

Dusan Polansky

READING OF NOVILARA STELE BY ANTONIN HORAK

Povzetek

STELA NOVILARA IN BRANJE ANTONINA HORAKA

Stela iz Novilare je edinstven zgodovinski dokument in z 12 vrsticami dobro berljivega besedila je eden izmed najdaljših napisov najdenih na tleh predrimske Italije. Stela iz Novilare uradno velja kot neprebran, nerazložen napis. Glavnina učenjakov je v dvomih ali naj bi bil jezik napisa sploh indo-evropski ali ne. Antonin Horak pa je predstavil svoje branje napisa stele in sicer na osnovi slovanskih jezikov.

V tem prispevku primerjam glasovne vrednosti posameznih znakov, kot je to ugotovil Antonin Horak, z glasovnimi vrednostmi privzetih od večine jezikoslovce, predvsem Jamesa Poultney-a in Joshua Whatmough-a. V primerjavo so vključena tudi prečrkovanja in glasovne vrednosti venetskih znakov Mateja Bora. Podajam analizo besednega zaklada in izbranih morfoloških značilnosti.

Upoštevač, da se Horakovo branje ujema z reliefom na zadnji strani stele - besedilo in slika opisujeta isto stvar in da je to smiselno povezano besedilo, ki ima številne slovanske značilnosti, vključno s priponami in vrstnim redom besed v stavku, lahko predpostavljamo, da je njegovo branje v bistvu pravilno. Manjše dopolnitve pri razlagi nekaterih besed ali fonetičnih vrednosti nekaterih znakov pa bi lahko bile predmet diskusije prvotnega branja Antonina Horaka.

Preface

Novilara Stele is a sandstone dated to 6th century BC, found in the 19th century near Novilara in the Adriatic Sea coastal region of Northern Italy. The stele is stored in Museo Preistorico e Etnografico »Luigi Pigorini« in Rome.

Inscription on the stele is written in the North Picene language, which is undeciphered. There are doubts among linguists, whether the language is Indo-European or not. North Picene is a poorly documented language, with Novilara Stele being the far longest inscription. The length of the text, which has 12 lines, is more than respectable even in the whole Italian territory context of the 6th and 5th century BC. Exceptional is the presence of a picture on the back side of the stele. It is estimated to depict a battle scene, a hunting scene or religious ritual [1].

Weblink to the photograph of the front side of the stele:

<http://paleoglot.blogspot.com/2009/02/novilara-stele-remains-mystery.html>

Weblink to the photograph of the back side of the stele:

<http://www.corbisimages.com/images/IH049564.jpg?size=67&uid=39FC396B-58C2-41EC-B5BC-2DFF912ED512>



Comparison of transliterations

Script of the stele is not too different from the North Etruscan script [1]. Thus it is easy to be transliterated. Text is written from the right to the left in continuous script, with unclear division of individual words as normal Venetic inscriptions [2].

Table 1 shows transliteration by Horak [3], using Czech version of the Latin alphabet, compared to the transliteration by Whatmough named in [1] and Poultney [4]. Right column of the Table 1 shows relevant Venetic graphemes and its transliteration by Bor [5]. Venetic alphabet is written on Table Es 23 from Este and is transliterated by Bor [5] and Vodopivec [6].

Venetic alphabet

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| .a.e.v.d.i.t.k.l.m..p.n.š.r.z.c.u.b.g.o. | correct record |
| a e v d i t k l m p n š r z c u b g o | correct transliteration |
| ⱥ ⱦ Ⱨ ⱨ Ⱪ ⱪ Ⱬ ⱬ Ɑ Ɱ Ɐ Ɒ ⱱ Ⱳ ⱳ ⱴ Ⱶ ⱶ ⱷ ⱸ ⱹ ⱺ ⱻ ⱼ ⱽ Ȿ | uniformed record |

List of differences between Horak and Poultney

Grapheme Nr. 3 - Horak transliterates as C, Poultney as P. Horak suggests acrophonic derivation of the sign as Czech »cep« = English »flail«, with suggested older version of the word to be »cap«.

