Latin *sancītō* vs. Lusitanian SINGEIETO. Is the Lusitanian inscription of Arroyo de la Luz I the westernmost *lex sacra*?

Latín *sancītō* frente a lusitano SINGEIETO. ¿Es la inscripción lusitana de Arroyo de la Luz I la *lex sacra* más occidental?

Blanca María Prósper
indoling@usal.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7888-4817
Universidad de Salamanca
Facultad de Filología
Plaza de Anaya, s/n
37008, Salamanca

ABSTRACT: The Lusitanian inscription of Arroyo de la Luz I (Cáceres, Lusitania Emeritensis) presents a number of problems derived from the fact that the language itself is virtually unknown, its dialectal attribution traditionally disputed regardless of the limits of sound methodology, and the inscription itself transmitted only by a drawing. In my present view, it contains a *lex sacra* that delivers instructions on the division and distribution of the meat obtained from animal sacrifice. The consequences of the abovesaid for the dialectal filiation of Lusitanian are manyfold, encompassing ritual, phonetic, lexical, morphological and word-formational traits that bring Lusitanian close to Italic in the genealogical tree of Indo-European.
KEYWORDS: Lusitanian language, Indo-European linguistics, Ancient animal sacrifice, Latin language

RESUMEN: La inscripción lusitana de Arroyo de la Luz I (Cáceres, Lusitania Emeritensis) presenta problemas derivados del hecho de que la lengua es prácticamente desconocida, su clasificación dialectal ha sido objeto de controversia más allá de los límites aceptables de la metodología comparativa, y la propia inscripción se ha transmitido solo en un dibujo. En mi opinión, contiene una *lex sacra* que imparte instrucciones sobre la división y la distribución de la carne del sacrificio. Esto tiene múltiples consecuencias para la clasificación del lusitano desde el punto de vista fonético, morfológico, léxico y sintáctico, que aproximan el lusitano al itálico en el árbol genealógico indoeuropeo.
PALABRAS CLAVE: Lengua lusitana, lingüística indoeuropea, sacrificio animal, lengua latina.

Introduction

As is well known, Lusitanian is a Western Hispanic Indo-European dialect still in use during the Roman conquest, which has left us half a dozen indigenous inscriptions in the Latin alphabet, most of them either prescribing future sacrificial rituals or, perhaps less probably, testifying to their celebration in the past. I shall try to show on linguistic and ritual grounds that Lusitanian is akin to Italic, and that the inscription of Arroyo de la Luz I constitutes the westernmost *lex sacra* attested thus far, and contains prescriptions regarding how to proceed with the meat of the sacrificial victims. While, of course, most details of the ritual will be lost on us, I think the general import of the text can be clarified to a reasonable extent.

The text of Arroyo de la Luz I was incised on a slab broken into two parts and is indirectly transmitted thanks to the drawing by Masdeu (1800: 631). It reads, according to *MLH* IV, 748-749:

> AMBATVS / SCRIPSI / CARLAE PRAISOM / SECIAS. ERBA. MVITIE/AS. ARIMO. PRAESONDO. SINGEIETO / IN(D)I AVA. INDI. VEA/M. INDI. [.]EDAGA/ROM. TEVCAECOM / INDI. NVRIM. / INDI / VDE[A]EC(OM?). RVRSE[.]CO[1] / AMPILVA / INDI / LOEMINA. INDI ENV/PETANIM. INDI AR/IMOM. SINTAMO/M. INDI TEVCOM / SINTAMO(M)[2]

The first sentence in the indigenous text is CARLAE PRAISOM. The form CARLAE in all likelihood reflects the locative singular of the place name **karlā*. The ancient settlement was probably in the same area as the present-day village of Arroyo de la Luz. PRAISOM is a form of the utmost interest: it goes back to a past participle **preh₂i + dʰh₁-tó-* (with laryngeal loss and the evolution **-tt- > -tˢt- > -ss-* common to all the Western Indo-European dialects). The prefix regularly preserves Indo-European /p/, and, in addition, is only attested in Italic. Either the two forms constitute the heading 'promulgated in Carla', or this is a passive sentence with omission of the auxiliary verb, again an Italic innovation: 'it has been promulgated in Carla (that)'.

