The mere mention of the *Carmen Saliare* is sufficient to elevate the heart rate of any historian of the Latin language: some of its fragments – if transmitted and interpreted correctly – would preserve a state of the language that is almost unimaginably archaic, most famously in the verb form *tremonti* ‘they tremble’, with the pre-apocopated 3 pl. thematic ending (as in Doric Greek -οντι, Sanskrit -anti), and in the vocative *Leucesie* (epiclesis of Jupiter), perhaps with original -ie and with intact eu diphthong preceding the change to ou (already complete by the earliest Latin we possess otherwise). Comparable forms are found nowhere else in the Italic languages, neither in the oldest epigraphic monuments of Latin or Faliscan (which may be as old as the 7th century BCE), nor in the earliest remains of the Sabellic languages (‘Osco-Umbrian’), including the oldest documents in South Picene, Pre-Samnite, and Paleo-Umbrian. Yet these fragments have more than linguistic interest, as considerable as that is, since they offer tantalizing glimpses of some of the earliest Roman religious ritual and liturgy. This is the first monograph-length treatment of the material since 1894, and it is very welcome indeed.

After a helpful ‘Premessa’, which underscores Sarullo’s focus on the textual tradition (rather than analysis in terms of Roman religious history), Ch. 1 (5–22) provides basic background on the *Salii* and the *Carmina Saliaria*, including comments on meter and poetics. Ch. 2 (‘Storia di un testo ‹dimenticato›’, 23–89) surveys first the manuscript readings of the transmitted fragments (as found in Varro, Terentius Scaurus, and Festus) and then the published versions of those materials in printed editions beginning in the Renaissance. Particularly helpful are the comparative tables summarizing the MS readings and published versions, as well as more than a dozen photographic reproductions of some of the more interesting MS passages. Ch. 3 (‘Per uno status quaestionis’, 91–141) sketches the interpretations of the fragments by 19th and 20th century scholars. The heart of the book is Ch. 4 (‘Le testimonianze del *Carmen Saliare*’, 143–312): here Sarullo takes up in turn each of the transmitted fragments and examines in detail its textual reconstruction and its linguistic interpretation, concluding with a survey of her own reconstructions of the texts (305–12). This is followed by the brief Ch. 5 (‘Riflessioni linguistiche’, 313–23), summarizing points of phonology, morphology, lexicon, and style as seen in the fragments, as well as a suggestive (if largely inconclusive) discussion of «tracce di sabinità», a long-standing issue in view of the traditional attribution of the text to Numa Pompilius. The book concludes with a brief envoi (‘*Sed haec quidem hactenus*’, 326–33), followed by a rich apparatus of appendixes and indexes.

There are minor blemishes, most pervasively the hyper-annotation and excessive (and excessively lengthy) quotation typical of work that originated in a dissertation. But this can be forgiven in a journeyman effort, along with other pec-
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1 I.e., as opposed to analogically remade vocatives of the type *filie* (Liv. Andr. 2); M. Weiss, ‘Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin’ (Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, 2011; 2nd corrected printing) 221.

cadilloes: the antiquated transcription system used for Avestan (probably in most cases reproducing Avestan citations in secondary literature; but these should have been modernized); some incorrect Sanskrit material (e.g. sunúṣ [1661103, 421] for sínúṣ); and citation of ancient texts without proper reference, e.g. 248 (with unreferenced Vedic passage), or the ‘iscrizione marsa’ quoted on p. 115, likewise without reference, and quoted again later (251) with reference only to the edition of Marsian inscriptions by C. Letta and S. D’Amato (Milan, 1985) rather than – or at least supplemented by – the more readily accessible standard collections of Sabellic texts. But in general, Sarullo is to be congratulated in particular for the book’s ‘indagini filologiche’: her investigations of the textual background of the fragments is extraordinarily thorough and places the study of these texts on a new and more solid footing. Her assessments of textual matters are lucid, sensible, and often illuminating. In contrast, the book’s ‘riflessioni linguistiche’ – which are pervasive in the monograph-length Ch. 4 and are not restricted to the eponymous Ch. 5 – are often disappointingly superficial. Two examples must suffice.

