emend “sola uel” to “soll <s>auel”, creating the more IE-like word *sael. This would have been retained by the (ever old-fashioned) Sabines, while the Romans went on to develop it into sol.\(^{179}\) Coleman suggests that sol is the result of Sabine monophthongisation, cf. plostru (CIL I.2.1831), replacing the Latin *sal <*sāul< *scHaul.\(^{180}\) Blumenthal finds further proof for his theories in Pisani’s suggestion that an Umbrian epithet of Jupiter, zal (II Umbria 2/ST Um 23), is the word for ‘sun’, derived from *sael.\(^{181}\) Bruno also supports Blumenthal’s reading.\(^{182}\)

Several issues exist with the corroborating evidence for this emendation. Umbrian zal cannot go back to *sael, as <z> represents a sound that goes back to a secondary *-ts-, cf. puze < *put-s- (ST Um 1 Ib 34).\(^{183}\) The syllabification in plastrum, where /au/ is followed by a consonant cluster, is different from the proposed *sael, where syllabification would make /u/ manifest as a glide, which would not be lost in Latin or Sabellic. Aside from being

\(^{176}\) Kretschmer 1925:310.

\(^{177}\) See Dickey 2007:88-89 on Hesychius and the issues of his lexicon.

\(^{178}\) von Blumenthal 1935:120; Poccetti 2016:360.

\(^{179}\) von Blumenthal 1935:121.


\(^{182}\) Bruno 1961:503, 531.

linguistically impossible, this theory betrays something of Blumenthal’s mindset about the Sabines.\(^\text{184}\) They are an old, conservative people, who keep old forms while the Romans innovate. Their old forms are not their own, but the Romans’. Like the antiquarians of the late Republic, Blumenthal treats the Sabines simply as a repository of Roman history.

Despite all that has been written about this Varronian passage, the simplest solution, to treat the <a> of sola as an insertion and instead read sol, is the best. Both emendations rely on reinterpreting one uel as part of the gloss. Of the sixteen instances of uel in the fifth book of LL, ten are found in a pair, introducing two possible etymologies. The use of iia, if understood in the sense ‘thus’, indicates that the Sabine form is similar or identical. The allure of other words which look less Latin is a dangerous one, as the methodological implications of such emendations are considerable. The discovery of a new inscription with the Oscan genitive singular suleis has made the speculation of the Sabellic word for ‘sun’ unnecessary.\(^\text{185}\) The question of Latin sol is better approached as the result of an o-stem, e.g. *soH₂-u₂.\(^\text{186}\) As for Varro’s gloss, it is not of the type of fircus, which provides a separate word to explain a Latin form, but rather like cascus, where a word used in Latin is identified as originally Sabine (see §§2.2.2, 2.2.11).

### 2.2.2 Fircus

Fircus appears as one of three Sabine glosses in a discussion of words for farm-animals.\(^\text{187}\)

Hircus, quod Sabini fircus

[We say] hircus ‘he-goat’, because the Sabines say fircus

\(LL\ V.97\)

Fircus is glossed as used apud antiquos by Velius Longus (GL VII.69.11). It is often cited alongside the gloss hirpus ‘wolf’, Oscan in Paulus ex F. 93L and Strabo V.4.12, and Sabine in Serv. ad Aen. XI.785 (see §5.2.3). Several scholars have confidently claimed that hirpus, as well as hircus and fircus, was derived from PIE *gʰers- ‘bristle’, the same root as horreo ‘bristle’ and hirsutus ‘rough, coarse’.\(^\text{188}\) The semantics of such an etymology are sound – both wolves and goats have rough coats. However, the formal criteria make it more uncertain. It is likely that hircus and hirpus are from the same root, but that the root is not *gʰers-. Hircus shows /i/ for /e/.
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\(^{185}\) Poccetti 2016:361.


\(^{187}\) Seven of Varro’s 12 animal terms at LL V.96-99 are given non-Latin etymologies.

\(^{188}\) WH s.v. hircus; IEW:445; Machajdiková and Blažek 2013:112; Blažek 2013:344.
something seen in the dialectal *Mircuros* for *Mercurios* and *stireus* for *stercus* ‘manure’, which has led to the position of a sound-change *-erc- > -irc-*.\(^{189}\) There have been suggestions that this change impacts any /e/ preceding an /r/ and any consonant, cf. *scirpus* ‘rush’, *firmus* ‘firm’, *hirtus* ‘tough, shaggy’ and Faliscan *loifrtato* ‘freedman’ (*LDAF* MF 31), *loifrtä* ‘freedwoman’ (*LDAF* MF 41), which would explain the /i/ in *hirpus*.\(^{190}\) However, many examples have unclear etymologies (such as *scirpus*) or could be explained by analogy (e.g. *hirtus* to *hircus*). Double forms such as *fiber* and *feber* ‘badger’ imply that a preceding *f* can lead to raising of /e/ to /i/, which would account for all remaining examples supporting *-erC- > -irC*-\(^{191}\). This indicates that *hircus, fircus* and *hirpus* are not from PIE *gʰers-*, but a Proto-Italic form *hirkʷ-os. See §5.2.3 on the semantics of this root.

*Fircus* does not appear in the epigraphic record, but Varro’s *RR* includes an interlocutor named *Fircellius*, derived with an *-io-* suffix from a diminutive (*firc-el-clo-* > *fircellus*, cf. *oculus* – *ocellus*). It occurs alongside a number of other animal- and plant-related names, e.g. *Scrofa, Passer, Agrius*.\(^{192}\) This implies that *fircus* would be known or at least recognised as an animal name by Varro’s audience.

The *f/h* variation seen in *fircus* is found in both other glosses and in the epigraphic record of Faliscan and Praenestine Latin. The glosses are presented in Table 2. Along with *fircus*, two more Sabine glosses show this variation: *fedus* for *haedus* ‘kid’ (*LL V.97; see §2.2.3) and *fasena* for *harena* ‘sand’ (*GL VII.69.8; see §4.10.1). Contrary to some modern claims, this was not seen as a specifically Sabine phenomenon in antiquity.\(^{193}\) All three *f/h* words glossed as Sabine are ascribed to the *antiqui* by Longus. In total, nine words are ascribed to the *antiqui* and three to the Faliscans. Three words are cited with *f/h* variants but not assigned to any particular people (see Table 2 for references).

However, it is clear that the ancients were aware of the phenomenon of *f/h* variation, as they often comment on it. Varro’s glossings of *fircus* and *fedus* are in the minority in this respect. It appears as if he discussed the phenomenon itself elsewhere, as Velius Longus cites Varro’s claim of *fasena*:
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\(^{189}\) Meiser 1998:81; Adams 2007:89-91. This has led Coleman 1990:11 and Baldi 2002:183 to list *hircus* as a loan into Latin.


\(^{191}\) Watkins 1973:196.

\(^{192}\) Storr-Best 1912:xxiv-xxv; Cardauns 2001:25; Wikander 2015:471. See Weiss 2009:281 on the formation of *-ellus* diminutives. The standard Latin diminutive *hirelus*, formed only with the *-el-* suffix, is attested in Pliny *HN* XII.46.

\(^{193}\) Claimed by Schrijnen 1922:235; Collart 1954b:98.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabine</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>Faliscan</th>
<th>Without glossing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fircus (hircus)</td>
<td>fircus (hircus)</td>
<td>GL VII. 69.10, 81.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fedus (haedus)</td>
<td>faedus (haedus)</td>
<td>GL VII. 11.4, 69.10, 81.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fasena (harena)</td>
<td>fasena (harena)</td>
<td>GL VII. 69.10, 81.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haba (faba)</td>
<td>haba (faba)</td>
<td>GL VII. 13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fariolum (harioleum)</td>
<td>fariolum (harioleum)</td>
<td>GL VII. 23.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hordeum (fordeum)</td>
<td>hordeum (fordeum)</td>
<td>GL VII. 81.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folus (holus)</td>
<td>folus (holus)</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 74L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fostes (hostes)</td>
<td>fostes (hostes)</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 74L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostia (hostia)</td>
<td>hostia (hostia)</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 74L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horreum (farreum)</td>
<td>horreum (farreum)</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 91L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hebris (febris)</td>
<td>hebris (febris)</td>
<td>Serv. ad Aen. VII. 695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hormiae (formiae)</td>
<td>hormiae (formiae)</td>
<td>Ov. Fast. IV. 73-4, Serv. ad Aen. VII. 695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hormiae (formiae)</td>
<td>hormiae (formiae)</td>
<td>Plin. HN III. 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanulum (fanulum)</td>
<td>hanulum (fanulum)</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 91L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ut testis est Varro, a Sabinis fasena dicitur, et sicut s familiariter in r transit, ita f in uicinam aspirationem mutatur:

as Varro attests it is called *fasena* by the Sabines, and as *s* changes into *r*, so *f* is changed into the aspirate that is closely related [to *f*].

*GL* VII.69.8-9

Although the existence of the variation was generally accepted and remarked upon, only some expressly describe it as a change from one sound to another, rather than parallel forms. Longus’ Varronian testimony describes *f* changing into *h* and explains that kids are called *haedi* in Latin “quoniam faedi dicebantur apud antiquos”, ‘since they were called *faedi* among the ancients’ (*GL* VII.69.10). Scaurus makes a similar claim when arguing against the loss of initial <h> in the spelling of *haedus*, as it is derived from *faedus*, used “apud antiquos”, ‘among the ancients’.

et ubi illi f litteram posuerunt, nos h substituimus

and where they put the letter *f*, we have substituted *h*.

*GL* VII.11.4-5

Servius also describes a change, but one going the other way:

Faliscos Halesus condidit. hi autem, inmutato H in F, Falisci dicit sunt, sicut febris dicitur quae ante hebris dicebatur, Formiae quae Hormiae fuerunt, ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρμῆς: nam posteritas in multis nominibus F pro H posuit.

Halesus founded the Faliscans. They however were called the Falisci by the change of *H* into *F*, just as what was previously called *hebris* is called *febris*, *Formiae* which used to be *Hormiae*, from *ὄρμη* ‘onslaught’: for later generations put *F* instead of *H* in many nouns.

Serv. ad *Aen.* VII.695

In a majority of the glosses with *f*/h variation, we find /h/ in the standard Latin word, and /f/ in the alternative. There are four exceptions: *haba* (for *faba* ‘bean’), *hebris* (for *febris* ‘fever’), *Hormiae* (*Formiae*) and *hanulum* (*fanulum* ‘shrine’).194 This can also been seen in the word *horda* (*Varro* *RR* II.5.6; *Paulus* ex *F*. 91L) for *forda* ‘pregnant cow’ (*LL* VI.15; *Paulus* ex *F*. 74L). This pair, from < *bh*<′, o-grade of *bh*‘er- ‘carry’, is never contrasted with one another. The connection between *forda* and *horda* is made by modern scholars, putting it rather on par with the epigraphic evidence. Several modern scholars describe *horda* as ‘dialectal’.195

In the epigraphic material, we are dealing with a similar situation of *f*/h variation. In

---

194 Strictly, *hanulum* is not contrasted with *fanulum*, but the latter is the explanation. Similarly, *horctum* and *forctum* (*Paulus* ex *F*. 91L) are given as parallels, with no one form being presented as standard.

Faliscan, some forms show <h> for expected <f>, e.g. *hileo* (LDAF MF 146) for *fileo* ‘son’ (LDAF MF 470), while others have <f> for expected <h>, e.g. *foied* (LDAF MF 59-60), cognate with Latin *hodie* ‘today’. The Praenestine examples all have <f> for expected <h>, e.g. *foratia* (Horatia) (CIL I.2.166), *fercles* (Hercules) (CIL I.2.564) and *felena* (Helena) (CIL I.2.566). This variation also occurs in Etruscan, e.g. *vhulenas* / *hulenas* (ET Vs 1.45, 1.28), with <vh> for / f/. In all these words, /f/h variation occurs only in initial position. Where the Italic forms can be traced back to PIE, the initial stop is an aspirate.

Cross-linguistically, the sound-change f > h is not uncommon, e.g. Latin *filius* > Spanish *hijo*. This makes it likely that Faliscan change underwent a change of initial PIE aspirates going to /v/, and then a separate change f > h. However, this is not simply a case of a change, but variation between two segments with no clear environment.

Firstly, we must separate the material that is not part of the same change. It would not be impossible for a change to affect both Etruscan and neighbouring Italic dialects through a wave effect, but this is not the case here. All Etruscan examples of /f/h variation are found in the north, particularly at Clusium, and not at sites closer to the Faliscan territory. Furthermore, the Etruscan examples are all much later than the Faliscan ones. If we were dealing with a sound change that moved from one language to another, we would expect the changes to be roughly contemporary.

This still leaves us with a change in the Faliscan territory and Praeneste. Wallace and Joseph suggest a Middle Faliscan sound-change f- > h-, spreading either in only certain dialects or by lexical diffusion, thus not affecting all potential words. Due to the fact that the original f- forms had higher prestige than the new h- forms (much like psilosis in British English has been stigmatised ever since the loss of /h/ started), speakers attempted to undo this change by hypercorrecting forms with etymologically expected h-, e.g. *fe* (LDAF MF 305) for *hec* (LDAF MF 88), Latin *hic* ‘here’. It is possible that the Faliscan change and resulting

---

197 Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:82; Bakkum 2009:82.
199 Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:82 cites three examples of word-internal /f/h variation: *vefere/vehere* and *trafere/trahere*, Sabine glosses that have been proven to be falsified (see §1.4), and Oscan *culchna/culfna* does not display /f/h variation but variation between /l/ and /k/ (see Hiersche 1965:112).
hypercorrection also affected Praenestine Latin.

What then of the glosses, ascribed to the Sabines and the antiqui? We must be cautious of trusting the ancient glossings. After all, few are consistent. The Faliscan territory, to the north of Rome, borders the Sabine to its east, while Praeneste lies south-east of Rome. If $f > h$ was an areal change, it is possible that it affected the Sabine territory too, although it would have circumvented Rome, which seems unlikely. It is also possible that the Praenestine examples are not part of the same change. As they are all personal names, it is possible that they were imported from the Faliscans. Stuart-Smith suggests that the $f/h$ variation spread from the Osco-Umbrian language Sabine to Faliscan, and that hypercorrected /h/ forms are due to Latin influence.\textsuperscript{205}

While we cannot ascertain where the change started, we can say for certain that at least fircus is not Sabellic, as it has a Latino-Faliscan labiovelar reflex (cf. Faliscan -cue $<\text{PIE} \ast-k\text{w}e$ (\textit{LD Af MF} 80, 158, 170). The Sabine and Faliscan territories lie side by side, on either side of the Tiber. Cures and Falerii Veteres were only just over 20 kilometres apart. This makes it likely that linguistic contact occurred, through areal changes or borrowing, through trade or transhumance.\textsuperscript{206} The geographical closeness also brings with it another possibility – that a source that had encountered the words fedus and fircus in Faliscan misreported their origins, or that either intermediary sources or Varro himself got confused. Although it is clear that Varro sometimes made his own discoveries in old books and inscriptions (e.g. \textit{LL VI.4}, 123), he likely relied on other sources, oral or written, for much of his information. We cannot assume that he roamed the countryside himself to look for dialectal forms.

\subsection{2.2.3 Fedus}

\textit{Haedus} ‘kid’ follows hircus.\textsuperscript{207}

Hircus, quod Sabini fircus; quod  illic fedus, in Latio rude hedus, qui in urbe ut in multis A addito haedus.

[We say] hircus, as the Sabines say fircus; and as they say fedus there, [they say] hedus in rural Latium, which is haedus in the city, with the addition of an A in many cases.\textsuperscript{207}

\textit{LL V.97}

\textsuperscript{205} Stuart-Smith 2004:124.


\textsuperscript{207} The psilotic forms ircus and aedus appear in the manuscript tradition and are given in Collart 1954a: 62.
When glossing *fedus*, Varro gives both a rustic form (*hedus*) and an urban form (*haedus*). He sees the -e- form as original, describing the -ae- form as the result of the insertion of a segment.208 One may relate this to Varro’s claim in *RR* III.1 that the countryside is older than the city (see §2.3.1). Instead of presenting monophthongisation as a corruption by the uneducated, as implied by Lucilius’ comment on Cecilius the *pretor rusticus* ‘rustic praetor’ (*LL* VII.96 = Lucilius F1146 Krenkel), it is a case of simple preservation.209 Monophthongisation of /ae/ is seen in Faliscan (cf. Faliscan *pretod* (*LDAF* LF 242) for *praetor*), but not in Praenestine Latin.210 This means that we can discount Praenestine as the source of *fedus*.

There are no other identifiable monophthongised diphthongs in any other Sabine glosses. The only other diphthong in an expressly glossed word is in *ausum* (Paulus ex F. 8L; see §3.2.2). In Paulus ex F. 74L and Velius Longus *GL* VII.69.10, the gloss, ascribed to the *antiqui*, is given as *faedus*, but it is possible that the diphthong was reintroduced during transmission. In *LL* V.97, the monophthongised /e/ must be correct, as Varro comments on this feature. This passage has been used as evidence for the early monophthongisation of /ae/ outside of Rome, and has led scholars to add Sabine to the list of monophthongising Sabellic languages.211

The cognates of *fedus* and *haedus* are restricted to Germanic: Gothic *gaits*, Old High German *geiz*, Old Swedish *get* and Old Icelandic *geit* ‘goat’ < Proto-Germanic *gait*-s. Attempts to identify a PIE root have largely failed.212

See §2.2.2 on *f/h* variation.

### 2.2.4 †*Apruno porco por*

The third Latin animal word Varro gives a Sabine etymology to is *porcus* ‘pig’ (*LL* V.97). Unfortunately, the passage is so corrupt that it is not entirely certain what this gloss is.213 This

---

208 Paulus ex F. 74L gives *faedum*, but *heda* and *haedo* both appear in the manuscripts.


213 Biville 2013:29 is evidently unaware of this, as she treats the passage as ambiguous as to whether it is *aprunus* or *aprunus porcus* that is Sabine.
has led many scholars to give only tentative forms marked with daggers or question-marks. Only Ribezzo and Ferriss-Hill give definite forms, *aprunu* and *porcus* respectively.\(^{214}\)

Readings vary in both word division and the rendering of certain letters. In addition to the gloss, the previous noun and verb are also corrupt, reading *sauini dicto.*\(^{215}\) Spengel and Spengel [1885] 1979 print:

Porcus quod Sauini [i.e. Sabini] dicunt aprinum porcum por; inde Porcus\(^ {216} \)

Goetz and Schoell 1910 give:\(^{217}\)

porcus, quod Sabini dicunt †apruno porco por; i<n>de porcus\(^{218}\)

Kent 1951a (who is required to come to a conclusion about corrupt passages in order to translate them) give the last words as:

aprunu<i>m> porcu<i>m>; proi<n>de porcus

*aprunas porcus* ‘boar pig’; therefore *porcus* ‘pig.’\(^ {219}\)

Collart 1954a:

dicto aprino porco, porcum, inde\(^ {220}\)

Bruno presents five possible readings of the Sabine word and its Latin translation:

1. Sabine †*aprum*, Latin †*porco por*
2. Sabine †*apruno porco*, Latin †*por*
3. Sabine *por*, Latin *apruno porco*
4. Sabine †*porco por*, Latin †*apruno*
5. Sabine †*apruno porco por*

---


\(^{215}\) Goetz and Schoell 1910:30.

\(^{216}\) Spengel and Spengel [1885] 1979:40.

\(^{217}\) In all editions except Spengel and Spengel [1885] 1979, the ethnic is given as *Sabini.*

\(^{218}\) Goetz and Schoell 1910:30-31.

\(^{219}\) Kent 1951a:92-93.

\(^{220}\) Collart 1954a:64.
Suggestions (1) and (2) are rejected as the Latin is not attested. Bruno rejects (3) as Varro uses *aprus* instead of *aprunus porcus* for ‘wild boar’ in his extant works. She claims (5) is possible, but finds it lacks the elegance of Varro’s etymologies. It also lacks a Latin explanation, which makes it unlikely. Bruno thus judges suggestion (4) the most likely, making the gloss †porco por, suggesting emending †*apruno* to *aprum*. However, both this suggestion and (3) would change the glossing from ‘pig’ to ‘wild boar’. As this word appears in a passage about domesticated animals, rather than later among wild animals, (4) and (3) look unlikely. Her list of possibilities is constrained by the fact that she assumes that the Sabine term must be different from the Latin. This does not take into account glosses such as *idus* and *sol* (despite attempted emendations – see §2.2.1), where the observation is that the word itself is or used to be Sabine, but is used in Latin.

Despite our efforts, there is little we can do with this level of corruption. All we can say with any certainty is that the gloss appears to be a form of Latin *porcus*, or a cognate of it and Umbrian *purka* (*ST Um 1 I Ib 27*), *pora* (*ST Um 1VIIa 6*), Avestan *parǝsa-*, Lithuanian *pašas*, Church Slavic *pras*, Old High German *far(a)h*, Old English *fearh*. The precise details of this gloss remain elusive.

The second part of Varro’s proposed etymology is also corrupt, but as the topic of discussion is Greek, it is possible to reconstruct it:

\[
\text{ nisi si a Graecis, quod Athenis in libris sacrorum scripta est πόρκη e<\text{t}> πόρκο<\text{ς}>. }
\]

\[
\text{unless it [Latin *porcus*] comes from the Greeks, because at Athens in the *Books of the Sacrifices* πόρκη [ - - - ] is written, and πόρκος}^{223}\]

\[ LL \ V .97 \]

Varro repeats the word πόρκος in *RR II.4.17*. However, neither of these words is attested in Greek meaning ‘pig’. Instead, πόρκος means ‘fishing-net’ and πόρκης is a metal ring holding a spearhead in place.

These words may go back to the same root as Latin *porcus*, but Varro is clearly wrong about their meanings.

---

221 Bruno 1961:510-511. It should be noted that *aper* and its Latin derivates have a Sabellic cognate in Umbrian *abruna* (*ST Um 1 Ia.11*).

222 Untermann 2000:615; *EDLI*:481. Bruno 1961:510 suggests tentatively that *por* (assuming that this is indeed the right reading, rather than Kent’s proinde) is the root of Latin *porcus* without the -ko- suffix. This seems unlikely, as the velar appears to be part of the PIE root.

223 Kent 1951a:93.

224 See *LSJ* s.v. πόρκης, πόρκος; Clackson 1994:164.
2.2.5 Lixula, similixula

The terms *lixula* and *similixula* occur as part of a discussion of words for food, many of which have non-Latin origins.

Circuli, quod mixta farina et caseo et aqua circuitum aequabiliter fundebant. Hos quidam qui magis incondite faciebant uocabant lixulas et similixulas uocabulo Sabino: quae frequentia Sabinis.

*Circuli* ‘rings’, because they poured into the pan a regular *circuitus* ‘circuit’ of a batter made of flour, cheese, and water. Certain persons who used to make these *[incondite]* called them *lixulae [...] and similixulae [...]*, by the Sabine name, such was their general use among the Sabines.225

Unlike most other Varronian Sabine glosses, *lixula* and *similixula* are cited not as linguistic parallels, but as anthropological observations about a distinctly Sabine thing for which Romans do not have a word. Despite the past tense, it does not appear that this passage refers to the mythical Sabines of early Roman history. *Lixula* are different from the Roman *circuli* as *magis incondite faciebant*.226 The meaning of *incondite* is not altogether clear. Kent and, following him, Ferriss-Hill interpret it as “rather carelessly”, taking the word as a derivate of *condère*, ‘to put in order’.227 If this is the right verb, the meaning ‘preserve, store up’ may be more obvious in the case of food. The other possibility is *condère* ‘season, flavour’, proposed by Hauri-Karrer.228

*Lixula* may be from *(u)likw-*, cf. Latin *liquidus* ‘liquid’, Old Irish *fliuch* ‘moist’, Tocharian A *lyiktsi* ‘wash’, Tocharian B *laikate* ‘washed’.229 Kent and Collart connect it to *elixus* ‘boiled’ (cf. Non. 52L).230 Nonius 626L claims that *lixa* was a word used by the ueteres for ‘water’. If this is the case, *lixula* could be formed from this word with a diminutive suffix, perhaps as ‘water’ was an important ingredient.231 This is more likely than a derivation directly from *(u)likw-*, which in order to work would require a *(u)-so- suffix, for which there are few parallels.232

---

225 Kent 1951a:103. Due to the uncertain translations of the Latin terms, I have excluded Kent’s renditions of them.

226 Kent 1951a:103; Collart 1954a:213; *EDLI*:347.


229 Collart 1954b:240 n.5; *LIV*:696; *EDLI*:345, 347; Ferriss-Hill 2014:101. See Lindsay 1891:10 on *lixa*.

230 Kent 1951a:102n; Collart 1954a:213.


232 Suggested by WH s.v. *lixulae; EDLI*:347. See Leumann 1977:341 on *(u)-so-*. 
The other form, *similixula*, has led to far more debate. The manuscript variants *semilixulas* and *semixulas* occur.233 The latter can be disregarded on account of *lixula*, but the former appears to be a possible variant. *Simi*- is considered by a number of scholars a form of Latin *semi*- with closing of -ē-, cf. Oscan *ligud* from *lēg-* (II Bantia 1/ST Lu 1 19).234 Kent argues that *similixulae* are semi-circles, while *lixulae* are full circles.235 Bruno rejects this argument on the basis of the retained /ē/ in Ausellii (see §2.2.1), Nerio (Gel. XI XII.22.7, see §4.8.2), and στρήνα (Lyd. Mens. IV 4, see §5.6.2).236 Hauri-Karrer suggests that the uncertainty of the vowel in *similixula* goes back to Varro himself. She believes he misinterpreted the first member as *semi*- and, knowing that some other languages had /i/ where Latin had /ē/, drew the conclusion that this form was dialectal.237 This sounds unlikely, as it requires Varro to have an understanding on regular and exceptionless sound-change, something he did not.

The other suggestion to explain *similixula* circumvents the problem of the closing of /ē/, the only feature of this word which implies a non-Latin origin.238 *Similixula* may be the product of haplology of *simila-lixula*, with the first member being Latin *simila* ‘flour’?239 Hauri-Karrer takes this to mean that the *lixulae* have more water (*lix*α) than the *circuli*, and *similixulae* have less cheese (which provide the seasoning, making them *incondite*). With less cheese, you instead need more flour (*simila*), leading to the word *similixulae*.240 The two most important ingredients are in the name.

While Hauri-Karrer’s etymology works well both formally and semantically, the suggestion that this indicates something specific about the type of bread does not ring true. After all, there is flour in both *circuli* and *lixulae*. Formally, this first member could be from *similis* ‘resembling, similar’. The resulting *simili-lixula* would be prone to haplology. However, the semantics are unclear, as Varro makes no particular distinction between the two words. The comparison is not between *lixulae* and *similixulae*, but them and *circuli*.

233 See Goetz and Schoell 1910:33; Spengel and Spengel [1885] 1979:44.
235 Kent 1951a:102n.
238 Ernout 1909:192.
This may leave simi- < semi- as the more likely explanation. If so, we would not expect Nerio and στρήνα to be from the same language or dialect as similixula. There is no convincing evidence to include Auselii (see §2.2.1).

2.2.6 Lepesta

*Lepesta*, at first sight an example of specialised vocabulary relating to vessels, has nevertheless generated one of the largest discussions on the question of Sabine. Varro discusses the gloss as follows:

Item dictae lepestae, quae etiam nunc in diebus sacris Sabinis uasa uinaria in mensa deorum sunt posita; apud antiquos scriptores Graecos inueni appellari poculi genus δεπέσταν: quare uel inde radices in agrum Sabinum et Romanum sunt profectae.

Likewise there are those called *lepestae*, the kind of wine-jars that are even now, on the days of the Sabine festivals, placed on the table of the gods; I have found in ancient Greek writers a kind of cup called δεπέστα, for which reason the source of the name quite certainly set out from there into the Sabine and Roman territory.\(^{242}\)

Lepesta is also associated with the Sabines in Nonius, who cites Varro’s *De Vita Populi Romani*:

lepistae etiamnunc Sabinorum fanis pauperioribus plerisque aut fictiles sunt aut aeneae.

Still today, *lepistae* in many poorer temples of the Sabines are made from clay or bronze. Non. 877-878L

Paulus ex F. 102L also gives *lepista*, glossed as “genus uasis aquarii”, but with no mention of the Sabines. This form also appears in Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum*:

ferunt pulchras creterras, aureas lepistas

They carry beautiful mixing-bowls, golden *lepista* vases\(^ {243}\)

GL VI.139.8, 266.1, 531.7 = Naevius 54 Strzelecki

Strictly, *lepesta* is not glossed as Sabine. The only references are to religion (*in diebus sacris Sabinis*) and place (*in agrum Sabinum*). The mention of the word coming into *ager Romanus* implies that it is also used in Rome or at least Latin. However, it is most often treated as a word in Sabine.

---

\(^{241}\) The long vowel in στρήνα (Lyd. Mens. IV.4, written after the Greek loss of vowel distinction) is corroborated by Latin *strēna* (cf. Ov. Am. I.9.10).

\(^{242}\) Kent 1951a:119.

\(^{243}\) GL VI.266.1 gives *pulchros crateras*. 
It is not entirely clear whether Varro is imagining this borrowing as going in three stages (Greek ⟷ Sabine ⟷ Latin) or two (Greek ⟷ Sabine, Greek ⟷ Latin). Varro never suggests Latin as a lending language, here or elsewhere. Latin only borrows (cf. §1.2.3). It is also obvious that Varro considers Sabine and Greek (or Sabines and Greeks) to be in contact.

Δεπέστας is not attested anywhere in Greek, but there is an attested form δέπαστρον, presumably derived from δέπας.244 There is also a limpet-shaped vase called λεπαστή (cf. λεπάς ‘limpet’), attested in comedy (e.g. Ar. Pax 916) and in Hesychius (λ.666), which seems a more obvious origin.245 Names of vessels are common borrowings, as types of earthenware are often exported, and their names will go with them. The origin of lepesta from λεπαστή is nigh-universally accepted.246

This easily explained loan-word unexpectedly became the stepping-stone for the Sabine l theory. This theory, which posits a Sabine sound-change *d > l to explain Latin words with /l/ instead of expected /d/, is an excellent example of a theory with little support in the evidence, which nevertheless has been reproduced so many times that it is treated as fact.247 Brugmann referred to the phenomenon as of “loca/dialektischen Ursprungs” in 1886.248 Seven years later, in 1893, Conway argues that this change could be traced to Sabine. As some words with d/l variation are part of the core vocabulary, Conway argued, the language must have been in continuous contact with Latin. Due to their proximity to Rome and their role in its founding, he identified the Sabines as “the guilty party”: “which of the non-Latin tribes had closer and more constant intercourse with the Romans whose very city they, the Sabines, helped to found?”249

Having suggested Sabine through negative evidence, Conway presents his positive evidence, lepesta and Novensides, gods “a Sabinis” according to Varro (LL V.74), contrasted with Di Novensiles (Liv. VIII.9.6, Arn. III.38). Any contradictory evidence in the form of glosses or

244 Conway 1897:355.
245 Conway 1897:355; von Planta 1897:592; Kent 1951a:118n.
246 The δεπέστας etymology is accepted by Ribezzo 1930:92-93; Collart 1954b:237, and tentatively suggested by Weiss 2010:430 n.74, despite the rejection of the Sabine l theory in Weiss 2009:475 n.59. Despite his previous support for this etymology, Conway 1897:355 accepted λεπαστή, and suggests δεπέστας is due to a miscopying in the manuscript, turning the lambda into a delta. This would be a neat explanation if it were not for the fact that the Greek words are written in the Latin script in the manuscripts.
247 The phonemes /d/ and /l/ have a similar point of closure, so one changing into the other is not difficult. See Baldi 2002:292.
249 Conway 1893:158-160.

In Italic Dialects, Conway has excluded lepesta from this list, but reiterates the argument, as “I regard the change of d to l as established in Sabine.” Already, the theory of Sabine l had taken on a life of its own, functioning independently of its evidence. It became pervasive enough that Conway’s article was not always mentioned. In the study of Latin, it was a constantly used tool. Leumann repeats most of Conway’s words with Sabine l, and Ernout invokes it frequently. Within the study of Sabine glosses, it was constantly present. Bruno spends ten pages on d/l variation, listing 39 words, though not lepesta. She dedicates another three pages to d/l variation in Romance forms.

Despite this popularity, skepticism was growing. In 1943, Bottiglioni questioned whether Conway’s d/l phenomenon was Sabine. Instead, he suggests interpreting the few words with true d/l variation on a case-by-case basis. Although Bottiglioni’s article was published twenty-three years earlier, it was Poucet’s 1966 article, which focused on Conway’s methodology and his reliance on negative evidence, that led to the fall of the Sabine l theory. It is likely that historical events prevented Bottiglioni’s article from reaching many scholars, as it was published in an Italian journal the year that Italy was invaded by Allied forces.

---

250 Conway 1893:161, 164.
251 Conway 1893:165-167.
252 Conway 1897:355. See ibid:359-361 for his second discussion of Sabine l.
253 e.g. Collart 1954b:99-100.
254 e.g. Schrijnen 1914:376; Ribezzo 1930:92-93; Dumézil 1944:153; WH s.v. Capitolium, consilium, lacrima; Battisti 1959:127-128. For a complete bibliography, see Poucet 1966:140. Lindsay 1894:286-287 sees most examples of d/l variation as down to analogy or faulty reasoning, but sees lepesta, Novensides and possibly larix as Sabine or ‘dialectal’. Petr 1899:151-156 identifies some instances of d/l variation as the result of a Latin change, but maintains that other examples are Sabine.
258 Bottiglioni 1943:316.
259 Poucet 1966:144.
When the 1893 article is taken apart, it is clear that Conway’s theory rests on shaky foundations. While some examples with /l/ are from Classical Latin, and the /d/ form is the expected considering the PIE roots, e.g. *lingua* and *leuin*, others are from ‘Vulgar’ Latin, e.g. *cicada* for *cicada* ‘tree-cricket’, or reliant on ancient etymologies, e.g. *delicatus* ‘luxurious’ from *dedicatus* ‘dedicated’ (Paulus ex F. 61L). At times, Conway obfuscates the actual state of affairs, as when he skates over the fact that the ‘Sabine’ form *Novensiles* is not given by Varro in his list of Sabine gods, but appears in Arnobius.\textsuperscript{260}

The Sabine /l/ theory dominated scholarship relating to Sabine and had considerably influence on Latin phonology for over half a century, despite being poorly argued and supported by a minimum of firm evidence. Why did it gain such a following? The evidence which Conway presented in 1893 is unlikely to convince a modern scholar, but evidently it was seen as believable in the late nineteenth century. Changes in theory and methodology during the intervening century provide part of the explanation. In the 1890s, comparative linguistics was still a young field. With the rise of Neogrammarian theories of regular sound-change in the 1870s and 1880s, the fact that there were some Latin words with /l/ rather than /d/ went from being a fact to being a problem, though a rather minor one. In his 1893 article, Conway presented a concrete suggestion to explain this phenomenon, using dialect mixture as a way of ‘rescuing’ regular and exceptionless sound-change. Like many scholars of the 1890s, he trusted ancient sources implicitly, and the frequently Roman bias was not problematised as it was in the postwar period. Unlike in today’s scholarship, where some questions are accepted as unanswerable, there was a widespread feeling in the late nineteenth century that there were answers to be found in the material. Although Conway’s process of elimination on closer inscription seems brief and even sloppy, and only constitutes an attempt at backing up the little evidence taken from the glosses, it can at first glance seem elegant. The fact that the negative and positive evidence line up so conveniently is pleasing.

The theory of Sabine /l/ has lost favour, but it still makes appearances.\textsuperscript{261} Twenty years after Poucet’s article, Coleman still called /l/ for expected /d/ “generally accepted as Sabine in origin”.\textsuperscript{262} Negri, writing more recently, has largely accepted the Sabine /l/ theory.\textsuperscript{263}

\textsuperscript{260} Poucet 1966:145, 148.


\textsuperscript{262} Coleman 1986:115.

Elsewhere, the theory of Sabine l, when mentioned, is mocked. Weiss describes it as “one of those modern myths like the Romans sowing the fields of Carthage with salt.”

The rejection of this theory means that the discussion of l for expected d in Latin is no longer stuck in the Sabine l mould. Several modern scholars still see external influence as an appealing explanation, but do not mention Sabine. A majority of the examples of d/l variation cited by Conway have been taken off the list of affected words. Lingua may have been influenced by lingere ‘lick’. While both Novensiles and Novensides are attested, it is the /d/ variant that Varro mentions (LL V.74). The /l/ form appears in a fragment from Piso Frugi in the fourth century writer Arnobius, who is remarking on the origin of the cult, not the etymology of the name (Arn. III.38 = FRH Piso Frugi 9 F43).

Other examples show d/l variation only if we accept the cognates suggested by Conway, which are few and unreliable. Bruno suggests that the /l/ in remeligo ‘delayer’, which Conway connects with Latin medeo ‘heal’ and meditor ‘consider’, is in fact assimilation of r/. The nominal suffixes -idius and -ilius, which Conway suggest are variants of one suffix, seem to be two unrelated forms. Deriving delicatus from dedicatus (Paulus ex F. 61L) is an ancient folk etymology. Consul may be derived from PIE *selH₁- ‘take’, making the verb consulo mean ‘deliberate’. Melica ‘hen’ only has d/l variation if we accept the unlikely etymology in Paulus ex F. 111L, the toponym Media. Silicernium ‘funeral feast’ and baliolus ‘swarthy’ only display this phenomenon if we accept connecting them to sedeo and badius respectively. Uligo ‘marsh-land’, supposedly from udus ‘wet’, could be analogical to e.g. fuligo ‘smoke’, as *udigo would be the only example of a Latin word ending in -digo. Ulixes for Ὀδυσσέας is not internal to Latin, but appears to be a loan from the Greek dialectal Ὄλυσσέας, reflecting d/l variation found in some Greek words, e.g. λάφνη/δάφνη ‘laurel’ and λαβύρινθος/Mycenaean da-pu-rí-to- (LB KN Gg(1) 702) ‘labyrinth’.

---

266 Bottiglioni 1943:318; Coleman 1990:20 n.6; EDLI:343; Weiss 2009:475. Conway 1893:165 acknowledges the possibility of such an analogy, but insists that this simply helped the borrowing of the Sabine word.
268 Conway 1893:157.
270 LIV:529; EDLI:131; cf. solino ‘consulo’ (Festus 476L, Paulus ex F. 477).
271 According to a number of scholars, the word basus is Sabine for badius, with -di̯ - > -s- (see §5.5.1).
272 Bottiglioni 1943:318.
Despite the large number of examples of $d/l$ variation which can be explained or rejected, a few words have not yet been explained. Scholars go out of their way not to mention the Sabine $l$ theory by name. Flobert refers to the phenomenon as “labdacisme”.\footnote{Flobert 1978:45.} de Vaan describes the change as “change of intervocalic *$d > -l$*” (in the case of *solium*), “with *$d > l$*” (in the case of *malus*) or simply that the “exact conditions [- - -] are unclear” (in *oler*).\footnote{EDLI:42, 361, 571.} When discussing the dendronym *larix* (supposedly cognate to Middle Irish *dair*), de Vaan does suggest it is a loan “from an unknown language”.\footnote{EDLI:328.} The closest he comes to discussing $d/l$ variation in earnest is under *levir* ‘husband’s brother’, taken to be cognate with Greek *δαήρ* and Sanskrit *devār*, which he assigns to “a non-urban Latin dialect”, similar to the above-mentioned “unknown language”.\footnote{EDLI:336.} When discussing *lepesta*, Adams describes $d > l$ as “a ‘dialect’ change”, and adds “I use the word ‘dialect’ here loosely. [- - -] It has traditionally been put down to Sabine influence, but the details are not clear.”\footnote{Adams 2007:166.} Baldi and Weiss also refer to $d > l$ as “dialectal”. Poccetti, Poli and Santini present it as a common change in the languages of ancient Italy.\footnote{Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:84; Baldi 2002:279; Weiss 2010:430 n.74; cf. Ernout 1954:67, who though previously supportive of the Sabine $l$ theory in his later work calls the variation ‘dialectal’.} Coleman specifies in a note that he sees *$d > l$* as a feature of “the Sabine language, of which admittedly we know very little, not, as Conway thought [- - -] the Sabine dialect of Latin, which may however have been affected by the phenomenon”.\footnote{Coleman 1990:21 n.9.}

However, there is little in the 1893 article which implies that Conway was referring to a dialect of Latin. He describes the change to come from “some one of the Umbro-Samnite dialects”, and compares Sabine to both Oscan and Umbrian.\footnote{Conway 1893:157, 160, 161.} He observes that there seems to be “a crossing of dialect-characteristics”, and that Sabine shares some features with Oscan and Umbrian, and some with “Latinian”.\footnote{Conway 1893:163-164 n.3. This is reminiscent of “Zwischendialekt” (von Planta 1892:23) and “minor dialects” (Buck 1928:2-3).} This can only mean that Conway is referring to the Sabine language, not the Sabine dialect of Latin. The word ‘dialect’ is often used in earlier scholarship to broadly mean ‘something other than standard Latin’, encompassing both geographical variants of Latin as well as other Italic languages (e.g. Mommsen’s *Die
Unteritalischen Dialekte and Conway’s The Italic Dialects).

In his discussion of *larix, de Vaan brings up *lingua and *lacrima, claiming that “there is no compelling reason to regard this [d/l variation] as non-urban”. This idea may be novel, but it causes problems, as he seems on the verge of positing an unconditioned sound-law. Despite Baldi’s claims that *d > *l happens “often” in Latin, there are six or fewer good examples of this, a sample far too small on which to base any arguments. There is no shared environment in the words which Coleman, de Vaan, Weiss ascribed *d/l variation to – *lingua, *lacrima, *levir, *solium, *olerre and *malus.

One last hope for the Sabine l theory exists – the appearance of *d/l variation in South Picene, which has been identified as Sabine by a number of scholars (see §1.2.3). The examples of this are kduiú (II Anxanum 1/ST Sp CH 1; cf. *clueo), qdufeniú (II Interamia Praetuttiorum 3/ST Sp TE 7; cf. *Clufennius), d[ij]kdeintím (II Falerio 1/ST Sp AP 3; cf. PIE *klej- ‘lean’). However, unlike in the Latin words, where we would expect /d/, it is the /l/ that is etymologically expected in the South Picene words. Furthermore, the change is seen exclusively in clusters with velars or, in one case, /p/, as well as preceding front vowels and *u.

On the shortlist of words with *d/l variation above, there are no examples where the impacted segment is part of a cluster. The /d/ in these South Picene words likely represents a fricative like [ð], similar to Umbrian <ř>. The “unstable” Umbrian outcome of *d was seized on already by Conway, who saw it as yet another detail incriminating the Sabines, as their neighbours the Umbrians “also were careless about the pronunciation of *d.” While areal changes and changes triggered by contact are real phenomena, we cannot base arguments on guilt by association. The change of *d in intervocalic position and *l in certain environments

283 The definition of a ‘dialect’ and ‘language’ is notoriously difficult, with both structural (Bakkum 2009:3-4.) and sociolinguistic aspects (Morpurgo-Davies 1987:8) to consider. Often, the distinction cannot be determined by linguistics alone, as illustrated by the famous statement that a language is a dialect with an army, a quip often cited without an originator (e.g. Bakkum 2009:3). The first to publish it was Weinreich 1945:13, although he states that he heard it from a member of the audience during a lecture.

284 EDLI:336.


286 Coleman 1990:4; EDLI:322, 336, 343, 360, 426, 571; Weiss 2009:475. de Vaan 2007:144, EDLI:25 suggests a change from *d to *l in *adutor, but assigns it not to regular sound-change but dissimilation, which he explicitly states cannot be the case with the words mentioned above or *uligo, due to the absence of a nearby dental.


290 Conway 1893:160.
into a voiced fricative written \( <q> \), transcribed \( <ř> \) or \( <rs> \) (\textit{zeřef} (\textit{ST} Um 1 Ia 25, 33, 34), cf. Latin \textit{sedens}) occurs in Umbrian.\textsuperscript{291} Something similar appears in clusters in South Picene, but neither of these changes aligns with the Sabine \( l \) theory.

Even if the theory of Sabine \( l \) is no longer considered credible, modern scholarship still struggles to find a definite explanation of a handful of examples of Latin /\( l \)/ where /\( d \)/ is expected. A possible reason for our inability to find a unified answer for \( d/l \) variation in Latin is that there may not be one. \textit{Lingua} has been given a plausible individual explanation through analogy to \textit{lingere}. The solutions to the problem of \textit{lacrima}, \textit{oleo}, \textit{levir}, \textit{solium} and \textit{mculus} may be easier to find if we approach the words individually instead of as examples of the same change.

\subsection*{2.2.7 Ciprus}

The gloss \textit{ciprus} appears in a discussion of street names.

\begin{quote}
Vicus Ciprius a cipro, quod ibi Sabini ciues additi consederunt, qui a bono omne id appellarunt: nam ciprum sabine bonum.