The next sentence runs SECIAS ERBA(S) MVITIEAS ARIMO PRAESONDO SINGEIETO. In my view, SECIAS ERBA(S) MVITIEAS is the direct object. As often happens in this kind of prescriptions, it is topicalised and moved forward to occupy the first place in the sentence. Final /s/ is consistently spelled only when a vowel follows. As observed in Prósper (forthc.), Lusitanian sibilants have probably undergone weakening and loss in coda position. SECIAS ERBA(S) MVITIEAS may approximately mean 'the meat cuts of the brown (sheep) offered' or 'the offered meat cuts'. Note, however, that an ablative form **erbād* '(cuts) from the sheep' cannot be

---

[1] Vv.ll. RVRSEⅡCO (Masdeu), RVRSEAICO (Schmoll 1959: 28).

[2] *MLH* IV, 750 asserts that ARIMOM and TEVCOM are followed by a genitive SINTAMO, which is untenable.

ruled out. These cuts are conceivably, but not demonstrably, the entrails, and MVITIEAS may alternatively refer to the fact that they are to be *distributed*.

SECIAS is therefore probably a match of L. *prōsiciae*, U. *pruseça* (acc. pl., IIa 23), Marrucinian ASIGNAS, all of them related to the Italic present **seka-i̯o/e-*, in turn from **sekh₁-* 'cut' (cf. L. *secāre*). The form MVITIEAS goes back to **moi̯ti̯-ai̯o-* and is an obvious cognate of L. *mūtuus*, Sicel μοίτον, all of them from **moi̯to-* 'exchange' (it cannot be ruled out that the Lusitanian form is a direct derivative of an action noun **moi̯ti-*). As for ERBA(S), its meaning has been part-ly clarified by the occurrence of OILAM ERBAM in the first line of the indigenous inscription of Portalegre (Prósper – Villar 2009), which may be taken to mean 'dark brown sheep' (cf. OIr. *eirp*, *erb* 'goat, roe', possibly OIc. *iarpr* 'brownish').

The ending -<AS> of SECIAS at least directly continues the acc. pl. **-ās* of the first declension, possibly with early, perhaps Indo-European loss of the nasal. As transpires from the previous paragraph, both ERBA and MVITIEAS may be in the genitive singular **-ās*, as in L. *pater familias*, but MVITIEAS may alternatively be an accusative plural.

Both syntax and word order are typical of this structure in western Indo-European: the verb SINGEIETO is a 2nd/3rd person future imperative form in **-tōd*, with loss of final -*d* when a long vowel precedes (which in all likelihood has taken place in Lusitanian before the writing tradition started), and, crucially, preserva-tion of Indo-European /o:/ (directly excluding the classification of Lusitanian as Celtic). This imperative form is a well known feature of ancient Celtic and Italic legal language. It is attested in Celtiberian, Italic, Greek and Indo-Iranian (Ved. *-tā́t*). Its use in western European legal texts is very common, witness the Um-brian *Tabulae Iguvinae*, Latin and Celtiberian. In Classical Latin, it is restricted to the archaic language of legal texts. The Latin forms show an ending -*tō*, OLat. -<TOD>, used for both 2nd sg. and 3rd sg. It is regularly added to the present stem of regular verbs or to the stem of irregular verbs, and the same formation is frequent in Sabellic: 1st verbal stem *amātō* 'he shall love', O. *deiuatud* 'he shall swear'; 2nd L. LICETOD 'it shall be permitted' = O. *lícítud*, Fal. *salvetod*; 3rd *agitō*, O. *actud*. See Vine (2017: 787).

The implicit subject is the magistrate or board in charge of the ritual proce-dure. As is often the case in ancient legislative texts in Old Celtic and Italic lan-guages, we find a number of nearly invariable traits: the accusative is topicalised and raised to the first place, but we have to allow for the comparatively archaic nature of legal language, which may have preserved the structure SOV as a relic. Other complements may precede or follow the verb, functioning as a coda. The unmarked order of the noun phrase is Noun + Adjective, and in all likelihood Noun + Genitive Complement. This is in accordance with the SVO order deduc-ible from Lamas de Moledo VEAMINICORI DOENTI ANGOM LAMATICOM.