Table 1: Comparison of transliterations

| Grapheme Number | Novilara Stele | Horak | Poultney | Venetic | Bor |
|-----------------|----------------|--------|----------|---------|-----|
| 1 | ∩ | A | A | 𐌆, 𐌇 | A |
| 2 | 𐌆 | B | B | 𐌆 | B,V |
| 3 | 𐌇 | C | P | 𐌇, 𐌈 | C |
| 4 | 𐌈 | Č | G | 𐌈𐌈 | Č |
| 5 | 𐌉 | Ě (ye) | E | 𐌉 | E |
| 6 | 𐌊 | H | Θ (th) | 𐌊 | H |
| 7 | 𐌋 | I | I | 𐌋 | I |
| 8 | 𐌌 | K | K | 𐌌 | K |
| 9 | 𐌍 | L | L | 𐌍 | L |
| 10 | 𐌎 | M | M | 𐌎 | M |
| 11 | 𐌏 | M | Š | 𐌏 | M |
| 12 | 𐌐 | N | N | 𐌐 | N |
| 13 | 𐌑 | O | O | 𐌑, 𐌒 | O |
| 14 | 𐌒 | R | R | 𐌒 | R |
| 15 | 𐌓 | T | T | 𐌓 | T |
| 16 | 𐌔 | U (uo) | U | 𐌔 | U |
| 17 | 𐌕 | V | V | 𐌕 | V |
| 18 | 𐌖 | ŠČ | S | 𐌖 | Š |
| 19 | 𐌗 | JA | D | | |

Grapheme Nr. 4 - Horak transliterates as Č, Poultney as G. The grapheme is similar to Venetic graphemes transliterated as C and Č by Bor. Supposing the language to be an Indo-European satem, it is natural to read rather Č than G.

Grapheme Nr. 6 - Horak transliterates as H, Poultney as TH = Theta. Horak suggests acrophonic derivation of the sign as Czech »chleb« = English »bread«. In this point it is interesting to mention the peculiarity of Old English *hlaf* = English *loaf* of bread, similar to the Czech »hlava« = English »head«. Possibly a piece of bread in the shape of a head - round.

Grapheme Nr. 11 - Horak transliterates as M, Poultney as Š. The grapheme is the same as Venetic grapheme for M by Bor. Horak transliterates both graphemes Nr. 10 and 11 - which are similar to each other, as M, while Poultney distinguishes the two as M and Š respectively.

Grapheme Nr. 18 - Horak transliterates as ŠČ, Poultney as S. The grapheme is the same as Venetic grapheme for Š by Bor. All the three transliterations are not so far from each other in the meaning of phonetic value. It is relatively close match, considering that we are dealing with an extinct language where phonetic values are just estimates. Horak suggests acrophonic derivation of the sign as Czech »štěp« = English »graft« (of a tree).

Grapheme Nr. 19 - Horak transliterates as JA, Poultney transliterates as D. The grapheme looks similar to Cyrillic grapheme for JA. Horak suggests acrophonic derivation of the sign as Czech »jařmo« = English »yoke«, and suggests older version of the word to be »jaram«.

All other graphemes are transliterated identically by Horak and Poultney. Total count is 13 graphemes transliterated identically and 6 graphemes transliterated more or less differently.

Comparison of the transcriptions by Poultney and Horak

Line 1 P [4] MΞRΛTME ΔΛΛ) T V ΔE MIMMIM

Line 1 H [3] MΞRΛTME ΔΛΛ) T V ΔE MIMMIM

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 2 P [4] M V M E T Δ Λ Λ 1 M I Δ V M E M T O Δ

Line 2 H [3] M V M E T Δ Λ Λ 1 M I Δ V M E M T O Δ

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 3 P [4] T E T M O Δ I O M I M E J O 1

Line 3 H [3] T E T M O Δ I O M I M E J O 1

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 4 P [4] I Δ V Δ K I M E M T Λ Δ T T V M

Line 4 H [3] E Δ V Δ K I M E M T Λ Δ T T V M

Poultney transcribes T V M = »sut«, Horak transcribes T V M = »mut«. The grapheme on the stele is unclear. Even if we accepted the Poultney »sut« which would correspond to Horak »ščut«, we could handle with the similarity to the Czech words »stít«, »setnout« = English »chop«, »decollate«, »behead« which would still make sense in the context of the reading.