The \textit{Vicus Ciprius} ‘Good Row’, from \textit{ciprum}, because there the Sabines who were taken in as citizens settled, and they named it from the good omen: for \textit{cirpum} means ‘good’ in Sabine.\textsuperscript{292}
\end{quote}

This street is also mentioned in Livy (I.48.6) and Dionysius (\textit{Ant. Rom.} III.22.8).\textsuperscript{293}

It appears more likely that the name of this street is, as Kent suggests, related to \textit{ciprius}, making it ‘Cyprian Row’ or ‘Copper Row’.\textsuperscript{294} Varro’s etymology is unlikely due to the -\textit{io}-suffix in \textit{Ciprius}. However, modern scholars often accept Varro’s etymology, connecting it to the Sabines of early Rome.\textsuperscript{295}

The reading of the gloss is stable as \textit{ciprum} (given in Goetz and Schoell 1909 and Collart 1954a), but in Kent’s edition and much secondary literature, the spelling is emended to

\begin{flushright}
\textit{LL} V.159
\end{flushright}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{292} Kent 1951a:149, 151, with modifications of the spelling of \textit{ciprus}.
  \item \textsuperscript{293} Ernout 1909:139; Palmer 1973:370.
  \item \textsuperscript{294} Kent 1951a:150. This interpretation is supported by the spelling \textit{Κύπριος} (Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom.} III.22.8).
  \item \textsuperscript{295} E.g. Battisti 1959:163; Palmer 1973:375. Varro likely has either Titus Tatius’ Sabines or the followers of Appius Claudius in mind.
\end{itemize}
 Von Planta and WH give *cuprum*. In order to stay as close to the attested text as possible, I will refer to this gloss as *ciprus* throughout.

The emendations of the gloss are due to the proposed cognacy with Umbrian *cupras* ([II Plestia 1/ST Um 17; II Plestia 4/ST Um 20], *cuprar* ([II Tadinum 3/ST Um 7]), found in the theonym *cupras matres/cuprar matres*, at times identified as Bona Dea. More recently, thanks to the decipherment of South Picene, another cognate has been uncovered, the adverb *kupri* ([II Aufinum 1/ST Sp AQ 2], *qupiřih* ([II Ausculum Picenum/ST Sp AP 2], interpreted as meaning ‘well’). The alternative reading *cyprus* is suggested as it is halfway between the manuscript tradition’s *ciprus* and the epigraphic *kupr-* forms, with the vowel fronted but still rounded. This difference has been likened to the intermediate vowel before a labial, represented as <u>, <y> or <i>, cf. *lubet/libet, lumpa/limpa, clupeus/clipeus*. However, *ciprus* does not share the environment of these words, where the change *u > i* (or possibly [u]) is between /l/ and a labial. It is also methodologically dubious to equate these examples, as the variant forms of *libet, limpa* and *clipeus* are internal to Latin, while the difference in the case of *ciprus* exists between languages. The only reason to emend *ciprus* to *cyprus* or *cuprus* is to make it fit better with the Sabellic evidence.

Both *ciprus* and the Sabellic cognates, Umbrian *cupras* and South Picene *qupiřih*, are clearly formed with the same secondary *-ro-* suffix. Other possible cognates are down to the assumptions we make of this word’s history. While the Sabellic forms could be reflexes of a labiovelar, they may equally be from *p*. This possibility is represented in the suggestion of

---

297 von Planta 1897:593; WH s.v. *cupia*. Wolfgang de Melo, editor of the forthcoming OCT edition of *LL*, reads *cuprum* (pers. comm.)
298 Mommsen 1850:350; Conway 1897:362; Buck 1928:331; Radke 1965:100; Bianchi 1978:229-230. This may be the same goddess as Cupra, named as a Tyrrhenian version of Hera by Strabo V.4.2; On the identification of this goddess as Bona Dea, see Mommsen 1850:351; Wissowa 1912:216 n.5; Ribezzo 1930:79; WH s.v. *cupio*; Battisti 1959:163; Bruno 1961:511; Radke 1965:100; Bianchi 1978:229-230. Bradley 2000:177 claims that Cupra was worshipped in the Sabine territory, but gives no evidence for this. She is not mentioned in Evans 1939.
299 Clackson and Horrocks 2007:39-40; Crawford 2011:12. The identification of these cognates is largely down to formal criteria, but the South Picene words correspond well to the commonly used inscriptional formula *bene fecit* (e.g. CIL VI.8875, 7682, 25802).
302 Despite some native Latin words occasionally being spelt with <y> (e.g. *lachryma*), the vast majority of words are Greek loans, as the words beginning with *cy-* in the *TLL* show. Many of them have alternative forms in *cu-* or *ci-*, and variation between <y> and <oe> as well as with <e> also occurs. (*TLL* s.v. *cymbatilis, cybicus, cynara, cyppus, cybrium, cyclo, cyla, cymertium, cynon, cylaula, cyliacus, cytopes.*) Neither ancient nor modern scholars have ever suggested *ciprus* ‘good’ is Greek.
Latin *cupio* < *kup-* with a semantic shift from “desired” to “good”.\(^\text{303}\) (See §5.2.4 on the proposed cognacy between *ciprus* and the Sabine gloss *cupencus*.) Sanskrit *śakrā*—‘strong’ and Old Irish *cichurda*—‘brave’ have been suggested if the preform has a labiovelar, though these cognates do not account for the changes the initial vowel must have undergone.\(^\text{304}\)

Whatever cognates we accept, we cannot draw many positive conclusions. *Ciprus* is not attested anywhere else in Latin, so it is likely not a loan into Latin but a non-Latin word. It cannot be Umbrian, as it has not undergone the sound-change *-pr-* > *-br-*, unless Varro is using a spelling from some two hundred years before his own birth, or it was borrowed into another language before this change.\(^\text{305}\) It is possible in theory that *ciprus* is from South Picene or its descendant. However, if we assume that the theonym Dea Cupra, which appears in an inscription found in Cupra Maritima in Picenum (*CIL* IX.5294) dating from the reign of Hadrian, is derived from the same South Picene word as *kupri*, this would not be the case as no vowel change has occurred.

Another possible source is Etruscan, where some (but not all) Greek loans undergo a change from /u/ to /i/, e.g. Ἐνυώ and Etruscan *enie* (*ET* La S.4), probably due to Etruscan approximating the pronunciation of a sound they lack. Some such forms have been borrowed into other languages of Italy, such as Praenestine *crisida* (*CIL* 1².566), cf. Etruscan *crisiθa* (e.g. *ET* La S.8) < Greek accusative Χρυσηΐδα.\(^\text{306}\) However, if this was the source of the form *ciprus*, the Sabellic word must first have been borrowed into Greek and then into Etruscan. The possibility of this seems slim.

The most promising lead on the vowel of *ciprus* may be found in the distribution of vowels in similar-shaped roots. Marrucinian *cibat* (*II* Teate Marrucinorum 3/ST MV 7) contrasts with South Picene *qupat* (*II* Falerio 1/ST Sp AP 3), Paelignian *incubat* (*II* Corfinium 11/ST Pg 10) and Latin *cubare*. This distribution of the forms of these two roots are illustrated in Table 3. The distribution of vowels in the Sabine gloss *ciprus* and its cognates corresponds to the distribution in Marrucinian *cibat* and other Italic forms. The Marrucini lived south-east of the Sabine territory, close to the Sabine city of Amiternum. The territories are close enough

---


\(^\text{304}\) See Ernout 1909:139 on the Sanskrit and Irish cognates.

\(^\text{305}\) Buck 1928:96; Meiser 1986:283. Umbrian *-pr-* > *-br-* is difficult to date, but *cupras matres* appears in inscriptions dated to 325-300 BCE (Crawford et al. 2011:98, 115-118). Meiser 1986:284 raises the possibility that *-br-* is orthographic, based on the occurrence of words with etymologically expected /b/ being written with /p/.

that Rix needs to explain his reasons for classifying one inscription as Marrucinian rather than Sabine.\textsuperscript{307}

Conway lists *ciprus* as a less certain gloss, as it has no “specifically Sabine features”\textsuperscript{308}. Might we take the \(/i/\) as such a feature, and posit a Sabine sound-change \(u > i\), one they shared with the Marrucini? In that case, we should consider the possible conditions of such a change.

\begin{itemize}
\item 1) \(u > i\) (everywhere)
\item 2) \(u > i / C\_C\) (medially)
\item 3) \(u > i / k\_\) (following a velar)
\item 4) \(u > i / _p\) (preceding a bilabial)
\item 5) \(u > i / k\_p\) (between a velar and a bilabial)
\item 6) \(u > i / C\_CR\) (medially when followed by a consonant and a resonant)
\item 7) \(u > i / k\_pr\)
\end{itemize}

There is in fact no evidence of any such change in the other Sabine glosses, whether Varronian or not. There are six Sabine glosses with a medial \(/u/\) (not counting terminations) – *lixula*, *crepusculum*, *curis*, *cumba*, *multa* and *cupencus*. Of these, three instances of \(/u/\) follow a velar. Options (1) and (2) can therefore be rejected. Option (3) can be rejected on account of *curis*, *cumba* and *cupencus*, and options (4) and (5) are disproven by *cupencus*. There are no other Sabine glosses fulfilling option (6) or (7), the precise environment found in *ciprus*. One example is not enough to posit a sound-change, and in this case, the restrictions on the environment would have to be incredibly specific. Unless we accept the restrictions of a following (bilabial)

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & South Picene & Umbrian & Paelignian & Marrucinian & ‘Sabine’ \\
\hline
-\textit{u} & qupat & - & *incubat* & - & - \\
-\textit{i} & - & - & - & *cibat* & - \\
\hline
-\textit{u} & qupíríh/ kuprí & *cupras/cubrar* & - & - & - \\
-\textit{i} & - & - & - & - & *ciprus* \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Distribution of \(-\textit{u}-\) and \(-\textit{i}-\) in South Picene, Umbrian, Paelignian, Marrucinian and ‘Sabine’ lexemes.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{307} Rix 2002:4.

\textsuperscript{308} Conway 1897:362.
stop and a resonant, we would at least expect *ciprus* and *cupencus* to both undergo the change. This raises the question whether these words are in fact from the same language, and by extension, whether we should or can treat the Sabine glosses as one entity. The assignation of *ciprus* to Marrucinian is tempting, but with only a handful of Marrucinian inscriptions and only one example of /i/ where other Sabellic languages have /u/, we do not have enough evidence to go beyond speculation.

### 2.2.8 Creper, crepusculum
*Crepusculum* is the only Sabine gloss in *LL* that appears twice. The first is part of a discussion of words for times of the day.

Secundum hoc dicitur crepusculum a crepero; id uocabulum sumperunt a Sabinis, unde ueniunt Crepuci nominati Amiterno, qui eo tempore erant nati, ut Lucii*<i> prima luce* in Reatino; crepusculum significat dubium; ab eo res dictae dubiae creperae, quod crepusculum dies etiam nunc sit an iam nox multis dubium.

In line with this, *crepusculum* ‘dusk’ is said from *creperum* ‘obscure’; this word they took from the Sabines, from whom come those who were named *Crepuci*, from Amiternum, who had been born at that time of day, just like the *Lucii*, who were born at dawn (*prima luce*) in the Reatine country. *Crepusculum* means doubtful: from this doubtful matters are called *creperae* ‘obscure’, because dusk is a time when to many it is doubtful whether it is even yet day or is already night.

*LL* VI.5

The second appears in a discussion of poetic language.


Plautus has this in *The Lazy Hanger-on*; “from there to here, right drunk, he came, at early dusk.” *Crepusculum* ‘dusk’ is a word taken from the Sabines, and it is the time when there is doubt whether it belongs to the night or to the day. Therefore in *The Finger-ring* there is this: “So at dusk, the times when wild beasts make their love, light up your lamps.” Therefore doubtful matters were called *creperae*.  

*LL* VII.77

---

309 Spengel and Spengel [1891] 1978:74 (as well as Wolfgang de Melo’s forthcoming OCT edition; pers. comm.) suggest excluding “a crepero”, which would change the meaning considerably. It would make *crepusculum* a Sabine form, attested in the name *Crepuscus*, from which *creper* would be derived (see Riganti 1978:94). However, this would be the opposite of the etymology given by all other ancient sources (Serv. ad *Aen* II.268; Non. 20L; Censorinus *DN* 24.5; Isid. *Etym.* V.31.7; see Maltby 1991:161), where *crepusculum* is derived from *creper* rather than the other way around.

310 Kent 1951a:177.

311 Kent 1951a:333.
Latin creper is relatively rare, mostly appearing in the term creperae res, ‘uncertain things’. When given as the etymology of the poetic word crepusculum, it is often defined, implying that it was uncommon.

While the connection between creper and crepusculum is clear, the ultimate etymology is uncertain. Greek κνέφας ‘darkness, twilight’ (where *kn- changes to cr- in Latin) is often mentioned, although different explanations are given as to the precise nature of the connection. While there are phonetic and semantic similarities, the lack of corresponding morphology means the cognacy is uncertain.

The final -r in creper has often been remarked upon. The -s- in crepusculum indicates that the original *crepos, *crepes- was an s-stem which has undergone rhotacism. This would mean that creper has undergone rhotacism, unlike the Sabine glosses ausum and fasena (see §3.2.2). Creper could be interpreted as word-final rhotacism, as seen in Umbrian, but the rhotacism may also have happened in oblique case-forms, e.g. dative *crepes-ei > creperi, and spread to the nominative through analogical levelling. Crepusculum is then formed with the diminutive *-kelo- used with consonant-stem nouns, e.g. osulum : os, the same pattern as in crepusculum : *crepos ‘dusk’. This is not to be confused with the formally similar suffix *-culum (<*-tlom), which tends only to appear with verbal stems, e.g. cubiculum : cubui, vehiculum : vehere, oraculum : orare. The use of the diminutive may be compared to the Greek euphemism εὐφρόνη ‘the kindly time’, meaning ‘night’ (Hes. Op. 560), and is reminiscent of the tabooistic practice of giving unthreatening name to predators (see §5.2.3).

The name Crepuscus, which Varro claims is given to children born at dusk in Amiternum, is not attested elsewhere, although names evidently derived from creper, all without the *-ko- suffix, are attested, e.g. the gentilicia Crepereius, Creperius and cognomina Creperianus and Creperulla. The fact that Crepuscus is not attested in inscriptions should not be taken as an

312 Ernout 1909:145.
316 See Buck 1928:74; Meiser 1986:277-279 on Umbrian word-final rhotacism.
318 Smal-Stocki 1950:492.
implication that Varro is plucking it out of the air. It may have been a regionally constrained name, which leads to Varro equating its usage with the origin of creper.

2.2.9 Februm
The Sabine gloss februm (a variant of februum, pl. februa) appears as part of Varro’s discussion of Roman religious festivals.

Rex cum ferias menstruas Nonis Februariis edicit, hunc diem februatum appellat; februm Sabini purgamentum

When the High-priest announces the monthly festivals on the Nones of February, he calls the day of the Lupercalia februates: for februm is the name which the Sabines give to a purification.320

II. VI.13

This is followed by a possibly corrupt passage: “et id in sacris nostris uerbum non”. In order to make sense of this, Goetz and Schoell suggested that the sentence above should be followed by an explanation of Latin februm, the leather thong with which young women were flogged during the Lupercalia, distinct from the gloss februm ‘purification’, like that found in the Danielis Scholia.321

ideoque et puellae de loro capri caeduntur, ut careant sterilitate et fecundae sint: nam pellem ipsam capri ueteres februm uocabant.

Therefore girls are flogged with a goat-skin thong, so that they would be cured of sterility and be fertile: for the ancients called the goatskin itself februm.

DS ad Aen. VIII.343

This emendation, given only in the commentary in Goetz and Schoell, appears in the text itself in Kent’s edition.322 Spengel and Spengel instead emend the passage by interpreting non as a corrupt nam which introduces the next clause, a reading which Riganti also uses.323 This solution is far more elegant, and avoids the lengthy emendation picked from a later source. The resulting passage is less explanatory, but nevertheless states the fact that the word in question is present in Roman rituals.

320 Kent 1951a:185.
321 Goetz and Schoell 1910:262. Ovid claims that februm also denotes a branch which priests wear around their heads (Fast. II.25-28). This is the only attestation of this meaning (Robinson 2011:74-75).
322 Kent 1951a:184-185. Wolfgang de Melo argues in favour of including this quote on account of Servius’ supposed tendency to copy Varro directly (pers. comm.)
Elsewhere, \textit{februm} is closely associated with the Roman past, being defined both in literature and \textit{fasti}. It is obscure enough to need an explanation:

Quaecumque denique purgamenti causa in quibusque sacrificiis adhibentur, februa appellantur.

To sum up, whatever is used for purification in certain sacrifices is called \textit{februa}.

\begin{quote}
Paulus ex F. 76L
Februa Romani dixere piamina patres: 
nunc quoque dant uerbo plurima signa fidem. 
pontifices ab rege petunt et flamine lanas, 
quis ueterum lingua februa nomen erat
\end{quote}

Our Roman fathers gave the name \textit{februa} to instruments of purification: even to this day there are many proofs that such was the meaning of the word. The pontiffs ask the King and the Flamen for woollen cloths, which in the tongue of the ancients had the name of \textit{februa}.

\begin{quote}
Ov. \textit{Fast.} II.19-23
Februarium a februio: est februum quidquid piat purgatque, et februamenta purgamenta, item februare purgare
\end{quote}

February is from \textit{februum}: \textit{februum} is anything that blesses and purifies, and \textit{februamenta} is purification, so \textit{februare} is to purify

\begin{quote}
Censorin\textus{us} \textit{DN} 22.13-14
[Februarium] dictus a febro uerbo, quod purgamentum ueteres nominabant
\end{quote}

[February] is named after the word \textit{februm}, which was what the ancients called purification.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Fasti Polemii Silvii Februarius} (\textit{InscrIt} XIII.43)
\end{quote}

The old-fashioned nature of the word \textit{februm} is emphasised again and again – it is used by the \textit{ueteres} or \textit{Romani patres}, appears in the \textit{ueterum lingua} and is used “apud intonsos [- - -] avos”, ‘among the long-haired forefathers’ (Ov. \textit{Fast.} II.30).

Varro’s discussion of \textit{februm} evidently assumes influence on the calendar from outside Rome. Censorinus (\textit{DN} 22.13-14) reports that Varro thought the month names were borrowed from Latium. The calendar systems in ancient Italy were similar in structure, if not in terminology (but see §2.2.10).

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Frazer 1959:57, 59.}
\footnote{Robinson 2011:71 observes that although \textit{patres} often refers to forefathers, \textit{Romani patres} tends to mean the senate. However, it makes little sense to have the senate as speakers of a certain form of language. On the idea of early Romans being long-haired and bearded, see Robinson 2011:76-77.}
\end{footnotes}
The few attestations of februm are all in religious contexts. Ritual language is often archaic or archaising. By the time the Carmen Arvale was written down in 218 CE, it was almost impossible to understand.\textsuperscript{326} The Carmen Saliare is similarly difficult to interpret – Quintilian (Inst. I.6.40) claims that not even the priests properly understood it. As archaisms may add credibility to ritual language, it is not surprising that religious words without a known provenance would be ascribed a long history. The early Sabine presence in Rome and the role of Numa in shaping Roman rituals unites the antiquity and religiosity of the word.\textsuperscript{327}

The formal etymology of februm is not entirely clear. There is general consensus that the initial f- comes from PIE *dʰe-. However, scholars are undecided which PIE root the word is derived from, *dʰues-ro- ‘smoking’ (Greek θεῖον, ‘brimstone’) or *dʰegʷʰ-ro- ‘burning’ (Latin foreo ‘heat’, Greek τέφρα ‘ashes’, Vedic aorist adhāk ‘burned’).\textsuperscript{328} Both are plausible both formally and semantically, referring to purification by fire.\textsuperscript{329} Whichever IE root februm comes from, it is undoubtedly a Latino-Faliscan form, as it has the Latino-Faliscan reflex -br-, expected for either root (cf. Latin funebris < Proto-Italic *funes-ris, febris < PIE *dʰegʷʰ-ri-s). In Sabellic, the outcome would be -fr- (cf. Umbrian tefra (ST Um 1 IIa 27) < *tes-ro, Umbrian vufru (ST Um 1 IIb 21) < *ugesʷʰ-ro-m).\textsuperscript{330}

\subsection*{2.2.10 Idus}

This gloss appears in one of the few sentences in LL where two possible foreign etymologies are given.

Idus ab eo quod Tusci Itus, uel potius quod Sabini Idus dicunt.

The Idus ‘Ides’, from the fact that the Etruscans called them the Itus, or rather because the Sabines call them the Idus.\textsuperscript{331}

\textit{LL. VI.28}

\textit{Idus}, in epigraphy often eidus (e.g. CIL I\textsuperscript{2}.584.4), appears in Oscan as eiduis (e.g. II Capua 15/ST Cp 8). Like Varro, Macrobius suggests an Etruscan origin:


\textsuperscript{327} cf. Riposati 1978:60, who argues that if februm is Sabine, the Sabine influence on Roman ritual is true.

\textsuperscript{328} See LIV:133, 158.

\textsuperscript{329} *dʰugesʷʰ-ro-: \textit{EDLI}:208. *dʰues-ro-: von Planta 1892:459; WH s.v. februm; Meiser 1998:123.

\textsuperscript{330} Buck 1928:78,94; Leumann 1977:206; Stuart-Smith 2004:23, 50-51.

\textsuperscript{331} Kent 1951a:201.
Iduum porro nomen a Tuscis, apud quos is dies Itis uocatur, sumptum est.

The name of the Ides was taken from the Etruscans, who call that day Itis.\textsuperscript{332} Macrobu. Sat. I.15.14

There is no consensus about the etymology of \textit{idus}, beyond that it is uncertain.\textsuperscript{333} Many different IE etymologies have been suggested, but none has proven particularly persuasive.\textsuperscript{334} This lack of IE etymology and the suggestions from Varro and Macrobius have made scholars turn their attention to Etruscan. The voiceless /t/ in \textit{itus} and \textit{itis} implies not an Etruscan origin, but rather that the word has been borrowed into Etruscan, and the /d/ in \textit{idus} has been devoiced in the process.\textsuperscript{335} Loans with devoiced segments are not revoiced when borrowed into a language with phonemic voicing, e.g. \textit{Catamitus} from Greek Πανυμής.\textsuperscript{336} Ultimately, the Etruscan glosses in Varro and Macrobius are not corroborated by any of the many dating formulas found in the epigraphic record.\textsuperscript{337}

The Sabine gloss \textit{idus} has been given little attention. It does not appear in Bruno 1961 at all. Conway and von Planta include it, but do not provide more than the quote and, in the case of Conway, the Oscan cognate.\textsuperscript{338} Mommsen does not even do that, but refers to the Oscan word instead.\textsuperscript{339} Ernout simply observes that there is nothing to confirm \textit{idus} as a Sabine loan.\textsuperscript{340} The fact that the Sabine gloss is (graphically) identical to the Latin word may well be the reason why this word has not been a point of interest. However, Varro appears to see them as different words. As he is suggesting that one is loaned from the other, he likely perceives them as separate. Ferriss-Hill gives the gloss as \textit{edus}, a form not given in any manuscript of \textit{LL}, which may be an attempt at making it look more like the Oscan and epigraphic Latin forms.

\textsuperscript{332} Kaster 2011a:181. Somewhat at odds with his \textit{itis} comment, Macrobius also suggests that \textit{idus} is from \textit{iduare}, “Etrusca lingua diuidere est” (Sat. I.15.17). As the gloss contains a voiced stop and looks nothing like an Etruscan verb, we can dismiss it.

\textsuperscript{333} Kent 1951a:200; WH s.v. \textit{idus}; \textit{EDLI}:295-296.

\textsuperscript{334} See EM s.v. \textit{idus}; WH s.v. \textit{idus}.

\textsuperscript{335} EM s.v. \textit{idus}; Bonfante 1985:203; Breyer 1993:296; \textit{EDLI}:295-296.

\textsuperscript{336} Transmission of Etruscan names into Latin has revealed a tendency to render stops in the vicinity of nasals and liquids and, less commonly, intervocically, as voiced, possibly indicating allophony (see Devine 1974:146-149; Rix 1995:77). Voicing in such environments is cross-linguistically common. However, this is seen in a minority of words, and may therefore be confined to certain dialects.


\textsuperscript{338} Conway 1897:355; von Planta 1897:591.

\textsuperscript{339} Mommsen 1850:352.

\textsuperscript{340} Ernout 1909:183.
By suggesting an Etruscan etymology and then settling for a Sabine one (uncommon in itself, as he seldom chooses between dual etymologies), Varro is hinting at connections across Italy. While he assigns *idus* to Sabine, he does not mention the Sabines when discussing other terms of the calendar. He appears not to believe that the Romans borrowed their calendar completely from the Sabines. Other sources imply quite the opposite. Plutarch claims that the Sabines adopt the Roman month names (Plut. *Rom.* XXI.1).

Dench has used this passage and the long lists of supposed Sabine gods, some of which seem rather to be Etruscan or Faliscan, in order to argue that “while the archaeological evidence for a period of Etruscan domination at Rome is clear, Etruscan influence and origins are minimized or even denied in the *LL.*”341 This denial, she claims, works in favour of the Sabines and their position in Roman history. However, the Etruscans are not absent from the works of Varro or his fellow antiquarians. In the books of *LL* that survive, Etruscan is discussed four separate times, including as the origin of the names of the Roman tribes (*LL* V. 55, V.161, VI.28, VII.35).342 Furthermore, Varro’s list of Sabine gods (*LL* V.74) is not as absolute as it is often presented. While some are clearly assigned to Sabine, others are given as either Sabine or Latin, while yet others are Sabine only in that they were invoked by Titus Tatius.

Varro’s understanding of Rome’s history would be different than a modern Classicist’s, not least because of the cultural importance it would have for him. Therefore it is inadmissible to assume that any perceived mistakes on the ancient writer’s part are malicious in nature. The idea that Varro actively shuns Etruscan influence in Rome turns primarily on *LL*’s reputation as a text dominated by Sabinisms rather than on the evidence itself (see §2.5). It is also reminiscent of the anachronistic idea of anti-Etruscan sentiment in Rome, which has been eloquently criticised by Cornell.343 Varro’s Sabinisms do not occur at the expense of other languages, and discussion of one language does not imply the conscious exclusion of another.

---

2.2.11 Cascus

Cascus is glossed as part of the discussion of words used by poets.\textsuperscript{344} It first appears in a passage quoted from the Carmen Priami (\textit{FPL Carmen Priami} F3), and is then defined.\textsuperscript{345}

\begin{quote}
primum cascum significat uetus; secundo eius origo Sabina, quae usque radices in Oscam linguam egit.
\end{quote}

Firstly, cascum means ‘old’; secondly its origin is Sabine, and ultimately has its roots in the Oscan language.

\textit{LL VII.28}

In order to prove that this is the case, Varro quotes a number of poets (Ennius F22 Skutsch; \textit{FPL} Manilius F1, Papinius/Popilius F1). He also offers a Samnite connection:

\begin{quote}
Idem ostendit quod oppidum uocatur Casinum (hoc enim ab Sabinis orti Samnites tenuerunt) et nostri etiam nunc Forum Vetus appellant. Item significat in Atellanis aliquot Pappum, senem quod Osci casnar appellant.
\end{quote}

The same is shown by the fact that there is a town called Casinum, which was inhabited by the Samnites, who originated from the Sabines, and we even now call it Old Market. Likewise in several Atellan farces the word denotes Pappus, an old man’s character, as the Oscans call an old man casnar.\textsuperscript{346}

\textit{LL VII.29}

This is the longest discussion of one Sabine gloss in LL, taking up two chapters.\textsuperscript{347} Other glosses only get a sentence, stating the meaning and the origin. The space spent on this discussion may be due to Varro wanting to use all the examples of cascus which he has at his disposal. Paulus ex F. 41L glosses cascus only as antiquum, and casnar as “senex Oscorum lingua”. While it is possible that Varro is the source, it may equally be that he and Flaccus shared a source.

At first sight, it appears as if Varro’s two statements are contradictory – the Samnites are orti ab Sabinis, but when it comes to cascus, “ eius origo Sabina, quae usque radices in Oscam linguam egit.” Kent translates this as “the Sabine language, which ran its roots back into Oscan”. In a footnote, he states his belief that Varro sees Sabine as an Oscan dialect.\textsuperscript{348} There

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{344} See Piras 2015:58 on Varro’s use of poetic words in etymologising.
\item \textsuperscript{345} Ferriss-Hill 2014:91-92 argues that Varro sees Casmena as derived from cascus, but Casmena is never mentioned in the discussion of cascus, and is instead part of the previous discussion of rhotacism in Carmen Saliare (\textit{LL VII.27}).
\item \textsuperscript{346} Kent 1951a:297, with modifications.
\item \textsuperscript{347} Adams 2004:355-356 argues that \textit{item} must be taken to mean “that cascus means ‘old’”. He also argues that casnar should be printed with a capital letter, as he interprets it as the name of a stock character, corresponding to Pappus.
\item \textsuperscript{348} Kent 1951a:296 n. c, 297.
\end{itemize}
is little to support this reading in the text, as the antecedent of *quaet* is not the Sabine language, but the Sabine *origo*. This would rather imply that it is this specific word rather than the Sabine language itself which goes back to Oscan. Whenever the tree analogy is used (especially *LL* V. 13, VII.4), it refers to specific words, not language.349 We should be careful not to assume that *radices* is a reference to a genetic relationship, as our *Stammbaum*.350 In this case, it seems to describe language contact.

When discussing Casinum, Varro says that *nostri* call it Forum Vetus. Mommsen and Ernout both take *nostri* to mean the Sabines.351 However, the Sabines are elsewhere always referred to in the third person, and Varro’s ‘we’ are Romans and Latin-speakers (*LL* V.3, 33, 37, VI.32). At the beginning of book five, he outlines three categories of words: “nostra aut aliena aut obliuia” (*LL* V.10). He even contrasts Sabines with *nostri* (*LL* VI.13; see §2.2.9).

Outside of *LL*, *cascus* is rare, and, when used, is often explained.352 However, it is clear from Varro’s examples that the word was used in Latin. Ernout suggests that Ennius may have introduced the word to Rome, a speculation which seems unnecessary.353 Adams notes that “clearly the word is no longer current”, while Skutsch thinks it “must have been obsolete in Ennius’ day.”354 It is difficult to tell when the word dropped out of use. Papinius (often dated to the time of Sulla) could make a pun on the name Casca, but this does not necessarily mean *cascus* was commonly used at the time.355 The obscurity of the word may even be part of the joke, poking fun at those who do not know its meaning and thus think Casca is a good name for a young girl. In the 40s BCE, Varro defines and discusses its meaning at length, which indicates at the very least that the word was not in general use any more. However, it is difficult to ascertain whether this happened before Papinius or between his and Varro’s time.

*Casnar* is attested in Paelignian (*II Corfinium* 11/ST Pg 10), a North Oscan dialect. Adams notes that as the Varronian passage about *casnar* is an accusative and infinitive construction with *esse* omitted, *casnar* should be in the accusative, but it is a Paelignian nominative, implying that Varro did not know how to decline it. He may be quoting a vocative

---


350 Taylor 1995a:105 and Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:402 interpret Varro’s use of *radix* as similar to the modern linguistic term ‘root’.

351 Mommsen 1850:349; Ernout 1909:137 n.1.

352 See *EDLI* 96; *TLL* s.v. *cascus* for references.

353 Ernout 1909:137.


from the Atellan farces, where Casnar was a stock character.\textsuperscript{356}

\textit{Cascus} is clearly formed with an adjectival *-ko- suffix. The Italic root is also found in Latin \textit{canus} ‘white-haired’ \textlt< *kas-no-.\textsuperscript{357} A PIE root \textsuperscript{\textit{H}1s} has been reconstructed on the strength of these cognates and others, such as Sanskrit \textit{śaśā-} ‘hare’, Welsh \textit{ceinach} ‘hare’ (literally ‘the grey one’) and Old High German \textit{hasan} ‘grey, shining’.\textsuperscript{358}

There is some dispute concerning whether to define \textit{cascus} as Sabine or Latin. von Planta and Schrijver gloss \textit{cascus} explicitly as Latin.\textsuperscript{359} Although EM quote the gloss \textit{cascus}, they do not mention Sabine in their analysis, but instead call it old and poetical.\textsuperscript{360} WH and Pokorny both refer to \textit{cascus} as “sabin.-lat.”\textsuperscript{361} Untermann includes it not under ‘Sabine’, but ‘Latin’ in his index.\textsuperscript{362} We know, from the fragments quoted by Varro and other ancient writers (e.g. Cic. \textit{Tusc}. I.27), that \textit{cascus} was used in Latin, even if it had fallen out of use by the late Republic. There is nothing in its morphology or phonology which calls its Latin origin into question, but equally nothing that rules out another one.

The Sabine connection is only mentioned by Varro, who does not claim it is a Sabine word, but that it is Sabine in origin. The Paelignian connection \textit{casnar} does not necessarily mean that \textit{cascus} is Sabellic, as it shares as much with this Paelignian word as it does with the Latin \textit{canus} – simply the root.

\textbf{2.2.12 Catus}

Like \textit{cascus}, \textit{catus} appears in Varro’s discussion of poetic language.\textsuperscript{363}

\begin{quote}
Apud Ennium:
\begin{quote}
Iam cata signa ferae sonitum dare uoce parabant.
Cata acuta: hoc enim uerbo dicunt Sabini: quare
Catus Aelius Sextus
non, ut aiunt, sapiens, sed acutus, et quod est:
\end{quote}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{357} EM s.v. \textit{cascus}; WH s.v. \textit{canus}; \textit{EDLI} 88. It is possible that the toponym \textit{Casinum} is derived from this root, as Varro suggests. The mention of the Samnites could imply that it is originally Oscan, which would explain the retention of intervocalic -s-, but the alternative spelling \textit{Cassinum} (see \textit{TLL} s.v. \textit{Casinum}) instead implies an original Latin form with geminates.

\textsuperscript{358} \textit{IEW} 533; \textit{EDLI} 2009:88. See Schrijver 1991:91 on the reconstruction of the vowel. Calling the hare ‘the grey one’ may be simply descriptive, but may also be taboo replacement.

\textsuperscript{359} von Planta 1897:33; Schrijver 1991:91.

\textsuperscript{360} EM s.v. \textit{cascus}.

\textsuperscript{361} WH s.v. \textit{canus}; \textit{IEW} 533.

\textsuperscript{362} Untermann 2000:874.

\textsuperscript{363} Sheets 1981:77-78 observes that Varro often assigns “dialectal” meanings to poetic words.
tunc c<o>epit memorare simul cata dicta,
acciopienda acuta dicta.

In Ennius is this verse:
Now the beasts were about to give cry, their shrill-tonèd signals.
In this, \textit{cata} \text{[\ldots]} is \textit{acuta} \text{[\ldots]}, for the Sabines use the word in this meaning; therefore
Keen Aelius Sextus
does not mean \text{[\textit{sapiens}]}, as they say, but \textit{[acutus]}; and in the verse
Then he began to say at the sae time words that were \textit{cata}
the \textit{cata} words must be understood as \textit{[acuta].}\footnote{LL VII.46 = Ennius F329, F450, F543 Skutsch}

\textit{Catus} is one of the best-attested words which Varro glosses as Sabine. Most of the attestations are in older texts, such as Plautus and Terence, or later archaising authors such as \textit{Horace}.\footnote{The attestations of \textit{catus} are Plautus \textit{Poen.} 1107, \textit{Men.} 131, \textit{Mil.} 794, \textit{Mostell.} 186, \textit{Persa} 622, \textit{Pseud.} 681, \textit{Trin.} 677; Ter. \textit{An.} 855; Hor. \textit{Epist.} II.2.39, \textit{Carm.} I.10.3.}
The word occurs only once in Cicero outside of a quotation, where it is marked with the phrase \textit{“ut ita dicam”} (\textit{Leg.} I.45), giving it an apologetic tone.\footnote{Keyes [1928] 1977:347; Dyck 2004:194.} In English it might be rendered as \textit{‘if you’ll pardon the expression’}. This is a strong indication that \textit{catus} is not a word which comfortably appears in a dialogue, even one concerning law. This is the only time the word is attested in prose.\footnote{Ernout 1909:138.}

There are a number of cognates to \textit{catus}, such as Vedic \textit{sīstā-} ‘sharpened’ and Middle Irish \textit{cath} ‘wise’, derived, like \textit{catus}, from \text{*}K\textsc{h}3-tó-, with the PIE adjectival suffix \text{*}-to-.\footnote{Ernout 1909:138; LIV:320; \textit{EDLI}} The laryngeal may be identified through Armenian \textit{sover} ‘sword, knife’ and Latin \textit{cos, cotis} ‘whetstone’ (which, being a \textit{t}-stem, has the same relationship with \textit{catus} as \textit{dos} ‘dowry’ has with \textit{datus} ‘given’).\footnote{EM s.v. \textit{catus}; LIV:320; Weiss 2009:503.}

The precise semantics of \textit{catus} are more difficult to ascertain, as it is not widely attested and primarily found in early Latin literature. A large number of these attestations (twelve of the forty-five in \textit{TLL}, over a quarter) are definitions or etymologies.\footnote{TLL s.v. \textit{1. catus}; Donat. ad Ter. \textit{An.} 855; Servius ad \textit{Aen.} I.423; Isid. \textit{Etym.} XII.2.38; Plut. \textit{Cat.} I.2.} This paired with Cicero’s discomfort with using the word in prose indicates that \textit{catus} was falling out of use, at least in everyday situations.

This leads us back to Varro’s definition of the word. His first glossing is \textit{acuta}. Then he rebukes other ancient scholars and claims that \textit{“Catus Aelius Sextus’ non, ut aiunt, sapiens,}
sed acutus” (LL VII.46). Although sapiens and acutus overlap semantically, by both describing intelligence, they are not synonymous. Sapiens implies rationality and insightfulness, as well as common sense and sanity. Acutus, the primary meaning of which is ‘sharp’, describes a different form of intelligence, ranging from ‘wise’ to ‘sharp-witted, clever’. At the furthest edge of this spectrum, acutus can even carry negative connotations.

Skutsch argues that Varro believes that in Sabine, catus pertains to sound, like acutus can. The only attestation of this meaning is found in the first fragment quoted by Varro (Ennius F450 Skutsch). All other attestations refer to intelligence. This leads him to conclude that catus ‘sharp, piercing’ is a Sabine dialectal word: “if Varro had meant ‘mentally acute’, a sense normal in Latin, he would hardly have argued for Sabine usage.” Acutus was used for sound already by Ennius:

Inde loci lituus sonitus effudit acutos

From that place the trumpet brought forth piercing notes

Paulus ex F. 103L = Ennius F544 Skutsch

Skutsch also argues that Varro, getting carried away by his own argument, “wrongly” argues that catus refers to sound in the other two passages. This is an unnecessary assumption. All Varro is implying is that the semantic scope of catus is similar to that of acutus, rather than sapiens, thus including meanings such as ‘piercing’ and ‘clever’. Although the first passage arguably has to do with sound, the other two seem rather to mean ‘sharp-witted’. The second example is usually printed as “catus Aelius Sextus”, but catus is not an adjective but a name. Aelius Sextus Catus (cos. 198) appears in the Fasti Capitolini, where one would not expect an adjective. As a sobriquet, the meaning ‘sharp-witted’ makes more sense than ‘high-pitched’ (even if Romans were no strangers to names with negative connotations). If Varro truly was arguing that catus did not have to do with intelligence, he would have avoided a word with that very meaning in his glossing.

As we have seen with acutus, the semantic shifts from ‘sharp’ (in reference to an object) to ‘clever’ and ‘high-pitched’ are entirely plausible. Considering the attestations, it seems safe

---

371 In later ancient scholarship, the term doctus is often used along with acutus to define catus (e.g. Porph. ad Hor. Carm. III.12.10; Donat. ad Ter. An. 855; August. CD IV.21).
373 Skutsch 1985:607.
374 Skutsch 1985:505.
375 Catus is also the basis of the cognomen Cato, formed with an -o, -onis suffix. de Simone 1992:234; Meiser 1998:37; Weiss 2009:309.
to posit that *catus* was far more common in the third and second centuries BCE, after which it slowly fell out of use due to the formal similarities with *acutus* combined with the overlap in meaning. This gradual process would have happened semantic sphere by semantic sphere. We find no attestations of *catus* meaning ‘sharp’. Although it is possible that *catus* was used with this meaning in early Latin, this is not a given. Middle Irish *cath* ‘wise’ may imply that this semantic shift happened in the mother-language, but it could just as easily have happened separately. Given that the Ennius passage quoted by Varro is the only attestation of *catus* referring to sound, we may assume that this sphere had already been usurped by *acutus*. Although Ennius is one of the earliest Latin writers, he is nevertheless a poet working in an archaising genre, which affects his use of language.

The question why Varro claims that *catus* is Sabine remains. We cannot say anything of the origin of the word – the Latino-Faliscan and Sabellic outcomes of *keH₁*-to- would be the same. As I have demonstrated above, there is no reason to rule out that *catus* in Roman Latin could mean ‘high-pitched’. Although it is possible for a dialectal pocket to retain an earlier meaning of a word, it is not necessary here. Additionally, this does not explain why Ennius, who was of Messapic extraction, would use a word in a way particular to a dialect to which he had no connection. It seems far more likely that this meaning of *catus* is uncommon, but not dialectal. Therefore, the glossing of *catus* as Sabine seems to be down to Varro himself or his source. Other archaic and uncommon words in Ennius are identified as Sabine in *LL*, e.g. *creper* and *cascus* (see §§2.2.8, 2.2.11). The age and the few attestations of *catus* may be reason enough for Varro to identify it as Sabine.376

2.3 De Re Rustica

*RR*, the only Varronian work to have survived intact, is an agronomical treatise in the form of a dialogue.377 In the dedication to his wife Fundania, he mentions his age as 80 (*RR* I.1.1), dating the composition to 37-36 BCE.378 The dialogue discusses a variety of agronomical questions, but Varro’s fascination with language and etymology is ever-present. Nevertheless, *RR* contains only one Sabine gloss.

Despite *RR*’s popularity both in antiquity and the Middle Ages, the manuscript

376 Skutsch 1977:1-2 reads the first Ennius quote as a description of the interrupted battle between the Romans and the Sabines. If this is the case, the subject-matter may have spurred on Varro’s interpretation.


tradition of *RR* is poor.\(^{379}\) It usually survives together with Cato’s agronomical treatise, going back to a lost codex which also included Columella’s work on farming.\(^{380}\) Although some readings are uncertain, the reading of the passage I will discuss below is secure.

### 2.3.1 Teba

*Teba* or *tebae* appears in a discussion where Varro endeavours to show that the countryside is older than the city.

Nec minus oppidi quoque nomen Thebae indicat antiquiorem esse agrum, quod ab agri genere, non a conditore nomen ei est impositum. Nam lingua prisca et in Graecia Aeolis Boeti sine afflatu uocant collis tebas, et in Sabinis, quo e Graecia uenerunt Pelasgi, etiam nunc ita dicunt, cuius uestigium in agro Sabino uia Salaria non longe a Re<ta>e miliarius clivus cum appellatur tebae.

The name of Thebes, too, no less clearly shows that the country is more ancient, in that the name given it comes from a type of land, and not from the name of the founder. For the old language, and the Aeolians of Boeotia in Greece as well, use the word *teba* for hill, leaving out the aspirate; and among the Sabines, a country which was settled by the Pelasgians from Greece, up to this day they use the same word; there is a trace of it in the Sabine country on the Via Salaria, not far from Reate, where a slope of a mile in length is called *tebae*.\(^{381}\)

*RR* III.1.6

The forms *teba* and *tebae* are used interchangeably in modern scholarship. The form *teba* is not attested in the text, but *tebas* may be triggered by the plural *collis*. However, Varro’s claim that *tebae* was used for *miliarius clivus*, a singular, implies that it is a plurale tantum.\(^{382}\) The word may also be a proper name for this slope on the Via Salaria, which would explain the difference in number.\(^{383}\) The plural toponym *Thebae* may also have been a driving force. For simplicity’s sake, I will use the singular form *teba*.

It is unclear whether the sentence concerning the Pelasgians, the mythical autochthonous people of Greece, means that colonists came to the Sabine territory to live

---

\(^{379}\) See Butterfield 2014; Rodgers 2015:161-162 on the manuscript tradition and editions.

\(^{380}\) Cardauns 2001:14.

\(^{381}\) Hooper and Ash 1967:425.

\(^{382}\) On *miliarius clivus* see Storr-Best 1912:242-423 n.4; Hooper and Ash 1967:425.

\(^{383}\) E.g. Briquel 1984:441-442.
among the population, or that the Sabines themselves were originally Pelasgians. If the latter, it would be the only time this suggestion was made in the extant literature, and the only place where Varro explicitly discusses Sabine origins. The connection to the Pelasgians tells us more about the Roman present than the Sabine past. It provides a link between Italy and Greece different from the theory of the Sabines’ Spartan ancestry, or Varro’s claims of trade and language contact in relation to lepesta (LL V.123; see §2.2.6). Like the Sabines, the Pelasgians belong to the past. They too create a link to times gone by. This connection is far deeper than the Roman relationship to Greece, once again presenting the Sabines first and foremost as ancestors of another people, and reinforcing Varro’s argument of the antiquity of the countryside.

The Sabines’ proposed Pelasgian origins imply a linguistic connection between Pelasgians, Greeks and Sabines. When discussing the language of the Pelasgians, Herodotus reasons that, based on towns in Thessaly changing names, the Pelasgians did not speak Greek. This meant that the Athenians, who due to their claim of autochthony must be descended from the Pelasgians, at some point changed their language (Hdt. I.57.1-3). Naturally we do not know whether Varro was aware of this passage (although Herodotus was clearly read in Rome during his lifetime, cf. Cic. Leg I.5) and, if he was, whether he agreed with it. However, if he did, he cannot mean that teba is a Greek word. Mommsen interprets lingua prisca as old Latin, but Latin would be a strange choice in this context. It is more likely that this refers to the language of the Pelasgians, considering the juxtaposition between it and Greek. Whatever the identity of lingua prisca, it reinforces the constant association of Sabines and the past. This passage also relies on the association of Sabines and the countryside. The existence of Sabine evidence strengthens the argument of the antiquity of rural life.