All this supports the classification of the text of Arroyo de la Luz as a *lex sacra*. In the preserved section, which may have formed part of a larger set of ritual instructions, the text deals with the distribution of the meat of the sacrificed animals or/and the offering of cooked meat to the divinities, and is in this respect a match of the corresponding passages of the Umbrian *Tabulae Iguvinae* and of the (sole) contents of the Marrucinian Tabula of Rapino.

In my present view, SINGEIETO is rendering *sı̄ŋgii̯e- < *sǣŋkii̯e- < *sHnk-i̯o/e-* 'sanctify, confirm, establish legally' (cf. L. *sanciō*, etc.). Voicing of voiceless stops preceded by a nasal is a universal tendency. Like voicing of intervocalic stops, this change is not likely to have been completed before Lusitanian became a written language, and accordingly only shows up in a number of texts. In fact, judging by this inscription, it seems to be completed or near completion in the Emeritensis. <EIE> cannot be taken at face value, but as a spelling device occasionally used in Western Hispania to note the disyllabic nature of -*ii̯e*-, in turn probably due to Sievers' law.[3] Extreme raising and fronting of original /a/ in this context is attested, for instance, in Old and Medieval Celtic. McCone (1996: 56) has adduced two Gaulish examples: the divine name BRIGINDONI (dat. sing., Auxey, Côte d'Or) goes back to Celtic **Brigant-*. Ιοουιγνκορειξ (Cavaillon), IO-VINCILLI (CIL V, 4536, Brescia), IOINCISSI (Bettingen, *CIL* XIII, 42-48), IOVINCI (Reims, *AE* 2016: 1086), etc., is the match of irl. *óac* 'young', bret. *yaouank* 'id.', from **i̯uu̯anko-*.[4] OIr. *tairnge*, Gallo-Lat. *taringa, tarinca* 'spike, point, nail', a form of unclear origin, may reflect a compound **tar-ang- < *t(e)rH- + *h₃ŋgʰ-* (cf. Schrijver 1995: 87).[5]

Accordingly, SINGEIETO may be identical to L. *sancītō*, from Proto-Italic **sank-i̯e-tōd*. This would seem to allude to the fact that the meat or the entrails are going to be offered to the gods mentioned later on, and for that reason they are purified or consecrated with the appropriate ritual, or is simply the way of saying they are placed in the sacred sphere by being given to higher beings, and then this form depicts the actual moment in which, whatever rituals and selection processes have preceded before or during the killing of the victim, sacred is dis-

---

[3] Cf. *LRP* ch. X.VI.

[4] In his view, [a] has been raised in this context to [æ], and then «If an [æ] sound roughly equidistant between /e/ and /i/ could be spelt *i* or sometimes *e*, comparable orthographical hesitation between *a* and occasionally *e/i* as a means of representing an [æ] more or less intermediate between /a/ and /e/ should present no difficulty».

[5] ANGOM (Lamas) and its variant form ANCNVN (Freixo de Numão, Guarda) are alternative spellings of [ˈaŋnom] or [ˈæŋnom] and come from **agᵘ⁽ʰ⁾no-* (cf. Gk. ἀμνός, OCS. *agnę*). Consequently, they do not run counter to the possibility of -*aŋK-* > -*ıŋK-* being an Early Lusitanian change. Crucially, this cannot be a Celtic form, because the reconstructed form would have given **abno-*, in turn replaced in Insular Celtic (see *EDCP*, s.u. **owigno-*), but possibly reflected in the Hispano-Celtic personal name ABANVS (with anaptyxis).

tinguished from profane meat, and therefore declared worthy of being given to the deities whose names occur next in the text.

It has passed unnoticed that the acc. sg. or gen. pl. SINTAMOM in the sequence ARIMOM SINTAMOM TEVCOM SINTAMO(M), at the end of the document, belongs to the same paradigm.