Poultney transcribes I Δ V Δ K = »kruvi«, Whatmough [1] transcribes »kruš«, Horak transcribes E Δ V Δ K = »kruvé«. The grapheme on the stele is unclear. In this point I would suggest to prefer Poultney's »kruvi«, which doesn't influence the meaning of the word - Czech »krev«, »krve« respectively = English »blood«.

Line 5 P [4] or M M E M T O Δ M E I I T V Δ T Δ M E T

Line 5 H [3] M E M T O Δ M E I I T V Δ T Δ M E I

Poultney transcribes Δ M E T = »tenag«, Horak transcribes Δ M E I = »i ščíc«. This sequence of graphemes represents the biggest discrepancy between Poultney and Horak in the whole transcription. Even if we accept Poultney's »tenag« which corresponds to Horak's »těnač«, we can still handle - taking »tě nač« as a shortened version of the Line 10 »tě načanjašč«. This shift in reading would not change the meaning of the given sentence and would even make the sentence smoother.

Poultney transcribes M E I I = »ipiem«, Horak transcribes M E I I = »iščem«.

Poultney is not sure whether to transcribe M E M T O Δ = »rotneš« or M E M T O Δ = »rotnem«, Horak transcribes M E M T O Δ = »rotněm«. In this case »rotnem« looks more

likely as this word occurs not only in Line 5, but also in Line 2 and Line 7, in all cases with a Slavic sounding suffix »-ěm«.

Line 6 P [4] JVF YOIƎ1MI VJŮ⊗ MIVTVJ

Line 6 H [3] JVF YOIƎ1MI VJŮ⊗ MIVTVJ

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 7 P [4] ƎV~ŮT YETŮ VET ~METŮ MET

Line 7 H [3] ƎV~ŮT YETŮ VET ~METŮ MET

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 8 P [4] ƎTŮJŮK YOIƎ1M ƎTŮM

Line 8 H [3] ƎTŮJŮK YOIƎ1M ƎTŮM

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 9 P [4] YŮ YETŮ1 MŮTŮJ1 MIM

Line 9 H [3] YŮ YETŮ1 MŮTŮJ1 MIM

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 10 P [4] T ƎRYŮ ŮYETMETŮB MIV

Line 10 H [3] T ƎRYŮ ŮYETMETŮB MIV

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Line 11 P [4] VŮTƎT YETƎT TVKŮJ TVM

Line 11 H [3] VŮTƎT YETƎT TVKŮI TVM

Poultney transcripts TVM = »šut«, Horak transcripts TVM = »nut«. The grapheme on the stele is unclear. In this point I would opt »nut«, knowing the context of the given sentence.

Poultney transcripts TVKŮJ = »lakut«, Horak transcripts TVKŮI = »iak ut«. The grapheme on the stele looks rather like »I« and knowing the context of the given sentence, I definitely opt »iak ut«.

Line 12 P [4] MVE MIVTŮM V~IT ~JŮ1 ƎM

Line 12 H [3] MVE MIVTŮM V~IT ~JŮ1 ƎM

No differences between Poultney and Horak.

Comparison of readings by Poultney and Horak

A. Horak gave division of words and understanding on the basis of Slavic, while Whatmough - Poultney give only translation without any understanding.

Line 1 W [1] MIMNIS ERUT GAARESTADES

Line 1 H [3] MIM NIŠČ ĚRUT ČA AR ĚŠČ TA JA ĚŠČ

Line 2 W [1] ROTNEM UVLIN PARTEN US

Line 2 H [3] ROTNĚM UVLIN CAR TĚ NUŠČ

Line 3 W [1] POLEM ISAIRON TET

Line 3 H [3] COLĚM IŠČ AI RON TĚT

Line 4 W [1] SUT TRAT NEŠI KRUŠ

Line 4 H [3] MUT TRATNĚMI KRUBE

In this line Whatmough reads »kruš«, Poultney's transcription reads »kruvi«. In my opinion »kruvi« is more likely than Horak's »krube«.

Line 5 W [1] TENAG TRUT IPIEM ROTNEŠ (or -M?)

Line 5 H [3] I ĚŠČIČ TRUT IŠČĚM ROTNĚM

»Tenag« seems more likely to me than »i ěščič«. Therefore I would read »tě nač«. Concerning Whatmough »rotneš« or »rotnem«, Horak reads »rotnĚm«.