---

384 Serv. ad Aen. VIII.600 reports that some writers saw the Pelasgians as originally Spartan. If this was paired with the theory of Spartan ancestry of the Sabines, it would make the origins of the Pelasgians, Spartans and Sabines the shape of a triangle. However, we must be cautious. In the same paragraph, Servius claims that Varro identified the Etruscans as Pelasgians. It is possible that he did this in some lost work, but Servius often gets Italian peoples mixed up (see §5.7), so this may be a garbled reference back to RR III.1.6.

385 Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.48 relates that Varro thought Cures was founded by colonists from Reate, in the words of Taylor 1960:61 n.56, “objecting, no doubt, to the primacy claimed for Cures”. Dionysius, who sees Reate as an originally Aborigine town which was later taken by the Sabines, does not equate the Aborigines (later the Latins, Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. I.93) and the Pelasgians (allied to the Etruscans, Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. I.25.2), but states that they lived together and were both originally from the Peloponnesian.

386 Collart 1954b:242 incorrectly equates these two connections.

387 See McInerney 2014:34.

388 Mommsen 1850:358.

389 See Gitner 2015:34 on the perceived Pelasgian linguistic influence on Latin.
Teba is not attested outside of this passage, in Latin or in Greek. The gentilicium Tebanus, which appears in Latin inscriptions from the Sabine territory (CIL IX.3602, 4518) has been proposed as a derivate from teba. However, it may also correspond to Greek Ὑπατος, cf. Thebanius (CIL IX.4848). The most promising connection has instead been within Italy: Mount Tifata in Campania (e.g. Liv. VII.29.6.4), the toponym Tifata (Paulus ex F. 43L) and the phrase tifata iliceta (Paulus ex F. 503L). It has also been connected to the Umbrian toponym Tifernum. There are also the gentilicia Tifatius and Tifanius (CIL XI.5688, 5712). These forms have led scholars to posit a Sabellic word *tifa or *tefa, cf. Calabrian Italian tifa, tiha ‘lump of earth’. Teba, with its Latino-Faliscan medial -b-, would be a clear cognate of such a form. However, *tifa is only theoretical, and its meaning is unclear.

No IE root has been successfully identified. Meyer has suggested that teba is a cognate to Calabrian Albanian timp, timbi, ‘rock, soil, clod’. However, it seems more likely that this is down to language contact between Calabria’s Italian and Albanian-speaking populations, as we find timp ‘rock’ in Calabrian Italian. Which language is the lender and which the borrower is less certain. Rohlfs claims that timp is from “prelatino” *timpa. While no Latin common noun starting with timp- is attested, the name Timpan(ius) (CIL VI.1058 iii.102) is. This may point to Italian being the lending language, but it does not connect it to teba.

The only evidence put forward from outside Italy are toponyms. Before the decipherment of Linear B in 1952, some scholars argued in favour of Varro’s suggestion that teba was connected to the Greek toponym Thebes. However, this must be disregarded, as Mycenaean records give the toponym as te-qa with a labiovelar in place of a bilabial stop (LB

---

390 Collart 1954b:241; Adams 2007:165. Teba is not listed in TLL.
392 Mommsen 1850:300; Corssen 1856:98; WH s.v. teba; Adams 2007:165. See Purcell et al. 2015 on geography.
395 Meyer 1892:324.
396 Rohlfs 1934:329.
397 Rohlfs 1934:329.
Stephanus of Byzantium writes of a Lydian city called Tabai, and claims that the Greeks interpret τάβα as ‘rock’ (Steph. Byz. τ.1). Some connect this to teba, but do not make it clear whether they see it as a genetic connection or one of contact. Meyer suggests that teba, as well as τάβα, is “vorarisch”, but offers no explanation how a pre-IE word from Asia Minor made its way to Italy or vice versa. More recently, Ceci, Negri and Fairbank have suggested an etymological connection between the toponym Tibur and teba. Ferriss-Hill leaves the issue of actual etymology aside and argues that this connection can be seen in Vergil’s term Tibur superbam (Aen. VII.630) as well as other ancient descriptions of Tibur as steep or sloping (Hor. Carm. III.4.23; Mart. VII.13.3; Juv. III.192, XIV.87. As none of these descriptions use the word teba, there is nothing to indicate that the ancients ever connected Tibur with this word.

Place-names more than any type of word make bad comparative material. While we can sometimes identify the origin of a place-name, we are usually at a loss. This is due to the tendency of this kind of vocabulary to survive language shifts. The examples of how British toponyms are a combination of Celtic, Roman and Germanic are well-known. Because of this, ancient toponyms may well go back to languages that are lost to us. Furthermore, we must be aware of the possibility of coincidences. If we allow ourselves some leeway for vowels and aspiration, we will find many toponyms in *t(h)Vb* around the Mediterranean: the Galatian settlement Tabia, Thebae Lucanae in Lucania or the river Tiber itself. In an area so big and with criteria so vague, our chances of finding similar-looking toponyms are good.

What then can we say of teba? I believe a connection with τάβα is unlikely on geographical grounds. In that respect, tifata looks much more promising. Comparing glosses is not without its problems. As each gloss comes with its own caveats, those will multiply if we base a reconstruction on them. Furthermore, the supporting evidence we have – the mountain

---

399 Aravantinos et al. 2001:52; Berman 2004:17 n.51. It is technically possible to see Θῆβαι, Mycenaean *te-qa* and teba as cognate if we assume teba is Sabellic, though this would not explain the difference in aspiration of the first stop. However, it is preferable to compare teba to words from within Italy.

400 Benveniste 1930-1932:55 suggests τάβα is Carian, but this language was not deciphered until 1981; see Melchert 2004:609.

401 EM s.v. tebae; WH s.v. teba.

402 Meyer 1892:324.


404 Ferriss-Hill 2011:276-278.

405 Mitchell et al. 2015; Edlund Berry et al. 2012. The Pleiades database of ancient places (<https://pleiades.stoa.org>) [accessed 22 December 2017] lists a large number of places starting in *tab-, tib-, teb-* etc. that have not yet been located.
**Tifata**, the city *Tifernum* and the names *Tifatius* and *Tifanius* – is onomastic. However, this material, unlike that spread all over the Mediterranean, is found in a relatively concentrated geographical area, and all forms include *tif-* , a Sabellic form that corresponds well to the Latino-Faliscan *teba*. Although we cannot be sure of the meaning of *teba*, as *RR* is the only attestation, it appears that the word *teba* existed, likely in a Latino-Faliscan dialect.

### 2.4 Sabine glosses in Varronian fragments

See *multa* (§4.8.1), *fasena* (§4.10.1), and *terenus* (§5.4.1).

### 2.5 Reflections on Varro’s Sabine glosses

Varro’s Sabine glosses can be placed into three rough categories: religious terminology (*sol*, *februm*, *lepesta*), agricultural terms (*fircus*, *fedus*, †*apruno porco por*, *teba*) and poetic words (*creper*, *cascus*, *catus*). *Ciprus* concerns the history and geography of Rome, making it most like the religious terminology, which often attempts to put Rome’s cults into a historical context. The only words which do not fit comfortably into these categories are *lixula* and *similixula*, which are specific cultural items with no convenient Roman word to describe them.\(^{406}\) Notably, the Sabine glosses are confined to books V-VII, which deal with etymology and have a more antiquarian slant. There are no Sabine glosses in books VIII-X, which deal with inflection. Instead, Greek features heavily, along with isolated examples of Gaulish, Punic and Egyptian (*LL* VIII.65).

Where did Varro come across his glosses? Many would say that his origin in the Sabine territory is crucial. Symmachus (*Ep. 2.2 = GRF Varro T2*) claims Varro was born in Reate, but Augustine gives Rome as his birthplace (*CD IV* .1). Even if the Reate suggestion is the one generally favoured by scholars, there is no real evidence to disprove Augustine’s claim. Some scholars believe, on the evidence of a fragment of *Logistoricon* in Non. 155L that Varro had a stern Sabine upbringing, much like that described by Cato (see §1.2.2).\(^{407}\) However, the Sabine territory is not explicitly mentioned in the Varronian fragment, and the first person singular does not mean the passage is autobiographical.\(^{408}\)

Despite this, mentions of Varro’s Sabine origins and interests are everywhere in

---

\(^{406}\) See chapter six on Sabine glosses and core vocabulary.


\(^{408}\) See Cornell et al. 2013a:412 n.4.
modern scholarship. Reate is identified as his *patria* alongside Rome.\textsuperscript{409} He is described as a “native of Reate” or “a Sabine”, whose origin gives him special insight into Sabine.\textsuperscript{410} While some see his Sabine status as giving him authority, others view him instead as a monomaniac whose interest in Sabine is so aggressive it sidelines other languages.\textsuperscript{411} Words such as ‘sabineophile’, ‘pansabinism’ and ‘sabinomania’ are often used.\textsuperscript{412} Varro’s Sabine glosses can be read as a sign of his Sabine authority or as proof of his personal Sabine obsession.

This interpretation of the evidence is one-sided at best. While Reate may have been further away than many of the villas in the *suburbium*, it was easily accessible by the Via Salaria.\textsuperscript{413} It is possible that Reate still retained its local flavour in the late Republic, but we cannot assume that every Reatinian would seem equally non-Roman. Varro was from an

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Language & Number of glosses & Percentage of total \\
\hline
Greek & 120 & 82% \\
Sabine & 14 & 9.6% \\
Oscan & 3 & 2% \\
Etruscan & 3 & 2% \\
Syrian & 2 & 1% \\
Lucanian & 1 & <1% \\
Gaulish & 1 & <1% \\
Armenian & 1 & <1% \\
Punic & 1 & <1% \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} & 146 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\caption{Non-Latin glosses in Varro’s *LL*.}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{412} Collart 1952:70; Collart 1954b:239; Poucet 1983:79; Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:65; Lundy 2013:214 n.225.

\textsuperscript{413} Tilly 1973b:280; J. Patterson 2004:67; Farrell 2014:96.
equestrian family, and was undoubtedly destined for military service and politics from an early age. The fact that his family lived in Reate is not any real indication of ethnic identity, as Rome was an unhealthy place which was often avoided, particularly in the summer. Varro would have experienced Reate (if indeed that is where he was from) very differently from the local farm-hand, slave or artisan (see §1.2.2). Because of this privilege, which leads to isolation from other societal groups, we cannot assume that Varro is an unbiased Sabine witness.\footnote{Cf. Smith 2014b:133 who sees Varro’s writing as the closest we can get to a true Sabine voice.}

The idea of Sabine glosses as a particularly Varronian concept may well be a consequence of survival. He cannot have been the first to have written of them – at \textit{LL} V.66, he reports that his old teacher Aelius Stilo saw Sancus as the Sabine name of Hercules (see §5.6.4). Varro may have taken his glosses from earlier works. Unlike in modern scholarship, the Romans had no culture of citation, and it is unlikely that Varro always discloses his sources. It is also possible that Varro’s antiquarian colleagues who have not survived wrote of them.

The number of glosses of different languages in \textit{LL} are presented in Table 4. Sabine is the second most common, after Greek, which has more than 80 percent of the words. Sabine is dominant only in comparison to languages mentioned three times or less. Here too it is important to remember how random the survival of ancient literature is. We only have six books of the twenty-five that made up \textit{LL}. If we had the entire work, or more of Varro’s writings in general, we might have very different numbers. If we had lost book V, we would have had only six Sabine glosses, and our understanding of Varro and Sabine would again be different. The fragments that have survived in later authors (see §2.4 for references) show that Varro discussed Sabine glosses in the lost material, but we cannot assume that Sabine glosses are as common in his other work as they are in book V of \textit{LL}. The fact that Varro is mentioned by name in the fragments may have less to do with Varro as the originator of the Sabine phenomenon and more to do with his authority as a scholar in general.

Varro’s Sabine glosses do not exist in a vacuum. Even if no glosses are attested in other late Republican works, the Sabines are clearly important ideologically and mythohistorically. Varro is not interested in Sabine words in their own right. They do not occur as interesting curiosities, but are presented as etymologies of Latin words. As with the Sabines in contemporary rhetoric and historiography, Varro is interested in Sabine as an actor in the emergence of Roman language.
Chapter Three

Sabine Glosses in Festus and Paulus’ epitomes of Verrius Flaccus’ *De Verborum Significatu*

Cornell has described Paulus-Festus, the two surviving epitomes of Verrius Flaccus’ *De Verborum Significatu* (*DVS*) taken together as one whole, as “a mess”. It is no wonder that many avoid this Frankenstein’s monster of antiquarianism, partially recreated in Lindsay’s 1913 Teubner edition. To be able to use this material, we must consider issues of authorship and subjectivity.

3.1 The history of *De Verborum Significatu*

3.1.1 Authors and epitomisers

M. Verrius Flaccus, the original author of *DVS*, was a freedman and teacher, born in 55 BCE and died during the reign of Tiberius. He was employed by Augustus to tutor the emperor’s grandsons, although he may also have served as court antiquarian, considering his annual salary of 100,000 sesterces (Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* XVII). Based on peculiarities found in the epitomes, it is sometimes suggested that *DVS* was never finished, but that Flaccus suffered a Vergilian fate where he was “overtaken by death” before his work was complete. Aside from *DVS*, Flaccus’ output included works on Cato’s archaic vocabulary and on the Etruscans.

---

413 Cornell 1995:21. See Moscadi 1999 on the fluctuating title. I will use the term Paulus-Festus when referring to both epitomes, and *DVS* when referring to the original work.


418 Lindsay 1933:79.

419 See Glinister, North and Woods 2007:2; Cornell et al. 2013a:649.
He was also heavily involved with the Fasti Praenestini, possibly authoring it himself. The fact that these Fasti were placed in Praeneste along with a statue of Flaccus (Suet. Gram. et rhet. XVII) has led modern scholars to speculate that he himself was from Praeneste, an argument reminiscent of the association of Varro with Reate, though it has never become as influential on his characterisation.\(^{420}\)

\(\text{DVS}\) can rightly be called Flaccus’ magnum opus. References to contemporary events allow us to date it to after 13 BCE.\(^{421}\) Analysis of fragments shows that the letter A filled at least four books, likely corresponding to a scroll, which could usually hold between 60 and 75 000 words.\(^{422}\) If the other letters were of similar length, the entire work would have taken up some 80 scrolls.\(^{423}\) Besides the expense of copying and the difficulties of storing such a long work, it makes cross-referencing virtually impossible. The alphabetisation, a feature which was quite new at the time \(\text{DVS}\) was composed, never goes beyond the first three letters, and would not have made navigation much easier.\(^{424}\)

We know almost nothing about Sextus Pompeius Festus, the next actor in the drama of \(\text{DVS}\). Charisius’ mention of him gives us a terminus ante quem of the fourth century (\(\text{GL}\) I.220). The second century is generally preferred, due to the inclusion of quotes from Lucan (Paulus ex F. 31L) and Martial (Paulus ex F. 506L).\(^{425}\) Another reason is the fact that Festus’ interests and approaches are reminiscent of second century intellectual culture.\(^{426}\) The one thing we know for sure about Sextus Pompeius Festus is that he is the reason why parts of \(\text{DVS}\) survived. He set out to make an epitome of the work to bring it down to a more functional size (Festus 242L).\(^{427}\) Had such an epitome not been made, \(\text{DVS}\) would probably not have survived due to its immense length.

---

\(^{420}\) Hernández 2005:108; Lhomme 2014:118. Glinister 2007:26 observes that Flaccus refers to Praeneste “perhaps more than to any other Italian town”, but admits that this may not tell us anything about his origins.

\(^{421}\) Glinister 2007:24 n.53.

\(^{422}\) Glinister, North and Woods 2007:2. See Fantham 1996:37 on the length of a \textit{volumen}. The fragments in Gell. M. V.17-18, refer to two lemmata of \(\text{DVS}\), both beginning with A (\textit{Allia} or \textit{Aliesis}, and \textit{Annales}), and specify that they are from book IV, which shows that the letter A took up at least four books (John North pers. comm.).

\(^{423}\) Glinister 2007:17; Kaster 2009:169 claim that the original \(\text{DVS}\) was 40 books long, but it is not clear from where this information comes.


\(^{427}\) See Glinister 2007:12 n.4; North 2007:62.
The third and final participant is Paul the Deacon, a Benedictine monk born in the late 720s. He too was the tutor of a royal child, Adelperga, the daughter of Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards. When Adelperga married the Duke of Beneventum, Paul followed her there. He entered the abbey of Monte Cassino, which was to be his base for the rest of his life. In the 780s, he went to Charlemagne’s court in order to plead with the king on behalf of his brother, who had been taken captive during the Lombard uprising. During his stay there, Paul dedicated his epitome of Festus’ work to Charlemagne. He died in 799 CE in Monte Cassino.428

Flaccus’ DVS has not survived, and of Festus’ epitome there remains only the second half of one manuscript, the Farnesianus, badly burnt at some point before its discovery. It was further damaged by careless handling and theft.429 The manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon’s epitome is far better, with the first manuscripts dating from the century after the composition.430

3.1.2 Approaching authorship in DVS

When engaging with DVS, we are presented not with one author, but with two or three: Flaccus, Festus, Paul. In nineteenth century scholarship, which searched for the purest and most unadulterated version of anything ancient, Paulus-Festus was seen only as a means of getting closer to Verrius Flaccus. Festus’ epitome was sometimes described as almost an act of sacrilege – an Augustan original would have been preferable to the second century abbreviation that pushed it aside.431 This approach has meant that Festus and Paul the Deacon have been given little attention in their own right.

Whatever our opinions of the practice of epitomising, we must ask to what extent we can trust Festus and Paul to correctly preserve Flaccus’ ideas. Can we assume that the context is still Augustan, rather than the second or eighth century? Nettleship views Festus’ “affair of scissors and paste” as only destructive; as Festus had no creative hand in the text, Flaccus remains the sole author.432 By contrast, North identifies “I” in DVS as Festus, assuming that he

---

429 Lindsay 1913b:115; Glinister 2006b:251; Glinister, North and Woods 2007:3; Cornell et al. 2013a: 67; Lhommé 2014:114.
430 For a complete list of manuscripts of Paul’s epitome, see Woods 2007:125-127. Bischoff 1994:64-65 n.43 suggests that the manuscript Escorial O.III.5 is copied directly from Charlemagne’s copy.
432 Nettleship 1880:254, 261.
is the single author, and, like Beard and Bourdin, identifies Flaccus only as Festus’ source.\textsuperscript{433} This presents Festus’ epitome as something more than mindless copying. Moscadi pushes this idea further by arguing that Festus’ work is not an epitome, but a new work based on as other writers as well Flaccus.\textsuperscript{434} However, Festus himself states that he sets out to abbreviate (Festus 242L). Drawing from other sources would be counterproductive, considering the length of \textit{DVS}.

As the original \textit{DVS} is lost, we must find ways to infer what changes happened during the process of epitomising. Considering the huge size of \textit{DVS}, the exclusion of entries would be necessary. Contemporary interests clearly dictated this choice – Festus states explicitly that he plans to leave out obsolete words of no interest (Festus 242L). Glinister sees it as possible that Festus reorganised the entries in his epitome.\textsuperscript{435} However, a major reorganisation would be laborious. When one is working with book-scrolls, it is much more difficult to move between passages than it is in codices. It seems more likely that any moved entries are the results of mistakes or a change of mind on the epitomiser’s side rather than a premeditated position. The inconsistency in the alphabetisation found throughout \textit{DVS} most likely goes back to Flaccus, and may be the result of him dying (or growing too old to continue) before being able to incorporate all the material alphabetically.\textsuperscript{436} Some material has been added by the epitomisers. Quotes from Lucan and Martial are often seen as Festus’ additions, but it is also possible that they come from Paul or from marginalia which have been accidentally incorporated into the text.\textsuperscript{437}

It is reductive to see Festus simply as a conductor of an existing text. At times he engages critically with the original \textit{DVS} by flagging up an opinion as Flaccus’ in particular, occasionally criticising him: “\textit{ait Verrius, \[- - -\]: mihi non satis persuadet” (Festus 228L; cf. Festus 218L, 236L, 476L).\textsuperscript{438} The fact that Festus namechecks Flaccus gives him an opportunity to disagree with him. This implies that when this does not happen, Festus has no major disagreements with Flaccus. Furthermore, the epitome was not, as Nettleship argues, done as a destructive deed. Festus must have thought \textit{DVS} was worth abridging, which also means that it was still in use during the second century. It was the respect for the writers of the

\textsuperscript{433} North 2007:50-52; Bourdin 2012:121; Beard 2014:173, 264 n.73.

\textsuperscript{434} Moscadi 1979:35; cf. Müller 1839:xxix.

\textsuperscript{435} e.g. Glinister 2007:11. North 2007:62 n. 47 observes such reorganisation in Paulus – \textit{senacula} appears in Festus 470L, but in Paulus ex F. 455L. However, the section of Festus corresponding to Paul’s entry is missing, meaning that we cannot be certain that there were not two entries on this word.

\textsuperscript{436} Reitzenstein [1887] 1966:73, 80; Strzelecki 1932:103.

\textsuperscript{437} Glinister 2007:11.

\textsuperscript{438} See Reitzenstein [1887] 1966:8-13 for all mentions of Flaccus in Festus.
antiquarian boom of the late Republic and early Empire that motivated the act of epitomising. Flaccus and his (near) contemporaries, including Varro, had the standing for second century scholars that Vergil and Horace had for epic poets of the same period. Unlike the stereotype, these ‘Golden Age’ predecessors were not unquestioningly followed, in scholarship or poetry. They were worth engaging with even when they were wrong.

Paul’s epitome appears to have been harsher than Festus’. Entries have been left out, and those spared have been heavily abbreviated, often cutting out scholarly discussion. At times, his epitome looks more like a glossary than an encyclopaedia. Like Festus’, his interests shape the content. Paul tries to distance himself from pagan religion, and clearly has no interest in Augustus whatsoever, a topic that must have been important to Flaccus. Even his interest in the city of Rome is questionable – he cuts down Festus’ thousand-word entry on Rome to nineteen words. For Paul, the epitome served a direct purpose as a gift to Charlemagne. He states in his preface that original work is not his strongest side (Paulus ex F. 1L). His engagement with the text may not have been the same as Festus’, but the decisions of what to exclude and what needed explaining to a Christian audience were not passive work. Just like Festus, Paul must have chosen this work to epitomise because it was considered important.

Despite the changes that DVS has undergone through these two epitomes, it is still, at its core, Flaccus’ work. Festus’ engagement with the text does not constitute a rewrite, and Paul’s deletions of nuanced discussion do not change the conclusions, only make them more absolute. There is still, after two epitomes and eight hundred years, an underlying Augustan ideology in DVS. Time and time again, it comes back to Roman topography and myth, with around 150 lemmata discussing these topics. Although this is a common theme in Roman antiquarianism, it becomes particularly relevant in light of Augustus’ rebuilding and ‘refounding’ of Rome. The political ideological influence on antiquarianism can be seen in Flaccus’ authoring of the Fasti Praenestini (Suet. Gram. et rhet. XVII), a central part of Augustus’

442 See Lhomme 2014:121.
446 Zanker 1988:192-193, 201-205, 210-211.
Based on these facts, I believe we can trace the ideas in the epitomes of DVS back to Flaccus. We cannot be certain of his precise wording, and it is likely that the entries I will discuss were longer and more detailed in his version. There may also have been other Sabine glosses that were excluded from the epitomes. Nevertheless, at its core DVS is Augustan. Because of this, I have opted to place the chapter discussing the Sabine glosses found therein before chapter four, that deals with miscellaneous Imperial writers, rather than by chapter five, on glosses found in late antiquity.

3.2 Sabine glosses in DVS

3.2.1 Alpus

The first Sabine gloss in Paul’s epitome is a word meaning ‘white’.

Album, quod nos dicimus, a Graeco, quod est ἀλφόν, est appellatum. Sabini tamen alpum dixerunt. unde credi potest, nomen Alpium a candore niuium uocitatum.

Albus, which we say, is called that because of ἀλφός from the Greek. But Sabines said alpus. The name of the Alpes can be thought to be named after the whiteness of the snow.

Paulus ex F. 4L

IE colour words have received much attention, not least albus and its potential cognates. The root has been described as common in IE and a substratum loan. Latin albus and Umbrian alf (e.g. ST Um 1 Ib 29), alfr (e.g. ST Um 1 VIIa 25) are clearly cognate. Some Greek words are likely also connected: ἄλφιτον ‘barley-groats’, ἀλφός ‘dull-white leprosy’, and ἀλφόν ‘white’, attested only in the passage above and Hesych. a.3347. A PIE root *H₂elbʰ- ‘white’ is often reconstructed, despite the fact there are cognates from only two adjacent branches.

448 All translations of DVS are my own.
450 Other suggested cognates include Armenian altam- ‘pigeon’, Hittite alpa- ‘cloud’, Albanian elb ‘barley’ (probably a Greek loan; see EDLI:32), and Germanic and Slavic words for ‘swan’, e.g. Old High German albiz and Old Church Slavonic lebeds. See EM s.v. albus; IEW:31; Frisk 1954-1972:82; Schrijver 1991:66; EDLI:32. Proper names such as Alba, the hydronym Albula, the mountain-chain the Alps (Latin Alpes), Albion, Irish Alba (Scotland), Latin Alba (Elbe) Old Irish elf ‘river’ has been hotly debated, and have been variously explained as IE or non-IE, e.g. Pokorny’s non-IE stem *alb- meaning ‘mountain’. See EM s.v. albus; WH s.v. albus; EDLI:32.
451 EDLI:32. Pinault 2016 argues that the root “*albh- vel sim. is a mirage”, but that the word is formed with a *-bho- suffix; see also EM s.v. albus. Adams 2007:306 suggests *al- ‘white’ as the etymology of Gaulish alaisa ‘peasant food’.
While the history of *albus* and its cognates is complicated, in this case we are only concerned with the words in Italic. The word, whether inherited or as a loan, must have existed in Italic before the change of *bh* to *b*, as can be seen from the different outcomes in Umbrian and Latin.

With its /-p-/ (with its /-p-/, the Sabine gloss *alpus* looks odd beside Latin *albus* and Umbrian *alfu*). Several theories were presented around the turn of last century. von Planta suggests *alpus* may be influenced by Greek ἀλφός, with the early Italic spelling <p> for /ph/. Brüch proposes that *alpus* is influenced by analogy to *alps* < ‘Sabine’ *aleps*, a variant of Latin *adeps* ‘fat’, as fat is white. Neither of these theories stands up to scrutiny. von Planta’s theory relies on the primacy of writing and Brüch’s suggestion relies on the Sabine l theory, which has rightly lost credibility (see §2.2.6).

More recently, Negri has rejected the common assumption that Sabine treats medial aspirates like Osco-Umbrian. Instead, he argues that /p/ is the regular Sabine development of the voiced aspirate *bh*, making Sabine a third branch of Italic. He further suggests that the Sabines referred to themselves as *Sapini* (< *sah*), but later changed the -p- outcomes into fricatives under influence of Osco-Umbrian, in order to distance themselves from their Roman enemies. Positing a new language branch on the basis of one lexeme is unwarranted, and the suggestion of ‘Sabellification’ of the Sabine outcome of medial aspirates (an idea that relies on Roman mythohistory) makes little sense. Phonological mergers cannot be undone, so changing only the examples of /p/ derived from PIE medial aspirates but not inherited instances of /p/ would be impossible.

Instead of searching for a diachronic explanation, we should turn to the possibility of language contact. Etruscan did not make a phonemic distinction between voiced and voiceless stops, and tends to devoice voiced segments in loanwords. Several scholars have therefore suggested that *alpus* was the result of some form of Etruscan influence. Onomastics is where the only clear parallels to *alpus* are found, e.g. Etruscan *alpna* (e.g. *ET* Cl 1.1172), Paelignian *alpis* (*II* Sulmo 2/ST Pg), Latin *Alpinius* (*CIL* III.4454), *Alarius* (*CIL* IX.1127). The existence of Latin names in *Alb-* (e.g. *Alburius* (*CIL* XI.3254), may indicate that the names in *Alp-* are Etruscan variants, though the *Alp-* names may be connected to *Alpes*.

---


454 It also assumes that Sabine underwent Sabellic syncope. On syncope, see Buck 1928:59; Benediktsson 1960; Nishimura 2014:174-175.


Aside from these names that can be explained in other ways, there is no corroborating evidence of the authenticity of *alpus*. There is nothing that implies a scribal error within the manuscript tradition. Therefore we should look earlier in the process. Notably, the Sabine gloss *alpus* precedes a sentence on the etymology of *Alpes*. Elsewhere in ancient scholarship, the name of the Alps is connected to *altus* ‘high’, but semantically ‘white’ makes sense due to the snow-covered tops of the mountains. It is possible that Roman writers on occasion consciously manipulated material to make a point. However, I do not believe that Flaccus is connecting *Alpes* to Sabine *alpus*. The Sabine territory lies far away from the Alps, and *DVS* is written during a time when the understanding of Italian geography is fairly good, unlike in late antiquity (see §5.7). The *unde* in the sentence on *Alpes* does not necessarily connect it to *alpus*, but may suggest a connection with the lemma, Latin *albus*. The difference in voicing is unlikely to have bothered an ancient etymologist. The meaning of this sentence is probably clearer in the lost unabridged version.

The remaining possibility is that a misunderstanding occurred when *alpus* first entered Roman scholarship, whether that was in *DVS* or earlier. Although our knowledge of ancient fact-finding is limited, it is clear that some scholars collected words through autopsy or through informants. Varro’s autopsy of the Praenestine sundial (*LL VI.5*) is well-known. In a letter to his teacher Fronto, the young Marcus Aurelius recounts asking a local in Anagnina about an unfamiliar word in an inscription (*Fronto Epist. IV.4*). This shows that some information was collected by asking locals.

Two possibilities present themselves. Some alphabets used around Rome, such as the early Faliscan script, did not have a separate sign for /b/, but used <𐌐>, usually /p/. The word *albus* may have been found on an inscription written <ALPUS>, and taken to be a Sabine word. The other scenario is that the form *alpus* was overheard spoken by a native Etruscan speaker who had Latin as a second language and may therefore have struggled to distinguish voiced and voiceless stops. The Faliscan script and the Etruscan language were found close enough to the Sabine territory that this linguistic observation may be done either within the territory, or close enough that it seemed logical to assign it to Sabine. This would make *alpus* not a word in itself, but simply a variant pronunciation of Latin *albus*.

---


3.2.2 Ausum

Like alpus, ausum is presented as an alternative, reported etymology, mentioned only after a Greek etymology. Flaccus appears to invoke Greek origins for Latin words more often than Varro.460

Aurum dictum, quia praeceptu custoditur. Graece enim ὠφεῖν custodire dicitur; unde et thesaurum. [- - -] alii a Sabinis translatum putant, quod illi ausum dicebant.

‘Gold’ is called aurum because it is carefully guarded, for in Greek ‘to guard’ is called ὠφεῖν; and from that comes thesaurum ‘treasury’. [- - -] Others think it is taken from the Sabines, because they said ausum.

Paulus ex F. 8L

Who the alii behind the ausum suggestion are is unknown. This is the only Sabine gloss surviving in DVS attributed to another source.

In most literature on Sabine glosses, ausum is mentioned mainly in conjunction with the posited form *ausel (see §2.2.1).461 However, ausum has two interesting features of its own – the diphthong /au/ and the non-rhotacised -s.-

Latin aurum has only two clear cognates, Old Prussian ausis and Lithuanian āuksas from *H₂eus-, also attested in aurora and other IE words relating to the East, dawn, spring and reddish colours.462 All major Latin etymological dictionaries give *ausum as a cognate, but only WH glosses it directly as Sabine. EM calls it “ancien”, and de Vaan calls it “Latin [- - -] from Sabine”.463 Many writers give not the attested ausum, but the unattested ausom, with or without an asterisk.464 Comparative evidence shows the original Latin form would have been *ausom, but giving the gloss these archaic features is a form of manipulation of material. The fact that such a form once existed in Latin does not justifiy imposing the archaic features on the Sabine gloss, no more than the Sabellic cognates of ciprus justify the emendations to cyprus and cuprus (see §2.2.7). Such a practice reinforces ancient ideas of Sabine as old and seminal.

The lack of rhotacism is seen in ausum as well as in the Sabine gloss fasena ‘harena’ (see §4.10.1). However, there are also counterexamples. Creper appears to have undergone

460 Nettleship 1880:263.
462 See EDLI:63. The -k- in Lithuanian āuksas remains unexplained, but introductions of velar before a sibilant is not uncommon in Lithuanian (IEW:86; Witczak 1992:91; Driessen 2003:351). Old Irish ār- and Welsh aur are generally seen as early Latin loans (IEW:86; eDIL s.v. őr 1; GPC s.v. aur). Driessen 2003:358-360 proposes the reduplicated form *H₂ė-H₂aus-o- to to account for the intonation of the Lithuanian word.
463 EM s.v. aurum; WH s.v. aurum; EDLI:63.
rhotacism (see §2.2.8). Rhotacism was wide-spread in Northern and Central Italy. It occurred in Latin (cf. *flos, floris < *flos-is), Faliscan (carefo (LDAF MF 59) < *kasefo) and Umbrian (cf. the feminine genitive plural ending -aru (e.g. ST Um 1 III 3)). Judging by the distribution of -s- > -r- / V_V, the change appears to have been areal. Oscan has not fully undergone rhotacism, only the necessary middle stage [z], e.g. -azum (e.g. II Bantia 1/ST Lu 1 24). The Sabine territory lies in between the regions where -s- was fully rhotacised (Umbrian, Faliscan and Latin) and where it was not (Oscan, Paelignian etc.) A language spoken there may have gone either way.

The diphthong /au/ in ausum has, along with the personal name Clausus, been taken as proof that Sabine kept its diphthongs (but see §2.2.3 on the diphthong /ae/). The diphthong was monophthongised to /o/ in ‘dialectal’ Latin, Umbrian and probably Faliscan, and appears to have been considered substandard, to judge by hypercorrections such as plaudo from original plodo. Monophthongisation of /au/ was far less common than that of /ae/. The form orum is given by both DVS epitomes and assigned to the rustici (Paulus ex F. 196L, Festus 197L).

Rhotacism is one of the most easily spotted changes in Latin, identified already in antiquity (e.g. Paulus ex F. 14L; Cic. Fam. IX.21.2). Though these forms did not survive in speech, they were available to Roman writers in fossilised hymns and old inscriptions. The two defining features of ausum are consistent with Oscan, with no full rhotacism and retention of /au/. It may equally be an old Latin word, like those cited by Varro from the Carmen Saliare (LL VII.26-27).

3.2.3 Curis

Curis is the most common Sabine gloss, appearing in the work of eight writers in total. Paul’s lemma on curis presents us with the complexity of approaching this gloss on its own:

---

464 Weiss 2009:151 n.15.
467 Bakkum 2009:106; Clackson 2011:516; Adams 2013:82-83. See also Suetonius’ anecdote about the prescriptive consul, where Vespasian comes out on top, humiliating the pedantic Florus (Suet. Vesp. XXII) Coleman 1990:13 and Cornell et al. 2013a:562 suggest that Vespasian retained his Sabine accent, and that the monophthongisation of /au/ was a Sabine feature.
Curis est Sabine hasta. Unde Romulus Quirinus, quia eam ferebat, est dictus; et Romani a Quirino Quirites dicuntur, quidam eum dictum putant a Curibus, quae fuit urbs opulentissima Sabinorum.

Curis is ‘spear’ in Sabine. Therefore Romulus is called Quirinus, because he carried a spear; and Romans are called Quirites after Quirinus. Some think that he is named after Cures, which was a particularly wealthy city of the Sabines.

Paulus ex F. 43L

In this section, I will first discuss modern scholarship on the lexeme curis, after which I will discuss the group of words and their interaction in ancient sources. Then I will revisit the question of the etymology of curis.

Despite the many attestations of curis, it never appears in its own right. It is only ever a gloss. This has led to some uncertainty about the word’s spelling, pronunciation and declension. The alternative spelling quiris has caused some confusion. This is not an archaising spelling, like pequinia for pecunia ‘money’, as <cu> has been replaced not with <qu> but <qui>, thus implying a pronunciation /kvwiris/ instead of /kuris/. The more likely reason for this alternative spelling is the fact that curis is never mentioned without some reference to a matrix of other words and names – Quirinus, Iuno Curitis, Ianus Quirinus, Cures and Quirites. As some of these forms start with /kwi-/ rather than /ku-/ , the existence of an alternative form of the gloss would help keep these words associated.

TLL gives the accusative -in and ablative -i of curis. While the ablative does not seem to be attested, the accusative curin appears in Macrob. Sat. I.9.16. This led Conway to suggest that curis is an n-stem, with the genitive curinis, thus explaining the -n- in Quirinus. It is far more likely that this form is due to the influence of a Greek source, e.g. Plutarch’s κύριν (Quaest. Rom. 285D), whether in the original or in transmission. It is easier to assume that curis is an i-stem, and the -n- in Quirinus is from a -no- suffix.

The etymology of curis is often labelled uncertain or obscure. As so often with words of uncertain etymology, there have been many suggestions of cognates, all of which have also been rejected by other scholars: Greek κείρω ‘cut’, Latin cudo ‘beat’, Latin curia, Volscian couehriu (II Velitrae 1/ST VM 2); Anglo-Saxon hosp ‘insult’, Gothic hairus ‘sword’, Sanskrit śaru-

---

471 Conway 1897:353 and Otto 1905:198 claim that quiris does not appear until the sixth century CE in Isid. Eym. IX.2.84, but this form is not attested in any edition or apparatus criticus of Isidorus.

472 Conway 1897:354.

473 von Planta 1897:46; EM s.v. curis; WH s.v. curis. Baldi 2002:183 calls curis a “possible” loanword into Latin.
‘projectile’, Old Irish *corr* ‘sharp point’. While some of these words may be cognate with one another, there has been no positive connection made to *curis*. The most common suggestion by far is Oscan *kúru* (*II* Saepinum 2/*ST* Sa 31) thought to mean ‘slingshot’, which, like a spear, is a projectile. However, the difference in stem (*a*-stem in *kúru* and *i*-stem in *curis*) speak against cognacy. Furthermore, the meaning ‘slingshot’ is dependent on the reading of the inscription and the interpretation of the item bearing it. The decipherment of South Picene revealed the word *qora* (*II* Interpromium 1/*ST* Sp CH 1; *II* Interamnia Praetuttiiorum 3/*ST* Sp TE 7), supposedly referring to the stele of the inscription, a more likely cognate to *kúru*, making this word’s meaning ‘stone’. The Oscan word may be present in *II* Anxia 1/*ST* Lu 39, where Crawford tentatively reconstructs κω[ρ], referring to the monument.

The linguistic discussion of *curis* is not only impeded by the lack of good comparative material. More than any other gloss, *curis* is a part of the Roman foundation myth, and many glossings come from retellings of mythohistory. *Curis* is also connected to a number of other words, a fact that often impinges on the discussion. In order to discuss the etymology of *curis* and words traditionally connected to it, we must make sense of the proposed relationships between these words. I will refer to this web of ancient etymologies as the *curis* matrix.

Firstly, we must define the lexemes which are seen as connected to *curis*. *Quirites* is most often translated as “Roman citizens in their peacetime functions”. Among the ancient, it is seen either as a derivative of *Quirinus* or as the original ethnic
associated with the Sabine town Cures. In this latter case, it is either what the Sabine
contingent of early Rome was called, which then spread to other citizens (LL VI.13; Paulus ex
F. 59L; Plut. Rom. XIX.7), or it was adopted to refer to the whole population from the start
(Liv. I.13.5).

Cures was located close to the Tiber in the Sabine territory (see Figure 1, §1.2.2). By
the first century BCE, it was only a small village (Strabo V.3.1), but in myths Cures was the
centre of Sabine power and the home of king Titus Tatius (see §1.2.1).

Quirinus was the divine name of Romulus, but was previously a separate deity. The
identification of Quirinus as Romulus only starts in the late Republic.\footnote{Dionysius reports
that Quirinus was the divine father of the founder of Cures (Ant. Rom. II.48.4). He is also
associated with Mars (Polyb. III.25.6). Wiseman has identified the spear-carrying man on the
She-Wolf Mirror as Quirinus, dubbing him “the god of the spear”. Some modern scholars
have described him as the protector of Cures, but the only dedication to him in the Sabine
territory is from Amiternum.\footnote{Quirinus also appears as an epithet of Ianus in Festus 204L, where he is mentioned as
one of the recipients of spolia opima, and in Macrobius (Sat. I.9.16). However, Plutarch (Marc.
VIII.5) and Servius (ad Aen. VI.859) repeat the prayer given in DVS, and name only Quirinus,
not Ianus. Several Augustan sources imply that this is a reference not to the god Ianus, but to
the Doors of Peace.\footnote{Iuno Curitis is one of the lesser-known aspects of Iuno. The
agnomen is also spelled Curritis, Curetis and Quiritis (see below). The fact that Iuno is often depicted carrying a spear
is emphasised both by ancient and modern etymologists. From the few explanations of this
aspect of the goddess (e.g. DS ad Aen. II.614), it appears that she is associated with war. Not
much else is known of her.\footnote{Wisowa 1912:186 and Dumézil 1970:296 see Iuno Curitis as a third century BCE import from
Falerii, while Palmer 1974:3-5 identifies her as the oldest incarnation of Iuno. Palmer rejects the image
of Juno as primarily concerned with women’s issues, something that tells us more of ideas of the
relative unimportance of women’s preoccupations when compared to men’s, than about the realities of
Juno. ‘Male’ and ‘female’ issues are not polar opposites, and often they can be protected by the same
deity – Athena is concerned with both spinning and military strategy.}}

Quirinus continues to be important into the Empire, when Augustus was
depicted as Quirinus, in an obvious reference to Augustus’ status as the “re-founder” of Rome.

\footnote{Preller and Jordan 1881:369; Evans 1939:114.}

\footnote{Hor. Carm. IV.15.9 describes how Ianus Quirini was closed (cf. Suet. Aug. XXII.5). Res Gestae Diui
Augusti XIII gives Πύλην Ἐνθάλιον for [Ianum] Quirin[um].}

\footnote{Wissowa 1912:153-155. Quirinus continues to be important into the Empire, when Augustus was
depicted as Quirinus, in an obvious reference to Augustus’ status as the “re-founder” of Rome.
Wiseman 1993:4-5; echoed in Coarelli 2003:51.}

\footnote{Wissowa 1912:186 and Dumézil 1970:296 see Iuno Curitis as a third century BCE import from
Falerii, while Palmer 1974:3-5 identifies her as the oldest incarnation of Iuno. Palmer rejects the image
of Juno as primarily concerned with women’s issues, something that tells us more of ideas of the
relative unimportance of women’s preoccupations when compared to men’s, than about the realities of
Juno. ‘Male’ and ‘female’ issues are not polar opposites, and often they can be protected by the same
deity – Athena is concerned with both spinning and military strategy.}
The ancient etymologies of these words are given below. Translations are provided in the footnotes. The relationships between them are represented in Figure 2.

**Quirinus from Sabine curis**

Curis est Sabine hasta. Unde Romulus Quirinus, quia eam ferebat, est dictus (Paulus ex F. 43L)

Quirino:/ [- - -] hasta curis priscis est dicta Sabinis/(bellicus a telo uenit in astra deus)

Qui<rinus> ab hasta, quae a Sabinis curis uocatur (InscriIt XIII.2 43)

Romulus autem Quirinus ideo dictus est, uel quod hasta utebatur, quae Sabinorum lingua curis dicitur (Serv. ad Aen. I.292)

Quirinus dictus est Romulus, quod semper hasta utebatur, quae Sabinorum lingua curis dicitur.

**Ianus Quirinus from Sabine curis**

‘Ianum Quirinum’ [- - -] quasi bellorum potentem, ab hasta quam Sabini curin uocant (Macrobr. Sat. I.9.15-16)

**Cures from Sabine curis**

Κύρεις, [- - -] τοὔνομα τῇ πόλει θέμενος, ὡς δ’ ἔτεροι γράφουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς αἴχμης· κύρεις γὰρ οἱ Σαβῖνοι τὰς αἴχμας καλοῦσιν.

---

486 This list is based on the relevant entries in *TLL* and Maltby 1991.

487 The instances where Iuno Curitis is derived from an unspecified word for ‘spear’ (Paulus ex F. 43L; Servius ad Aen. I.8; DS ad Aen. I.17) are not included in the graph and quotes, but will be discussed below.

488 A fragmentary etymology survives in the *Fasti Praenestini Febr* 17 (InscriIt XIII.2 119) which may derive the name Quirinus from curis, possibly glossed as Sabine. However, due to the amount of speculation necessary to make the sentence function, I have chosen not to include it.

489 “Curis is ‘spear’ in Sabine. Therefore Romulus is called Quirinus, because he carried a spear.”

490 “Quirinus. [- - -] because the ancient Sabines called a spear curis, and by his weapon the warlike god won his place among the stars” (Frazer 1959:91).

491 “Quirinus is named after the spear, which is called curis among the Sabines.”

492 “Therefore Romulus is also called Quirinus, or because he used a spear, which is called curis in the language of the Sabine.”

493 “Romulus is called Quirinus because he always used a spear, which is called curis in the language of the Sabines.”

494 “Ianus Quirinus’ [- - -] as a god of war, from curis, the Sabine word for ‘spear’” (Kaster 2011a:99).