In matters of etymology, Sarullo is generally content to cite the etymological dictionaries (not always with accuracy). But this has its limitations. Thus, in her discussion of Durante’s analysis of the possible sequence beteti as a word belonging with Lat. baetere (216–17), Sarullo, citing Ernout-Meillet and de Vaan, first observes that the etymology of the Latin word is said to be unknown. She then goes on to say that the word’s only possible explanation would involve a variant of the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) root *gʷem-(as in Lat. venī and Gk. βαίνω), namely *gʷa-, (sic; nowadays properly *gʷeb-), for which she cites Walde-Hofmann. This last citation is misleading: Walde-Hofmann (s.v. baetō, I.93) actually state, addressing a proposed connection with Baltic material and the assumption of a borrowing from Sabellic to Latin, that the word has no connection with *gʷa- or venī. Sarullo, assuming such a background, then considers the ‘Sabine’ features of Carm. Sal. beteti in comparison with Umbrian ebetræfe (Tab. Ig. Vla 12), long compared with Lat. baetere; finally, she comments on the era at which the borrowing would have occurred (in part based on the appearance of baetere in the Laws of the XII Tables) and the probable connection between baetere and arbiter. In all of this, however, she has missed the attractive etymological (and textual) analysis of baetere by R. Garnier, indeed based on
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1 This is Atharvaveda (Saunakīya) 2.31.2.
4 A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, ‘Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch’ (Heidelberg: Winter, 1938–1954). Whether *gʷa- should be referred to as un allotropo della radice *gʷem-> is questionable, but that matter is best left aside here.
PIE *gʷeb- (as Sarullo had surmised), including detailed discussion of Lat. baetere as it appears in Latin texts, as well as Lat. arbiter and U. ebetrafe. Here, Sarullo’s instincts were good; but her treatment of the matter – relying on nothing but the standard etymological dictionaries – is uninformed and far less useful than it could have been.

Other types of problems are more severe. Fr. 3, preserved by Terentius Scaurus (De orthog. VIII.6 = VII.28.11K), contains the archaic forms cited at the outset above, and begins as follows in the transmitted version: cui nos leucesiae praetexeremonti. Since the mid-19th century, this has been interpreted, with slight variations, as cume tonas, Leucesiae, prae ted tremonti, i.e. ‘When you thunder, Leucesius, they tremble before you’. The form cume, however, is very puzzling, and Sarullo (especially 200–2) does little to elucidate it. Etymologically, the conjunction meaning ‘when’ should have appeared as quom (as still in Early Latin), whence the alternative emendation quome; but as Sarullo correctly argues, cume remains closer to the transmitted text, and (despite complications involving the fact that Terentius’s passage actually begins with quomiam) there is not much difficulty understanding cume as a modernization. The real problem is the final -e: what does this represent? Sarullo has almost nothing to say about this (thereby misrepresenting the severity of the problem), merely stating that various solutions have been proposed, and then listing three of them: 1. (Norden, followed by Pisani) it is a «Beteuerungsartikel» è corresponding to the e in the famous phrase e nos Lases iuvate in the Carmen Arvale; 2. (Durante, option 1) it corresponds to the enclitic particle -i- found in various Sabellic pronominal forms, such as Oscan iz-i-e ‘is’ and iz-i-dum ‘(masc.) idem’; 3. (Durante, option 2) it corresponds to a deictic particle -de in Umbrian forms like puni, pon(n)e. There is no discussion; but in fact, all of these are problematic. As for the particle in e nos Lases iuvate (in that text also e nos Marmor iuvate): there is, to be sure, an asseverative particle ē (or ē, with shortening) associated with vocative theonyms, as also in ēcastor, edepol, ēiūnō, ēquirēne, etc.1 But the syntactic behavior is clear from the attested Latin data: the particle appears either directly before the vocative (ēcastor etc.) or directly before a second-position (‘Wackernagel’s Law’) enclitic pronoun, which itself precedes the vocative (e nos Lases, e nos Marmor).2 There is no reason to expect an enclitic usage following a conjunction, or appearance (whether as enclitic or proclitic) interposed between a conjunction and its governed verb. Durante’s comparison with O. izic is specious, since this form is underlingly *iz-id-k(e), with an enclitic particle -id- ultimately derived from the neuter anaphoric pronoun (cf. O. neut. idic and, in the native alphabet, idik/idik, i.e. *id-id-k(e));3 there is thus no ‘-i-’ that can be compared with the -e of cum-e.
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1 See in detail G. E. Dunkel, ‘Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme’ (Heidelberg: Winter, 2014) 2.211–12, with Sanskrit comparandum.