Line 6 W [1] LUTUIS THALU ISPERION VUL

Line 6 H [3] LUTU IŠČ HALU IŠČ ČĚRI ON VUL

Line 7 W [1] TES ROTEM TEU AITEN TAŠUR

Line 7 H [3] TĚŠČ ROTĚM TĚU AI TĚNTAM UR

Line 8 W [1] SOTER MERPON KALATNE

Line 8 H [3] ŠČOTĚR MĚR CON KALATNĚ

Line 9 W [1] NIS VILATOS PATEN ARN

Line 9 H [3] NIŠČ VILATOŠČ CA TĚN ARN

Line 10 W [1] UIS BALESTENAG ANDS ET

Line 10 H [3] UIŠČ BAL ĚŠČ TĚ NAČANJAŠČ ĚT

Line 11 W [1] ŠUT LAKUT TRETEN TELETAU

Line 11 H [3] NUT IAK UT TRĚTĚN TĚLĚTAU

Line 12 W [1] NEM POLEM TIŠU SOTRIS EUS

Line 12 H [3] NĚM COLĚM TIMU ŠČOT RI ŠČĚ UŠČ

Reading by Horak in Czech and English in word by word sequence

- 1 MIM NIŠČ ĚRUT ČA AR ĚŠČ TA JA ĚŠČ
My (jim) nic věříc. Co pán je to já jsem.
We (them) nothing believe. What master is that I am.
- 2 ROTNĚM UVLIN CAR TĚ NUŠČ
Bojem (ubíjením) uvadlý, čaroděj tě zbídačí (nouze).
(By) fight (eradication) wilted, wizard (will put) you (in) indigence.
- 3 COLĚM IŠČ AI RON TĚT
Celkem věštec aj (v) základu zloděj.
Stands (out as) seer also inside thief.
- 4 MUT TRATNĚMI KRUBE
Zmučeni ztrácíme krve.
Tortured (we are) loosing blood.

- 5 I ĚŠČIČ TRUT IŠČĚM ROTNĚM
I věštíc trápí věštěním, bojem (ubíjením),
And foretelling torment (by) foretelling, eradication,
- 6 LUTU IŠČ HALU IŠČ ČĚRI ON VUL
lítou věštící saní. Věštec léčí on vůl,
fierce foretelling dragon. Seer medicates he fool,
- 7 TĚŠČ ROTĚM TĚU AI TĚNTAM UR
těšící ubíjením těl. Aj tentam (je) úroda.
enjoying eradication body. Oh gone (is) harvest.
- 8 ŠČOTĚR MĚR CON KALATNĚ
Součty měř skrývají špinavě (kalí).
Sums (of) measures hiding filthily.
- 9 NIŠČ VILATOŠČ CA TĚN ARN
Ničící vilnost co ten pan
Destroying vileness what the master
- 10 UIŠČ BAL ĚŠČ TĚ NAČANJAŠČ ĚT
ující (bůh) bál je. Tě začínají jí-
ing (god) baal is. You start ea-
- 11 NUT IAK UT TRĚTĚN TĚLĚTAU
st jak zvíře obětní (ztracený), telátko
t as animal sacrifice (lost), (little) calf
- 12 NĚM COLĚM TIMU ŠČOT RI ŠČĚ UŠČ
němé. Veřejně ti (vezmou) vše(součet). Věru chci zdechnout (ujít).
mute. (In) public you (take from) all (sum). Really want (to) die (escape).

Free Czech and English translation of Novilara Stele

- 1 My jim nic nevěříme. Co pán jest, to i já jsem.
We don't believe them anything. What a master is, the same I am.
- 2 Jsi bojem uvadlý a čaroděj tě zbídačí.
You are wilted from fight, eradication and wizard will put you in indigence.
- 3 Navenek věštec a zároveň uvnitř zloděj.
He is posing as a seer, but in fact, he is a thief.
- 4 Zmučeni ztrácíme krve.
We are loosing blood being tortured.
- 5 I věštíc, trápí nás věštěním, ubíjením,
Whilst foretelling, they torment us by foretelling, eradication,