495 “Cures: he gave it this name [- - -] as others state, from a spear, since the Sabines call spears cures” (Cary 1937:451).
Figure 2. Etymological connections proposed in ancient sources between *curis*, *Quirites*, *Quirinus*, *Cures*, *Ianus Quirinus* and *Iuno Curitis*. The arrow-heads indicate which word is proposed as the derivate. Each arrow represents one attested etymology.
Cures from Quirinus

Κύρεις, ὡς μὲν τινες ἱστοροῦσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίμονος, ἐξ οὗ γενέσθαι ὁ λόγος αὐτὸν εἶχε, τούνομα τῇ πόλει θέμενος.496 (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.48.4)

Iuno Curitis from Sabine curis

quia matronae Iuonis Curitis in tutela sint, quae ita appellabatur a ferenda hasta, quae lingua Sabinorum curis dicitur.497 (Paulus ex F. 55L)

Iuno Curitis from Cures

Curibus, quod nomen loci est, unde et Iuno Curetis dicitur, quia ibi vehementer colitur.498 (Scholia ad Pers. Sat. IV.26 Iahn)

Quirinus from old curis

[Κυρίνον] οἱ δὲ τὴν αἰχμὴν ἢ τὸ δόρυ τοὺς παλαιοὺς κύριν ὀνομάζειν499 (Plut. Rom. XXIX.1)


Iuno Curitis from old curis

[Kυρίνον] οἱ δὲ τὴν αἰχμὴν ἢ τὸ δόρυ τοὺς παλαιοὺς κύριν ὀνομάζειν, καὶ Κυρίτιδος Ἑρας ἅγαλμα καλεῖν ἐπ᾽ αἰχμῆς ἱδρυμένον501 (Plut. Rom. XXIX.1)

Ἑρας δ᾽ ἱερὸν τὸ δόρυ νενόμισθαι, καὶ τῶν ἅγαλμάτων αὐτῆς δόρατι στηρίζεται τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ Κυρίτις ἡ θεὸς ἐπωνόμασται, τὸ γὰρ δόρυ ‘κύριν’ ἐκάλουσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὀνομάζειν502 (Plut. Quaest. Rom. 285C-285D)

Quirinus from Quirites

Quirinus a Quiritibus.503 (Varro LL. V.73)

496 “Cures: he gave it this name, as some say, from the divinity whose son he was reputed to be” (Cary 1937:449, 451).

497 “Because of this matrons would be under the guardianship of Iuno Curitis, who is named this because she carried a spear, which is called curis in the language of the Sabines.”

498 “‘From Cures’, which is the name of a place, and because of it Iuno is called Curetis, because there she is vigorously worshipped.”

499 “‘Quirinus [- - -] other says that the ancients ancients called the spear-head (or the whole spear) quiris” (Perrin [1914] 1998:183).

500 “for the men of old used to call the spear curis; wherefore they further relate that Enyalius is called Quirinus by the Romans” (Babbitt [1936] 1972:135).

501 “[O]ther says that the ancients called the spear-head (or the whole spear) quiris, and gave the epithet Quiritis to the Juno whose statue leans upon a spear” (Perrin [1914] 1998:183).

502 “Now the spear is commonly held to be sacred to Juno, and most of her statues represent her leaning on a spear, and the goddess herself is surnamed Quirinus; for the men of old used to call the spear curis” (Babbitt [1936] 1972:135).

503 “Quirinus is from Quirites.”
Κυρίνον [ - - ] προσαγορεύουσιν οἱ δὲ πολίτην, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς πολίτας Κυρίτας ὄνομαζον.504 (Plut. Rom. XXIX.1)

siue suum regi nomen [Quirinus] posuere Quirites505 (Ov. Fast. II.479)

**Quirites from Quirinus**

Romani a Quirino Quirites dicuntur506 (Paulus ex F. 43L)

**Quirites from Cures**

Quiritibus, qui cum Tatio Curibus uenerunt ad Romam507 (Varro LL V.51)

Quirites a Curensibus508 (Varro LL VI.68)

populo Romano Quiritibusque, quod est Curensibus, quae ciuitas Sabinorum potentissima fuit509 (Paulus ex F. 59L)

Ita germinata urbe, ut Sabinis tamen aliquad daretur. Quirites a Curibus appellati510 (Liv. I.13.5)

Κυρίτας δὲ Ῥωμαίους ἀπαντας ἐπὶ τῇ Τατίου πατρίδι511 (Plut. Rom. XIX.7)

ἡν δὲ πόλεως μὲν ὁ Νομᾶς ἐπιφανοῦς ἐν Σαβίνοις τῆς Κύρεων, ἀφ’ ἃς καὶ Κυρίτας Ῥωμαίοι σφᾶς αὐτούς ἀμα τοῖς ἀναμειχθείσι Σαβίνοις προσηγόρευσαν512 (Plut. Num. III.4)

Romani Quirites dicti sunt, quod nomen Sabinorum fuerat a ciuitate Curibus513 (Serv. ad Aen. VII.710)

Romani a Curibus Quirites appellati sunt.514 (DS ad Aen. VIII.635)

[Κυρίνος] ἀπὸ Κύρεως γάρ, πολίχνης Σαβίνων, οὐτως ἀυτὸν παρονομασθῆνι βούλονται515 (Lyd. Mag. I.5)

---

504 “[O]thers [gave the meaning] of Citizen, because the citizens were called Quirites” (Perrin [1914] 1998:183).
505 “[T]he Quirites gave their own name to their king” (Frazer 1959:91).
506 “The Romans are called Quirites after Quirinus.”
507 “[F]rom the Quirites, who came with Tatus from Cures to the vicinity of Rome” (Kent 1951a:49).
508 “The Quirites were named from the Curenses ‘men of Cures’” (Kent 1951a:235).
509 “For the Roman people and the Quirites, that is the people of Cures, which was the most powerful city of the Sabines.”
510 “In this way the population was doubled, and that some concession might after all be granted to the Sabines, the citizens were named Quirites, from the town of Cures” (Foster [1919] 1967:49).
511 “…but that all its citizens [should be called] Quirites, from the native city of Tatus” (Perrin [1914] 1998:151).
512 “Numa belonged to a conspicuous city of the Sabines called Cures, from which the Romans, together with the incorporated Sabines, took the joint name of Quirites” (Perrin [1914] 1998:315).
513 “The Romans are named Quirites, because that was the name of the Sabines from the city of Cures.”
514 “The Romans are called Quirites after Cures.”
515 “[Quirinus] is named after Cures, a Sabine town, and thus they wish to name it after him.”
Quirinus from Cures

quidam eum [Quirinum] dictum putant a Curibus\(^{516}\) (Paulus ex F. 43L)
seu quia Romanis iunxerat ille Cures.\(^{517}\) (Ov. \textit{Fast.} II.480)

Throughout, \textit{curis} is given as Sabine, except in Plutarch, where κύρις is assigned to \textit{οἱ παλαιοί} (Plut. \textit{Quaest. Rom.} 285D; \textit{Rom.} XXIX.1) The tendency for words to be glossed both as Sabine and ‘old’ is seen elsewhere (see chapter six). In the case of \textit{curis}, which is so prominent in the early mythohistory of Rome, it is not surprising. Notably, \textit{curis} is never described as a specific type of spear; and there is no hesitation to equate it with the generic \textit{hasta}. It is not an anthropological observation, but a discussion of a foreign word.

The attestations of these words stretch from Augustan times to the sixth century CE. There are indications that Varro discussed \textit{curis}, but without the extant passages, we cannot be certain.\(^{518}\) Some writers who discuss these words no doubt read others; Ovid appears to have used the \textit{Fasti Praenestini} when writing the \textit{Fasti}, and the sentences on \textit{Quirinus} in Servius (ad \textit{Aen.} I.292) and Isidorus (\textit{Etym.} IX.2.84) are strikingly similar.\(^{519}\) It is likely that these etymologies and derivations did not spread solely through scholarly texts. Instead, they were a form of received knowledge, shared among well-educated elite Romans. Three times when the etymology of \textit{Iuno Curitis} is discussed (Paulus ex F. 43L; Serv. ad \textit{Aen.} I.8; \textit{DS} ad \textit{Aen.} I.17), \textit{curis} is not explicitly mentioned. Instead, \textit{hasta} is used, which implies that the reader would know that the missing etymological link was \textit{curis}.\(^{520}\)

The words \textit{curis}, \textit{Quirinus}, \textit{Quirites}, \textit{Cures} and \textit{Iuno Curitis} are frequently connected by ancient writers, but within this matrix, some connections are never made. Some modern scholars are keen to interpret \textit{Quirites} as meaning ‘spearmen’, but there are no ancient attempts to derive \textit{Quirites} directly from \textit{curis}.\(^{521}\) The ancient etymologies always go through the

\(^{516}\) “Some think he [Quirinus] is named after Cures.”
\(^{517}\) “or [he was named Quirinus] because he united Cures to Rome.” (Frazer 1959:91)

\(^{518}\) Both Macrobr. \textit{Sat.} I.9.16 and Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom.} II.48.4 name Varro as their source for stories touching on \textit{curis}, but not directly in conjunction with the gloss.

\(^{519}\) See Wallace-Hadrill 1987:227 on Ovid and Flaccus.

\(^{520}\) As one needs \textit{curis} to connect \textit{hasta} with Curitis, it seems unlikely that \textit{curis} has been excluded from the epitome.

theonym Quirinus or the toponym Cures.\textsuperscript{522}

Other connections are made multiple times. The most common by far is deriving Quirites from Cures. Deriving Quirinus from Sabine curis is also common.\textsuperscript{523} On occasion, there is no clear consensus on the direction of the derivations, as with Quirinus and Quirites (Varro LL V. 73; Plut. Rom. XXIX.1; Ov. Fast. II.479; Paulus ex F. 43L).

\textit{Iuno Curitis} is the least connected of this group of words. While modern scholars sometimes describe her as a Sabine goddess, she is never explicitly described thus in ancient sources.\textsuperscript{524} In the scholia of Persius’ \textit{Sat.} IV.26, her name is connected with Cures, and Paulus ex F. 55L associates her with Sabine curis, but elsewhere, curis is either not included or glossed as ‘old’.\textsuperscript{525} Iuno Curitis is also the only one given an etymology outside the curis matrix. In \textit{DS} ad Aen. I.17, she is closely associated with currus ‘chariot’, both through the observation that it is certain that she has one, and through a prayer which asks for her protection \textit{tuo currui clipequo} ‘with your chariot and your shield’. There is no mention in the prayer of a spear.\textsuperscript{526}

\textit{Curis} displays an interconnectedness seldom seen in ancient etymologies, as this matrix remained intact for at least five centuries. During this time, the words influenced each other to make the connections stronger. The alternative spelling quiris reinforces the connection between the word for ‘spear’ and Quirinus and Quirites. Similarly, the different etymologies for the agnomen Curitis can be seen in the various spellings – Curitis (cf. curis, Cures), Curritis (cf. currus) and Quiritis (cf. Quirites).\textsuperscript{527}

Is there any truth to these etymologies? The words fall into two rough categories, those starting in /kur-/ and those starting in /k\textsuperscript{w}ir-/\textsuperscript{528} A change from one to the other requires a change in the nature of both the initial stop and the vowel. A change resembling \textit{k\textsuperscript{w}i} > \textit{k\textsuperscript{w}y} > \textit{ku}- is unparalleled in Latin, where many common words start in \textit{qui}- The opposite change, \textit{ku}-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{522} Paulus ex F. 43L, which singles out \textit{curis} \textit{→} Quirinus \textit{→} Quirites as the favoured explanation, and only reports the Cures etymology, is contradicted at 59L: “Quiritibusque, quod est Curensibus”. This is likely due to the length of Verrius Flaccus’ \textit{DFS}. While the lemmata under which these explanations appear are only sixteen pages apart in Lindsay’s edition, the distance between them in Flaccus’ would have been several scrolls. On such a scale, contradiction can easily happen. It may also be a by-product of the epitomising.
\item \textsuperscript{523} O’Hara 1996:181, 276 suggests that the fact that Vergil mentions \textit{arma} twice of the three times he refers to Quirinus is an attempt at wordplay with the Sabine \textit{curis}, but this is not much more than conjecture.
\item \textsuperscript{524} e.g. Evans 1939:215.
\item \textsuperscript{525} See Zetzel 2005:27 on the readings of the scholia passage.
\item \textsuperscript{526} \textit{TLL} s.v. \textit{Curritis} prefers the spelling closest to currus.
\item \textsuperscript{527} cf. Evans 1939:218; Dumézil 1966:293.
\item \textsuperscript{528} Conway 1897:333 argues that forms in \textit{quir} are Latin and forms in \textit{cur} are Sabine. This has led Evans 1939:219 to posit *Curinus as an ‘original’ form of Quirinus.
\end{itemize}
> \(kwi\)-, may at first remind us of the change \(u > i\), seen in the Sabine gloss \(ciprus\) and Marrucinian \(cibat\) \(II\) Teate Marrucinorum 3/ST MV 7) (see §2.2.7), leaves the labialisation of the velar unexplained. Furthermore, an intervocalic -\(r\)- in Latin may go back to either a *-\(r\)*- or *-\(s\)*-, due to rhotacism. This means that these forms may just as well go back to *\(kwi\)-is*- as to *\(kwi\)-ir*. Due to these factors, it is likely that words in /\(kwi\)-/ are connected to \(Cures\) and, ultimately, \(curis\) only by folk etymology.

The discussion of these words has often been disrupted by the lingering willingness to believe the Roman mythohistorical narrative. Some scholars believe that the term \(populus\) \(Romanus\) \(Quiritesque\) proves that \(Quirites\) referred to component other than the strictly Roman. Nótari and Almagro-Gorbea repeat the connections between \(curis\), \(Quirinus\) and \(Iuno\) \(Curitis\). de Vaan even uses the existence of the foundation myth to argue that \(Quirites\) is a loan, as it is often “connected to Sabellic immigrants into Rome”, something that sounds far more plausible and neutral than any mentions of Sabines fighting a war over their abducted daughters. The fact remains that the narrative in which these words appear is emotive and aetiological.

There are scattered non-mythical explanations, such as Latin \(quercus\) ‘oak’, making \(Quirinus\) the ‘Oak-god’ and \(Cures\) ‘the Oaks’. However, this would be impossible, as \(quercus < *\(perkw\)-\) (cf. Old English \(furh\) ‘fir-tree’) is a case of distance assimilation, and neither \(Quirinus\) nor \(Cures\) has the required labiovelar to trigger this change of initial \(*p\). Rix has identified -\(t\)- in ethnics such as \(Quirites\) and \(Samnites\) as possible examples of Etruscan influence. However, toponyms, ethnics and theonyms are notoriously difficult to etymologise. It may be that the origins of \(Quirinus\), \(Iuno\) \(Curitis\), \(Quirites\) and \(Cures\) are beyond our reach. If we are to find such origins, we must disconnect them from the ancient connotations.

This leaves \(curis\). All attempts at finding convincing etymologies have been unsuccessful. Holthausen and Szemerényi have suggested that \(cusp\text{\(i\)}s\) ‘sharp point, spear’ is derived from a compound *\(kuri\)-spid*-\(\), the latter being the hypothetical Proto-Italic form

---

529 EDL1:510.
530 Ernout 1909:149; WH s.v. \(Quirinus\); Negri 1992:236 all identify the \(curis\)-\(Quirites\) link as folk-etymological.
531 Kretschmer 1919:147; Ribezzo 1930:62; WH s.v. \(Quirites\); Poccetti, Poli and Santini 2001:64.
533 Cook 1904:368; Conway reported in Cook 1904:368-369 n.22. Evans 1939:213 n.4 suggests deriving \(curis\) from the same root, interpreting it as “oaken spear”.
534 See EDL1:506.
*spid-*, presumably meaning ‘pointed stick’, cf. Middle High German *spiz*, Old English *spitu* ‘spit’. Such a compound ‘spear-lance’ would be uncommon in Latin. The fact that it relies on a hypothetical form makes this etymology uncertain at best.536

There are no attestations of *curis* being used in its own right, and there is no certain corroborating linguistic evidence. With this in mind, it would be narrow-minded not to ask whether we can trust that *curis* is a real lexeme, rather than a Roman fabrication. Doubtlessly, the matrix of etymologies is older than the first surviving attestations of it. It may even predate Roman scholarship, as it is closely connected with the myths of early Rome; myths sometimes address the origin of names (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 195).537 The process of creating and accepting *curis* would have been a combined effort of reanalysis and analogy. While the matrix of etymologies can exist without *curis*, it is far stronger with it. The similarities of these words would have led to the idea that there was a word from which the others, directly or indirectly, were derived. The semantics would be provided by the two deities, Quirinus, the Mars-like god who carries a spear, and Iuno Curitis, who appears fully armed with spear and shield. The morphology may have been prompted by *Cures* or *Quirites* — *curis* looks much like a singular form of the toponym, or the uncommon singular *Quiris* (Festus 304L) — but the driving force is likely another word, *secūris* ‘axe’, securely attested as a derivative of *seco* ‘cut’.538 The two words are not connected in text until late antiquity, but the folk-etymology *semi-curis* is obvious enough that it may have been generated several times.

hasta enim, id est curis, telum est cum longiore ferro, unde et securis, quasi semicuris

a *hasta*, that is, a *curis*, is a spear with a longer point, and from that derives *securis*, like ‘half-curis’

Serv. ad *Aen.* I.292

Item securis quasi semicuris; ex una enim parte acuta est, ex altera fossoria.

Likewise, *securis* ‘axe’ is like *semi-curis*; for on one side it is sharp, and on the other is used for digging.

Isid. *Etym.* XIX.19.11

Just as the etymologies connecting *Quirinus, Quirites, Iuno Curitis* and *Cures* became accepted as truth over time, so the existence of the word *curis* became a fact.

536 On the connection to *cuspis*, see Holthausen 1920:72; IEW:981; Szemerényi 1989:26; EDLI:159. A number of other etymologies of *cuspis* not including *curis* have been put forward; see EM s.v. *cuspis*; WH s.v *cuspis*. See Maltby 1991:168 on ancient etymologies.


538 EDLI:550. *Secūris* cannot be connected to *cūris* due to the difference in vowel quantity.
There is no evidence to suggest that the lexeme *curis* was ever used. Neither is there any evidence that it did not exist. Words with obscure etymologies and without cognates do occur, and it is possible that all epigraphic and literary attestations have been lost to us. Nevertheless, between the different parts of the etymological matrix and the already existing lexeme *securis*, the material exists for *curis* to have been created as part of aetiological mythology or learned discussion.

### 3.2.4 Cumba

*Cumba* survives only in Paul’s epitome.

Cumbam Sabini uocant eam, quam militares lecticam, unde uidetur deriuatum esse cubiculum.

Sabines call what soldiers call *lectica* ‘bed’ *cumba*, and it seems as if *cubiculum* ‘bed-chamber’ is derived from it.

Paulus ex F. 56L

This is not to be confused with *cumba*, borrowed from Greek κύμβη ‘small boat’ (glossed at Paulus ex F. 44L).[^539]

Unlike most Sabine glosses, *cumba* is not glossed with a single word, but with an explanation. The word *lectica* is not exclusively used in military jargon; in Cic. *QFr.* II.7.3, it refers to a litter for transportation. Varro gives the following etymology:

*Lectica, quod legebant unde eam facerent stramenta atque herbam, ut etiam nunc fit in castris*

*Lectica* ‘couch’, because they *legebant* ‘gathered’ the straw-coverings and the grass with which to make them, as even now is done in camp.[^540]

Varro *LL* V.166

Although Varro is not right when it comes to the etymology of *lectica* (which is a derivative of PIE *legʰ- ‘lie down’, displaced in Italic by the *cub-* root), he provides us with a description of the old way of making a couch, one still used in military camps.[^541] This implies that *cumba* is a

[^539]: Isid. *Etym.* XIX.2.1 incorrectly connects *cumba* ‘boat’ to *incumbo* ‘press on’. Maltby 1991:170 gives both words together. However, they are unlikely to be connected. Ernout 1909:147; EM s.v. *cumba*; WH s.v. *cumba* all warn against this confusion (but Ernout 1954:225 falls victim himself when giving references to both words under the same index heading). Neither should it be confused with Gallo-Latin *cumba* ‘valley’ (WH s.v. *cumba*) and Welsh *cwm* ‘deep narrow valley’ (although GPC s.v. *cwm* gives Greek κύμβη ‘basin’ as a cognate).


rather primitive type of bed, which tallies well with ideas of Sabine austerity and belligerence (see §1.2.1).

*Cumba* is easily connected to Latin *-cumbere*, which occurs only in compounds such as *accumbere*. Ernout argues that *cumba* proves that the form *-cumbere* once existed on its own. As it stands, the Latin simple verb is *cubare*. The verb is also attested in other Italic languages, Faliscan *cupat* (e.g. *LDAF* LF 224), South Picene *qupat* (*II* Falerio 1/*ST* AP 3, *II* Urbs Salvia 1/*ST* MC 1), Marrucinian *cibat* (*II* Teate Marrucinorum 3/*ST* MV 7) and Paelignian *incubat* (*II* Corfinium 11/*ST* Pg 10).

What the Sabellic forms of this word (often interpreted as an Italic or Italo-Celtic root, rather than an IE one) have in common is that none of them has a nasal infix. Nasal infixes are rare in Sabellic, to the extent that Untermann argues that there are no inherited instances of them. The only example he accepts as genuine is Oscan *uincter* (*II* Bantia 1/*ST* Lu 1 21), which he nevertheless believes is influenced by Latin *uincere*. However, the nasal infix in *sansie* (*ST* Um 1 IVb 9, 10, 12, 14, 15) and Oscan *saah'tum* <*_san-k-to-_* would speak in favour of its existence (see §5.6.4). The present tense-forming nasal infix was no longer productive in Latin, and in some cases, the /n/ had spread to other principal parts, e.g. *mingo minxi minctum* ‘piss’. This did not happen in the case of *-cumbere*, which shared a perfect form with *cubare*.

Paul and, presumably, Festus and Flaccus are not concerned by the presence or absence of the nasal, but suggest that *cubiculum* (formed from the perfect stem) may be derived from *cumba*. However, this mention, with its tentative *esse uidetur*, gives the impression of being part of some longer argument which has been lost in the epitomes.

The fact that no Sabellic form of the *-kub-* verb contains a nasal infix but the Latin form does would speak in favour of *cumba* being a Latin formation. The form *-cumbere* may well have existed parallel to *cubare* in other non-Roman dialects of Latin. *Cumba* is a *τομή*-type noun, cf. *fuga* ‘flight’ – *fugere* ‘flee’. These nouns are usually action nouns, but the semantic shift required here is attested, e.g. *mola* (cf. *molere* ‘grind’) meaning both ‘ground-grain’ and

---

542 WH s.v. *cubo*.
543 Ernout 1909:146.
545 On the PIE status of *cubo*, see *EDLI* 152.
547 The older forms *mixi, mictum* continued in parallel with the newer forms; cf. Hor. *Sat*. I.8.38.
548 Weiss 2009:300.
‘millstone’.\textsuperscript{549} It is likely that \textit{cumba} was a marginal word, probably in a dialect with little or no epigraphic tradition, as it is not attested elsewhere.

3.2.5 \textbf{Scensa}

The gloss \textit{scensa} is the only Sabine gloss which survives to some extent in Festus as well as in Paul’s epitome. The reconstructed version of Festus’ fragmentary definition is as follows:\textsuperscript{550}

\begin{quote}
Scensas <Sabini dicebant, quas> nunc cenas. Quae autem <nunc prandia, cenas> habeabant, et pro cenis <uespernas>

The Sabines <said \textit{scensa}, which is> now \textit{cena} ‘dinner’. But for that which <is now \textit{prandium},> they had \textit{cena}, <and \textit{uesperna}> for \textit{cena}.

Festus 456L
\end{quote}

The reconstruction is heavily based on the section from Paul’s epitome:

\begin{quote}
Scensas Sabini cenas dicebant. Quae autem nunc prandia sunt, cenas habeabant, et pro cenis uespernas appellabant.

The Sabines said \textit{scensa} for \textit{cena} ‘dinner’. But they had \textit{cena} for that which is now \textit{prandium} ‘lunch’, and they called it \textit{uesperna} instead of \textit{cena}.

Paulus ex F. 457L
\end{quote}

See §3.2.6 on the semantic shift of \textit{scensa}.

The gloss \textit{scensa} brings with it two particularities, the cluster -\textit{ns}- and the initial \textit{s}. Earlier in Festus, a form \textit{cesna} appears to illustrate -\textit{sn}- \textgreater{} -\textit{nn}-.

\begin{quote}
Pesnis, pennis, ut Casmenas dicebant, pro Camenis: et cesnas pro caenis [sic]\textsuperscript{551}

\textit{Pesnæ} for \textit{ペンネイ ‘feathers’}, as they said \textit{Casmenæ} for \textit{Camenæ}, and also \textit{cesna} for \textit{cena} ‘dinner’

Festus 222L
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Pennas antiquos furtur appellasse †\textit{peenas}† ex Graeco, quod illi \textit{πετηνὰ quae sunt} uolucria, dicant. item easdem pesnas, ut cesnas.

They say that the ancients called \textit{ペンネイ ‘feathers’} †\textit{peenas}†, from the Greek, which they call \textit{πετηνά}, that is ‘birds’. Likewise [they said] \textit{pesnæ}, like \textit{cesnæ}.

Festus 228L
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{549} cf. \textit{EDLI}:386-387.

\textsuperscript{550} See North 2008:159 on the difficulties faced when reconstructing Festus.

\textsuperscript{551} It is safe to disregard the form \textit{caenis} as a mistake for \textit{cenis}.
The -sn- variant is more like the Oscan kersnu (II Cumaec 8/ST Cm 14) and Umbrian çesna (e.g. ST Um 1 Va 9), šesna (e.g. ST Um 1 Vb 9). The traditional etymology is *kertsna < *kert-s-nH₂, ultimately from PIE *kert- ‘cut’ (as a meal is a part cut off).  

In light of this, the -ns- in the Sabine gloss scensa is likely to be a mistake. It may be a conscious attempt by a scribe to correct the form, explaining why in 222L and 228L, where its strangeness is important, the -sn- form is preserved. It is also possible that a word such as mensa ‘table’, which has a natural connection to meals, may have influenced the scribe. It is therefore warranted to emend scensa to cesna.

As for the second peculiarity, the initial s-, Conway argues against it in light of the Oscan and Umbrian forms and the form given by Festus elsewhere. If we are to amend the word to cesna, we have to ask how the initial s- found its way there in the first place. It cannot be a scribal error, as the gloss is listed under the letter s, between senonas and signa in Festus and sentes and segnitia in Paul. Furthermore, we cannot impose Osco-Umbrian features onto Sabine glosses only because we assume Sabine is Sabellic (see §§2.2.7, 3.2.2).

There are two possible explanations of the s-. One possibility is that s- is correct and that it is a case of s mobile, which occurs with PIE *kert- in e.g. Old High German skrindan ‘to break’, Norwegian skrinda ‘notch’, Old Prussian scođo ‘skin, rind’. The s mobile appears sporadically, primarily in Germanic and Indo-Iranian, but it can be seen in Latin scortum < *skort-o-m, originally ‘skin’, but mostly used as a pejorative word for a sex-worker. The o-grade appears in Latin without the initial sibilant in cortex ‘bark’ and corium ‘hide’. Based on this we could posit a form *skert-sna existing in parallel to *kert-sna. However, the s mobile is uncommon enough in Latin that it looks like special pleading.

The second explanation is the more likely of the two. The initial s- cannot be a scribal error, but the -c- may be. The alphabetical order in DVS is rough, but usually it takes at least the first two letters into account. In neither epitome is scensa flanked by any words starting in sc-. Instead, they start in se- and si-. A form *sesna may be an attempt to represent Umbrian šesna, with an initial palato-alveolar spirant, which in the Latin alphabet would be written with

---

552 EM s.v. cena; WH s.v. cena; Meiser 1998:118; Untermann 2000:393; EDLI:106.
553 This emendation is made in Conway 1897:352; von Planta 1897:497; WH s.v. cena.
554 Every letter in DVS can be divided roughly into two halves, one where the lemmata are alphabetised to the second or third letter, and another where the the lemmata are arranged instead by theme or source (Müller 1839:xvi-xvii; Cornell et al. 2013a:67). Scensa is located in the first type of section, where we would expect the alphabetisation to extend at least to the second letter.
555 IEW:941-942; LIV:559-560.
556 LIV:560 n.1; EDLI:546.
a modified <S>. Alternatively, it may be a form from a non-Umbrian dialect, displaying the same phenomenon of *ke-* /śe-/. The -c- was then added during copying to make the word more reminiscent of *cena*.

### 3.2.6 Vesperna

*Vesperna* occurs in the explanation of *scensa* in Paulus’ epitome, but is lost in Festus.

*Scensas Sabini cenas dicebant. Quae autem nunc prandia sunt, cenas habeabant, et pro cenis uespernas appellabant.*

The Sabines said *scensa* for *cena* ‘dinner’. But they had *cena* for that which is now *prandium* ‘lunch’, and they called it *uesperna* instead of *cena*.

Paulus ex F. 457L

The same semantic shift is described in an earlier entry in the epitome, but is ascribed to the *antiqui*:

*Cena apud antiquos dicebatur, quod nunc est prandium: uesperna, quam nunc cenam appellamus.*

Among the ancients they said *cena* for what is now *prandium*, and *uesperna* for what we now call *cena*.

Paulus ex F. 47L

It is then reiterated under *uesperna* as a word used by Plautus:

*Vesperna apud Plautum [- - -] cena intellegitur.*

*Vesperna* in Plautus is understood as *cena*.

Paulus ex F. 505L

It is also glossed by Isidorus:

*est autem cena uesperinum cibum, quam uespernam antiqui dicebant*

but *cena* is the evening meal, which the ancients called *uesperna*.

Isid. *Etym. XX.2.14*

*Vesperna* also appears in a short inscription on a bronze tablet found in Lavinium, dated to the third century BCE. The mention of Ceres has led to this being interpreted as a theonym. The suggestions range from an Italic goddess of food to some aspect of Venus, either as the

---

Evening Star (Vesperugo) or as the goddess of horticulture.\textsuperscript{559} It has also been suggested that this is a description of the offering to be interpreted as a meal for the gods.\textsuperscript{560} Whichever interpretation is correct, the sphere of this inscription is clearly very different from that of the word discussed in Paul’s epitome.

When discussing the specific semantics of scensa and uesperna, we must first establish the basic meanings of these words and prandium in classical Latin. The word uesperna is semantically transparent as connected to uesper ‘evening’, but seems to not have been used by the early Empire. The other terms are more well-attested, but less easy to pin down. Our knowledge of Roman meals is scarce, as our sources are often shy about food, a topic which was seen as shallow.\textsuperscript{561} When food is discussed in literature, it is often as a showcase for grotesque excess. Although some information can be found in letters, most of the information – and therefore scholarship – concentrates on the conuiutum, a more lavish cena, a banquet rather than a dinner.

Different sources will give a different answer to the question of how many meals the Romans ate a day, ranging from one to three.\textsuperscript{562} This is completely down to what one considers a meal. Sassatelli sees ientaculum and prandium as such informal affairs that they do not qualify as meals, while Smith counts these two and cena as actual meals.\textsuperscript{563} There is a general consensus that cena is “the main meal of the day”.\textsuperscript{564} I avoid Modern English dinner, as it has different meanings in different geographical areas (see below).

As for prandium, we can tell when it was eaten from another entry in Paulus:

Prandium ex Graeco π<ρ>οένδιον est dictum, nam meridianum cibum cenam uocabant.

*Prandium* is said to be from Greek προένδιον [ἔνδιος ‘at midday’], for they called the midday meal *cena*.

Paulus ex F. 249L

Similarly, the timing of cena is implied by Isidorus, who describes it as “uespertinum cibum” (Isid. *Etym.* XX.2.14). These descriptions casts doubt on Dupont’s argument that the difference between prandium and cena was not one of time, but of quality, where cena implies


\textsuperscript{560} Bloch 1954:211.

\textsuperscript{561} See Gowers 1993:2.

\textsuperscript{562} Smith 2003:21; Sassatelli 2013:107; Dupont 2013:123.

\textsuperscript{563} Smith 2003:21; Sassatelli 2013:107.

\textsuperscript{564} Bradley 1998:37. Weinstock 1952:35 rejects that uesperna is the evening meal, claiming that “the Romans had no evening-meal”, a claim far too absolute for the scant evidence we have.
leisure and luxury and *prandium* is simply for nourishment. However, we should not assume in our haste that all Romans had the same kind of meals. Our understanding is skewed towards the meal-keeping of elite men. Anyone else, particularly people of fewer means, would most likely eat their meals in a different way.

With this in mind, we can interpret *prandium* as ‘midday meal’ and *cena* as ‘main meal’. The semantic shift described by Paul is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabine/old</th>
<th>Contemporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midday meal</td>
<td><em>cena</em> (<em>scensa, sesna</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main meal</td>
<td><em>uesperna</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word *uesperna* has fallen out of use, *cena* has shifted meaning from midday meal to main meal, and *prandium* has been introduced to fill the gap left by *cena*.

Semantic shifts in words for meals are cross-linguistically common. In English, this has led to regional differences. *Dinner* originally referred to a midday meal, a meaning it has retained in Northern British English, but generally lost in Southern British English. Similarly, *tea* can mean a light afternoon meal, the original meaning, retained in Southern English, a cooked evening meal in Northern British, Australian and New Zealand English, or the first meal of the day in Jamaican English. Similar shifts can be seen in Swedish, where *middag*, from *middagsmål* ‘midday meal’, has shifted to mean ‘evening meal’, and *frukost* has gone from referring to the meal eaten at midday to the morning meal. Often these changes can be traced back to changes in when people eat their main meal, often connected to socioeconomic factors, such as industrialisation and stricter work-hours. However, the shift of meal names is not isolated to post-industrial societies. It can be seen in the Old French *disner*, from which Modern English *dinner* developed, which originally referred to the first meal of the day, rather than the main meal. Although we do not have any independent evidence of a semantic shift of *cena*, or of the use of *uesperna*, there is plenty of linguistic precedents.

The question remains why the old words *uesperna* and *cena* are also glossed as Sabine. The statements on Paulus ex F. 457L implies continuity between the Sabine/’old’ glosses and the contemporary words for the meals. It is noticeable that the wording of the above sentence

---

563 Dupont 2013:124.
566 *OED* s.v. *dinner* n.
567 *OED* s.v. *tea* 4a.
568 SAOB s.v. *middag* 2, *frukost*.
569 *OED* s.v. *dine*. 
is very similar to the one in Paulus ex F. 47L. Is there a case of confusion due to the length of DVS? The two entries are virtually on either side of the alphabet. It is possible that the author(s) have forgotten the fact that these terms have already been assigned to the antiqui, or that Sabini and antiqui are close enough to be essentially interchangeable.

3.3 Reflections on the Sabine glosses in the epitomes of DVS

The epitomes of DVS preserve six Sabine glosses, considerably fewer than Varro’s LL, but more than contemporary or later works containing Sabine glosses. The original number of Sabine glosses in DVS cannot be determined, but in light of Festus’ exclusion of obsolete words and Paul’s tendency to leave out scholarly discussion, it is possible that we have lost some.

At first glance, the Sabine glosses of DVS are more down-to-earth and everyday than Varro’s. The words refer to furniture and types of meals, not religious concepts. However, we cannot make assumptions of what kind of Sabines the author(s) had in mind, considering that we are dealing with only six surviving examples, in no way a sufficiently large sample-size. Furthermore, we cannot divide the words into ‘realistic’ and ‘mythical’ without considering their context.

Neither ausum nor alpus are lemmata themselves, but are invoked as relevant to etymologies of Latin words. This type of inclusion of material is more reminiscent of Varro, whose glosses are often used to argue a point relating to Latin. The words that seem everyday – sesna, uesperna andumba – are all lemmata. DVS set out to include all kinds of obscure, dialectal and strange words. That facilitates the inclusion of words which are more anthropological observations than linguistic examples. These words have more in common with Varro’s liqua and similixula, which appear in a section explaining all sorts of food-stuffs, than with e.g. fircus, which is presented for etymological purposes (see §§2.2.2, 2.2.5).

DVS provides us with one of the earliest attestations of curis, which appears both as a lemma and in other etymologies. Like most glosses, curis is never etymologised in its own right beyond its Sabine origins. Although it is an early attestation, we cannot credit Verrius Flaccus with this etymology. It appears in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in Ovid’s Fasti, also written during the reign of Augustus, and there are indications that the gloss appeared in

\footnote{The only exceptions are both related to Greek, lepesta (LL V.123; see §2.2.6) and nerio < νεῦρα (Μακ X.3.23.7-9; see §4.8.2).}
Varro (see §3.2.3). Considering the central standing of the words of the curis matrix in the myths of early Rome, it may have featured in early historians or in oral retellings of myths.

This brings us to the question of sources. Of the glosses in DVS, only ausum, from which alii derived aurum (Paulus ex F. 8L), is given a source, however obscure. We cannot identify these ‘other’ scholars, but assuming that the plural is not an exaggeration for effect, we may assume that this view was held by multiple scholars. This may not have been presented in writing, but may equally be based on discussions among learned acquaintances.

The Sabine glosses in DVS serve to further dilute the picture of Varro as the originator of the Sabine gloss phenomenon. He is never mentioned in DVS in association with Sabine. As we are dealing with epitomes, we cannot be certain of what has been lost, but it is unlikely that references to Varro in all of the Sabine glosses would be struck out, while other references to him were kept. Verrius Flaccus may well have picked his glosses from other writers, but there is nothing that requires that Varro is the source. Even if we were to identify a (hitherto unnoticed) connection between the two, it may not be direct, as Flaccus often used the same sources as Varro.

Glinister has argued that DVS became a way for new Romans from other parts of Italy to build a Roman identity, as it included discussions of mythology, history and topography of other Italian peoples. In such cases, Glinister suggests, DVS would work like a “two-way mirror”, teaching the readers about Roman customs and ideas, but also allowing them to see their culture in a Roman context, concentrating on “equality and integration” instead of resistance and conquest as in e.g. Livy. Simply in terms of the linguistic evidence, Glinister’s argument holds. In the surviving epitomes, there are thirty-nine glosses from non-Roman languages of Italy. Most noticeable are the fifteen Oscan glosses (three of which are names),

571 Ovid appears to have used the Fasti Praenestini as inspiration for his poetical Fasti, so it is possible that his direct source was Flaccus (see Wallace-Hadrill 1987:227). However, this does not make Flaccus the originator.
572 The closest is when Varro is cited as saying Sabini is from the Greek σεβέσθαι (Festus 464L, Paulus ex F. 465L).
573 Lhommé 2007:40 argues that Flaccus sought to replace Varro as the main authority, as he is only cited 22 times in the epitomes, but we have likely lost some mentions through Paul’s habit to cut scholarly discussions. See Glinister 2007:13-17 for an alternative view of Flaccus’ opinion of Varro. While there is no positive evidence to this effect, it is intriguing to consider that as Flaccus was born in 55 BCE and Varro did not die until 27 BCE and was apparently healthy enough to write well into his eighties, it is not impossible that the two met.
576 Based on the index at Lindsay 1913a:564. This includes glossed names and the Sabine glosses discussed in this chapter, including the Sabine name Talus (Festus 492L, Paulus ex F. 493L).
which include *pilpit* ‘quidquid’ (Paulus ex F. 235L) and *pitora* ‘quattuor’ (Festus 226L, Paulus ex F. 227L).\(^{577}\) These are not of general interest, but would intrigue scholars of language. They may make an impression on any Oscan-speaker reading *DIVS*. However, many of these Oscan words are isolated mentions, with nothing connecting them to the wider idea of elite Roman identity. At the time Flaccus was writing, around 13 CE, Oscan had not been used in epigraphy for almost a hundred years, and though it was probably still spoken, it appears to have lost much of its prestige. This leads to the question whether an Italian seeking to become part of the Roman elite would find that reminder as comforting as Glinister suggests.

The Roman rhetoric of heterogeneity emphasises the idea of Roman generosity and deflects discussion from conflict and violence (see §1.2.3). The focus is on putting Roman fears to rest rather than embracing Italian immigrants. The Roman emphasis on integration is a form of consolidation, which quietly props up the established peace and avoids opening old wounds. The mythology, customs and languages of Italy become the subject of scholarly interest. Ideas and concepts which were central to a people’s identity are made into anthropological observations and quaint examples, all parts of Verrius Flaccus’ linguistic menagerie.

\(^{577}\) Although we can verify some of these words, others may well be incorrect.
Chapter Four

Sabine Glosses in the Principate and High Empire

4.1 Sabine and Sabines during the Principate and High Empire

4.1.1 Sabines in Imperial myth and ideology

The Sabine glosses of the late Republic were part of a broader discourse seeking to use the myth of the Sabines to control relations with Italy by emphasising shared ancestry and Roman generosity. In the early days of Augustus’ reign, parts of Italy still retained their cultural and linguistic distinctiveness, but by the end of the first century, Italy was no longer the frontier it had once been. With the reach of Rome spreading over the known world, Italy became home-turf. The changing nature of Italy, both real and perceived, required different mythological tools.

The ideological requirements of the various emperors were different from those of the Republican elites, leading them to use different myths in cementing their image. The Aeneid is the clearest example of this, uniting the divine, Trojan and Romulan origins of Rome and presenting one origin for the kings of Rome and the Julii, with Augustus as the pinnacle of the genealogy. Augustus created a role for himself as the re-founder of Rome through his hitherto unique political position and his extensive building-work around Rome.

Over time, Augustus himself became mythologised, and many later emperors leaned heavily on his legacy as the founder of imperial Rome. The Flavians often emphasised the continuity with the Julio-Claudians. During the Nerva-Antonine dynasty, Augustus’ image was all-pervasive. When Augustus’ Mausoleum was used for Nerva’s burial, it was in order to reconnect with this first emperor.\footnote{Griffin 2000a:11; Griffin 2000b:85; de Jong and Hekster 2008:87; Hekster 2009:103.} This use of a mythologised image of a first ruler is reminiscent of the status of Lenin in the Soviet Union or Kim Il-sung in North Korea, both in
many ways creators of the political entities they controlled. Augustus’ ideology, more or less freely interpreted, stretched far beyond his own death.

Although the Sabines did not play a major part in Augustus’ mythical discourse, they were by no means uninteresting. Many of the retellings of the myths of Sabines are from this period (see §1.2.1). The Sabine territory itself plays an important part in the poetry of Horace. While it deals with the country rather than the people, it is no less stereotyped. The territory seems largely empty of inhabitants, and filled only with villas awaiting their elite Roman owners.

Two emperors in particular emphasised their Sabine heritage, much as senators during the Republic had done. Claudius had a clear claim on Sabine blood due to his gens. In the Tacitean version of Claudius’ speech on the Gaulish senators, he opens with discussing his own Sabine ancestors and non-Roman origins of other well-known families. The excellent result of embracing other peoples in the past, in particular in Claudius’ own family, encourages the emperor to do the same in the future (Tac. Ann. XI.24; see §1.2.3). The fact that Claudius’ imperial predecessors did not share his Sabine heritage adds the further dimension that Claudius does not only diversify the senate with this decision, but has himself diversified the dynasty.

Vespasian, born close to Reate (Suet. Vesp. II), also made claims on Sabine heritage, as did his family; both his father and his brother bore the cognomen Sabinus. Rather than emulating Claudius’ narrative of immigrating aristocracy, he emphasised the austere aspect of the Sabines, which works alongside his image as a military man. The Sabine-like frugality and toughness, important both to a soldier and an emperor after a time of instability, likely hails from the same source as Cato’s stereotyped Sabine image over two centuries earlier.

The two emperors utilise different types of Sabineness. In Claudius’ speech, a Roman could have Sabine heritage, but being Sabine was at odds with being Roman. In Silius Italicus’ Punica, a prophecy of Jupiter characterises the Flavians by their Sabine heritage, emphasising its antiquity by the mention of Cures, the central Sabine city in Roman mythology:

579 Augustus gained a cult-like standing already during his lifetime as the image of him as the saviour of Rome solidified. Crook 1996:143-144 has observed that by the end of his rule, Augustus, like many autocrats, implemented methods associated with “police-states” in order to control opposition. The term “Augustan Rome” is reminiscent of that of “Stalinist Russia” or “Maoist China”, two totalitarian states with a person-cult at their centre.


581 Griffin 2000a:15; Mellor 2003:71; OCD s.v. Vespian; Patterson 2008:492; Coarelli, Kay and Patterson 2008; Cornell et al. 2013a:561.


exin se Curibus uirtus caelestis ad astra
efferet. et sacris augebit nomen Iulis
bellatrix gens bacifero nutrita Sabino.

Later still, godlike excellence shall come from Cures and soar to heaven, and a warrior family, reared on the berry that grows in the Sabine land, shall increase the fame of the deified Julii.304

Sil. Pun. III.594-596

Being Sabine is simply another aspect of being Roman. In the first century BCE, Italy was still foreign enough for the difference described in myth to be applicable. By the late first century, Italy was no longer thought of as particularly alien. Sabine heritage was something distant to be utilised, and only for positive effect, unlike for instance Trajan’s Spanish origins, which were only ever mentioned as criticism.305 The world has become larger, and what is strange has changed.

4.1.2 Imperial literature and Sabine glosses

While we have far more literature surviving from the first two centuries CE than we do from the Republic, much more has also been lost. Thus there are without a doubt Sabine glosses which have not survived. As a result, the complete picture is lost to us, but we may take what has survived as a general baseline, and factor in the popularity of genres such as antiquarianism, with which glosses are often associated. Where there is a period of no attested Sabine glosses, we cannot rule out that there were Sabine glosses included in works at the time, but if we correlate it with the interest in early Roman history and the aetiological connections examined by antiquarians, we will gain a rough idea of the fortunes of Sabine glosses throughout this period.

The antiquarian boom of the late Republic was still going during the reign of Augustus. The main contributor of Sabine glosses from this time, Verrius Flaccus, has already been discussed in chapter three. One more gloss survives in Strabo, whose Geographia is usually dated between the late 10s and mid-20s.586 Both Ovid (Fast. II.477) and Dionysius (Hal. Ant. Rom. II.48.4) discuss Sabine curis (see §3.2.3).

