REMAINS OF OLD LATIN

ARCHAIC INSCRIPTIONS

Translated by

E. H. WARMINGTON

REMAINS OF
OLD LATIN

ARCHAIC INSCRIPTIONS

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

E. H. WARMINGTON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON, ENGLAND

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB 1911

EDITED BY
JEFFREY HENDERSON

EDITOR EMERITUS
G. P. GOOLD

REMAINS OF OLD LATIN
IV

LCL 359

INTRODUCTION

Object and scope of this book.   The archaic period.

My main object in this fourth volume of *Remains of Old Latin* is to present and to translate a number of the older Latin inscriptions as being an important part of early Latin remnants; this book has, however, a wider scope, because it also introduces readers to the general subject of Latin epigraphy and, in a narrow sense, to the study of Roman numismatics. Epigraphy, which is a branch of palaeography or the study of ancient writing, deals with the lettering, language and subject-matter of inscriptions written on hard and durable material such as stone and metal; it includes inscriptions on coins, though this part of the subject is usually separated under the title of numismatics, and inscriptions on gems, which likewise are usually studied separately.

I have set the year 80 B.C. as the latest limit of the archaic period; but it must be noted at once that archaisms in the Latin language and spelling occur to a much later date, especially in official documents. In fact there are large records of a date later than 80 B.C. which in spelling [1] present an appearance just

---

[1] It should be noted however that the predominant surviving archaism or quasi-archaism is the spelling *ei* for *i* (for which see below).   Cf. for example the *Lex Antonia* of 71 B.C. (*C.I.L.*, I, 2, 204); the so-called *Lex Iulia Municipalis* of 45 B.C. (*C.I.L.*, I, 2, 206); and the inscription on the arch of Augustus at Ariminum, of 27 B.C. (*C.I.L.*, XI, 365).

as archaic as many of the inscriptions given in this
book and written before that year. Of some such,
the date after 80 B.C. is indisputable. A good
example of a doubtful one is the extant *Lex de
Gallia Cisalpina* also called *Lex Rubria de civitate
Galliae Cisalpinae* (not included in this book), *C.I.L.,*
I, 2, 592. Though it is usually dated in 49 B.C., there
is reason to believe that it was passed and inscribed
before Sulla's time. In this book will be found some
inscriptions beyond the given limit (*a*) which are of
unknown date but contain archaisms in spelling, and
(*b*) which are of known date but contain deliberate
archaisms correct or false. Note also that there are
inscriptions known to be earlier than 80 B.C. which
show no archaisms at all. I have included most co-
herent inscriptions known to have been written before
80 B.C., except such as consist merely of letters,
numbers, or names, or of one or two words only.

The interest of the archaic period regarding Latin studies.

Inscriptions are almost wholly pieces of writing
which have come down to us each in its original and
unique form,[1] if we except physical damage caused
by the passing of time, and some deliberate altera-
tions made during the ancient periods; they have,
by their very nature, not suffered the changes which
are produced in literary texts through frequent
copying by hand. Thus through old Latin inscrip-
tions we can get a closer picture of the Latin language
in the making than we can from remains which have

[1] This statement does not apply so fully to coins, which
were of course produced in the mass from mould or die.

come to us by tradition of manuscripts. The picture is, to be sure, very imperfect: we need many more old inscriptions than we have; again, since the subject-matter has an interest not less attractive than the language has, I have followed, without keeping equal pace with, an accepted division, based on Hübner's, of Latin inscriptions into classes and sub-classes, and have kept a roughly chronological order in each sub-class; in the chronology furthermore there is much that is guesswork. Still, what we have may be called early Latin straight from the workshop and throwing light on Roman and Italian public and private life.

The different kinds of Latin inscriptions.

There are two main classes of Latin inscriptions.

I. TITULI or INSCRIPTIONS PROPER, which are written on durable objects to show their special purpose. The great majority of them mention a person or persons or public authority, and their relation to the object. Some, however, lay down conditions relative to the object itself or to its purpose; these overlap into Class II described below. This first class—the class of TITULI—is sub-divided into the following sub-classes.