- 6 lítou věštící saní. Věštec, ten vůl, léčí
fierce foretelling dragon. Foolish seer medicates
- 7 ubíjením těl a je mu to potěšením. Ach, tatam je úroda.
through eradication of bodies and he is enjoying it. Oh, the harvest is gone.
- 8 Podvodně, špinavě skrývají součty měř.
They are hiding sums of measures in a filthy manner.
- 9 Ničící zloba, to je pan-
Destroying vileness is the description of the master-
- 10 ující bůh bál. Začnou tě pojídat,
ing god baal. They start to eat you,
- 11 jako bys byl obětní zvíře, telátko
as if you were a sacrifice animal, as if you were a mute little calf.
- 12 němé. Otevřeně ti vezmou vše. Věru chci zdechnout.
They'll take everything from you openly, in public. I really feel I want to die.

Explaining of individual words

I am using Czech words, in spite the fact, that often a better fitting word can be found in other Slavic languages. In several cases I helped myself with Old Church Slavonic, when I found short with Czech.

1. MI = Czech »my«, English »we«.
2. IM = Czech »jim«, English »them«.
3. NIŠČ = Czech »nic«, English »nothing«.
4. ĚRUT = Czech »věříc«, English »believe«.
5. ČA = Czech »co«, English »what«.
6. AR = Czech »pán«, English »master«.
7. ĚŠČ = Czech »je«, English »is«.
8. TA = Czech »to«, English »that« or »it«.
9. JA = Czech »já«, English »I«.
10. ĚŠČ = Czech »je«, English »is«.
11. ROTNĚM = Old Church Slavonic »rati« [7], p. 1374 = English »war«.
12. UVLIN = Czech »uvadlý«, English »wilted«.
13. CAR = Czech »čaroděj«, English »wizard« or »magus«. Maybe connected to Czech »čára«, English »line«.
14. TĚ = Czech »tě«, English »you«.
15. NUŠČ = Czech »nouze«, English »indigence«.
16. COLĚM = Czech »čelem«, English »forefront«, »openly«, »in public«. In Czech we have similar word »celkem« meaning »in the whole« or »quite«.

17. IŠČ = Czech »věštec«, English »seer«.
18. AI = Czech »i«, slang »aj«, »aji«, English »also«.
19. RON = Czech »ronit slzy«, English »to sweep tears«, something that goes from inside out. Slovene »ronek« = English »foot of the mountain«, some kind of base.
20. TĚT = Old Church Slavonic »tati« [7], p. 790, English »thief«. In Czech we have a verb »tát« in the meaning of melting snow, disappearing or softening.
21. MUT = Czech »mučení«, English »tortured« Alternative ŠČUT could be Czech »setnuti«, English »chopped«, »decollated«.
22. TRATNĚMI = Czech »ztrácíme«, English »we are loosing«.
23. KRUVĚ or rather KRUVI = Czech »krev«, »krve«, English »blood«.
24. I = Czech »i«, English »also« or »and« Alternative, accepting the reading of Whatmough - Poultney would be TĚ = Czech »tě«, English »you«.
25. ĚŠČÍČ = Czech »věštic«, English »whilst foretelling« Alternative, accepting the reading of Whatmough - Poultney would be NAČ = Czech »zač« or also less frequently used »nač« as shortened »začínají«, »načínají«, English »they start«.
26. TRUT = Czech »trápit«, English »torment« or »bother«. The word root is as Czech »trud« which means English »sadness«.
27. IŠČĚM = Czech »věštěním«, English »by foretelling«.
28. ROTNĚM = Old Church Slavonic »rati«, English »war«.
29. LUTU = Czech »lítou«, English »fierce« or »savage«.
30. IŠČ = Czech »věšticí«, English »foretelling«.
31. HALU = Czech »saň« English »dragon«. »Hala« is traditional Slavic expression for (mostly female) dragon. In Czech we have its sounding in the word »hulava« for a fierce wind or cloudy stormy weather.
32. IŠČ = Czech »věštec«, English »foreteller«.
33. CĚRI = Old Church Slavonic »cěli« [7], p. 306, English »cures«, Old Czech »cerat« = English »medicament«.
34. ON = Czech »on«, English »he«.
35. VUL = Czech »vůl«, English »fool«. This is an interesting point: French »il est fou«. English »he is fool«. Czech »on je vůl«. Novilara stele »on vul«. All the four cases have the same meaning and are phonetically very close to each other. It looks like pretty ancient and persistent saying. Word »vůl« literally means »bullock«, castrated bull in Czech and it is widely used in the meaning of »fool«.
36. TĚŠČ = Czech »těšící se«, English »enjoying«.
37. ROTĚM = Old Church Slavonic »rati«, English »war«.
38. TĚU = Czech »těl«, English »of bodies«.
39. AI = Czech »ach«, English »oh« or »ah«, Yiddish »oy«. Czech slang word »aj« is used in both meanings of »oh« and »also«.
40. TĚNTAM = Czech »tentam«, English something like »gone«, »away«, »vanished«
41. UR = Czech »úroda«, English »harvest«.
42. ŠČOTĚR = Czech »součet«, English »sum«.
43. MĚR = Czech »měr«, English »of measures«.