In the century between the end of Tiberius’ reign and the beginning of Hadrian’s, only one Sabine gloss is attested, in Historia Naturalis by Pliny the Elder. Pliny was active during

---

304 Duff 1968:157, 159.
the reign of Vespasian, and died the same year as him (Plin. Ep. VI.16; Suet. Vesp. XXIV). During this time, the interest in antiquarianism that had been so strong in the early days of the Empire was flagging. Instead, other genres and lines of enquiry were explored. Holford-Strevens disparagingly describes the writers of the latter half of the first century as “modernists who reeked of Nero and neo-classicists tinted by Domitian”. In his Historia Naturalis, dated to 77 CE, Pliny sets out to describe everything (HN praef. 13). However, there is only one Sabine gloss in the 37 books of this work. Explaining an absence is often difficult, but it seems inconceivable that it is due to Pliny not knowing of Sabine glosses. At the time he was writing, Verrius Flaccus’ encyclopaedia was still in use, and Varro was a figure of authority. More likely, this absence is due to a lack of interest on Pliny’s part. There is no indication that Pliny had any interest in language. There are a few examples where he discusses language in general, such as the great variety of linguae and sermones among humans, which are like the different colours of animals (HN VII.1.7). When describing the dog-headed men who dwell far away, he notes the fact that they bark rather than speak (HN VII.2.23). Discussions of specific languages or individual words are uncommon. Apart from the Sabine gloss, Pliny gives only two other Italic glosses, the Marsian-Umbrian porculeta, the spacing between vines (HN XVII.35.171) and arula from Campania, used for the mound of dirt around newly planted elms (HN XVII.15.77). Like the Sabine gloss, these words refer to farming and planting. The non-Italic glosses, primarily from Gaul or Spain, are similarly technical. For a scholar with no antiquarian interests, the Sabine origin of words used by Romans is largely uninteresting.

After Pliny, the Sabine trail goes cold once again until the next renaissance of antiquarianism, when Trajan’s interest in the Julio-Claudians and Hadrian’s philhellenism spark new interest in the study of the past. Four Sabine glosses survive from this period. One is


589 Rackham 1967:viii; Gibson and Morello 2011b:vii; Cornell et al. 2013a:102. The dating is based on the dedication to Titus, who is described as sexies consul (HN pref.3).


591 The Umbrian and Marsian example concerns the spacing between vines: “Umbri et Marsi ad uicenos intermittunt arationis gratia in his quae uocant porculeta” (HN XVII.35.171). This is likely to be a regional word, rather than a non-Latin one.

592 e.g. Plin. HVIII.17.123, XVIII.11.62, XXV.46.84, XXXIII.21.66-78, XXXV.48.169.

593 It is clear that Pliny cared about the past, cf. Beagon 2005:11, but his interest is more general than that of antiquarians, who concern themselves with details rather than large-scale changes.
found in Suetonius’ biography of Tiberius, which likely draws on older traditions.\textsuperscript{594} We know little of the author of the second, Velius Longus, except that he wrote about the language of Republican writers and authored a commentary on Vergil. His only surviving work, a piece on orthography, includes engagement with Varro’s Sabine glosses from \textit{LL} and one new gloss.\textsuperscript{595} Plutarch, born sometime before 50 CE and died after 120 CE, wrote for both a Greek and a Roman audience. The gloss is found in his antiquarian work \textit{Roman Questions}, part of the \textit{Moralia}.\textsuperscript{596} The fourth writer, Aulus Gellius, was active during the reign of Antoninus Pius.\textsuperscript{597} His \textit{Noctes Atticae}, datable to after 138 CE, deals with all manner of things, not least language.\textsuperscript{598}

A fragment containing a Sabine gloss, \textit{terenus} ‘mollis’, survives from Gellius’ contemporary Favorinus in Macrobius’ \textit{Saturnalia}. It is discussed in §5.4.1.

4.2 Strabo’s \textit{Geographia}

4.2.1 Πίκος

Πίκος appears in the story of the Sacred Springs migration of the Picentes (see §1.2.3), where the woodpecker is the animal guide.\textsuperscript{599}

\begin{quote}
\textit{\textgreek{ ωρμηνται δ’ ἐκ τής Σαβίνης οἱ Πικεντῖνοι, δρεοκολάπτου τὴν ὄδον ἕγησαμένου τοῖς ἀρχηγέταις, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ τούνομα: πῖκον γὰρ τὸν ὄρνιν τούτον ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ νομίζουσιν Ἄρεως ἵερὸν.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{595} \textit{DNP} s.v. \textit{Velius 3}; \textit{OCD} s.v. \textit{Velius Longus}. His lost work is known through mentions in Gell. \textit{NA} XVIII. 9.4, Serv. ad \textit{Aen. X.245}; Macrobr. \textit{Sat. III.6.6}.
\textsuperscript{596} \textit{OCD} s.v. \textit{Plutarch}; Payen 2014:237.
\textsuperscript{598} See Baldwin 1975:13 on dating. Baldwin 1975:71 calculates that a quarter or more of \textit{NA} is dedicated to language and \textit{Latinitas}. Taylor 1995b:108 claims that 60 percent of \textit{NA} is connected to grammar. Whatever the amount, it is a great interest of Gellius’.
\textsuperscript{599} \textit{WH} s.v. \textit{pica} calls the woodpecker the “totem” of the Picentes, but as far as we can tell, the Picentes did not use the woodpecker as an emblem or symbol of their people. If Salmon 1989:235 is correct in that the Hirpini saw themselves as “‘wolf’-people”, the word totem may be more correct in that context, but we only know for sure that the Hirpini were named after a wolf, according to a myth which, though likely Italic, is not necessarily the Hirpini’s own.
The Picentini are originally from the Sabine country, a woodpecker having led the way for their progenitors; and hence their name, for they call this bird “picus”, and consider it sacred to [Ares].\textsuperscript{600}

Strabo V.4.2

Πῖκος is obviously Latin \textit{picus}, ‘woodpecker’ with Greek terminations.\textsuperscript{601} I will distinguish between the Sabine gloss \textit{πῖκος} (as given in Strabo) and Latin \textit{picus} by the use of script.

It is not entirely clear whether Strabo means that \textit{πῖκος} was a word of the Sabines or the Picentes (if indeed there is a difference between them in the myth). The fact that the Picentes are the subject of the previous sentence would speak in their favour, but Sabine glosses are a far more well-established concept than Picene ones.\textsuperscript{602} Both von Planta and Bruno interpret \textit{πῖκος} as a Sabine gloss, while Conway appears to interpret it as the Latin word.\textsuperscript{603}

The Sacred Spring of the Picentes is described in \textit{DVS}, and while the Latin word \textit{picus} appears, it is not strictly glossed as Sabine.

Picena regio, in qua est Asculum, dicta, quod Sabini cum Asculum proficiscerentur, in uexillo eorum picus consederat.

The Picene region, where Asculum is located, is called this because when the Sabines set out for Asculum, a woodpecker sat down on their standard.

Paulus ex F. 235L

Dionysius writes of the Aborigine word \textit{πῖκος} in his description of the woodpecker oracle of Mars, which he compares to the pigeon oracle at Dodona.

παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἀβοριγῖσι θεόπεμπτος ὀρνιν, ὃν αὐτοὶ μὲν πῖκον, Ἑλληνες δὲ δρυοκολάπτην καλοῦσιν, ἐπὶ κίονος ξυλίνων φαινόμενος τὸ ἑαυτὸ ἔδρα.

among the Aborigines a heaven-sent bird, which they call \textit{picus} and the Greeks \textit{dryokolaptēs} ‘woodpecker’, appearing on a pillar of wood, did the same [made prophecies.]\textsuperscript{604}  

Dion. Hal. \textit{Ant. Rom.} I.14.5

\textsuperscript{600} Jones 1923:427.

\textsuperscript{601} The fact that \textit{πῖκος} is a Latin word with Greek terminations may be why it is not included on the list of foreign words in Strabo at Dueck 2000:92.

\textsuperscript{602} Conway 1897:449-456 lists no glosses associated with Picenum, an area which until the decipherment of South Picene did not have a readable language closely associated to it (cf. Buck 1906:101).

\textsuperscript{603} von Planta 1897:593; Conway 1897:450; Bruno 1961:528.

\textsuperscript{604} Cary and Spelman 1948:49.
According to Dionysius (Ant. Rom. I.9.3, 10.1) as well as other writers (e.g. Liv. I.2.4), the Aborigines were later renamed Latini. This does not necessarily mean that Dionysius saw them as Latin-speakers; just like the Romans, they were ultimately Greek. It is unlikely that Dionysius saw πῖκος as a Sabine word, as the Sabines are distinct from the Aborigines, the original inhabitants of the area around Reate before being ousted (Ant. Rom. I.14.1, 6).

Words attested in Latin are glossed as Sabine elsewhere, such as Varro’s literary words cascus (LL VII.28) and catus (LL VIII.46), and Gellius’ multa (VIII XI.1.4) (see §§2.2.11, 2.2.12, 4.5.1). The difference between these instances and Strabo’s glossing is that it is uncertain whether Strabo was aware of the Latin word. As both Strabo and Dionysius are native Greek-speakers, we must address their proficiency in Latin. Dionysius writes about learning Latin and reading some Latin literature, but to what level of proficiency is unknown (Ant. Rom. I.7.2-3). Strabo never discusses his knowledge of Latin, and his inclusion of Latin in the Geography is limited to individual words. Dueck believes that he had enough “passive knowledge” to work through Latin texts, but it is evident that Strabo prefers to use Roman sources in Greek translation. It is therefore possible that Strabo did not know the Latin word for woodpecker, and upon hearing the word pīcus in the context of the Picentes’ Sacred Spring, assumed it was Sabine.

While bird-names may be specialist vocabulary (i.e. words that not all native speakers know) today, they were important in antiquity for religious and divinatory purposes. As both Strabo and Dionysius write about regional cults and mythology, they would encounter this type of vocabulary on a regular basis. Woodpeckers were important to religion in Italy as auspices (cf. Pliny HV X.20; Val. Max. V.6.4) and as forms or companions of gods e.g. Latin Pīcus Martius (Non. 834-835L; Isid. Etym. XII.7.47), Picumnus, Umbrian pīquier martier (ST Um I Vb 9, 14-15).

There is nothing in the phonology of Latin pīcus to indicate that it is a loanword, though it does not guarantee that it is native. It is from PIE *(s)peiko-, like Latin pīca ‘magpie’, Umbrian peico (e.g. ST Um I VIA 3, 16), ‘woodpecker’, Old Prussian picle ‘fieldfare’, Old High
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605 See Linderski 1992:4; De Jonge 2008:61 n.68.
606 Another Aborigine connection is the king and prophet Picus, son of Saturn and grandfather of Latinus, who was turned into a woodpecker by Circe after slighting her (Ov. Met. 320-440; Pliny HV 10.41). Festus 228L and Isid. Etym. XII.7.47 give this as the etymology of the bird-name.
608 Dench 1995:185; Paschalis 1997:249. The woodpecker is paired with Feronia once as Pīcus Feronicus (CIL IX.4873-4785). Bruno 1961:528 attempts to connect the Italian woodpecker deities with the Old Prussian god Pekols, but there is no concrete evidence for this. Pekols is associated with death and the underworld (hence Lithuanian piktas ‘devil’), and never to the woodpecker (Balys and Biezais 1973:429, 434). Fraenkel 1962:589 rather connects it to Lithuanian piktas ‘bad, evil’ or pēklà ‘hell’.
German *speht* and Swedish *spett* ‘woodpecker’ (with Germanic *s mobile*). As for the ethnic *Picentes*, the only reason to relate it to this root is the myth. This does not mean that there is no connection, but the likelihood that the ethnic was invented or changed because of the bird is no greater than that the woodpecker became the animal guide in the myth of the Sacred Springs because of an already existing ethnic. The etymologies of ethnics are always difficult, and in a case such as this, where a mythical narrative and an ethnic can form and strengthen one another, it is not possible to ascertain which is the egg and which is the woodpecker.

4.3 Ovid’s *Fasti*
See *curis* (§3.2.3).

4.4 *Antiquitates Romanae* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus
See *curis* (§3.2.3).

4.5 Pliny the Elder’s *Historia Naturalis*

4.5.1 *Regia*
The passage where Pliny’s only Sabine gloss appears discusses when to pick hard-skinned olives.

   differuntur uero etiam in Martium mensem callosae, contra umorem pugnaces ob idque minimae, Licinia, Cominia, Contia, Sergia, quam Sabini regiam uocant, non ante fauonii adflatum nigrescentis, hoc est a. d. VI id. Feb.

   But the gathering of the hard-skinned olives, which strongly resist damp and consequently are very small, is put off even till the month of March, the Licinian, Cominian, Contian and Sergian kinds, the last called by the Sabines the ‘royal olive’, not turning black before the west wind blows, that is before February 8.

   *Plin. HN* XV.3.13

This gloss has been given very little attention. It is not even listed in Bruno or Negri. In Conway, von Planta and Vetter, it only appears with the quote. Only von Planta has included it in any discussion, along with possible Sabellic cognates, e.g. Oscan *regaturei* and

---

609 EM s.v. *pica*; *IEW*:999; *EDLI*:464. Note the difference in vowel length between the Latin form and its cognates. This may be due to a difference in gradation.


611 Conway 1897:262; von Planta 1897:593; Vetter 1953:373.
Marrucinian *regena*, in order to illustrate the outcome of PIE *ǵ*.

In Latin, the term *regius* is used to describe a “remarkable production of nature or art”, used of pears (*HN XV.15*) or laurels (*HN XV.39*). Our knowledge of the Sergian olive comes primarily from Columella, a rough contemporary of Pliny’s. It deals well with the cold (Columella *RR* V.8.6), and gives an abundant harvest (Columella *RR* V.8.4). It shares its name with the Sergian tribe, which incorporated the Sabines of Cures as well as other groups (Cic. *Leg. agr.* II.66). Columella explicitly says that the Sabine territory is excellent for olive-trees such as the Sergia (Columella *RR* V.8.5). Thus it seems likely that the Sergian olive is so named as it is often grown in the homelands of that tribe.

What then of the specifically Sabine *regia*? Yet again, Columella gives an interesting insight. He lists ten kinds of olive-trees he knows of, among them *Sergia* and *regia*. What is one kind in Pliny is two kinds in Columella. The latter characterises the olives as *speciosissima* ‘very showy’ or ‘handsome’ (Columella *RR* V.8.4), not far off from the abundant Sergian olive tree. The two may easily have been confused with one another, or treated as one category instead of two.

*Regius* is a Latin word, used here in a narrow but well-attested context. While there may have been some regional preference for the term *regia oliua*, it cannot be proven, and the word does not tell us anything about ‘Sabine’, whether as a language or dialect.

### 4.6 Plutarch’s *Quaestiones Romanae*

#### 4.6.1 Σπόριον

*Σπόριον* occurs in a discussion of why Roman children with unknown fathers are called *spurii*. Plutarch argues in favour of another explanation, that the abbreviation of the praenomen Spurius is *Sp.*, which he interprets as an acronym of “σίνε πάτρε οἶον ἄνευ πατρός”, “*sine patre*, that is without a father” (*Quaest. Rom.* 288E). The other explanation is added despite Plutarch finding it ἀτοπώτερος ‘quite absurd’. It starts with a Sabine gloss:

τοὺς Σαβίνους φασὶ τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον ὄνομαζειν σπόριον

They say that the Sabines call a woman’s genitals *spurium*.

---


Because of this, Plutarch explains, children of unwed mothers were called *spuriī* in mockery.

This gloss is not included in Mommsen, von Planta or Conway, possibly because of its meaning. In *L&S*, *OLD* and Negri, as well as in Babbitt’s translation, it is rendered only as *pudenda*.\(^{615}\)

In his discussion of *spurius* ‘illegitimate child’, Isidorus mention *spurium*, which he ascribes to the *ueteres*:

muliebrem naturam ueteres spurium vocabant

The ancients called the woman’s natural parts *spurium*.  

Isid. *Etym*. IX.5.24  

*Spurium* is also used to denote a marine animal, although which type is unclear.\(^{616}\) Apuleius makes a joke about this in the only attestation of *spurium* meaning ‘vulva’.\(^{617}\)

posse dicitis ad res uenerias sumpta de mari spuria et fascina propter nominum similitudinem

You could say holias [*spuria*] and pricklebacks [*fascina*] taken from the sea can help with sex because of the similarity of their names\(^{618}\)

Apul. *Apol*. 35

This indicates that this was a genuine word, something that aligns the gloss more with Latin words such as *cascus* and *februm*, which are given Sabine origins. Perhaps Plutarch’s Sabine glossing is a way to soften the blow of the word.

The etymology reported by Plutarch and Isidorus, where *σπόριον*/*spurium* is the origin of the adjective *spurius*, is unlikely. Instead, *σπόριον* must be a substantivised form of the adjective. *Spurius* may well share a root with *sparcus* ‘dirty, unclean, impure’; both *spur-ko-* and *spur-io-* are likely formations.\(^{619}\) A connection, through cognacy or loan, between *spurius* and Greek *σπείρω* ‘sow, beget’ and *σπορά* ‘sowing of seed’ and therefore ‘offspring’, is difficult to

---


\(^{616}\) See *L&S* s.v. *spurium*; *OLD* s.v. *spurium*. Jones 2017:95 n.83 suggests that it is a kind of salmon.

\(^{617}\) As with many modern English words, there appears to be some vagueness in ancient words for women’s genitals, encompassing both the vagina and vulva (Braun and Kitzinger 2001:154-155; cf. Adams 1981:235 for parallel ancient examples).

\(^{618}\) Jones 2017:95.

\(^{619}\) WH s.v. *sparcus*; EM s.v. *sparius*.
explain. A Latin loan of σπορά would be rendered as *spora, which leaves the -u-unexplained. The semantics make a shared descent unlikely, as *spur- seen in Latin has meanings of social impurity, while the Greek words relate to sowing.

A popular suggestion is that the origin of spurius is Etruscan, backed up by the Etruscan name spurinas (e.g. ET Cr 1.101), Spurinna (CIL VI.26708, XI.1847). There are many other names in spur- attested, the above-mentioned praenomen Spurius (CIL VI.2476), Etruscan špuri (e.g. ET Pe 1.399), Spurinus, Spurilius, Spurianus, Spurennius, and in Oscan Spurieis (II Pompei 4/ST Po 36). Onomastics is often of limited usefulness when seeking to pin down a word’s origin, as the peoples of Italy to a large extent share an onomastic system (cf. §4.7.1). While the suffix -(n)na seems to be genuinely Etruscan, it has been used with Latin stems, e.g. sociennus ‘partner’ (Plaut. Aulularia 659), Dossennus, a hump-backed character from the Atellan farces (cf. dorsum ‘back’). Thus spur- is not guaranteed to be an Etruscan root. The similar-looking Etruscan genitive špural ‘city’ (e.g. ET Liber Linteus V.23) has been suggested as a parallel, but the semantics are unclear. It was previously thought to mean ‘foreigner’, meaning spurius could be rendered as ‘another’s child’. Considering that špural in fact means ‘city’, it is not a likely origin of spurcus ‘unclean’, spurius ‘illegitimate’ and spurium ‘vulva’.

Sexual vocabulary often works along different lines than other semantic fields due to societal taboos. It is not entirely clear where σπόριον/spurium falls on the scale of formality, which is going to impact the semantics. Adams suggests that, in addition to ‘vulva’, spurium meant ‘sex-worker’, in particular Etruscan women working in Rome, as eugium was used for Greek sex-workers as well as for ‘vulva’. Cross-linguistically, it is not uncommon for words to mean both ‘vulva’ and ‘woman’, particularly as sexual objects. Eugium is often connected to εὔγειος ‘fertile’, expressing joy and admiration, cf. English hoo-haa, chuff. Eugium in the meaning ‘sex-worker’

---

620 L&S s.v. spurius.
623 See Breyer 1993:386 on the incorrect translation of Etruscan špural. Alessio 1976:388 suggests spurium should mean ‘uterus’ rather than ‘vulva’, from Etruscan špural ‘city’ and influenced on Greek μητρόπολις. While the shift from inner to outer sexual organs is common (cf. Clackson 2004:88), the connection to ‘city’ is unlikely.
627 Braun and Kitzinger 2001:149 categorise these under “nonsense” words, but the connection to chuffed ‘pleased’ and the onomatopeia of cheering cannot be overlooked.
is likely a *pars pro toto*, like the derogatory modern English term *a piece of ass*.

However, there are no indications that σπόριον/spurium ever meant ‘sex-worker’. The inference made by Adams appears to come from the way that the mothers of extramarital children are usually maligned. This can be seen in Germanic words, e.g. German *Hurenkind* (often used as a translation of *spurius*), Swedish *horunge*. Although the implication that someone’s mother being promiscuous and/or for hire is a common form of abuse, it is on the extreme end of a spectrum on which extramarital sex is placed. The words for ‘illegitimate child’ above should be seen not only in relation to German *Hure* and Swedish *hora* ‘whore’, but also German *huren* ‘to fornicate’ and Swedish *hor* ‘extramarital sex’.

With no clear reason to see σπόριον/spurium as meaning ‘sex-worker’, we should instead explore the semantics of words for ‘vulva’. The adjective *spurius* ‘false, of illegitimate birth’ could take on a more general meaning of ‘impure’. Thus *spurium* may mean ‘the impure thing’, cf. English *naughty bits, naughty place*. Another possibility is that σπόριον/spurium is connected to one of the many personal names based on *spurius*, making it a term similar to English *fanny, percy*. The fact this word is a neuter would speak against this. However, the plural of *spurium* is identical to the feminine name *Sp[uria]* (CIL XII.4143). Several Latin words for ‘vulva’, e.g. *eugium, scortum*, are neuter, which may have led to a back-formation of *spurium*.

**4.7 Suetonius’ *De Vitis Caesarum***

**4.7.1 Nero**

*Nero* is one of a number of Sabine glosses of the same PIE root (see §§4.8.2, 5.6.3). Suetonius approaches it primarily as a name, and only by extension as a word, as part of the history of the Claudii. Pausing the family history, Suetonius digresses onto the topic of names.

> Inter cognomina [- - -] Neronis assumpsit, quo[d] significatur lingua Sabina fortis ac strenuus.

To their cognomina, they added *Nero*, which means ‘strong’ and ‘vigorous’ in the Sabine language.

> Suet. Tib. I

The term *lingua Sabina* leaves little room for doubt that Suetonius sees this as a non-Latin word.

*Nero* is also glossed by Aulus Gellius and Lydus, who may have had Suetonius as their source:

---

628 See Kajava 1995:76. The name *Sp[uria]* is clearly feminine, as it is paired with the name *Cassia*.
siue ‘Nerio’ siue ‘Nerienes’ est, Sabinum uerbum est, eoque significatur uirtus et fortitudo. Itaque ex Claudii, quos a Sabinis oriundos accepimus, qui erat egregia atque praestanti fortitudine ‘Nero’ appellatus est.

whether it be Nerio or Nerienes, it is a Sabine word that means valour and courage. Hence among the Claudii, who we are told sprang from the Sabines, whoever was of eminent and surpassing courage was called Nero.\textsuperscript{629}

Gell. \textit{NA} XIII.23.8

νέρωνας τοὺς ἀνδρείους οἱ Σαβῖνοι καλοῦσιν.

The Sabines call the manly nerones.

Lyd. \textit{Mens.} IV.60

Νέρων ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τῇ Σαβίνων φωνῇ

\textit{Nero} is the strong man in the Sabine language

Lyd. \textit{Mag.} I.26

\textit{Nero} is a reflex of the well-attested PIE root *\textit{H}_1\textit{ner}-, and cognate of Sanskrit \textit{nar} ‘man, hero’, Avestan \textit{nar} ‘man’, Greek \textit{ἀνήρ} ‘man’ and Armenian \textit{ayr} ‘man’.\textsuperscript{630} The root is attested in all three major Sabellic languages – Oscan \textit{niir} (e.g. \textit{II} Cumae 8/\textit{ST} Cm 14; \textit{II} Bantia 1/\textit{ST} Lu 1 29, 31), Umbrian \textit{ner} (\textit{II} Asisium 1/\textit{ST} Um 10; \textit{ST} Um 1 VIa 30-VIIa 48), South Picene \textit{nír} (\textit{II} Urbs Salvia 1/\textit{ST} Sp MC 1; \textit{II} Falerio 1/\textit{ST} Sp AP 3). The root is curiously absent in Latin, having been substituted by PIE *\textit{uiH}_1\textit{r}-\textsuperscript{631} Untermann suggests that the ousting of the *ner-reflex, like the reflex of *\textit{teuta} ‘people’, may be down to changes in pre-state structures of Rome.\textsuperscript{632} It is obvious that the Sabellic cognates had a political use, as in \textit{trium nerum} (\textit{II} Bantia 1/\textit{ST} Lu 1 29), parallel to Latin \textit{tresuiri}. Oscan \textit{niir} may also have been used as a title, as in \textit{II} Cumae 8/\textit{ST} Cm 14, where it appears after a personal name.\textsuperscript{633} Throughout our ancient sources, \textit{nero} is consistently glossed as Sabine. It is not, like some glosses, treated in modern scholarship as generally Sabellic, but retains the Sabine label.\textsuperscript{634}

\textsuperscript{629} Rolfe [1927] 1960:481, 483.

\textsuperscript{630} EM s.v. \textit{Nero}; WH s.v. \textit{neriosus}; \textit{IEW}:765; \textit{EDLI}:406-407.


\textsuperscript{632} Untermann 2000:497.

\textsuperscript{633} Untermann 2000:496. It is possible that South Picene \textit{nerf} (\textit{II} Interamnia Praetuttiorum 2/\textit{ST} Sp TE 6) is some type of office.

Ancient scholars present *nero* as an adjective, but its morphology is that of a noun.\textsuperscript{635} WH suggests that the *n*-stem may be down to influence from *homo*, *homones*, Oscan *humuns* (\textit{II} Capua 34/\textit{ST} Cp 37 9).\textsuperscript{636} However, vowel length speaks against this, as all vowels in *homones*, *humuns* are short (and hence subject to Latin weakening in *hominis*), whereas the second vowel in *Nerōnis* is long. This rather indicates that the influence is from cognomina in *-o, -onis*, e.g. *Naso*, *Nasōnis*, *Varro*, *Varrōnis*, as suggested by Leumann and Weiss.\textsuperscript{637} It is unlikely that a lexeme would be influenced in this way by onomastic material. This indicates that *nero* is in fact only a name.

A parallel to the name *Nero* may be found in Etruscan *neries* (\textit{ET} Cr 2.5). Rix reads the Oscan name *ner(eís)* (\textit{II} Capua 20/\textit{ST} Cp 25), but Crawford’s reading *ner(trak)* from a verb meaning ‘to leave’ is more likely in this case.\textsuperscript{638} Common nouns from this root are well-attested in Sabellic, and there may have been names derived from it that have not survived. The Roman name *Nero* could be borrowed from a Sabellic language which retains the *ner*-root, but it is not impossible that the otherwise obsolete *ner*-root survived in Latin onomastics.\textsuperscript{639} Even if scholars tend to look for one origin, it is possible in cases of onomastics that the same name arises simultaneously in two language areas, whether in isolation or through contact.

Despite the Sabine myth of the Claudian family and the many (probably related) claims of *nero* being a Sabine word, there is no evidence to back this up. The myth of the Claudian family’s Sabine heritage is as biased as the myth of the Sabine presence in early Rome, as it seeks to weave this family into the mythical mesh of Roman society, not unlike the Julian family tradition of their descent from Venus.\textsuperscript{640} The existence of the story of the Claudii as Sabine does not make Nero a Sabine word or name. Compelling evidence of the Sabine origin of this *gens* is lacking, and ethnicity and onomastics are not required to match up. Many ancient Italian names were used by many different cultures, and the ultimate origin of the name was not important, or even known, as in the case of Latin *Titus*, Umbrian *titis* (\textit{ST} Um 1 Ib 45), Oscan and Paelignian *titis* (\textit{II} Sulmo 20/\textit{ST} Pg 45, \textit{II} Pompei 124/ \textit{ST} tPo 13), South Picene *tetis*, usually read as *tites* (\textit{II} Interamnia Practuttiorum 4/\textit{ST} Sp TE 2).

\textsuperscript{635} See Buck 1928:63.

\textsuperscript{636} von Planta 1897:62; WH s.v. *neriosus*.


\textsuperscript{639} Etruscan can be ruled out due to the IE connection.

\textsuperscript{640} The family tradition of the Julii appears to go back to at least 130 BCE, when the moneyer Sex. Julius Caesar issued coins with Venus (see Weinstock 1971:17; Rives 1994:294).
and Etruscan *tite* (e.g. *ET* Ta 1.242). We cannot tell anything about ethnic origin based on names, any more than we can tell the linguistic origins of onomastics from the bearer’s ethnic origins, or legendary claims thereof.

### 4.8 Aulus Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae*

#### 4.8.1 Multa

Gellius’ passage on the word for ‘fine’ takes up an entire chapter in *NA*. Naturally, the etymology is central.

Vocabulum autem ipsum ‘multae’ idem M. Varro in uno uicesimo *Rerum Humanarum* non Latinum, sed Sabinum esse dicit, idque ad suam memoriam mansisse ait in lingua Samnitium, qui sunt a Sabinis orti. Sed turba grammaticorum *nouicia* κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν, ut quaedam alia, hoc quoque dici tradiderunt.

Furthermore, Marcus Varro, in the twenty-first book of his *Human Antiquities*, also says that the word for fine (*multa*) is itself not Latin, but Sabine, and he remarks that it endured even to within his own memory in the speech of the Samnites, who are sprung from the Sabines. But the upstart herd of grammarians have asserted that this word, like some others, is used on the principle of opposites.

The way *multa* is defined as *non Latinum, sed Sabinum* showcases the idea that all loan-words, however well-integrated they are, do not become Latin. In Varro’s three categories of words in Latin, there is no category of loans, but *aliena* ‘foreign’, alongside *nostra* ‘ours’ and *obliuia* ‘forgotten’ (*LL* V.10). The essence of *multa* remains Sabine. It is reminiscent of Pomponius Marcellus’ criticising Tiberius for using a loan-word: “tu enim, Caesar, ciuitatem dare potes hominibus, uerbo non potes”, ‘you may be able to grant citizenship to people, Caesar, but you cannot grant it to a word’ (Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* XXII).

In this passage, Varro is an authority not only because of his reputation as a scholar, but also as an eyewitness to Italy’s multilingual past. The *turba grammaticorum nouicia* who disagree with him are likely Gellius’ contemporaries, and considering the use of the negatively charged *turba* ‘mob’, a group Gellius feels disdain for. His opinion of them is also made clear through *nouicius*, used of recently imported or purchased slaves (e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 78), with connotations of fashionableness and inexperience (e.g. Quint. *Inst.* I.12.9). These new-fangled scholars are still novices who either do not know their elders or do not respect them.

---


642 These grammarians instead suggest an etymology of opposites, where a word is derived from what it is not; see O’Hara 1996:66.
The word *multa* appears in *LL*, but with an internal Latin etymology rather than a Sabine glossing.\(^{643}\)

Multa <e>a pecunia quae a magistratu dicta, ut exigi posset ob peccatum; quod singulae dicuntur, appellatae eae multae, <et> quod olim u<i>num dicebant multam: itaque cum <in> dolium aut culleum uinum addunt rustici, prima urna addita dicunt etiam nunc.

A *multa* ‘fine’ is that money named by a magistrate, that it might be exacted on account of a transgression; because the fines are named one at a time, they are called *multae* as though ‘many’, and because of old they called wine *multa*: thus when the countrymen put wine into a large jar or a wine-skin, they even now call it a *multa* after the first pitcherful has been put in.\(^{644}\)

Varro *LL* V.177

This etymology is not compatible with the Sabine gloss. The only times that words are given a further etymology (*lepesta* and *nerio*), it refers to Greek, and is not internal to Sabine (see §§2.2.6, 4.5.2). It is possible that Varro simply changed his mind. The passages in Paulus-Festus, where *multa* is glossed as Oscan only, show that Varro discussed *multa* as Oscan in *Epistolicae Quaestiones* as well as in *Rerum Humanarum* and *LL*.

Multam Osce dici putant poenam quidam. M. Varro ait poenam esse, sed pecuniariam, de qua subtiliter in lib. I. Quaestionum Epist. refert.

Certain people think that a punishment was called *multa* in Oscan. Marcus Varro says it is a punishment, but a monetary one, about which he writes plainly in the first book of *Epistolicae Quaestiones*.

Festus 126, 128L = *GRF* Varro F223

Multam Osce dici putant poenam. They suppose that a punishment was called *multa* in Oscan.

Paulus ex F. 127L

Some scholars have seen *multa* as only an Oscan gloss, but Gellius’ explicit statement that *multa* is a Sabine word means we have to see *multa* as both an Oscan and a Sabine gloss.\(^{645}\) This dual assignation does not detract from the validity of either claim.

The fragment in Gellius gives an interesting glimpse of Varro’s encounters with Oscan. The statement “idque ad suam memoriam mansisse ait in lingua Samnitium” may imply that Varro heard Oscan spoken, which is not impossible. He was a young man during the Social

---

\(^{643}\) Ernout 1909:201 erroneously claims that Varro gives the Samnite etymology in the *LL* passage.

\(^{644}\) Kent 1951a:165.

\(^{645}\) See Conway 1897:200, 356; EM s.v. *multa*; WH s.v. *multa*; IEW720.
War, when Oscan was still used, albeit alongside Latin. However, we do not know enough of Varro’s movements in his young years to know whether he might have travelled in Oscan-speaking areas. Another possibility is that Varro had seen it in writing, e.g. an Oscan legal inscription, or heard reports of it being used in Oscan.

Whatever Varro’s source, we can verify his claim. Along with *nero, multa* is the Sabine gloss with the most Sabellic cognates: Oscan *molto* (*II Bantia 1/ST Lu 1 11, 26*), Umbrian *mutu* (*ST Um 1 Vb 6*). There is also a possible South Picene attestation in the badly preserved inscription *II Superaequum 1/ST Sp AQ 1*, where *molk[·]a[ appears. While Crawford refrains from reconstructing the word, Rix reads *molk[t]a[h. The semantics are made plausible by Weiss’ reading of *II Asculum Picenum 3/ST Sp TE 1*, which includes a warning to anyone considering destroying the grave. In such a context, a word for ‘fine’ would not be out of place. The possible form *molk[t]a[h is reminiscent of the alternative Latin form *muleta*, found in a number of manuscript traditions. For a long time, this form was rejected as a corrupt form. A closer look at the etymology, taking the South Picene example into account, makes it necessary to nuance this statement. South Picene appears not to have undergone the simplification *-Rkt- > -Rt-* seen in other languages, e.g. Proto-Italic *forktis > Latin *fortis, Oscan *fortis* (*II Bantia 1/ST Lu 1 12*). Latin *muleta* has either been retained by some speakers (whether marginal Latin-speakers or speakers of another Italic language), or the velar has been reintroduced.

If we are to assume that latter-day South Picene-speakers retained the *-lkt- cluster, we may posit that as a source for the form *muleta*, but we do not know what type of contact occurred early on. Reintroduction remains the easiest solution. We would expect something similar to the supines of *mulgere* ‘milk, extract’, *mulsum* and *mulctum*. However, this is unlikely to be the source of the analogy, as the verb *mulgere* ‘milk’ is never used for extracting money, like in English. Two more likely possibilities are *mulcare* ‘discomfit, damage’ (as a fine does the perpetrator) or *mulcere* ‘appease, alleviate’ (as a fine appeases the requirement of the sentence

---

646 The Umbrian loss of /l/ in -lt- clusters is regular. See Buck 1928:69; Pinna 2003:95.
648 *TLL* s.v. *multa*. The variant *muleta* occurs in some manuscripts of Tac, *Germ. XII.2; Liv. XXX.30.24 and is thought to appear in Catull. LXIV.190 in the mother manuscript X.
649 e.g. *EM* s.v. *multa*; Sommer and Pfister 1977:189.
650 Untermann 2000:484.
or the victim of the crime).\textsuperscript{653}

The ultimate etymology of \textit{multa} is more uncertain.\textsuperscript{654} Ernout points out that while there is nothing in its phonetic make-up which indicates that \textit{multa} is a loan, it is just as likely to be a loan as \textit{poena}, an early loan from Greek.\textsuperscript{655} Like \textit{poena}, \textit{multa} is attested early, e.g. \textit{moltai} (\textit{CIL I}.2.366, dated to after 241 BCE).\textsuperscript{656} The possibility that this is a loan is still entertained. Both Oscan \textit{molto} and Umbrian \textit{mutu} appear in inscriptions written in a bilingual context. However, there is no consensus as to whether Oscan and Umbrian borrowed the word from Latin or vice versa.\textsuperscript{657} With all the cultural, legal and linguistic exchange between peoples of ancient Italy, it is difficult to pinpoint the direction of loan.

Linguists are fond of invoking biological analogies. This case of one word with more than one possible origin may be compared to a chimera, a creature which through the merging of zygotes has the genetic material of two or more individuals. Like the biological chimera, \textit{multa} cannot be identified as ultimately Latin or Sabellic. Through borrowing, reborrowing and bilingual contact, the question of the original language of \textit{multa} becomes unimportant. It belongs to and is derived from several languages at once.

4.8.2 Nerio, nerienes

Gellius discusses \textit{nerio} at length, starting with quoting an old prayer found in the books of the priests:

\begin{quote}
Luam Saturni, Salaciam Neptuni, Horam Quirini, Virites Quirini, Maiam Volcani, Heriem Iunonis, Moles Martis Nerienemque Martis
\end{quote}

\textit{NA XIII.23.2}

Gellius primarily sees this as an abstract representation of Mars’ power and strength (\textit{NA XIII.23.10}), but he cites a number of poets who see \textit{Nerio} as a goddess, the wife of Mars.

\textsuperscript{653} See \textit{WH} s.v. \textit{multa}, where these suggestions are rejected as they require a form \textit{mulcta}, which is in fact the case.

\textsuperscript{654} See Untermann 2000:484 on other suggested etymologies. \textit{EDLI}:394 discusses \textit{multa} under \textit{multus}, even if he concedes the connection is not certain; see also \textit{WH} s.v. \textit{multa}. Melior and \textit{μάλα} are taken as cognates to \textit{multus}.

\textsuperscript{655} Ernout 1909:201.

\textsuperscript{656} Pietrangeli 1937:30.

The nominative form of *Nerienem* is not clear, as some use *Nerio*, while others use *Nerienes* (*M* XIII.23.4). The declension echoes the hydronym *Anio, Anienem*, a peculiarity Gellius ascribes to the *ueteres*:


But *Nerio* was declined by our forefathers like *Anio*; for, as they said *Anienem* with the third syllable long, so they did *Nerienem*.  

\[M\] XIII.23.6-7

Gellius glosses the word as Sabine, and gives a further etymology:

Id autem, siue ‘Nerio’ siue ‘Nerienes’ est, Sabinum uerbum est, eoque significatur uirtus et fortitudo. Itaque ex Claudiiis, quos a Sabinis oriundos accepimus, qui erat egregia atque praestanti fortitudine, ‘Nero’ appellatus est. Sed id Sabini accepisse a Graecis uidentur, qui uincula et firmamenta membrorum νεῦρα dicunt, unde nos quoque Latine ‘neruos’ appellamus.

Furthermore, that word, whether it be *Nerio* or *Nerienes*, is Sabine and signifies valour and courage. Hence among the Claudii, who we are told sprang from the Sabines, whoever was of eminent and surpassing courage was called *Nero*. But the Sabines seem to have derived this word from the Greeks, who call the sinews and ligaments of the limbs νεῦρα, whence we also in Latin call them *nerui*.  

\[M\] XIII.23.7-9

Along with *lepesta*, this is the only Sabine gloss given an etymology beyond the Sabine label. Just as in the case of the vessel described by Varro (see §2.2.6), the further etymology is Greek. Gellius appears to see Latin *nerui* as derived from Greek νεῦρα, not from Sabine, making it a parallel to *nerio*.

Gellius blames Greek for what he sees as the mispronunciation of *nerio*. While the first vowel should be short, many Latin-speakers lengthen it, as “*Graeci modo dicunt Νηρεῖδες*” (*M* XIII.23.3). He illustrates this through scansion of early poets.

---

658 Here Aulus Gellius also cites *FRH* Gn. Gellius 14 F5, who uses *Neria*, which looks far more like a feminine than *Nerio*, is used.


660 *EDLI*:406 incorrectly assigns this gloss to Suetonius.


662 *M* XIII.23.19 includes another Greek etymology without a Sabine connection. This theory derives *Nerio* from ‘*Nerio*’, *hoc est sine ira*, as *ne* is a Greek privative.
Lucinius Imbrex, a early writer of comedies, in the play entitled Neaera, wrote as follows:

Neaera I’d not wish to have thee called;
Neriene rather, since thou art wife to Mars.

Moreover, the metre of this verse is such that the third syllable in that name must be made short, contrary to what was said above. [- - -] Ennius also, in this verse from the first books of his Annals,

Neriene of Mars and Here,

if, as is not always the case, he has preserved the metre, lengthened the first syllable and shortened the third.663

Gellius also quotes a passage of Plautus’ Truculentus:

Mars peregre adueniens salutat Nerienem uxorem suam.

Mars, coming home, greets his wife Nerio.664

To reiterate the argument in a manner easier for a modern reader to understand, Gellius argues that the correct pronunciation is Nērio, Nēriēnem. However, most people say Nērio. The poets Gellius quotes do not adhere to what he thinks is the right vowel-length, and instead write Nēriēnem. Thus Gellius appears to be the only person who uses what he claims is the correct pronunciation. For the evidence provided by Ioannes Lydus’ Νηρίνης and νερίνη, see §5.6.3.

It is clear that Nērio derives from PIE *H₂ner- (see §4.7.1) and is formed with a nominal

---

suffix *-iōn-. In Latin, this *ner-iōn- would be an abstract noun, cf. *duplio ‘doubling’ from *duplus ‘double’. This would fit with the tradition of Nerio as Mars’ numen. The alternative nominative Neriones must be a back-formation from the accusative Nerienem, possibly triggered by masculines in -iōn, e.g. centurio ‘centurion’, derived not form -iōn- but -on- added to an a-stem ending in -ia. The only other word with the same strange variation, the hydronym Anio, accusative Anienem, underwent a similar change. The modern name of this river is Aniene, obviously formed from the oblique case-stem. Some paradigmatic levelling can be seen already in antiquity. Priscian reports nominatives Anio and Anienis, as well as Anien, used by the antiqui (GL II.208.1-3).

Due to the similarity between Anio and Nerio, Anio has sometimes been identified as a ‘Sabine’ hydronym, an identification that also relies heavily on geography. The Anio has its source in the Apennines, close to the ancient Lacus Fucinus, in the area which today is the Monti Simbruini. It flows along Via Valeria, past Empulum and Tibur, before joining with the Tiber just north-east of Rome. Only Pliny (HN III.107) mentions Sabines living in this area – no other ancient writer identifies it as part of the Sabine territory. It is more often seen as part of Latium. The identification of a place-name as belonging to the (supposed) local language is uncertain in any area without defined, consistent borders. It would be just as likely that the hydronym is the language of the Aequi, through whose territory the Anio flows, or Marsian, the language spoken around its source. The reason behind arguing that Anio is a Sabine hydronym is simply to explain the strange oblique case stem found in nerio.

Ernout calls Anio and nerio the only Italic words which display ablaut. Even if these two words show a variation between /o/ and /e/, it cannot be seen as IE ablaut, which would not be productive this late. While the *-iōn- suffix is common in feminine abstracts, *-iēn- is
only attested in these two forms. The most likely explanation for this alternation of suffixes is that two words with different suffixes, *ner-iēn- and *ner-iōn-, merged into one irregular paradigm.\(^{672}\) It is far more plausible that *Nerio and *Anio underwent paradigmatic merging rather than being two isolated cases of an obscure paradigm with ablaut changes.\(^{673}\)

As for the meaning of *nerio, most scholars have concentrated solely on the suggestion that this is a goddess, which is undeniably easier to grasp than *nerio as a numen. Domaszewski has attempted to interpret the prayer which includes *Nerienemque Martis, arguing that the names in the accusative are personifications of characteristics associated to the gods in the genitive.\(^{674}\) Ultimately, only two were positively identified – *Nerio (‘the strong one’) and *Salacia (‘the salty one’).\(^{675}\) Other accusatives are obviously deities in their own right, such as Hora, who is paired with Quirinus, her husband. This poses the question whether the numen and goddess theories are in fact incompatible. If the numen is personified (and, in the ancient tradition of personifications of abstract things, thus female), it makes sense that the resulting new deity would be closely associated to the god whose numen it has stemmed from.

See also §5.6.3, on the gloss νερίνη.

4.8.3 Nero
See §4.7.1.

4.9 Favorinus
See terenus (§5.4.1).

4.10 Velius Longus’ Orthographia

4.10.1 Fasena
The Sabine gloss *fasena is part of a discussion of the inclusion or exclusion of <h>. Velius Longus rejects two internal etymologies for *harena – that sand sticks (*haereo) or that it swallows (*haurio) water (cf. Servius ad *Aen* I.172; *Beda GL VII.274). Instead he favours Varro’s claim:

---

\(^{672}\) Brugmann [1892] 2010:338-339, who sees the suffix as specifically Sabine, approaches this idea when suggesting that gen. *-iēn-is was influenced by Latin *-iōn-is. von Planta 1897:67 rejects this as it does not take Anio into account.

\(^{673}\) Hydronyms in Italy are often formed with the suffixed -on- and -ion- (Silvestri 2009:65).