2 On the ‘Wackernagel’ behavior of Latin enclitic (non-nominative) pronouns, see J. N. Adams, ‘Wackernagel’s Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin’ (Cambridge: The Philological Society, 1994) 1–2, 5, and the references to Wackernagel (and others) at 91 n. 5.

Similarly, for Durante’s ‘iz-i-dum’,¹ this too may very well reflect *is-id-om, as is often thought.² As for Umbrian pon(n)e etc. < *k₂om-de: this is acceptable phonology for Umbrian; but Latin retains -nd- for *-md- (with -md- often restored, as in quamdiū ‘for how long?’), cf. Umbrian pane < *k₂am-de = Early Lat. quamde and quande ‘quam’, further inde ‘thence’ < *im-de, etc. Are we to suppose that Lat. cume or quome reflects an aberrant Latin treatment -md- > -m(m)-? No other evidence supports this ad hoc assumption, which must be regarded as all but impossible. Or does cume (cf. the transmitted cuine) really reflect a ‘Sabine’ form cuine or quome (vel sim.), as a borrowing from Sabellic? But the borrowing of a conjunction is very difficult to accept. It has been customary, since Scaliger, to compare cume with Festus’s notice about tame («Tame in carmine positum est pro tam», 494.6L), and Sarullo duly records the comparison (see especially 292 on tame). But tame has its own problems, and, as an isolated form without context and as an adverb with quite different properties as compared with quom/cum, the comparison is of limited value for elucidating cume. Thus in this case (and others): the riflessioni linguistiche arising from this difficult textual material should at least have provided a preliminary evaluation, rather than simply listing previous (and, as here, highly problematic) approaches to the issue at hand.³

There is, then, a great deal of work that remains to be accomplished on these extraordinarily interesting and important fragments, especially concerning their linguistic analysis. But all future study of this material must depend on Sarullo’s meticulous and judicious presentation of the texts.
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¹ Not actually attested in the Roman-alphabet Oscan texts; properly ísídum, εισειδομ, etc.
² Buck (op. cit.) 147; Untermann (op. cit.) 348; Dupraz (op. cit.) 233–4; Dunkel (op. cit.) 2.376 with n. 5.
³ Given the nature of the difficulties, it may be preferable to view the recalcitrant eo as belonging not to quom/cum but rather to the following word. In that case, a solution might involve an abbreviation ë (for en) at some stage of the tradition (cf., in the passage in question, ëtexeremonti for praetexeremonti, in the Codex Bernensis of Ter. Scaur.; cf. Sarullo 75 on the abbreviation), eventually misread as plain e and assigned to the preceding word; the original, then, would have been Early Lat. ENTONAS (cf. EN ‘in’ in the Duenos Inscription, CIL I 2 4) = Class. Lat. intonas, frequently with the same reference (intonuit caeli pater ipse Cic. Div. 1.106.15, etc.). Similarly: in the succeeding portion of the same fragment, which ends (enigmatically) with cum tonarem in the transmitted version, Durante supposed an original TONAREN, containing -EN as a postposed element (see Sarullo’s discussion, 134).