SINTAMOM may simply continue the superlative of the past participle **sHnk-tó-*, literally 'sanctissimum', 'legally sanctioned'. This would explain why /t/ was not voiced in a sequence *-nt-*. Somewhere down the line, the velar stop was probably weakened by fricativisation and possibly palatalisation, as in Italic: **sæŋxto-* > **sæŋçto-* with ensuing loss of the nasal in coda position, which was analogically restored before the writing tradition started (and then > **sıçto-* >> **sınto-*), or mere cluster simplification with total effacement of the velar sound (and then > **sınto-*). Pre-nasal raising is a common phonetic phenomenon, favoured in this case by the fact that the nasal is contextually velarised and, additionally, by the existence of a complex coda *-ŋk-* in the root in preconsonantal position. This is immediately reminiscent of the etymological play in the Oscan tabula of Agnone, which reads *saahtúm tefúrúm ... saka(ʿra)híter* 'a sacred burnt-offering ... has to be sacrified' (*ST* Sa 1 A 17-19). One could of course interpret SINGEIETO directly as 'should be sacrified'. In that case, SECIAS is deprived of its most plausible etymology. The substantivated ERBAS would also designate an offering of indeterminate nature in the acc. pl. (and SECIAS ERBAS would be enumerated asyndetically), or simply (as in Portalegre) an adjective meaning 'dark brown' and agreeing with SECIAS. But the fact that the specific number of offerings of each kind remains unmentioned is somewhat outlandish.

Note that there are hardly any etymological alternatives. If we favoured an original present form **sn̥g-io/e-* 'burn, roast', the imperative would obtain a reasonable sense, but we would have to justify the superlative of its past part. SINTAMOM. Conceivably, the text would deal with a holocaust, in which the sacrificial victim is totally burnt, and the superlative form SINTAMOM 'completely burnt' would then allude to this.

Lusitanian may not have shared the innovation by which a complex superlative suffix **-is -əmo-* was created in Celtic and Italic and the inherited suffix **-əmo-* (< **-m̥Ho-*) gradually receded from use. In fact, such a superlative is still well attested in the western periphery of Indo-European Hispania, as in the Hispano-Celtic personal names TONGETAMVS, CLVTAMVS.

As regards the phrase ARIMO PRAESONDO, I would presently favour an ablative/ instrumental absolute construction, in which ARIMO is reflective of a derivative in *-mo-* built from an enlarged variant of the root **h₂er-* 'assemble' (but see below on the problematic semantics), and PRAESONDO is an active present participle **preh₂i- + h₁s-ont-* (with generalisation of the thematic ending, as in Oscan) that

is a close match of *praesens*, the present part. of L. *praesum*, and then may have meant 'being in front', but also 'present', 'taking precedence', or even 'propitious'.

It should be noted that, in the present state of our knowledge, -<o> is very likely not to reflect the dative singular ending *-ōi̯. When the reading LAEBO was preferred for Cabeço das Fráguas, and consequently identified with the divinity LAEPO, to whom a number of altars had been devoted in the skirts of the same hillock, we had every reason to believe that at least one Lusitanian dialect had a thematic dative ending /o:/. Sánchez Salor – Esteban Ortega (2021) have most recently brought to light a new dedication to LABBO, which they analyse as a dative singular. However, it is in all likelihood nothing other than the dative plural ending -<BO>, which goes back to Indo-European *-bʰos, and confirms the reading LABBO for Cabeço das Fráguas. It follows that the extant cases of an ending -<o> must now be attributed to a different case. The only candidates are the thematic ablative and the instrumental, which have been syncretised early in Italic and probably also (or *a fortiori*) in Lusitanian.[6]

After SINGEIETO there comes a list of forms in the accusative, some of them very mangled and consequently unreliable, probably referring to the offerings destined to at least two divinities, AMPILVA and LOEMINA. Both are *ā* stems in the dative singular, the second of which is already mentioned in Cabeço das Fráguas as LOIMINNA. After these divine names comes a new sequence of accusative forms INDI ENV/PETANIM. INDI AR/IMOM. SINTAMO/M. INDI TEVCOM / SINTAMO(M), which are likely to refer, again, to offerings. Given the usual text architecture Acc. + Dat., it is quite conceivable that other divine names follow this part of the broken inscription. It could even be the case that what followed were terms for priests or local magistrates. So we have to content ourselves with a basic attempt at etymological explanation of the more transparent forms.

