

BRENT VINE

REMARKS ON THE ARCHAIC LATIN “GARIGLIANO BOWL” INSCRIPTION

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 121 (1998) 257–262

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

REMARKS ON THE ARCHAIC LATIN "GARIGLIANO BOWL" INSCRIPTION

I. Introductory

Two extremely archaic Italic inscriptions on a small bowl ("scodella d'impasto") of buccheroid type, datable to approximately the late sixth or early fifth century B.C.E., have recently been published by M. Cristofani.¹ Subsequently, M. Mancini has devoted a short monograph to the texts in question, with important linguistic and interpretive notes.²

Although the circumstances surrounding the discovery of the bowl are somewhat unclear,³ its provenance is apparently an area associated with a sanctuary of the goddess Marica (where excavations have been carried out since 1926), near the mouth of the Garigliano river, between Lazio and Campania. This places the object in a zone roughly corresponding to the ancient territory of the Aurunci, situated between the Latini and the Volsci.

II. The Readings and Interpretation of Cristofani and Mancini

It will be convenient to recapitulate briefly some of the basic facts concerning the readings and interpretation of the two texts ("A" and "B"), as presented initially by Cristofani, with several interpretive modifications suggested by Mancini.

Text A consists of a single word (a name), incised left-to-right on the outside of the bowl; text B, with 44 visible characters written in *scriptio continua* (also left-to-right), is inscribed all the way around the upper part of the bowl's interior, with somewhat smaller lettering. The two texts appear to be written in different hands, and text A may be somewhat older than text B.

The reading of text A poses no difficulties:

A: **AHUIDIES**⁴

The ending **-IES** is evidently "Italic" in the narrow sense (i.e. non-Latin), either nom. sg. (as common in Oscan or Paelignian gentile names corresponding to Lat. *-ius*), or, less probably, gen. sg. (as attested in the more or less contemporaneous "Paleo-Oscan" or "Pre-Samnite" *Besitzerinschriften*, as well as in the similar South Picene text TE. 4, among other possible South Picene genitives in *-ies*). As for the name itself, Mancini (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 11ff., esp. 15-16) astutely compares what appears to be the same name in both early Oscan (**ahvdiu** Ve 70 [fem. nom.sg.], already with syncope as compared with **AHUIDIES**) and later Oscan (**avdiis** Ve 16, $\alpha\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\epsilon\varsigma$ Pocc 154), corresponding to Lat. *Audius/Audeius*.

The reading and interpretation of text B are more problematic. As initially read by Cristofani, the text reads:

B: **PARIMEDESOMKOMMEOISSOKIOISTRIVOIADDEOMDUO[- - -]NEI**

In this text there are certain indeterminacies (apart from the word division) explicitly noted, especially for character 35 (the **D** at the end of the sequence ...**TRIVOIAD**), for which **D**, **I**, and **U** all seemed

¹ *Due testi dell'Italia preromana*, Quaderni di Archeologia etrusco-italica 25 (Rome 1996). Cristofani's meticulous editio princeps, with full description (including extensive photographic documentation) and preliminary interpretation, forms part 1. of this work ("Per regna Maricae", pp. 9-32).

² *Osservazioni sulla nuova epigrafe del Garigliano*, Opuscula IV(1), Biblioteca di Ricerche Linguistiche e Filologiche, 42.1 (Rome 1997). I am extremely grateful to Professor Philip Baldi (of Pennsylvania State University), who brought this find to my attention in July of 1997, and graciously provided me with details concerning the two publications just named.

³ The bowl seems to have been in private hands for some period of time, until its importance was recognized by scholars at the University of Naples, who brought it to the attention of Cristofani.

⁴ The **U** (upsilon) is "capovolto", a type which I have discussed elsewhere: *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions* (Innsbruck 1993), 88f.

possible, and for the broken area of the edge of the bowl, beginning just after **DUO**[and located mainly above **PARI**.