(i) *Tituli sepulcrales*, or *Sepulchral Inscriptions*, which are properly epitaphs; in the earliest times these gave only the dead person's name, and later, lists of names, where more than one person shared or was meant to share the sepulchre; later again, various details were added, even short laudatory pieces (' *elogia* ') of prose or verse, or details of careers, which in nature approach the sub-class (iii) called honorary

as shown below. Further details added, like instructions about the proper use and preservation of the sepulchre, are in a sense *Instrumenta*, ' *Documents*,' of Class II given below. Details of the sepulchre's size and the deceased's age are supposed not to have been added on monuments dating before Augustus' time ; but this is doubtful, and I have included some examples. I have included also certain inscriptions which refer to sepulchres but do not necessarily give actual epitaphs. In the Augustan age some sepulchral inscriptions overlap into the next subclass by dedication of the sepulchre to the *dei Manes*.

(ii) *Tituli sacri* or *Dedicatory Inscriptions* on objects dedicated, that is, presented to a god or gods (not to a man); or on something attached to or connected with a dedicated object and announcing its dedication. Some of these overlap into sub-class (iii) when a statue of a man or representing a people, with ' honorary ' details, is devoted to a god, and when a dedicator is in some way ' honoured ' in the inscription; and into sub-class (iv) when the dedicated object is a public work such as a temple or part of a sacred building. Typical examples of dedicatory inscriptions name dedicator and deity.

(iii) *Tituli honorarii* or *Honorary Inscriptions*, in the Greek fashion, in honour of a man (rarely of a nation personified), never of a god, and mostly written on pedestals of statues, sometimes on busts or stone tablets. About Sulla's time the person honoured begins to be put in the dative case, but even so the statue, not being devoted to a god, is not ' dedicated.' The sub-class honorary inscriptions overlap into subclass (i) when the ' honouring ' inscription is on a sepulchre ; into (ii) when the statue is also dedicated

(presented to a god), or an ' honouring ' inscription records a dedication also ; into (iv) when the honouring inscription is written on a public work.

(iv) *Tituli operum publicorum* or *Inscriptions on and concerning Public Works*, especially buildings including temples, with overlapping here into sub-class (ii) ; also boundary-stones, milestones, bridges, roads, aqueducts. Many of the inscriptions overlap into sub-class (iii) because the official inaugurator or builder or giver of the work is ' honoured ' therein ; and some of the works are inscribed with INSTRUMENTA, ' Documents,' of Class II described below.

(v) *Instrumentum* (to be carefully distinguished from the INSTRUMENTA of Class II) or *Equipment*. The word *instrumentum* is here used to indicate all kinds of movable objects made for use in public and especially private life, but not dedicated ; and covers among others the following sorts : vessels and other articles of metal ; earthen vessels ; tiles ; stamps and seals ; tickets and tokens ; [1] products of quarries and mines ; leaden pipes ; armour and missiles ; weights and measures. The word *instrumentum* may be taken to include also any inscriptions on the articles, since the inscriptions are part, often a necessary part, of the articles, though they do not necessarily show, in their words, the purpose for which the articles were made. Coins likewise are *instrumentum*, and since their inscriptions belong to epigraphy, I have included some in this book, though as stated above, the subject

[1] Including such guest-tokens (recording pacts between man and man, or man and community) as were portable ; some were not portable and are classed with *Instrumenta* or ' *Documents* '—see below, p. xii.

of coins is generally treated as a separate study Numismatics.

II. INSTRUMENTA (not *instrumentum* of Class I (v) above), also called ACTA, or DOCUMENTS, DEEDS, public and private. They are records written on durable stuff, normally bronze plates, for publication and preservation as long as required or as long as possible. The inscriptions of this class have no reference to the things on which they are written; the inscriptions are themselves the objects. They may be subdivided as follows, though I have not followed any strict order in giving the archaic examples.

(i) *Foedera* or *Treaties* made by Rome with other states. Akin to these are agreements of guestship or of patronage between any man and a community. But the examples in this book were portable, and so find their place in Class I among the inscriptions on *instrumentum*—see above, p. xi.

(ii) (*a*) *Leges Publicae Populi Romani* or *Leges Rogatae* or *Laws* (including *Plebiscita* or *Plebiscites*) passed as ' acts of parliament ' by the Roman people.