44. CON = Czech »cloní« English »cone«, »hiding«. This word is maybe the biggest puzzle of all the words of the stele. My guess is that it has something to do with the »conus« and the holes in the ground used for long term storage of the corn.
45. KALATNĚ = same root like czech »kal«, English something like »dirt«, »filth«. »Kalatně« in the meaning of »dirty, filthy manner« as the suffix is frequent in Czech and understandable.
46. NIŠČ = Czech »ničící«, English »destroying« On the stele it is the same word like »nothing«. In Czech we have a small difference between the two. Czech »nic« versus »ničít«, English »nothing« versus »destroy«.
47. VILATOŠČ = Czech »vilnost«, English »vileness«, »villainous«.
48. CA = Czech »co«, English »what«.
49. TĚN = Czech »ten«, English »the«.
50. ARNUIŠČ = Czech »panující«, English »mastering«. The word »ar« is uncommon, but the suffix sounds common.
51. BAL = baal, popular god in that times, known also as phallus.
52. ĚŠČ = Czech »je«, English »is«.
53. TĚ = Czech »tě«, English »you«.
54. NAČANJAŠČ = Czech »začínají«, less frequent use »načínají«, English »they start«.
55. ĚTNUT = Czech »jíst«, »pojídat«, English »eat« Sentence is »tě načánjašč ětnút«, »they start to eat you«. In Czech, when we want to accent »you« = »tě«, we place it at the beginning of the sentence. So it is again correct sentence with accentuated »they start to eat you«.
56. IAK = Czech »jak«, English »as«.
57. UT = Czech »úd«, which means in English »limb«, »extremity«. Estimated from the context as »animal«.
58. TRĚTĚN = Czech »ztracený« or »utracený«, English »lost« or »put to death«.
59. TELETAU = Czech »telátko«, English »little calf«. Basic word for »calf« is »tele« in czech, »telátko« means a »very small calf«.
60. NĚM = Czech »němý«, English »mute«.
61. COLĚM = Czech »čelem«, English »forefront«, »openly«, »in public«. In Czech we have similar word »celkem« meaning »in the whole« or »quite«.
62. TI = Czech »ti«, English »to you«.
63. IMU = Czech »vezmou«, English »they take from«. Closest Czech word seems to be »jímat«, English »to collect«.
64. ŠČOT = Czech »součet«, English »sum«.
65. RI = Czech »věru«, English »really« or »believe me«, known also from other inscriptions read by Horak.
66. ŠČĚ = Czech »chci«, English »I want to«.
67. UŠČ = Czech »ujít«, English »escape«, Czech »ujít« is also used for a perforated ball, that blows the air out of itself. May be used as »blowing the soul out of the body«.

Discussion

Concerning words in given basic vocabulary, the fit is perfect. Compare words MI, IM, TI, TĚ, IAK, ON to Czech equivalents MY, JIM, TI, TĚ, JAK, ON, (English we, them, to you, you, as, he).

Sentences like MI IM NIŠČ ĚRUT. TĚ NAČANJAŠČ ĚTNUT. COLĚM TI IMU ŠČOT, in English WE DON'T BELIEVE THEM ANYTHING. THEY START TO EAT YOU. THEY'LL TAKE EVERYTHING FROM YOU OPENLY, IN PUBLIC, are well understandable in the means and also corresponds with syntax and flexion.