The noun TEVCOM cannot be Celtic, since it apparently preserves /eu̯/, like its derivative TEVCAECOM some lines above.[7] It may be the case that *téu̯ko- is akin to the Italic noun *téu̯ko-, originally perhaps meaning 'fat': cf. *LIV* 641 *teu̯k- 'stark, fett werden, schwellen' (cf. U. TOCO, *WOU* 774, possibly L. *tucca* 'meat preserve', if from Early Latin *tou̯kā through *Lex Iuppiter*, OIr. *tón* 'back part').[8] Accordingly, TEVCOM SINTAMOM may designate the fat or the hind legs,

---

[6] Our honorand has ingeniously proposed a reading LARBO «que estaría envolviendo una forma 'LAR(I) BVS'» for Cabeço das Fráguas (and then an instance of interference or *Mischsprache*?). Cf. Siles (2018: 930), now superseded by the new discovery.

[7] In fact, Western Hispano-Celtic inscriptions, like peripheral Gaulish dialects, attest to the tendency of /ou/ to be monophthongised (see Prósper 2019b).

[8] Schmoll's interpretation TEVCOM SINTAMOM < *teu̯tikom sentamōm «assembly of senior citizens» (1959: 55) looks attractive at first sight but lacks verisimilitude, since, to begin with, it requires

which were best meat, as they had been ritually approved for its symbolic consumption either by divine beings or by the upper layers of society. As for ARIMOM SINTAMOM, it seems reasonable to assume that it should carry a similar message, possibly meaning that ARIMOM is related to the Indo-European form *HŗH-mó- in L. *armus*, Skt. *īrma-* 'shoulder, upper arm' and designates the upper part of the animal or the upper organs (L. *exta*). The phrase ARIMO PRAESONDO some lines above, however, calls for prudence.

Does the preceding form ENVPETANIM mean 'choice meat'? Faultless victims were called *eximiae* and those chosen for sacrifice *optata* or *optima*. The sanctity of the victim is evident from its denomination, *hiereion* in Greek, and *hostia* in Latin (see Ekroth 2014). According to the testimony of Festus 284 Lindsay, *optatam hostiam, alii optimam appellant quam aedilis tribus constitutis hostiis optat quam immolari velit* 'a chosen victim which others call a best victim is that which the aedile chose from among the three stationed victims which he wants to be sacrificed'. When the animal is butchered after sacrifice, the best cuts are offered as a meal to the gods, and thereupon distributed among the priests and the local élites. If the directions contained in this document deal with the final destination of meat after sacrifice, ENVPETANIM and the following words allude to the latter part of the ritual. In that case, ARIMOM SINTAMOM and TEVCOM SINTAMOM could have been intended as an explanatory expansion of ENVPETANIM.

This form definitely looks like an adjectival derivative of the Lusitanian match of L. *optāre* 'choose, wish'. This verb has given rise to a vast number of compounds in Latin: *exoptāre, adoptāre, praeoptāre*. It has long been assumed that it is a frequentative formation based on a form **optā-,* or more probably **opetā-* (by regular medial syncope). Frequentative verbs in *-ā-* built from the past participle are a typically Italic innovation: cf. the Latin verbs in *-tāre*, U. *etatu* 'let them go' or Venetic **pitāmno-* in the patronymic *pi.t.tam.m.niko.s.* (*LV* 160, Calalzo di Cadore), in all likelihood the formational and semantic counterpart of L. *alumnus* (see Prósper 2019a: 15). In turn, the underlying verb and the Umbrian imperative form *upetu* have been cogently traced back to an iterative present **h₁op-éi̯e/o-* by Vine (1999: 521).[9]

Raising and backing of /o/ in the neighbourhood of labial stops is an early change in the southern and south-eastern part of the Lusitanian territory (comprised of the Emeritensis and the Pacensis). It is probably to be placed prior to the

---

syncope, and the superlative formation of **sentamo-* is entirely unwarranted.

[9] See Weiss (2010: 83) for former attempts at etymologising this verb. He has narrowed down the meaning to 'accept, take for ritual purposes', and compared Festus 284 Lindsay: *optatam hostiam, alii optimam appellant quam aedilis tribus constitutis hostiis optat quam immolari velit* 'a chosen victim which others call a best victim is that which the aedile chose from among the three stationed victims which he wants to be sacrificed'.

outset of the written tradition but posterior to rounding of /e/ between two labi-ovelars, as transpires from the personal name PVMPI (< *pomp(i)i̯o- < *ku̯oŋku̯(i) i̯o- 'fifth' ← *penku̯e) in Portalegre,[10] and is also attested in Arroyo de la Luz II, where we read PVPPID.[11]