(*b*) *Leges Coloniarum et Municipiorum* or *Laws issued to Colonies and Boroughs.* These are charters or constitutions granted to other communities by Roman officials having *imperium* (state authority of Rome). The constitutions are *Leges datae* or *Conditions granted*, issued by such officials in obedience to terms laid down by a general or particular *Lex Rogata* or by a decree of the Roman Senate (see pp. xiii, xl–xli). Under the empire, *Leges* of (ii) (*a*) became mostly mere ' archaisms,' but those of (*b*) continued more freely to be issued, as *leges*; those of (*a*) under the Empire took the form of decrees of the senate and imperial *constitutiones*.

(*c*) *Leges dictae*, see below p. xl, or *Conditions prescribed* for public properties, all such in this book being written on sepulchres or public works of Class I above.

(*d*) *Locationes* or *Contracts* and the like. Nearly all which are found in this book are connected with a public work so closely that I give them as belonging to Class I (iv) above (*Tituli operum publicorum*). Indeed, the inscriptions recording *locationes* are often really a part of the work.

(iii) (*a*) *Senatus consulta* or *Decrees of the Senate* of Republican Rome (see p. xli). Most of the archaic examples occur only as reproduced by magistrates in their decrees of (iv) below, or in a Greek translation only.

(*b*) *Decrees* of similar bodies in Rome's colonies, in *municipia*, and in *pagi* (for these see below, pp. xxxvi–vii). The archaic examples in this book fall rather under other headings, that of *Pagus Herculaneus* (pp. 108–111) being classed in this book among dedicatory inscriptions, the *Lex parieti faciendo* (pp. 274 ff.) being rather a public *locatio* of sub-class (ii) (*d*) above. The public and private notices painted on walls—see (vii) below—for some definite purpose are generally classed here.

(*c*) *Decrees* of private *collegia* ' guilds ' (not colleges of priests or magistrates) and *sodalicia* ' associations.' See p. xlii.

(iv) *Decreta magistratuum* or *Decrees of magistrates* of Rome, and other Italian towns under Rome, sometimes in the form of letters. In a sense they are *leges datae*, sometimes even *leges dictae*—see p. xl.

(v) Various *Acta sacra et Acta publica* or *Deeds sacred and Deeds public* such as temple-laws; oracular

replies; minutes of priestly *collegia* such as the Arval Brothers; *fasti* of magistrates; *acta triumphorum*; calendars.

(vi) *Acta privata* or *Private Deeds* of various kinds including curses, gifts, wills, accounts; but not including any of the next sub-class.

(vii) *Inscriptiones parietariae* or *Inscriptions* (public and private) *on walls* mostly at Pompeii; (*a*) painted: about local elections, lost property, property to let, announcements of shows, and so on; (*b*) ' *graffiti* ' or scratched on the wall; these consist of private scribblings of various kinds. (*a*) and (*b*) do not of course include inscriptions painted scratched or stamped on movable articles, since the latter are *instrumentum* —see Class I (v) above. Some of (*a*) are temporary *leges* or rather decrees private or public—see above (iii) (*b*).

[(viii) *Diptycha Consularia* tablets (of invitation?) of carved ivory on which are represented public shows; they are inscribed the names of high magistrates (whose portraits also are often included). But they date from A.D. 406–541 only. (ix) *Diplomata militaria*, recording privileges granted to veteran soldiers, date from A.D. 52 to A.D. 305.]

Dating of inscriptions.

Sometimes an inscription bears its own date; or mentions an event or conditions whose date or period is known from other sources; or reveals in other ways by its own subject-matter the time to which it must belong; or is mentioned or used by a literary source; again, the style of the lettering, the spelling of the words, and the way in which the meaning intended is expressed, are important though not precise evidence;

even the material [1] on which inscriptions are written should not be ignored.

Peculiarities of Older Latin.[2]

I have not concerned myself with the actual facsimiles of inscriptions or the actual shapes of the letters, nor with ligatures, monograms, or *apices* or apexes denoting long vowels from Sulla's time onwards, or single dots or marks separating words, or signs used to express numbers, other than special cases mentioned in the text and critical notes. More important are archaisms in spelling and pronunciation which show the Latin language in its progress from the primitive to the mature. I give therefore next a few remarks about the Latin alphabet and then a survey of the old spellings and sounds and . their changes, as they occur in the inscriptions. When desirable I use capital letters to indicate writings as distinct from pronunciation. Section numbers are used for ease of cross reference.