\(^{674}\) von Domaszewski 1909:105.

\(^{675}\) Wissowa 1912:22 n.2.
We do not say *harena* for the reasons I lay out above so much as for the origin of the word, since it is called *fasena* by the Sabines, as Varro attests, and just as *s* turns into *r* as we know, so *f* turns into something close to aspiration.

GL VII.69.4-9

The etymology of *harena* is by general consensus unknown.\(^{676}\) The -*na* suffix has prompted suggestions of the word as an Etruscan loan, as in *lanterna* from Greek λαμπτήρ ‘grate’, but this cannot be more than a theory.\(^{677}\)

I have already discussed the issues of *f*/*h* variation (see §2.2.2) and intervocalic -*s* (see §3.2.2). The issues I will discuss here are therefore only those presented by Longus.

The Varronian passage where *fasena* is discussed has been lost, but *asena* appears in *LL* VII.27 in a discussion of rhotacism.\(^{678}\) The sentence following Longus’ glossing of *fasena* indicates that he has used *LL* too:

\[
\text{similiter ergo et haedos dicimus cum aspiratione, quoniam faedi dicebantur apud antiquos: item hircos, quoniam eosdem aeque fircos uocabant. nam et e contrario quam antiqui habam dicebant, nos fabam dicimus.}
\]

GL VII.69.9-12

Though Longus glosses these two words as used by the *antiqui* rather than the Sabines, the fact that *fircus* and *faedus* (here, unlike at *LL* V.97, with the diphthong retained) appear together indicates that *LL* is the source.\(^{679}\) These two words are found separately in Paulus ex F. 74L (*faedus*) and Scaurus (*GL* VII.13.8-9) (*fircus*), both times associated with the *antiqui*, but the appearance of the words as a pair must be traced back to *LL* V.97, especially considering the mention of Varro previously. At the end of *De Orthographia*, Longus revisits the question of *f*/*h*/.

---

\(^{676}\) EM s.v. *harena*; WH s.v. *harena*; Breyer 1993:259; *EDLI*:279.


\(^{678}\) Kent 1951a:295 n.27a; Uhlfelder 1963:30 n.16.

\(^{679}\) The inclusion of the diphthong in Longus may be down to variation in manuscripts, as in Paulus ex F. 74L.
antiquorum consuetudo respicienda est, quibus moris fuit pro hac aspiratione litteram dicere f. itaque harenam iustius quis dixerit, quoniam apud antiquos fasena erat, et hordeum, quia fordeum, et, sicut supra diximus, hircos, quoniam firci erant, et haedos, quoniam faedi.

the usage of the ancients should be considered. For them it was regular practice to say the letter f for this aspiration. Therefore whoever says harena does so more correctly, because among the ancients it was fasena, and fordeum, because it used to be fordeum, and as I said above, hirci, because it used to be firci, and haedi, because it used to be faedi.

GL VII.81.9-12

The argument is the same — harena is the correct form due to fasena — but the glossing of fasena has changed. In this passage, the word is assigned to the antiqui, just like faedus and fircus above. Is this a question of confusion, or are the Sabines and the antiqui close enough in Longus’ mind that this is not a contradiction?

To Conway, the occurrence of the f/h variation and the intervocalic -s- “may be allowed to substantiate” this gloss as Sabine. Therefore he lists fasena as “well-attested”. Stuart-Smith observes that “it is uncertain to what extent an f/h alternation really exists in Sabine”, as only one of the three words in question, fasena, “is not also ascribed to Latin”. Considering that neither fedus nor fircus is ever used in Latin, or associated with nos or Latini, she must be referring to these two words being assigned to the antiqui (Paulus ex F. 74L; GL VII.11.4, 69.10, 81.12). Stuart-Smith’s claim is incorrect, as fasena is also glossed as ‘old’, and we cannot assume that antiqui means Latin. Although there is obviously some continuity between the contemporary Latin-speakers and the antiqui, their actual identity is uncertain, as the term is used in a variety of different meanings, just like the term ‘Sabine’. As with the Oscan and Sabine glossings of multa, multiple glossings do not reduce the credibility of each individual glossing.

4.11 Reflections on the Sabine glosses of the Principate and High Empire

The appearance of Sabine glosses during the first two centuries CE can be correlated with the popularity of the discipline of antiquarianism. The glosses from this time are primarily from the reign of Augustus, when the antiquarian engagement starting in the late Republic was still ongoing, and later from the period of Trajan, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. The only example of a Sabine gloss between these two periods is the one gloss given by Pliny. Although we may have lost some attestations, the loss of material cannot explain this lack of glosses. It is due to

680 Conway 1897:354.
a disinterest in not only in Sabine glosses, but glosses in general.

Of the seven glosses reliably dated to the Empire, two – *fasena* and *multa* – are explicitly attributed to Varro.\(^{682}\) It is likely that other glosses appeared in earlier works, in particular *nero*, considering the connection between the Claudii and the Sabine territory. Furthermore, we know that Varro and Verrius Flaccus were important sources for Pliny, Longus and Gellius.\(^{683}\) By contrast, no surviving glosses in Paulus-Festus have a named source, and in Varro, only one word glossed as Sabine – the theonym Sancus – is given a source, Varro’s teacher Aelius Stilo (*LL* V.66).

Although both glosses with a named source go back to Varro, we cannot assume that Sabine glosses during the Empire are simply an exercise in reception. The mention of Stilo by Varro and the unnamed scholars in *DVS* who gloss *alpus* as Sabine (see §3.2.1) show that the tradition go back further than them. Like Imperial writers, Varro and Flaccus may also have had sources that they did not name.

It is also possible that some glosses were based on contemporary observation. However, the increasing linguistic integration of Italy changed the availability of strange-seeming words. As the non-Latin languages of Italy died out, and the direct memory of them disappeared, fewer unknown words from within Italy reached scholars to be discussed and glossed (whether correctly or incorrectly). Through this ever-growing distance to the multilingual Italy, Sabine glosses in imperial antiquarian literature are more likely to be repeated than added to.

\(^{682}\) Adams 1982:97 sees it as “certain” that Plutarch and Isidorus has the same source for *sparium*, and names Varro as the likeliest candidate. However, there is little reason to posit a common source as they ascribe it to different groups, and the word was used elsewhere. The only reason to single out Varro appears to be his reputation of ‘sabinomania’ (see §2.5).

\(^{683}\) Baldwin 1975:76-77; Cornell 1995:22; *DNP* s.v. *Velius* 3; Cavazza 2004:68; Gatzmeier 2011:108. See Beagon 1992:13 on Varro as Pliny’s predecessor. Strabo, a contemporary of Flaccus, seems not to use Varro, which may be because of his tendency to use sources in Greek (see Dueck 2000:92-94).
Chapter Five
Sabine Glosses in Late Antiquity

5.1 Antiquarianism and glosses in late antiquity
No works containing Sabine glosses between the mid-second and the fifth centuries survive. The world of late antiquity was not the same as the world of the writers of the High Empire in terms of politics, religion or language diversity, and the approach to Sabine glosses is therefore also different.

5.1.1 Authors, works and dating
Servius and Macrobius were contemporaries, as can be seen by the fact that Servius appears as an interlocutor in the *Saturnalia*. The dating of Macrobius has largely revolved around attempts of identifying him as one of three Macrobii that held office around the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries CE, but, as Cameron has shown, none of them is likely to be the author. He would have been referred to by one of his other names, Theodosius. It is now common to identify Macrobius with the praetorian prefect Theodosius in 430. Two of Macrobius’ works survive, *Saturnalia* and the commentary on the *Dream of Scipio*.

Servius is known primarily for his commentary on Vergil, written for the use of schools. He is usually dated through Macrobius, although one of this works, *De centum metris*, can be dated to 414 CE through its dedication to Albinus, prefect of Rome. Kaster states that one third of all Servius’ comments concern language, while only a seventh discuss

---

684 The dramatic date of *Sat.* is 382-384 CE; see Kaster 1988:171; Cameron 2011:243-245; Kaster 2011a:xxiv-xxv; Stok 2012:473.
686 Murgia 2003:61; Stok 2012:472. Cameron 2011:241, 576 suggests Servius was born around 360 CE, started to teach in 382 and was still writing in the 420s.
The commentaries survive in two versions, one consisting only of Servius’ commentary, the other consisting of both Servius and another commentary. The latter version is known as Danielis Scholia (DS), named after the first editor Pierre Daniel, or Servius auctus ‘extended’. The other component of DS is often identified as a commentary by Donatus, a grammarian and school-master active in the early fourth century. Both manuscript traditions are poor – Marshall describes editing Servius’ commentaries as an “unenviable” task. Four Sabine glosses appear in Servius, and one in DS.

The commentary on Horace associated with the name Pseudo-Acron is not a text in itself with a distinct manuscript tradition. Instead, it has survived in the margins of manuscripts of Horace, most notably the Codex Parisinus Latinus 7900. The name Acron was not connected to the commentary until the fifteenth century, and is widely rejected, hence the use of the term Pseudo-Acron. Due to the nature of the commentary, dating is difficult. It is likely that the text is a composite with no single author. Certain parts of the commentary may go back to the second century CE. Graffunder, who sees Pseudo-Acron as one man, sets 176 CE as a terminus ante quem, due to the details of a discussion of the water-supply to the town Canusium (Pseudo-Acron ad Hor. Sat. I.5.91). However, this does not date the rest of the commentary. The compilation in its current form is usually dated to the fifth century, making it more or less contemporary with Servius and Macrobius. For simplicity’s sake, the commentary is still referred to as Pseudo-Acron.

Ioannes Lydus was born in Philadelphia in Lydia in 490 (Mens. IV.2, Ost. 105, Mag. III. 26, 50, 29). He was a civil servant in Constantinople until language skills earned him a post at the Imperial School, where he also translated Latin texts for the emperor. He died at some

---

687 Kaster 1988:170. It is unclear whether Kaster counts the comments with Sabine glosses as mythological or linguistic. These comments tend to veer more towards antiquarianism than language teaching.


691 Graffunder 1905:142; Noske 1969:5. The suggestion rests on the fact that Helenius Acron was an opponent of the Latin dual, and argued in favour of word-forms such as duos and ambos, which are found at e.g. Pseudo-Acron ad Hor. Sat. II. 3.180; see Graffunder 1905:140.

692 Rudd 1960:139.

point after retiring in 552. Lydus authored several works, most of which are now lost to us. The three that survive – *De Mensibus*, *De Ostentis* and *De Magistratibus* – are all in a poor state.

5.1.2 Sentimental antiquarianism in late antiquity

In the minds of the people whose writings will be discussed in this chapter, there is a clear continuity between them and Imperial Roman culture. Just like the Imperial writers, the authors of the late Empire saw earlier writers as great authorities. Earlier scholarship was not easily accessible; many works had no doubt already been lost. Others were still in existence, but of limited availability. It appears that most fourth-century writers did not read Varro in the original, but instead learned of his ideas through second-hand accounts, something which makes Augustine’s close reading of *Res Divinae* unusual. Servius and Macrobius appear to have relied on the same source which reproduced Varro’s opinions, as they will often cite the same statements. Sometimes, these rewritings garbled the original text. For instance, Macrobius claims that Varro cites Verrius Flaccus (Macrob. *Sat.* I.15.21). While this is not outside the realm of possibility – their lifetimes did overlap – it is far more likely that it was Flaccus who cited Varro. The passage of time ‘flattens’ history, making the understanding of these centuries-old writers vague.

Despite the temporal distance, the literature of the early Empire is central to the work of both Servius and Macrobius. Servius’ commentary on the poems of Vergil is almost reverential, particularly compared to some of the testimonia of earlier commentaries on the *Aeneid*. Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* reads like a cross between Cicero’s *Re Publica* and Aulus Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae*, seeking to gather as much information on a variety of topics within the context of a Ciceronian dialogue. The *Saturnalia* also treats the *Aeneid* as a ‘sacred poem’ of

---

694 On Lydus’ life, see Maas 2013:xviii; Bandy et al. 2013a:2, 4-5; 17-19; Cornell et al. 2013a:88-89.
696 Servius mentions Varro 87 times, *Danielis Scholia* (*DS*) 101 times, Macrobius 80 times; see Holford-Strevens 2015:151. *DS* tends to refer to Republican authors where Servius uses Imperial writers (see Stok 2012:470; Kaster 1978:208). Cameron 2011:572 suggests this is due to Servius’ relative disinterest in antiquarianism.
697 Frend 1968:318; Cameron 2011:615; Holford-Strevens 2015:155. Cameron 2011:622 observes that “if Augustine managed to get hold of one [copy of the *Antiquitates*] in remote Hippo Regius, Macrobius too could surely have done so if he had really looked, whether in Rome itself or in one of the libraries kept in the suburban villas of the old aristocracy”.
698 Some of the Varronian testimonia are from Gellius, while others are from an unidentified source. See Cameron 2011:583-584, 617-620.
701 On Macrobius’ use of dialogue conventions, see Cameron 2011:243.
immense importance (e.g. Macrobr. Sat. I.24.13).\textsuperscript{702} This interest in Vergil can also be seen in Augustine, who criticises, not contemporary pagan ideas, but the customs presented some four centuries earlier.\textsuperscript{703} The standing of Augustan literature is also the reason for Pseudo-Acron’s commentary on Horace.

Servius and Macrobius’ interest in the Republican and early Imperial past has been called “sentimental antiquarianism”.\textsuperscript{704} This is often connected to the idea of a “pagan resistance”, where intellectual pagans push back against the spread of Christianity by promoting and revering the pagan past. The religious beliefs of both Servius and Macrobius are unclear. Servius is often described as non-Christian, while there is no clear consensus on Macrobius.\textsuperscript{705}

A debate similar to that of Macrobius’ religion exists over the beliefs of Ioannes Lydus. During the reign of Justinian (527-565 CE), strong anti-pagan laws were enacted, which has led most modern scholars to assume that Lydus must have been Christian.\textsuperscript{706} However, based on his apparent associations with people targeted by the anti-pagan laws and his love of Roman antiquarianism, Kaldellis argues that Lydus was in fact pagan.\textsuperscript{707} Others who think Lydus was Christian have nevertheless called him “crypto-Pagan”.\textsuperscript{708}

The question of whether or not these writers of the fifth and sixth centuries CE were Christian or pagan has dominated the scholarship on their work. It is clear that religion can matter. The fragments of Varro saved for posterity in CD would most likely have been framed differently, had Augustine not been writing an anti-pagan polemic. However, personal religious belief is only interesting in so far as it changes perspectives. We often think of religious faith in this period as a zero-sum game, when in fact the situation was far more complex than a simple pagan-Christian binary. While Christianity in theory excludes other beliefs, there are both ancient and modern examples where it coexists with polytheistic beliefs. The fact that Graeco-Roman paganism is not a distinct collection of beliefs, but one that

\textsuperscript{702} See Kaster 1988:16.
\textsuperscript{703} Cameron 2011:792.
\textsuperscript{704} Hedrick 2000:47; Kaster 2011a:xviii. This term has been used in more modern contexts, see Altick 1978:166; Brinckerhoff Jackson 1980:117.
\textsuperscript{705} To the best of my knowledge, it has never been suggested that Servius was Christian. On Servius not being Christian: Stock 2012:472. On the theory that Macrobius was Christian: Cameron 2011:265; Kaster 2011a:xxiii. Some of the arguments presented in favour of this theory are ambiguous, and none of them are decisive. I have excluded Pseudo-Acron from this discussion as the commentary is likely a composite text with more than one author.
\textsuperscript{706} Bandy et al. 2013b:3; Maas 2013:xxi.
\textsuperscript{707} Kaldellis 2003:306.
\textsuperscript{708} See Maas 1992:5.
frequently borrows and incorporates new gods and practices, makes it possible for it to survive in symbiosis with other religions. Neither is monotheism exclusively Christian, as pagan monotheism was much in evidence in late antiquity (cf. Macrobr. Sat. I.17-23).\footnote{Kaster 2011a:xix; Liebeschuetz 1999:201.}

The issue of personal convictions is difficult to discuss and ultimately not particularly useful. Servius and Macrobius were active during a period when both paganism and Christianity had influence. It appears that many of the pagan ideas they both discuss are historical rather than contemporary. When Macrobius brings up the *Penates* (Sat. III.4), the context is clearly the early Empire.\footnote{Cameron 2011:619.} What he and Servius engage in is rightly called sentimental antiquarianism, but the pagan resistance it has often been connected to is not in evidence. The discussion of pagan rites and ideas does not in itself constitute resistance.\footnote{Cameron 2011:572; Stok 2012:473.}

By Lydus’ lifetime, Christianity is far more dominant than in the previous century. In his writing, he occasionally struggles with understanding Roman religious beliefs (see §5.6). However, his work can still be described as sentimental antiquarianism. Whether there is some political, ideological or religious message in his writing is difficult to say. Any decision or statement in writing can be construed as such, and it is difficult to distinguish between genuinely charged comments and ones where we ourselves impose subtext. For instance, Kaldellis has asked why, if he was Christian, Lydus does not use the Old Testament as a source for early human history. The answer lies in the fact that Lydus writes in a genre hailing back to Varro and his contemporaries. Whatever his beliefs, Lydus was clearly a Romanophile, and as an admirer of antiquarianism he would attempt to stay true to his genre.

It is undeniable that the world of late antiquity is far removed from the world of the Roman Republic and Empire, and the antiquarians struggled far more with both obtaining and understanding sources of pre-Roman Italy than before. However, this does not make them unusable. It simply requires us to read them more carefully, with the secondary nature of some of their information in mind.

### 5.2 Servius’ commentary on Vergil’s *Aeneid*

The only complete edition is by Thilo and Hagen, a project with many shortcomings.\footnote{Fraenkel 1948; Marshall 1983:385.} The so-called Harvard edition sets out to address some of these problems, particularly by giving Servius and *DS* in separate columns where they differ. However, this edition has only reached
Aeneid V. Due to this, I will use the Harvard edition (Rand et al. 1946, Stocker and Hartmann Travis 1965) in §5.2.1, and Thilo and Hagen 1878-1902 elsewhere.

5.2.1 Dirus

In Aeneas’ encounter with the Harpies, the adjective dirus ‘ill-fated’ plays a central role, appearing five times in 67 lines (Aen. III.211, 228, 235, 256, 262). Most of Servius’ Sabine glosses are picked from the second half of the Aeneid, which deals with Italian mythohistory, but this passage is part of the Odyssean wanderings of the first half. Neither the Sabines nor the Umbrians play any role in this passage, so Servius’ glossing is not inspired by the passage in question.

sociis tunc arma capessant
edico, et dira bellum cum gente gerendum.

Then I bid my comrades seize arms and declare war on the fell race.\(^{713}\)  

Aen. III.234-235

Servius comments:

Sabini et Umbri quae nos mala, dira appellant.

The Sabines and Umbrians call what we call ‘bad things’ dira.  

Serv. ad. Aen. III.235

While there are passages, such as Varro’s idus, where an alternative etymology is provided alongside a Sabine one, this is the only time that a gloss is clearly assigned to both Sabine and another language in the same passage. Although Umbria is close to the Sabine territory, the Umbrians and the Sabines are seldom mentioned together in ancient sources.\(^{714}\) Instead, the Sabines are usually associated with Oscan-speaking peoples in Central and Southern Italy. In addition to this, Umbrian is uncommon in Roman scholarship; there are only five glosses ascribed to Umbrian, of which two – dirus and porculeta (Pliny HN XVII.22) – are ascribed to another language in the same passage (see Appendix II).

Latin dirus primarily refers to bad omens, but a broader use also exists. The earliest attestations are found in Cicero (Leg. II.21; Div. I.29; Att. X.8.7) and fragments of early tragedy (e.g. Non. 485L = TRF Accius F80 and a translation of Aeschylus’ Prometheus in Cic. Tusc. II.

\(^{713}\) Fairclough and Goold 1999:389.

\(^{714}\) The only clear connection with the Umbrians is a theory from Zenodotus of Troezen, related by Dionysius, that the Sabines were a branch of the Umbrians (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.49.1 = FHG 531 F1).
There is a tendency to assume that when a word is glossed as e.g. Sabine, it is a reference to the form, rather than the meaning, but we cannot rule out that Servius’ observation is a semantic one. *Malus* is a much more generic word with no explicitly religious or divinatory aspect, encompassing meanings from ‘unpleasant, nasty’ to ‘distressing, painful’.

It is possible that Servius means that while Latin-speakers use *dirus* to mean ‘dreadful omens’, Umbrians and Sabines use it for ‘bad things’.

Despite this possibility, the generally quoted etymology has put the spotlight on the formal phonetic differences of the word. Many see *dirus* as cognate with Greek δείδω ‘fear’, Sanskrit dves- ‘hate’ and possibly Armenian erkñɛim ‘I am afraid’. The Corinthian name Δείδων (SEG XI.244.7) and the Armenian outcome erkñ- indicates an initial *dʊ-, making the reconstructed root *dʊeɨ-. Therefore we would expect, not the attested *dirus*, but *birus*, cf. Latin *bis* < *dʊis*, *bellum* < *duellum*. A few glosses with *d*- for expected *b*- are attested, but no standard Latin examples of a *d*- outcome exist. However, *d*- is the regular Sabellic outcome of *dʊ-*, e.g. Umbrian *dífiu* (ST Um 1 Vlb 4), Oscan *diasiis* (II Pompei 27/ST Po 19), cf. Latin *bi*-, *bis* ‘two, twice’. This suggestion that *dirus* is a loan is presented as vindication of Servius’ claim.

de Vaan observes that the Umbrian glossing opens the door to a reconstruction *dʊeis-o-*, where the intervocalic /s/ would undergo rhotacism. *Dʊeis-o- > dirus* would not tally with the unrhotacised Sabine glosses *ausum* and *fasena* (see §3.2.2), but would align with *creper* <...
*krepes- (see §2.2.8). However, the adjective may be formed with a *-ro- suffix (cf. carus < *keH2-ro-s ‘beloved’).

There is no denying the fact that there are Sabellic loan-words in Latin. Some examples are easy to identify without comparative evidence, such as *bufo, which cannot be Latin as medial /f/ does not occur in inherited forms. However, *d- is a Sabellic feature only if it is a reflex of *du-. In other cases, *d- can be a Latin outcome. The cognates given above make sense, but the willingness to derive dirus from a stem beginning *du- relies at least implicitly on Servius’ glossing. If we put aside Servius’ suggestion, another, equally promising, lead presents itself: PIE *deiH1-, and cognate to Skt. diyati ‘flees’, Greek δίομαι ‘put to flight’. Formally, *diH1-ro-s > Latin dirus works perfectly. The semantics are also in line. A parallel can be seen in Greek φέβομαι, which is used to mean ‘flee’ (the meaning seen in many IE cognates) in Homeric Greek, but later takes on the meaning ‘frighten’ or ‘be frightened’.

Neither *du- nor *deiH1- has any other Latin reflexes, and neither has given rise to any *-ro- adjectives in other surviving IE languages. Thus both suggestions are root etymologies, and cannot be seen as definite. However, we must question the consensus that dirus is a Sabellic loan, as another IE root with similar semantic meaning gives the same form through internal Latin changes.

5.2.2 Herna

Servius comments on the mention of the Hernica saxa, “Hernician stones” (Verg. Aen. VII.684) in the so-called catalogue of Italic troops:

Sabinorum lingua saxa hernae uocantur. quidam dux magnus Sabinos de suis locis elicuit et habitare secum fecit in saxosis montibus: unde dicta sunt Hernica loca et populi Hernici.

Rocks are called hernae in the language of the Sabines. A great chief led some Sabines from their land and made them live with him in the rocky mountains. This is why it is called the Hernician place and the Hernician people.

Serv. ad Aen. VII.684

Herna also appears in a ninth century glossary, where the lemmata of two adjacent entries have been accidentally swapped:

harenæ saxa sabinorum lingua
harenæ lacus uel pauimentum theatri

724 IEW:187.

Harenae rocks in the language of the Sabines
Hernae a reservoir or floor at the theatre

CGL V.364.43-44

Hernae is glossed as Marsian in DVS and in a commentary on the Aeneid held in Verona, preserved in a fifth century manuscript.

Hernici dicti a saxis, quae Marsi herna dicunt.

The Hernici are named after stones, which the Marsi call herna.

Paulus ex F. 89L

Audiendum est, quod sic etiam Marsi lingua sua | [saxa h]ernas vocant, [unde loca] Hernica [et populi Hernici sunt.

You should understand that since also the Marsi call rocks hernae in their language, the place is called Hernica and the people are Hernici.

Schol. Veron. ad Aen. VII.684

Baschera has observed that there are some similarities in wording between the Verona glossing and the Servius glossing, which raises the possibility that Servius used this commentary.726

This gloss occurs in two forms, herna (Paul) and hernae (Servius, CGL and the Veronese scholia). The latter form is likely a reanalysis of a neuter plural herna as a feminine singular, leading to a new plural hernae. As herna is attested only four times and thus unlikely to be well-established, it would be more susceptible to such reanalysis.

Some have been hesitant to see herna as completely Sabine, as with dirus (§5.2.1). EM only calls it “mot marse”, and Bruno suggests herna is from Marsian or Oscan, not Sabine.727 Negri includes herna in his section on Sabine vocabulary, but includes the Marsian glossings as if it makes the Sabine assignation uncertain.728

When it comes to etymology, one possible cognate is mentioned throughout, Avestan zarštwa- ‘stone’.729 While it means the same thing, and both words could be reflexes of the root *gʰers-, they have different suffixes. While herna is formed with a *-no- suffix, common in Latin, Avestan zarštwa- is not, so the connection remains uncertain. In Latin, outcomes of the root *gʰers-, e.g. Latin hirsutus ‘shaggy’, horreo ‘bristle’, refer only to organic things such as animals, but if Avestan zarštwa is derived from the same root, this is not the original semantic range. The Sabine glosses fircus and hirpus are often proposed as derived from this same root,

727 EM s.v. herna; Bruno 1961:530.
but this argument does not stand up to scrutiny (see §§2.2.2, 5.2.3). This makes Bruno’s concern for the different outcome of the vowel in *herna* unnecessary.\(^{730}\)

We cannot say much about the origin of *herna*. The only diagnostic present is the initial *h-*, a feature it shares with the Sabine gloss *hirpus*. By contrast, other Sabine glosses (*fircus, fedus* and *fasena*) have *f-* which must be the result of *h-* > *f-* (see §2.2.2). This indicates that *herna* is not from the same language or dialect as these three *f-* forms, and that it is likely not Faliscan. The gloss gives us no further clues to whether it is Sabellic or Latin in origin.

In the discussions of *herna*, three ethnic groups feature: the Hernici, the Sabines and the Marsians. The CGL passage includes only the Sabines, but it is likely that this gloss is derived from a passage mentioning the Hernici. Servius explicitly names the Sabines as the first Hernici. Although neither Paul nor the Veronese commentator elaborates on the relationship between the Marsi and the Hernici, the natural assumption would be that they are suggesting that the latter are descended from the former. Interestingly, *herna* is never glossed as Hernician. This may be due to the fact that this is an origin myth, in which the Hernici do not yet exist.

The Hernici lived in Latium, south-east of Rome (Strabo V.3.4). They are thought to have been among Rome’s early conquests.\(^{731}\) Little is known of their language. There is one gloss (*samentum* ‘pellicula de hostia’ Fronto *Epist.* IV.4), and Crawford includes fourteen inscriptions under “Hernici”, but only two are longer than a few letters (*II* Hernici 13/*ST* He 13; *II* Hernici 14/*ST* He 3). Considering this dearth of evidence, there is an uncertainty around their language similar to that surrounding Sabine.

The neighbouring Marsi are more closely associated with the Oscan-speaking south.\(^{732}\) Four clearly Sabellic inscriptions have been identified as Marsian by Rix (*II* Marruvium 2/*ST* VM 4; *II* Marruvium 1/*ST* VM 4; *II* Supinum 1/*ST* VM 6; *II* Marsi 1/*ST* VM 7), but the Marsi are often paired with ‘minor’ tribes such as the Sabines, Volsci and Aequiculi.\(^{733}\) Most of the Social War coinage found in Marsian territory has monolingual Latin legends.\(^{734}\) This has been taken to indicate that by this time, the Marsi were Latin-speaking monolinguals, but

\(^{730}\) Bruno 1961:530.

\(^{731}\) See Beloch 1964:268; Oakley 1993:10; Cornell et al. 2013c:554; *OCD* s.v. *Hernici*.

\(^{732}\) The Marsi were allies of Rome during the Second Samnite War (Liv. VIII.29; Diod. Sic. XX.44, 101) and the Second Punic War (Liv. XXVIII.45), but stood against Rome in the Social War (Vell. Pat. 2. 21)

\(^{733}\) e.g. Mommsen 1850:344; Buck 1928:3; Rix 2002:66.

it may equally mean that their language was distinct from Oscan, making the Oscan legend of
the coins unintelligible to them.

No extant ancient source other than Servius addresses the origin of the Hernici. Stories of Sabines as the ancestors of other Italic groups are by no means uncommon, and the
gloss *herna* is, like πίκος and *hirpus* (see §§4.2.1, 5.2.3), the supposed origin of an ethnic.735

However, this story has none of the hallmarks of a Sacred Springs narrative (see §1.2.3).736

Nevertheless, the Sabines take the role of a seminal people in this myth. It is thus not strange
that Conway interprets Servius’ comments as saying that the Hernici are “a Sabine tribe”.737

However, the Marsi are only separated from the Hernici by the mountains that gave the latter
their name. The Veronese scholia appears to see them as closely related:


Colonists of the Marsians inhabit Anagnia. Therefore the ‘Hernican’ country is almost
the Marsian.

*Schol. Veron. ad Aen. VII.684*

When faced with two conflicting stories of this kind, it is a common instinct to want to pick
one. Mommsen suggests that the Servian passage is corrupt, and that what is a reference to
the Sabines should actually be one to the Marsians, but we cannot decide which glossing is
correct by majority rule.738 When we evaluate the evidence, it becomes apparent that the two
earlier glossings are both Marsian, whereas the late antique suggestion is Sabine. This
diachronic change in assignation can be seen in Servius’ discussion of *hirpus* (§5.2.3).

### 5.2.3 Hirpus

*Hirpus* appears in a comment on Apollo’s role as sancti custos Soractis, “the guardian of holy
Soracte” (Verg. *Aen*. XI.785-788), which relates the origin of the priests called the Hirpi
Sorani.

> Soractis mons est Hirpinorum in Flaminia conlocatus. in hoc autem monte cum
> aliquando Diti patri sacrum persolueretur – nam diis manibus consecratus est – subito
> uenientes lupi exta de igni rapuerunt. quos cum diu […] sequerentur, delati sunt ad
> quandam speluncam, halitum ex se pestiferum emittentem, adeo ut iuxta stantes

---

735 O’Hara 1996:91 speaks of the adjective *Hernicus* as a Sabine word, something which is not implied
by either Vergil or Servius.

736 Strabo, who provides most of the Sacred Springs narratives, does not say anything about the origin
of the Hernici, and only mentions them in passing when discussing Latium (Strabo V.3.4).

737 Conway 1897:355.

738 Mommsen 1850:348 n.6.
necaret: et exinde est orta pestilentia, quia fuerant lupos secuti. de qua responsum est, posse eam sedari, si lupos imitantur, id est rapto uiuerent. quod postquam factum est, dicti sunt ipsi populi Hirpi Sorani: nam lupi Sabinorum lingua uocantur hirpi.739

Mount Soracte is situated in Flaminia in the territory of the Hirpini. Once when a sacrifice was offered up in honour of Dis Pater – for it is sacred to the spirits of the underworld – some wolves suddenly came walking and snatched the innards out of the fire. When they had followed them for a long time, they were led into a cave which emitted noxious vapour, to such a degree that it killed those standing beside it, and from it rose plague, because they had followed the wolves. When they asked about the plague, the response was that it could be stopped if they lived like wolves, that is, by making their living through robbery. After they had done this, these people were called Hirpi Sorani, because wolves are called hirpi in the language of the Sabines.

Serv. ad Aen. XI.785

This story is not found elsewhere, but hirpus appears as a gloss already in Augustan times. Then it was glossed, not as Sabine, but as Samnite, in relation to the wolf that guided the Hirpini to their new home.740

Irpini appellati nomine lupi, quem irpum dicunt Samnites

The Hirpini are named after the word for the wolf, which the Samnites call irpus.

Paulus ex F. 93L

ἱρπον γὰρ καλοῦσιν οἱ Σαυνῖται τὸν λύκον

For the Samnites call the wolf hirpos.

Strabo V.4.12

The Hirpini were a Samnite tribe in the southern reaches of the Apennines. The Hirpi Sorani were a priesthood based by Mount Soracte (Strabo V.29; Plin. HN VII.2.19). They are often connected to wolves in modern scholarship, but there are no clear ancient indications of this.741 The topic of Servius’ story is unclear, as it does not seem to discuss a priesthood or a people, but rather a band of outcasts.

In the above passage, Servius confuses two distinct groups. Servius obviously knows where Mount Soracte was located, as he mentions Flaminia, but appears to think this is where the Hirpini live. The immediate area around Soracte was inhabited by Faliscans, while the Hirpini lived over 200 kilometres further south.742 The similarity of the names may have

739 Italics indicate words only found in DS ad Aen. XI.785.
740 Salmon 1989:235 argues that this wolf is the same as Romulus’, but see Dench 1995:210 n.137 for criticism.
741 e.g. Mauss 2000:338; Rissanen 2012:118.
confused him, but it is clear that in general his understanding of non-Roman tribes of Italy is sketchy at best. In his comment on Aen. XI.787, Servius even calls the priests of Soracte Hirpini.

When encountering a gloss that is not widely attested outside the context of glosses, it is worth asking whether we have conclusive evidence that this is in fact a real word. Hirpus does not appear in any Latin or Sabellic texts. However, its authenticity can be validated by (h)irpex ‘hoe’:

Irpis genus rastrorum ferreorum, quod plures habet dentes ad extirpandas herbas in agris.

Irpis are a type of iron hoe which has several teeth for pulling out weeds in farmland. Paulus ex F. 93L

While it may have been lost in the epitomising, no etymology is suggested, despite hirpus being mentioned in the entry directly following irpex. This may mean that irpex was no longer semantically transparent, due to temporal and geographical distance. However, hirpus ‘wolf’ makes the meaning obvious, as it refers to the ‘teeth’ of the hoe, like a wolf’s teeth, cf. lupatum frenum ‘jagged bit’ (Hor. Carm. I.7.7). There are also two proper nouns apparently derived from hirpus, Faliscan írpios (LDAF Cap 389) and Latin Hirpius.

Hirpus is a cognate of hircus and fircus < Proto-Italic *hirkʷ-os (see §2.2.2), but de Vaan rejects this connection on semantic grounds: “‘wolf’ and ‘goat’ are no good friends”. The formal similarities of hircus and hirpus cannot be the only thing we take into account when making this reconstruction, but the semantics are not as detrimental as de Vaan make them out to be. A shift from ‘goat’ to ‘wolf’ is not unlikely. Taboo replacement is common in communities whose livelihood is threatened by predators. Examples of replacements of inherited words for ‘wolf’ can be found in languages ranging from South Caucasian

743 Pocchetti, Poli and Santini 2001:131 nevertheless lists it as such, alongside irpex, which is not a word for an animal, as they claim.

744 Schulze [1904] 1991:234. Bakum 2009:208, 265 suggests that this gentilicium is connected to the Hirpi Sorani, which in light of the close proximity to Mount Soracte is possible. Plin. HN VII.2.19 states: “familiae sunt perpaucæ quæ uocantur Hirpi”, “There are few families [- - -] named the Hirpi”, but this may not be a reference to a family name but the name of the priesthood, as it goes on to describe the sacrifices to Apollo at Mount Soracte.

745 EDLI:286.

746 On different types of taboo, see Alinei 1997:12n.2; Emeneau 1948:57, 60, 62-63; Smal-Stocki 1950:490. On the Luperci as a remnant of a Roman wolf taboo, see Nilsson 1956:133; Ogilvie 1965:51. The metathesis of the Indo-European root *u̯lkʷ- in Greek λύκος and Latin lupus (with Sabellic reflex of the labiovelar) has been explained by taboo, cf. Ukrainian vedmïd’ vs. Russian medved’. bear’ (Smal-Stocki 1950:490; EDLI:353).
languages, where the word has been widely replaced by IE loans, to Scandinavian languages, where \( \text{ulv} < \text{PIE} * \text{kʷ}-\text{os} \) has largely been displaced by \( \text{varg} \) ‘outcast, thief, killer’ < \text{PIE} *\text{gergʰ}–’, ‘strangle’ (cf. English worry ‘attack, maim’, often used of wolves).\(^747\) It is common to use names of less dangerous animals as replacement words, where the perceived magic power of the friendly animal’s name will change the nature of the predator, e.g. Ukrainian \text{pesyk} ‘doggie’ for the wolf and Old Irish \text{mathgamain} ‘good calf’, ‘deer’ for the bear.\(^748\) Such taboo replacement would account well for the semantics of \text{hirpus}. It is a case of a wolf in goat’s clothing.

The issues of \text{hirpus} and \text{fircus} are instead formal. Firstly, it is uncommon to find two words in one language derived from the same protoform without some split (as with \text{deus} and \text{diuus}, both from \text{*deu}-\text{os}). Secondly, \text{hirpus} and \text{fircus} show different outcomes of this protoform. \text{Hirpus} does not display the initial \text{f}- for expected \text{h}- as in \text{fircus}, \text{fedus} and \text{fasena}. It also displays a Sabellic labial outcome of the labiovelar, while \text{fircus} displays a Latino-Faliscan velar outcome. As \text{hirpus} is the only Sabine gloss with a labial outcome, it has become crucial for some scholars who believe that Latin words with this reflex, primarily \text{lupus} ‘wolf’, are Sabine loans. While it is possible that a language has two words for the same animal, particularly if one takes taboo replacement into account, it is suspicious that the one word which supports \text{lupus} as Sabine means exactly the same thing.

Some scholars suggest that instead of rejecting the passage outright, \text{Sabinorum} in the Servius passage should be changed to \text{Samnitium}, assuming either corruption or a misunderstanding on Servius’ part, just as in \text{herna}.\(^749\) However, the confusion between Sabines, Faliscans and Oscan-speakers is found throughout the passage, and this change would not make the passage more coherent in terms of geography. The only reason for changing \text{Sabinorum} to \text{Samnitium} is to make it fall in line with glosses in Paul and Strabo. An author’s ignorance cannot be used as grounds for emendations. That should only be done if the error has been introduced in transmission.

It is obvious in the case of \text{hirpus} and \text{herna}, both supposed bases for ethnics, that Servius’ sense of geography of the multiethnic Italy of the first millennium BCE is very poor. He stretches the territory of the Hirpini two-hundred kilometres northwards and thinks they spoke Sabine, and associates the Hernici with the Sabines, two groups have no previous

---

\(^747\) \text{OED} \text{s.v.} \text{worry} \text{3a}. \text{See} \text{Tuite and Schulze} \text{1998:372} \text{for South Caucasian examples}. \text{In Swedish,} \text{varg} \text{has completely displaced} \text{ulv} \text{which now only appears in onomastics and archaisms}. \text{In Norwegian and Danish, the two words coexist}. \text{Falk and Torp} \text{1906:428}; \text{SAOB} \text{s.v.} \text{varg}. \text{See} \text{LII}:/688 \text{on} \text{*gergʰ}–.

\(^748\) \text{O’Reilly and O’Donovan} \text{1864:352}; \text{d’Arbois de Jubainville} \text{1899:166}; \text{Smal-Stocki} \text{1950:492}; \text{Alinei} \text{1997:13}; \text{Matasović} \text{2009:259}; \text{eDIL} \text{s.v.} \text{mathgamain}, \text{math}, \text{gamain}, \text{gaman}.

\(^749\) \text{e.g. Vetter} \text{1953:368}; \text{Salmon} \text{1989:225}. 
connection. These two examples indicate that Servius has a tendency to reinterpret words as Sabine. As the gap between multiethnic Italy and ancient scholars grew, the understanding of small ethnic groups became worse, to the extent where their names seemed meaningless. However, through the writings of both ancient scholars and poets, the Sabines were still vivid figures to the writers of late antiquity. Claiming that a word which appears in an ethnic adjective is Sabine grounds it much better in an inherited Roman world-view than mentioning the Samnites or the Marsi.

5.2.4 Cupencus

The name Cupencus appears during Aeneas’ aristeia:

    nec di texere Cupencum
    Aenea ueniente sui

    nor did his gods shield Cupencus when Aeneas came.\textsuperscript{750}  
     \textit{Verg. Aen. XII.539-540}

Servius claims this is a word as well as a name:

    sane sciendum cupencum Sabinorum lingua sacerdotem uocari

    You should be aware that ‘priest’ was called \textit{cupencus} in the language of the Sabines  
     \textit{Serv. ad Aen. XII.538}

\textit{DS ad Aen. XII.538} further explains that this makes the sentence a pun of sorts, as Cupencus serves as both a name and a phrase. The personal name \textit{Cupencus} also appears in Silius Italicus (\textit{Pun. IV.535}), presumably a direct reference to \textit{Vergil}, and the derivate \textit{Cupencius} appears in the epigraphic record (\textit{CIL VI.16612}).\textsuperscript{751}

    Due to a raising of *e to /i/ before a velar nasal, e.g. *k\textsuperscript{e}nke\textsuperscript{e} → quinque, there are virtually no examples of words in Latin ending in \textit{-encus}. The only example is \textit{iuuencus} ‘young man’, ‘bull’, in all probability in analogy to \textit{iuuentus} ‘youth’.\textsuperscript{752} ‘There is no analogy to explain \textit{cupencus}, meaning that it is unlikely that it was in use in Latin when this change operated. Suggested Latin etymologies such as \textit{cupa} ‘beaker’ often fail to explain the second part of the

\textsuperscript{750} Fairclough and Goold 2000:339.

\textsuperscript{751} Mommsen 1850:350; Schulze [1904] 1991:108. Bruno 1961:532 observes that this name, formed from the stem of the word and an \textit{-io} suffix, is closely parallel to Flamininius, cf. \textit{flamen}.

\textsuperscript{752} Gradenwitz 1966:478; Weiss 2009:137. Ernout 1909:148 has proposed that \textit{iuuencus} is dialectal alongside \textit{cupencus}, which is less likely.
word. The most common suggestion is probably the Sabine gloss *ciprus, but *cupencus does not display the change $u > i$ (see §2.2.7), and -encus remains unexplained. It is therefore worth to start from the end of the word.

_Cupencus_ appears to be formed with a *-ko- suffix. If we remove this, we are left with *cupen. This is reminiscent of an n-stem, where the final -en is from a syllabic nasal, e.g. _pecten_ ‘comb’ < *pekt-η. It is also similar to _flamen_, the title of a Roman priest. This addition of a *-ko- suffix onto an n-stem can be seen in Latin _homunculus_ < *homon-ko-lo-. It is likely also the origin of _iuuencus_, as _iuuenis_ was originally an n-stem.

Our posited *cupen is noticeably similar to Etruscan _cepen_ (e.g. _ET_ Liber Linteus 7.8, Ta 1.23), widely assumed to be a kind of priest. However, there is a difference in vowel. Scholars disagree on how much weight difference in vowels should hold. Vowel variation occurs in Latin before a labial, e.g. _lubet/libet_ (see §2.2.7). Some Etruscan words show vowel fluctuation such as in _aχile_ (_ET_ Pe G.1), _aχule_ (_ET_ Um S.3), _aχele_ (_ET_ Vs G.1), but this appears only in medial syllables, likely due to vowel weakening, and cannot be the case with *cupen and _cepen_. This also means that _cepen_ could not be a result of the change $u > i$ seen in the Sabine gloss *ciprus_.

_Cupencus_ itself shares features with another Etruscan word, _hatrencu_ (e.g. _ET_ Vc 1.5, 1.61), a religious or civic title found in funerary inscriptions of twelve women in Vulci. It appears to be an exclusively female title, but Etruscan does not have grammatical gender.

Could we, based on these two Etruscan words and our gloss, posit two Latin priest titles, *cupen and *hatren, which both have forms derived with a *-ko- suffix? However tempting this is, we cannot jump to conclusions. _Hatrencu_ is more likely to be an Etruscan title.

---


755 See _EDLI_317.


758 See Wallace 2008:37 on Etruscan vowel weakening.


760 See Wallace 2008:51 on Etruscan grammatical gender.
qualitative adjective or a verbal noun, both of which end in -u. Some verbal nouns have a velar added to the verbal stem, e.g. zina-k-u (ET Fs 6.1), ali-q-u (e.g. ET Fa 3.1, Cr 3.4, AT 0.1), which has been seen as a past marker. The morphological boundaries may then be hatren-c-u. We do not know what this verbal root means, but considering our poor knowledge of Etruscan, this is not a major hurdle. We would not expect a Latin word in -us to be loaned into Etruscan ending in -u (cf. Latin Scarpius, Etruscan ścarpe (ET Pe 1.211)). We could attempt to explain cupencus as a verbal form too, imagining a verb *cupen- and deriving *cupencu, which would then be loaned into Latin as cupencus. However, this does not account for the Etruscan noun cepeπ. It therefore makes more sense to see cupencus as a Latin formation and hatrencu as an Etruscan. Cepen may be a loan of the form *cupen, required for cupencus, but the change in vowel needs to be accounted for.