Frequent use of suffix »-em«, still in frequent use in Czech, suffix »-u« corresponding to Czech »-ou« - LU-TU HA-LU = Czech »LÍ-TOU HÁ-LOU«, suffix »-ut« corresponding to Czech »-at«, suffixes like VILA-TOŠČ = Czech VIL-NOST. ARNU-IŠČ = Czech PANU-JÍČÍ are giving the impression of just a new found Slavic dialect.

The main trouble that linguists do have with this reading, is to admit the fact, that the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European is not sustainable in its current form [8].

About the possible discrepancy with Venetic inscriptions and language deciphered by Matej Bor - it is important to note that Slavic languages are essentially closer to each other than Germanic or Romance languages and Slovene exceeds with the best correlations with other Slavic languages and also with standardized Sanskrit and with older Vedic languages [9]. Please note, that under the paradigm of Slavic languages being widespread in Europe since Neolithic, the dialects in the first millenium BC could bear already a high level of diversity of dialects, but also some other, non-Slavic, non-Satem, or even non-Indo-European words, on different territories, in different societies.

Devout Christians often point to the remarkable consistency of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and call these the »Synoptic Gospels«. By definition »synoptic« means »as each seen simultaneously by different eyes«. Such independent binocular documentation is presumed to bestow upon opus a high degree of veracity. The writings of Bor and Horak are independent and synoptic. Slight inconsistencies are seen as proof that no conspiracy, collaboration or plagiarism took place.

This reading of Novilara Stele fits the picture on the back side of the stele which confirms contents of Horak's understanding.

References

1. V. Blazek, *On the North Picenian Language*, contains transliterations of Poultney and Whatmough, Masaryk University, Brno **2009**.
2. V. Vodopivec, *Nabor venetskih napisov, delitev, prevod in slovar, Collection of Venetic inscriptions, division, translation and vocabulary*, Proceedings of the Fourth International Topical Conference, Ancient Inhabitants of Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2006**, 118-144.
3. A. Horak, *O Slovanech uplne jinak*, Lipa - A. J. Rychlik, Vizovice **1991**.
4. J. Poultney, The Language of the North Picene Inscriptions, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* **1979** 7, 49-64.

5. J. Šavli, M. Bor, I. Tomažič, translated by A. Škerbinc, *Veneti First Builders of European Community*, Editiones Veneti, Wien Austria and Boswell B.C. Canada **1996**, 189.
6. V. Vodopivec, *Atestinske tablice verski in jezikovni pomniki naših prednikov, Atestine tablets, the religious and language reminder of our ancestors*, Proceedings of the First International Topical Conference, The Veneti within the Ethnogenesis of the Central-European Population, Jutro, Ljubljana **2002**, 167-181.
7. C. D. Buck, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1949, Paperback edition **1988**.
8. V. P. Nikčević, *Kritika monogenetskoga etničkoga i jezičkoga pristupa, A criticism of a monogenetic ethnic and linguistic approach*, Proceedings of the International Workshop, Traces of European Past, Jutro, Ljubljana **2003**, 24-42.
9. V. Vodopivec, *Primerjava sodobnih evropskih, indoevropskih in nekaterih starih jezikov, Comparison of Modern European, Indo-European and Some Ancient Languages*, Proceedings of the Third International Topical Conference, Ancient Settlers of Europe, Jutro, Ljubljana **2005**, 86-106.

Abstract

The Stele of Novilara is an exceptional historical document, with its 12 rows of a well readable text, making it one of the longest inscriptions found on the territory of Pre-Roman Italy. Novilara stele is officially considered to be undeciphered. Mainstream scholarship is in doubt, as to whether the language of the inscription is Indo-European, or not. Antonin Horak presented his reading of the Stele, based on its similarity to Slavic languages.

I am comparing the transcription and sound values of individual graphemes by Antonin Horak, to the transcription and transliteration by mainstream linguistics, namedly James Poultney and Joshua Whatmough. Comparison to the relevant Venetic graphemes and its transliteration by Matej Bor is also included. Analysis of lexicon and chosen morphological features follows.

Considering, that Horak's reading fits the picture on the back side of the stele - text and picture describe the same thing - and it is a monothematic contextual text. Comprising of numerous Slavic features, including suffixes and word order in sentence, I assume this reading to be basically correct, even though minor adjustments in explanation of several words, or phonetic values of some graphemes, may result from the discussion on the initial (amateur) reading by Horak.