§ 1. The Latin alphabet, derived from a Greek alphabet that was neither Attic nor Ionic,[3] had no use for the Greek aspirated consonants $\oplus = \theta = th$, $\mathbb{O} = \phi = ph$, and $\mathbb{W} = \chi = ch$ (Latin had no aspirated sounds), and kept them only as numerals; soon it lost $\mathbb{I} = Z = dz$, though Z was retained in

[1] Cf. A. Gordon, on marble as a criterion for dating, in *Trans. and Proc. of the Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, 1934, xlii, xliii; *Univ. of California Publ. in Class Arch.*, I, No. 4, No. 5.

[2] This section has been thoroughly revised by the late Roland G. Kent, to whom my thanks are due.

[3] A. Grenier, *L'Alphabet de Marsigliana et les Origines de l'Écriture à Rome*, École Franç. de Rome. *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d' Histoire*, XLI (1924), 3–41; R. Kent, *Sounds of Latin* (eds. 2 and 3), § 12.

some non-Latin dialects to indicate *ts*. The letter
C, a form of $\Gamma = \gamma$, was at first used for the sound *g*
(as in Greek), but soon was used also as an alternative
for $K = k$; in the third century a new letter G,
formed out of C or of $\perp$,[1] was introduced, and about
234 B.C. was placed by Spurius Carvilius, a freedman
of the consul Spurius Carvilius Ruga, in the alphabet
where $\perp = Z$ stood in the Greek.[2] The letter K
now fell mostly into disuse, though it survived
regularly in K. = *Kaeso*, and also sometimes before
a in inscriptions, and even, for example in *Kaeso*,
Kalendae, in literary records; where also *Caius*[3] and
Cnaeus, always abbreviated *C.* and *CN.*, often survive
for *Gaius* and *Gnaeus*, always pronounced with *g*.
The complete Latin alphabet was thus for a time
like ours, but having I for both vowel *i* and con-
sonant *j* (as in English *yet*), and V for both vowel *u*
and consonant *v* (as in English *we*), and lacking
W, Y, Z. Soon after the middle of the second
century B.C., *ph*, *th*, *ch* were introduced (cf. pp. 84–
86), and a little later also initial *rh-* (for Greek
initial $\dot{\rho}$-) and medial *-rrh-* (for Greek medial $-\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}$-),
and Y and Z, in order to represent better the pro-
nunciation of words and names transliterated from
contemporary Greek.[4] Our *u* is of course always V

[1] Cf. Hempl, *Trans. of the Amer. Philol. Assn.*, XXX (1899),
24–41.
[2] This seems the best interpretation of Plut., *Qu. Rom.*, 59.
[3] Note that the *ai* in this word is two syllables *āī*, not a
survival of the archaic diphthong *ai* which developed into *ae*
(cf. § 5).
[4] *ph*, *th*, *ch* were occasionally used in native words, such as
pulcher, perhaps through a fancied derivation from the Greek,
and in personal names such as *Cethegus*, to give a fashionable
Greek touch.

in old Latin, but I print *u* according to custom, where the V is a vowel.[1] " Capital " letters [2] only were used except in *graffiti* and other examples of rough writing or handwriting.

§ 2. The main archaisms in spelling and pronunciation (other than differences in length of monophthong vowel-sounds, some of which I here ignore), as found in the old inscriptions, are as follows.

§ 3. EI as real diphthong. In early Latin, *ei* was as true a diphthong in pronunciation as in spelling, being so used notably in ' root-syllables ' as in *deico* and other words ; in the dative and ablative plural of the first declension (where it was from earlier *ai*) : in the nominative, dative, and ablative plural of the second declension (here from earlier *oi*) : and in the dative singular of the third declension. But even old Latin records show, by the substitution of *e* alone (until *c*. 200 B.C.) or of *i* alone, that the pronunciation

[1] J began in ordinary writing, and appears in inscriptions in the 2nd century A.D.; dotted *i* first appears about A.D. 500. U appears for both vowel *u* and consonant *v*, in the uncial style *c*. A.D. 200, and elsewhere later on. W is a late writing as a ligature of more than one letter. The distinctions (*a*) between vowel *i* and consonant *j* and (*b*) between vowel *u* and consonant *v* were not definitely made until some time after the introduction of printing.