As for word division, **PARI MED ESOM KOM MEOIS SOKIOIS** is immediately clear, and **ESOM KOM MEOIS SOKIOIS** must mean something like “I am [i.e. belong] together with my companions”, in familiar *titulus loquens* format, the “companions” presumably referring to other bowls or votive objects.⁵ Given the provenance of the inscription (cf. I. above), and given associations between Marica and Diana (on which Cristofani discourses at length), it seemed irresistible to Cristofani (and he is followed in this by Mancini) to take the immediately following **TRIVOIAD** or **TRIVOIAI** (ignoring the possibility that the last letter of this sequence might actually be a **-U**, cf. above) as an early version corresponding to the Class. Lat. epithet *Trivia* (sc. Diana). This, in turn, determined the interpretation of the following sequence as **DEOM DUO**[**NAD/I**], Class. Lat. *deorum bonā/bonae*, i.e. the cup is described as being “from/to Trivia, the good (one) of (among) the gods”. In the end, both Cristofani and Mancini favor dat. sg. **TRIVOIAI** as being semantically easier, in a votive context, than abl. sg. **TRIVOIAD**.

As for **PARI MED** and **JNEI**, Cristofani saw that **PARI MED** must mean something like “procure me” or “take/appropriate me” (**PARI**, 2sg. imperative; *pario* in the meaning ‘procure, appropriate’, and with 4th-conjugation forms, is easily paralleled in Old Latin), but was unable to integrate **JNEI** into the text, except to speculate that this might be the end of some additional epithet of the goddess. **NEI**, however, is actually squeezed in above **PARI MED**, whence Mancini’s attractive proposal (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 19ff.) that these three belong together as a phrase **NEI PARI MED**, i.e. a concluding injunction “Do not appropriate me”; cf. similar prohibitions on other vessel inscriptions, notably the end of the Duenos inscription, in the widely-accepted interpretation of H. Rix (*MSS* 46 [1985], 193-220).

III. Problems in Reading and Interpretation (Cristofani, Mancini)

There are at least seven serious or relatively serious problems with the Cristofani/Mancini readings and interpretation of the sequence **TRIVOIAI DEOM DUO**[**NAI**], most of them surrounding the alleged (dat. sg.) theonym **TRIVOIAI** itself:

III.1. Apart from problems with the reading of individual letters in the sequence **TRIVOIAI** (as discussed in III.2, III.3, III.4 below), the fundamental difficulty with the form concerns the proposed identification with Lat. *Trivia*; this, in turn, rests on the answer to the following two-part question: can one accept either (a) an *o*-grade for the ancestor of Lat. *via* (to frame the problem in morphological terms), or else (b) (in terms of orthography) a spelling of the preform of *Trivia* that makes use of an **<O>**? It is difficult to arrive at anything but a negative answer for both parts of this question:

(III.1.a) According to Mancini, “l’epigrafe del Garigliano induce a ritenere che dietro la parola latina [sc. *via* — add. BV] non vi fosse una protoforma con vocalismo *-e-*, bensì un più antico *woyā-*”, thus providing “la forma apofonica originaria del nome latino della ‘strada’” (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 18). Mancini does not, however, specify the phonological developments envisioned, which are far from straightforward: an *o*-grade **uoiH-eh₂*,⁶ presumably of the type *toga, rota* etc., will not yield Lat. *via* directly in any phonologically regular way. But even if one could account, by some essentially *ad hoc* stratagem, for a development of Arch. OLat. **(-)VOIA** > Class. *via*, there remains the intractable fact that the Os-

⁵ The remarkable form **ESOM** is discussed in detail by Mancini, *op. cit.* [n. 2] 27-39, with full bibliography. Note also **KOM**, Class. Lat. *cum*, and the early ablatives in **-OIS**, with unreduced final diphthong hitherto evidenced in a Latin context only (and somewhat equivocally) in the (dat. pl.) **QUROIS** of the Castor-Pollux dedication (*CIL* I². 2833), and in the still-controversial (abl. pl.?) **RIVOIS** of the Duenos inscription (*CIL* I². 4), according to the interpretation of H. Eichner, “Reklameiamben aus Roms Königszeit”, *Sprache* 34 (1988[-1990]), 207-238.