Consequently, ENVPETANIM is a substantivised adjective reflecting a preform *en(i)-opetā-n-(i)i̯o-, in all likelihood with reduction of syllabicity in the suf-fix followed by final vowel syncope (though an -i- stem cannot be ruled out). It looks roughly comparable to the Latin adjectives in -āneus, in turn original-ly based on compound verbs of the -ā-class, such as *supervacāneus* 'surplus-', *transportāneus* or *praeligāneum* 'wine made of unripe grapes' (cf. Bader 1962: 292; Weiss 2020: 294). Its productivity has increased to the point of deriving ad-jectives from other verb classes, as in *consentiō* → *consentāneus*. Let us note in passing that the Lusitanian form reflects the structure *h₁op-e-* (and not *h₁op-i-*) of non-personal forms corresponding to the causatives and iteratives in *-ei̯o/e-*.

Vine (1999) has exposed L. *praedopiont* (glossed as *praeoptant* in Festus 222.24 Lindsay, in turn just a scholarly emendation of the transmitted *praedo-tiont*) as a ghostword, the result of a misreading somewhere during the manu-script transmission, and has thus ruled out the existence of L. *opiō*. It could consequently be further argued that Italic had lost the verb that constitutes the ultimate derivational base of -optāre early on. In that case, all cases of U. *upetu* would have to be analysed, like the gen. sing. U. VPETER, as a regular past part. *opeto-*. This would become the only survivor of the original paradigm, with restoration of medial /e/, as usual in -eto- forms. *opeto-* suffced to generate the agent noun *ope-tōr* and the iterative *opetā- > *optāre*.[12] In fact, this is the usually admitted analysis of *upetu* in IIb 8, 11; III 22, 26. This can be extended to Va 7, where *upetu*, as in these cases, is followed by a 3rd p. fut. imperative. Only IIb1 resists interpretation as a past participle in view of the absence of a finite verb form closing the sentence. Since, however, the context and word or-

---

[10] Names like this one, beside their phonetics, show derivational patterns peculiar to Italic and un-known to Celtic, since they are derivatives from the cardinal form: cf. Prósper (2016: 26-28, 52).

[11] This is a pronoun obviously going back to *ku̯od-ku̯id and therefore not to be classified as Celtic. *Pace* Villar – Pedrero (2001), PVPPID can only be taken to be a relative pronoun.

[12] According to García Ramón (2012: 115), the praenomen of a consul transmitted as Ὀπίτωρ (D.H., 5, 4, 91) and Ὀπιτώριος (D.C. 41) leads one to assume the existence of the Latin names *Opitōr*, *Opitōrius*, derived from this root. We can flesh out his comment by pointing out that, in accordance to the «Italic rule», this presupposes a preform *ope-tōr at a stage prior to vowel reduction. In that case, this name is not Sabellic (where we would in fact expect either medial vowel syncope or analogical restoration of /e/). In fact, the derivational stem ending in -e- in past participles, and consequently also in agent nouns corresponding to causative present formations, is due to a reanalysis of -ei̯o/e- as -e-i̯o/e-, which is common to Italic and Celtic and has become opaque in Latin after medial vowel reduction.

der is identical to that of the other occurrences of *upetu*, and the text reads *sim kaprum upetu*, in which *upetu* could in principle be the past participle 'chosen, selected' in the acc. pl. modifiying the animal names as in other cases, I deem the distinction somewhat artificial. The context of IIb 1 is far too obscure, and in my view hardly qualifies as the only testimony of an imperative *upetu* < **opeįe-tōd*. While the Umbrian 3rd pl. imperative *upetuta* would seem to be based on Italic **op-ē-*, in turn from **Hop-éįe-*, it stands to reason that an inherited **upetā-tūtād* would probably have undergone haplology anyway. To recap, there is no ironclad indication that **Hop-éįe-* survived into the Italic dialects in its pristine outlook. All the abovesaid goes some steps towards a confirmation of Viti's (2015) hypothesis, according to which «the relationship with prefixes must be of relevance to explain the very origin of frequentative verbs... We claim that in frequentative verbs the prefixed form is primary compared to its correspondent unprefixed form, that is, *exoptāre* is for example primary with respect to *optāre*». In sum, Lusitanian may have inherited a prefixed present form **en(i)-opet-ā-įo/e-* that teams up with the Italic materials and points to Lusitanian having shared an innovation peculiar to this branch.