Even if we can explain the origin of -encus, there is no clear reason why cupencus has not undergone the change to -incus. This may indicate that cupencus was not used at the time of the change, particularly not as a common noun. Names are often slower to undergo change, and can easily be borrowed from other language variants. Although the comparative evidence supports that cupencus was a common noun, the fact that it is not attested as such outside of Servius cannot be overlooked. It is possible that the double meaning Servius reads into this Vergilian passage was not intentional. Contrary to what O’Hara and Ferriss-Hill argue, Vergil’s play on words cannot be seen as glossings (see §1.1). It is indisputable that Vergil’s wording often has several layers, but we cannot know that his intentions were those ascribed to him by Servius, who lived four centuries later. The possibility that Vergil may have seen cupencus as a word for ‘priest’ (in Sabine or elsewhere) is not enough to allow us to claim this as a fact. Even if this is in fact not a word, but simply a name, the Etruscan comparative material may still play a role as an inspiration for the interpretation of Cupencus as a word meaning ‘priest’. However, this can only be speculation.

5.2.5 Curis

See §3.2.3.

---

763 Hadas-Lebel 2004 does not discuss cupencus or either Etruscan term.
5.3 Danielis Scholia on Vergil’s Aeneid

5.3.1 Nar

*Nar*, the only gloss to appear in *DS* but not in Servius, is discussed in relation to a description of the region over which the fury Allecto’s war cry carries.

It was heard by Trivia’s lake afar, heard by [white] Nar with his […] sulphurous water, and by the springs of Velinus.\(^{764}\)

_Verg. Aen. VII.516-517_

Servius discusses the geography of the Nar, while *DS* also lists possible etymologies:

Moreover, for this reason he [Vergil] says “the sulphurous water” and “white Nar” because when it runs, it is the colour of sulphur, and when it is still, it is white. Also the Sabines call sulphur nar in their language. Therefore they say that this river is called *Nar* because it assaults one’s nostrils with a sulphurous odour, or because the river has two outlets, in the fashion of a pair of nostrils.

*DS* ad *Aen.* VII.517

The different etymologies are likely to be due to the nature of *DS* as a composite text, where the usual siue or uel, which divide alternative etymologies, have not been added. The suggestion of an etymology related to *nares* ‘nostrils’ can be immediately dismissed, as it is semantically implausible and phonetically unlikely, as Latin *nares* goes back to Proto-Italic *nas-*, cf. the (inexplicably) non-rhotacised forms *Naso*, *nasus* ‘nose’. The -r- in *Nar* is original, cf. the toponym *Narnia*.\(^{765}\)

The gloss *nar* has received minimal attention.\(^{766}\) WH and Lattes suggest a connection to Umbrian *naharkum*, *naharce* (*ST* Um 1 Ib 17, VIIa.12) (where \(<aha>\) represents /ā/). It

---

\(^{764}\) Fairclough and Goold 2000:39, with modifications.

\(^{765}\) Ernout 1954:112; _EDLI_:400. If Nar was from *nas-*, we would expect *Nas-nia > *Nánia. Liv. X. 10.5 and Serv. ad *Aen.* VII.517 suggest that Narnia is derived from Nar.

\(^{766}\) Negri 1993:253; Conway 1897:362; von Planta 1897:592 only quote the glossing itself, while Bruno 1961 and Ernout 1909 do not include it at all.
is not clear whether it is a reference to an ethnic group or a geographical place.\textsuperscript{767} In the relevant entry of \textit{TLL}, \textit{nar} is compared to Old Russian \textit{voznozhit} ‘pierce, stab’, Old Church Slavonic \textit{nož} ‘knife’, Middle Irish \textit{ness} ‘wound’ and possibly Greek \varepsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\omicron\varepsilon ‘spear, supposedly from PIE *H₁\textit{neg}ʰ- ‘harm’.\textsuperscript{768} This is unlikely on both formal and semantic grounds. The Old Church Slavonic form is an \textit{o}-stem, while Middle Irish and Greek forms are \textit{s}-stems. If \textit{nar} is from a zero-grade and a *-\textit{ro}- suffix, i.e. *H₁\textit{neg}ʰ\textit{ro}-, Schrijver’s rule (*-\text{RDC}- > *-\text{RaDC}-) would give us *\textit{naro}-.\textsuperscript{769} While a loss of -\textit{os} is found elsewhere, e.g. Latin *\textit{agros} > \textit{agers}, the necessary reanalysis of the word as a consonant-stem is a larger hurdle. We might posit a suffix -\textit{ar}-is, but it would be without parallels. Latin polysyllabic words ending in -\textit{ar} are formed with a -\textit{nī} suffix on an \textit{a}-stem noun (e.g. \textit{iubār} ‘light’, cf. \textit{iūba} ‘mane’), derived from either an adjective in -\textit{aris} (e.g. \textit{lupānār} ‘brothel’, cf. \textit{lupanāris} ‘associated with sex work’) or a noun formed with an -\textit{ario}- suffix (e.g. \textit{pulina}\textcircled{r} ‘couch’ cf. \textit{pulvinarius} ‘cushioned seat’). The \textit{s}-stem does not give us the desired outcome either. Firstly, there is no accounting for /a/. Even if we posit *\textit{nars}-, the simplification of the -\textit{rs}- cluster gives us a Latin genitive *\textit{Narris}, not the actual \textit{Naris}, cf. Latin \textit{far}, \textit{farris} ‘grain’ < *\textit{fars}-.\textsuperscript{770} This word appears in Umbrian as \textit{far} (\textit{ST} Um 1 Vb 10,15), genitive \textit{farer} (\textit{ST} Um 1 Vb 9, 14), but an Umbrian origin does not solve our problems with the \textit{s}-stem, as it does not account for the toponym \textit{Narnia}. While *\textit{nars-nia} would give \textit{Narnia} in Latin, in Umbrian it would become *\textit{Nasnia}, cf. *\textit{kersna} > Umbrian \textit{česna} (\textit{ST} Um 1 Va 9) (cf. §3.2.5).\textsuperscript{771}

Furthermore, the semantics of the *H₁\textit{neg}ʰ- connection are based on a false premise. Considering the words for wounds and weapons, the proposed semantic connection appears to be to the dangers of acid to living beings. However, ancient peoples would not connect this to sulphur. The smell of sulphur in rivers comes from hydrogen sulphide gas in the springs. Although this gas forms a weak acid which could corrode metal objects if they were exposed for an extended period of time, it is not harmful to humans. Sulphuric acid, which is highly corrosive, cannot be derived from hydrogen sulphide, and the connection between them was


\textsuperscript{768} \textit{TLL} s.v. \textit{nar}; see also Boisacq 1950:214; \textit{IEW}:760; \textit{LIV}:250. \textit{eDIL} s.v. \textit{nes(s)} 3 gives the meaning ‘wound’ of \textit{ness} only with a question-mark, and gives the main meaning as “a lump or swelling on the body caused by a blow”.

\textsuperscript{769} Schijver 1991:477-485.

\textsuperscript{770} See Untermann 2000:265; \textit{EDLI}:201-202. The /a/ in Latin \textit{far} is found in several IE cognates, e.g. Old Icelandic \textit{barr} ‘grain’, Old Irish \textit{bairen} ‘bread’, Old Church Slavonic \textit{brašno} ‘food’, possibly indicating a loanword into the mother language.

\textsuperscript{771} See Buck 1928:68, 77; Weiss 2009:179.
not known in antiquity. Therefore, this suggestion can be rejected.

While Narnia is generally described as an Umbrian town, the river Nar runs through both Umbria and the Sabine territory. As with Anio (see §4.8.2), we cannot be certain that the hydronym has its origin in the language spoken along the river. We are not helped by the fact that the Nar runs down the margins of an epigraphic blind-spot. To the south and west, Etruscan and Umbrian are found, and to the east are the Apennines and Sabine territories where virtually no non-Roman inscriptions have been found. Along the Nar itself, only a few inscriptions are indicated on McDonald’s language map: a second or first-century Greek inscription in Narnia (SEG 37 788), an Umbrian inscription in nearby Ameria (II Ameria 1/ST Um 21, 22) and a number of Etruscan funerary inscriptions in Orte (ET AH 1.53-80). Thus it is difficult to pin down one language in particular. The claim that the elsewhere unattested common noun nar (as opposed to the hydronym) is Sabine relies completely on geography, which due to the vague borders of the Sabine territory is questionable.

If nar is just a hydronym and not a common noun, where does the meaning ‘sulphur’, given in DS, come from? Of the mentions of Nar in ancient literature, two look familiar:

Sulphureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas.

He built blow-holes by the sulphurous waters of the Nar.

Prisc. GL II.223.6 = Ennius F222 Skutsch

Nar amnis exhaurit illos sulphureis aquis Tiberim ex his petens

The Nar takes these lakes into its sulphurous waters, and from there heads for the Tiber.

Pliny HN III.12.109

Whenever the waters of the Nar are characterised, the word sulphureus is used. The smell of sulphur is central to the Nar, enough that one might draw the conclusion it gave the river its name. When this went from a common idiom to an etymology is impossible to say, but there is nothing that says Ennius and Vergil mean it as etymologising. It is clear that was a common way to describe the Nar, and the Vergilian passage may consciously echo the Ennian one without bringing with it ideas of the meaning of the hydronym.

---

772 I am indebted to Alexander Guttenplan and Benjamin Smith for this information.

773 On Narnia see Conway 1897:437; Maltby 1991:404; OLD s.v. Narnia; Barr. 42. Ferriss-Hill 2011:266 n.2 claims that Servius “clearly” means to gloss nar as Umbrian instead of Sabine due to the location of Nar.

774 McDonald 2017.

5.4 Macrobius’ *Saturnalia*

5.4.1 Terenus

The passage in which the Sabine gloss *terenus* appears works on three temporal levels: Varro (first century BCE), Favorinus (second century CE) and Macrobius (fifth century CE).

Nux terentina dicitur quae ita mollis est ut uix attectata frangatur. de qua in libro Favorinini sic reperitur: “item quod quidam Tarentinas uesel nuces dicunt, quae sunt terentinae a tereno, quod est Sabinorum lingua molle, unde Terentios quoque dictos putat Varro ad Libonem primo.” quam in culpam etiam Horatius potest uideri incidere, qui ait et “mollc Tarentum.”

The nut that’s so soft it breaks when you’ve scarcely touched it is called “terentine.” About this nut one finds the following in a book by Favorinus [- - - ]: “Similarly, there’s the fact that some people call sheep and nuts ‘Tarentine’ when they are properly ‘terentine,’ from *terenus*, the Sabine term for ‘soft’: Varro, in his first book *To Libo*, expresses the view [- - - ] that the Terentii are so called from the same term.” Horace could seem to fall into the mistake noted by Favorinus when he speaks of “soft Tarentum,” too.

Macrob. *Sat. III*.18.13 = Varro *GRF* 231; Favorinus F.161 Amato

In some manuscripts, the gloss is given as *tenero* instead of *tereno*, the intended form, considering the forms in *Taren-* and *Teren-*.

The comparative evidence for *terenus* is unusually strong. Both in form and meaning, it is reminiscent of Greek τέρην ‘soft’, as well as the gloss τέρυ ‘weak, delicate’ (Hesych. τ.559), Vedic tārṇa- ‘young, tender’, Avestan tauruna- ‘young’, Ossetic təxyn ‘boy’ < PIE *ter- with a range of adjectival suffixes *-u-, *-ro- and *-no-.

The main question has been the relationship between the gloss *terenus* (and its IE cognates) and Latin *tener* ‘tender’. The arguments that there is no connection between these two are generally unconvincing. The more likely explanation is that *tener* is a case of metathesis, derived from a word similar or identical to the gloss *terenus*, likely due to analogy with *tenuis* ‘soft’ or *teneo* ‘hold’. No reflex of this root has been found in Sabellitic. It is possible

---

776 Holford-Strevens 2003:120 argues that this passage cannot be from Favorinus, as he is not known for writing about language, and suggests instead that it is from a lost part of Gellius. This is an unnecessary emendation.

777 Kaster 2011b:137.

778 See Kaster 2010:110.

779 WH s.v. *tener*; *IEW* 1070; Mayrhofer 1992:632; *EDLI* 613.


that this gloss is such an example, though it is equally possible that a non-metathesised form survived in a dialectal form of Latin or Latino-Faliscan.

The connection between *terenus* and *Tarentus* that Macrobius describes is likely to be a folk etymology. There are no attestations of either the sheep or the nuts with the *Terentum*-form. Both Varro (*RR* II.2.18) and Columella (*RR* VII.2.5) speak of *Tarentinae*, probably a special breed with some real or perceived connection to Tarentum. The *nux Tarentina* appears in Pliny (*HV* XV.9.35) as a subtype of pine-nuts that you can break open with your fingers. We can reject the example from Horace, presumably added by Macrobius rather than by Favorinus. Macrobius implies that Horace hypercorrects a form *Terentum*, derived from Sabine *terenus*, to *Tarentum*. However, this is untrue, as it is clear from the context that this is a personification of the city, referring to the supposed effeminacy of the people of Tarentum:

pectinibus patulis iactat se molle Tarentum.

luxurious Tarentum plumes herself on her broad scallops.

Hor. *Sat.* II.4.34

This seems to indicate that Macrobius did not know this poem well enough to realise that *molle Tarentum* was not a gloss.

It is unclear whether Varro’s claim that his own gentilicium *Terentius* is from Sabine *terenus* has gone through Favorinus or was derived directly from the original text, or a second-hand account other than Favorinus. The meaning of *terenus* seems concerned more with texture than consistency, but if it had the aspect of effeminacy encoded in *mollis*, this would put *Terentius* in the same perceived category as other names based on ‘negative’ attributes, e.g. *Naso* ‘big-nose’, *Varro* ‘bow-leg’. However, this etymology is unlikely to be true, as it does not account for the -*t*- in *Terentius*. Some names in -*ius*, e.g. *Tiberius, Aventius*, appear to be derived from geographical places. Following this pattern, Terentius could be derived from Terentum on the Campus Martius, where the *ludi saeculares*, also known as the *ludi terentini* (cf. *terentinus* ‘of the *Terentii*’) were held (Paulus ex F. 479L). This connection to a specific place in Rome.

---

782 cf. *WH* s.v. *terentinae*.

783 Unlike Pliny, Macrobius describes the *nux Tarentina* as distinct from the pine-nut.

784 Fairclough [1929] 2005:189

785 The work *ad Libonem*, thought to be dedicated to Lucius Sabinus Libo, is never mentioned anywhere else; see Amato 2010:465; Cornell et al. 2013c:516-517. Ibid:516 sees the entire argument as derived from Varro.

786 Other gentilicia in -*ius*, e.g. Servius, Tullius, Marcius, are usually seen as fossilised patronymics (see Weiss 2009:448-449).
explains why Terentius, unlike many names, is not found in any other languages in Italy.\textsuperscript{787}

In conclusion, Macrobius, Favorinus and Varro appear to be correct about the meaning of the gloss \textit{terenus}, but their surrounding arguments about nuts, sheep and gentilicia are largely groundless.

5.4.2 Curis
See §3.2.3.

5.5 Pseudo-Acron’s commentary on Horace

5.5.1 Trimodia

\textit{Trimodia} does not appear in Horace, only in Pseudo-Acron’s discussion of the word \textit{cumera}. At Paulus ex F 55L, \textit{cumera} is assigned to the \textit{antiqui}, where it (like at Paulus ex F 43L and Varro \textit{LL} VII.34) is connected to wedding ceremonies. However, both times when \textit{cumera} is used in Horace it is explicitly connected to grain (\textit{Epist}. I.7.30; \textit{Sat}. I.1.53). Pseudo-Acron attempts to explain \textit{cumera}:

\begin{quote}
Cumeram dicimus uas ingens uimineum, in quo frumenta conduntur [- - -] siue cumerae dicuntur uasa fictilia similia dolis, ubi frumentum suum reponebant agricolae. Tertio cumerae dicuntur uasa minora, quae capiunt quinque siue six modios, quae lingua Sabinorum trimodiae uocantur
\end{quote}

We call a large wickerwork container a \textit{cumera}, in which grain is stored.[- - -] or \textit{cumerae} are clay vessels, similar to \textit{dolia}, where farmers placed their grain. The third possibility is that \textit{cumerae} are smaller vessels which hold five or six \textit{modii} and are called \textit{trimodiae} in the Sabine language.

\begin{center}
Pseudo-Acron ad Hor. \textit{Sat}. I.1.53
\end{center}

\textit{Trimodia} is used for measuring dry volume, primarily in an agricultural context (Columella \textit{RR} II.9.9, XII.18.2, XII.52.8). It is also used by Pliny to measure the quantity of gold rings sent back by Hannibal to Carthage (\textit{HN} XXXIII.6.21). The singular form \textit{trimodium} also appears (e.g. Plaut. \textit{Men}. prol. 15). This variation is made more likely by the fact that the word denotes a plural, i.e. three \textit{modii}.

The \textit{trimodia} we encounter in agronomical texts equals three regular \textit{modii}.\textsuperscript{788} However, the term \textit{trimodia} and Pseudo-Acron’s claim that the Sabine vessel \textit{trimodia} can hold five or six

\textsuperscript{787} Schulze [1904] 1991:106-107 n.2 has suggested that Etruscan \textit{trenbini} (\textit{ET} Pe 1.159) may be Terentia instead of ‘the Tarentian’, but there is no further examples. It is unclear whether the name \textit{tirentium} (II Capua 15/\textit{ST} Cp 8) is related or not.

\textsuperscript{788} \textit{OCD} s.v. measures; Duncan-Jones 1976b:55.
modii do not match. This had led Conway to observe that a Sabine modius must be twice the size of the Roman measure.789

Before discussing the intricacies of ancient measurements, it is important to acknowledge that the trimodia Pseudo-Acron speaks of is not a unit of measurement, like the one Columella, Pliny and Plautus mention, but rather a vessel. This is a semantic shift seen elsewhere. Terms such as urna and cyathus, used in the same poem as cumera, were used both for vessels and measurements.790 Nevertheless, we would expect the vessel’s name and its capacity to match, and the word trimodia was by no means semantically opaque.

Ancient measures were not standardised like modern ones are, and different systems, sometimes using the same names for different measures, coexisted. The regular modius, sometimes called the modius Italicus, was roughly 8.8 litres.791 The mensa ponderaria found in Pompeii (II Pompeii 27/ST Po 19) gives us an insight into the Campanian system, which uses a basic unit of 590.5 ml, only somewhat larger than the Roman modius.792 The so-called modius xystos, which was used alongside the modius Italicus, was also used in Italy, with no clear way to distinguish the two.793 The sizes of the basic unit, one modius and three modii in these three systems are given in Table 5.

Pseudo-Acron gives three possible definitions of cumera. The third is that the cumera is a smaller vessel, holding five or six modii, a vessel which the Sabines call trimodia. The sentence is

---

789 Conway 1897:363.
791 See Duncan-Jones 1976a:51-52 for evidence of the size of the different modii.
792 Crawford et al. 2011:663.
793 Duncan-Jones 1976b:55. A corn-measure found in Pompeii is the size of a modius xystos (see Duncan-Jones 1976a:45, 48).
perplexing, and while we cannot completely rule out that a scribe has written the wrong numerals, it is unlikely that *quinque siue sex* is due to textual corruption. Therefore, we should attempt to find a consistent logic to it.

Assuming that Pseudo-Acron is using the *modius Italicus*, the Sabine *trimodia* would be between 43.5 and 52.2 litres. The Campanian system’s equivalent of three *modii* (cavity A in the *mensa ponderaria*, marked [hd]ǐmnúm, possibly a rendering of ἡμιμέδιμνον, a Greek measurement of around 26.25 litres) does not come near this with its 28.3 litres. However, the measurements related to the *modius xystos* are more promising. The lower end of Pseudo-Acron’s range, 43.5 litres, is only seven litres larger than the three *modii xystoi*. In a world where things were largely done by eye, a measure may well become larger by a sixth which would account for this difference. There likely was a vessel called a *trimodia*, based on the *modius xystos*. This does not mean that it was necessarily Sabine. Whoever named this vessel must have been a Latin-speaker, as this is a Latin word with an obvious and uncontroversial etymology.

*Trimodia* is seldom discussed by scholars of Sabine glosses. The only impact it has had on the debate of the Sabine language is by providing a counter-example to proposed Sabine assimilation of the cluster -dī-. This change was posited on the basis of *Clausus* < *Claudius* (e.g. Liv. II.16.3; Verg. Aen. VII.707; Ov. Fast. IV.305, V.155; Tac. Ann. IV.9) and the non-Sabine gloss *basus* “rufus niger” (*CGL* V.170.2) interpreted as derived from *badius* ‘reddish-brown’. However, Negri, who often writes about this change, admits that *trimodia* and *Modius Fabidius*, the name of the founder of Cures (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.48.3), do not show this change. This does not stop him stating that -dī- > -s- is an established sound-change. Even without the counter-examples, one gloss (which is not even glossed as Sabine) and one name is not enough evidence to posit a sound-law. Even if we could suggest scenarios where *trimodia* was not affected, e.g. later introduction or reborrowing, there is no reason to consider the argument of assimilation in Sabine as viable.

5.5.2 Tesqua, tesca

*Tesqua* appears in an epistle where Horace addresses the bailiff of his villa in the Sabine territory, and discusses how their tastes differ (see also §1.2.2).

---

794 Untermann 2000:342; Crawford et al. 2011:663.
795 See *EDLI*:384-385.
nam quae deserta et inhospita tesqua
credis, amoena uocat mecum qui sentit, et odit
quae tu pulchra putas.

What you hold to be desert and inhospitable wilds, he who shares my views calls lovely,
and hates what you believe so beautiful.  

Hor. Epist. I.14.19-21

Porphyry’s comment is only “tesqua: loca aspera atque siluestria” (Porph. ad Epist. I.14.19).
Pseudo-Acron goes further:

T[h]esqua (P) Loca deserta et difficilia lingua Sabinorum sic dicuntur, inde deserta et
completa sentibus sic nominarunt

T[h]esqua Empty and harsh places are thus called in the language of the Sabines, and
from that they called deserted places full of thorn-bushes this.

Pseudo-Acron ad Hor. Epist. I.XIV. 19

Tesqua, alternatively spelt tesca, bears an implicit value-judgement in Horace, highlighting the
bailiff’s lack of appreciation for the beautiful countryside. In other attestations, it has a more
descriptive function.

Varro spends two chapters on tesqua, but does not mention a Sabine origin. Instead, he
connects it to attueor ‘look after’ (LL VII.11). He defines tesqua as inviolable places in the
country, “quae alicuius dei sunt” ‘that belong to a god’ (LL VII.10). Tesqua also appears in
Paul’s epitome and Isidorus.

Tesca loca augurio designata. Cicero aspera ait esse et difficilia.

Tesca are the places marked out for augury. Cicero says they are harsh and inaccessible.

Paulus ex F. 489L

Tescua quidam putant esse tuguria, quidam loca praerupta et aspera.

Some think tescua are shepherds’ huts, while others think they are rugged and harsh
places.

Isid. Etym. XV.12.3

The passage at Festus 488L is badly damaged, but it is possible to make out the same
definition as in Paul. All in all, the word is only attested ten times, either in poetry (e.g. Apul.


799 Mommsen 1850:354 observes that this is in fact two separate pieces of scholia, which have been
united with the addition of “sic dicuntur” in Ascens’ 1519 edition. He quotes it as “loca deserta et
difficilia lingua Sabinorum: deserta et repleta sentibus sic nominantur”. Although this changes the text,
it does not impact that glossing of tesqua as Sabine.
Although the word is given as *tescum in several modern discussions, this form is never attested. Only nominative, accusative and ablative plurals appear: This could be an accident of the scarcity of attestations, but considering that the lemma in Paulus-Festus is plural, and the singular does not appear at all in Varro’s long discussion of the term, it seems likely that it is *plurale tantum. In the Accius fragment (*LL VII.11 = *TRF Accius F554), *tesqua appears alongside *loca, which has led scholars such as Negri and EM to assume the existence of an adjective *tesquus. This lone example does not necessarily mean that *tesca is or can be used as an adjective. This may simply be a case of apposition.

Only the gloss in Pseudo-Acron displays the initial /th-. This is likely a scribal error, possibly influenced by another word. Chanut suggests *thesaurus as a possible culprit. Although the first syllable is similar, there are no semantic grounds for such an analogy.

The alternation between the labiovelar and velar variants of *tesqua/*tesca is never mentioned in ancient sources, but much attention has been paid to it by modern scholars. The fact that the word is uncommon makes it more susceptible to spelling variations, meaning the two forms may simply be orthographic (see §3.2.3). We must also explore the other possibility, that the different spellings do represent a difference in pronunciation.

Ernout suggests that *tesca is from a dialect where labiovelars lose the labial element when preceding /a/. It is unnecessary to posit the existence of such a dialect, as the genitive plural *tesquorum > *tescorum would be enough to lead to paradigmatic levelling, without sidelines *tesqua completely. Leumann and Negri suggest that the unattested adjective *tescus is where the delabialisation of the labiovelar took place, but it is more likely that *tesqua once had a singular *tesquum, and this form would have even more potential for paradigmatic levelling after *kʷ > k.

The ultimate etymology of this word has been long disputed. The most popular suggestion by far is that *tesqua is a cognate of Sanskrit *tuccha- ‘empty’, from a zero-grade
*tusk-o.- However, tesqua cannot be derived from this proto-form – the reflex in Latin would be *tusquum. Bruno, who believes that the cluster -squ- is secondary, has suggested a derivation from terreo ‘frighten, alarm’, with simplification of -rsk- > -sk-, where tesqua would be “luoghi abbandonati per superstizioso terroe”, a convoluted semantic argument.  

Borrowing has also been suggested, but as so often this is presented more as a last resort than a worthy theory in itself. Bruno suggests it may be an ‘Indo-Europeanised’ loan, but does not specify where from. Alessio observes that both the root hes- (e.g. hesan, ET Cr 4.2) and the suffix -γνα (e.g. marunγna (ET AT 1.96) are attested in Etruscan. Based on these two segments, he proposes *θesγua, with the aspiration seen in Pseudo-Acron. Alessio’s theory may have some appeal, but it cannot be taken seriously with no attestation and no semantic connection. The fact that the syllables (and supposedly morphemes) /hes/- and /-skua/ appear in Etruscan does not mean that a word /θeskua/ is guaranteed to exist. Every language has forms that are possible but unrealised. In this case, we are not even certain that it is possible. If we disregard semantics and attested forms, and base our arguments on a form attested only once, we would be able to find morphemes similar to those making up tesqua in many languages. 

A more convincing argument is a connection with torreo ‘parch, dry’ < PIE *ters-‘dry’. The semantics are likely not, as de Vaan suggests, “arid soil”, as it is clear that while the tesqua are empty and harsh, they are also siluestria, nemorosa, and completa sentibus. Instead, the dryness is in contrast to the sea, a semantic meaning which would align tesqua with Latin terra, Oscan teras ‘earth, dry land’ (II Capua 34/ST Cp 37), the only certain Italic e-grade of this PIE root. The most logical derivation would be a *-ko- suffix, giving *tersko- > *tescum, plural tesca.  

Having discussed the attestations and possible etymologies of tesqua, we can turn to the question of semantics. Tesqua has two meanings – “wastes, wild regions”, and a religious term for a place where augury is conducted. It is far easier for a profane word to take on religious
meaning than for a religious term to lose that aspect and become secular; cf. Greek ἄγγελος ‘messenger’, which now means ‘angel’, a messenger of God. Therefore it is more likely that the original meaning is ‘wastes’. Chanut has suggested that the augural term is due to the fact that the sides of the Capitolium, where augury was performed, were so steep they could not be built on, leaving them deserted.\footnote{Chanut 1980:295; \textit{EDLI:}617.}

There are indications that the meaning of \textit{tesqua} was uncertain already in antiquity. The passage in Varro implies that the word is at least on occasion misunderstood.\footnote{Lee 2005:120.} Isidorus appears uncertain of the precise meaning of the word. Chanut suggests that the definitions become more and more vague.\footnote{Chanut 1980:298.} Although there are indications that the word causes confusion, there is no clear indication that the understanding deteriorates. In fact, the uncertainty are confined to the early definitions (in Varro) and the late (Isidorus). With few attestations spread over several centuries, it is difficult to find a coherent pattern.

Certain adjectives such as \textit{aspera}, \textit{deserta} and \textit{difficilia} often occur with \textit{tesqua}. This has led Chanut to argue that the word was reduced to a few stock phrases.\footnote{Chanut 1980:298.} The adjectives used by Cicero, \textit{aspera} and \textit{difficilia}, are repeated elsewhere, which is unsurprising considering how widely read Cicero was. Equally, Porphyry and Pseudo-Acron are both dependent on Horace, and their works may have been subject to cross-contamination. Both use \textit{difficilia}, as well as words referring to the wooded or overgrown nature of the \textit{tesqua}. With so few attestations of \textit{tesqua}, it is not possible to tell if this is just a coincidence or an indication that this word tends to be used in allusions to previous uses.

Chanut has tried to find a correlation between the two meanings and the different spellings of this word. Having observed that both Horace and Accius use the form \textit{tesqua} in the secular meaning, while Varro and Paulus-Festus use \textit{tesca}, he suggests that \textit{tesca} is the religious form, and \textit{tesqua} has remained as a worldly variant.\footnote{Chanut 1980:295-296.} This hypothesis does not stand up to scrutiny. There is no guarantee that the author’s original spelling has been retained through transmission, and there is not necessarily consistency between manuscripts of the same text.\footnote{Chanut 1980:295-296.} Therefore we are unable to draw any such conclusions.

Being an uncommon word makes \textit{tesqua} more likely to be glossed as Sabine, but in the

\footnote{Chanut claims Accius uses the labiovelar variant, but Spengel and Spengel [1885] 1979, Goetz and Schoell 1910 and Kent 1951a all print \textit{tesca}. Similarly, he counts Horace in the labiovelar camp; Wickham and Garrod 1901:53 give \textit{tesqua}, Macleane 1853:616 gives \textit{tesca}.}
Horatian context, the epistle’s Sabine setting may well have been the driving force behind the glossing. Kiessling theorises that Horace sometimes uses jargon specific to the addressee, an opinion based on Epist. I.5, the recipient of which is thought to be a lawyer.\footnote{Kiessling 1961:121. However, this is only based on the last two lines, Epist. I.5.30-31, and is by no means certain.} Thus the use of the ‘Sabine’ word *tesqua* is seen as Horace either accommodating or imitating his bailiff.\footnote{Ernout 1909:236; Kiessling 1961:120; Garnier 2010:11.} However, no one has been able to point to any other examples of regional or rustic Latin in this poem. It is likely that, had the Sabine glossing in Pseudo-Acron not survived, there likely would be no ‘Sabinisms’ to point out in Epist. I.14.

It is better to see *tesqua* as poetic rather than regional (cf. §§2.2.11, 2.2.12). It is certainly possible that *tesqua* retained a primarily profane meaning in some areas, but with so many potential examples of the non-religious use, it may not be necessary to hypothesise about its meaning in Latin dialects. The meaning ‘waste-lands’ may have existed as a possible, if uncommon, meaning in standard Latin.

5.6 Ioannes Lydus’ *De Mensibus*

Of the two existing editions, I have chosen to use Teubner’s 1898 edition by Wünsch rather than the posthumous edition by Bandy.\footnote{For a comprehensive view on the Bandy edition’s shortcomings, see Kaldellis 2014.}

5.6.1 Νέρων

See *nero*, §4.7.1.

5.6.2 Στρῆνα, στρῆνα

This gloss appears in a discussion of the ceremonial use of laurel leaves in Rome during the month of January. Lydus spells the word with different accents, first as στρῆνα and then as στρήνα (Lyd. Mens. IV.4). The goddess, whom Lydus calls Strena and claims is in charge of war, is elsewhere known as Strenia or Strenua, a goddess of good omens and health who had a sanctuary on the Via Sacra (LL V.47, Festus 272L, Paulus ex F. 373L, Symm. Eph. X.15).\footnote{von Planta 1897:30 presents the gloss as a theonym and not a word. Augustine describes Strenia as “dea sit strenuum facienda” (CD IV.11) and “quae faceret strenuum” (CD IV.16).}

After some discussion of the various uses of laurel, Lydus returns to the gloss, which he claims is used to refer to laurel leaves given to magistrates by the people, citing the otherwise unknown writer Elpidianus:
ὁ δὲ Ἐλπιδιανὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἐορτῶν στρήναν τὴν ὑγείαν τῇ Σαβίνων φωνῇ λέγεσθαι φησι

Elpidianus in his work *On Festivals* says that in the language of the Sabines health is called *strena*\(^{825}\)

Lyd. Mens. IV.4

Latin *strena*, often plural *strenae*, means ‘good omen’, but can be used for a new-year’s gift. There is no mention that this gift consists of laurel leaves outside of Lydus. Symmachus, writing in the late fourth century, associates *strenae* with *uerbenea*, branches taken from the grove of Strenia at the new year by the consuls (Symm. Ep. X.15).\(^{826}\) While etymologies other than Lydus’ exist (Non. 24L; Festus 410L; Paulus ex F. 411L), they are all internal to Latin, and do not mention the Sabines.

Latin *strena* is often associated with the adjective *strenuus*.\(^{827}\) Evidence such as Plaut. *St*. 672, where an adjectival form *bona scena strenaque* implies that an adjective form ending in \(-us\) rather than \(-uus\) existed. This change likely happened by analogy to words such as *continuus* ‘incessant’.\(^{828}\) *Strena* can thus be interpreted as a neuter plural substantivisation that was reinterpreted as an \(a\)-stem, or was made into a noun through being associated with some feminine noun.

Lydus suggests a connection with Greek *στρήνος* ‘passion, pride’. Cognacy between *strena* and Greek *στρήνης* ‘rough’ is supported by Bruno and von Planta, but is rejected on semantic grounds by de Vaan.\(^{829}\) Szemérenyi suggests Old Irish *trén* ‘strong’ < *treg-sno-*; Old Icelandic *strekr* ‘strong’, Old English *pracu* ‘force’, < *sterg-* as cognates, and Bruno suggests a number of Slavic cognates, but none of these shows the same formation as *strena*, leaving the root uncertain.\(^{830}\)

Lydus’ glossing has often been accepted with not much thought. *L&S* give the word *strena* as “Sabine”.\(^{831}\) EM see Lydus’ glossing as vindicated by Symmachus, who claims that

---

\(^{825}\) Bandy et al. 2013a:157.

\(^{826}\) Pliny describes the *uerbenea* grass pulled up from the soil, and used for purification (HN 22.5.105).

\(^{827}\) Ernout 1909:232; *EDLI*:591. However, Bruno 1961:506 suggests that the connection between Strenua and *strena* is a folk etymology.


\(^{829}\) von Planta 1897:30; Bruno 1961:506; *EDLI*:591.


\(^{831}\) *L&S* s.v. *strena*
the *strenae* were introduced by the Sabine king Titus Tatius. The Via Sacra, where Strenia’s sanctuary was located, also has a connection to him, as it was there, according to Paulus-Festus, that the truce between Romulus and Tatius was sealed (Festus 372L, Paulus ex F. 373L). Palmer uses a similar argument, but reverses it. The Sabine word “accounts for the attribution of the New Year ceremony to Tatius.” Strenia is called a Sabine goddess, even if she is never described in such a way in antiquity. Lydus’ remarks only concern the name. This argument feeds itself, becoming circular.

de Vaan claims that the Romans “regarded *strena* as a Sabine word.” While Lydus would have called himself a Roman, we would call him a Byzantine. We have no indications that Republican and Imperial scholars saw this word as Sabine. With the state of the evidence being what it is, we should be cautious, and not assume anything about how this word was perceived centuries before it was explicitly glossed.

5.6.3 Νερίνη

Νερίνη, sometimes given as νερίκη, is often cited in isolation. However, the entire passage is necessary to understand the argument.

Τῇ πρὸ δέκα Καλενδῶν Ἀπριλίων καθαρμὸς σάλπιγγος καὶ κίνησις τῶν ὁπλῶν, καὶ τιμαὶ Ἀρεος καὶ Νερίνης, θεᾶς οὗτος τῇ Σαβίνων γλώσσῃ προσαγορευμένης, ἣν ἡξίουν εἶναι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἢ καὶ Ἀφροδίτην. νερίνη γὰρ ἢ ἀνδρία ἢστι καὶ νέρωνας τοὺς ἀνδρείους οἱ Σαβῖνοι καλοῦσιν.

On the tenth day before the *Kalendae of Aprilis* there was a purification of the military trumpet and a movement of arms and venerations to Ares and to Nerine, a goddess called thus in the language of the Sabines, whom they claimed to be Athena, or even Aphrodite, for *nerine* means *bravery* and the Sabines designate brave men as *nerones*.

The gloss is given to explain the name of a Sabine goddess Nerine who is mentioned together with Ares. Nerine is clearly the same goddess as Nerio or Nerienes, whose name Gellius

---

832 Ernout 1909:231; EM s.v. *strena*; Palmer 1974:100. The assignation of a religious innovation to Titus Tatius is uncommon, as these are usually associated with Numa, but notably the Sabine-Roman truce was associated with the Via Sacra, where Strenia’s sanctuary was.

833 Palmer 1970:100.

834 Strenia is not included in Varro’s list at *LL* V.74 of Sabine gods which were called upon during the truce. This is not proof that she was not considered a Sabine goddess, but no positive evidence that she was exists either.

835 Fowler 1899:278; Palmer 1970:100; *EDLI*:591.

836 *EDLI*:406. EM s.v. *nero* interpret νερίκη as a feminine form of an adjective, presumably *nericus*, but this is unlikely.

837 Bandy et al. 2013a:253.
derived from the Sabine gloss *nerio*, meaning *uirtus et fortitudo* (M. XIII.23.7-9; see §4.8.2). Both these words and *ánbrió* bear meanings of manliness and bravery. Following the glossing, Lydus argues that Nerine is Athena and not Aphrodite, as Athena is involved in battle, a pursuit he sees as unambiguously male. He uses quotes from Homer (*Il. V*.428, 430) to characterise the goddesses. Putting aside that this is methodologically inadvisable, as the context is Roman, the fact that such a basic fact about the gods had to be backed up shows to what an extent the pagan gods had been forgotten.

We have two different glosses (*νερίνη* and *nerio, nerienes*) which mean the same thing (‘manliness’, ‘bravery’), used to explain two different names for the same goddess. The change in the theonym is easily explained. The nominative *Nerienes*, formed by analogy to accusative *Nerienem*, is attested as early as the late Republic (M. XIII.23.4 = Sat. Men. F506 Astbury). It is likely that it eventually replaced the irregular nominative *Nerio*. The lack of the final /-s/ in Lydus may be the result of a conscious attempt at making the Roman name look like a Greek feminine, as the -es looks more like a masculine a-stem. It may also have happened through analogy to the modern hydronym *Aniene*, cf. Latin *Anio*. The <ι> in *Νερίνη* for -ie- in *Neriene(s)* is most likely a simplification or contraction, although it may also be a mistake. Nerio was an obscure goddess already in Gellius’ day, and Lydus’ understanding of her is patchy. Furthermore, we should not base any arguments on the fact that Lydus writes the theonym both as *Νηρίνης* and *νερίνη*, as Greek had lost the distinction of vowel-length.838

The reason why the Sabine glosses *νερίνη* on the one hand and *nerio, nerienes* on the other are different is that the theonym is different. *Νερίνη* gives no additionally linguistic information, but hints at Lydus’ thought-patterns and sources. Lydus does not specify any source for his etymology, but the suggestion that the goddess had a Sabine name may well have gone back to Gellius, directly or indirectly.

5.6.4 Σάγκος

Fittingly, the last properly attested Sabine gloss is also the first. In an isolated sentence, Lydus claims:839

> τὸ Σάγκος ὄνομα οὐρανὸν σημαίνει τῇ Σαβίνων γλώσσῃ.

838 See Horrocks 2010:248, 285. It is possible that the form *Νηρίνης* is influenced by *Νηρεΐδες*, just as Gellius (M. XIII.23.3) believed had happened in his own day.

839 In Bandy et al. 2013a, this sentence is moved to Mens. App.12 Bandy.
The name Sankos means ‘sky’ in the Sabine language. 

Sancus was seen as a Sabine deity already in the second century BCE. Dionysius of Halicarnassus relates Cato’s version of the origin of the Sabines:

Κάτων δὲ Πόρκιος τὸ μὲν ὄνομα τῷ Σαβίνων ἔθνει τεθήναι φησιν ἐπὶ Σάβου τοῦ Σάγκου δαιμόνος ἔπιχωρίου, τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Ζάγκου ὑπὸ τινων πίστιν καλείθαι Δία.

But Porcius Cato says that the Sabine race received its name from Sabus, the son of Sancus, a divinity of that country, and that this Sancus was by some called Jupiter Fidius.840

Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.49.2 = FRH Cato 5 F50

Here, Sancus is already identified with an aspect of Zeus that protects oaths. This is also evident in a passage where Varro cites his teacher Aelius Stilo (born around 150 BCE):

Aelius said that Dios Fidius was a son of Diouis, just as the Greeks call Castor the son of Zeus, and he thought that he was Sancus in the Sabine tongue, and Hercules in Greek.841

Varro LL V.66 = GRF Aelius F9

Ov. Fast. VI.216 and Tert. Nat. II.19 claim that the temple to Sancus on the Quirinal was built by Sabines. During late antiquity, likely in an attempt to emphasise the idolatry of paganism, Augustine says Sancus was the first king of the Sabines, who was then made into a god, much like the Latini deified Aeneas (CD XVIII.19).

The proposed Sabine origin of Sancus is accepted by some modern scholars.842 Others have observed that, curiously, there is no epigraphic evidence of Sancus found in the Sabine territory, although deities with similar names appear in other parts of Italy.843 The theonym saçe (e.g. ST Um 1 IIa 4, IIb 10, 24) is most likely derived from the same root, though without the nasal infix, which can be seen in the adjective sanśie (e.g. ST Um 1 VIb 9).844 When used together with fisouie (e.g. ST Um 1 IVb 9, 12), it may refer to a variant of Dios Fidius. The result is a protector of oaths who is an amalgamation of (an aspect of) Jupiter, Dios Fidius and

---

841 Kent 1951a:65.
842 EM s.v. Sancus; Weiss 2010:175.
843 Evans 1939:237; Radke 1965:280. A drawing of CIL IX.4676 by Gutenstenius starts “Sanco Deo”. However, this is missing in the other two drawings.
Sancus.

With the exception of Lydus, there is no mention of *sancus/*σάγκος as ‘sky’, and there is no comparative evidence supporting this meaning. The theonym *Sancus* (sometimes written *Sangus* in Latin) is derived from Proto-Italic *sak-* (Latin *sacer*, Faliscan *sacra* (LDAF MF 127), Oscan σακόπ[ο] (II Messana 4/ST Me 1)), with a present nasal infix as in Latin *sancère* < *sa-n-k, sanctus*, Oscan *saahúm* (II Teruentum 34/ST Sa 1 A 17) < *sa-n-k-to*. There is no evidence to support Conway’s claim that Sancus is from *sankw*-.

The theonym seems to be both an *o*-stem and a *u*-stem; Livy uses the genitive *Sangus* (Liv. III.2.1) but the dative form *Semoni Sango* (VIII.20). The *u*-stem can also be seen in the adjectival form *Sanqualis*, used for augury birds related to Sancus and a gate close to his temple (Paulus ex F. 465L), as well as the personal name *Sanquinius*. This variation is not unknown in theonyms, cf. *Consus – Consualia, Ianus – Ianualis*.

Untermann observes that if we rely on Lydus’ gloss for the meaning of *σάγκος*, we must reject the above etymology of *Sancus*. The comparative evidence is too strong to be shaken by one gloss, especially one attested so late. Nevertheless, we should ask what led him to this conclusion. The answer can be found in Varro.

Both before and after his discussion of *Dius Fidius*, Varro asserts that Jupiter is the sky and Juno is the earth:

\[
\text{Idem hi dei Caelum et Terra Iupiter et Iuno} \quad \text{LL V.65}
\]

\[
\text{Iouis Iuno coniunx et is Caelum, haec Terra} \quad \text{LL V.67}
\]

A discussion of the name of Jupiter follows, connecting it to both *dies* ‘day’ and *deus* ‘god’, but also *diuum* ‘sky’, and *sub diuo* ‘under open sky’ (LL V.66). Varro then introduces *Dius Fidius*,

---


846 EM s.v. *Sancus*; Woodard 2006:184; Bandy et al. 2013b:137 mention the glossing, but only the latter two with any conviction.


848 Conway 1893:163-164 n.3.

849 Conway 1897:357; Whatmough 1940:187; Radke 1965:281-282.


851 Untermann 2000:656.
whose name he derives from the same root.\textsuperscript{852}

Itaque inde eius perforatum tectum, ut ea uideatur diuum, id est caelum. Quidam negant sub tecto per hunc deierare oportere.

Thus from this reason the roof of his temple is pierced with holes, that in this way the \textit{diuum}, which is the \textit{caelum} ‘sky,’ may be seen. Some say it is improper to take an oath in his name, when you are under a roof.\textsuperscript{853}

\textit{Varro LL V.66}

Most likely, Lydus’ glossing of \textit{σάγκος} as a word meaning ‘sky’ is due to his misunderstanding Varro’s argument. While Varro argues that Dius Fidius is associated with the sky, Lydus takes the idea a step further and assumes that this is the etymology of Sancus, another name for the same god. This indicates that Lydus used Varro, or some source closely based on \textit{LL}. The mistake may be down to a number of reasons. Lydus’ source-text may have been corrupt. It is also unclear how good Lydus’ Latin was. This passage may cast doubt on the argument brought forward by Bandy and Cornell that it was excellent, and justify Maas’ scepticism on the issue.\textsuperscript{854} Whatever the state of his Latin, it is clear that Lydus struggles with the many gods discussed in his sources, and confusion has led him astray.