[2] The official monumental style (*scriptura monumentalis*) of the alphabet, in very neatly shaped capitals cut by professionals, developed in the last three centuries of the Republic and reached its best under Augustus and the early Empire. Many of the more ordinary inscriptions have a smaller and simpler *scriptura actuaria* ; some are in ' handwritings,' *scriptura cursiva*, of which the *s. uncialis*, with rounded letters and decorative curves taken over from writing on papyri and parchments, appears in inscriptions after the middle of the 3rd century A.D.

tended to monophthongize sometimes into the sound
$\bar{e}$ (in talk of the country), and sometimes into a sound
between $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{\imath}$; and after *c.* 150 B.C., this latter
sound became $\bar{\imath}$, with I as the fixed spelling except
where remembrance of the older spelling or deliberate
archaism (correct or erroneous) was practised (see § 4),
though $\bar{\imath}$ was the fixed pronunciation whatever the
spelling.

§ 4. EI as diphthong in spelling only.   From about
150 B.C. or the beginning of the Gracchan period a
custom arose, influenced partly by recollection of
the older spelling and partly by attempts at archaism
(often mistaken), as well as by a desire to produce a
convenient distinctive spelling for different sounds,
of using EI to represent in writing the long $\bar{\imath}$-sound
in any words, whether these words originally had the
true diphthong *ei* or not.[1]   Thus the spelling EI is
a false archaism or fanciful spelling when it is used
for the $\bar{\imath}$ in the genitive singular of the second
declension; in the accusative plural and ablative
singular in the third declension (such as *omneis,
fontei*); in words like *ameicus, audeire*; and possibly
in the present infinitive passive.   See for example
Popillius' milestone, pp. 150–1, where the *ei* is correct
in *fecei, poseivei, conquaeisivei, redidei*;   false in
ponteis, omneis, fugiteivos;   uncertain in *meilia*.   Note
that in *conquaeisivei* the diphthong of the second
syllable was written *-aei-* as a compromise between
older *ai* and normal *ae*.   In *mihei, tibei, sibei, nobeis,
vobeis, ubei, ibei, utei* there is good reason for *ei*, though
the pronunciation here, as in all these other words,

[1] For the opinions of Accius and Lucilius on the spelling
of *ei* or *i*, see *Remains of Old Latin*, Vol. II, xxii–iv; Vol. III,
114 ff.

was now *ī*.[1] Very rarely an EI of this kind was falsely used where the sound was properly long *ē*, and even where it was short *ĭ* (as in *parenteis* for gen. sing. *parentis*) or short *ĕ*. About Sulla's time a tall *I* was introduced to express *ī*, whether from original ī or from original *ei*; this tall letter was sporadically used until late in the 2nd century A.D.

§ 5. AI, real diphthong (not two syllables as in *Gāïus Achāïa*; nor the two long syllables *āī* in the old genitive singular—see § 25). This, soon after 200 B.C., changed to *ae* to represent a slight change in pronunciation, in any kind of word or ending (in the dative and ablative plural first declension, it had previously changed to *ei* in very old Latin). In the dative singular of the first declension old Latin had -*ai*, and also occasionally -*ā*; both being from very old -*āi*,[2] which gave -*ăi* (later -*ae*) before a consonant, but -*ā* before a vowel. The nominative plural of the first declension ending in -*ā* is a dialectal form ending in -*ās*, with the final consonant dropped in writing. We sometimes find *e* for *ai* and *ae* in very old inscriptions of the country districts, and often in the language of the common people, especially after *c.* 100 A.D.

§ 6. OI, real diphthong, later changed, with slight shift in pronunciation, to *oe*; and then in most words to *u*, representing long *ū*, about 200 B.C.; though writings OI and OE continued to be used into the 1st

---

[1] But *mihi, tibi, sibi, ubi, ibi* got a short final *i* by Iambic Shortening unless the metrical ictus fell on the final vowel and required the length to be kept; we even find the inscriptional writing *sibei* in verse to represent two shorts.

[2] All diphthongs are long by nature, but some had the first part short (as in *ăi*) and others had the first part long (as in *āi*).