This casts doubts on Harðarson's (2011) segmentation and interpretation of <OPET> in the Vase of Duenos as /ope:t/, the 3rd person sg. of a present tense going back to **h₃op-éįe-ti* (from a root **h₃ep-* uneconomically integrated in *LIV* without further ado on the strength of the Italic forms). The second line of Duenos, unfortunately conducted in *scriptio continua*, has been segmented by Harðarson (2011) as asted NOISI OPET OITESIAI PACA RIVOIS, analysed and translated as *as(t) tēd noį si* (or *noį si*) *opēt oiįezįįaį, pākā rīųoįs* 'and if she does not want to be intimate with you (or enjoy your love), then soothe (her) with the streams (of fragrance)!'.[13] As observed by Harðarson (2011: 155), we would expect the pronoun to be in the accusative, not the dative case. But, if we read OPETOI(S) TESIAI PACA RIVOIS, we could translate 'appease (her) with streams (of perfume) selected *for her*'.[14] This would have the relative advantage of explaining the dative form, which would be modifying the participle, and of being consistent with the assumption that the past part. **opeto-* was already the sole survivor of this paradigm at the earliest stages of Italic.

---

[13] This interpretation of PACA RIVOIS was suggested by Steinbauer (1989: 34-35) 'schaffe Frieden / besänftige durch die Gusse', and refined by Eichner's (1990) interpretation of the last three words, which he segments and translates as *as(t) tĕd noį sį ó(p)petóįt, esi/įáį pācǎ rĭųóįs* (iambic reading) 'wenn dir die Maid... Nicht in die Arme fliegt, / versöhn' ihr Herz durch Duft!'.

[14] A perseverative scribal error <OPETOITESIAI> for <OPETOISESIAI> = /opetoįs esįaį/ is not entirely inconceivable, especially since <T> and <S> are distinguished by one stroke, but of course hardly demonstrable, and the text is notable for being carefully carried out. At any rate, omission of final -<S> before a consonant, which at that time was probably phonetic in nature, has an early parallel in the inscription reading ECO VRNA TITA(S) VENDIAS MAMAR[COS M]ED VHE[CED (Rix 1998: 251, fn. 20).

Harðarson's segmentation <ОITESIAI> (in his view the archaic infinitive of ūtor, in which the ending -ziịaị is said to result from an analogical process and replaces -δịaị < *-dʰịaị) has additionally been refuted on a solid comparative basis by recent interpretations (especially Fortson 2013: 108-109), and is hardly viable in view of the nonexistent **ūterier. As for the beginning of the line, which reads <ASTEDNOISI>, this sequence and its segmentation remain entirely obscure to me, and none of the plethora of former interpretations is irrefutable (or, come to that, sustainable for more than one or two of their tenets: see Martzloff 2015 for recent criticism of former assumptions).[15]

In sum, Arroyo de la Luz I is in my view a *lex sacra* with directions on ritual procedure and is reminiscent of Italic texts of the same genre. Some of the vocabulary items of this inscription have cognates exclusively in Italic. Regular preservation of Indo-European /p/ renders its attribution to Celtic virtually impossible.

Bibliography

Bader, F. (1962), *La formation des composés nominaux du latin*, Besançon.

Eichner, H. (1988-90), «Reklameiamben aus Roms Königszeit», *Die Sprache* 34, pp. 207-238.

Ekroth, G. (2014), «Animal sacrifice in Antiquity», in G. L. Campbell (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, Oxford, pp. 324-354.

Fortson, B. (2013), «Latin -*rier* and its Indo-Iranian congeners», *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117, pp. 75-118.

García Ramón, J. L. (2012), «Anthroponymica Italica. Onomastics, lexicon, and languages in contact in Ancient Italy: Latin and Sabellic names with /Op-/ and /Ops-/», in T. Meißner (ed.), *Personal Names in the Western Roman World. Proceedings of a Workshop Convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, Held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16-18 September 2011*, Berlin, pp. 109-123.

Harðarson, J. A. (2011), «The 2ⁿᵈ line of the Duenos inscription», in G. Rocca (ed.), *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Le lingue dell'Italia antica. Iscrizioni, testi, grammatica. In memoriam Helmut Rix* (1926-2004) = *Alessandria* 5, pp. 153-163.