5.7 Reflections on Sabine glosses in late antiquity

Of the eleven Sabine glosses attested in late antiquity, five have been included in earlier works. Of these five, two are theonyms given as Sabine (\textit{σάγκος}, \textit{νερίνη}, cf. \textit{neriene}). Another two were glossed differently earlier; \textit{herna} was ascribed to the Marsi and \textit{hirpus} to the Samnites. The fifth gloss, \textit{terenus}, is a testimonium from Favorinus and Varro. Among the Sabine glosses first attested during the High Empire, only two were testimonia (see §§4.8.1, 4.10.1). As far as we can tell, none of the imperial glosses had previously been glossed as belonging to another language. In the authors of late antiquity, we see greater reliance on earlier sources, but also a reinterpretation of the origin of the glosses, from tribes such as the Marsi and the Samnites to the Sabines.

In both Varro and Paulus-Festus, Sabine glosses are already over-represented, but other glosses appear too. In Servius, Macrobius and Lydus, the numbers are much starker. Table 6 shows mentions of peoples and languages of Italy in these three authors. Almost 55

\textsuperscript{852} Derivatives of PIE *djeu- are often correctly connected by ancient writers, e.g. Festus 62L and Paulus ex F. 65L, where \textit{diuum}, Jupiter and Greek \textit{Δία} are connected. See Maltby 1991:187 for more examples.

\textsuperscript{853} Kent 1951a:65.
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per cent of the references are to Sabines. The runner-up, Etruscans, only make up roughly a quarter. Like Sabines, Etruscans were mythologised in Roman thought and literature at an early stage and seen as ‘Other’. They were remembered long after the disappearance of their language and culture for their mysterious learning and divination. Other peoples, like the Samnites (whom Macrobius and Lydus do not even mention), the Oscii, the Umbrians or other smaller tribes make up the other 22 mentions.

The overrepresentation of Sabine among glosses in reputable antiquarian sources such as Varro and Verrius Flaccus is only part of the explanation for these statistics. It also owes much to the Sabine presence in historical texts such as Livy, ethnography and geography such as Dionysius and Strabo and poetry such as Ovid, Horace and Vergil. The keen interest in Sabines and their role in Rome’s origins left little room for other non-Latin-speaking or non-Roman groups in literature. While the Sabines became useful archetypes of various characteristics and provided explanations of obscure customs, contemporary peoples were complex, demanding and potentially belligerent, making them poor symbols. As a result, these

---

855 Of the 12 mentions of the Sabines in Pseudo-Acron’s commentary, six are in Sabiniis, which is a phrase used for geography, rather than as reference to the Sabine people. These instances have been added to Table 6 in order to be exhaustive.

856 See Bittarello 2009.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Servius</th>
<th>Macrobius</th>
<th>Lydus</th>
<th>Pseudo-Acron</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabini (lingua Sabina)</td>
<td>25 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 (2)</td>
<td>56 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusci/Tusci (lingua Etrusca)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samnites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osci (lingua Osca)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campani</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneti</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernici</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Italian peoples mentioned in the writings of Servius, Macrobius, Pseudo-Acron and Lydus. Numbers in brackets indicate how many of the unbracketed number refer to language. The statistics are compiled based on the indices in Keller 1906, Mountford 1960, Willis 1963 and Bandy et al. 2013b.
groups are seldom discussed in any great detail outside works of history.

Writers of the fifth and sixth centuries CE have no first-hand experience of the world they venerate, but have based their ideas on Republican and Imperial literature, all written from a Roman perspective. The Italy of late antiquity was not like Italy before Rome. The peninsula, which had previously been the home of different cultures and languages with varying levels of contact, was now largely homogenous, though diversified by migrating people from the north. With no evidence of Sabellic-speakers on the ground and little mention of them in Roman literature, these late writers are given no opportunity to form an opinion of them. Therefore, ethnics such as Samnites, Umbri, Marsi etc. mean little to them. However, the Sabines have a well-known and obvious meaning. The Sabines of myth are more relatable and easier to engage with than the peoples who have not left or have not been allowed to leave their mark on history.
Chapter Six

*De Lingua Sabina*: Contexts and Conclusions

The Sabine presence in Roman mythohistory provided the Romans with a tool to reflect on ideas of conquest, diversity and integration. Their connections both to early Rome and to Italy beyond Roman control made them a bridge to Sabellic-speaking peoples of Central and Southern Italy. The Sabines also represented something purely native, unsullied by decadent influences from abroad and from modernity.

Some modern scholars have dismissed the Sabine glosses as an idiosyncrasy of Varro’s, which possibly exaggerates the importance of Sabine.\(^{857}\) This view fails to take into account how ubiquitous Sabines are in both scholarship and literature from the first centuries BCE and CE. While Varro is the most frequent source, accounting for 15 of 39 glosses, he is by no means alone in his fascination for Sabine glosses. At times, the idea of Varro’s dominance is backed up by falsehoods, such as claiming Varro to be the source of Sabine glosses he never mentions.\(^{858}\) The trope of Varro’s ‘sabinomania’ apparently leads to an assumption that if it is Sabine, it is from Varro.

The importance of Sabines can be seen not only in the stories told about them, but also through the sheer number of Sabine glosses. Statistics of glosses ascribed to the languages of Italy are presented in Table 7. The list underlying the statistics, which follows the criteria used to compile the list of Sabine glosses outlined in §1.4, is given in Appendix II.\(^{859}\)

There are 110 glosses assigned to languages of Italy during all of antiquity, ranging

---

\(^{857}\) e.g. Salmon 1967:32; Poucet 1985:79; Dench 1995:157; Coleman 2001:84; Biville 2013:43; Cornell et al. 2013c:516-517; Smith 2014b:133.

\(^{858}\) Ribezzo 1930:73 (*hirpus*); Spadoni 2004:392 (*curis*); Mastrorosa 2004:236 (*herna*); Thomson de Grummond 2009:34 (*cupencus*); Spadoni 2016:23 (*curis*). None of these words are discussed in Varro’s extant work.

\(^{859}\) I have excluded 13 Etruscan plant-names from the *Notha* of Dioscorides, as their provenance is unclear. In Wellmann 1907-1914, the glosses are given as alternative readings instead of additional material.
from Varro to Byzantine scholars. Of these, Sabine is the largest group, with 39 instances, over a third of the glosses. This is far more than glosses assigned to Oscan; even if we add the glosses ascribed to Oscan-speaking peoples and places (i.e. the categories Campanian, Lucanian, Oscan and Samnite in Table 7), there are only twenty glosses, making up eighteen per cent of the total. There are 31 Etruscan glosses, which is unsurprising considering the Roman fascination with the Etruscan Other, not least in terms of language. This number is especially inflated by the fifth-century lexicographer Hesychius, who includes fourteen Etruscan glosses, thirteen of which are not glossed as such elsewhere.
There is also a difference in what type of words are glossed. Some of the Sabine glosses are very specialised, but nine of the glosses appear on the Swadesh and the Leipzig-Jakarta lists of core vocabulary: *ciprus* (‘good’), *fasena* (‘sand’), *nero* (‘man’), *herna* (‘stone’), *alpus* (‘white’), *sol* (‘sun’), *cascus* (‘old’), *catus* (‘sharp’) and *σάγκος* (‘sky’). By contrast, the non-Sabine glosses are far more specific, with the meaning of only two glosses, Marsian *herna* (‘stone’, *Schol. Veron. ad Aen. VII.684, Paulus ex F. 89L) and Etruscan *falado* (‘sky’, Paulus ex F. 78L), appearing on either the Swadesh or Leipzig-Jakarta lists. The rest are primarily religious or agricultural terms or words for cultural items and concepts. The Sabine glosses are also different in the parts of speech which are glossed. Overall, most glosses are nouns. While this is true of Sabine too, five adjectives are also glossed as such. By contrast, only three adjectives are glossed as being from other languages: Oscan *daliuus* ‘mad’ (Paulus ex F. 59L) and *sollus* ‘entire’ (Festus 372L, Paulus ex F. 373L) and Umbrian *dirus* ‘bad’ (Serv. ad *Aen. III. 235*).

This prevalence of Sabine leads to two questions. Why is Sabine so overrepresented among glosses, and why are the types of words, both in terms of parts of speech and semantics, glossed as Sabine different? One possibility could be that these glosses were easily accessible to Roman writers. Proximity was likely a factor for inclusion on a large scale, explaining why we have more words from Greek and the languages of Italy than from languages spoken further afield, but it clearly does not work on a smaller scale. If this were the case, we would see more Faliscan and Praenestine glosses. In reality, there are only four and five glosses respectively ascribed to these linguistic variants.

This lends credence to the other possibility, that the Sabine glosses are overrepresented because they convey something of importance to the writers who include them. The Sabine role in Rome runs all the way back to the founding of the city. It is the truce between them and the early Romans that is the prototype for Roman generosity, and it is because of their influence that Rome has its cults and customs. The Sabines of old were seen as a honourable ally and a formidable enemy. They were austere, rough and pious, an opposing force to the supposedly decadent Greeks and Easterners. It was to them the Romans turned when they

---


861 With some good-will, we may add Lanuvian *mane* (‘well’, *Macrob. Sat. I.3.13*), as ‘good’ is on the lists.

862 The exceptions are the adjectives given above, two adverbs, Lanuvian *mane* (*Macrob. Sat. I.3.13*) and Praenestine *tammodo* (*Plaut. Trin. 711*), one pronoun, Oscan *pitpit* (Paulus ex F. 235L) and one numeral, Oscan *pitora* (Festus 226L), as well as one verb, Etruscan *iduare* (*Macrob. Sat. I.15.17*).
wanted examples of devout and severe character to emulate. As vaguely but noticeably Other, the Sabines were also a bridge to the rest of Italy. The myths among peoples of Central and Southern Italy, detailing their descent from the Sabines, can be utilised to connect them to the Romans. Present conflicts could be put aside by turning to mythohistory and pointing to a shared origin. This picture had little to do with the people who lived in the Sabine territory. It was confined to the misty past, where ethnic groups could be reduced to simple archetypes.

To the Roman writer, the act of positing a Sabine origin for a Latin word is much like giving Numa, the first Sabine king of Rome, credit for establishing many of Rome’s cults. It strengthens the story of the Romans’ past and present diversity and age-old bond with the rest of Italy. Just like the Sabines were fundamental Rome and its history, the Sabine language influences Latin.

***

The tense associated with Sabine glosses has been given some attention by Negri, who has argued that Varro’s use of the present tense indicated that the words were in use at the time he included them in his work. This puts too much emphasis on what may simply be a stylistic choice. It also fails to consider the number of uses of the present and past tenses. Overall, the present tense is the most common, with 27 verbs associated with Sabine. The past tenses are used six times, while 13 glossings do not include a verb. (This includes each individual glossing, and thus the numbers do not correspond to the number of glosses, as some are glossed multiple times, e.g. curis, glossed seven times as Sabine.) Varro also uses the present tense most often, with four instances, but of his glossings, eight – more than half – do not include a verb. Only once is it unambiguous that a word is currently used, when Varro says that teba is used etiam nunc, ‘even now’ (RR III.1.6).

Glossings using the present tense are mainly found in later material, from the Empire and later antiquity. We cannot take the use of dicunt or est as an indication that the word in question is currently used. It does not make sense considering what we know of antiquarian working methods, which were not primarily built on autopsy but from studying written materials. We may not always be able to trust our manuscripts on the difference between tenses. Lindsay prints dicebant in a passage describing how the rustici used the word orum ‘gold’ (Festus 196L, Paulus ex F. 197L), but one manuscript, which he considers written by a

---

scriba neglectissimus, gives the verb as the present *dicunt*.\(^{864}\) At Festus 180L, Lindsay and Pieroni’s readings differ, with the former reading *dixit* and the latter *dicit*.\(^{865}\) Tenses are therefore often unreliable evidence, as they are subject to stylistic measures and possible scribal errors.

While the use of tenses does not throw any light on when the Sabine glosses were used, the close association between the Sabines and ‘the ancients’ tells us something of how the Sabines are conceived. Seven Sabine glosses – *fircus, fedus, februm, scensa, uesperna, curis, σπόριον* and *fasena* – have also been glossed as used by the *antiqui, ueteres* or *παλαίοι*.\(^{866}\) It is not always clear what these terms mean, and it is likely that they might have changed over time. What is considered old in the late Republic is not the same as what is old in the second century CE. Some words associated with *antiqui* are illustrated with literary examples, which has led North to translate *antiqui* as ‘early writers’, and Moscadi to identify them specifically as Plautus, Lucilius and Naevius.\(^{867}\) It is clear that on occasion, *antiqui* can carry this meaning. However, it is not the only one. When everyday words such as names of animals or meals are ascribed to the *antiqui*, it is to show a continuity between modern Roman life and their early ancestors. *Antiqui* may be rendered as ‘people of old’. They are primal, and markedly different from modern Romans, as the *intonsi aui* in Ov. *Fast.* II.30, but they are originators of what has become the status quo. Most often, forms ascribed to the *antiqui* are, like the Sabine forms, quoted to show changes leading to forms familiar to the Roman reader.\(^{868}\)

With this in mind, it is no surprise that there is an overlap between Sabine glosses and ‘old’ glosses. The Sabines were intimately connected to the early days of Rome. There may have been disagreement among the scholars of antiquity whether certain early words were Sabine, or simply old Latin, as there certainly is some fluidity between the concepts. This can be seen in how Velius Longus glosses the same word as both Sabine and ‘old’ in the same work, and uses ‘old’ and Sabine examples side by side (*GL* VII.69.4-12, 81.11). This fluidity

---

\(^{864}\) Lindsay 1913a:xx.

\(^{865}\) Pieroni 2004:36, 137.

\(^{866}\) These glossings are found in Paulus ex F. 47L, 74L, Festus 228L; Ov. *Fast.* II.19-23; Plut. *Rom.* XXIX.1, *Quaest. Rom.* 285D; *GL* VII.69.10-11, 81.8-12; Isid. *Etym.* IX.5.24. *Strena* is according to Festus 410L, Paulus ex F. 411L formed through a tendency of the *antiqui* to add /s/ in the beginning of words, but *strena* itself is never glossed as such.


\(^{868}\) These words signalling the antiquity of words appear to sometimes emphasise the specifically Roman or Italian origin of the word. When Pliny calls Ennius *antiquissimus uates* (*HN* XVIII.84), he purposefully uses the native word for ‘poet’. Moscadi 2003:582 calls the alternative *poeta* “banal”, but, more to the point, it is a Greek loanword.
does not mean that we can see the antiqui and the Sabines as interchangeable. The overlap is partial, not complete.

***

Earlier linguistic work on the Sabine glosses, ranging from Mommsen, through von Planta, Conway and Buck, to Coleman and Negri, has sought to identify features of the Sabine language. All these scholars have assumed from the outset that the glosses are by and large remnants of a language spoken in the Sabine territory. However, we cannot take this unity for granted. The material does not allow a simple division of Sabine and non-Sabine glosses. Do we consider dirus an Umbrian word as well as a Sabine word? Does the Sabine glossing of e.g. fircus weigh heavier than the glossing associating it with the antiqui?

Throughout this thesis, I have discussed the issue of linguistic compatibility, an idea that builds on the concept of exceptionless and regular sound-change. It is not without its problems, and cannot be applied to ordinary corpus languages. Through analogy and borrowing, words that may seem incompatible with other lexemes may occur. For instance, Latin popina ‘cookhouse’ may seem incompatible with coquo ‘cook’, both from Proto-Italic *kwekʷ- < PIE *pekʷ-, until we take into account that popina is a Sabellic loan, thus explaining the /p/ outcome of *kw. The difference between this and a group of words only assumed to be the same language is that we have good evidence that both popina and coquo are Latin words, as they are both used. Linguistic compatibility is useful for creating a baseline of what may or may not be Sabine.

At the outset, we must accept the subjectivity of etymology. Our assumptions of a word’s origins may colour the etymology we assign to it. Dirus has often been seen as a Sabellic loan, but this is only the case if we accept the etymology *djeH-. If we instead accept the equally likely etymology in *deiH₁-, there is no longer anything to say that dirus is Sabellic. Equally, similixula can be seen as a case of raising of -ē as seen in Oscan, or it may be a simplification of a compound where the first member is simila ‘flour’. This flexibility makes it easy to argue the case one wants to argue.

Some glosses display sound-changes that align them with one another. Both teba and februm show a -b- outcome of a medial aspirate, a Latino-Faliscan reflex. Herna and hirpus have h- in initial position. Meanwhile, fircus, fedus and fasena all show h- > f-. Both fasena and ausum have not undergone rhotacism, something that in itself is not diagnostic as it is a retention, but

---

which groups the words together.

Several of these sound-changes are incompatible with one another. The original initial aspirates manifest as either $h$- or $f$- in Sabine glosses, with no identifiable constraints. The velar reflex in $fircus$ from an original labiovelar is at odds with the $-p$- outcome of $hirpus$. While two words show retention of original $-s$-, $creper < *krep-es$- has undergone rhotacism. $Ciprus$ has undergone a change $*u > i$, which cannot be seen in $cupencus$, $curis$ or $cumba$. If we throw the net wider, the vowel-change in $ciprus$ is also absent in $multa$ and the diminutive suffix in $lixula$ and $similixula$.

What is to be done about this web of contradictory sound-changes? We could choose which words we believe to be Sabine and which are not, e.g. by deciding that $h$- $> f$- is a Sabine change, and that $herna$ and $hirpus$ are incorrectly glossed. We might amend $ciprus$ to $cuprus$ or $cyprus$ to make it align better both with its Sabellic cognates and other Sabine glosses containing $-u$-. We might also impose different categories, for instance a Sabine language and a Sabine dialect of Latin, or Tiberine and inland Sabine.

There are two reasons why such classification would be inadvisable. Firstly, the material does not fall into distinct variants, but a range of differences which do not align. Secondly, it is methodologically dubious, as we then allow our hypothesis to shape our evidence. Even if we keep in mind the possibility that words may be subject to analogy and borrowing, there is not enough material left to establish a Sabine baseline. The more straightforward conclusion is that the Sabine glosses are not the remnants of one lost language or dialect but an artificial, nebulous group.

The classification of the Sabine glosses argued for in this thesis is summarised in Table 8. A majority of the Sabine glosses are Latin words which occur more or less frequently. Other words are not attested elsewhere, but appear to be Latin words which through the lottery of survival are not attested in our extant literature. Some words are archaic or poetic. Five glosses are proper nouns, not common nouns as the ancient sources claim. I have argued that two glosses, $alpus$ and $curis$, are not represent actual lexemes but fabrications, not through any ill-will but simply through Roman misconceptions. Some words appear to be retentions, probably found in Latin dialects. Five words, $ausum$, $teba$ and all three words in $f$-, are clearly Latino-Faliscan, but we cannot distinguish which variant. All we can say for sure is that they are not urban Latin. Finally, three words are likely Sabellic forms – $ciprus$, $sesna$ and $hirpus$. $Herna$ may belong in this group, but may equally be a Latin form.

We have little understanding of the Sabines independent of Roman mythohistory. Even when we turn to material that may at first glance seem objective, such as archaeology and linguistics, the Sabine mirage found among the ancients is hard to dispel. It is nevertheless
clear that, at some point in the past, there was a group of people living in the Sabine territory. Although we do not know what they called themselves, the Romans called them Sabini. This group must have spoken a language, whether a separate Sabellic language, a dialect of an elsewhere attested Sabellic language, or a form of Latino-Faliscan. What we know for certain is that the Sabine glosses give us no clear evidence to settle this question. Neither do the glosses give us any clear insight into the Sabine regional dialect of Latin. Quintilian (Inst. I. 5.56) indicates that there was Sabine regional vocabulary (as well as Etruscan and Praenestine). That this is a case of dialectal Latin is clear as Quintilian says that “licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam”, “I would regard all Italian words as Roman”. However, he does not name any such vocabulary.

This fact does not make the Sabine glosses useless. They provide comparative evidence. The words *fedus, fircus* and *fasena* provide more evidence of the change *h* - > *f* seen in Faliscan and Praenestine. *Terenus* elucidates the contested etymology of Latin *tener*. *Ciprus* may

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attested Latin words</th>
<th>Latin words, not attested elsewhere but probably in use</th>
<th>Archaic or poetic Latin words, attested elsewhere</th>
<th>Likely retentions in Latin dialects or sociolects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creper</td>
<td>cumba, lixula, similixula</td>
<td>catus, cascus, februm, tesqua</td>
<td>terenus, uesperna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crepusculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lepesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίαος (picus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στρήνα (strena)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπόφον (sprium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trimodiae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latino-Faliscan words of unknown dialect</th>
<th>Likely Sabellic words</th>
<th>Likely fabricated words</th>
<th>Onomastic material reinterpreted as lexemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ausum, ?cuipeneus, fasena, fedus, fircus, ?herna, teba</td>
<td>ciprus, scensa, ?herna, hirpus</td>
<td>alpus, curis</td>
<td>Nar, Nerio, Neipho, Nero, Σίδερος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Categorisation of Sabine glosses based on phonology and comparative material. †: *Apruno porco por* has been excluded, as this gloss is too corrupt to categorise.

The words *fedus, fircus* and *fasena* provide more evidence of the change *h* - > *f* seen in Faliscan and Praenestine. *Terenus* elucidates the contested etymology of Latin *tener*. *Ciprus* may
point to a sound-change *u > i, as seen in Marrucinian, although more evidence is required.

The Sabine glosses also give us an invaluable insight into the Roman study of language and ancient ideology. Examples such as *fasena and *fedus show how Roman scholars conceived of sound-changes. The proposed Sabine etymologies of Latin words, either everyday or poetic, allow us to study ancient theories of borrowing, linguistic naturalisation and the unchangeable essence of words. The association between Sabine and Oscan, as in *multa, shows us how Romans understood relationships between peoples of Italy. The status of Sabine as a fount for both Latin and Oscan makes the Sabine glosses part of late Republican fascination with Italic Sacred Springs narratives and Roman myths of Sabines. Roman antiquarian and grammatical study of the past was not conducted in the isolation of an ivory tower, but was intertwined with contemporary preoccupations and preconceptions. The Sabine glosses are a way of explaining the Latin language, just as the Sabines of the past explain Rome of the present. Just as myths are not objective, the attribution of words to Sabine cannot be taken as a bland statement of fact. Our approach to Roman antiquarians and grammarians must be like our approach to Roman historians – unafraid to dismiss ancient claims but open-minded to the possibility that the material is useful.
Appendix I
Glosses Ascribed to Sabine

alpus       Paulus ex F. 4L
†apruno porco por Varro LL V.97
ausum       Paulus ex F. 8L
cascus      Varro LL VII.28
catus       Varro LL VIII.46
ciprus      Varro LL V.159
creper      Varro LL VI.5
crepusculum Varro LL VI.5, VII.77
cumba       Paulus ex F. 56L
cupencus    Serv. ad Aen. XII.539
curis       Paulus ex F. 43L
dirus       Serv. ad Aen. III.235
fasena      Velius Longus GL VII.69.8
februm      Varro LL VI.13
fedus       Varro LL V.97
ficus       Varro LL V.97
herna       Serv. ad Aen. VII.684
hirpus      Serv. ad Aen. XI.785
idus        Varro LL VI.28
lepesta V.123
lixula V.107
multa XI.1.4
nar VII.517
nerinē L.60
nerio XII.22.7
nero Tib. I
πίκος V.4.2
regia olīua V.3.13
sángkos L.90
scensa 465L, Paulus ex F. 457L
similixula V.107
sol V.68
spóriōn Quaest. Rom. 288F
strēnā L.4
tebae III.1.6
terens Sat. II.14
tesqua, tesca Hor. Epist. I.14.19
trimordia Hor. Sat. I.1.53
wesperna Paulus ex F. 457
## Appendix II

Glosses Ascribed to Other Languages of Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campani</td>
<td>arula</td>
<td>Plin. <em>HN</em> VII.15.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meddix</td>
<td>Liv. XXIII.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secula</td>
<td>Varro <em>LL</em> V.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uersus</td>
<td>Varro <em>RR</em> I.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falisci</td>
<td>haba</td>
<td>Scaurus <em>GL</em> VII.13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernici</td>
<td>samentum</td>
<td>Fronto <em>Epist.</em> IV.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanuuini</td>
<td>cenaculum</td>
<td>Varro <em>LL</em> V.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mane</td>
<td>Macrobr. <em>Sat.</em> I.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nebrundines</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 157L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucani</td>
<td>βρέττιος</td>
<td>Strabo VI.1.4, Diod. Sic. XVI.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsi</td>
<td>herna</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 89L; <em>Schol. Veron.</em> ad <em>Aen.</em> VII.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>porculeta</td>
<td>Plin. <em>HN</em> XVII.22.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messapi</td>
<td>βρέντιον</td>
<td>Strabo VI.3.6; Steph. Byz. β.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osci</td>
<td>casnar</td>
<td>Varro <em>LL</em> VII.29; Paulus ex F. 41L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dalius</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 59L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>famel</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 77L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meddix</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 110L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multa</td>
<td>Gell. XI.1.5; Festus 128L, Paulus ex F. 127L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitora</td>
<td>Festus 226L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipatio</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 235L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitpit</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 235L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sollus</td>
<td>Festus 372L, Paulus ex F. 373L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supparus</td>
<td>Varro LL V.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ueia</td>
<td>Paulus ex F. 506L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unculus</td>
<td>Festus 514L, Paulus ex F. 515L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uorsus</td>
<td>Frontinus De Limitibus 10.17-18 Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Praenestini**
- conia: Plaut. *Truc.* 677
- medidies: Varro LL VI.4
- nefrones: Paulus ex F. 157L
- tammodo: Plaut. *Trin.* 711
- tongitio: Paulus ex F. 489L

**Samnites**
- hirpus, ἱρπος: Strabo V.4.2, Paulus ex F. 93L
- multa: Gellius XI.1.5

**Tusculani**
- struppus: Festus 410L

**Volsci**
- sublicium: Festus 374L

**Tusci**
- ἀγαλήτωρ: Hesych. α.274

2124
- ἄνδας: Hesych. α.4703
- ἄνταρ: Hesych. α.5329
- ἄρακος: Hesych. α.6957
- arimus: Serv. ad *Aen.* IX.712
- arseverse: Paulus ex F. 17L
- ἀταισόν: Hesych. α.7998
- αὐκήλως: Hesych. α.8283
- balteus: Charisius GL I.77.10
βυρρός  Hesych. β.1333
γάπος  Hesych. γ.164
γνίς  Hesych. γ.567
δάμνος  Hesych. 8.203
δέα  Hesych. 8.342
δροάνα  Hesych. 8.2426
falado  Festus 78L
iduare  Macrobius. Sat. I.15.17
ister  Liv. VII.2.4; Val. Max. II.4.4
ίταλος  Apollod. II.10
itus, itis  Varro LL VI.4; Macrobius. Sat. I.15.14-17
καδμίλος, camillus  Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II.22.2; Macrobius. Sat. III.8.6;
Serv. ad Aen. XI.543, X.558
κάπρα  Hesych. κ.738
capys  Serv. ad Aen. X.145
cassis  Isid. Etym. XVII.14.1
laena  Festus 104L
lanista  Isid. X.159
lucumones  Serv. ad Aen. II.278
mantisa  Festus 119L
subulo  Varro LL VII.35, Festus 403L

Umbri

dirus  Serv. ad Aen. III.235
plotus  Festus 274L, Paulus ex F. 275L
porculeta  Pliny. HN XVII.22.171
strebula  Festus 410L, Paulus ex F. 411L
uorsus  Frontinus De Limitibus 10.17-18 Campbell
Bibliography

Aberson, Michel, Maria Cristina Biella, Massimiliano di Fazio and Manuela Wullsleger (eds.) (2014), *Entre archéologie et historie: dialogues sur divers peuples de l’Italie préromaine*, Bern: Peter Lang


Alföldi, Maria, Edilberto Formigli and Johannes Fried (eds.) (2011a), *Die römische Wölfin: Ein antikes Monument stürzt von seinem Sockel / The Lupa Romana: An Antique Monument Falls from her Pedestal*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner

Alföldi, Maria, Edilberto Formigli and Johannes Fried (2011b), “Vorwort/Preface” in Alföldi, Formigli and Fried 2011a, pp. 7-13


Almagro-Gorbea, Martín (2016), “*Lancea*, palabra lusitana, y la etnogénesis de los *Lancienses*” in *Complutum* 27, pp. 131-168


Baldwin, Barry (1975), *Studies in Aulus Gellius*, Lawrence: Coronado Press

Balg, Gerhard Hubert (1887), *A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language*, Mayville, Wis.: The Author


Bandy, Anastasius C. et al. (2013b), *Index to the Three Works of Ioannes Lydus (De Mensibus, De Ostentis, De Magistratibus)*, Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press

Baschera, Claudio (1999), *Gli Scoli Veronesi a Virgilio*, Verona: Mazziana

Baschera, Claudio (2000), *Ipotesi d’una relazione tra il Servio Danielino e gli Scoli Veronesi a Virgilio*, Verona: Mazziana

Battisti, Carlo (1959), *Sostrati e Parastrati nell’Italia Preistorica*, Firenze: Felice Le Monnier


Beloch, Karl Julius (1926), *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Punischen Kriege*, Berlin: de Gruyter


Biddau, F. (2008), Q. Terentii Scauri De Orthographia, Hildesheim: Weidmann
Billerbeck, Margarethe (2006-2015), Stephani Byzantii Ethnica, 4 vols., Berlin: de Gruyter
Blänsdorf, Jürgen et al. (eds.) (2011), Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum, Berlin: de Gruyter
Boisacq, Émile (1950), Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes, Heidelberg: Winter
Bottiglioni, G. (1954), Manuale dei dialetti italici, Bologna: STEB


Braun, Virginia and Celia Kitzinger (2001), “‘Snatch,’ ‘Hole,’ or ‘Honey-pot’? Semantic Categories and the Problem of Nonspecificity in Female Genital Slang” in *The Journal of Sex Research* 38, pp. 146-158


Bréal, Michel (1875), *Les tables eugubines*, Paris: F Vieweg


Brinckerhoff Jackson, John (1980), *The Necessity for Ruins, and Other Topics*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press


Bruno, Maria Grazia (1961), “I Sabini e la loro Lingua” in Rendiconti Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche 95, pp. 501-544


Buck, Carl Darling (1928), A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, Boston: Ginn and Company


Burman, Annie (in preparation b), “Rape, Conquest and Origins: the Sabine Women in Roman Mythology”


Cameron, Alan (2011), The Last Pagans of Rome, Oxford: Oxford University Press


Campbell, Lyle and William J. Poser (2008), Language Classification, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Carandini, Andrea (1997), La Nascita di Roma, Torino: Giulio Einaudi


Ceci, L. (1987), Latium Vetus, Alatri: Istituto di Storia e di Arte del Lazio Meridionale

Chantraine, P. (2009), Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots, Paris: Klincksieck


Clackson, James (1994), The Linguistic Relationship between Armenian and Greek, Oxford: Blackwell


Clackson, James (2015a), Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press


Coarelli, Filippo, Stephen Kay and Helen Patterson (2008), “Investigations at Falacrinae, the Birthplace of Vespasian” in *Papers of the British School at Rome* 76, pp. 47-73


Coarelli, Filippo and Helen Patterson (2008b), “Introduction” in Coarelli and Patterson 2008a, pp. 11-12

Coleman, Robert (1986), “The Central Italic Languages in the Period of Roman Expansion” in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 84, pp. 100-131


Conway, R.S. (1893), “On the Change of *d* to *l* in Italic” in *Indogermanische Forschungen* 2, pp. 157-167


Cornell, T.J. and Kathryn Lomas (eds.) (1997), *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, London: Accordian Research Institute


Corssen, Wilhelm (1856), “Oskische Beiträge” in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 5, pp. 81-134

Corssen, Wilhelm (1863), *Kritische Beiträge zur lateinischen Formenlehre*, Leipzig: Teubner


Dahlmann, H. (1940), *Varro: De Lingua Latina Buch VIII*, Berlin


Daly, Lloyd W. (1967), *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Brussels: Latomus


Dueck, Daniela, Hugh Lindsay and Sarah Pothecary (2005), Strabo’s Cultural Geography: the Making of a Kolossourgia, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Duff, J.D. (1968), Silius Italicus Punica, 2 vols., London. William Heinemann

von Duhn, Friedrich (1924), Italische Gräberkunde. Erster Teil, Heidelberg : Carl Winter

Dumézil, Georges (1944), Naissance de Rome, Paris: Gallimard

Dumézil, Georges (1966), La Religion Romaine Archaique, Paris: Payot

Dumézil, Georges (1968), Mythe et épée, Paris: Gallimard


Ehrlich, Hugo (1900), “Über die sekundäre Aktivendung der 3. Person Pluralis im Oskisch-Umbrischen” in Indogermanische Forschungen 11, pp. 299-307
Evans, Elizabeth C. (1939), The Cults of the Sabine Territory, Rome: American Academy in Rome
Falk, Hjalmar and Alf Torp (1906), Etymologisk ordbog over det norske og det danske sprog, Kristiania: H. Achedhoug
Fantham, Elaine (1996), Roman Literary Culture: From Plautus to Macrobius, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press


Fick, August (1870), Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht


Fowler, W. Warde (1899), The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic, London: Macmillan


Fraenkel, Ernst (1948), review of Rand et al. 1946 in Journal of Roman Studies 38, pp. 121-143


Frazer, James George (ed.) (1959), Ovid’s Fasti, London: William Heinemann


Funaioli, Hyginus (ed.) (1907), Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta, Stuttgart: Teubner


Garrucci, Raffaele (1871), “On an Archaic Latin Inscription in the Faliscan Character” in Archaeologia 43, pp. 43-55

Garrucci, Raffaele (1872), “Remarks on a Faliscan Inscription” in Archaeologia 44, pp. 259-263


Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru <http://welsh-dictionary.ac.uk/gpc/gpc.html> [accessed 22 December 2017]

Gibson, Roy and Ruth Morello, (eds.) (2011a), Pliny the Elder: Themes and Contexts, Leiden: Brill


Gleba, Margarita and Helle W. Horsnæs (eds.) (2011), Communicating Identity in Italic Iron Age Communities, Oxford: Oxbow


Gowers, Emily (1993), The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature, Oxford: Clarendon Press


Gradewitz, Otto (1966), Laterculi Vocum Latinarum: Voces Latinas et a Fronte et a Tergo Ordinandas, Hildeheim: Georg Olms


Grammont, Maurice (1895), La dissimilation consonantique dans les langues indo-européennes dans les langues romanes, Dijon: Imprimerie Darantiere


Güntert, Hermann (1914), Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen, Heidelberg: Carl Winter


Hauri-Karrer, Antoinette (1972), Lateinische Gebäcksbezeichnungen, etc., Zürich: Juris

Healy, John F. (1999), Pliny the Elder on Science and Technology, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hedrick Jr., Charles W. (2000), History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity, Austin: University of Texas Press


Helm, Rudolfius (1912), Apulei Platonici Madaurensis pro se De Magia Liber (Apologia), Leipzig: Teubner

Henderson, Bernhard William (1927), Five Roman Emperors, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hiersche, Rolf (1965), “Der Wechsel zwischen anlautendem f und h im Lateinischen” in Glotta 43, pp. 103-118


Holford-Strevens, Leofranc (2003), Aulus Gellius: an Antonine Scholar and his Achievements, Oxford: Oxford University Press


Ihm, Maximilian (ed.) (1925), C. Suetoni Tranquilli Opera De Vita Caesarum, Leipzig: Teubner


Jiménez Zamudio, R. (1986), *Estudio del dialecto peligno y su entorno lingüístico*, León: Universidad de León


Kaldellis, Anthony (2014), review of Bandy 2013 in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2014.01.09


Keller, Otto (1902), *Pseudoacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetusiora*, vol. 1, Leipzig: Teubner
Ker, James and Christoph Pieper (eds.) (2014), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, Leiden: Brill
Koch, C. (1933), *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien sol Indiges und der Kreis der di Indigetes*, Frankfurt: Klostermann


Labbaeus, Carolus (1606), *Veteres Glossae Verborum Iuris*, Paris: Adrianus Beys


Lee, Benjamin Todd (2005), *Apuleius’ Florida: A Commentary*, Berlin: de Gruyter

Lehmann, Yves (1997), *Varron théologien et philosophe romain*, Bruxelles: Latomus


Lindsay, Wallace M. (1891), “Notes on Festus and Nonius” in Classical Review 5, pp. 9-11


Lindsay, Wallace M. (ed.) (1903), Nonii Marcelli De Conpediosa Doctrina, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner


Lindsay, Wallace M. (ed.) (1913a), Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner

Lindsay, Wallace M. (1913b), “Notes on Festus” in Classical Quarterly 7, pp. 115-119

Lindsay, Wallace M. (1933), review of Strzelecki 1932 in Classical Review 47, pp. 78-79

Lindskog, C.L. and K. Ziegler (eds.) (1973), Plutarchus Vitae, Leipzig: Teubner

Loewe, Gustav and Georg Goetz (eds.) (1965), Corpus Glossarium Latinorum, 7 vols., Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert


Macleane, A.J. (ed.) (1853), Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia, London: Whittaker
Malcovati, Henrica (1953), Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Liberae Rei Publicae, Torino: Paravia
Marchesini, Simona (2009), Le lingue frammentarie dell’Italia antica, Milano: Ulrico Hoepli
Marinetti, Anna (1985), Le iscrizioni sudpicene I: Testi, Firenze: Olschki
Matasović, Ranko (2009), Etymological Dictionary of proto-Celtic, Leiden: Brill
Mayhoff, Carolus (ed.) (1906-1909), C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae, Leipzig: Teubner
McDonald, Katherine (2015), Oscan in Southern Italy and Sicily: Evaluating Language Contact in a Fragmentary Corpus, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
McDonald, Katherine (2017), Languages of Italy c.700 – c.50 BC <https://katherinemcdonald.net/research/maps/> [accessed 22 December 2017]


Meineke, A. (ed.) (1824), Strabo Geographia I, Leipzig: Teubner

Meiser, Gerhard (1986), Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft

Meiser, Gerhard (1998), Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft


de Melo, Wolfgang (2010), review of Biddau 2008 in Mnemosyne 63, pp. 329-335


Milnor, Kristina (2014), Graffiti and the Literary Landscape in Roman Pompeii, Oxford: Oxford University Press


Mommsen, Theodor (1850), Die Unteritalischen Dialekte, Leipzig: Georg Wigard

Mommsen, Theodor (1865), Römische Geschichte, Berlin: Weidmann

Moscadi, Alessandro (1981), “Nuove glosse festine in Festo” in *Prometheus* 7, pp. 159-17
Mullen, Alex (2012), “Introduction: Multiple Languages, Multiple Identities” in Mullen and James 2012, pp. 1-35
Müller, Frederik (1926), *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht
Nelsestuen, Grant, A. (2015), *Varro the Agronomist: Political Philosophy, Satire, and Agriculture in the Late Republic*, Columbus: Ohio State University


Ogilvie, R.M. and A. Drummond (1990), “Sources for Early Roman History” in Walbank, Astin, Frederiksen, Ogilvie and Drummond 1990, pp. 1-29


Ollier, François (1933), *Le mirage spartiate*, Paris: E. de Boccard

O’Reilly, Edward and John O’Donovan (1864), *An Irish-English Dictionary*, Dublin: J. Duffy

Osborne, Robin (2012), “Cultures as Languages and Languages as Cultures” in Mullen and James 2012, pp. 317-334


Pallottino, Maximus (1954), *Testimonia Linguae Etruscae*, Firenze: Nuova Italia


Parry, Adam (1963), “The Two Voices of Virgil’s *Aeneid*” in *Arion* 2, pp. 66-80


Patterson, Helen (ed.) (2004), *Bridging the Tiber: Approaches to Regional Archaeology in the Middle Tiber Valley*, London: British School at Rome


Patterson, John (2008), “Modelling the Urban History of the Tiber Valley in the Imperial Period” in Coarelli and Patterson 2008a, pp. 487-498


Persson, Peter (1912), Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung, Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln


Pieroni, Paolo (2004), Marcus Verrius Flaccus’ De Significatu Verborum in den Auszügen von Sextus Pompeius Festus und Paulus Diaconus, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang


Pinna, Francesca (2003), La Lingua degli Umbri, Perugia: Edizioni Jama


Pisani, Vittore (1931), “Die Inschrift der Statuette von Auximum” in Glotta 20, pp. 94-100
Pisani, Vittore (1942/1945), “La donna e la terra” in *Anthropos* 37/40, pp. 241-253

Pisani, Vittore (1953), *Le lingue dell’Italia antica oltre il latino*, Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier


Poccetti, Paolo, Diego Poli and Carlo Santini (2001), *Una storia della lingua latina*, Roma: Carocci


Preller, Ludwig and Henri Jordan (1881), Römische Mythologie, Berlin: Weidmann


Prosdocimi, A. (1996), “Curia, Quirites e il ‘sistema di Quirino’ (Populus Quirium, Quirites II)” in Ostraka 5, pp. 243-319


Radke, Gerhard (1965), Die Götter Altitaliens, Münster: Verlag Aschendorff


Rawson, Elizabeth (1985), Intellectual Life in the Late Republic, London: Duckworth


Reitzenstein, Richard ([1887] 1966), Verrianische Forschungen, Hildesheim: Georg Olm
Ribbeck, Otto (ed.) (1897), Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, Leipzig: Teubner
Rix, Helmut (1994), "Südpikenisch kduino" in Historische Sprachforschung/Historical Linguistics 107, pp. 105-122
Rix, Helmut (2002), Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen, Heidelberg: C. Winter
Rix, Helmut and Martin Kümmel (2001), LIV: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben, Wiesbaden: Reichert
Rohlfs, Gerhard (1932), Dizionario dialettale delle tre Calabrie. Parte prima: Calabro-italiana, vol. 1, Halle: Niemeyer
Rohlfs, Gerhard (1966), Vocabolario supplementare dei dialetti delle Tre Calabrie. Volume Primo, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
Rolfe, J.C. and John T. Ramsey (eds.) (2013), Sallust: The War with Catiline, the War with Jugurtha, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press
Sacconi, Anna (1974), Corpus delle iscrizioni vascolari in Lineare B, Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo
Scopacasa, Rafael (2015), Ancient Samnium: Settlement, Culture, and Identity between History and Archaeology, Oxford: Oxford University Press
Schironi, Francesca (2009), From Alexandria to Babylon: Near Eastern Languages and Hellenistic Erudition in the Oxyrhynchus Glossary (P.Oxy.1802 + 4812), Berlin: de Gruyter
Schmidt, Mauricius (ed.) (1965), Hezychii Alexandrini Lexicon, 4 vols., Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert
Schrijver, Peter (1991), The Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin, Amsterdam: Rodopi
Schrijnen, Jos (1922), “Italische Dialektgeographie” in Neophilologus 7, pp. 223-239


de Simone, Carlo (1968), *Die Griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*, vol. 1, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz


Sittig, Ernst (1931), review of Cortsen 1925 in *Gnomon* 7, pp. 35-39


Solmsen, Felix (1901), *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*, Stassburg: Trübner


Sommer, Ferdinand and Raimund Pfister (1977), *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter


Storr-Best, Lloyd (1912), *Varro on Farming*, London: Bell

Strzelecki, Ladislaus (1932), *Quaestiones Verrianae*, Warsawa: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego


*Svenska Akademiens Ordbok* <http://www.saob.se> [accessed 22 December 2017]


Syme, Ronald (1937), “Who was Decidius Saxa?” in *Journal of Roman Studies* 27, pp. 127-137

Syme, Ronald (1958), “Sabinus the Muleteer” in *Latomus* 17, pp. 73-80

Szemerényi, Oswald (1989), *An den Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck


Tadmor, Uri, Martin Haspelmath and Bradley Taylor (2010), “Borrowability and the Notion of Basic Vocabulary” in *Diachronica* 27, pp. 226-246


Taylor, Lily Ross (1960), The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic, Rome: American Academy
Thomson de Grummond, Nancy and Erika Simon (eds.) (2006), The Religion of the Etruscans, Austin: University of Texas Press
Thurneysen, R (1907), review of Walde, Alois (1906), Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg: C. Winter, in Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen 169, pp. 795-807
Tikkanen, Karin (2011), A Sabellian Case Grammar, Heidelberg: Winter
Trombetti, Alfredo (1928), La lingua etrusca: Grammatica, testi con commento, Firenze: Rinascimento del libro


de Vaan, Michiel (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, Leiden: Brill

Vetter, Emil (1953), *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg: C Winter


Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew (1990), “Pliny the Elder and Man’s Unnatural History” in *Greece & Rome* 37, pp. 80-96


Weinreich, Max (1945), “דיוקי און די פרארבליםמסן און אונדרם ציינ Carpenter in *YIVO Bleter* 25.1, pp. 3-18


Weinstock, Stefan (1960), “Two Archaic Inscriptions from Latium” in *Journal of Roman Studies* 50, pp. 112-118


Weiss, Michael (2010), *Language and Ritual in Sabellic Italy*, Leiden: Brill

Weissenborn, Guilelmus and Mauritius Müller (eds.) (1902), *Titi Livi ab Urbe Condita Libri*, Leipzig: Teubner


Wellmann, Max (1907-1914), *Podanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De Materia Medica*, Berlin: Weidmann


Whatmough, Joshua (1940), “A Note on Raetic” in *Classical Philology* 35, pp. 186-188


Wuensch, Ricard (ed.) (1898), *Ioannis Laurentii Lydi Liber De Mensibus*, Leipzig: Teubner
Zair, Nicholas (2010-2011), “British *-āw-* and *-āg-*, and the Celtic words for ‘Sun’” in *Die Sprache* 49, 194-208
Zair, Nicholas (2016), *Oscan in the Greek Alphabet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Zair, Nicholas (2017), “The Origins of -<i>urC</i>- for Expected -<i>orC</i>- in Latin” in <i>Glotta</i> 93, pp. 255-289