⁶ Despite Mancini’s notation, the root implied by this particular etymology of Lat. *via* is clearly laryngeal-final, cf. Ved. *vēti* ‘nachspüren etc.’ (ptcple. *vītá-*), Gk. *ῥέμαι* [*ῥέμαι*] ‘move forwards, strive after’, Li. *víti* ‘chase after, drive’ etc.; see recently M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen* (Heidelberg 1986ff.) II. [Lief. 17, 1995], 509f. s.v. *VAY*^l.

can, Umbrian and South Picene forms for this word⁷ cannot possibly derive from an *o*-grade. Indeed, as argued persuasively by I.-J. Adiego Lajara,⁸ the evidence of South Picene *viam* is particularly telling, and requires a preform **uiH-éh₂*, which will in fact account directly for all of the Italic forms, including Lat. *via*.⁹ From a linguistic point of view, then, an identification of (-)VOIA (assuming that to be the correct reading) with Lat. *via* is doubtful from the start, and quite likely impossible.

(III.1.b) Cristofani, recognizing that Lat. *via* and its Sabellian congeners must be subsumed under a single preform (which he takes to be an *e*-grade), proposes an orthographic solution: "poiché un passaggio *-ei-* > *-oi-* non è giustificabile, si dovrebbe supporre, rispetto a *uei-a**, che la sostanza fonica di [u] sia realizzata con un digrafo *vo* nel quale *o* rappresenta *u*" (*op. cit.* 22, similarly 23: "*-uia* (scritto *-voia*) rispetto a *-ueia** in *Trivoia*"). Even if Lat. *via* etc. derived from an *e*-grade, the diphthong /ei/ that would be expected for this period could not be spelled with <-I->. Still more difficult is the idea that the labial glide preceding it could be spelled with a digraph <-VO->: an extraordinary and highly improbable suggestion, for which, not surprisingly, no parallels are offered, since no parallels exist. An orthographic interpretation of this sort must clearly be entertained with the utmost suspicion.

Thus the identification of the sequence TRIVOIAI with a (dat. sg.) *Triviae* rests on the most precarious morphological and orthographic foundations. Such an interpretation might be worth considering only if the reading itself were beyond reproach; yet this is not the case, as discussed in the following three sub-sections.

III.2. The alleged final **-I** of TRIVOIAI is almost certainly not an **-I**. Of the three possibilities admitted by Cristofani (see II, above), by far the best is **-U** (which effectively excludes an *ā*-stem interpretation altogether, although, as we shall see, one need not assume that the word division is as claimed). Even if, as Cristofani observes (*op. cit.* [n. 1] 11), the right stroke of the two diagonal strokes forming this letter is somewhat less deeply carved than the left one, it is clearly intentional, and cannot simply be ignored; these two strokes form an entirely unexceptionable *upsilon*, as is quite clear from the photographs and facsimile published by Cristofani.¹⁰ It is equally clear that the horizontal stroke crossing the tops of the diagonals — responsible for the possible interpretation as **D** (see II. above) — is a chance marking, as Cristofani himself suggests; the resulting **D**, as he notes, would be "un *delta* di forma eccezionalmente triangolare", entirely unlike the immediately following **D** and the other two **D**'s in this text. Admittedly, the *upsilon* of DUO[is of a slightly different type from that in (TRIVOIA)U, with nearly-vertical left stroke and a small Greek-style tail. Nevertheless, this variation falls squarely within norms otherwise well-documented for this period (or slightly earlier), as seen, for example, in the Forum Inscription (*CIL* I². 1), where <Y> and <V> (both = *upsilon*) coexist.¹¹

III.3. The **-V-** of the presumed TRIVOIAI is a *wau* ("digamma", i.e. <F>), versus the **-U-** (*upsilon*) of DUO[NAI]; nevertheless, both characters are assumed to spell the glide /w/ (in the case of TRIVOIAI, allegedly as part of a digraph <-VO->, cf. III.1.b). But there is no parallel for such a distinction appearing in one and the same text, i.e. **-V-** (or **-VO-**) for intervocalic /w/ vs. **U** for post-consonantal /w/. At best, if **-V-** spells /w/, then the **-U-** of DUO[must spell /u/, as in the famous VETUSIA of

⁷ O. *viú* (and *amvían(n)ud*), U. *vea*, *via/via*, SPi. *viam* (TE. 2).

⁸ *Protosabelio, osco-umbro, sudpiceno* (Barcelona 1992), 94-6, building on E. Nieto Ballester, in: "Veia: apud Oscos dicebatur plaustrum (P. F. 506,3)", *Emerita* 56 (1988) 37-41.

⁹ As for the morphology of **uiH-éh₂*, which remains unspecified in Adiego Lajara's treatment: a zero-grade feminine (concretized) abstract of this sort ('striving, pursuit, direction' etc. > 'path, road') would be best understood as a root-noun replacement of the type *fuga* 'escape' (for the root noun, cf. Gk. φύγα-δε), on which see M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich 1977) 277; for the root noun itself, cf. RV *ví-* 'sich zuwendend', *pada-ví-* 'die Spur verfolgend, Wegweiser', etc. (Mayrhofer *loc. cit.*, [n. 7]).

¹⁰ The facsimile (Cristofani, *op. cit.* [n. 1]16) is reprinted by Mancini (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 7); see, however, n. 13 below.

¹¹ On early Latin <Y> and <V>, see R. Wachter, *Altlateinische Inschriften* (Bern 1987) 67 with n. 166; most recently D. Urbanová, "La paleografia delle iscrizioni latine arcaiche" in *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina: Preatti* (Rome 1997), 121-132 (128 on *upsilon*).

the Bernardini tomb cup;¹² but the character <F>, in a Latin context, might just as well spell /f/, or conceivably its voiced counterpart. Indeed, the character in question is unusual in some respects, and may not in fact be a wau at all, as discussed further below (V.1.). The most judicious approach would be to transcribe it provisionally as <F̣>.

III.4. The alleged second **-I** of **TRIVOIAI** is in two important respects entirely unlike any other **I** in this text, and is almost certainly not an **-I**: (1) it has a distinctly jagged appearance, and may comprise at least three strokes (and possibly more);¹³ and (2) it is nearly twice the length of all of the other six **I**'s, thus strikingly extending below the line, precisely in the manner of **S** in this text (including the **S** of text A). Indeed, these features make it reasonably clear that this is a “narrow **S**”, of a type I have discussed elsewhere (*op. cit.* [n. 4] 76f.) in connection with the (approximately contemporaneous) Corcolle Altar Fragments (CIL I². 2833a).

III.5. Contra **DUO[NAI]**: considerations of spacing and layout, partly arising from Mancini's own arguments concerning the adjacent **NEI PARI MED**, make it most unlikely that **DUO[** is completed by more than one additional letter. A sequence **[NAI]** would need to extend well into the broken area above **PARI**, where available space is limited, as Cristofani himself observes (*op. cit.* [n. 1] 22) with reference to the “spazio ancora a disposizione, per una o due lettere che precedono il - -]nei finale”; moreover, the curvature of **DUO[**, including the possible traces of an immediately following character (not represented on the facsimile, but visible in the photographs), indicates no such direction into the broken area. Finally, if one accepts Mancini's attractive arguments (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 20f.) supporting the intentional superposition of **NEI** with respect to **PARI MED**, it is difficult to understand why what appears to be **DUO[-]PARIMED** (with **NEI** beginning over **RI**, and the alleged **[NAI]** of necessity curving upwards into the break — a highly complex *ordinatio*, far more inept than the simple superposition of **NEI**) would not have been written instead, for example, as **DUONAIMED**, with **DUONAI** completed normally and with superposed **NEIPARI**.

III.6. “Triviai, deom duonai” (Class. Lat. *Triviae, deorum bonae*) is an extremely odd phrase; neither is (Diana) Trivia otherwise known as “Bona Dea” (a different entity altogether), nor is any other justification to be found in extant references to Trivia, Diana, or, for that matter, any other deity. Trivia (sometimes *dea Trivia*, e.g. Prop. 2.32.10) is, for example, *potens* (Cat. 34.15, Apul. *Apol.* 31) or *virgo* (Lucr. 1.84); but there is nothing to support such highly unnatural phraseology.

III.7. “(ego) sum + dative” has no parallel in a votive text: *tituli loquentes* with “ego/sum”¹⁴ regularly contain a possessive genitive or dative, specifying the ownership of the object in question (“I am [the such-and-such] of so-and-so”, i.e. “I am [belong] to so-and-so”). Such expressions, to be sure, occasionally appear on objects designated as “belonging to” a divinity; in such cases, however, the genitive seems normally to be found, as in (Oscan) **herentateís.súm**, ‘Veneris sum’ (Ve 107A; altar), **herettates:súm** ‘id.’ (Ve 172A; bronze key). For Latin, I know of no comparable examples, either with genitive or dative. Mancini appositely remarks (*op. cit.* [n. 2] 17f.) that text B on the Garigliano bowl fills the “conspicuous void” of *tituli loquentes* in Latin context hitherto observable from the late sixth to the end of the fourth century B.C.E.; in contrast, the conspicuous absence of *tituli loquentes* with phraseology of precisely the sort assumed by Cristofani and Mancini—in any linguistic context from anywhere in ancient Italy—is distinctly troubling.

IV. Towards a Revised Reading and Interpretation

Taken together, the above considerations make it virtually impossible for text B to refer to “Trivia”, or indeed any other divinity. Each of these problems, however, is easily resolved by the following new

¹² See e.g. R. Wallace, “The Origins and Development of the Latin Alphabet” in *The Origins of Writing*, ed. W. M. Sener (Univ. of Nebraska, 1989) 121-135, with facsimile p. 123.

¹³ It is important to note that the facsimile (see n. 10), while in general fairly accurate, is in this respect quite deceptively inaccurate in its smooth representation of this character.

¹⁴ See in general L. Agostiniani, *Le “iscrizioni parlanti” dell'Italia antica* (Florence 1982).

reading for the sequence in question (which also has at least one additional point in its favor, quite apart from the issues raised above):

TRIFOSA UDEOMDUO[M]

i.e. (with word divisions):

TRIFOS AUDEOM DUO[M].

Thus the longer portion of text B would run as follows:

ESOM KOM MEOIS SOKIOIS TRIFOS AUDEOM DUO[M]

"I am, together with my three companions, [the bowl/possession/votive offering] of the two Audii."

The vessel thus indicates that it forms part of a set of four such bowls or votive objects, and describes itself, according to a standard "ego/sum + gen." format of *tituli loquentes* expressions, as belonging to two members of the Audius gens. For Audius, see II, above on Mancini's interpretation of **AHUIDIES** (text A, on the outside of the bowl), which presents the family name in a different (i.e. non-Latin) guise (perhaps inscribed earlier, and in any case by a different hand). While there is no requirement that the inner and outer texts refer to one another, an interpretation according to which the two can be related in such a direct and satisfying way would seem to be highly favored.

V. Additional Notes

V.1. **TRIFOS** (Class. Lat. *tribus*). If the letter in question is indeed <F>, then **TRIFOS** (for expected **TRIBOS**) could be explained in at least two ways. In theory, the form could simply reflect a phonological archaism, showing the bilabial spirant assumed to have developed from PIE medial **-bh-*, before the despirantization that yielded Lat. /-b-/.¹⁵ As it happens, words containing segments derived from PIE medial **-bh-* seem not to occur with any certainty in comparably early Latin texts.¹⁶ Alternatively, one could consider such a spelling to reflect an Oscanism (perhaps attributable to a local engraver), of a sort that might not be surprising for this time and place (cf. O. **luisarifs**, Ve 74.3, with /-fs/ preserved in pre-spelling-reform Oscan).¹⁷ Nevertheless, as already noted above (III.3.), this is not an ordinary <F>; the photographs reveal the following three striking features: (1) there is distinct downward curvature at the end of the upper cross-stroke, (2) the lower cross-stroke appears to be longer than the upper one, but with a slight *upward* curvature at its end, and (3) (most surprising of all, oddly without mention in Cristofani's description) the two strokes appear to be joined by a curved segment which, though discontinuous, does not have the look of an accidental marking. It thus seems possible that the form might with equal propriety be read simply as **TRIBOS**, with an unusual or crudely-formed **B**.

¹⁵ As a variant of this account, one could suppose that the despirantization was essentially an urban feature, and that forms like **TRIFOS** could have survived longer in conservative outlying dialect areas. Interestingly, this particular isogloss involving the treatment of medial **-bh-* (and also **-dh-*) is one of the few that separates Latin and Faliscan: cf. early Fal. **carefo**, 'carebo', late Fal. **efiles**, 'aedilis', etc.)

¹⁶ The **B** of **HAB**[in line 9 of the Forum Inscription is not altogether certain (see Wachter [n. 12 above] 67), and a pre-form **ghab-* remains possible in any case; the **BERBER** of the Carmen Arvale (CIL I², 2) is of course without value for this sort of problem, and may not have a medial **-bh-* (see most recently J. Katz, in: "Testimonia Ritus Italici", *HSCP* 97 [in press]). The earliest probable instance of **-B-** from **-bh-* known to me is the **JBOS** in line 9 of CIL I², 361b (assuming dat./abl. pl.), in what may be a fifth- or fourth-century text (see Wachter [n. 12 above] 460, with facsimile).

¹⁷ This latter interpretation, in turn, would have implications for the evaluation of **ESOM** as an echt-Latin form, cf. "Paleo-Oscan"/"Pre-Samnite" **esom**, **esum**, South Picene *esum*. One may add that under this interpretation, the spirant spelled by <F> could in principle be voiced: on the possible retention of a voiced bilabial spirant in medial position for Oscan of this period, see e.g. E. Campanile, *Studi sulla posizione dialettale del latino* (Pisa 1968) 110; for South Picene, see M. Janda, "Die Inschrift des Helms von Canosa und der Buchstabe b des Südpikenischen" in *Oskisch-Umbrisch: Texte und Grammatik*, ed. H. Rix (Wiesbaden 1993), 147-154.

V.2. **KOM MEOIS SOKIOIS TRIFOS** (or **TRIBOS**). Although a precise phraseological parallel is not quotable, one may compare the early Oscan vessel inscriptions Ve 124A-C, in which each vessel bears the plural notation **upsatuh:sent:tiianeī**: ‘(they have been) made in Teanum’, presumably referring to a set or “service”.¹⁸ The word order with postposed numeral (“cum meis sociis tribus”) is not problematic, whether conceived in Latin or Oscan terms.¹⁹

V.3. **AUDEOM()DUO[M]**. I.e. the expected OLat. gen. pl. forms (= Class. Lat. *Audiorum duorum*); **AUDEOM** perhaps most simply taken as *Audeom* = *Audium* (vs. *Audeium*), with the banal OLat. (and partly non-urban) prevocalic **E** for **I** of CIL I², 2658 **FILEOD** (“Tibur Pedestal Inscription”), 60 **filea** (Praeneste), etc. Note also **AHUIDIES** in text A vs. syncopated **AUDEOM** in text B (as already in the oldest Oscan version of this name, cf. II. above). The specification of a votive offering from two family members is a commonplace: in addition to examples on cippi and pedestals,²⁰ note especially, on a vessel dedicated to Diana in *titulus loquens* format, CIL I², 43 **Cn.Q.Et.med.Diana**, at least according to the most plausible interpretation of this text (R. Wachter, *ZPE* 74 [1988], 151-152).

One may well be grateful to Cristofani for his illuminating disquisitions on “una serie di problemi di carattere storico-religioso” (*op. cit.* [n. 1] 26, see 26-32), mainly concerning Marica, Diana, and their relationship. In the context of the Garigliano bowl inscriptions, however, these problems may be largely irrelevant. The nature of the find spot is an essential datum for the interpretation of such texts, but must not be allowed to prejudice the details of orthography, paleography, or linguistic history.²¹

University of California, Los Angeles

Brent Vine

¹⁸ References and discussion in my work earlier cited (n. 4, above), 137ff.

¹⁹ On postposition of numerals in Latin, see A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1963), 408; for Oscan, cf. **ekas | iúvilas.trís**, Ve 81.2-3.

²⁰ E.g. CIL I². 30 **M.C.Pomplio.No.f | dedron | Hercule**, 61 **Q.K.Cestio.Q.f | Hercule.donu | [d]edero**.

²¹ I am grateful to Philip Baldi (above n. 2) and to Rex Wallace (of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst) for helpful discussions during the preparation of this paper.