---

[15] It would be undoubtedly too cavalier to see ASTEDNOISI (or part of it) as a single word, *ex hypothesi* a locative plural in *-oịsi (<< *-oịsu), in which the final -*i* had been preserved for some time in sandhi (before vowels). This would compromise the accepted theory, according to which L. -*īs* and its Sabellic congeners go back to the Indo-European instrumental plural *-ōịs.

Lindsay, W. M., ed. (1913), *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, Leipzig.

LIV = H. Rix et al. (2001²), *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, Wiesbaden.

LRP = B. M. Prósper (2002), *Lenguas y religiones prerromanas del Occidente de la Península Ibérica*, Salamanca.

LV = M. Lejeune (1974), *Manuel de la langue venète*, Heidelberg.

Martzloff, V. (2015), «La plus ancienne composition poétique à Rome. L'inscription latine archaïque du *duenos* (*CIL* I² 4)», *Revue des Études Latines* 93, pp. 69-106.

Masdeu, J. F. (1800), *Historia crítica de España*, vol. XIX, Madrid.

McCone, K. (1996), *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*, Maynooth.

MLH IV = J. Untermann (1997), *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum* IV. *Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.

Prósper, B. M. (1999), «The inscription of Cabeço das Fráguas revisited: Lusitanian and Alteuropäisch populations in the West of the Iberian Peninsula», *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97, pp. 151-183.

Prósper, B. M. (2009), «Nueva inscripción lusitana procedente de Portalegre», *Emerita* 77, pp. 1-32.

Prósper, B. M. (2019a) «Celtic and Venetic in Contact: the dialectal attribution of the personal names in the Venetic record», *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 66, pp. 7-52.

Prósper, B. M. (2019b), «Language change at the crossroads: what Celtic, what Venetic, and what else in the personal names of Emona?», *Voprosy Onomastiki* 16, pp. 33-73.

Prósper, Blanca M. (2021), «The Lusitanian oblique cases revisited: new light on the dative endings», to appear in a Festschrift.

Rix, H. (1998) *«*Eine neue frühsabellische Inschrift und der altitalische Präventiv», *Zeitschrift für vergleichenden Sprachforschung* 111, pp. 247–69.

Sánchez Salor, E. - Esteban Ortega, J. (2021), «Un testimonio del dios 'Labbo' en una inscripción lusitana de Plasencia (Cáceres). ¿‹Labbo› también en Cabeço das Fráguas?», *Emerita*, 89, 105-126.

Schmoll, U. (1959), *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische*, Wiesbaden.

Schrijver, P. (1995), *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam.

Siles, J. (2018), «Sobre el orden seguido en el ritual de Cabeço das Fraguas y la naturaleza de las *hostiae* y *victimae* en él ofrecidas y sacrificadas», *Anuari De Filologia Antiqua Et Mediaevalia* 8, pp. 927-941.

ST = H. RIX (2002), *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*, Heidelberg.

STEINBAUER, D. H. (1989), *Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei Plautus belegten Verben der lateinischen ersten Konjugation. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Denominative*, Altendorf.

VILLAR, F. - PEDRERO, R. (2001), «La nueva inscripción lusitana: Arroyo de la Luz III», F. Villar - P. Fernández, eds., *Actas del VIII Coloquio de lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, Salamanca, pp. 663-698.

VINE, B. (1999), «Latin *opiō* and *optāre*», in L. Fleishman *et alii* (eds.), *Essays in Poetics, Literary History and Linguistics Presented to Viacheslav Vsevolodovich Ivanov on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, Moscow, pp. 520-526.

VINE, B. (2017), «The morphology of Italic», in J. Klein - B. Joseph - M. Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, Vol. 2, Berlin-Boston, pp. 751-803.

VITI, C. (2015), «The use of frequentative verbs in Early Latin», in G. Haverling (ed.), *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century: Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Uppsala, June 6th-11th, 2011, Uppsala, pp. 170-182.

WEISS, M. (2010), *Language and Ritual in Sabellic Italy. The Ritual Complex of the Third and Fourth Tabulae Eugubinae*, Leiden.

WEISS, M. (2020), *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor.

WOU = J. UNTERMANN (2000), *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg.