STUDIES IN THE ETRUSCAN LOANWORDS IN LATIN

Margaret Mary Thérèse Watmough
University College London

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1

ABSTRACT

In the political and cultural relations between archaic Rome and Etruria the Etruscans were not the speakers of a 'dominant language'. Since Rome was not under Etruscan domination nor was there any prestige associated with the Etruscan language, the conditions under which large scale lexical borrowing takes place were absent. A recent survey of the whole field is reviewed and its results are found to be uncertain or ill-supported; in it the constraints of space preclude the detailed treatment of individual words which is necessary if the nature of the influence of Etruscan on the Latin lexicon is to be fully understood.

This thesis deals with some specific problems in Etrusco-Latin interaction and in the Etruscan loanwords in Latin; a small number of words is treated in detail. It is established that each word is on phonological and morphological grounds unlikely to be Indo-European. Concrete reasons for suspecting Etruscan origin leads to an examination of morphological, phonological and semantic factors in the light of the Etruscan lexicon, word-formation and phonology. Emphasis is placed on explaining the structure of the Etruscan source and the way in which it is naturalized in Latin. In some cases the Etruscan source word is identified; in others it is shown that an Etruscan source is probable. Data from the literary sources and archaeology are combined with linguistic and onomastic arguments.

The extent of Etrusco-Latin interaction in terms of the number of bilingual speakers was small; it is likely that the number of Etruscan loanwords in Latin is also small. Hence a proposed Etruscan etymology for a Latin word of dubious origin must be examined critically. The detailed analysis of individual words brings new results.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Languages and grammatical terms

abl.	ablative
acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
arc.	archaic
Arm.	Armenian
Av.	Avestan
beg.	beginning
Bulg.	Bulgarian
CL.	Classical Latin
cogn.	cognomen
Dan.	Danish
dat.	dative
du.	dual
EL.	Early Latin
Engl.	English
Etr.	Etruscan
f.	feminine
Fal.	Faliscan
Fr.	French
gen.	genitive
gent.	gentilicium
Germ.	German
Goth.	Gothic
Gr.	Greek
Hitt.	Hittite
Hom.	Homeric
i.e.	id est
IE	Indo-European
Ir.	Irish
It.	Italian
Ital.	Italic
Lat.	Latin

Latv.	Latvian
Lith.	Lithuanian
LL	Liber Linteus
loc.	locative
Log.	Logudorese
m.	masculine
Marr.	Marrucinian
ME.	Middle English
med.	mediaeval
MHG.	Middle High German
MIr.	Middle Irish
Myc.	Mycenaean
n.	neuter
nom.	nominative
OBr.	Old Bretonic
OCS.	Old Church Slavonic
OE.	Old English
OFr.	Old French
OHG.	Old High German
OIce.	Old Icelandic
OInd.	Old Indian
OIr.	Old Irish
OIt.	Old Italian
ON.	Old Norse
OPort.	Old Portuguese
OPers.	Old Persian
Osc.	Oscan
OSp.	Old Spanish
Pael.	Paelignian
pert.	pertinentive
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Pl.	Plautus
pl.	plural
Pol.	Polish
Port.	Portuguese
praen.	praenomen

rec.	recent
Rom.	Romanian
Russ.	Russian
s.	singular
Sab.	Sabellic
Sard.	Sardinian
Sp.	Spanish
S.Pic.	South Picene
subst.	substantive
Swed.	Swed.
Toch.	Tocharian
Umb.	Umbrian
Ved.	Vedic
vb.	verb
Ven.	Venetic
Volsc.	Volscian
Wel.	Welsh

Editions of texts and dictionaries

App	G.F. Gamurrini, Appendice al Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum, Firenze 1880.
Chantraine	Pierre Chantraine, Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque, Paris 1968-1980.
CIE	Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum.
CII	A. Fabretti, Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum, Torino 1867.
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
EM	A. Ernout et A. Meillet, Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine, Paris 1985⁴.
Frisk	H. Frisk, Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 Bd., Heidelberg, 1960-1970.

Giacomelli	Gabriella Giacomelli, La lingua falisca, Firenze 1963.
IEW	Julius Pokorny, Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 2 Vol., Bern 1959-1969.
ILLRP	A. Degrassi, Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, 2 vol., Firenze 1965^2, 1963.
IP	Iscrizioni Parlanti (see Agostiniani 1982).
Liddell and Scott	A Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie, Oxford 1940^9.
LIMC	Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, Zürich u. München, 1981-1990 (five volumes with alphabetical entries up to *Kenchrias*).
LSAG	L.H. Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, Oxford 1961.
Marinetti	Anna Marinetti, Le iscrizioni sudpicene, Firenze 1985.
NRIE	M. Buffa, Nuova raccolta di iscrizioni etrusche, Firenze 1935.
OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1968-1982.
Pocc.	P. Poccetti, Nuovi Documenti Italici a complemento del Manuale di E. Vetter, Pisa 1979.
REE	Rivista di epigrafia etrusca (in Studi Etruschi).
SE	Studi Etruschi.
ThLE	Thesaurus Linguae Etruscae. I. Indice Lessicale da Massimo Pallottino, a cura di Maristella Pandolfini, Roma 1978.

TLE	Testimonia Linguae Etruscae a cura di M. Pallottino, Firenze 1968[2].
Ve.	E. Vetter, Handbuch der italischen Dialekte, Heidelberg 1953.
WH	A. Walde, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, neubearbeitet von J.B. Hofmann, Heidelberg 1938.

Note: Etruscan forms are cited from *Etruskische Texte, Editio minor* by Helmut Rix (in Zusammenarbeit mit Gerhard Meiser), 2 Bd., Tübingen 1991. The reading Vs 7.25 *zaθ-laθ: aiθas* includes the typing error *zaθ-* for *zat* (Helmut Rix: personal communication); this is of importance for the chapter on Lat. *SATELLES*.

Periodicals

The titles of journals are abbreviated following the practice used in *Bibliographie Linguistique* with the addition of the following:

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung I,2, 1972
BB	Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, Göttingen
CAH	The Cambridge Ancient History
Dial.Arch.	Dialoghi di Archeologia
MAAR	Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome
PCIA	Popoli e Civiltà dell' Italia Antica 6, 1978: Lingue e Dialetti

The works of <u>Roman and Greek authors</u> are referred to according to the practice adopted in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* and in the *Liddell and Scott*.

The following improvisations have been made for linguistic symbols, which the computer programme used cannot reproduce:

u̯ (consonantal u) is represented by u̲

i̯ (consonantal i) is represented by i̲

ḥ (syllabic h) is represented by ḣ

l̥ (syllabic l) is represented by ĺ

r̥ (syllabic r) is represented by ŕ.

Further, it should be noted that:

Accented short vowels appear as ắ or ẳ etc.

Accented long vowels appear as ā́ or ā̀ etc.

INTRODUCTION

The origin of Latin words is a subject which already fascinated Varro and Quintilian, who made a distinction between native and foreign words in the Latin vocabulary (Var.*L*.5.10 ...*verba, quae sunt aut nostra, aut aliena, aut oblivia...*; Quint.*Inst*.5.55 *verba aut Latina aut peregrina sunt*). The lexicon of Latin, its native terms and its loanwords, is one of the most thoroughly studied areas in the field of historical linguistics. That our knowledge of the Latin language is, however, not complete and that new results must still be sought and can be achieved has recently been demonstrated by Szemerényi 1989. Amongst the loanwords in Latin, those of Etruscan origin, as compared to those of say Greek, Celtic, and Italic origin, have been infrequently and inadequately researched and new studies are needed.

1. History of the research

The first attempt at a synthesis of the problem of Etruscan loans in Latin was that of <u>Alfred Ernout</u> 1929, who offered his work <u>Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin</u>, *BSL* 30, 1929, 82-124, with reserve as an interim study, cf. p.123: "La présente étude ne vise pas à être exhaustive, pas plus qu'elle ne prétend être arrivée à une certitude; elle tend seulement à orienter les recherches. Prise en soi et considérée isolément, chacune des hypothèses et des tentatives d'explication ici proposées pourra paraître faible: mais leur union leur donne quelque force."

His pioneering work led to two major treatments (doctoral theses) of the same subject (see below), and to numerous articles on specific problems. Ernout succeeded in directing the attention of scholars to the question of Etruscan

loanwords in Latin. That his own work must now be considered as methodologically unsound (cf. De Simone 1981:95), and that his proposals must be rejected or qualified to a considerable extent, does not diminish the importance of the seminal contribution which he made.

The first to take up Ernout's challenge was <u>Louis Baudoux</u>, whose dissertation <u>Mots étrusques du vocabulaire latin</u> was completed in 1943 at the University of Louvain (unpublished; the dissertation is referred to by Louis Deroy, L'Emprunt Linguistique, Paris 1956). He treats systematically: i) words attested as Etruscan by ancient authors; ii) the Etruscan mediation of Greek words into Latin; iii) (his main section) words whose analysis appears to reveal an Etruscan character. He concludes that the following Latin words are with some certainty Etruscan: *aplustre, caerimōnia, fala, grōma/grūma, histriō, lanista, lar̲s̲, lucumō, marō, orca, persōna, servus, spēlunca, sporta, spurius, triumphus, verna*. It is a merit of his work that he carefully weighs the evidence for each proposed Etruscan etymology, though judgement must sometimes be left open. Lat. *amō* and *tōfus* are in his opinion definitely not Etruscan. He brings up to date the work of Ernout, making use of the secondary literature (including M. Pallottino, Elementi di lingua etrusca, 1936) to have appeared in the intervening period. His work is unknown to Breyer (see below) and is unacknowledged in the work of modern scholars in the field.

The second doctoral dissertation to be based on Ernout 1929 and intervening work, and the newest major treatment of the subject, is that of <u>Gertraud Breyer</u>, whose work warrants a somewhat fuller discussion. Her dissertation, <u>Etruskisches Sprachgut im Lateinischen</u>, was completed in July 1984 at the University of Vienna; its publication is forthcoming. Breyer seeks to check and, where necessary, correct Ernout's

judgements on certain or possible Etruscan elements of the
Latin vocabulary and, to a lesser extent, morphology. She
exploits the findings of modern research, mainly that of
Pfiffig 1969; Rix 1985a was not available to Breyer. To
Ernout's list are added all Latin words which have since
been suspected to be of Etruscan origin.

The information which Breyer presents is extensive. For each
word discussed she cites the remarks of Ernout 1929, EM, WH
and Alessio's Lexicon Etymologicum. There follows a
presentation of the main arguments given in the secondary
literature, when this postdates EM and WH. Breyer has,
therefore, rendered service to anyone interested in Etruscan
loanwords in Latin by having produced a detailed record of
scholarly opinion on the subject; the chief merit of the
work is that of a data base. The thesis is, however, not
only long (1,113 pages) but also repetitive; the essential
information could have been given in three quarters of the
space, without allowing for the fact that much space is
devoted to words which are patently – and admittedly – not
Etruscan (cf. infra).

Breyer's aim (p.2) is the "Gewinnung eines gewissen
Überblicks über Problematik und Forschungsstand bezüglich
etruskischen Sprachgutes im Lateinischen". She recognizes
that in view of the breadth of the material it will only
rarely be possible to dwell on particular problems or to
handle a specific topic in the depth necessary in the
particular context (the fullness of her treatment of
individual lexical items is largely determined by the extent
of the secondary literature). Further: "Geschweige denn, daß
Anspruch auf endgültige Klärung der aufgeworfenen Fragen
erhoben werden dürfte; das meiste kann nur angedeutet, in
Frage gestellt oder einer eingehenderen Untersuchung
empfohlen werden." A necessary limitation of such a survey
is that it precludes the detailed treatment of individual

15

words which is necessary if the nature of the influence of
Etruscan on the Latin vocabulary is to be fully understood.

The characteristic restraint with which Breyer makes her
concluding remarks on individual lexemes is frustrating.
Repeatedly she leaves open to further research the question
of whether a Latin word is of Etruscan origin or not; the
available evidence on some words makes this unavoidable but
often a more decisive judgement could be wished for.

Similarly in her concluding categorization of words she
frequently fails to make it clear whether a Latin word is,
in her opinion, of Etruscan origin or mediation. Of the
c.540 words she discusses, she concludes (p.7) that around
30 are very probable or secure Etruscan loans and over 170
of possible Etruscan influence. The words which she
separately categorizes under the heading "Etr. Herkunft oder
Vermittlung sehr wahrscheinlich oder sicher" (p.1040-1041)
are: *arillātor*, *ātrium*, *Bacchānal*, *balteus*, *bardus*,
camillus, *capys*, *carisa*, *cella*, *cicōnia*, *fala*, *favissae*,
histrio, *lanius*, *lārgus*, *lārua*, *mantīsa*, *mundus*, *napurae*,
nēnia, *nepeta*, *palacurna*, *persillum*, *persōna*, *sacēna*,
santerna, *satelles*, *spurius*, *sūbulō*, *trossulī*.

There are some errors here; in the above list, for instance,
Lat. *cella* has a satisfactory IE etymology and is not of
Etruscan origin or mediation (see ∮I.7.). Included in the
list of words which Breyer rejects as borrowed from or
influenced by Etruscan are *populus* and *fenestra*, the
Etruscan source for which is demonstrated in the present
work. Further, it has long been recognized that most of the
considerable number of words which she lists as 'non-
Etruscan' (e.g. *laus*, *membrum*, *sequester*, *servus*), while
once suggested to be Etruscan loans, are of IE origin; the
space given over to the discussion of these words obscures
the stated goal of the work. And words such as *mīles*, for

which there is neither an IE nor an Etruscan etymology to hand, should not be included in a list of 'non-Etruscan' Latin words, all the less so since there are reasons for entertaining the hypothesis of Etruscan origin in this case; rather a separate category of obscure or dubious words is required.

It would not be profitable to comment on all the words discussed by Breyer; indeed it would go against the aims of my own work to do so. I intend only, while acknowledging the value of her collection, to question some of her results.

Bonfante 1985 gives the following list of certain or probable Etruscan words in Latin: *atrium, camillus, carisa, cella, fenestra, Lūcĕres, madulsa, Mamurra, mantīsa, puteus, satelles, Suburra, Tiberis, verna*; of possible Etruscan origin are, in his opinion, *camēna, Celerēs, procerēs, Ramnes, Takiēnsēs, transenna, trossulī*.

2. Problems and aims

Anyone researching Etruscan words in Latin must meet the same obstacles which faced Ernout, namely the lack of attention paid to Etruscan by the Roman grammarians (cf. Ernout 1929:82ff.) and the state of the Etruscan and Early Latin evidence.

A small number of words are glossed as Etruscan by Roman and Greek writers (TLE 801-858; see Torelli 1976), but some of these glosses are clearly to be rejected, e.g. Hesychius (TLE 820): *κάπρα· αἴξ Τυρρηνοί*; since *κάπρα* (*capra*) is Latin, one must assume that the word reached the Greeks when the profile of the Etruscans in Central Italy was high and that by *Τυρρηνοί* Hesychius understands not only the Etruscans but the peoples of Central Italy. Lat. *capra*, 'she-goat', could conceivably have been confused with Etr.

capra, a general term for 'vessel', cf. Vt 1.77, Vt 1.80 (*capra* designates here ossuaria) and Vt 2.12 (*capra* designates a patera). *Lat. capra: Etr. capra* illustrates the danger, taken lightly by Breyer, of assuming Etruscan origin on the basis of homophony, which can be particularly deceptive with short word forms.

"Die Gesamtzahl der verwertbaren etruskischen Texte", to the exclusion of those 'texts' defined by Rix, Etruskische Texte, I, §§7,8, as "Untexte" or "zu fragmentarische Texte", is approximately 8,600, of which approximately one tenth are of archaic date, but of these only a handful preserve texts of any length. In the commonest type of Etruscan inscription, the 'grave inscription', the name of the deceased, sometimes with the age at death and/ or any political office held, is recorded. These inscriptions provide a very limited knowledge of the Etruscan lexical vocabulary. Hence, the Etruscan material is mainly onomastic; appellative vocabulary is largely unknown or of disputed meaning. Consequently there are large gaps in our knowledge of Etruscan grammar. Moreover Latin inscriptional evidence for the early period is meagre. Including the Praenestine fibula[1], there are fifteen Latin inscriptions from the seventh and sixth centuries, of which six or seven of the ten earliest come from Rome; for a list see Wallace 1989:128.

In the face of these difficulties and in view of the uncertain results obtained by Breyer, it is clear that the only way to make progress in the study of Etruscan loanwords in Latin is to research individual lexemes in the fullest detail; data from the fields of literature and archaeology and art must be combined with those of linguistics and onomastics. The assumption of an Etruscan origin for a Latin word is worth little when it is not supported by strong evidence. A new study of Etruscan loanwords in Latin which

18

deals with specific problems without aiming to provide
another survey of the whole field needs little
justification. In recent years scholars have made
considerable advances in the interpretation of the longer
Etruscan texts and in Etruscan phonology and word formation;
of particular importance is the work of Helmut Rix in the
last decade (see bibliography). These developments demand
that the question of Etruscan influence on the Latin
vocabulary be treated to renewed and careful examination.

I intend, therefore, to concentrate on a small number of
loanwords, which have the advantage not only of
demonstrating various areas of contact between early Rome
and Etruria, but also of exemplifying the existence of
various types of Etruscan influence on the Latin lexicon,
namely 'loanwords (*stricto sensu*)' (*populus, satelles*),
'foreign words' (*sūbulō*) and possibly a type of 'loan
translation' (?? *līctor*). The choice of words was made on
the basis of the availability of a range of linguistic,
archaeological and literary evidence, not exploited by
Breyer.

When a given Latin word has no cognate in other IE
languages, the question arises whether it is a borrowing
from some other, non-IE language. The possibility of IE
origin cannot, however, be rejected out of hand, especially
if there is no apparent reason why the term should have been
borrowed; it is in theory possible that a PIE word may have
survived in only one IE language; or an existing cognate may
not have been identified. But if a given Latin word is on
phonological and morphological grounds unlikely to be IE, it
is legitimate to try to identify the source word in a non-IE
language. For a Latin word of probable non-IE origin a
possible source of borrowing is Etruscan, the language of
Rome's neighbours across the Tiber. There may be concrete
reasons for suspecting Etruscan origin, e.g. a gloss (cf.

sūbulō) or the existence in Etruscan of a homophonous, but not necessarily related, form (cf. *Spurius)* or the survey of the use of the Latin word in texts, leading to a more precise definition of its meaning and associations which may suggest an Etruscan provenance (cf. *satelles).* Such reasons prompt an examination of the word in the light of the Etruscan lexicon, phonology and word-formation, in the hope of identifying the source word or of being able to show that an Etruscan source is probable. Since the Etruscan lexicon is poorly known and semantic questions will rarely receive completely satisfactory answers, it is particularly important that a proposed Etruscan etymology for a Latin word conforms to the known word-formation rules of Etruscan. The proposed borrowing must also be culturally and historically plausible.

All the words treated in the present work have at some time, chiefly on the basis of literary evidence and in the absence of a sound IE etymology, been assumed to be of Etruscan origin, but the formation (component parts) and the meaning of the Etruscan sources and the course of their transmission (and naturalization) into Latin have not been clarified in a satisfactory way. Each word is treated differently; as the material demands, more or less space is devoted to establishing the original meaning, to considering arguments for an IE origin and to demonstrating that an Etruscan origin is certain or probable. For *populus* IE origin can be assumed only under the hypothesis of a special case of *o-*reduplication in Proto-Latin; since *unus testis* is *nullus testis* it is legitimate to look for a source word in Etruscan. *Līctor* has a Latin etymology, but it is proposed here that it is a type of loan creation from Etruscan. Each word has its own particular problems (e.g. the double consonant in *satelles),* which are pointed out and for which solutions are offered. The goal of this work then is to

20

show that detailed analysis of individual words can bring new results.

Chapter I, which begins with some general remarks on loanword types and the motivations for borrowing, reviews the evidence which can broadly speaking be called 'linguistic' for language contact between Etruscan- and Latin- speakers. It provides some specific background material for the main chapters.

3. Preliminary notes on terminology

i. All dates are B.C., unless otherwise indicated.

ii. The abbreviations arc. and rec. follow the practice of modern German and Italian scholars of differentiating between Archaic-Etruscan (*archaisch, arcaico*) and Neo-Etruscan (*rezent, recente*) texts. It is the phenomenon of syncope, observable in texts of the first half of the fifth century, which enables this differentiation to be made (see Rix 1985a:216 and below, §I.6).

iii. In this work the term 'Sabellic' is used, following the practice used by Meiser 1986:1 as a cover term for the "sämtliche Dialekte des Oskisch-Umbrischen, zu denen außer dem Oskischen, dem Umbrischen und den traditionell 'sabellisch' genannten 'Zwischendialekten' mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit das Südpikenische und wohl auch die in einigen Inschriften des 6. - 5. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts bezeugte Sprache Kampaniens gehört, die im folgenden als 'Präsamnitisch' bezeichnet wird". The Sabellic dialects are: Umbrian, Oscan, Paelignian, Marrucinian, Vestinian, Marsian, Aequian, Sabine, Volscian, South Picene and the language of the 'pre - Samnian' inscriptions. The term 'Italic', which is sometimes used to refer to the Osco-Umbrian (i.e.

Sabellic) dialects alone, in this work describes Latino
- Faliscan, Venetic and the Sabellic dialects.

iv. Pertinentive' is the translation of Germ. *Pertinentiv*,
the term coined by Helmut Rix for a 'case' in Etruscan that
is morphologically a locative to the genitive; on the
formation and function of the 'pertinentive' see Rix
1985a:§34.

Note

1. The authenticity of the fibula has been much disputed,
    but scholarly opinion is now more inclined to accept it
    and its inscription as genuine; there is no solid proof,
    especially scientific proof, that the fibula is a fake.
    Authenticity cannot be challenged on linguistic or
    epigraphic grounds. See most recently Campanile 1985
    (with bibliography), who cites other authorities in
    favour, and Coleman 1990:§III.2.

22

Chapter I: <u>Etrusco-Latin interaction</u>

1. <u>Borrowing</u>

'Borrowing' describes the adoption of linguistic features from one language into another; it is the result of linguistic contact, i.e. the meeting of two (or more) languages in one community. 'Borrowings' are chiefly lexical items. When a word (or phrase) is first borrowed and is not yet integrated (perhaps intentionally) into the recipient language, its foreign origin is clear and it may be described as a 'foreign word', cf. Italian music terms and phrases such as *raison d'être* and *quid pro quo* used by educated speakers of English. When the borrowed lexical item has been adapted to the phonological and morphological patterns of the recipient language it may be described as a 'loanword', cf. Engl. *egg, sky, ugly*, loanwords from Norse. All 'loanwords' are first 'foreign words'. A 'loan translation' (or 'calque') is a type of loan formation in which the individual elements of a lexical item in the source language are replaced by semantically equivalent elements in the recipient language, cf. Gr. συμ-πάθεια → Lat. *com-passio* → Germ. *Mit-leid*, Engl. *body-language* → Germ. *Körper-sprache*. Idiomatic expressions can also be calqued, cf. Fr. *il va sans dire* → Engl. *it goes without saying*, Engl. *to make the best of something* → Germ. *das Beste aus etwas machen*. Since the meaning of a loan translation is not obvious on the basis of native material, calquing indicates a deeper knowledge of the grammatical structure of the source language (: the morphological and semantic structure of given lexical items) than does simple lexical borrowing. Lexical borrowing, when it is intense and/or when the source language is held in particular prestige, can lead to a) 'phonological borrowing' and b) 'morphological borrowing', e.g.: a) the alternation of [k]

with [s] present in Engl. *electric, electricity* which entered English through borrowings from French, b) the Late Latin agent noun suffix *-ārius* > OE. *-ere* > Engl. *-er*. The use of foreign derivational morphemes with native elements produces forms known as 'hybrids'.

The borrowing of lexical items is naturally concentrated in areas where contact is intense; it is motivated by need or by prestige. The most obvious reason for lexical borrowing is the need of a term in the recipient language for a previously unknown artefact, technique or concept; the word is borrowed with the thing it designates. Borrowings are also made when a foreign culture and language are held in prestige; 'prestige borrowings' may replace existing native words (cf. Engl. *beef, pork, veal* from Norman French) or provide synonyms in the recipient language (cf. Engl. *regal, royal, sovereign* from Norman French beside native *kingly*).

Since it is often maintained that Rome was under Etruscan domination (cf. infra), borrowing in the context of conquest is considered. It is generally observed that the language of a conquered people (the 'lower' language) takes in words by the hundreds from the language of the conquerors (the 'dominant' language) and now and again the deeper levels of language are affected (phonology, morphology, spelling conventions). There are, for instance, vast numbers of borrowings from English in the languages of countries formerly under British rule. A particular example is the influence of Norman French on the English lexicon as a result of the Norman Conquest. Within a short time of the invasion all the great landowners, bishops and abbots were French speakers; the scriptoria were under French control (this resulted in the introduction into English of French spelling conventions such as *qu* [kʷ] for native *cw*, cf. OE. *cwēn* beside Engl. *queen*). The languages of public life, of the Church, the law and learning, were Latin and French. For

24

more than three centuries English ceased to be used for official purposes. During this time English borrowed from French approximately ten thousand terms of government and law, warfare and religion, as well as terms of general cultural import and household terms. These borrowings were to a large extent 'prestigious' or 'redundant'; this shows not so much that the Normans had more to offer, rather that the native speakers had more reason to borrow; they needed to build a common vocabulary with their rulers in order to prosper. The rate of borrowing from French was to begin with rather modest; this is because borrowing on a significant scale requires a good number of bilingual speakers.

Speakers of a 'dominant' language are not always rulers over speakers of the 'lower' or borrowing language. This is clear from the large scale borrowing from Greek into Latin which can be categorized roughly into early pre-literary borrowings (*bal(i)neum*), early cultural and popular borrowings (*architectus, discus, harpago* (cf. infra), *tragoedia*), learned borrowings in the Classical period (*philosophia*) and Christian borrowings (*angelus, baptisma*). Large scale borrowing from Greek begins in the third century, when Rome becomes an important power in the Mediterranean and comes into closer contact with Greek culture and literature. The Hellenizing tradition in Latin poetry really started with Ennius, who used a Greek metre, imitated Greek phrases (*δια θεαων* → *dia dearum*) and created compound adjectives in the style of Homer (*altivolans, suaviloquens*). Greek 'prestige' borrowings in Ennius include *poeta* (beside native *vates*) and *poema* (beside native *carmen*). By the third century there were Greeks settled in the city, including many household slaves, who were bilingual and introduced into Latin numerous Greek loanwords that became an integral part of lower class speech and are reflected in the predominant use of Greek words and expressions by Plautus in passages spoken by slaves and low

characters, e.g. *harpago* 'a grab-all', an adaptation of Gr. ἁρπαγή. By the late Republic one can speak of 'Graecomania' among the intellectual élite, cf. Cicero's description (*Brut.247*) of Gaius Memmius: *perfectus litteris, sed Graecis, fastidiosus sane Latinarum*. Cicero himself was a Graeco-Latin bilingual: *Tusc.1.15: scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam in Graeco Latine.* The Greeks, on the other hand, borrowed little from Latin, although Greece was for a long time under Roman control.

Large scale borrowing occurs then either as the result of political domination, when the speakers of the donor or dominant language exercise a strong and continuing influence and their language is used for official purposes, or as the result of prestige associated with the culture, literature and language of the speakers of the donor language. In studying loanwords it is, therefore, important to know something about the political and cultural relations of the two communities involved. Where this knowledge is not complete, as in the case of the relations between archaic Rome and Etruria, the study of loanwords may provide important indications of these relations as well as clues to language history.

The role of bilingualism has already been mentioned. Contact between two languages produces bilingual speakers, i.e. individuals who are competent in the use of a second language. Bilingualism leads to linguistic interference, in the first place in vocabulary (loanwords and loan formations) and then in further linguistic levels (phonology, morphology, syntax etc.) if contact between the languages is extensive.

A number of factors, not least the Etruscan loanwords in Latin and the Latin loanwords in Etruscan, indicate the existence of Etrusco-Latin bilingual speakers. The questions

therefore arise: What was the nature and extent of contact between Etruscan and Latin speakers? What was the status of the Etruscan language at Rome? What linguistic evidence is there for contacts between Etruscan and Latin speakers?

2. Historical background

There are two main views about the relationship between Rome and Etruria in the early period (VII – VI B.C.). The modern theory of A. Alföldi, Early Rome and the Latins, Ann Arbor 1965 (also that of H. H. Scullard, The Etruscan Cities and Rome, London 1967), is followed by Breyer; Alföldi argues that Rome only became independent at the end of the regal period: the rule of the Tarquins is viewed not as the rule of individual foreigners, but as that of a foreign power, cf. Breyer 1984:3: "Rund eineinhalb Jahrhunderte währte die etruskische Herrschaft über Latium; in Rom wurde eine etruskische Monarchie installiert....Intensive Kontakte zwischen Etruskern und den Bewohnern Roms waren die unvermeidliche Folge dieser historischen Entwicklung." A consequence of this theory is that it can lead one to expect a large number of Etruscan borrowings in Latin and to be rash in accepting Etruscan origin for individual Latin words.

The traditional view of the relations between Early Rome and Etruria, now regaining favour on good grounds, is that Rome was independent under the Tarquins; she traded with the Etruscan cities and was influenced by various aspects of Etruscan life, so much so in fact that D.H.1.29.2 can refer to Rome as an 'Etruscan city', but was not under Etruscan domination, cf. R. M. Ogilvie, *CAH²* VII.2, 1989, 15-16: "We should not think of an 'Etruscan conquest' of Rome but of a synoecism which resulted in Etruscan families settling permanently in Rome (as at Ardea or Satricum), in Etruscan political and religious institutions being adopted and in

Etruscan art being welcomed for its aesthetic beauty." Since I subscribe to this view, my initial outlook is very different from Breyer's.

The archaeological and literary evidence cannot be reviewed here, but a few salient points may be made. There is no evidence for a military invasion and large scale settlement of Rome by Etruscans. Etruscan influence on Rome does not begin with the arrival of Tarquinius Priscus nor end with the expulsion of the second Tarquin. Rather it appears to have declined sharply in the second quarter of the fifth century; the beginning of this period falls together with the defeat of the Etruscans by Aristodemus of Cumae in 474 B.C. We should probably view this as part of "a general [economic] recession" in Central Italy in the fifth century (see A. Drummond, *CAH*² VII.2, 1989, 130). The expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus is not accompanied by an expulsion of all Etruscans from Rome; Etruscans continue to play a role in the Roman ruling class, as Etruscan names such as *Larcius* and *Herminius* in the Fasti Consulares of the early Republic demonstrate (e.g. *Sp. Larcius Rufus*, cos. 506 B.C.).

A willingness to admit foreign immigrants into their society was a feature of archaic Rome and of other central Italian cities. Ampolo 1981 argues that the measure of openness in archaic Rome to foreigners and foreign influence was probably greater than elsewhere; archaic Rome is for Ampolo *the* "città aperta". The current trend is in fact to stress inter-city mobility of Etruscans, Italic speakers and Greeks in archaic Central Italy; traders and other professionals moved from centre to centre as did aristocratic band leaders, cf. T. Cornell; J. Matthews, Atlas of the Roman World, Oxford 1982, 23-24: "The evidence seems to imply a kind of horizontal social mobility, by which individuals and groups could move from one community to another and expect to be accepted and integrated into the

social structure even at the highest levels. Thus a simple story of how the elder Tarquin made a purely personal decision to leave Tarquinia and seek his fortune in Rome is another case in which the ancient tradition turns out to be more credible than the modern theories that aim to replace it." The Tarquins are simply the most famous foreign immigrants in archaic Rome. Tarquinius Priscus was allegedly the son of a Greek, was brought up in Etruria and became king at Rome; he embodies the Graeco-etrusco-Latin cultural *koiné* of archaic Central Italy. Nothing definite can be said about the number of Etruscans living in Rome, though settlement on a large scale did not take place; individual Etruscans - builders and other craftsmen, actors, boxers, soothsayers, scribes and aristocrats (with their entourage) - moved to Rome, some to stay temporarily, others to settle there permanently. In archaic Rome there was a fusion of native, Etruscan and Greek elements, but the city was and remained Latin.

3. Transmission of the alphabet and numeral system

The Latin alphabet was derived via a southern Etruscan alphabet from the West Greek alphabet used by Chalcidian colonists at Ischia (settlement founded 800-775 B.C.), Cumae and Naples. There may also have been some Phoenician influence on the Etruscan alphabet; Phoenician models may account for the direction of writing from right to left in Etruscan. Just as the Greek alphabet is adapted by the authors of the Etruscan alphabet to their own sound system (see Rix 1985a), so too the Etruscan alphabet is adapted to the exigencies of the Latin sound system. Certain features of the Etruscan adaptation explain otherwise apparent peculiarities in the Latin alphabet (see Cristofani 1978, Radke 1967, Wallace 1989). Four of these features are here briefly discussed.

Since Etruscan does not have a voiced velar stop, gamma is used as an allophonic variant of /k/. In seventh century inscriptions from Southern and Central Etruria three allophonic variants of the phoneme are found; these are koppa with the back vowel /u/ (e.g. *qutum*), kappa with the middle vowel /a/ (e.g. *karkanas*) and gamma with the front vowels /i,e/ (e.g. *fariceka*). Wachter 1987:14ff. argues that the use of *C, K, P (>Q)* in Etruscan is a purely orthographic convention, influenced by the Greek letter names gamma (the earliest attested form being γέμμα: c + e/i), kappa (k + a), qoppa (q + (o)/u). The preferred letter is *C*, probably because *e* is the most common Etruscan vowel, and is generally used in all contexts by the early fifth century (in Northern Etruria *K* is used exclusively till the beginning of the third century). The Etruscan re-elaboration of gamma is adopted in the Latin alphabet; in Early Latin inscriptions *C* has the values /k/ (e.g. *feced* in the 'duenos inscription' for CL. *fecit*) and /g/ (e.g. *recei* in the *lapis niger* for CL. *regī*). The letter *G*, probably a differentiated form of *C* with a bar added to the lower end, is introduced into the Latin alphabet around the middle of the third century. After the introduction of *G*, *C* is still occasionally found for /g/ (e.g. CIL I² 60 (250-200 B.C.) *cratia* for *gratia* beside *primogenia* in the same inscription) and survives in the abbreviations *C.* (*Gaius*) and *Cn.* (*Gnaeus*). The Etruscan use of *C, K, Q* is also taken over by the Romans, extended to the use of *Q* before /o/ (cf. EL. *kalatorem* for CL. *calatorem*, EL. *qoi* for *quoi* = CL. *quī*); the Roman adoption of this system implies not only familiarity with the Etruscan alphabet but also with Etruscan writing syllabaries. If the Romans had borrowed the alphabet directly from the Greeks *C* would certainly have been used for /g/ alone and *K* for /k/.

In southern Etruria the three-stroke sigma indicates postdental /s/; in Caere and Veii a variant four-stroke

sigma indicates palatal /š/. In Early Latin both signs are used for /s/. The three-stroke sigma is soon generalized in Latin; the four-stroke sigma is seen, for instance, in the 'Tita inscription' from Gabii (c. 620-600 B.C.; Wallace 1989:n.1).

A third feature is Latin X /kˢ/. In the West Greek alphabet X has the value /kˢ/. In Archaic Etruscan inscriptions from Caere and Veii X is used for /s/. Because the value of X is the same in Latin and West Greek, it does not necessarily follow that X was borrowed secondarily from Greek. The authors of the Latin alphabet may have learned from the Etruscans both the Etruscan and the Greek values of X and have chosen to adopt X for /kˢ/. Likewise they may have learned that C indicates /k/ in Etruscan but /g/ in Greek; C is then used in Latin for both values. An indication of secondary borrowing is that the borrowed letter is placed at the end of the alphabet; since the letters theta, phi and psi are not used in the Latin alphabet because they represent sounds not existent in the Latin sound system, X is already at the end of the Roman alphabet. If Roman X comes directly from West Greek, it could be the only Roman letter not to have been borrowed via Etruscan.

Greek had until post-Classical times no sound [f] and, therefore, no sign to represent it. The Etruscans, it appears, when they borrowed their alphabet from the Greeks and found there no satisfactory correspondent to the voiceless spirant /f/, which formed part of their phonological system, had to create a symbol for /f/. In archaic times they made use of a digraph FH, e.g. velvheras, vhulvenas, vhelmus. The logic behind its creation has been attributed to Greek influence since the formation of FH is analogous to a procedure of archaic alphabets in Greece which realize the tenues aspiratae φ and χ with ΠΗ/ΦΗ and KH/ϘΗ. The digraph FH is known from some Greek dialects

31

(e.g. Boeot. *Fhεκαδαμοε* = Att. *'Ekaδήμωι*), where it
represents an unvoiced aspirated labial glide (see Coleman
1990:§III.2.3). As a digraph for /φ/ *ΠH* is quite rational as
the Greek aspirate was pronounced as a 'p' followed by the
sound of a 'h'. Campanile 1985:92 finds Etruscan *FH*
(literally /u̲h/) as a digraph for /f/ quite irrational. It
could, however, be a borrowing from Gr. *FH* (although the
value here was different), or have been created in Etruscan
on the same principle as Mod. Gr. *MΠ* = [b]. In Etruscan, as
in Latin, [f] is a labio-dental (< bi-labial) voiceless
fricative (see below); since *F* (voiced) and *H* (voiceless)
are both fricative (mainly *H*) and *F* is bi-labial, combined
they represent, it could be held, the distinctive features
of [f][1].

In Venetic inscriptions, which date from the fifth century,
FH is the regular orthography for /f/, e.g. the personal
names *.a.vhro.i* (dat., cf. Lat. *Afer*), *vhetiana*;
[v]hratere.i. 'frātrī'. It was borrowed from the writing
practices of southern Etruria, together with the use of
syllabic punctuation, which the Veneti continued to use long
after it had been abandoned by the Etruscans[2].

The Romans also borrow the digraph *FH* which is attested in
two Early Latin inscriptions. One occurrence is on the 'Tita
Vendia inscription' from Caere (Wallace 1989:fig.3, late
VII): *eco urna titas vendias mamar[cos m]ę̣d ẉhe[ced]*, 'ego
urna Titae Vendiae. Mamercus me fecit'. The wine container
on which this inscription is found is of Latin production
and of certain Latial source, although its precise
provenance is unknown. The other (double) occurrence is in
the reduplicated perfect *vhevhaked* on the Praenestine fibula
(675-650 B.C.): *manios: med: fhe;fhaked: numasioi*, 'Manius
me fecit Numerio'.

Greek digamma *F* /u̱/ has in Latin the phonetic value /f/.
Latin has a /u̱/ sound, for which *F* would surely have been
used had the Romans adopted the Greek alphabet directly;
instead they made use of the Greek upsilon – the shape *V* in
Latin rather than *Y* is due to Etruscan influence – for
vocalic /u/ and consonantal /u̱/, e.g. Lat. *vespera* : Gr.
(F)ἑσπερα. The explanation of *F* for /f/ is found in
Etruscan: the Romans simplify the digraph by discarding the
second element and retaining just the first. It is quite
likely that in the earliest written Latin – as in Greek and
Etruscan – /u̱/ was represented by digamma and /u/ by
upsilon. Digamma for /u̱/ is observed in the '*karkaFaios*
inscription' (525-500 B.C.) from the locality of Acqua
Acetosa Laurentina (see Colonna, in Stibbe 1980:64-65). The
use of *F* for /u̱/ and *F(H)* for /f/ may have caused some
confusion (cf. Engl. *p* = [p]/ *ph* = [f], which causes no
confusion for native speakers, but can for foreigners), and
the simplification of *FH >F* /f/ will have roughly coincided
with the practice of representing both /u/ and /u̱/ with
upsilon; certainly it makes better sense that one sign
represents /u̱/ and /u/ than /u̱/ and /f/.

The letters beta, delta and omicron appear in the earliest
Etruscan model alphabets, but not in the Etruscan
syllabaries (e.g. Cr 9.1, 675-650 B.C.) nor in any other
Etruscan text nor in later abecedaria[3]. This has led some
scholars to argue these letters were borrowed secondarily
into Latin from a Greek model. Others argue that had these
letters been borrowed secondarily from Greek, they would
have been added at the end of the alphabet, cf. Roman *Y* and
Z, secondarily borrowed from Greek and added to the end of
the alphabet at about the end of the Republic; Venetic *O*,
also borrowed secondarily from Greek and placed at the end
of the end of the alphabet. The Etruscan alphabet preserves
(at least in the seventh century) and transmits the letters
B, D, O (just as san was transmitted from Greek   to

Etruscan, although the sign was not used by the Euboeans) so that the Romans are able to make use of the signs never used to write Etruscan. The presence of *B, D, O* in the Archaic Etruscan abecedaria suggests that the Etruscans knew their Greek values which were learnt mechanically; two pieces of evidence indicate that this was the case and support the theory that the authors of the Roman alphabet took *B, D, O* from an Etruscan model.

Unlike the names of the letters in Greek, which echo their Semitic names, the names of the Latin vowels consist in the emission of the vowel itself (a, e, i, o, u) and the names of the consonants in the articulation of the consonant followed or preceded by a supporting vowel (te, de, em, en). The supporting vowel is normally /e/, the most neutral Etruscan vowel. The two exceptions are the names for *K* and *Q*, which are 'ka' and 'qu' and reflect the special Etruscan usage of these letters. It is commonly supposed that this practice was of Etruscan origin. The Etruscans taught the Romans the alphabet as a sequence of letter forms and letter names.

The second piece of evidence is the Etruscan (abridged) name for the alphabet (see M. Lejeune, Un nom étrusque de l'alphabet. *REL* 59, 1981, 77-79). This name occurs on the base of a vase (Pe 9.1, 550-500 B.C.) inscribed with a model alphabet; the identified name of the alphabet (*abat()*) is written in a second hand with bigger characters and its first letter overlaps the end of the abecedarium. The full inscription is: ᵃa e ᵛ z h θ i k l m n p ś r ό t u φ χ f ᵇa b a t. Lejeune argues that since the Greek and Latin names for the alphabet are acrophonic and since Etruscan initially had a theoretic alphabet including letters which had no phonetic value, the Etruscan name for the alphabet was probably also acrophonic and formed from the names of the first letters of the alphabet, including those later

eliminated. The practice of naming consonants outlined above may have been abandoned in the case of these 'dead letters', which kept their Greek names ($\beta\tilde{\eta}\tau\alpha$ etc.). Hence the name of the alphabet in Etruscan may have begun with *a + bēta*, assimilated to *a-bata-*, the first four letters of which are inscribed on the Perugia vase. Once adopted, this designation for the alphabet survived the later elimination of *B*, which explains the coexistence of *abat* beside a model alphabet without *B*. Lejeune's interpretation of *abat* is not certain but is persuasive.

Around the beginning of the seventh century the Etruscans tranmitted an alphabet to the Romans which they adapted to their own language. The transmission of this alphabet with the letters in the 'correct' order, the Roman knowledge of Etruscan syllabaries and the existence of model alphabets and syllabaries suggest that the alphabet was taught to the authors of the Roman alphabet in a scribal school or at least by scribes, cf. the Hittite borrowing of cuneiform writing in the 18-17th centuries through a north Syrian scribal school. The Etruscan letter 8 /f/ (cf. below: n.3) is not borrowed by the Roman alphabet; this indicates that Etruscan influence on the Roman alphabet stopped sometime before 600 B.C.

It is theoretically possible that the Roman alphabet was borrowed exclusively from Etruscan. But in view of the cultural *koiné* of archaic Central Italy it is more likely that Roman writing owes something to Greek as well as Roman pratice.

The influence of Etruscan on Latin <u>numerals</u> is probably two-fold, affecting both the designation through subtraction of particular numbers (see Lejeune 1981, cf. J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, Göttingen 1930, III, *196) and the cyphers (see Keyser 1988).

In various IE languages the formation of numerals by means of subtraction occurs sporadically, e.g. Gallic 77 *namyn tri pedwar ugain* 'save-3-80', Gr. 29 ἀνδράσιν ἐνὸς δέουσιν τριάκοντα 'to 30 lacking 1 men' beside ἐννεακαιεικοσι, Skt. 19 *ekayā na viṃśati* 'by 1 not 20' beside *návadaśa*; such subtractive structures are almost always the occasional doublets of inherited additive structures. Latin is the only IE language in which certain numerals with subtractive structures are canonical. These numerals are 18-19 (28-29,...98-99): *duodēvīgintī* '2 from 20', *undēvīgintī* '1 from 20', whose formation is not exactly paralleled in another IE language, although prepositional subtractive structures are known. The additive structure *octōdecim* (Liv.+) is rare; *novemdecim* does not exist. In Sanskrit 19 is alternatively expressed by the compound *ekonaviṃśati* (eka + ūna + viṃśati) '1 less 20'. R. Coleman, in: J. Gvozdanović (ed.), Indo-European Numerals, Berlin 1992, 397 argues that the formation of *duodēvīgintī* "seems to be expanded from *undēvīgintī* ..., which may have been an inherited variant, if Skt. *ekonaviṃśati* ... is older than its attestation suggests".

In Etruscan the numerals 17-19, 27-29,...97-99 have subtractive formations exactly parallel to those of the Roman numerals 18-19 etc., e.g.: *ci-em-zaθrum-* '3 from 20', *esl-em-zaθrum-* '2 from 20', *θun-em-zaθrum-* '1 from 20', *θun-em-cialχ-* '1 from 30'. The exact parallelism of the Latin and Etruscan construction makes independent innovation in the two languages unlikely. Assuming then that the formation was borrowed from one language into the other, we must consider the direction of the borrowing. If the source of borrowing is Latin we must assume either with Coleman that *undēvīgintī* has an inherited formation without being an inherited form or that both *undēvīgintī* and *duodēvīgintī* are Latin innovations; the Etruscans then calqued words for 18 and 19 on the Latin model and extended this model to 17. If,

on the other hand, the source of borrowing is Etruscan, we must assume that the Romans imitated the Etruscan construction only partly; *trēdēvīgintī* (cf. also *trēdētrīgintā*) may have been avoided because it is heavily alliterative. Either way *undēvīgintī* beside *θunemzaθrum*-provides important evidence for Etrusco-Latin socio-linguistic contact. On the evidence of the cyphers, however, we may favour a direction of borrowing from Etruscan into Latin (cf. infra).

The best account of both ancient and modern theories on the origin of the Roman symbols for 1 to 1000 is that of Keyser 1988. These theories include tally-mark, pictographic and acrophonic principles; Keyser demonstrates that each is to a greater or lesser degree problematic. One may note here only that Keyser (with Rix 1969) rejects the widely accepted mixed theory of Theodor Mommsen (1850). Mommsen explains the Roman symbols for 1, 5 and 10 as pictographs of the extended finger, the five fingers or the one hand, and the two hands; the symbols for 50, 100 and 1000 are explained as forms of the Greek letters for the aspirates which were unused in Latin. Keyser (like Rix 1969) follows a line of scholars that began with G. R. Carli, Delle antichità italiche 1, Milan 1788, 22, who argue that the Roman symbols are of Etruscan origin; he disagrees with Rix on the origin of the Etruscan symbols for 10, 100 and 1000.

The familiar forms of the Roman symbols are: I = 1 (*ūnus*), V = 5 (*quīnque*), X = 10 (*decem*), L = 50 (*quīnquaginta*), C = 100 (*centum*), D = 500 (*quīngentī*), M = 1000 (*mīlle*, pl. *mīlia*). The symbol for 50 has an earlier form ↓ , ⊥ (see Gordon 1983:45 and inscription n.12); hence one assumes the development in shape ↓ > ⊥ > L. The symbol for 500 was regularly written with a middle bar (: ϴ), the presence of which Keyser explains satisfactorily for the first time (cf. infra). M was never used by the Romans as a mere

37

numeral; rather it was an abbreviation for *mīlle* or *mīlia* in the phrases M(*ille* or *-ilia*) N(*ummi* or *-ummum*) and M. P(*assus* or *-assuum*). The symbol for 1000 has a different form which shows four variants: a circle divided in half by a vertical line ⟨Φ⟩ and a similar form ⟨Φ⟩ , a symbol like an Arabic 8 on its side ∞ and a similar form ⟨✕⟩ (see Keyser 1988:530).

The Etruscan symbols are: | = 1 (*θu(n)*), Λ = 5 (*maχ*), X = 10 (*śar-*), ↑ = 50 (*muvalχ*), ✳ (later ⟩|⟨ or C) = 100 ⟨?⟩, ⊗,⊕ = 1000 ⟨?⟩. Keyser and Rix agree that the Etruscan symbols for 5 and 50 were each the lower half of the symbols for the succeeding decade; the symbol for 500 (unattested, unless designated by a graffito ⟨⟩ (Keyser:fig.7;10)), which Keyser supposes must have been ⟨⟩ , was probably created on the same principle.

Rix 1969 assumes that the base symbols, that is those for 10, 100, 1000 etc., are acrophonic (cf. Gr. Π for *πέντε*, X for *χίλιοι* etc.), but this is impossible to prove or disprove since we do not know the Etruscan terms for 'hundred' and 'thousand'; they may or may not have begun with the letters theta and phi, to the shape of which the symbols for 100 and 1000 bear a certain similarity. The best evidence for an acrophonic system is the symbol X for 10 (see Rix 1969:853-856). The Etruscan word for 10 is /sar/ (not *san: so, Keyser 1988:537); the genitive case is attested twice: LL VIII.1 *θucte. ciś. śariś.* 'on the 13th of August', AT 1.40 (II) *avils huθzarṣ* (for *huθs-sars*) '(at the age) of 14 (or 16) years'. Since in archaic inscriptions from S. Etruria (Caere, Veii) a sign X is found for postdental /s/, one may assume that in S. Etruria in archaic times the Etruscan word for 10 was written with initial X-. Following the acrophonic principle X could then have been used as the symbol for 10. The practice of using X for 10 will have been easily established since X ceases to

be used for /s/; indeed, the use of X for 10 may have led to the abandonment of the use of X for /s/. X for /s/ may be explained as the Etruscan temporary utilization of X for the 'second element' of West Greek chi /ks/, the combination /ks/ being unknown in Etruscan.

Keyser 1988 suggests that the Etruscan cyphers for 10, 100, 1000 etc. are tally-marks: X for 10 is formed by the crossing of the single tally-mark | for 1, ✗ for 100 by a successive crossing of the symbol for 10, ⊗ or ⊕ for 1000 by a circling of this symbol. Since ⊗ exists beside ⊕ for 1000, we may assume that 10 was represented by both X and (unattested) + ; + , we may assume, was avoided in order to prevent confusion with the letter T, while the symbol X, we might suggest, was preferred under the influence of X for *śar-*.

The main point here is that the Roman symbols are derived from Etruscan; they were probably borrowed together with the alphabet. The Romans inverted the Etruscan symbols for 5 and 50 to obtain V and ↓ ; Keyser 1988:542 suggests that the retrograde Etruscan numerals may have been read both prograde and inverted: hence Etruscan |∧ '6' becomes Roman VI. The Etruscan symbol ✗ (which occurs in two Latin inscriptions; see Keyser 1988:545) developed a cursive form)|(, later simplified to C. The Etruscan use of C is rare. The abbreviation of)|(to C was probably made by the Romans, probably under the influence of *centum*. Keyser 1988:543 explains the Roman symbols for 1000 as variants of the original Etruscan symbol ⊗ or ⊕ , which "became (X) when written quickly .... The form (X) (attested in Latin as ∞) written cursively would lead naturally to the well-attested Latin form ∞. This 'horizontal-8' figure can also appear in a 'compressed' form ထ which leads naturally to the well-attested formal Latin numeral ⏀ . Although the development of Etruscan ⊗ to Latin ⏀ is not obvious at

first glance, every step is attested in Latin". Latin Ð ,
later D, for 500 is the right half of ⊕ .

Finally, we may note parallels in the formation of the
cyphers for non-decades and non-half-decades. The numerals
4, 8 and 9 and their compounds (14, 18, 19 etc.) in Latin
are formed by addition and subtraction, cf. IV beside IIII,
IIX beside VIII, IX beside VIIII, XL beside XXXX, XXC beside
LXXX etc. The same appears to be true for Etruscan, but with
the addition of 7 and its compounds (cyphers for 7, 8, 9 are
not attested), e.g.: XIIIXX '27', IIΛX '17', ΛI↑X '44', IIII
'4', XIIXX '28', IIIΛXX '28', XI↑ '59', IIIIΛXXX '39'.
Numerals formed by subtraction for '4' and its compounds in
Etruscan are very rare (and late), which suggests that such
numerals were influenced by the method used (and presumably
initiated – under the influence of IX) at Rome. The
formation of numerals by subtraction for 7, 8 and 9 and
their compounds, however, was most likely an Etruscan
creation (see Lejeune 1981). All other numerals in Latin and
Etruscan are formed by addition (III = III etc.). The
Etruscan origin of the cyphers and the subtractive formation
of the symbols for 17, 18 and 19 argue in favour of an
Etruscan origin for Lat. *undēvīgintī* and *duodēvīgintī*.

4. Onomastic evidence

The gentilicium system of nomenclature is a phenomenon of
archaic Central Italy; it was a co-production of Italic
speakers and Etruscans. The system began in prehistoric
times, probably in the second half of the eighth century,
emerging from an older system of patronymics (see Rix 1972
and below, §II.1). In an appendix Rix 1972:758 suggests
Falerii as the "Entstehungsort des Gentilnamensystems". The
rise and spread of the gentilicium system is a social
as well as a linguistic phenomenon, since for the first
time a man was designated by an individual

name (or praenomen) and by a family name (or nomen gentile) which indicated his membership of a clan (or gens); it constitutes important evidence for the Etrusco-Italic *koiné* of archaic Central Italy.

Other onomastic evidence for this *koiné* is the frequent borrowing of personal names from one language into another (see Rix 1972:ƒ3.12). Examples include the praenomina Lat. *Mamercus*, Etr. *mamarce/ mamerce* from Oscan (: μαμερεκς), Lat. *Aulus* from Etruscan (: *aule* < *avile*) and Etr. *luvcie-* from Italic (: *Loukjos*), *numesie-* probably from Latin (: *Numerius*).

The rich onomastic material of Etruscan provides a special case for the study of the exchange of personal names in archaic Central Italy. It is important to note first of all that scholars now generally agree that before the arrival of the Etruscans (or 'Proto-Etruscans') in Tuscany, sometime in the second half of the second millenium, Italic languages were spoken there. Etruscan was influenced by the speakers of these languages and above all many Italic individual names entered Etruscan. These Italic languages were with the exception of Faliscan ousted by Etruscan. Hence some individual names of Italic origin in Etruscan may be explained as substratum borrowings, others as borrowings made from the seventh century onwards; a systematic study of these names is needed. Italic gentilicia, on the other hand, can have been borrowed only from the late eighth century; since individual Italic settlers must have introduced these gentilicia into Etruscan, they testify to the occurrence of social mobility in archaic Central Italy (cf. supra). Archaic Etruscan inscriptions which contain an Etruscanized Italic name (i.e. the individual was probably an Italic speaker) such as Vs 1.90 (VI/V) *mi mamarces kaviates*, Ve 2.4 (late VII/early VI) *mi titeš latineš* may be distinguished

from those (more numerous) inscriptions which record the name of an Etruscan who has a gentilicium of Italic origin.

The presence of (Latinized) Etruscan gentilicia in the Fasti Consulares has already been mentioned. The Etruscan inscriptions from Rome are discussed in the following section.

5. Etruscan inscriptions from Rome

The following Etruscan inscriptions from Rome are known:

La 2.2 (S. Omobono, late VII/early VI) *?]uqnuś [?*

La 2.3 (S. Omobono, VI) *araz silqetenas spurianas*

La 2.4 (Campidoglio, 550-500) *ṃi araziia laraniia*

La 2.5 (Palatino, arc.) *ṃi aniθ[*

La 6.1 (Esquilino, III/early II) *veḷ numnal*

La 6.2 (Esqilino, mid II) *pultuceś*

La 0.1 (Cloaca Maxima, 550-500) *ana*

Since it is generally believed that La 2.2 provides the earliest linguistic evidence for the presence of Etruscans in Rome, it is particularly regrettable that a satisfactory interpretation of <u>uqnuś</u>, which may not be a complete text, is not available. If we have the end of the text, we can think of a genitive in *-s* to a personal name in *-nu*, although an Etruscan personal name **uqnu* or in **-uqnu* is not otherwise attested, cf. AS 1.259 *zịnu* (a hapax), Cl 1.1196+ *aθnu*. Steinbauer 1983:217 suggests as possible a connection with one of the Latin and Greek mythological names *Ocnus/*

42

"Όχνος and Κύκνος. Since Latin and Greek *-o* stems are borrowed regularly into Etruscan as *-e* stems (cf. **Marcos >* marce, and indeed Κύκνος *> kukne* in Cl G.3 (V) and Fa G.1 (500-450); see De Simone 1970:§70), *uqnuś* could not be a Latin or Greek borrowing in Etruscan; instead we would have to think of a Latin or Greek inscription (cf. Steinbauer:loc. cit.) in Etruscan script.

La 2.3 *araz silqetenas spurianas* 'Arnθ Silqetena, son of Spurie' is inscribed on an ivory lion cub found among votive material in the area of S. Omobono. One may consider it as a votive offering made in the sanctuary of Fortuna and Mater Matuta that was once on the site; the material and form of the object suggest to Messineo 1983 that it was a *tessera hospitalis* of a private character (cf. also De Simone 1987:34). La 2.4 *mi araziia laraniia* 'I (am the vessel) of Aranθ ?Larana' is an inscription of possession. The most notable feature of these two inscriptions is the form of the praenomen: nom. *araz* for *ara(n)θ* and gen. *araziia* for *ara(n)θiia*, cf. Rix 1985a:§19: "Von /t'/ aus erklärt sich auch der Übergang zur Affrikata [ts] *z* im Etruskischen von Rom ....; aus einer Aspirata [th] hätte das lokale Latein wohl nur ein [t] gemacht wie bei *tus* aus gr. θύος [thuuos]." The occurrence of *z* in place of *θ* in these two inscriptions from Rome may be interpreted as "ein einheimisches Dialektalmerkmal" (Helmut Rix: personal communication); this speaks against the external provenance of the texts. The parallel to *araziia* given by De Simone 1968a; 1987:32 in arc. *larziia* is not certain. *Larziia*, a 'Vornamengentilicium'[4] in Cr 2.68 (550-500) *mi hulus larziia*, may demonstrate that the transition from [t'] to [ts] also occurred once (or at most: occasionally) in the neighbouring city at Caere. But an alternative interpretation may be preferred, viz. that *larziia* is the genitive of the praenomen *larza*, known from inscriptions of recent date (As 1.339+), which is a diminutive in *-za* to

larθ (/lart'tˢa/ > /lartˢ'a/), cf. nom. *arnza*, diminutive to *arnθ*, beside gen. *arnzial*. Steinbauer 1983:218 interprets *laraniia*, perhaps correctly, as the genitive of a feminine gentilicium; he then supposes that *araziia* must be the genitive of a feminine praenomen, which he reconstructs as nom. *ara(n)zai*, gen. *ara(n)zaia* beside the attested archaic feminine form Cr 2.45 (600-550) *arantaial*. The common genitive form of the archaic masculine praenomen is *aranθia*, of which there are eighteen examples from Volsinii; a variant *araθiia* is attested in OA 2.3 (late VII) and OI 2.1 (VI), cf. AT 2.2 (VII) *veleliiaɾs* for *velelias* (Cr 2.36+); Ta 7.24 (late VI), Pe 1.639 (rec.), Vs 1.54 (500-450) *larθiia* for common *larθia*. *Araziia* may then be interpreted as the genitive to *araz* on the model of *ara(n)θ* - *ara(n)θiia*. Since *laraniia* does not end in *-s* (cf. Vs 1.46 (VI/V) *mi aranθia tusmenas*), it cannot be a masculine gentilicium (so De Simone 1968a) and may be interpreted as such only if we suppose that the ending *-iia* has been influenced by that of the praenomen, probably as the result of scribal error. If Steinbauer's interpretation of *laraniia* is correct, we may assume that the form is a metronymic, cf. Ta 2.5 (early VI) *mi larθa šaršinaia* 'I (am the vessel) of Larθ, the son of Sarsinei'.

La 2.5 *mi aniθɾ* 'I (am the vessel) of A....' is a fragment of an inscription of possession; the personal name cannot be amended. Colonna, in Stibbe 1980:58, reads the inscription as Latin (: "la lettura ... riportata non consente dubbi sulla sua latinità"): *[---]ṇianioṣ[---?]*.

La 6.1 *vel numnal* 'Vel, the son of Numnei' is a potter's stamp, of which there are nine other examples of similar date (Cm 6.2, AT 6.1+); the vessel was imported from Etruria. La 6.2 *pultuceś* 'of Pultuce' is a production mark on a vessel imported from northern Etruria (see Steinbauer 1983:216).

La 0.1 _ana_ is probably a masculine praenomen (nom.), which is attested in other Etruscan inscriptions of archaic date (Fa 6.1+) including six vessel incriptions from Caere (Cr 2.91+) in which _ana_ is the full inscription, cf. praen. f. gen. _anaias_ in OA 2.58 (400-350).

Since it is not certain that La 2.2 and La 2.5 are Etruscan and La 6.1 and La 6.2 are inscriptions on third/second century imported wares, the most important evidence is La 2.3, La 2.4 and La 0.1. La 0.1 is probably best interpreted as an inscription on an imported vessel, perhaps from Caere. The importance of La 2.3 and La 2.4 is not only cultural but also linguistic, since it seems possible to identify in _z_ for _θ_ a peculiarity of Etruscan at Rome.

Some Italian scholars (see Pallottino 1986) argue that this epigraphic evidence demonstrates that the area between the Palatine and Campidoglio, which corresponds perhaps to the area in Rome known as _vicus tuscus_ (Liv.2.14), was the site of an Etruscan colony; this argument overstrains the epigraphic evidence, and does not find confirmation in the archaeological evidence. But La 2.3 and La 2.4 do demonstrate the presence of Etruscans at Rome; they reflect the social mobility of archaic Central Italy (cf. supra).

It is worth remembering, however, that outside territory settled by Etruscans no city has produced so many Etruscan inscriptions as Rome. From Ostia we have the recent inscription La 2.6 _vipi_ on a vessel probably imported from Etruria. From the Tomba Barberini at Praeneste we have a silver cup inscribed with the name _vetusia_ (La 2.1, 650-625); scholars debate whether the inscription is Etruscan (: gent. f. gen.), in which case the cup may have belonged to the Etruscan wife of a Praenestine prince, or Latin (: gent. f. nom., later _Veturia_) (see A. L. Prosdocimi, _SE_ 47, 1979, 379-385). From Satricum we have La 3.1 (650/early

VI) *mi muɾlu larisalɹe velχainaṡi* 'I (am) a gift from Laris Velχaina'. The inscribed vessel was probably an offering made in the sanctuary of Mater Matuta by a foreigner from Caere, cf. Cr 3.10 (late VII/VI) *mi mulu larisale velχainasi*. Epigraphic evidence then, as far as it goes, indicates a stronger Etruscan presence in Rome than in other cities in Latium.

The earliest Latin inscriptions do not show any features to suggest that Latin was not always the 'official language' at Rome; nor is there any report to this effect in the literary sources. Ampolo 1986:424 argues that the *lapis niger* (CIL I² 4, 570-550), our oldest 'official document' from Rome, "ci dà la prova del carattere latino e non etrusco della populazione".

6. Initial stress accent

The accent of Latin was not inherited from PIE, which had a free pitch accent. Latin instead has an accent characterized by stress. The best evidence is available for Early Latin (cf. infra) and for the post-Classical period, for which we may refer *inter alia* to the Appendix Probi (III/IV A.D.) *oculus, non oclus* (we assume *oclus < óculus*), *calida, non calda* (we assume *calda < cálida*) and the testimony of Pompeius (K. v.127; V A.D.): *illa syllaba quae accentum habet plus sonat*. The pronunciation *caldus* was known at the time of Cato (Cato *Agr.6.1 in agro crasso et caldo*) and of Augustus, who reportedly considered the pronunciation *calidus* pedantic (Quint.*Inst.*1.6.17), so that we may assume that in Classical Latin *calidus* is a spelling convention which conceals the common pronunciation.[5]

The Early Latin accent is a stress accent fixed on the initial syllable of the word. This accent leads to the 'weakening' of short vowels, that is raising and fronting

to *e* in non-initial closed syllables/ to *i* in non-initial open syllables, with loss by syncope of certain short vowels in open syllables before a single consonant or before *-s* plus tenuis (see Rix 1967a). Long vowels are not affected; diphthongs are affected by a change in the quality of their first element. Examples are: *perfectus* < *pérfăctos*, *perficit* < *pérfăcit* beside *faciō*, *novitas* < *nóvŏtas*, *adsideō* < *ádsĕdeō*, *inceidō* (CIL I² 581,26 *inceideretis*) < *éncaidō*, *dexter* < *déxiteros* (= δεξιτερός). The initial stress accent affects early Greek loanwords in Latin; this dates its end to some time in the fourth century (thus Leumann 1977:§243). Examples are: μαχανά > *macina* > *machina*, νόμιμος > *nummus*, τάλαντον > *talentum*; these borrowings are clearly distinguishable from later borrowings, which show neither vowel weakening nor syncope, e.g. *cerasus* < κερασός (the cherry tree was introduced into Italy by Lucullus in 76 B.C.).

In Classical Latin the accent fell on the penultimate syllable if this was heavy and on the antepenultimate if the penultimate was light: *ducāmus*, but *dúcimus*. Since at the time of Plautus the earlier accentuation persisted in words with the rhythmical structure ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ᷄ (e.g. *fácilius*, *múlierem*), we may assume that the accentuation described with the term 'penultimate law' was a relatively recent development; it must have begun in the late fourth or early third century. The new system of accentuation was probably in part brought about by educated bilingual Romans, who modified their pronunciation under Greek influence; the Classical Latin accent resembles that of Greek in that it cannot stand farther back than the third syllable from the end of the word. Greek influence probably reinforced a change that was already taking place in Latin. Since in words of more than three syllables (except the *facilius* type) an initial stress accent did not have enough force to provide a dynamic structure for the whole word, a secondary

47

accent was needed: *cónfundántur, ímperatóribus, múliéribus.*
A development away from a heavy initial stress accent
probably began in such polysyllabic words, where it was
weakened under the influence of the secondary accent, which
then replaced it as the main accent. Polysyllables in
Classical Latin have an initial stress accent, but it is
weaker than the stress accent on the (ante)penultimate
syllable.

Allen 1965:83 remarks that "there is little disagreement
that the prehistoric accent of Latin was a stress accent,
and that this fell on the first syllable of the word", but
cf. Szemerényi 1990:84: "Der idg. freie Akzent wurde nach
der Mitte des 1. Jahrhunderts v.Chr. von einem an die erste
Silbe gebundenen dynamischen Akzent abgelöst ...In den um
500 datierbaren Inschriften ist von diesen Vorgängen (sc.
vowel weakening and syncope) noch keine Spur". Allen does
not discuss the earliest Latin inscriptions of the seventh
and sixth centuries in which there is no trace of vowel
weakening or syncope. The forms to which Szemerényi alludes
are: *vhe:vhaked* 'fecit', *numasioi* 'Numeriō' (CIL I² 3, 675-
650), *mamar[cos* 'Mamercus' (Tita Vendia inscription, 620-
600; Wallace 1989:fig.3), *iouestod* 'iūstō' (CIL I² 1, 580-
570), *iouesat* 'iūrat', *sakros* 'sacer' (CIL I² 4, 570-550),
kapaios 'Caneius' (CIL I² 474, 550-500; see Colonna in:
Stibbe 1980:66), *mamartei* 'Mamerti' (*lapis Satricanus* (see
Stibbe 1980), c.500). Since we cannot assume that vowel
weakening and syncope are concealed in these inscriptions
by standard spelling, the only reasonable conclusion is that
there was at this time no vowel weakening or syncope.
However, since an initial stress accent can exist without
affecting pronunciation (and thence spelling) it does not
necessarily follow that Latin did not have an initial stress
accent at this time.

The situation is similar in the Sabellic languages, where the syncope of short vowels before a single consonant or before *s* plus occlusive occurred as the result of an initial stress accent (see Meiser 1986:130-132). The oldest Oscan and Umbrian inscriptions (IV/III B.C.) post-date the occurrence of syncope, cf. Umb. *mersto-* < *meřesto-* < *médesto-* to Lat. *modestus*. In the oldest Sabellic inscriptions from the sixth century, however, there is no trace of syncope: Pre-Samnite *peracis* (see Meiser 1986:20, c.500 B.C.), SPic. *matereíh, patereíh* (Marinetti AP.2). Hence one may date the beginning of syncope in Oscan and Umbrian to the fifth century, but a more precise date is not available; the same is probably true for Latin, where there are no inscriptions from the fifth and fourth centuries. There is no trace of vowel weakening or syncope in Faliscan (see Giacomelli 1963:127-128), but the much quoted (Latinized!) form *cuncaptum* (Giacomelli n.138) hardly supports an assumption that Faliscan did not have an initial stress accent. We may assume then the existence of an initial stress accent in Proto-Umbrian and Proto-Oscan, perhaps also in Proto-Sabellic and Proto-Latin (under the assumption that it had not yet led to vowel weakening and syncope) and maybe even in Proto-Italic.

The origin of the Latin initial stress accent has been a topic of great debate, cf. Leumann 1977:247: "Das Aufkommen der neuen Anfangsbetonung, spätestens im 6./5. Jhdt., sucht man meist durch fremden Einfluß zu motivieren als Adstrat- oder Substratwirkung von Sprachen mit erschlossener Anfangsbetonung, nämlich - mit absteigender wahrscheinlichkeit - von Etruskisch, Oskisch, Keltisch, Germanisch, Mittelmeersprachen." F. Skutsch, Der lateinische Accent, *Glotta* 4, 1931, 187-200, already makes a powerful case for an initial stress accent in Etruscan as the source of the initial stress accent in Latin, Oscan and Umbrian. His thesis is more attractive today, when as a

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

result of the precise dating and chronological ordering of Etruscan texts it has been established that the initial stress accent of Etruscan caused first phonetic variation in the quality of internal short vowels in the seventh, more so in the sixth, century, and then gave rise to a period of syncope (where short vowels in both open and closed syllables are lost) that can be dated to the first half of the fifth century, more specifically to 480-460 B.C. (see Rix 1984:34; 1985a:§§10,11). Since vowel weakening occurs in Etruscan at an earlier date than in Latin, it is appealing to suppose either that Latin borrowed its initial stress accent from Etruscan or that vowel weakening and syncope first occurred in Latin under Etruscan influence, although Latin already had an initial stress accent. This cannot, however, be proven. Nor can the counter position that an initial stress accent was a feature of the West Indo-European languages (Germanic, Italic and Celtic) and that the Etruscans borrowed their accent from the speakers of Proto-Latin or Proto-Sabellic. Remarkable, however, is the occurrence of syncope in Etruscan and Latin at approximately the same date. The safest assumption is that syncope as the result of an initial stress accent is a *koiné* phenomenon. Untermann 1968:(see esp. §5) emphasizes the role played by the "Wortgrenze in den altitalischen Sprachen". It is conceivable that an initial stress accent was used in the languages of archaic Central Italy because it coincides with the semantic basis of the word and produces a 'boundary' between one word and the next; this facilitated communication between speakers of the different languages.

7. Italic loanwords in Etruscan

Relatively little work has been done on Latin and Sabellic loans in Etruscan; this is due in large measure to the chiefly onomastic nature of the Etruscan evidence. The most recent work dedicated exclusively to Etrusco-Sabellic loans

is that of Olzscha 1961, cf. also De Simone 1991, Devoto 1975:28-29, Meiser 1986:8-10.

The earliest Etruscan texts are considerably older than the earliest texts in most of the Italic languages; the oldest Faliscan inscriptions are about fifty years younger. Latin/Sabellic loanwords in Archaic Etruscan texts are important, therefore, because they testify to a process of borrowing between Etruscan and Latin/Sabellic at a date for which texts in Latin/Sabellic either did not exist, are not extant or provide no relevant evidence. Further, Latin/Sabellic loanwords in Archaic Etruscan may indicate spheres of contact/contexts of borrowings between Latin/Sabellic and Etruscan speakers.

The identification of Latin/Sabellic loans in Etruscan is problematic, not least because our knowledge of the Etruscan vocabulary is limited. There are two further difficulties.

Firstly, it is very difficult, and in many cases impossible, to demonstrate from which Italic language a loanword in Etruscan was borrowed. For geographical reasons borrowings are most likely to have been made from Umbrian and Latin (Latino-Faliscan), but a judgement even between Umbrian or Latin as the source of a borrowing cannot always be made. A prime example here is Etr. *vinum* (15 attestations in the *liber linteus*)/ *vinm* (1x) 'wine' which may have been borrowed from Latin, Faliscan or Umbrian[6]. An inherent problem is that the Umbrian corpus is small. It is, therefore, possible that there are Umbrian loans in Etruscan for which the Umbrian form is neither attested nor can be reconstructed. There is also a danger of incorrectly assigning a borrowing to Latin because a form is not extant in the corpora of the other Italic languages (cf. below, for example, on Etr. *putlum-* : Lat. *pōculum*). Conversely, when a word is attested in Umbrian but not in Latin, borrowing from

51

Umbrian (and not from Latin) is probable. For a work chiefly concerned with the influence of Etruscan on Latin the importance of determining whether a loanword in Etruscan comes from Latin or a Sabellic language (: Umbrian) is that contacts between Etruscans and Sabellic speakers do not prove the existence of contacts between Etruscans and Latins/Romans; rather they count as parallels of central Italian cultural exchange.

Secondly, Latin/Sabellic origin must not be inferred for an Etruscan word on the basis of homophony; there should be clear semantic and phonological connections between the words in Etruscan and the donor language. This difficulty has already been intimated in connection with Etr. *capra* 'vessel name' beside Lat. *capra* 'she-goat'. It is better exemplified by Etr. *tular* "Grenze, Gebiet" beside Umb. nom./acc. sg. *tuder* 'boundary' (discussed in detail by Meiser 1986:$70, cf. also Olzscha 1961:488-90). Umb. *tuder* might go back to a form *tuîer, which could have been the source of Etr. *tular* 'boundary'. Etr. *tul* 'stone'(?) is also attested, which could be a) a native Etruscan word, to which the plural *tular* '(boundary) stones' > 'boundary' was formed, in which case there would be no connection with the Umbrian word, or b) a back formation from Etr. *tular* (< Umb. sg. *tuîer-*, which was interpreted as a plural form).

Under 'loanwords' are to be understood here A) appellatives and B) theonyms.

A) Below are listed those Etruscan words for which a Sabellic or Latin origin is certain, likely or highly plausible. Those Etruscan words which occur in the *liber linteus* and have a corresponding form in the Iguvine Tables are marked with a sign (**), which serves to indicate the possible religious context of the borrowing. This is not the place to discuss all these loans in detail; a more detailed

discussion is given of three words because they demonstrate the early borrowing of Sabellic/Latin words into Etruscan (Etr. *ais*, *putlumza*, *?spanti*); the reason for discussing Etr. *cela* in some depth will become clear in the chapter on *SATELLES*.

<u>ais</u> (**) 'god'. The PIE word for 'god, divinity', *deiṷos* (cf. Av. *daēva-* 'demon', Skt. *dēváḥ*, OIr. *dia*), was known in Proto-Italic and developed in Latin to *deus* (< *deos* < *deiṷos*), *dīvus* (modelled on the gen. *dīvī* < *deiụī*). The noun itself is not attested in the Sabellic dialects, but derivatives of it are known in Osc. *deivinais* (= Lat. *dīvīnīs*) and Umb. *deueia* (= Lat. *dīvīnam*). The Sabellic word for 'god' is *aiso-* (see Devoto 1975:29; IEW 16; Meiser 1986:252-253), cf. Osc. *aisusis* (dat. or abl. pl.; a scribal error for *aisuis* according to H. Rix, Oskisch aisusis, *MSS* 22, 1967, 67-79, n.13), Marr. *aisos pacris* (nom. pl.) 'dii propitii', Mars. *ēsos* (nom. pl.), Pael. *aisis* (dat. pl.), Umb. *ēsunu/ēsono* adj. 'of the gods'/ neut. noun 'sacrifice', Volsc. *esaristrom* 'sacrificium'. The Gallic theonym *Aesus* is a borrowing from Sabellic. The Sabellic forms do not show rhotacism of *-s-*; Steinbauer (forthcoming) is probably correct in assuming "daß im Umbrischen die Lautung des Nom. auf andere Kasus derselben Wortes und auf Ableitungen übertragen wurde: Nom. [sg.] *aịsos* > *aịss* > *e:s(s)*".

The word is also frequently attested in Etruscan, particularly in the *liber linteus*, where *ais-* is an archaism (cf. §I.8): *ais*, *aiś*, *eis*, *aiser* (nom. pl.), *eiser*, *aiseraś* (gen. pl.), *eiseraś*, *aisna* 'pertaining to a god, ritual, sacrifice', *eisna*, *aisvale*, *aisunal*. Other attestations are: *aisece* (Vt 4.2, rec.) *aiser* (Ru 4.1, late VI; Pa 4.1, early V), *aiseras* (AV 4.1, mid V; TC 37; OA 3.5, rec.), *aisias* (Vs 4.3, VI/V), *aisiu* (AV 0.22, rec.), *aisṇ[-]e* (Vc 3.6, mid VI), *eiṣeras* (Cl 3.7, rec.), *eisnẹyc* 'a priestly office' (AT 1.1, rec.).

The Etruscan and Sabellic words are clearly connected. The base word must be a borrowing from the one language (or language group) into the other; the direction of the borrowing has been much disputed (see Meiser 1986:252,n.5; 253,n.2). Much argumentation has rested on three glosses in ancient writers: <u>D.C.56.29.4</u> τὸ λοιπὸν τὸ ὄνομα (i.e. αἶσαρ) θεὸν παρὰ τοῖς Τυρσηνοῖς νοεῖ; <u>Hsch</u>. αἰσοί . θεοὶ ὑπὸ Τυρρηνῶν; <u>Suet.Aug.97</u> aesar ..... Etrusca lingua deus. These glosses, together with the early (VI B.C.) attestation of the word in Etruscan, suggest an Etruscan origin. The Etruscan word would then have been borrowed by the Sabellic dialects (but not by Latin) and have replaced the native word (cf. Lat. *deus*).

Since, however, all the Etruscan attestations, with the exception of *eisnev-c*, are from the North and East of Etruria, the possibility that the word is of Sabellic origin and was borrowed into Etruscan must be considered. Moreover it is now clear that Sabellic *aiso-* has cognate forms in other IE languages[7]: Av. *aēša-* 'kraftvoll', Goth. *aistan* 'sich scheuen, achten', Gr. αἴδομαι 'scheue, verehre', αἰδώς, -οῦς 'Ehrfurcht, Scheu, Scham', Hom. ἱερός 'krafterfüllt, vital, heilig' (cf. the formulaic phrases Hom. ἱερὸν μένος and RV. 8.48.7 *iṣiréṇa...mánasā*), Doric-Northwest Gr. ἱᾱρός, Aeol. Gr. ἶρος, East-Ionic Gr. ἱρός (with /ī/), Myc. *i-je-ro*, Skt. *iṣirá-* 'kräftig, regsam, frisch, munter'. On the basis of the Indic and Greek forms a root *$h_2$is-* 'strong' (> 'divinely strong; manifesting divine power, supernatural; holy, sacred') has been reconstructed. The -*s*- of this root is retained in the Indo-Iranian and Gothic forms, but is lost intervocalically in Greek: *$h_2$is-eros* > *i(h)eros* > ἱερός (with 'Hauchumsprung') (suffix variants may be supposed for ἱᾱρός (? < *$h_2$isṛos*) and ἱρός (? < *$h_2$isros*)). The Sabellic forms are built with the full grade of the root *$h_2$eis-* > *ais-*; the same is true for Gr. αἴδομαι and Goth. *aistan*

54

(< *h₂eis-d-). The ablaut gradation *h₂is- / *h₂eis- is paralleled by Lat. *im-āgo* / *aem-ulus* and *mis-er* / *maes-tus*. It must, therefore, be supposed that both words - *deiuos* and *aiso-* (perhaps originally employed as the epithet of a Sabellic god: 'sanctus, holy' → 'the holy one, god') - were present in Sabellic (but not Proto-Italic (?); there is no trace of *aiso-* in Falisco-Latin) and that for some reason *aiso-* survived at the expense of *deiuos*, possibly to avoid confusion with the theonym, Umb. *dei* (voc.), *di* (acc.) 'Juppiter' (< *diē(m)*, cf. Lat. *Iovem*).

Etr. *ais* 'god' will have been borrowed from Sab. nom. sg. *ais(o)s* (with syncope of a short vowel before final -s), to which the Etruscan plural ending in -r was then added. The borrowing will have been made by the sixth century.

alumnaθ, alumnaθe (Ta 1.17, 200-150) might be connected with Lat. *alumnātus*, p.p.p. of *alumnārī* 'nurture, rear (children)', *alumnus* 'a nursling of the male sex, (foster) son or child'; one might suppose that *alumnaθ* is a hybrid form composed of Lat. *alumn-* and Etr. *-aθ*. The meaning of the Etruscan word is not known.

-c 'and' has been compared with Lat. *-que* (< PIE *-kʷe*) 'and'. The Etruscan word may have been borrowed from Latin (with the prehistoric apocope of *-e* (see Rix 1985a:∮13) and the simplification of /kʷ/, a sound not native to Etruscan, to /k/). The similarity between the forms may be coincidental; it is unlikely that the Etruscans did not have their own word for 'and'. Indicative of Latin origin, however, are the facts that *-c* like *-que* is an enclitic and that Etruscan shows the sequence *-c ...-c* (cf. Lat. *-que ...-que*, 'both ... and'): Cr 5.2 (IV) *apac. atic* 'paterque materque', LL IX.12 *haθec. repinec* '?', LL X.f1 *θapnaç. θapnzaç.* 'poculumque pocillumque'.

capi-, cape- (**), cf. Umb. *kapi, kapiř, kapiře* 'bowl', Lat. *capis, -idis* 'bowl with one handle (esp. used in sacrifices)'. One must distinguish between Etr. *capi* 'take' (see Agostiniani 1984) and *capi-/cape-* '?bowl', which is extracted from loc. sg. *capiθi* (LL XII.1) and pl. *caper-c* (LL VI.6). Olzscha 1961:482,490 prefers borrowing from Latin for the Etruscan noun.

cela, celati, cf. Lat. *cella* 'store or larder (Pl. +); chamber in a temple (Cic. +); a small room (Mart. +)'. Breyer 1984:375-376 considers *cella* to be of non-IE origin because of the lack of a satisfactory explanation for *-ll-* and to be of Etruscan origin because the word is a "Terminus des Bauwesens": "... und die Etrusker sollten für eine für ihre Bestattungsart so typische architektonische Erscheinung, die in älteste Zeiten hinaufreicht, kein Wort aus ihrer eigenen Sprache gehabt haben? Sie hätten erst einen ie. Ausdruck adaptieren müssen? Sie, von denen die Römer das Bauen erst lernten? Das Kulturgefälle und die Sache sprechen entschiedend gegen eine Zurückführung von etr. cela auf lat. cella." Bonfante 1985:208 believes that an IE etymology is "possible, although very difficult ..., because of the *ll*, which is not admitted in Indo-European" and that "the meaning of the word, concerning architecture and therefore supposing a more advanced stage of culture than that of the huts of the Palatine, certainly favors an Etruscan origin ...". If we propose that Etr. *cela* is a loanword from Lat. *cella* (or from an unattested Sabellic form), we are obliged first to establish the etymology of the Latin word.

Lat. *cella* is traditionally associated with the PIE root *ḱel-* 'bergen, verhüllen' (IEW 553) and with Skt. *śālā* 'Hütte, Haus, Gemach', Gr. καλιᾱ 'Hütte, Scheune, Nest', OHG. *halla* 'Halle' (v. Kluge 1989²²:288). Reflexes of the PIE root may be observed in Latin, both the e-grade *ḱel-*

(: *occulō* 'hide from view, conceal' < *ob-k̂el-ō*) and the lengthened grade *k̂ēl-* (: *cēlō* 'hide, conceal' < *k̂ēl-ō*). In ancient Latin etymologies *cella* is derived from *cēlāre*: Var.*L*.5.162 *ubi quid conditum esse volebant, a celando cellam appellarunt*; Paul.*Fest*.p.66L *cella, quod ea celentur, quae esse volumus occulta*; Don.Ter. *Ad*.552 *et cella et cellarium a reponendis celandisque rebus esculentis et poculentis dicitur*. Donatus' etymology of *cella* as a storeroom for food and drink connects the noun with *cēlāre* in a secondary meaning 'contain, store' (cf. *reponere*). Varro's etymology comes in a section of the "Lingua Latina" dealing with the names for the rooms in a house. Both he and Paulus explain *cella* as the room or place in which those things are stored which one wishes to put away for concealment (*condere*)/ keep hidden (*occultāre*); they connect *cella* with *cēlāre* 'hide, conceal'. *cella* appears to have meant originally 'hiding-place'. The development in meaning to '(small) room, in which items may be concealed or stored' and then to 'small room' must have taken place in PIE, if we uphold the connection with *śā́lā*. (A semantically comparable form is OHG./OE. *hūs* (> Germ. *Haus*/ Engl. *house*) < *kūsom* to the PIE root *keu-* "bedecken, umhüllen" (IEW 951-952), also present in Gr. κεύθω "verberge", κεῦθος "verborgene Tiefe".)

Maintenance of the connection with *śā́lā* demands an explanation of the -*ll*- of *cella*, which we may explain either as < *k̂ēlā* by the *littera* rule (cf. *lītera* > *littera*, *Iūpiter* > *Iuppiter*; see Sommer-Pfister §84,6), or as < *k̂el-nā* with the assimilation of -*ln*- to -*ll*-. The former account may be favoured since our Sanskrit form may also be from *k̂ēlā* (or from *k̂olā* by Brugmann's law); for Gr. καλιά we must assume the reduced grade *k̂l̥-*. If we explain *cēlāre* as a denominative verb, viz. with the semantic development '*to make a hiding-place (for)' > 'to hide', then the base noun could be *k̂ēlā*, but not *k̂elnā*; the derivation order *cella* → *cēlāre* would be the opposite of

57

that supposed by the ancient etymologists. The denominative nature of *cēlāre* is disputed (cf. Steinbauer 1989:142); in theory the verb might also be derived from a root noun *ǩel*, of which there would be otherwise no trace.

In Etruscan inscriptions we find *cela* (Vc 0.40 (rec.): *cela: sal: θn*) and *celati* with the locative ending *-ti* (Ta 1.66 (late IV/early III): *vel: aties: velθurus: lemniσa: celati: cesu*); each of the inscriptions was made on a *paries sepulcri*. The first inscription is obscure. The second means 'in the *cela* is laid (*cesu*) Vel Aties (son of Velθur) the *lemni*' (on the meaning of *cesu* see *ʃIII.3.*); lemniσa is an articulated cognomen or adjective); *cela-* here must designate the sepulchral chamber.

Lat. *cella* and Etr. *cela-* have then similar meanings. There are semantic grounds, therefore, to assume that the two words are not fortuitous homonyms, but that one form was borrowed from the other. Since Lat. *cella* has an IE etymology, the direction of borrowing must be from Latin into Etruscan.

The Etruscan form either represents /kēlā/ and was borrowed from Proto-Lat. *cēlā*, in which case the final vowel of *cela* was long and therefore not apocopated and the internal vowel of *celati* likewise long and therefore not syncopated, or was borrowed after the first half of the fifth century, i.e. after the operation of syncope, from Lat. *cella* /kella/, but the gemination was as usual not indicated by the Etruscan orthography. The second option is favoured by the chronology of the attestations.

cletram (**), attested nine times in the *liber linteus*, is a certain borrowing from Umb. acc. sg. *kletram* (IgT.), a sacrificial instrument, probably a litter on which sacrificial animals were transported. The Umbrian word has a

58

clear IE etymology (see De Simone 1991:134-135; Meiser 1986:8; Olsen 1988:*1.5; Olzscha 1961:482-483); it is an instrument noun to the root *ĝlei̯- 'bend, incline' (cf. Lat. clīno, OHG. hlīnēn): *ĝlei̯-trah₂ > *ĝlei̯trā > Umb. kletra-, cf. Goth. hleiþra 'tent', Lat. dimin. clitellae (< *ĝlei̯-tro-lah₂) 'pack saddle', MIr. clethar 'support'. Given the meaning of the root one must think of some kind of sleigh that was pulled or dragged at an inclination; Prof. James Cathey (: personal communication) suggests that the cletra may have been similar in structure to the travois of the American Indians.

vinum (**) (see above)

lusχ-nei (Vs 7.42, rec.) < (with metathesis) Umb. *lōχsnā < *lōksnā < Ital. *louksnā 'raggiante' (<> Lat. lūna) (see Devoto 1975:31-32; Rix 1976a:177).

macstrev-c, macstrna (AT 1.1, rec.; Vc 7.25, IV). Etr. macstr- is generally held to be a borrowing from Lat. magister/magistr-. The attested forms are macstrevc and macstrna. macstrev- designates the office or position of being macstr-: AT 1.1 ...eisnęyc. eprθnevc. macstrevc. tęnſ--..., 'having held the eisnev-, the eprθnev- and the macstrev-'. The name macstrna occurs in a painting in the François tomb, where macstrna is shown freeing caile vipinas from his chains.

nefts, nefš, nefis (Ta 1.17, Vs 1.179, Vs 1.180, rec.; each form has just one attestation) (? nefts > nefš > (with anaptyxis) nefis) '(paternal) grandson'. The Etruscan word has been judged by Heurgon 1976 and others to be a borrowing from Lat. nepos 'grandson, descendant'; the borrowing might then testify to the process of the Romanization of Etruria. The -f- of the Etruscan forms, however, points to borrowing from Sabellic (prob. Oscan or a dialect of Oscan, not

Umbrian) *neft-s < *nept-s (for *nepōts, on the model of the genitive *nept-es); on Proto-Sab. -pt- > -ft-, > Osc. -ft-, Umb. -ht-, see Meiser 1986:ƒ39. Etr. papals '(maternal) grandson' is a native term.

prumts, prumaθś (Ta 1.17, Vs 1.178, rec.) (prumts > prumaθś with anaptyxis ?) '(paternal) great grandson' has been considered by Trombetti, Heurgon and others (see Heurgon 1976) to be a borrowing from Lat. pronepos (> *prumφts (with nasal assimilation) > prumts, prumaθś). However, comparison with Etr. nefts suggests that Etr. prumts is also of Sabellic (probably Oscan) origin, i.e. < Sab. *pronefts. The loss of Sab. -f- is no harder to explain than loss of Lat. -p-; the following derivation has been offered by Agostiniani 1986:34: Sab. (probably Umb.) *prunefts > Etr. *prumfts > prumts > prumaθś.

putlum-za, a hapax, is attested on an oinochoe from Tarquinia: Ta 2.31 (late IV/early III) mnev: putlumza. Etr. putlum- corresponds to Lat. pōculum 'drinking vessel, cup', or rather, to an earlier form of the Latin word (see Colonna 1984:311 and De Simone 1991:135). The Proto-Italic sound change -tl- > -kl- is known for all the Italic languages with the exception of Venetic (cf. Ven. magetlon, metlon), e.g.: *sai-tlo- > *saeklom > Lat. saeculum, cf. OBr. hoetl. Likewise *poh₃-tlo- > *pō-tlo- > *pōklom > Lat. pōcolom > pōculum, cf. Skt. pātram 'drinking vessel'. Lat pōcolom is the form inscribed on Roman vessels of a date similar to that of the oinochoe from Tarquinia. The problem is to explain the -tl- of the Etruscan form. Two explanations have been offered. Before these are reported, it may be noted that there is no reason to suppose that -tl- was easier than -kl- for Etruscan speakers: the two consonant groups are attested frequently in Etruscan, both in word-initial position and internally (e.g. tlapu, tlesna - vatlui, hustle, nevtlane; clan, clapiθi - aclani, mlacli); other

loanwords in Etruscan show /kl/ for /kl/ of the source word,
namely *cletram* < Umb. *kletram*, *eucle* < Gr. *Εὐκλῆς*, *hercle* <
Gr. *'Ηρακλῆς*, *herclite* < Gr. *'Ηρακλείδης*.

The first explanation is that of Aldo Prosdocimi (*Atti dei
convegni Lincei* 39, 1979, 159-161), who argues that a
backformation with *-kl-* > *-tl-* must have taken place in
Etruscan; this explanation has been criticized, rightly, by
Colonna 1984:316,n.5: "l'ipotesi di una retroformazione -kl-
> -tl- da imputare all'etrusco è chiaramente ad hoc e da non
ritenere". It is quite improbable that the Etruscans knew
that *-tl-* > *-kl-* was a sound development in Proto-Italic and
consequently created the hypercorrect or archaizing form
putlum-.

The second and only credible explanation is that the
Etruscans borrowed *putlum-* from a form **pōtlom*, cf. Colonna
1984:311: "*Putlum* corrisponde certamente a *pocolom* di tanti
vasi coevi, ma la conservazione di *-tl-* denuncia un prestito
arcaico, certamente anteriore al V sec." Since a cognate of
Lat. *pōculum* is not attested in any other Italic language,
borrowing from Proto-Latin seems attractive (but cf. infra),
but a non-Latin source cannot be ruled out. SPic. *puqloh*
'son' (Marinetti AQ.1) dates the development *-tl-* > *-kl-* to
the sixth century (terminus ante quem)[8]; the Etruscans must,
it seems, have borrowed *putlum-* in or before the sixth
century. The borrowed word in Etruscan will have kept *-tl-*
unchanged; it is then a matter of chance that no Etruscan
attestation for pre - c.300 B.C. is known. Since the
development *-tl-* > *-kl-* is Proto-Italic, Etr. *putlum-* can
have been borrowed from Proto-Latin (or Proto-Sabellic) only
if we assume that Proto-Latin retained beside regular
*pōclom a relic form **pōtlom*. However, since the sound
development is not known for Venetic, borrowing from Ven.
*pōtlom presents no chronological difficulty. For this
reason we may give equal, if not more, weight to the

possibility that the source of *putlum-* was Venetic; the Venetic word may have been borrowed in or after the late sixth century by Etruscans in Adria or Spina. Borrowing from Proto-Italic *pōtlom*, for which we must assume a date of around 1600 B.C., may be rejected, if it is correct that the first Etruscan speakers immigrated around 1200 B.C.; linguists are now inclining towards this view.

Etr. *-za* is a diminutive suffix (see G. Colonna, *SE* 49, 1981, 85-86), found, for instance, in LL X.22 *θapnza* 'small vase' beside *θapna* '(normal sized) vase'. When the suffix is added to vessel names inscribed on objects of normal dimensions the connotation is of endearment, cf. the affective use of *little* in English; such is the case with *putlumza*. Since this hypocoristic usage is archaic (cf. Colonna, op. cit.,n. 21 : "il vezzeggiativo si più dire scontato coi nomi di vasi specialmente nel VII secolo", e.g. *leχtumuza, qutumuza, zavenuza*), Etr. *putlumza* (? < *putlumuza*) might be dated back to the seventh century. On its own this would not be a strong argument for the early borrowing of Etr. *putlum-*, but it is consistent with the theory of an early (VI or pre - VI B.C.) borrowing.

Lat. *pōculum* is a general term for drinking vessels of all types and purposes, above all, as literary evidence shows, a drinking vessel for water, wine and honey. However, "bemerkenswert ist die Herrichtung des menschlichen Schädels zu einem poculum für sakrale und alltägliche Zwecke" (see Werner Hilgers, Lateinische Gefäßnamen, Düsseldorf 1969, 74-75, 255, 259). Literary and epigraphic evidence show that the *poculum* was used as a dedication gift or votive vessel[9] (e.g. CIL I² 443 *FORTUNAI POCOLO*; CIL I² 453 *VOLCANI POCOLOM*; Juv. 13.147 *templi/ pocula...populorum dona*) and as a sacrificial vessel (e.g. Liv.23.24.12 *idque sacrum vas iis erat quo sollemnibus libarent poculumque idem sacerdoti⟨bus⟩ esset ac templi antistitibus*; Sal.*Hist*.frg.II.86 *pocula et*

alias res aureas, diis sacrata instrumenta; Verg.*A*.3.354 *aulai medio libabant pocula Bacchi*). The context of the borrowing may, therefore, have been religious or sacrificial; *putlum-* may have been borrowed as an every day term for 'drinking vessel', but this is unlikely in view of the existence of *θapna*, the general term in Etruscan for 'drinking vessel'.

spanti (**) 'plate, dish' is attested five times in Etruscan, once as a diminutive *spanza* (*spanti-za* (LL I.2) and four times in inscriptions on plates or shallow dishes found at Caere and dated to the beginning of the seventh century; each inscription is of the type 'I (am) the plate of *X*', e.g. Cr 2.2 *mi spanti larices* 'I (am) the plate of Larice', cf. Cr 2.1, 2.3, 2.4. Steinbauer (forthcoming) holds *śantiśtś* (LL XI.2) to be a scribal error for *śpantiśtś* (cf. LL XI.3 *θapneśtś* to *θapna*). In Umbrian we have acc. sg. *spanti* (IgT. IIIa 34 and IVa 2, cf. II 30a *spantea*, IIIa 33 *spantimař*); the meaning of the Umbrian word has been deduced from Etruscan. The direction of the borrowing has been disputed (see Steinbauer (forthcoming)); the *opinio communis* is, however, that the Etruscan word was borrowed from Umbrian (G. Colonna, *SE* 36, 1968, 265-267 and 1973-74:144-145; De Simone, *Glotta* 53, 1975, 172-173 and 1991:133-134; K. Olzscha, *Glotta* 48, 1971, 263-264); it would be the earliest attested Sabellic borrowing in Etruscan.

An argument in favour of Etruscan origin is the existence of the individual name *spantu-* in Etruscan; it is attested in Ta 1.13 (late IV/early III) as the 'Vornamengentilicium' or cognomen f. nom. *spantu-i*, m. gen. *spantu-s*. From *spantu-* one can isolate the verbal base *spant-* (see below under *SŪBULŌ*), to which *spanti* may have been formed; a parallel to Etr. *spant-* : *spantu-* : *spanti* exists in *śuθ-* : *śuθu-* : *śuθi*, where *śuθ-* is a verb 'place, build', *śuθu-* an

individual name which one can extract from the gentilicium
(here a gamonym) Cl 1.1780 (rec.) *óuθunal* and *óuθi* the well-
attested noun for 'tomb, grave'. The meaning of *spant-* is
unknown.

In the Iguvine Tables *spanti(m)* is a plate used in
sacrifice, on which the cut meat is placed. The etymology of
the word would confirm the original sacral significance of
the plate, if it is derived, as generally held, from the PIE
root *spend-* (see IEW 989) 'ein Trankopfer darbringen;
geloben', cf. Gr. σπένδω 'verspreche (Gortyn); bringe ein
Trankopfer dar, spende', Hitt. *šipand-* 'spenden, opfern',
Lat. *spondeō, spōnsiō*, Toch. AB *spänt-* 'trust'.

Umb. *spanti* can be, however, in origin neither a -_io_-
derivative to *spñd-* (*spñd-_io_- would become *spandi̲o-*)
Umb. *spanni̲(o)-*) nor a derivative in -*t-* (*spñd-ti-*)
*spñt*ˢ*ti-* > *spñfi-* > Umb. *spanfi*) (*spāfi*)) (Gerhard
Meiser: personal communication). Steinbauer (forthcoming)
suggests that "das etr. Wort könnte als anatolisch plausibel
mit der idg. Wurzel *spend-* verbunden werden: heth.
ispantuzzi 'Ration, Guß' < *spanduti > etr. *spanti(?)*"; one
should note that a *spanti* is a shallow dish or plate, not a
vessel for liquids. For this same reason the etymology of
Helmut Rix (: personal communication) is attractive. Rix
argues that *spanti* is a -*ti-* derivative to the nil grade of
the PIE root *spen-* "ziehen, spannen" (IEW 988): *spñ-ti-*
"das Ausgespannte" > Umb. *spanti-* "plate". Semantic
parallels are provided in a number of IE languages by words
for "Eimer" such as Dan. *spand* and OIce. *spann*, which are
formed from the same root (see IEW 989).

Both an IE and an Etruscan etymology are available then for
Umb./Etr. *spanti*. A further argument for borrowing from
Etruscan is that, if *spanti* were a genuine Umbrian term, one
would expect borrowing from the acc. sg. into Etruscan (cf.

64

cletram and the names for Greek vessels in Etruscan, cf. Colonna 1973-74), i.e. Etr. *spantim*. One may, however, assume that Etr. *spanti* is a borrowing either from Umb. acc. sg. *spanti(m)*, which shows the phenomenon of the weak articulation of final -*m*[0] (cf. IgT. IV 28 acc. sg. *aŕkani* 'musical accompaniment' for **aŕkanim < *ad-kanjom*), or from an unattested instrumental singular (so Rix, in the discussion of Steinbauer (forthcoming)). On the other hand, if the term is in origin Etruscan, one may assume that Etr. *spanti* > Umb. *spanti*, which is naturalized among the *i*-stems > *spantim*. The origin of *spanti* must remain *sub iudice*.

tut-, tuθ- (**) '?cittadino', cf. Umb. *tuta* 'state', Osc. *touto*, PIE **teutā* (see Olzscha 1961:485-488; Devoto 1975:29). Borrowing from Umbrian is probable; the Oscan form preserves the diphthong. The word may have been borrowed as a religious or political term: one can compare Etr. *cepen tutin* (LL VII.8)/ *cepen. tuθiu* (AV 4.1, mid V) with Osc. *meddís túvtiks* and Lat. *sacerdos publicus*.

fanu (Pe 5.2, rec.; Ta 5.6, 175-150), cf. Lat. *fānum* 'a piece of consecrated ground; shrine' < **fasnom < *dʰh̥is-no-* (see IEW 259: "*dhēs-, dhəs-* in religiösen Begriffen", cf. Gr. **θεσός* > *θεός*, Hom. *θέσφατος*). The Sabellic forms (: Umb. acc. pl. *fesnaf-e*, Osc. acc. sg. *fíísnam, fíísnú*, Pael. *fesn(am)*) are from Proto-Sab. **fēsnā-* (cf. Lat. *fēstus*; see Meiser 1986:45) formed with the full grade of the root **dʰehis-*. The borrowing is certainly from Latin *fānum*, an *o*-stem noun (cf. the Sabellic *ā*-stems), which shows the loss of preconsonantal -*s*- with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel.

faśe (**) "polta" and its derivative *faśena* (Sp 2.36, mid IV) 'vessel for *faśe*' are discussed by Rix (forthcoming b):§§6.5, 8.3. *faśe* "sacrificio di pasta" is, according to Olzscha 1961:483-484, probably a borrowing from Umb. *farsio*

65

(VIb 2) 'spelt-cakes', the *-r-* of which before *-s-* was pronounced weakly, as the spellings *fasiu* (IIa 12) and *fasio* (VIb 44) indicate. The Umbrian term, cognate with Lat. *farreum*, is a derivative of PIE **bʰars* (see IEW 111), which develops > **fars* > **farr* > Lat. (*Lex XII*, Cato +)/Osc./Umb. *far* 'husked wheat'. Olzscha's etymology is difficult on two counts, one semantic, the other phonetic: 1. the vessel designated by *fašena* will have contained wheat grains or a wheat porridge, but not cakes; 2. the *-e* of *faše* renders, according to Olzscha, the *-ịo-* suffix of the Umbrian word, whereas we expect Etr. *-ie* (see under *SPURIUS*). It seems better, therefore, to assume that *faše*, if it is of Italic origin, is a borrowing from an Italic, probably Umbrian, reflex of **bʰars*; we must then assume i) that *faše* is an early loanword from Proto-Umb. **fars* with the addition of *-e* on the model of Etruscan terms such as *male-* (see under *FENESTRA*), *papalše-* 'grandson' (see Rix 1985a:§13) and ii) that either *-rs-* developed to *-s-* or *-š-* in Etruscan or that *r* before *s* was pronounced weakly and not always written, cf. Vt 1.78 (rec.) *cursnia-* beside Pe 1.873 (rec.) *cusnia*, Cr 3.18 (600-575) *hirsunaie-* beside Cl 1.1396 (rec.) *hióunia*, Vs 1.52 (VI/V) *θanursie-* beside Po 2.12 (V) *θanusịe* (a diachronic study of all Etruscan forms showing *-rs-* is needed).

To sum up, there are nine attested Etruscan terms of probable or possible (: indicated by a question mark) Sabellic (: Umbrian) origin (*ais, cletram, lusχ-nei, nefts, prumpts, ?spanti, ?tular, tut-, ?faše*), six of Latin origin (*?alumnaθ, ?-c, cela, macstr-, ??putlum-, fanu*), two of Sabellic or Latin origin (*capi-/cape-, vinum*) and one of possible Venetic origin (*?putlum*). Of these we can assume fifth century (terminus post quem) borrowing for *ais, cletram, spanti, tular, tut-, faše; -c, putlum-; capi-/cape-, vinum*. The context of the borrowing may have been

ritualistic for *ais, cletram, spanti, ?tut-* (or juristic?), *faśe; putlum-, fanu; capi-/cape-, vinum.*

B) The most important work on Etruscan theonyms of Sabellic origin is now that of Rix 1981 (on Etr. *uni, menerva, neθuns*) and Rix (forthcoming a)[11], whose results considerably alter the traditional picture of cult exchanges. In the sphere of theonyms, in which no borrowing from Etruscan into Latin has been established, Rix demonstrates that a good dozen Etruscan theonyms are of certain or probable Sabellic (in particular, Umbrian) origin. These theonyms are listed and briefly discussed below, together with theonyms collected from other sources. There is evidence also for the borrowing of Latin/Roman theonyms into Etruscan. The theonyms in *-ns* constitute important evidence for the etymology of *POPULUS*.

cilens is attested in Vs 7.39 (175-150) and three times on the bronze liver from Piacenza. In the fifth century /i/ > /e/ before a following /e/ in Etruscan, e.g. arc. *piθe-* > rec. *peθe* (Rix 1985a:§8); since *cilens* (not *celens*) appears to contradict this phonetic rule, there is reason to suppose foreign origin. Rix suggests borrowing from Umb. *kīlēns* < Proto-Sab. *kēl-ēno-s*. The proposal is made tentatively because we have almost no knowledge of the nature of the Etruscan divinity, apart from the fact that *cilens* is a female divinity (cf. Rix: "l' antefissa però, che reca il nome *cilens* rappresenta una donna."): would we not then expect Umb. *kīlēnā*? Etruscan knows other forms in *cil-*, namely a gentilicium exemplified by Ar 1.55 (late IV/early III) f. *kilnei* < (?) *kil(e)-na-i* and the pl. noun *cilva* (LL X.f2) < (?) *kil(e/i)-χva* (on *-χva* see Rix 1985a:§27). Etr. *cilens* could then be a hybrid of Etr. *cile-* + 'Italic' *-ns* on the model of *neθuns* (analysed as *neθu-ns*), *seθlans* (analysed as *seθla-ns*); we must assume that the vowel in

cil- is retained under the influence of the syncopated forms *kilnei/cilva*.

crap-śti is attested in the *liber linteus*; the form is probably a locative to the genitive of a nom. *crap-* and was probably borrowed from Umb. *Krapuvi, Grabouie*, an epithet of the gods Jupiter, Mars and Vofionus (see Olzscha 1961:475-477), cf. Epirote Mod. Gr. *γράβος* 'oak', Russ. *grab* 'hornbeam'.

culśanś-l (gen.) "dio della porta" is an Etruscan theonym formed to Etr. *culś-* 'gate' (nom. pl. *culścva* (LL VIII.2), gen. sg. *culsl* (Ta 1.17)) with the suffix *-anś* of Sabellic origin (< the PIE possessive suffix *-h3no-*, which is discussed briefly in §III.1.). The theonym is attested twice, once as the addressant in a fourth or third century dedication (Co 3.4) inscribed on a bronze statuette with two faces (iconographically related to Roman *Iānus*) and once in Co 4.11 (rec.); there is no linguistic evidence to suggest that it was or was not created at an earlier date. Another bronze statuette (Krauskopf n.6), dated to the beginning of the sixth century, depicts a figure with two faces and two pairs of arms. It is only a possibility that the figure represents Culsans; it could also be "eine Verschmelzung zweier Figuren aus dekorativen Gründen" (Krauskopf). Another derivative of *culs-* is *culśu* (Cl 7.4, rec., stone relief), the name of a female demon, who is depicted stepping out of the gate to Hades to await the dead. The base noun *culs-* and its derivatives are discussed by Rix 1986; on *culśanś-* and *culśu* see Ingrid Krauskopf, LIMC III,1, 306-308; 308-309. Etr. *culśanś-* is then a hybrid form of *culś* (Etr.) and *-anś* (← Sab.); it might also be a calque of Lat. *Iānus*.

veiveś (gen., LL), _vetisl_ (gen., bronze liver of Piacenza): these Etruscan theonyms are to be compared with Lat. *Veiovis*

- *Vedius* "il dio dei inferi". Rix's (forthcoming a) argumentation on the borrowing of these theonyms, which are compounds of an element *vē* with pejorative function and the name of Jove, is extremely complicated. It is sufficient here to repeat his conclusion, namely that Etr. *veive-* is a borrowing from Latin, quite possibly via the locative/ablative form **Veiove* (this is the Latin form by the fourth century BC) < Proto-Italic **Vē-dioui*; borrowing from a Sabellic dialect can be ruled out since *-di-* would not then have been assimilated to *-ii-*), while Etr. *vetis-* is a borrowing from Umb. **Vēdīs* (borrowing from Lat. **Vēdiēs* is unlikely: "essà presupporrebbe però che *-(i)iē-* fosse finito in etrusco in *-i-*, ciò che è non troppo probabile"). Etr. *veiveś* deserves special mention because it is of Latin (and not Sabellic) origin; the date of the prototype of the *liber linteus* and Latin phonetic rules combine to date the borrowing to the fifth century.

velχ-, an abbreviated form on the bronze liver of Piacenza, is otherwise unattested, and the possible borrowing of this theonym from Lat. *Volcānus* (cf. Ved. *ulkā*, Ossetic *Wärgon*) or from a corresponding (but unattested) Sabellic form cannot be confirmed. If the theonym is connected with the personal name *velχanaś* (Cr 3.11, late VII/early VI), this would speak for seventh century borrowing (terminus ante quem).

vesuna (Vs S.15, late IV/early III) is a certain borrowing from a Sabellic language, probably Umbrian, where the dat. sg. *vesune* /uesōne/ is attested five times (IgT. IV); *vesune* is also attested twice in Marsian (Ve. 223. 228b). Meiser 1986:255-256 has a new etymology for the Sabellic theonym which accounts for the retention of intervocalic *-s-* (< *-ss-*): Proto-Sab. **uetsōnā-* < **uetso-h₃n-ah₂-* 'Herrin des Jungviehs' (cf. Skt. *vatsá-* 'calf') (see also Olzscha 1961:479-480).

klaninś-l (gen., Ar 4.1, V) is probably a river god (of the river _Clanis_) and a borrowing from Sab. (prob. Umb.) *_Klanīn(o)s_, cf. _Tiberīnus_ - _Tiberis_. A terminus ante quem for the date of borrowing is, therefore, the fifth century.

mae (bronze liver of Piacenza) is, according to Van der Meer 1987:§9.4, "most probably the Etruscan form of Maius, a male god worshipped at Tusculum in Latium", cf. Macr.1.12.17 _sunt qui hunc mensem ad nostros fastos a tusculanis transisse commemorent, apud quos nunc quoque vocatur deus Maius, qui est Iuppiter, a magnitudine scilicet ac maiestate dictus._

mantrnś-l (gen., Co 3.7, rec.; for *_mantrāns_) < Sab. *_Mantrāns_ "signore della *mantrā" (for *_mantrā_ 'pensiero', cf. Ved. _mántra-_ 'formula sacra, inno, consiglio'). The etymology is uncertain, not least because it assumes that Etr. _mantrns_ is a scribal error for *_mantrāns_, the _ā_ of which could not have been syncopated.

menerva, _menarva_, _menrva_ is a borrowing from Umbrian, Latin or Faliscan. The Proto-Italic form is *_menesuā_ "dotata di intelligenza" (> Lat. _Menerva_ > _Minerva_). The Etruscan theonym is attested seventy three times (see Rix, Etruskische Texte, I, 141-142); the oldest known forms are from the fifth century (e.g. Ve 3.45 (arc.) _menaryɾas_; OI S.2 (early V) _menerva_).

neθuns (> _neθunus_) < Umb. *_Nehtuns_ < Sab. *_Neptūn(o)s_ "padrone delle umidità", cf. Lat. _Neptūnus_. The earliest Etruscan attestations are _neθunus_ (with anaptyxis, Vc G.3, V/IV) and _neθuns_ (AT S.4, 350-300); phonological considerations and the occurrence of the name in the _liber linteus_ indicate that the theonym was borrowed by the fifth century.

70

óanś-1 (Co 3.8, rec.; Pe 3.3; III/II) < Umb. *sansi(e)*, an epithet, as attested in the Iguvine Tables, of the gods Fisus, Fisovius, Juppiter and Vesticius, and a theonym in its own right (IIb 10). Umb. *sansi(e)* is related to Lat. *Sancus, Sancire*; it shows the palatalization of /k/ before a vowel (cf. Meiser 1986:§67, e.g. Umb. *śihitu* < Proto-Sab. **kīnχto-* < **kink-to-*, cf. Lat. *cinctus*). Since the Etruscan form is *sanś-* (and not ***sanc-*), the possibility of borrowing from Latin is eliminated. See Olzscha 1961:477-478.

satre, *satrs* (attested in the *liber linteus* and on the bronze liver of Piacenza) may be a borrowing from Lat. *Saturnus* (a 'Sabine' god according to Var.*L*.5.74) or from a corresponding (but) unattested Sabellic form of the name (see Van der Meer 1987:§9.25); the terminus ante quem for the date of borrowing is the fifth century.

seθlans, probably < Sab. **Situlān(o)s* "signore delle situle". The theonym is attested five times in Etruscan; the oldest known occurrence is Ta G.3 (mid V) *σeθlanś*. The etymology offered by Rix is semantically attractive since "dem griechischen Hephaistos und dem lateinischen Volcanus entspricht in Etrurien *Sethlans*. Das geht aus Spiegeln hervor, auf denen *Sethlans* die Rolle des Hephaistos spielt" (Simon 1985:163).

selvans (attested eleven times) < **silvans* (Pa 4.1 (early V) *silnanz* is a scribal error for **silvans*) < Umb. **Silvān(o)s*, cf. Lat. *Silvānus* "signore del bosco". At least one of the epithets of the Etruscan divinity, *sanχuneta*, also comes from the Sabellic world: Vs 4.8 (III/II) *selvans sanχuneta cveṛạ* (see G. Colonna, Selvans Sanχuneta, *SE* 34,1966,165-172; Van der Meer 1987:65-66). Two recent attestations come from Umbria: Um 3.2 *selvan[s]* (Carpegna) and Um 4.3 *selva(ns)* (Todi); this is consistent

with an Umbrian origin for the Etruscan theonym. The
earliest attestations of the theonym are Etruscan: *silnanz*
(cf. supra), *selvansel* (OA 4.1, 475-450).

tecvm, *tecum* is attested in the *liber linteus* and on the
bronze liver of Piacenza. The Etruscan theonym is explained
as a borrowing from Umb. *tikam-* (IgT. dat. sg. *tikamne iuvie*
'Dicamnus Iovius'); the phonological changes   Umb. *-i-* >
Etr. *-e-* and Umb. *-am-* > Etr. *-um/vm* are unproblematic (see
Van der Meer 1987:§9.5). The occurrence of the theonym in
the *liber linteus* suggests that the borrowing was made by
the fifth century.

tiiurś (gen. pl.), *tiu*, *tiv* 'moon, month'. The archaic
dedication Cl 4.1 *mi tiiurś kaθuniiaśul* and the presence of
tivs (gen. sg.) on the bronze liver of Piacenza show that
the moon was worshipped as a deity in Etruria. The
inscription Cl 4.1 is inscribed on a bronze moon, now in the
Vatican (Van der Meer 1978:fig. 66)[12]. There seems to be a
connection between the Latin theonym *Dīāna* (< *diuiiānā*)
'lady of the moon' and Etr. *tiu* /tiịu/, but the Etruscan
theonym cannot have been borrowed directly from *diuiiā*
'moon', which would have yielded Etr. ***tivia**. The solution
offered by Rix is that Etr. *tiịu-* (also written *tiu*) was
borrowed from the Lat. nom. *dīịō* (< *diuiịō*) 'la (dea)
raggiante', which forms a pair with the theonym *Dīāna*, cf.
Iūnō - *Iūnī*.

tluscv, *tlusc* (attested on the bronze liver of Piacenza) may
be an abbreviated form of a plural *tluscva*. If Etr. *tlus-*
is an abbreviated form of Lat. tellus (see Bonfante 1988
on abbreviated spellings), then the *tluscva* could have been
gods of the Earth (cf. *Tellurus*, *Tellumo*) (see Van der Meer
1987:§9.11).

uni (twenty+ attestations) < Proto-Lat. or Proto-Sab. *_iūnī_
(cf. _Iūnius_) parallel to *_iūnō_ (> Lat. _Iūnō_). The earliest
attestations come from Pyrgi: Cr 4.2 (late VI/early V)
uniiaθi, Cr 4.3 (late VI/early V) _u]neial, uneialχias_, Cr
4.4 (early V) _unialastrᵉs_, Cr 4.5 (early V) _unias_. The
formation of the individual name _uneiθaś_ (Cl 2.5 (mid VI),
Fe 2.1 (late VII/early VI)) to the theonym shows that it was
borrowed by the sixth century.

uσil 'day, sun' (attested on the bronze liver of Piacenza)
<Sab. (almost certainly Umb.) *_ōzel_ < *_ausel_ 'sun', cf. Lat.
aurōra 'dawn, sunrise'. The Etruscan theonym is first known
from two mirrors of the fourth century, on which _uσil/uσil_
is represented with a kind of nimbus encircling his head (AT
S.4) or with a radiant crown (Vc S.21). The theonym was,
however, certainly borrowed by the seventh century; a
personal name based on the theonym is attested from the
mid seventh century: _mini uσile muluvanice_ (Cr 3.1).

fufluns (< ? Umb. *_foflōns_) is discussed in detail below in
the chapter on _POPULUS_. The earliest attestations of _fufluns_
are from the early fifth century.

To sum up, eleven known Etruscan theonyms are of probable or
possible (: ?) Sabellic (: Umbrian) origin (_crap-, vetis-,
vesuna, klaninś-, neθuns, σanσ-, seθlans, selvans, ?tecvm,
uσil, ?fufluns_), four are of Latin origin (_veive-, ?mae,
tiu, ?tlus-_) and five of Sabellic or Latin origin (_?velχ-,
?mantrnśl, menerva, ?satre, uni_). Etrusco-Sabellic hybrids
are _culśanś-_ and possibly _cilens_; _cilens_ might also be a
Sabellic loan.

Since, as Rix points out, there are about a dozen known
theonyms in Etruscan of certain or probable native origin
(while the source of _leθams, marിσ, tinia_ and _turms_ is
problematic), the number of Etruscan cult divinities of

Sabellic origin is very high, much higher than the number of divinities of Greek origin (three: *aplu, aritimi, hercle*) and too high, in Rix's view, to be the result only of cultural contact, although this will presumably have been the source in some cases. The high number of Sabellic theonyms is rather "il documento di una relazione <u>sostrato sabellico</u> : <u>superstrato etrusco</u> di cui alcuni fonte greche e latine parlano"[12]. The date of the supposed borrowing of most of the Sabellic theonyms is the fifth century (terminus ante quem), and the seventh century (terminus ante quem) in the case of *uøil*. Since only 'termini ante quem' can be established for the existence of the Sabellic theonyms in Etruscan, it is not possible to determine which individual theonyms were present in Proto-Etruscan; at best one can argue that the fact that each of the theonyms with the exception of *øanø-* occurs in Archaic Etruscan texts is consistent with the theory of a Sabellic substratum in Etruscan.

By contrast only four Etruscan theonyms are of (possible) Latin origin. The 'terminus ante quem' for the existence of *veive-* and *tiu* in Etruscan is the fifth century; for *mae* it is the first century. Van der Meer 1987:147 suggests that *mae* as well as *satre* (which is of Italic , but not necessarily Latin origin) and *vetis-* (which is of Sabellic origin) may "testify to the process of Romanisation in the Etruscan religion". There is no reason to suppose a Latin substratum for Etruscan.

On the evidence of appellatives and theonyms presented here the linguistic influence of the Latins/Romans on the Etruscans, particularly when compared to that of Sabellic speakers, appears to have been small (theonyms are admittedly a specialized group of names from which it is difficult to extrapolate to 'linguistic influence' in general). There is no evidence here for the borrowing of

theonyms from Etruscan into Latin. What evidence there is demonstrates then the existence of contacts between Etruscan- and Latin-speakers from the fifth century, but it warns that any Latin word of dubious origin, for which the suggestion of Etruscan origin is advanced, must be thoroughly examined from all aspects, semantic, morphological, phonological and cultural.

8. Etruscan literature?

If there were original works of literature in Etruscan (drama, epic poetry, historical prose etc.) they have completely disappeared. From the fact that no Etruscan literature has survived one cannot conclude that none existed, but Heurgon 1964:247 goes well beyond the evidence when he supposes the existence "of a long line of [Etruscan] poets whose names we shall never know but whose productions were reflected in the decorations on funerary urns, whose verses echoed in the memory of workmen, whose tragic style finally imposed itself on Etruscan historiography and gave it its peculiar form."

Greek and Roman sources contain short, but consistent and probably reliable references to only one type of Etruscan writing, namely sacred books of the *disciplina etrusca* called in Latin *libri haruspicini*, *libri fulgurales* and *libri rituales*; translations of these books into Latin were reportedly made in the first century B.C. (see Simon 1985:136-139). It is probably not mere coincidence that the content of four of the five longest Etruscan texts is ritual. These texts are: i) a calendar of rituals contained in a uniquely preserved linen book known as the *liber linteus* (LL). The original text contained about 600 lines and 2800 words, of which approximately half have survived. The text is formulated in prescriptions. The date of the *liber linteus* is discussed by Rix 1985c:35-36. The text

which we have dates from the first century. The language contains a number of archaisms such as *ais* (beside *eis*) which are relics of a version of the ritual calendar written in the time when *ais* represented the pronunciation /a$\underline{i}$s/. Since the diphthong /a$\underline{i}$/ became /e$\underline{i}$/ at the beginning of the fourth century, we may conclude that the ritual calendar existed in oral, if not written, form in the fifth century and that "la storia redazionale del testo conservato nel liber linteus comincia dunque almeno nel quarto secolo avanti Cristo". ii) a shorter fifth century ritual calendar on a clay tablet from Capua known as the *tabula capuana* (TC). There are about 60 lines of text, of which half are poorly preserved. iii) ritual prescriptions (c. 75 words) from the mid-fifth century contained on a lead plate from Magliano (AV 4.1). iv) forty theonyms engraved on a bronze model of a sheep's liver found near Piacenza (Pa 4.2). The bronze liver, which is dated to c.100 B.C., was used by a haruspex. The formulation in prescriptions of the first three of these texts suggests that the *libri haruspicini*, *fulgurales* and *rituales* were not what we would call literary works but rather prescriptions for the execution of rituals and the interpretation of entrails and omens. Another piece of evidence for the existence of a *liber haruspicinus* is a phrase from the elogium of the priest Lar Pulena (Ta 1.17; 200-150). The elogium comes from a sarcophagus lid; it is inscribed on the representation of a partly unrolled volumen held in the hands of a reclining figure. The relevant phrase is *ancn. z$\underline{i}$χ. neθsraç. acasce*, "der diese Schrift über die (Opfer-)Leber verfertigte" (trl. Rix 1986:20,22). Torelli 1976 argues persuasively that the books of the *disciplina etrusca* were the original source of the genuine Etruscan glosses.

Cornell 1976 argues for the existence of three types of written source material, dating from an early period, which could have been used by an historian of Etruria writing in

later republican times or in the first century A.D. These
are the private archives of aristocratic families, a list of
magistrates at Tarquinia and maybe also at Caere, and
records of religiously significant events, perhaps in the
form of a priestly chronicle similar to the Roman *annales
maximi*. In addition the historian could have drawn on an
oral tradition of popular stories. But there is no evidence
for history writing in Etruscan. Historians now generally
agree that when the emperor Claudius refers to *auctores
Tusci* he means scholars such as Verrius Flaccus and A.
Caecina, who, like Claudius himself, wrote in Latin on
Etruscan matters, cf. A. Drummond, *CAH*[2] VII.2, 1989, 16:
"The existence of early Etruscan historical accounts is
speculative and the use of Etruscan material by Roman
sources seems in general to have been late and occasional".
Similarly the *tragoediae Tuscae* of Volnius (Var.*L*.5.55) were
almost certainly written in Latin in the later Republic but
took as their theme early Etruria or relations between early
Rome and Etruria. Volnius (cf. Etr. gent. *velna*), like
Caecina (cf. Etr. gent. arc. *caicna-*, rec. *ceicna*), may have
had an Etruscan background which influenced his choice of
theme.

9. Parallel expressions

The 'bilinguistic method' is a process of interpretation
which seeks to determine the significance of Etruscan texts,
the vocabulary and structure of which are relatively poorly
understood, on the basis of texts in Greek, Latin and other
Italic languages. This method, better called the method of
'parallel texts' or the "metodo del confronto storico-
culturale" (De Simone 1985:29), presupposes that the
cultural *koiné* of archaic Central Italy produced in the
various languages expressions which are 'parallel', i.e.
semantically equivalent but not necessarily formally
equivalent (cf. Fr. *eut lieu* : It. *ebbe luogo* : Engl. *took*

place). Recent research by Agostiniani 1981; 1984 and Rix
1985b demonstrates the existence in the languages of archaic
Central Italy of two such 'parallel' expressions. The model
or source of the expression in each case appears to be
Greek.

The first Greek expression is καλος καλō (see Agostiniani
1981). It was a Greek custom (numerous attestations are
known from the seventh century onwards) to include in
inscriptions on cups, vases and other vessels an adjective
to designate a positive quality of the vessel, e.g. ποτήριον
- εὔποτον (cup of Nestor, LSAG plate 47, n.1). The adjective
usually employed was καλός 'beautiful'. In two fifth century
inscriptions on vessels from Opountian Lokris and Thisbe
καλός qualifies not only the vessel but also the possessor
of the vessel; the rhetorical figure employed is 'I am the
beautiful vessel of the beautiful *X*' (see Agostiniani
1981:99). The same or similar rhetorical figure is attested
once in Faliscan, once in Early Latin and in eight Etruscan
inscriptions from the seventh and sixth centuries.

The Faliscan inscription is *eco qutoɲ euotenosio titias
duenom duenas* 'ego poculum Evoteni; Titiae bonum bonae'
(Giacomelli n.2, Civita Castellana, 675-650), in which
duenom qualifies *quton* 'drinking vessel' and *duenas*
qualifies the name of the woman to whom the vessel was
probably given as a present by Evotenus. *quton* is a
borrowing from Etr. *qutum/n* (cf. Cr 2.18 (675-650): *mi qutum
karkanas*), itself a borrowing from Gr. *kώθων*.

A similar (or modified) rhetorical figure occurs in Latin in
the so-called 'duenos inscription' (CIL I² 4, 600-575):
duenos med feced en manom einom duenoi ne med malos tatod.
The inscription is in continual script; the final word
division, long thought to be *malo(s) statod* with sanddhi, is
from Rix 1985b, who demonstrates that *tātōd* is an

78

imperative derived from PIE *teh₂-ie-tōt 'steal!'. Rix translates the line thus: "ein 'Guter' machte mich (/ ließ mich machen) zu einem guten .?. für einen 'Guten'; nicht soll mich (ihm) ein 'Schlechter' stehlen"/. *Duenoi* (dat. sg.) designates the recipient of the vessel and *duenos* (nom. sg.) the maker of the vessel or the person who had it made.

EL.- Fal. *duenos* probably meant 'beautiful', cf. CL. *bellus* (diminutive, with depreciatory value) 'pretty' < *duen-los (see Agostiniani 1981:101-103). Since καλός = *duenos* = beautiful, the Greek (καλος καλō) and Faliscan (*duenom duenas*) expressions are in structural and semantic agreement; with these the Latin expression *duenos duenoi* is in semantic agreement and structurally related.

The eight Etruscan inscriptions in which the rhetorical figure occurs have been collected by Agostiniani 1981, who demonstrates the correspondence between Etr. *mlaχ mlakas*[15], Fal. *duenom duenas* and Gr. καλος καλō, e.g. Cr 2.36 *mi velelias θinạ mlaχ mlakas* 'I (am) the beautiful vessel of the beautiful Velelia'. Two of the eight inscriptions show a variant polyptoton, in which the recipient rather than the owner of the vessel is designated as 'beautiful', e.g. OA 3.1 *mi mulu aveḷlesi mḷịaχ mḷakasi* 'I (am) a beautiful gift for beautiful Avele'. In two further inscriptions *mlaχ/c* qualifies *mulu* (Cr 3.19 (600-550) *mi mulu [-?-] mlac* ...; OA 3.2 (650-625) *mi mulu lari(le)zili mlaχ*); in two more inscriptions *mlaχ/kas* describes the owner of the vessel (Cr 2.115 (V) *mi: arnθ(al); ves(;)traçẹs; mlaχas*; Fa 2.3 (650-625) *mlakaš; šela; aška mi eleivana*). All twelve inscriptions are "iscrizioni parlanti" (cf. infra). Eleven are inscriptions of possession or gift; one (Cr 6.2 *mini zinace aranθ arupzina mlaχu mlacasi*) is a production inscription.

79

In demonstrating the parallelism of Fal. *duenom duenas* and Etr. *mlaχ mlakas* to the Greek model Agostiniani 1981:109 argues that "tutte e tre le sequenze pertengono alla stessa koiné formulare". It seems possible to argue further that the rhetorical figure reached Faliscan and Latin through the mediation of Etruscan.

A rhetorical figure of the type *mlaχ mlakasi*, where *mlaχ* qualifies the vessel and *mlakasi* the recipient of the vessel, occurs only in Etruscan; it is a variation on the figure *mlaχ mlakas*, based on Greek καλος καλō. A further variation or modification is the use of the polyptoton in an inscription of production. A further extension of the type in Etruscan appears to have been the designation not only of the vessel and its recipient as 'beautiful' but also the manufacturer or the one who commissioned the manufacture; a polyptoton *mlaχ mlaχ mlakasi* is not attested but may be assumed on the basis of *azaru azaru azaruaś* in Ve 6.1 (650-625)[16]. Hence the evidence suggests that an Etruscan expression could have been the model for the the figure *duenos duenoi* in the 'duenos inscription'.

The earliest known inscriptions for the individual languages of ancient Central Italy are, with the exception of Umbrian, "iscrizioni parlanti" (see Agostiniani 1982:esp. 269ff.), which mark themselves out as a (large) subclass of all inscriptions on objects by a stylistic device, whereby the object itself speaks. The diffusion in ancient Italy of the stylistic model of "iscrizioni parlanti" is, as Agostiniani demonstrates, one aspect of the diffusion of writing. The Etruscans learn from the Greeks the alphabet, writing and the device of "iscrizioni parlanti", which becomes a local tradition in Etruria; similarly the Romans learn from the Etruscans the alphabet and the device of "iscrizioni parlanti". The diffusion of the rhetorical figure καλος καλō from Greek into Etruscan and from Etruscan into Latin and

Faliscan is then part of the phenomenon of "iscrizioni parlanti" in the cultural *koiné* of archaic Central Italy.

The second Greek expression is a "Diebstahlverbotformel". The prohibition to steal in the last phrase of the 'duenos inscription' (see above) may be compared with similar formulae in Greek inscriptions from Cumae and Gela: ... *hòs δ' ἄν με κλέφσει, θυφλὸς ἔσται* (IG XIV 865, Cumae, 675-650 B.C.); ... *μὲ̄ θίγε̄ς* (IP p.41, Gela, early V B.C.). Rix 1985b:208 writes: "Cumae war die Stadt, von der aus in archaischer Zeit griechische Kultur und Zivilisation nach Mittelitalien ausstrahlte; im Zusammenhang damit mag auch die 'Diebstahlverbotformel' nach Rom gekommen sein, wo wir sie etwa ein Jahrhundert nach dem cumanischen Beleg in leicht veränderter Form in der Duenos-Inschrift antreffen". For Rix the historical plausibility of the interpretation of the last phrase of the 'duenos inscription' as a "Diebstahlverbotformel" is increased by the existence of a similar phrase in Etruscan. The Etruscan phrase *eiminipicapi* (or similar) is attested six times as vase graffiti dating from the second half of the seventh century to the first half of the fifth century. The phrase has been analysed by Agostiniani 1984 as a negation *ei*, the personal pronoun *mini* 'me' (refering to the vase) plus an enclitic *-pi*, the function of which is unknown, and a verb *capi* 'take!' (or similar): *ei minipi capi* 'don't take me!' = 'don't steal me'. The evidence for the diffusion *καλος καλō̄* > *mlaχ mlakas* > *duenom duenas* makes it possible that the use of a theft prohibition formula in Latin was also adopted from Greek via Etruscan.

The success of the 'bilinguistic method' in the interpretation of ritual formulae in the *liber linteus* on the basis of better understood formulae in the Iguvine Tables (see Rix (forthcoming b), cf. Etr. *un nunθen*, Umb. *tiom subocau*, Lat. *te precor*) suggests the existence of a

common form of ritual in the cultural unity of archaic
Central Italy.

10. Summary

In the second section of this chapter the occurrence of
inter-city social mobility and the existence of a cultural
koiné in archaic Central Italy have been indicated. The
'linguistic' phenomena discussed are not only consistent
with historical and archaeological evidence for social
mobility and a cultural *koiné* but constitute important
evidence for their existence.

In comparison with the extent of Greek influence on the
Latin lexicon the influence of Etruscan is small, even by
the generous standards adopted by Breyer (cf. above on Lat.
cella and see *CONCLUSION*). There appear to be two main
reasons for this. Firstly, Rome was not under Etruscan rule
and Etruscan was never an official language at Rome.
Secondly, there is no evidence to suggest that the Etruscan
language was held in prestige; and it is fair to assume
that it was not, especially given the lack of evidence for a
creative literature in Etruscan.

Since there is no indication that language provided a
serious barrier to communication in archaic Central Italy,
it is a fair inference that a number of individuals,
including craftsmen, traders and envoys, demonstrated
'functional' bilingualism, i.e. they could communicate
adequately in the second langage on a restricted set of
activities with a limited vocabulary and grasp of
grammatical rules. Especially in view of the composite
nature of the Roman population, one must assume that
Etruscan immigrants in Rome had to learn Latin quickly;
Etrusco-Latin bilingualism in their families may have lasted
only two generations. Even scholars who believe in the

Etruscan domination of Rome must assume that the effects of this rule in terms of Etrusco-Latin bilingualism were minor, cf. Helen Homeyer, Observations on Bilingualism and Language Shift in Italy, *Word* 13, 1957, 435: "In the sixth century, while the Etruscans ruled Rome, part of the Roman nobility became bilingual for the cultural and political prestige which they derived fom this. Latin-Etruscan biligualism, documented by the exchange of personal names, survived the downfall of the Royal House and was preserved until the beginning of the fourth century (Livy 9,36,3; Cicero, De divinatione 1,92). But the mass of the population was not affected by this transitory bilingualism."

The transmission of the alphabet, the numeral system and the art of writing (as well as the calques *undēvīgintī* and *duodēvīgintī* and the hybrids *culśanś-* and perhaps *fufluns*) speaks in favour of the existence of some Etrusco-Latin bilinguals, including perhaps aristocratic priests, who were more than just competent in the second language, but the number of individuals involved was certainly small.

Another factor to be considered is that Etruscan, a non-IE language, is genetically unrelated to Latin. Breyer assumes that this makes borrowing *a priori* difficult and, therefore, that borrowing under these conditions attests to close contact between Etruscan and Latin speakers, cf. Breyer 1984:8: "Entlehnung ganzer Wörter oder Entlehnung von Wortelementen, überhaupt Entlehnung jedweden Sprachgutes wird umso schwieriger, je verschiedenartiger zwei Sprachen sind. Und dieser erschwerende Umstand liegt in unserem Falle vor: Das indo-europäische Lateinische tritt in Kontakt mit dem nicht indo-europäische Etruskischen. Wenn die Unverständlichkeit einer Sprache außer auf einem im Grunde völlig fremden Wortschatz auch noch auf einer andersartigen Sprachstruktur, auf einer fremden Morphologie und Syntax beruht, wenn der Zugang zu ihr dermaßen erschwert ist, wird

nur bei wirklich engsten sprachlichen und kulturellen
Kontakten - im besonderen bei Vorliegen eines Kulturgefälles
- die Übernahme von Wörtern oder gar Wortelementen ein
Minimalmaß überschreiten." The genealogical and structural
difference of two languages is not an obstacle to the
acquisition of the other language as a second language (many
Hungarians, for instance, speak excellent German) nor to the
processes of word borrowing (cf. Semitic borrowings in
Greek; see Emilia Masson, Recherches sur les plus anciens
emprunts sémitiques en Grec, Paris 1967). It is difficult to
establish what restrictions to word borrowing, if any, were
the result of the genealogical difference between Etruscan
and Latin, but the existence of some restrictions cannot be
excluded. Finally, it is interesting to note that for
Quintilian (*Inst.*1.5.55) Etruscan is no more a foreign
language than is Sabine or Praenestine, borrowings from
which he regards as native, while foreign are Gallic,
Carthaginian, Spanish and Greek words in Latin.

Notes

1. I hope on another occasion to argue that /f/ developed
    from /β/ in Etruscan and that the digraph *FH* was created
    to represent the distinctive features of /β/.
2. There is no instance of *FH* in an inscription from
    Northern Etruria with the exception of Vt 3.1 (625-600)
    on a vessel that was produced and inscribed at Caere.
3. The occurence of *o* (: *frontac*) in the late first century
    bilingual Um 1.7 from the Ager Gallicus is attributed to
    local influence.

    The occurrence of *b* (: *mazbavanaiah*) in AT 0.1 (late
    VII) may be explained if it stands for /f/. The
    Etruscans replace the digraph *FH* /f/ (cf. infra in text)
    with the symbol *8*, which is found as a new letter (final
    position) in the model alphabets of the sixth century.
    No extant model alphabet from the seventh century
    contains this symbol. The earliest extant use of *8* is in
    Vn 1.1 (VII) *feluskeś*. The origin of *8* is obscure. Two
    suggestions have been made, but the poverty of
    inscriptional evidence does not permit a definitive
    solution: 1. *8* represents a local Etruscan development
    of the symbol ⊟ for /h/ and the second element of the

earlier digraph (Lejeune 1966, Radke 1967:408, Penney 1988:723). 2. The symbol was borrowed from the Sabine region. In the three inscriptions on a late seventh century flask from Poggio Sommavilla (Ve. 362; new reading by Cristofani 1977a) – they are the oldest extant Sabellic inscriptions – the sign *8* /f/ occurs four times:

    a) *aletneipoh'⁰eh'²ik·f'⁵euf'⁸s*
    b) *skerf²⁴s*
    c) *h²⁶edusef³²*

These are the symbols 15, 18, 24 and 32 in Cristofani 1977a. Numbers 15 and in particular 24 are clear examples of rounded *8*; 18 is incomplete at the top as it runs into the rim of the vase – the left hand side of the letter is more straight than round; 32 "è stato risolto con una barra verticale" – it looks like a *B* but cannot be because the direction of this letter would then be contrary to the others in the same word [The suggestion of Marinetti 1983:168 that n.32 should be read as a 'h' (so Vetter) cannot be right: "per quest'ultima è anche possible che l'obiettivo finale della correzione fosse *h* e non *f*: pare infatti di vedere un tratto verticale che inquadra il segno". The inscriptions contain three other letters recognized as 'h' by Marinetti (in Cristofani letters n.10,12,26), none of which have a horizontal through the middle]. That the sign is close in form to a beta – Cristofani compares n. 32 to two betas which would have had the value /f/ on two Oscan inscriptions of the sixth/fifth centuries from tombs in the necropolis of Nuceria – may be indicative of its origin. Cristofani himself argues that the sign *8* was a local creation, to which the creation of *ł* /f/ in Faliscan can be compared, probably modelled on *B*. But it is hard to see what would have influenced Sabellic speakers, who had the sound [b] in their language, to employ the sign *B* for the voiceless fricative. A more logical adaptation would be the use of *B* [b] (voiced stop) to indicate also the voiced fricative [β]; the one sign *B* would then have been used for the voiced stop and for the voiced fricative until orthographic development took place to distinguish *8*, the voiced fricative, from the voiced stop. If Sabine created *8* for [β] (and used it also for the voiceless fricative), this implies that there were voiced fricatives at least in some positions in Sabine in the seventh century, and suggests that there may have been voiced fricatives also in Etruscan, which borrowed the sign – soon after its creation in Sabine – as a more convenient means of indicating the sound till then represented by the digraph *FH*.

A third alternative is also possible: *8* was based on the letter beta, but this development took place in Etruscan. The Etruscans could have made use of the

symbol *B* (> *8*) for a sound in their own language. There would be a good reason for using beta, the sound of which was known to the Etruscans, for a different sound, if this sound (in Archaic Etruscan) was the voiced fricative /β/. If Etruscan created *8* for the voiced fricative, this implies the existence of voiced fricatives not only in Etruscan but also (at least in some positions) in Sabine (in the late seventh century) and the other Sabellic dialects.

There is no conclusive evidence to determine whether *8* was an innovation of the Sabine or the Etruscan alphabet. Since the Sabine inscription is dated to the late seventh century and the earliest occurrence of *8* in Etruscan to the seventh century and both dates are approximate, there is no chronological argument (based on attestations) for Sabine or Etruscan origin. Notably no Etruscan model alphabet contains both the symbols *B* and *8*; *B* is found in model alphabets of the seventh century, *8* in those dating from the sixth century. This suggests that *8* may be based on *B*.

4. The term 'Vornamengentilicium' describes the use of a praenomen as a gentilicium (see Rix 1963:342ff. and 1972:737-739). An example of a 'Vornamengentilicium' is *tite* in Vt 1.154 (550-525) *mi avileś tite-...*; in Vs 1.170 (rec.) *tite: ecnate:...* the praenomen *tite* is attested.

5. The nature of the Classical Latin accent (stress or pitch?) is disputed, but the arguments need not be discussed here since I am chiefly concerned with the early period, for which the *opinio communis* assumes a stress accent; arguments for a stress accent are: 1. syncope in the syllable immediately following the accent in Plautine forms, e.g. *audacter* < *audáciter*, 2. 'iambic shortening', e.g. *égō* > *égŏ*, *ắmā* > *ắmắ*, 3. the 'penultimate law' (cf. infra) is based on syllabic and not vocalic quantity: *relíctus* is accented in the same way as *relátus* because it makes no difference whether the heaviness of a syllable results from a long vowel or from a consonantal closure (which cannot carry variations of pitch), 4. the coincidence between ictus and accent in the last two feet of the Latin hexameter and the fact that the frequency of such coincidence significantly increases from Ennius to Vergil. See Allen 1965:83-88; Leumann 1977:235-254; Meiser 1986:32-33; Rix 1967a; Sommer-Pfister 1977:72-92; E. H. Sturtevant, The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin, Groningen 1968[2], 177-189; Szemerényi 1990:75-85.

6. Meiser 1986:9. On the PIE word for wine see Robert Beekes, On Indo-European 'wine', *MSS* 48, 1987, 21-26. Since there was a PIE word for 'wine', the words for 'wine' in Sabellic need not be attributed to borrowing from Latin, as has been thought; the word was equally available for borrowing in all the Italic languages.

Olzscha 1961:490-491 considers that the Etruscan word is of Latin origin, but this cannot be stated with certainty. Archaeological evidence (seed samples) has revealed the earliest known appearance of the cultivated vine in central Italy at Gran Carro in southern Etruria (see Spivey and Stoddart 1990:66); this suggests a terminus ante quem of the eighth century B.C. for the borrowing into Etruscan of the word for 'wine'.

7. The forms recorded here have been taken from Meiser 1986:253, IEW 16 and Manfred Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen I. Band, Lieferung 3, Heidelberg 1988, 199. J.T. Hooker, 'ΙΕΡΟΣ in Early Greek' (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 22), Innsbruck 1980, argues that since in Homer there are about twenty cases where ΙΕΡΟΣ does not possess a religious significance ('holy, sacred') and does not always mean 'strong', it is better "to think of an original meaning which in different contexts can express the concept of 'strong' or the concept of 'sacred'".

8. Later attested Italic forms are Osc. *pukele[.....]* (nr. Colle Vernone, Pocc. 20), *puklum, puklui* (Capua, Ve. 6); Pael. *iouiois puclois* (Sulmona, Ve. 202); Mars. *[i]ouies pucle[s]* (Luco, Ve. 224) (the Pael. and Mars. expressions, both dat. pl., 'Ioviis pueris' are calques of Gr. *Διόσκουροι*). These forms go back to a PIE **putlós*, cf. Av. *puθrō*, Skt. *putráḥ*, OPers. *puça*. The word survives in Latin in the diminutive *putillus* 'very young; tiny'.

9. Theun-Mathias Schmidt, Die Beiden 'Pocola' in der Berliner Etruskerausstellung, in: Die Welt der Etrusker (for reference see Rix 1990), 265-270 (see esp. 266-267) records *pocula* with Old Latin dedication inscriptions to the following deities: *Aequitas, Aesculapius, Bellona, Cerus, Concordia, Cura, Fortuna, Iuno, Laverna, Lucrius, Minerva, Salus, Saturnus, Venus, Vesta, Vulcanus.*

10. See Meiser 1986:§78 : 'Auslautnasalierung'. On the same phenomenon in Early Latin (*viro* for *virum* etc.) see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§170,3; in the course of the second century BC a consistent writing of final *-m* was introduced in Latin, cf. S.C. de Bacch. *senatum, exdeicendum* etc.

11. De Simone 1991 criticizes in principal Rix's reconstruction of Italic theonyms, but offers no alternative etymologies for the Etruscan theonyms; the smallness of the Sabellic corpus should be emphasized. On the Etruscan theonyms listed below see also Van der Meer 1987, Erika Simon, 'Etruskische Kultgottheiten' in Cristofani 1985b:152-167, and Olzscha 1961:475-481. All etymologies of Etruscan theonyms given in the following pages are Rix's, unless otherwise indicated.

12. Van der Meer 1987:133 suggests that "Kathuniia might refer to the rising moon". All attestations of the Etruscan theonym/noun are collected by Van der Meer

(p.135). Of particular interest are the recent inscriptions Cl 1.133-135 from the Tomba del Tassinaia: *tiuza* (Cl 1.133); *tiuza: tius: vetusal: clan* ... : (Cl 1.134); *tiuza tius: vetusal clan* ... (Cl 1.135). The emblem of the family is a shield with a moon. Van der Meer refers to M. Pallottino, Un ideogramma araldico etrusco, *AC* 4,1952,245-247 (non vidi).

13. cf. Van der Meer 1987:147 on the 'Italization' of the Etruscan pantheon. Some of his conclusions are untenable, such as his position on Etr. *hercle* (a borrowing from Greek via Italic (sic!)), but he gives the same impression of strong Sabellic influence on the Etruscan pantheon; in his view "about half of the 28 Liver gods appear to be of Italic origin".

14. EL. *mānos* 'good' (Var.*L*.6.4 *bonum antiqui dicebant manum*) does not survive in the Classical language, except perhaps in the adverb *māne* 'early in the day' (cf. Fr. *de bonne heure*); P. Considine, The Indo-European Origin of Greek *MĒNIS* 'Wrath', *TPS* 1985, 157ff., argues that *mānus* may well have had religious associations: '(religiously) good'. The best interpretation offered up to now for *einom* is that of Rix 1985b:197;n.20, viz. that it is a *-no-* formation to the full grade root *h₁ei̯-* 'go' with the general meaning "Gang"; the phrase *en manom einom* could then mean "zum Wohlergehen" or "zu einem guten Fortgang", designating the vessel as 'good' in the sense of 'well-made', 'lasting' or similar, or, following Considine's interpretation of *mānos*, as 'for a religious purpose'.

15. The phonetic and morphological problems raised by Agostiniani 1981, viz. gen. *mlaka-s* beside base form *mlaχ* with final consonant, and the correspondence *k : χ* in these forms, are, according to Rix 1985b:n.22, "nicht unlösbar". Certainly *mlaχ* beside *mlaka-s* is unproblematic, if one assumes *mlaχ < *mlaχa* with the prehistoric apocope of final *-a*; for parallels see Rix 1985a:§13, e.g. sg. *papals < *papalse* beside pl. *papalse-r*.

16. The close of the Formello vase inscription (Ve 6.1) is: *velθur zinace azaruazaruazaruaś*. The first two words mean 'Velθur produced (me)' or 'Velθur had (me) produced'; *azaruazaruazaruaś* presumably designates the vase and in some way further qualifies its production. The following word divisions, suggested by Dieter Steinbauer, have been adopted in the new edition of Etruscan texts by Helmut Rix: *azaru azaru azaruaś*. Etr. *azaru < *azarua* appears to be a base form (nom.-acc. sg.) and *azaruaś* a genitive singular in *-s*. The only way to explain the triple expression appears to be to interpret *azaru* as an adjective '*x*', whereby in one occurrence *azaru* is a nominative singular qualifying the subject *velθur*, in the other an accusative singular qualifying the vase, the understood object of the sentence, while *azaruaś* qualifies the recipient of the

vase: '*x* Velθur produced *x* (me) of an *x* (man)'. As a genitive *azaruaš* is clumsy. The more probable sense is 'for an *x* (man)', for which one must assume either that the genitive *azaruaš* is used for the dative (cf. Rix 1985a:*f*32) or stands for the expected pert. (with dative function) **azaruasi* (cf. Cr 6.2). The meaning is therefore: '*x* Velθur produced *x* (me) for an *x* (man)'. '*x*' probably describes a positive quality. The possibility that *azaru azaru* is a dittography cannot be completely discounted; *azaru azaruaš* could then be compared either to *mlaχu mlacasi* in Cr 6.2 or to *duenos duenoi*.

In this chapter it is argued that only the personal name *Spurius*[1], and not the adjective *spurius*, was borrowed from Etruscan. The Latin, Oscan and Etruscan onomastic evidence is first presented. In the absence of an IE etymology for *Spurius*, the option of Etruscan origin is explored and found satisfactory.

1. Onomastic evidence

Spurius is one of the oldest known Roman <u>praenomina</u>, cf. *Sp. Cassius Vecellinus* cos. 502 B.C., *Sp. Lucretius Tricipitinus* cos. 509 B.C. It is common amongst patrician gentes at the beginning of the Republic and also amongst plebeian gentes in the fifth century. The praenomen is known for 6.2% of officials before 300 B.C. and is as such the seventh commonest praenomen after *Lūcius* (19.6%), *Marcus* (15.4%), *Gaius* (14.7%), *Pūblius* (10.1%), *Quintus* (7.1%) and *Titus* (6.4%). Later the name is rare: only 0.1% of known officials in the years 100-31 B.C. are called *Spurius*. The latest datable occurrence of the name is in CIL VI 209: *Sp. Censorius Iustus*, a soldier from Noricum in A.D. 150. The distribution of the praenomen is discussed by Salomies:52-54,155, to whom I owe the statistical figures given above. The evidence collected by Salomies includes Greek inscriptions of the second and first centuries from Greek cities, chiefly Delos, with which the Romans and Samnites (*negotiatores*) are known to have traded. It is not always possible to know if Σπόριος in a particular inscription designates a Roman or an Oscan-speaker, but it is safe to assume that Romans (or Roman citizens) are referred to in a number of inscriptions, amongst which there are certain examples: I. Delos 1687 Σπόριος Στερτίνιος Σπορίου 'Ρωμαῖος, 2593 Σπόριος 'Ρωμαῖος (see Fraser and Matthews 1987:410).

In Latin inscriptions the praenomen is known only in abbreviated form with the exception of the full genitive in the filiation *Spuri . f* , where *Spuri* is the genitive of the praenomen of the father. The earliest known and only republican example is CIL I 1034 (Rome) *Polla . Caecilia . Spuri . f*; later attestations are known from Rome (see CIL VI,7, p. 5393) and from Aesernia (CIL IX 2696). That the praenomen is a *-io-* stem (*Spurius*, not **Spurus*) is clear from the nom. pl. *Spurii* in Lib. praen. 6 *Spurii patre incerto geniti quasi σποράδην*, from the Greek form Σπόριος and from the occasional full spelling *Spurius* in Roman authors (e.g. Cic.*Rep*.1.18: *Spurium Mummium*); the form is further assured by the use of *Spurius* as a cognomen, by the gent. *Spurīlius* and by the Oscan evidence (cf. infra).

The Greek form Σπόριος (not **Σπύριος) for Lat. *Spurius* deserves comment. The occurrence of Gr. *o* for Lat. *ŭ* in Latin words (personal names and common nouns) in Greek inscriptions and literature is accounted for by the fact that in historical Latin *ŭ* was an open sound (Sommer-Pfister 1977:ƒ59, cf. Καλπόρνιος for *Calpurnius*). Σπόριος is then the expected Greek form for Lat. *Spurius*, cf. Theodor Eckinger, Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften, München 1893, 64: "... so finden wir, dass *o* (sc. for Lat. *ŭ*) immer die frühere, bisweilen die herrschende (Πόπλιος) oder gar (wie bei νόμοι, Σπόριος) die einzig gebräuchliche Form repräsentiert, dass die Schreibart *ou* allerdings erst vom Beginn unsrer Aera an aufkommt, ...".

The original abbreviation *for Spurius* was *S*; it is seen in older inscriptions including the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* (CIL I² 581, 186 BC): *S. Postumius L. f*, cf. also CIL I 91 *S. Casios*; 201 *L. Postumius S. f.*; 375 (= Crawford, RRC 335 (9, 10a); ?96 B.C.) *A. A(?l)binus. S. f.* The use of *SP.* for *Spurius* "ist anscheinend erst im letzten

vorchristlichen Jhdt. aufgekommen und dann von den Historikern auch auf die älteren Träger dieses Namens angewendet worden" (Reichmuth 1956:18); Salomies 1987:50 dates the "Durchsetzung" of the abbreviation *Sp.* to the Sullan era at the latest. Reichmuth's assumption that the original use of *S.* for *Spurius*, but *SER.* for *Servius* and *SEX.* for *Sextus*, shows *Spurius* to be the oldest of these three praenomina is unacceptable. All three names were probably existent when the use of abbreviations was introduced, probably in the mid-sixth century in the census allegedly carried out under the king Servius Tullius (cf. Rix, review of Salomies, *BZN* 26, 1991, 89, and Rix (forthcoming c)). The reason for *S.* vs. *SER.*, *SEX.* must be sought elsewhere, probably in the frequency overall of the name or in its frequency in a higher stratum of society: of the three names *Spurius* has the most attestations amongst the greater number of patrician gentes at the beginning of the Republic, cf. Salomies 1987:48 (for *Servius*), 50 (for *Sextus*), 52 (for *Spurius*), 155. The replacement of *S.* by *Sp.* is accounted for by the fact that the praenomen *Spurius* was already rare in the late Republic: "Diese Seltenheit kann sehr wohl dazu geführt haben, dass man die Abkürzung *S.* als undeutlich empfand; es gab ja zwei andere Pränomina, *Sextus* und *Servius*, die beide mit einem *s* begannen, von denen zumindest *Sextus* in dieser Zeit mehr verbreitet war als *Spurius*. Wenn man *Sp.* anstelle von *S.* schrieb, konnte es keine Verwechslung zwischen den drei Pränomina geben. Und überhaupt auf die allgemeine Tendenz hinzuweisen, Namen usw., die mit zwei Konsonanten beginnen, mit diesen zwei Konsonanten abzukürzen" (Salomies 1987:149).

As a <u>gentilicium</u> *Spurius* (see Schulze 1900:95) is attested in one inscription from Ostia (CIL XIV 420 *L. Spurius. Thiophanes/ L. Spurius. Fortunatus*) and in four from the Campanian towns of Herculaneum (CIL X 1457 *M. Spurius. M. f*), Nola (CIL X 1329 *A. Spurius. Antiochus*) and Pompei (CIL

X 879 *M. Spurius. Mesor*; 8058, 33 *M. Spuri/ Sarnini*); to these can be added a recently (1954) discovered inscription found on the site of ancient Capua (ILLRP 712: *N. Spurius D. f.*). The gentilicium is also attested nine times in inscriptions from the city of Rome (CIL VI 26710 ff.; they are listed together on p. 5393 of CIL VI,7: *C. Spurio C. f., C. Spurio Fyrmo, L. Spurio L. l. Heracli, L. Spurio L. l. Picentino, L. Spurio Maximo, M. Spurio Secundo, A. Spurius, L. Spurius L. l. Communis, L. Spurius Severian*). None of these inscriptions is earlier than the end of the first century. The only (certain) republican attestation of the gentilicium is CIL I 1245 *M. Spurius M. f* (Herculaneum). There may be one more republican attestation, namely in the coin legend *A. Spuri* (Crawford, RRC, n. 230; 139 B.C.); the abbreviated form *Spuri* may stand for *Spurius* or for *Spurinna* or *Spurilius*.

The occurrence of *Spurius* and of the other eight praenomina in -*ius* (*Appius, Caius/Gavius, Lūcius, Mānius, Numerius, Pūblius, Servius, Tiberius*) also as gentilicia is discussed by Reichmuth 1956:98), who describes the date of the gentilicia (end Republic and later) as a "Zeit, in der das Gefühl für das römische Namensystem schon arg zerrüttet war: man kann hier also nicht mit Sicherheit entscheiden, ob es sich hiebei wirklich um Gentilableitungen handelt oder ob einfach ein Praenomen die Stelle eines Gentiliciums einnimmt. Ich neige eher dazu, das zweite anzunehmen, ...". At no point does Reichmuth suggest Oscan origin for the gentilicium *Spurius* (see below), whereas Salomies 1987:160- 161 considers that it is "ziemlich sicher osk. Ursprungs, also: identisch mit dem osk. *spuriis*". He refers to CIL I[2] 1625 from Herculaneum and CIL I[2] 1162 from Vigna S. Cesario ("wo offenbar viele Zuwanderer aus Kampanien bestattet wurden"). The Oscan evidence is discussed below.

Other gentilicia belonging to the praenomen *Spurius* are *Spurenius*, *Spurennius*, *Spurilius*, *Spurillius** (f. *Spurillia*), *Spurina* and *Spurinna* (f. *Spurinnia*) (see Schulze 1900:94-95). *Spurenius* and *Spurennius* are attested in the same inscription from Moesia Inferior CIL III 12437: *L. Spurenius Herculanus ... L. Spurennio Rufo*. The gentilicium *Spurilius* is known from the following inscriptions from Rome: CIL VI 26706 *L. Spurilius Hypnus*, 26707 *C. Spurilio Soteri* (cf. *Spurilia Deutera* in the same inscription), 33651 *C. Spurilius C. l. Hermaiscus*. From Tarquinia we have CIL XI 3487 *L. Spurilius. L. f.*, and from Ameria CIL XI 4455 *C. Spurilio Albano*, 4527 *C. Spurilius Secundus*. From f. *Spurillia* in CIL XIV 1608 (Ostia) *Spurillia Murtis* we can reconstruct the gentilicium m. *Spurillius**. *Spurina* is known from CIL III 15105 (Thignica) *Lucilius Spurina Marcianus Rusticus*; *Spurinna* from CIL VI (Rome) 26708 *L. Spurinna*, 31150 *Aelius Spurinna* and CIL XI 1847 *Q. Spurinnae. Q. f.*; f. *Spurinnia* from CIL XI 3488, 3489 (Tarquinia) and CIL IV 7290, 26709 (Rome). On the formation of these gentilicia see below.

The introduction of the gens system of nomenclature brought about a reduction in the number of praenomina, some of which are later found as <u>cognomina</u>. On the model of these praenomina-cognomina other individual names still in use as praenomina were employed in Imperial times as cognomina (Reichmuth 1956:101). This practice accounts for the five attestations of *Spurius* as a cognomen; these are CIL IV 1397 (Pompei); CIL VI 32326,14 (Rome); IX 2696 (Aesernia), 4139 (Aequiculi); XI 5662 (Nocera). As CIL IX 2696 *C. Afinio. Spuri.f / Spurio* shows, *Spurius* was still in use as a praenomen. The cognomina *Spurianus* (CIL XI 2042, freedman, Perugia; EE VIII 322, Pompei) and *Spurinus* (*Q. Petillius Spurinus*, cos. 176, RE 19, 1150) are also attested. The morphostructure of *Spurius* and the related gentilicia and cognomina requires analysis.

First the Oscan evidence. Oscan is the only other Italic language, in which the personal name is preserved. The gentilicium is attested three times: nom. *sĴpuriĴs* (Ve. 17, cf. *SE* 45, 1977, 327; Pompei), gen. *spuriĴeĴs* (Ve. 25; Pompei), gen. *spuriieis* (Ve. 131; Surrentum). The praenomen is attested in abbreviated form in Ve. 84 (Capua): *sp(urieĴs)*; the full form can be reconstructed from our knowledge of the gens system of archaic Central Italy.

This system replaces a system of patronymics, attested in other IE languages. In other words, the Latin and Oscan gentilicia are in origin patronymic adjectives formed from an individual name (→ praenomen) by means of the suffix -*i̯o*-, cf. Hom. *(Aἴας) Τελαμώνιος*, OInd. *Paurukutsyás* (see Rix 1972). Hence to a praenomen *Mārcus* there corresponds a gentilicium *Mārcius*.

The pair *Mārcus-Mārcius* demonstrates that a gentilicium in -*i̯o*- is formed to a praenomen in -*o*-. To a praenomen in -*i̯o*-, therefore, one expects a gentilicium in -*i̯i̯o*-. In Oscan indeed praenomina in -*is* (< -*i̯os* with syncope of *ŏ* before final -*s*) correspond to gentilicia in -*iis*, -*iĴs* (< -*i̯i̯os*), e.g.:

lúvkis	(Ve. 4)	–	*lúvkiĴs**	(dat. *lúvkiĴúĴ*, Ve. 1)
statis	(Ve. 221)	–	*statiis*	(Ve. 178)
τρεβις	(Ve. 191)	–	*trebiis*	(Ve. 15)

From the Oscan gentilicium *spuriĴs* one can, therefore, reconstruct the Oscan individual name **spuris* (< **spuri̯os*), which corresponds to the Roman praenomen *Spurius*, cf. *Σπόριος* in the inscriptions from Delos (see above).

In Latino-Faliscan the opposition between -*i̯o*- and -*i̯i̯o*- was eliminated. As a result a Roman praenomen in -*i̯o*- was pronounced just as an Oscan gentilicium to a praenomen in -*i̯o*-, e.g. Proto-Lat. praen. abl. **Louki̯ōd* > **Louki̯i̯ōd* to

95

Proto-Osc. gent. abl. *Loukijōd, cf. also Lat. *medius*,
pronounced *mediius*, < *medʰios* to Skt. *mádhyas*. Hence Lat.
Statius (pronounced *statiius*), a borrowing from Oscan,
stands for both the Oscan individual name *Statis* and the
gentilicium *Statiis*. The Latinization of Oscan names gives,
therefore, the false impression that an individual name
(*Statius*) has been used as a gentilicium (*Statius*). On the
model of pairs such as *Statius* - *Statius* Roman praenomina
in -*ios* of non-Oscan origin were in Imperial times used as
gentilicia.

Next to the inherited patronymic suffix -*io*- the Latino-
Faliscans created a new patronymic suffix -*elio*-, whose use
was restricted to the formation of patronymics (→
gentilicia) to praenominal stems in -*io*-, e.g. *Mānīlius* (<
Mani(o)-elio-s) to *Mānius*, *Servīlius* to *Servius*, Fal.
Voltīlio (Ve. 324f.) to *Voltio* (Ve. 324b.) (see Rix
1972:§3.213). Gentilicia in -*elio*- are also attested for
praenominal stems in -*io*- of Oscan origin, so that triplets
of the following kind could exist, where gentilicium[1] is a
Latinized Oscan formation and gentilicium[2] a Latin
formation :

Praenomen	Gentilicium[1]	Gentilicium[2]
Statius	*Statius*	*Statīlius*

Where triplets of this type exist, in which the
gentilicium[1] is formally identical to a praenomen in -*io*-,
it is possible that the gentilicium[1] was borrowed from
Oscan (or another Sabellic dialect). The possibility arises,
therefore, that, since Latin knows the triplet *Spurius* -
Spurius - *Spurīlius* (with *Spurillius** by the *littera* rule)
and Oscan attests *Spuris** - *Spuriis*, the Roman
gentilicium[1] is a borrowing from Oscan. Since a good
proportion of the known occurrences of the gentilicium
Spurius come from Samnite territory, the most likely

interpretation is that *Spurius* is the Latinization of Osc. *spuriis* (cf. Salomies above), which is later also found in some cases in place of *Spurīlius*.

The existence of the triplet *Spurius - Spurius - Spurīlius* says, however, nothing about the origin of the praenomen. For Oscan origin of the praenomen appears to speak the fact that a large number of Roman praenomina in *-ius* are borrowings from Oscan, including *Appius, Decius, Maius, Marius, Minius, Paccius, Statius, Trebius, Vibius* (see Lejeune 1976, Rix 1972, Salomies 1987:21-24, 101, 75, 76-78, 79, 83-84, 90-91, 94, 96-97), but of these only *Appius* was common in Rome before the Roman expansion of c.300 onwards, e.g. *Ap. Villius, tr. pl.* 449 (Liv.3.54.13). The remaining praenomina are later Latinizations of Sabellic praenomina, cf., for instance, *Marius Statilius*, a Lucanian in the battle of Cannae (Liv.22.42.4); *Marius Blossius, praetor Campanus* in 216 B.C. (Liv.23.7.8). Since *Spurius* is one of the oldest Roman praenomina (cf. supra), the possibility of Oscan origin is then small. Native Roman praenomina in *-ius* are *Gaius, Lūcius, Mānius, Numerius, Servius, Tiberius* and probably *Pūblius*.

Finally, the possibility must be mentioned that the Oscan praenomen *Spuris** could be a borrowing from the Roman praenomen.

It remains to consider the gentilicia *Spurina, Spurinna, Spurenius, Spurennius* and the cognomina *Spuriānus, Spurīnus*. The cognomina are Latin formations. Cognomina in *-inus* are patronymic possessive adjectives, e.g. *Sextinus* 'son of *Sextus*'; "ebenso", writes Reichmuth 1956:73, "wird bei *Spurinus < *Spuri-inus* der erste Träger der Sohn eines *Spurius* gewesen sein". *Spuriānus* is an 'adoptive cognomen'; it is a derivative in *-āno-* of the gentilicium *Spurius*, cf. *Aemiliānus* to *Aemilius* (a concrete example - taken from

Kajanto 1965:139 – is *Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus*, consul in 145 B.C., the son of *L. Aemilianus Paullus* and adopted son of *Fabius Maximus*); *Spuriānus* is much younger than and its formation has nothing to do with that of the Archaic Etruscan (pre-syncopated) gentilicium *spuriăna* (cf. infra). In order to understand the gentilicia, for which Schulze 1900:262-263 assumes Etruscan origin, it is appropriate to consider now the Etruscan onomastic evidence; analysis of the Roman gentilicia is offered below.

The <u>individual name/ praenomen</u> *ś/spurie* is attested in a number of Archaic Etruscan inscriptions from the seventh and sixth or fifth centuries; the attested forms are nom. *spurie* (Cr 3.9, Vs 1.47), gen. *spuries* (Vs 1.73, 1.83, 1.122, Vt 1.55), pert. *spurieisi* (Cr 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8). The pertinentive form is unexpected: just as *hulχniesi* is the pert. to the gen. *hulχnies* and *ceisiniesi* the pert. to the gen. *ceisinies*, so to a gen. *spuries* we expect a pert. **spuriesi*, not *spurieisi*. Since the attested form occurs in four identical vase inscriptions and is reconstructed for a fifth, all from Caere and dated to 625-600 B.C. (*mi spurieisi teiθurnasi aliqu*), we may assume that *spurieisi* is a spelling mistake repeated four times.

spuria-, a phonetic variant of *spurie-*, is attested in Archaic Etruscan in the diminutive form *spuriaza*. Attested forms are nom. *spuriaza* (Cl 3.1, Cr 3.15), gen. *spuriiazas* (Ta 1.1) and *spuria[z]es* ... *spu[r]iaze[-?-* (in a fragmentary section of Cr 4.3). A consequence of the initial stress accent of Archaic Etruscan was variation in the quality of internal short vowels (e.g. *avile* besides *avale*; see Rix 1985a:∮11). This variation may be invoked to explain *spuria-*; since the form occurs only where an *a* follows (cf. below *spuriana*) we may also assume some role played by vocalic assimilation: **spúrieza* > **spuriəza* > *spuriaza*, i.e.

ə (the pre-syncope murmur vowel) is realized as *a* on account of the following -*za*.

spurie is not attested as a praenomen in Neo-Etruscan, where there are, however, three known occurrences of 'Vornamengentilicia': nom. *spuri* (Pe 1.399, 1.400), gen. *spuṛieś* (Pe 1.401).

Forms of the <u>gentilicium</u> attested in Archaic Etruscan are *spurienaṣ* (Vs 1.7, VI/V) and the phonetic variant *ṣpuriana* < **spuriəna* < *spúriena-* (Ta 5.1, 550-525). *spurinas*, attested partly in the transitional period between Archaic- and Neo-Etruscan (AT 2.20, AV 2.10, OA 2.26, Vc 2.30 - all late VI/ early V; Cl 2.22, 6.2, Cr 2.116 - all V), reflects the later pronunciation. In Neo-Etruscan there are a further 17 attestations of masc. *spurina*, fem. *spurinei*, of which some are gentilicia in cognominal function, e.g. the metronymic *aneinal: spuṛinal* from Pe 1.408. *spurina-* derives from *spuriena-* with syllabic /i/ from consonantal /i̯/ through *samprasāraṇa* (Rix 1985a:§§ 9, 10). The vowels *i* and *u* which develop from the semi-vowels as the result of *samprasāraṇa* are not syncopated; syncope has already had an effect in the *samprasāraṇa*. One cannot conclude, therefore, from the non-syncope of the internal vowel in *spurina* that this vowel is long. The Latin material, however, demands that we assume *spurīna* for Etruscan (cf. infra).

One inscription deserves special mention. This is the sixth century inscription La 2.3 *araz silqetenas spurianas*, 'Arnth Silqetena, son of Spurie', on an ivory lion cub found in Rome (cf. supra, §I.5.). The inscription attests knowledge of Etruscan in Archaic Rome. Although the language is Etruscan, this does not necessarily indicate an Etruscan origin for the name. It is possible that the Latin adjectival patronymic **Spurielios* was imitated by the Etruscan adjectival patronymic *spuriana*.

The Roman gentilicia in -na can only be explained as borrowings from Etruscan: *spurīna* > *SpurĪna* and *Spurinna* (by the *littera* rule). *Spurēnius* (with *Spurennius* by the *littera* rule), which cannot be explained as a direct borrowing from Etruscan, must rather come via Sabellic (probably Umbrian), which has the patronymic suffix -*ēno*- (-*enno*-), cf. *Alfēnus*, *Pīcēnus* (see H. Rix, Picentes - Picenum, *BZN* 2, 1950/51, 237-247; Rix 1972:§3.241; Lejeune 1976:84); the addition of the Italic -*io*- suffix (functionally equivalent to the Etruscan possessive/patronymic suffix -*na*) clarifies these forms as Italic gentilicia, cf. Etr. *hermena*- > Lat. *Herminius*. The fact that the Roman gentilicia in -*na* are borrowed from Etruscan does not indicate that the praenomen *Spurius* was also borrowed from Etruscan, since gentilicia can be derived from praenomina of foreign origin. The possibility of Etruscan origin may of course be explored.

Against borrowing from Etruscan speak the facts that the formation of individual names by means of the suffix -*io*- is an Italic phenomenon (so Prosdocimi, *SE* 48, 1980, 242 n.12; cf. *Appius*, *Lūcius*, *Servius* etc.) and that there are individual names in -*ie* in Archaic Etruscan of Italic origin, e.g. *numesiesi* (Ta 3.1, early VII).

It was as a patronymic suffix that -*io*- was first introduced into Etruscan, probably in "fertigen Gentilnamen" such as *latinie*- 'Latinius' (Rix 1972:esp. 728ff.); it yields -*ie* in Etruscan because names such as *Latinius* were learned in the vocative form. The suffix became productive in Etruscan, forming patronymics to native Etruscan individual names. Native Etruscan individual names in -*ie* are also known in Archaic Etruscan. The use of the suffix in Etruscan is discussed in detail below (with examples). The theoretical possibilities for a connection between Lat. *Spurius* and Etr. *spurie* are: i) *spurie* < *Spurius*, ii) *spurie* > *Spurius*, iii)

(unlikely) *spurie* and *Spurius* are both native forms, unconnected with each other.

The praenomen is attested in Latin, Oscan and Etruscan; the number of attestations in each language is not sufficient to provide a statistical argument on the source of the name. The origin of Lat. *Spurius* must be determined through etymological argument.

2. The etymology of Lat. *spurius* and *spurium*

Those who hold that Etr. *spurie* is of Italic, or specifically Latin, origin are obliged to explain *Spurius* in terms of the Latin lexicon and word formation rules. It is not sufficient to assume that the Roman praenomen is based on *spurius* 'bastard, son of an unknown father', which is not attested in Latin before the second century A.D. and is itself of dubious origin, cf. Hans Gundel (Der kleine Pauly, vol. 5, 331) on *Spurius*: "Röm. Praenomen (abgekürzt *Sp.*, häufig und ohne die urspr. anzunehmende zurücksetzende Einstufung des unehel. Kindes) und Gentilicium."

Ancient etymologies (rejected by Plutarch, cf. infra) connect *spurius* with the Greek adverb σποράδην 'scatteredly', which is related to σπορά 'sowing (of seed; children); seed; offspring', σπείρω 'sow; engender, beget; scatter, strew' (< PIE *(s)p(h)er- 'sow, strew'; IEW 993): Gaius, *Inst.1.64 unde solent spurii filii appellari vel a Graece voce quasi σποράδην concepti vel quasi sine patre filii*; (cf. Lib. praen. 6 *Spurii patre incerto geniti quasi σποράδην*); Mod.*dig.1.5.23 vulgo concepti dicuntur qui patrem demonstrare non possunt, vel qui possunt quidem, sed eum habent, quem habere non licet. qui et spurii appellantur* παρὰ τὴν σποράν; Isid.*Orig.9.5.23 sq. Nothus dicitur, qui de patre nobili et de matre ignobili gignitur, sicut ex concubina. Est autem hoc nomen Graecum et in Latinitate*

deficit. Huic contrarius spurius, qui de matre nobili et patre ignobili nascitur. Item spurius patre incerto, matre vidua, velut tantum spurii filius; quia muliebrem naturam veteres spurium vocabant; velut ἀπὸ [τοῦ] σπόρου, hoc est seminis; non patris nomine. Eosdem et Favonios appellabant, quia quaedam animalia Favonio spiritu hausto concipere existimantur. Unde et hi, qui non sunt de legitimo matrimonio, matrem potius quam patrem sequuntur. Latine autem spurii quasi extra puritatem, id est quasi inmundi. Other ancient notices are Plut.quaest.Rom.288E-F διὰ τί τοὺς ἀπάτορας 'σπορίους' υἱοὺς καλοῦσιν; οὐ γάρ, ὡς Ἕλληνες νομίζουσι καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ῥήτορες ἐν ταῖς δίκαις, συμφορητοῦ τινος καὶ κοινοῦ σπέρματος γεγόνασιν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ Σπόριος τῶν πρώτων ὀνομάτων, ὡς ὁ Σέξτος καὶ ὁ Δέκιμος καὶ ὁ Γάιος. τὰ δὲ πρῶτα τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ὁλογραφοῦσιν ἀλλ' ἢ δι' ἑνὸς γράμματος, ὡς τὸν Τίτον καὶ τὸν Λούκιον καὶ τὸν Μᾶρκον, ἢ διὰ δυοῖν, ὡς τὸν Τιβέριον καὶ τὸν Γναῖον, ἢ διὰ τριῶν, ὡς τὸν Σέξτον καὶ τὸν Σερούιον. ἔστιν οὖν καὶ ὁ Σπόριος τῶν διὰ δυοῖν γραφομένων, τοῦ 'σ' καὶ τοῦ 'π'. γράφουσι δὲ διὰ τούτων καὶ τοὺς ἀπάτορας 'σίνε πάτρε' οἷον ἄνευ πατρός, τῷ μὲν 'σ' τὸ 'σίνε' τῷ δὲ 'π' τὸ 'πάτρε' σημαίνοντες. τοῦτ' οὖν τὴν πλάνην ἐποίησε, τὸ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν γραμμάτων τὸ 'σίνε πάτρε' καὶ τὸν Σπόριον γράφεσθαι. λεκτέον δὲ καὶ τὸν ἕτερον λόγον, ἔστι δ' ἀτοπώτερος· τοὺς γὰρ Σαβίνους φασὶ τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον ὀνομάζειν σπόριον, εἶθ' οἷον ἐφυβρίζοντας οὕτω προσαγορεύειν τὸν ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀγάμου καὶ ἀνεγγύου γεγενημένον; Paul.Fest.p.182L nothum Graeci natum ex uxore non legitima vocant, qui apud nos spurio patre natus dicitur, quod Ser. Tullius qui Romae regnavit natus est ex concubina Spuri Tulli Tiburtis, nisi forte malumus credere Oclisia Corniculana captiva eum susceptum matre serviente; Isid.diff.1.506 spurius ... patre incerto, matre vidua genitus, quasi ... spurii filius. quia muliebrem naturam antiqui spurium vocabant.

Modern scholars, most recently Bonfante 1985:205, connect
spurius ('als verstoßen, verschmäht'; see WH II,581) with
spernō, -ere, sprēvi 'dissociate, separate (from); reject
with scorn, spurn'. These ancient (: σποράδην) and modern (:
spernere) etymologies are rejected by WH, who prefer the
explanation of Wilhelm Kubitschek (Spurius, spurii filius,
sine patre filius und spurius, *WSt.* 47, 1929) that the
adjective *spurius* first arises due to a misunderstanding of
abbreviation *s(ine) p(atre)* as the siglum for the praenomen
Spurius. EM refer to the Etruscan name *Spurinna* and consider
spurius to be "peut-être mot d' origine étrusque, apparenté
à *spurcus*"; the etymology of *spurcus* 'dirty, filthy',
attested since Cato, is uncertain.

Kubitschek's explanation (also that of Plutarch, cf. supra)
is attractive and deserves to be presented in more detail.
Since I have not been able to see *WSt.* 47, I quote the
summary of M. Leumann (*Glotta* 20, 1932, 284): "*spurius*
behandelt, mit evidenter Richtigkeit wie mir scheint,
Kubitschek, WSt. XLVII 130-143. Eine ganze Reihe Namen auf
einer neugefundenen Inschrift mit Namenlisten in voller Form
haben für Vatersnamen und Tribus die Zeichen *s p f col*: das
ist aufzulösen in *s(ine) p(atre) f(ilius) (tribu) Col(lina)*;
s p f wurde aber schon zu Anfang der Kaiserzeit, da es ja
immer parallel stand mit *M.f., C.f.* usw., in *Sp(urii)
f(ilius)* aufgelöst und brachte damit den alten, an sich
keinen Makel bedeutenden Vornamen Spurius zum Verschwinden.
Das Adjektiv *spurius* 'unehelich geboren' des 2. Jh.s n.
Chr. ist erst in Anlehnung an das Pränomen aus dieser
Umdeutung von *s p f* entstanden [vielleicht über eine
Umgestaltung *spurius filius* für *Spurii filius*; denn am
Bedeutungsinhalt des *Sp. f.* als 'unehelich' bestand für die
Zeitgenossen kein Zweifel]; es ist also als Adjektiv nicht
zu etymologisieren."

Kubitschek's explanation is persuasive not least because it accounts for the late (attested) date (II A.D.) of Lat. *spurius*. A *terminus post quem* for a misunderstanding of *Sp. f.* as the equivalent of *s p f* is the first century B.C., when *Sp.* was first used as an abbreviation for *Spurius* instead of earlier *S*. Corroboration for Kubitschek's dating of the emergence of adjective *spurius* seems to come from Quintilian's report on the Roman borrowing of Gr. νόθος, cf. Verg.*A*.9.697 *Antiphates* ... *Thebana de matre nothum Sarpedonis*. Quintilian (: 3.6.97 *nothum, qui non sit legitimus, Graeci vocant: Latinum rei nomen, ut Cato quoque in oratione quadam testatus est, non habemus, ideoque utimur peregrino*) does not appear to know the term *spurius*, which indicates that the term entered the Latin lexicon after the end of the first century A.D. or was a very recent addition to it. Kubitschek's theory is based on the report of Plutarch (cf. supra), who states clearly that the starting point for an etymology of *spurius* is the praenomen *Spurius*, the abbreviation for which was also used for the expression *sine patre*.

Salomies 1987:51-52, 54-55 follows the explanation of Kubitschek, but raises the date of the misunderstanding of *Spurius* (→ *spurius*) as *sine patre* to the first century. He bases his argument on the facts that a) Plutarch, and probably his source Varro, knew the Latin adjective, and b) in five late Republican inscriptions *SP. F* clearly designates "ein uneheliches Kind". We must now reconsider the significance of Quintilian's report. Since the meanings of *nothus* (child of a prostitute) and *spurius* (child of an unmarried woman) are similar but distinct, we can interpret the Quintilian passage strictly, i.e. Latin did not have its own word for 'child of a prostitute'; Quintilian may then have known the term *spurius*.

The advantage of Salomies' chronology, which is certainly correct, is that it accounts for the decline of the praenomen *Spurius* in the late Republic, cf. p. 55: "Wenn nun schon in spätrepublikanischer Zeit die *Spurii* mit den *spurii* verwechselt werden konnten, so ist es leicht verständlich, dass der Vorname *Spurius* schon im 1. Jhr. v. Chr. fast ausser Gebrauch gekommen war."

We must turn now to the etymology of *Spurius*. If *Spurius* is judged to be a native Italic praenomen, it must be analysable as a substantive formed with the suffix -*io*- to a base word *spur*-: this base word may be a verbal root (cf. Lat. *pluvius, genius, socius*) or a nominal stem (cf. Lat. *patrius, rēgius*) (Leumann 1977:§273ff.). In Latin there is no verb in *spur*- except *spurcāre*, a derivative of *spurcus*. The only other substantive in *spur*- is *spurium*, a name for the *pudenda muliebra* (Isid.*Orig.*9.5.24), which, according to Plutarch (cf. supra), were designated by σπόριον (= τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον) among the Sabines. Pisani (see 1982:193) thinks it probable that *spurius* and *spurium* are "due parole completamente diverse, di cui la seconda tratta da etimologi a spiegare la prima e solo per questo giunta a nostra conoscenza". He connects *spurium* (Plut.: σπόριον) with Gr. σπείρω and holds it to mean originally "luogo della semina"; it constitutes, in his view, "una delle tante isoglosse greco-oscoumbre". The assumption of a Graeco-Osco-Umbrian isogloss cannot, however, be accepted since the sole occurrence of σπόριον in Greek is that in Plutarch. Rather, Gr. σπόριον must be a transliteration of a term used in Italy, which Plutarch ascribes to Sabine. Since Gr. *o* can represent Lat. ŭ (cf. Σπόριος for *Spurius*) but also ŏ (cf. Πόστομος for *Postumus*, Eckinger op. cit., 67), the source of σπόριον may have been /spurium/ or /sporium/. The advantage of a form *sporium* (rather than *spurium*) is that it can be analysed in terms of IE word formation rules, viz. as a -*io*-formation to the *o*-grade of a root *sper*- 'sow', cf. *solium*

105

(< *sod_io-) to *sedere* and *spolium* 'abgezogene oder abgelegte Tierhaut; dem Feinde abgenommene Rüstung, Beute' to *(s)p⁽ʰ⁾el-* 'spalten, abspalten, absplittern, abreißen' (IEW 985). If we assume that the source of Gr. σπόριον was *sporium*, we must be able to explain the attested Latin form *spurium*; the development *-ŏ- > -ŭ-* is not known before *-r-* in Latin (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:85-86). There are two known occurrences of *spurium,* in Apuleius (born c. A.D. 123) *Apol.*35 (*ad res venerias sumpta de mari spuria*) and in Isid. (A.D. VII, cf. supra). Since the date of σπόριον (in Plutarch: lived c. A.D. 50-120) is earlier than the attestations of *spurium* and not much later than the emergence of *spurius,* it is possible that *spurium* arises from a contamination of *sporium* and *spurius.* An alternative explanation is that Lat. *spurium* is of Sabellic origin (cf. Plutarch: Sabine). This assumption is possible because *ŭ* is sometimes attested before *-r* in Umbrian, where the Latin cognate has *ŏ,* i.e. *-or-* is raised to *-ur-*; a good example, before single *-r,* is IgT. VIIa, 52 acc. sg. *furo* 'forum', cf. also IgT. VI, 2 acc. sg. *curnaco* 'crow' (Lat. *cornix*) (see Meiser 1986:116). The name *Spurius,* forms of which are recorded in Classical Latin, cannot be explained as < **Sporios*; there is no tangible base word for Lat. *Spurius.*

It is legitimate, therefore, to explore further the possibility of Etruscan origin. This has recently been suggested by Pisani 1982, according to whom "presso gli Etruschi *spureni spurena Spurinna* aveva due valori: di aggettivo 'appartenente alla città', e di nome proprio. Il secondo valore ha servito da modello per il *praenomen* romano *Spurius*; il primo ha fornito l' appellativo *spurius,* il quale dapprima avrà semplicemente indicato 'appartenente alla città' ma poi si è specializzato a designare quei bambini che, nati da una ragazza-madre senza che se ne conoscesse il padre, erano considerati come figli della comunità" (note: *spurena* is not an attested Etruscan form

and *spureni*, given in ThLE, is now read as *spurem* (Ta 1.17)). He argues that Etr. *spureni/spurana* 'cittadino', a derivative of Etr. *s/špur* 'città' and "l'equivalente in grafia indigena del nome proprio *Spurinna*", is remodelled in Latin to *Spurius/spurius*. While there are sufficient arguments to believe that Lat. *Spurius* is of Etruscan origin, it cannot be accepted that *spurius* is also of Etruscan origin; the implication that the adjective is as old as the individual name is clearly contradicted by the chronology of the attestations, as shown above. Pisani does not discuss the Etruscan onomastic evidence in any detail nor mention the existence of the Etruscan individual name *spurie*; he makes no distinction between onomastic forms (*spuriena, spurina* etc.) and the adjective *spurana* (discussed below); and there is no discussion of the formation and the relation to one another of the noun *spura**, the adjective *spurana* and the name *spurie*. These forms are now discussed.

3. The Etruscan suffix *-ie*

I begin with the individual name *spurie* and a fuller presentation of the uses made in Etruscan of the Italic *-io-* suffix. The suffix was introduced into Etruscan in gentilicia and individual names of Italic origin, e.g.:

Etruscan gentilicia in *-ie* (gen. *-ies*) from Italic gentilicia in *-io-*

aciie	Cm 2.86 (inc.)	cf. Osc. *AKKÍÍS*, Lat. *Accius*
apuniie, *apunie*	Ve 3.5 (early VI) Ta 1.203 (inc.)	cf. Pael. *apunies* (Ve. 215s)

clavtie,	Cr 1.158 (IV)	cf. Lat. *Claudius*
clavtieớa (<	Cr 1.157 (IV)	
*clavties-σa)		
latinies	Vs 1.62 (VI/V)	'*Latinius*'
	Vs 1.81 (VI/V)	
petrunie	Vs 1.138 (rec.)	cf. Lat. *Petronius*
flaviies	Cm 2.61 (500-450)	cf. Lat. *Flāvius*

Etruscan individual names/praenomina in *-ie* (gen. *-ies*) of Italic origin

atiies	Ta 2.27 (arc.)	cf. Lat. *Attius*
ḳavies,	Vs 1.159 (VI/V)	cf. Lat. *Gavius*, Osc.
ḳavΓies]	Vs 1.99 (550-500)	[Ga]*avíeís*, Fal. *cauio*
cavies	Cr 2.74 (late VI)	(Vetter p.405)
vipies	Cr 2.76 (late VI/V)	cf. Lat. *Vibius*, Osc.
		vibis (Vetter p.445)
vuvzies	Vs 1.164 (rec.)	cf. Lat. *Lūcius/* Umb.
luvcies	Cr 2.139 (rec.)	*Vuvçis* < **Loukịos*
θihyaries	Cr 2.7 (700-650)	cf. Lat. *Tiberius*
naie	Cm 2.72 (V)	cf. Lat. *Gnaeus*. Etr.
		naie is prob. fr. Umb.,
		where *gn-* > *n-* (Meiser
		p. 161)
nerie	Cr 2.5 (700-675)	cf. AT 1.81 rec. gent.
		f. *nerinai*. Etr. *nerie*

108

is from a Sab. name
(see Vetter 370-1, 415-
6) derived from *h₂ner
'man' (> Gr. ἀνήρ).

numisiies,	Cm 2.8 (550-500)	cf. Lat. *Numerius*
numesiesi	Ta 3.1 (early VII)	
up( )siies,	Cm 2.18 (550-500)	cf. Lat. *Opsius*, Osc.
upsiie	Cm 2.63 (500-450)	dat. *ÚPSIIÚĹ*

The suffix *-ie* is productive in Etruscan at four levels.
These are discussed below. For categories 1. and 2. one may
note that, according to Rix 1972:728ff., the patronymic (→
gentilicial) suffix *-i(e)* is known for about ten per cent of
cases in Etruscan, though it is rare in Archaic Etruscan.

1. The suffix is added to Etruscan gentilicia in *-na*. The
development arc. *-na + -ie* > rec. *-nie*, gen. *-nies* (with the
syncope of *a*) appears to have taken place. This (working)
hypothesis is based on the facts that the ending *-naie* is
known only for Archaic Etruscan and that Neo-Etruscan knows
only the ending *-nie* (cf., in addition to the examples given
below, rec. *cazlanies, ceisinies, cuclnies, cuprnies,
velarnies, huṣunieš, laucinie, saturinies, semnies,
tamsnies, fuflnies)*. The evidence is difficult to assess
because to none of the known archaic forms in *-naie* (i.e.
*aruzinaie, vhlakunaie, [-?-h]eṛmenaie, hirsunaiesi,
luscinaies, n)uzinaie, paḷenaies)* is there an attested
recent form. That the ending *-naie* is composed of *-na* plus
-ie is indicated by the existence of the archaic variants
*h]eṛmenaie - h]ermena-, n)uzinaie - nuẓina-, paḷenaie- -
palena-. It does not necessarily follow, however, that from
rec. *caθrnie* and arc. f. *caθarnaial* we may reconstruct a
form arc. *caθarnaie*, from rec. *hulχnie-* and arc. *hulχena-* a

109

form arc. *hulχenaie, from rec. nevrnie- and arc. neverna- a form arc. *nevernaie, or from rec. tusnutnie and arc. tušnutina- a form arc. *tusnutinaie.

Indeed there are two objections to the assumption of a phonetic development arc. -naie > rec. -nie. The first is that syncope of a with retention of i, although not totally unparalleled, is not a regular development: the archaic genitive ending of feminine gentilicia -na-i-al (: caθarnaial, culnaial, teiθurnaial) > rec. -nal demonstrates the usual loss of -i- between vowels. Arc. cipaies (Cr 2.62, VI) > rec. çipies, cipieɾs (Cr 1.116, 1.117) and rec. tutnial (Cl 1.1185) beside the common form rec. tutnal, both from arc. *tutna-i-al, serve as parallels for -naie > -nie, where we would, however, have to assume the role of some other factor, perhaps the wish to retain the Italic 'feel' of the ending.

A more serious objection is the existence of -nie already in Archaic Etruscan, cf. below zeriniieɾs, θarnieš, reciieniies, uólnieš, ursumunieš, so that it is possible to assume that rec. -nie is in all known cases the continuation of arc.-nie (i.e. we would posit arc. *hulχenie > rec. hulχnie- etc.).

Since arc. -nie contains the -n- of the Etruscan -na suffix plus the suffix -ie of Italic origin, it seems best to interpret arc. -nie as a contamination of -na and -ie, perhaps under the influence of gentilicia in -nie of Italic origin where -n- belongs to the stem (cf. above apun-iie, latin-ie, petrun-ie). Forms in -naie then show the initial stage of the contamination. The development -naie → -nie took place then in Archaic Etruscan and was not phonetic.

Since -na is functionally equivalent to -ie, -na+-ie is strictly tautological, cf. Herminius. The original

110

motivation for the combination (and subsequent contamination) of the suffixes, that is of the addition of *-ie* to *-na*, may have been to underline or clarify the Italic origin of gentilicia formed to an Italic base (cf. *vipinies, fuflnies*); *-naie* (→ *-nie*) then became a variant on *-na* but added an 'Italic flavour'. A supplementary motive is conceivable, namely analogy to the stem of the archaic feminine gentilicial suffix *-naia-*.

Some examples of Etruscan gentilicia in *-naie*, *-nie*, including all archaic attestations, are given below:

aznie	Ta 1.227 (III/II)	to the praen. rec. *az*
aninies	Cr 2.139 (rec.)	to the praen. rec. *ani*, cf. gent. rec. *aninas* (e.g. Pe 1.921)
aruzinaie	OA 0.1 (VII)	
caθrnies	Cs 2.8 (early III)	cf. gent. f. gen. *caθarnaial* (Cr 4.2; late VI/early V)
carpunies	Cm 2.60 (500-450)	
carχvanies	Cm 2.36 (500-450)	
varnie	Ta 7.30 (500-450)	cf. rec. *varnas/ś*, *varna*, e.g. Pe 1.1013
vestarcnies	Ta 1.6 (rec.)	cf. *vestrcnaś* (cognom. funct.) in Pe 1.25 (rec.)
vhlakunaie	Vt 3.1 (625-600)	

111

vipinies	Vs 1.231 (rec.)	cf. Lat. *Vibius*
zerinie[s-?-]	Ta 2.7 (late VI)	
harenies	Vs 4.63-65 (late IV/ early III)	
[-?-h]eṛmenaie	Ve 3.9 (VI)	cf. *hermenas* (Pa 3.1; 500-450), *[-?-h]ẹrmenas* (Vs 1.152; VI/V BC)
hirsunaieš̌i	Cr 3.18 (600-575)	
hulχniesi *hulχnięṣ*	Ta 5.2 (350-325), AT 5.2 (rec.)	cf. *hulχenas* (Vs 1.28; VI/V), *hulχnas* (Vs 2.35; V)
huσinie, *huσinies*	Cm 2.59 (500-450) Cm 2.58 (500-450)	
θarnieš	Vt 1.85 (late VI)	
leceniies	Ad 2.1 (late VI/ early V)	cf. rec. *lecnies* in Vs 1.301, 2.48
lẹịnies, *leinies*	Vs 1.178 (IV/III) Vs 1.180 (IV/III)	
luscinaies	Cr 2.69 (550-500)	
muranies, *murani(e)s*	OA 2.68 (inc.) OA 2.50 (V/early IV)	cf. *＊murana*, which can be reconstructed from *mura* (Vc 1.27, 1.28, Cr 1.120)

nevrnies	Vs 1.149 (rec.)	cf. *neverṇas* (Vs 1.101; VI/V BC)
nꭓuzinaie	Ve 3.2 (625–600)	cf. *nuẓinas* in Cr 2.43 (early VI), f. *nuzinaia* in Cr 2.1 (700–675)
numclanies	Cm 2.39 (500–450)	
paḻenaies	Vs 1.36 (VI/V)	cf. rec. gent. nom. f. *palnei* < *palena-i*
pacnies	Vs 1.282 (rec.)	cf. rec. gent. nom. f. *pacnei* (Pe 1.1132) < *pacna-i*
parnies	OA 2.57 (450–400)	cf. rec. gent. nom. *parna* (Cl 1.564)
ṛeciḻeneies	Ta 7.21 (late VI)	
reciḻeniies	Ta 7.18 (late VI)	
tetnies	Vs 1.260 (IV/III)	
tunies	Vs 1.232 (rec.)	
tusnutnie	Cl 0.8, 0.9 (rec.)	cf. *tuśnutinas* Vt 1.57 (600–550)
uólnieś	Vt 1.162 (arc.)	
ursumunieś	AS 1.507 (arc.)	

2. The suffix is used to form gentilicia to native Etruscan praenomina. This category is difficult to assess since,

113

where the praenomen is not attested, it is not always possible to distinguish a gentilicium in -*ie* from a praenomen in -*ie* in gentilicial function: *θ/tveθelies*, which is attested as a gentilicium, could be the gentilicium of an unattested praenomen *θ/tveθel* or it could be a 'Vornamengentilicium'; the same uncertainty exists for other gentilicia including rec. *peiseties*. *leθaies* in the late sixth century inscription Ve 3.44 (*mini mulvanice laris leθaies*) appears at first to be a gentilicium to a praenomen *leθa*, which one can reconstruct from the gent. f. rec. *leθanei* (Ta 3.9, Cl 1.1914) < arc. *leθa-na-i*. Vs 1.142 (VI/V) *mi leθaes vircenas*, which shows the praenomen *leθaes* [let'aies], proves, however, that *leθaies* is a 'Vornamengentilicium'. (Hence we must assume for Etruscan a native praenomen *leθa* and an Italicized praenomen *leθaie*). Other difficult cases are one member names, particularly hapaxes, where it is unclear whether the form is attested as an individual name/praenomen, as in the case of Vc 2.16 (VI) *mi larus* (cf. Vc 2.15 (VI) *mi larus lanaθes*), or as a gentilicium, as in the cases of Vc 2.7 (late VII) *mi epunianas* and Vc 2.24 (late VI-450) [apun]*ies. mi* (cf. supra, Ve 3.5 ...*mamarce apuniie*...). Hence *venelies* in Vc 2.10 (600-550) *m(i) venelies* could stand for *venelus*, the genitive to the praenomen arc. *venel*, i.e. it demonstrates the existence of a variant praenominal form *venelie-* beside *venel*, or could be the genitive of a gentilicium *venelie-* formed to the praenomen *venel*. Similarly, *zarmaies* (Vc 2.26; VI-450) could be the genitive of an individual name *zarmaie-* or the genitive of the gentilicium formed to a praenomen *zarma*. Of the two examples given below only *tataies* is certain. It cannot be excluded that the praenomen *tita*, which resembles Lat. *Titus*, Fal. *tito(s)*, is a variant to Etr. *tite* of Italic origin; one can conceive of borrowing from an unattested Fal. *tita* or of formation under the influence of Faliscan masculine praenomina in -*a*, e.g. praen. nom. m. *iuna, volta* (Giacomelli 1963:195, 233).

114

tataies	Cm 2.48 (500-450)	to the praen. *tataš* (Sp 2.36; c. 350), cf. gent. *tatanas* (Vs 1.29; VI/V)
titaie	Cm 2.74 (V)	to the praen. *titas* (Um 2.1; VI), *titasi* (AH 3.4; 325-300), rec. *tita* (AS 1.387, Cl 1.714)

3. Native Etruscan individual names/praenomina in *-ie* are known from archaic times. Since in at least two instances, namely *sertur* (Vs 1.149; rec.) beside *[se]ṛturie* (Vs 1.202; rec.) and **leθa* beside *leθaie** (cf. supra), a praenomen in *-ie* is a variant (Italicization?) to a praenomen not in *-ie*, the possibility exists that individual praenomina in *-ie* are enlarged forms of unattested praenomina. (A third example could be rec. *auḷieš* in Cl 1.2169 *larθi: punpui: auḷieš:*, if this form is a filiation, i.e. the genitive to a praenomen *aulie-* and a variant on the usual form *aules* (nom. *aule*); *auḷieš* could also be a gamonym and hence a gentilicium, in which case it belongs in category 2..) A parallel for such enlargements may be seen in Faliscan, which knows the praenominal pairs nom. *marco - marcio, volta - voltio* (see Giacomelli 1963:203, 233); it cannot be proved, however, whether or not the type *sertur - [se]ṛturie* was influenced by the type *marco - marcio*. It is unlikely that all known praenomina in *-ie* are Italicized variant forms since we would expect the base forms (i.e. praen. ***velθ(e)*, ***θanirs(e)* etc.) to be attested for a majority of cases. The following list of examples of individual names/praenomina, which serve as parallels for *spur-ie*, include two cognomina, viz. *hupie* and *hutie*. *hutie* is an interesting case; it is attested in Cl 1.2413 (*lθ : tetina : huṭie : latinial*) and as an articulated gamonym in Cl 1.934, 1.935 (*marcnei hutieδa; larθi : marcnei : hutieδa;* on

115

cognomina instead of gentilicia in gamonyms see Rix 1985a:§56). If *hutie* is composed of Etr. *hut* 'six' and *-ie*, then it may be compared to the Roman praenomen *Sextus*.

velθieš (Vornamengentilicium)	Cr 2.15 (675-650)	cf. gent. *velθie-nas* (Vs 1.4; VI/V)
hupie	Cl 1.1921 (rec.)	
huṭie, *hutieɗa* < **huties-ɗa*	Cl 1.2413 (rec.) Cl 1.934, 1.935 (rec.)	Etr. *huθ/hut* = 6; cf. Lat. *Sextus*?
θamries (filiation)	Vs 1.171 (IV/III)	beside filiation *θamres* [t'amr'es] (Vs 1.115: IV/III) of the same family
θanirš̌iie, *θanirsiįę*	Ve 3.30 (VI) Ta 7.2 (550-525)	cf. gent. *θanarsįenas* (Vs 1.13; VI/V)
lavɗies	Fs 1.8 (arc.)	
lauχusies	Vs 1.81 (VI/V)	
maclaie ('Vornamengentilicium'?)	Cr 1.67 (mid IV)	The name must have been formed recently since *a* is not syncopated.
ninieš praen. *ninieš* patr.	OB 2.7 (arc.) Fs 1.1 (525-500)	
stauθurie-	Vc 0.21 (arc.)	extracted from the gent. *stauθuriena*

σuθie-   Vs 1.57,1.95 (VI/V)   extracted from the
                                               gent. *σuθienas*

4. A fourth small category of Etruscan forms ending in
-ie are common nouns. Forms attested in the *liber linteus*
are *θarθie* (a scribal error according to Rix (forthcoming
b):§7.2), cf. *θartei*) and *scuχie*; on the *tabula capuana*
*anpilie, θirie, lunaσie, pacusnaσie, racvanies, saiuzie,
savlasię* and *saχiie* are attested. The forms *anpilie* (<
anpiliei < *anpilia-i*) "im Mai" and *saiuzie* (< *saiuziei* <
saiuzia-i) "am Ort *saiuzia*" have been identified as
locatives (see Rix 1985c; 1990). This warns against the
assumption that the other forms, the meanings of which are
unknown, are base forms in *-ie*.

The assumption of formation in *-ie* is, however, likely to be
correct in the case of *saχiie*, which we cannot derive from a
locative *saχiia-i*, since there is no morphological
explanation available for a native Etruscan base form
saχiia with double *-ii-*. The sequence *-iie(-)*, also seen
in *aciie, apuniie, flaviies, atiies, numisiies, upsiie,
θanirsiie* and *spuriiazas* (!), may be an attempt to represent
an Italic sound unknown in Etruscan itself, i.e. it is an
orthographic convention. *saχiie* may be analysed as a) base
form *saχ* + *iie*, b) base form *saχi* +*ie*, c) < loc. *saχ* + *iie*
-i, or d) < loc. *saχi* + *ie* *-i*; there is no analysis
available which does not assume that *saχiie* was formed with
the suffix *-(i)ie*.

The following forms in *-ie* are known from short
inscriptions:

cluθincie, a hapax, occurs in the vase inscription Cr 3.25
(rec.) *nuna . larθi . marcei . curieas ; ²cluθincie.* The
construction, with the base form *nuna* 'gift(?)' followed by
a personal name (feminine) in the nominative, is unclear.

117

cluθincie cannot be a cognomen; we would expect f. **cluθincia*. It could be a vase name in agreement with *nuna*; other interpretations cannot be excluded.

lautneterie from Ar 1.52 (rec.) *larθ avaini clau(ce)* *lautneterie* is probably an epithet composed of *lautn* 'family' (cf. *lautni* 'freedman', *lautniθa* 'freedwoman') and *eteri*, which is to be connected with *etera* 'cliens(?)'. The usual form, attested twelve times, is rec. *lautneteri*, normally written as *lautn eteri*. *lautneterie* beside *lautneteri* may be compared to the gentilicia rec. *titie* beside rec. *titi*, where *titie* represents the older form. The conclusion that *lautneterie* is a compound of *lautn* + *eter* *-ie* is apparent; it is also possible that *lautneterie* (hypercorrect form?) has been formed to *lautneteri* on the model of *titie* beside *titi*.

trutvecie occurs on the basis stelae OA 3.5 (rec.) *tite: alpnas: turce: aiseras: θuflθicla: trutvecie*. The elements of the sentence are the subject *tite alpnas* (praenomen + gentilicium), the preterite verb *turce* 'dedicated, gave', *aiseras θuflθicla*, the gen. of *aiser θuflθica** 'gods (assigned) to (the divinity) θ.' (*aiseras θuflθicla* is a 'genetivus dedicatorius', see Rix 1985a:§§ 32, 34.) and the hapax *trutvecie* of unknown meaning. Britta Schulze-Thulin (forthcoming) in a new study of word order in sentences with a preterite active verb interprets *trutvecie* as a direct object. A (single) parallel for the word order of OA 3.5 is seen in that of Vc 3.10 *vipia alσinas turce verσenas caṇa*, "V. A. weihte V. das Bild (?)", viz. *S - V - O (indirect) - O (direct)*. Following the word order rules established by Schulze-Thulin another interpretation is possible, namely that *trutvecie* is a nominal adverb (temporal or locative), cf. §5: "Das dem Verb folgende Satzglied muß eine adverbielle Angabe (sc. aus einer Nominalgruppe bestehend) sein, wenn der Satz weder ein Pronomen noch einen

Gleichsetzungsnominativ enthält und das nachgestellte Satzglied kein Personenname im obliquen Kasus ist". This rule is based on the evidence of nineteen examples of the word order *S - V - Adv (temp.)* and two examples of *S - V - Adv (loc.)*; the order *S - Adv (temp.) - V* is attested five times and the order *S - Adv (loc.) - V* twice. For a sentence containing the elements subject, verb, indirect object and nominal adverb, of which there is no recognized example, we would expect, since Etruscan is "in der Regel" an *S - O - V* language and since nominal adverbs are normally placed after the verb, the word order *S - O - V - Adv*, not *S - V - O - Adv*. Hence from our present knowledge of Etruscan word order it is more likely that *trutvecie* is a direct object than an adverb, but this interpretation is not certain.

If *trutvecie* designates the object inscribed, the meanings 'stele', or, less specifically, 'monumentum' come into question[2]. Other known forms in *trut-* are *trutnvt* in the late first century bilingual Um 1.7 (*[L. CA]FATIUS. L. F. STE. HARUSPE[X] FULGURIATOR cafates. 1r. 1r. netʊvis. trutnvt. frontac*), *trutnuθ* in the inscription Ta 1.174 (350-II) (*ạpries. ar. vθ. trutnuθ*), *truθ*, *trutu-m* and pl. *trutur* in the *liber linteus*. Rix 1986:30 analyses *trutnvt/trutnuθ* as a nomen agentis with the meaning "Beobachter". In the bilingual Etr. *trutnvt. frontac* corresponds to Lat. *fulguriator*, 'one who interprets omens given by lightning'; Lat. *haruspex*, 'soothsayer; one who foretells events from the inspection of the entrails of victims', is represented in the Etruscan text by *netʊvis* (also known from Cl 1.1036 (rec.) *nae cicu peθnal netʊ́viŚ*). The phrase *ancn. zịχ neθʊraç. acasce* from Ta 1.17 has been interpreted by Rix 1986:20,22 as "der diese Schrift über die (Opfer-)Leber verfertigte". *neθʊrac* may be analysed as *neθʊ-ra-ac*, that is as a noun *neθʊ* 'liver', a suffix *-ra* 'belonging to; pertaining to' (used from archaic times as a patronymic suffix, e.g. *velχra*; see Rix 1972:§3.254) and the suffix

119

-*aχ/c*. Since orthographic variation of *t* and *θ* is known in Etruscan (e.g. *puts - puθs, clutraš - cluθraš*), *neθσ-* may be equated with *netσ-* and *netσvis* interpreted as an Etruscan augural title ('liver-diviner') composed of *netσ-* 'liver' and *-vis* of unknown meaning. Since the meaning of *netσvis* approaches that of Lat. *haruspex*, we may have confidence in an interpretation of *trutnvt. frontac as* 'observer of lightning, lightning-diviner' (? poss. connection with Gr. βροντή 'thunder'). The meaning of *-vecie* (*trutvecie*) is unknown; since the base word *trut-* connects *trutvecie* with *trutnvt*, *trutvecie* too may have a sacral or augural connotation, but a specific interpretation cannot be offered at the present time.

ecisie occurs in an early seventh century vase inscription Cr 2.7 *mi θihvaries ecisie*. Steinbauer (forthcoming) holds *ecisie* to be equivalent to the Roman gentilicium *Egerius* (< **Egesios*) and the inscription to mean, therefore, 'I (am the vase) of *θihvarie ecisie*'. This interpretation involves the assumption that *ecisie* is a scribal error for the expected genitive **ecisies*; the omission of final *-s* is not paralleled in any other '*mi*' inscription from Caere, but cannot be excluded in this case. The alternative interpretation is to take *ecisie* as a noun (nominative) in agreement with *mi* 'I'. Possession inscriptions of the type 'I (am) the vessel of *X*', where *X* is a personal name in the genitive, are common, e.g. Cr 2.20 *mi karkanas θahvna*, 'I am the drinking vessel of Karkana': there is a strong possibility that *ecisie* designates a vessel. Agostiniani 1982:190 is correct to be cautious, when he notes "non vi è invece motivo, sulla base di quest' unica testimonianza, di ritenere *ecisie* il nome tecnico del vaso stesso". Other vessel names are also hapaxes in Etruscan (see Colonna 1973-74 on *aska* and *ulpaia*, cf. below on *staslar, malehvra, talape*); the fact that *ecisie* is a hapax makes difficult but not impossible the assumption that *ecisie* is a common noun,

viz. that it designates the object (a vase), on which it is inscribed. In every other inscription of the type 'I (am) the *x* of *X*', where the meaning of *x* is known, *x* designates the object inscribed; it may be a vessel (numerous examples; see Colonna 1973-74, Agostiniani 1982), a tomb (e.g. Vs 1.98 *mi uçeles apenas ouθi*, 'I (am) the tomb of Uçele Apena'), a *monumentum* (e.g. Vt 1.57 *mi velθuruś kana tuśnutinas*, 'I (am) the *monumentum* (= cippus) of Velθur Tuśnutina') or a mirror (e.g. Um 2.3 *mi malena larθia puruhenas*, 'I (am) the mirror of Larθia Puruhena'). In two other 'iscrizioni parlanti' of the type 'I (am) the *x* of *X*' *x* is also a hapax, whose meaning cannot be tested by the combinatory method; these inscriptions are: *velelias mi staslar (v)* (Fa 2.5; loom weight); *mi metias malehvra* (IP 146; anforetta d'impasto). As with *ecisie*, the likelihood is that *staslar* and *malehvra* designate the object inscribed.

This means that a noun in *-ie*, probably a vase name, is known for Etruscan: *ecisie*. One can add that, since gift inscriptions are constructed in Archaic Etruscan with the pertinentive (e.g. Cr 3.12 *mi hirumesi mulu*, 'I (am) a gift from Hirume'), it is unlikely that *ecisie* could mean 'gift, present'. *peróie* (Pe 3.1), a common noun in *-ie*, is probably also a vessel name; the form is discussed below in ʃV.3.

One further piece of evidence may be mentioned, namely the form *karθazie* in a late sixth century inscription on an ivory *tessera hospitalis* found in Carthage: *mi puinel karθazie ; ẹḷṣ φ[----]na* (Af 3.1). There is difficulty in translating the inscription, not only because the reading is in part uncertain, but also because after the personal pronoun *mi* 'I' one normally expects a name in the genitive case. *puinel karθazie* can only be interpreted as a nominative, *puinel* as a praenomen which is otherwise not attested, to which we may compare arc. *venel*, and the

121

gentilicium *karθazie* as an ethnic 'Carthaginian', strictly
'(the one) belonging to Carthage'. Inscriptions of the type
mi mamerce asklaie (Cm 2.9, 550-500, Capua), 'I (am) Mamerce
Asklaie', where the attribute to *mi* is a personal name in
the nominative, are known from Campania; *mi puinel karθazie*,
'I (am) Puinel from Carthage', may be identified with this
type.

The importance of the forms *cluθincie*, *lautneterie* and
trutvecie lies in the fact that they are probably base forms
in -*ie*. The importance of *ecisie* and *perόie* goes beyond
this, because we know a number of Etruscan instrument
(especially vessel) names, with the formation of which it is
possible to compare the terms in -*ie*. These instrument names
are formed to nominal bases by the addition of a possessive
suffix, -*na* or -*ra*, e.g.: *ca-na* 'monumentum, σῆμα', *cap-ra*
'vessel', *zave-na* 'vessel', *θaf-na* '(drinking) vessel', *θi-
na* 'vessel for water' (this interpretation for *θina*, up till
now thought to be a borrowing from Gr. δίνος, is from Dieter
Steinbauer; see Rix (forthcoming b):§8.3), *male-na* 'mirror',
ουθi-na 'belonging to the tomb or grave, grave gift', *faśe-
na* 'bowl for porridge' (on *faśena* cf. supra; on the other
terms see the glossary in Pfiffig 1969 and for the vessel
names Colonna 1973-74), cf. *ais-na* 'belonging to a god,
sacrifice'. From the use of -*ie* in Etruscan to form
gentilicia to native Etruscan praenomina on the model of
Etruscan gentilicia in -*ie* of Italic origin we can infer
that in -*ie* the Etruscans recognized an element, with which
gentilicia could be formed to praenomina, but not that they
knew what -*ie* meant; they might conceivably, for instance,
have thought that -*ie* meant 'child; son, daughter', cf. the
Icelandic patronymics, e.g. *Einar Hardarson* 'Einar, the son
of Hördur', *Gúdrun Jónsdόttir* 'Gúdrun, the daughter of Jόn'.
Since, however, the element -*ie* is used to form the ethnic
karθazie and common nouns, we may assume that the Etruscans
recognized in -*ie* the semantic equivalent of the native

suffix -na. Hence it is possible to assume that the native Etruscan praenomina in -ie are in origin possessive adjectives to a nominal base; from spurie we can isolate a noun spur-.

4. Etruscan appellatives in *spur-

It is now time to consider the Etruscan appellative vocabulary in spur-. A nom. - acc. sg. spura* is reconstructed as the basis of the adjective spura-na and of the following attested forms of the noun: loc. spure- < *spura-i, gen. spural < *spura-la, abl. spures < *spurass < *spura-si-s (see Rix:1985a). The evidence is:

1. A phrase which forms a frequent conclusion to prayer in the liber linteus: śacnicleri cilθl śpureri meθlumeric enaś, 'for the fraternity of the cilθ (= arx?), for the spura* and for the meθlum of ?' (for the interpretation of śacnica as 'fraternity' see Rix (forthcoming b)). Śpureri is loc. śpure- plus the postposition ri 'for'.

2. tular śpural 'boundary of the spura*', which occurs on four cippi of recent date from Faesulae; on two cippi the phrase is abbreviated: Fs 8.2 tular śpural..., Fs 8.3 tular. śpural..., Fs 8.4 tular. śp. ..., Fs 8.5 tular. śpu. ...

3. The abbreviation sp which appears on bronze weights and as an official stamp on tiles, designating both weights and tiles as the property of the spura* (Cristofani in: Cristofani 1985b:121).

4. The "iscrizioni parlanti" Cl 2.27 (III; pithos) mi śpural 'I (am the pithos) of the spura*; I belong to the spura*'; Um 2.9 (rec; cassis aen.) mi spural 'I (am the cassis) of the spura*; I belong to the spura*'.

5. The adjective *spurana* which is found 3 times in combination with *mar(u)nuχ/c* in *cursus honorum* :

AT 1.171 (300-250) ... *marunuχ: spurana; cepen: tenu...*
Vs 1.179 (IV/III) ...*marnuχ spurana: eprθneyç: tenve: ...*
Ta 1.88 (II)   ... *marunuc; śpurana. ci tenu ...*

marunuχ spurana, to take the form of AT 1.171, is the object of *tenu* 'having held'; *marunuχ* designates the office of the *maru. marunuχ spurana ... tenu* = 'having held the office of the *maru* of the *spura*'. Functionally equivalent is Ta 1.196 (early III) ...*spural. marvas...* 'having been *maru* of the *spura*', and AT 1.108 (rec.) ... *spureθi...marunuχva ... tenu* 'having held the office of *maru* in the *spura*'. The adjective *spurana* also occurs in AS 2.10 (rec.; bronze vase) *mi. śpurana . talape*, 'I (am) a *talape* (= vessel name?) belonging to the *spura*'.

6. The locatives *spureθi* (see above) and *spure-* in Ta 1.17 (200-150) ...*tarχnalθ. spurem. lucairce. ...* '(he) was *lucumo* in Tarquinia in the *spura*'; *spurem* is a new reading by Rix-Kouba (cf. supra).

It has long been recognized that *spura* forms part of the Etruscan politico-institutional vocabulary[3], but only recently have the experts come to agree on a meaning 'community, civitas'[4]. Earlier views that *spura* was equivalent to Latin *populus* or *urbs* may be rejected since Rix:1984b recognized in Etr. *rasna* the equivalent of *populus* and Colonna:1966 in Etr. *meθlum* a territorial designation equivalent to *urbs*. Comparison with Sabellic (specifically Umbrian) terminology, in which *touta* designates the community and *ocar* its religious centre, suggests that *cilθ*, whose sacral character is indicated by *śacnicleri* (*śacnicleri cilθl*, 'for the fraternity of the *cilθ*'), is equivalent to Umb. *ocar*, Lat. *arx*, and that *spura* may be

equivalent to Umb. *touta*. The meaning 'community' fits in
each of the six usages identified above. For (2) (*tular
śpural*) one can add that in the alternative phrase *tular
raśnal* (Co 8.1 (II), cippus) 'boundary of the people', too
the human element is seen. For (3) (the abbreviation *sp*) it
is appropriate to quote Cristofani (loc. cit.): "*sp*
erscheint sowohl auf Bronzegewichten als auch als
offizieller Stempel auf Ziegeln, so wie es griechische
Stempel mit der Bezeichnung *demosion* 'öffentlich' gibt". *sp*
(3) and *mi śpural* (4) designate the objects so inscribed as
community property. The phrase from Ta 1.17 (6) is better
translated '(he) was *lucumo* amongst the community of
Tarquinia'.

5. The etymology of Etr. *spurie*

Since *spurie* is attested in Archaic Etruscan (i.e. before
the operation of syncope in the fifth century) it is out of
the question that *spurie* derives phonetically from **spura-
ie* '*one belonging to the community'. We now have,
therefore, two nouns to consider: *spur-* (the base of *spurie*)
and *spura** 'community'. One may assume that *spur-* and *spura**
are related and that the longer formed is derived from the
shorter. A suffix *-a* is not known in Etruscan, but there is
good evidence for a possessive suffix -*ra* (see above). Hence
it is possible that *spura** derives from *spur-* with the
addition of the suffix -*ra: *spur-ra* > *spura** with the
blending of -*rr-* > -*r-* or the single spelling of a double
consonant, cf. gent. *velθura* < **velθur-ra* to the praenomen
velθur. As a substantive in -*ra, spura** may be compared with
cap-ra, malehv-ra and *neθσ-ra-* .

On the assumption that *spura** derives from *spur-*, it is
possible to say that *spurie* does not mean '(the one)
belonging to the community/*spura*'* nor indeed '(the one)
belonging to the *populus* or *urbs*'. *spurie* is rather '(the

one) belonging to the *spur-*'. The precise meaning of *spur-* is unknown; the idea that *spurie* designates one member of the community is attractive but undemonstrable.

It is also conceivable that the name *spurie* was created by Italic speakers living in Etruria from an Etruscan base word and an Italic suffix. In this case one might assume that *spurie* 'one belonging to the community' derives from *spur(a)-ie* on the model of *marc(o)-io*, where the stem vowel is deleted (cf. Leumann 1977:§253b); *spurie* could have been the name for the first child of the foreign family born in Etruria.

The suggestion of Pisani and of previous scholars that *spurie* has the developed or specialized meaning 'son of an unknown father' may be rejected, not least because Lat. *spurius* is first attested in the second century A.D. (cf. supra). The Archaic Etruscan evidence shows that *spurie* was not used as an individual name to designate the son of an unknown father: Cr 3.9 (late VII) *mini śpurie utaś muluvanice*, 'Spurie, the son of Uta, presented me (a vase) as a gift'. The Etruscan name cannot have been borrowed into Latin with any connotation of 'bastard'.

The conviction that the Latin name is of Etruscan origin depends on the fact that an etymology is available for the name only in Etruscan; the name was created in Etruria by Etruscans or perhaps by Italic speakers. It cannot be assumed that *Spurius* is in origin a Roman praenomen because there is no Latin explanation available for a base noun *spur* and because we cannot assume that Etr. *spura-* was borrowed into Latin. It remains theoretically possible that the name entered Latin via Oscan, but given the evidence of the gentilicia in *-na, -n(i)us* (*Spurinna* etc.) and of *spurianas* (La 2.3) this is unlikely; rather, the Oscan name was of Latin or independent Etruscan origin. The *opinio*

communis attributes certain Etruscan origin to only one Latin praenomen, namely *Aulus*; to this with greater confidence than before we can now add *Spurius*.

Notes

1. The discussion in this chapter of *Spurius* and related onomastic forms draws on Reichmuth 1956, Rix 1972 and Salomies 1987. Reference is also made to Wilhelm Schulze 1900.
2. Pfiffig 1969:287 suggests that *elš* in the stele inscription Vt 1.76 (550-450) *mi elš . a-[----]-rnaš reχu* means 'Stele'. Agostiniani 1982:120, 191 is dubious of this interpretation, not only because the sequence *elš* is a hapax, but also because the morphosyntax of the sentence is not transparent: after *mi elš* 'I (am) the stele (sic)' one expects a name in the genitive, whereas the cognomen *reχu* shows that the lacuna bore a name in the nominative. Af 3.1 (= NRIE 1042, Carthage, VI B.C.) *mi puinel karθazie ! els φ[----]na* may also show the sequence *els*, if the new reading by Rix is correct. Since Af 3.1 is inscribed on an ivory *tessera hospitalis*, this invalidates the suggestion that *elš* means 'Stele'. It is interesting to note that an animal is depicted on each of the inscribed objects, on the stele a horse (cf. Agostiniani 1982:120: "Stele a ferro di cavallo") and on the *tessera hospitalis* a wild pig (cf. Buffa, NRIE 1042 (p. 292): "È probabilmente un amuleto. Da una parte vi è disegnato un cinghiale, dall' altra vi è la scritta, ..."); at the present time at least this does not aid an interpretation of *elš/s*.
3. See Baudoux 1943:181-184 and Breyer 1984:491-494; cf. also Giovanni Alessio, Osservazioni sui riflessi latini e sabini dell' etr. *spur-* 'città', *Atti del Convegno di Studi sulla Città Etrusca e Italica Preromano*, Bologna 1970, 361-363, who suggests that Etr. *s/špur-* = μητρόπολις in order to provide an explanation for *spurium*, and Pisani 1981,1982. Baudoux, following Muller, Ernout, Kretschmer and Vetter, understands Etr. *spur* as "ville, cité, état" and interprets *spurius* as "enfant sans père connu, enfant public". For Breyer "Zugehörigkeit dieser EN zu etr. *špura 'Stadt' scheint gesichert, Zusammenhang mit lat. spurius liegt auf der Hand."
4. See Cristofani 1985b, Rix 1985a and 1986.

Lat. *sūbŭlō* 'flute-player' is attested in two glosses; the vowel quantities are ascertained from Ennius: <u>Var.*L*.7.35</u> *apud Ennium: 'subulo quondam marinas propter astabat plagas'. subulo dictus, quod ita dicunt tibicines Tusci: quodcirca radices eius in Etruria, non Latio quaerundae;* <u>Fest.p.402L</u> *subulo Tusce tibicen dicitur. itaque Ennius (Sat.65): '<u>sūbŭlō</u> quōn/dăm mărīnās/prŏptĕr ādstĭrۯā/bāt plăgas'.* Otherwise the noun is attested as the cognomen of *P. Decius Subulo IIIvir* (Liv.43.17.1). In this chapter it is demonstrated *sūbŭlō* cannot be an IE term, as Bonfante 1985 maintains, but is, as generally believed, an Etruscan loanword in Latin. The structure of the Etruscan source is analysed and its passage into Latin described.

1. The possibility of Indo-European origin

Lat. *sūbŭlō* belongs to a group of masculine nouns in -*(i)ō*, -*(i)ōnis*, most recently researched by Gaide 1988. The Latin suffix was inherited directly or indirectly (loanwords) from the PIE suffix *-$h_3$en-*, *-$h_3$on-* (> Gr. -ων/- ονος, - ων/-ωνος), the original function of which was "peut-être de former des adjectifs désubstantivaux à valeur possessive accompagnant des substantifs portant le sème «animé»"[1],cf.:

Av. *puθra* 'son, child'	*puθrān-* 'who has a son, father'
Skt. *pakṣa* 'wing'	*pakṣin-* 'having wings, bird'
PIE *$\hat{g}^h$om-* 'earth, land'	EL. *hĕmō* (>hŏmŏ), acc. *hemōnem*, *homōnem* 'earthling, man', cf. Osc. nom. pl. *humuns*.

Latin forms in -*iō*, -*iōnis* are the result of an ancient contamination of forms in -*ōn*- and in -<u>*io*</u>-.

The PIE suffix is widely attested in the IE languages
(Sanskrit, Avestan, Greek, Germanic, Balto-Slavic, Gallic);
it demonstrates a variety of functions, which are broadly
described by Gaide as those which produce "dérivés
possessifs" (e.g. *puθrān-*, Athenian month names such as
Λήναιων 'month of the *Λήναια*', Greek and Gallic toponyms
such as *Μαραθών* (:*μάραθον*) and *Cularō* "ville de
concombres"[2], Greek nouns "désignant un local" such as Hom.
χαλκεών 'forge') and those which produce (secondary)
"dérivés caractérisants" (e.g. Gr. *κέντρων* "esclave qui
mérite le *κέντρον*", Goth. *heimo* 'cricket (insect)' which
characterizes the *heim* 'house', Lat. *cūriō* "curion; celui
qui préside à la *curia*").

The suffix *-ō, -ōnis* in Latin normally carries a value of
characterization, but can also be augmentative (e.g. *saccō*
'money-bags, plutocrat') or have a diminutive value (e.g.
seneciō 'an old man').

It is not necessary to discuss in detail the Latin "dérivés
caractérisants", since Lat. *sūbulō* is most obviously to be
associated with a sub-group of "noms de métiers", but it is
worthwhile listing the main categories and exemplifying them
briefly:

1. "noms de métiers" - see below.

2. "noms de fonctions" (desubstantival), e.g. *epulō* 'one who
organizes the *epulum (Iovis)*'.

3. Appellatives (used as nicknames and in Comedy) and
personal names (Roman cognomina) (deadjectival,
denominative, deverbative) based on a characteristic
personal quality or (usually) a characteristic bodily
feature; their use is often pejorative. The difference
should be noted between strictly 'possessive' denominativa

and 'individualizing' deadjectiva. Examples are: *edō* 'glutton' to *esse* 'eat', *Nāsō* 'Big-nose' (Roman cognomen) to *nāsus* 'nose', *mōriō*, 'buffoon' to *mōrus-a-um* 'foolish'.

The pejorative significance of these names in Latin depends upon Greek influence exercised through the genres of Comedy, farce and mime; no IE language except Latin and Greek knows this pejorative significance. Some of the Latin names are Greek calques (e.g. Κεφάλων - *Capitō*) or direct borrowings from Greek (e.g. 'Αγάθων - *Agathō*), but for the most part the Latin names are "sobriquets imaginés spontanément" (cf. Fr. *Grossetête*, Engl. *Harliss* 'ear-less', *Longbones* 'long-legs'), although naturally based on the Greek type (see Gaide 1988:125, Lazzeroni 1963 and Reichmuth 1956:69-71).

4. Theonyms, formed with the substantivizing suffix variant *-h₃n-*, which when added to a short vowel stem yields *-Vn-*, e.g. *Bellōna*, *Dīāna*, *Neptūnus*, *Pōmōna*, cf. Skt. *Indrāṇī* 'wife of *Indraḥ*' and Lat. *dominus* < *dom-h₃no-* 'he who has a dwelling/house'.

5. Instrument nouns (deverbativa, e.g. *pīsō* 'mortar' to *pī(n)sere* 'grind'.

6. Animal names, e.g.: *crābrō* 'hornet' < *crāsrō* < PIE *$\mathring{K}\bar{r}sr\bar{o}$, cf. Lith. *širšuõ* (for *širšruõ*), OHG. *hornuz*; *mūsiō, mussiō* 'cat' to *mūs*; *sūbulō* 'yearling deer, pricket' to *sūbula*.

Latin has very few "noms de métiers" in *-(i)ō, -(i)ōnis*; the smallness of this group is to some extent concealed in Gaide's treatment by the fact that she tends to discuss these nouns together with those nouns which indicate "un métier ou une fonction" (see, however, p. 277: "au cours de la latinité ce type a été d'une productivité réduite; ce sont les suffixes *-tor* et surtout *-ārius* qui (sur base

130

substantivale) ont produit les noms des innombrables métiers dont Rome s'est enrichie"). The following "noms de métiers" of Latin formation (denominative or deverbative) are known (those of obscure/dubious origin are discussed briefly below):

Denominativa

aselliō (Ennodius, v. rare) 'vil ânier' to *asinus* 'ass, donkey'

libelliō (Var., rare) 'dealer in books' to *liber* 'book' (on these two words see Gaide 1988:110, $1.2)

linteō (Pl.+) 'weaver of, or dealer in, linen' to *linteum* 'linen'

mūliō (Pl.+) 'mule-driver' to *mūlus* 'mule'

pelliō (Pl+.) 'tanner' to *pellis* 'skin, hide'

restiō (Pl+.) 'dealer in rope' to *restis* 'rope'

Deverbativa

accendō (Tert., hapax) 'one charged with rousing gladiators to combat' to *accendere* 'kindle, set on fire; rouse the feelings, incite'

pol(l)iō (Tarr.+, v. rare) 'soldier charged with polishing arms' to *polīre* 'polish'

scrībō (Greg., v. rare) 'officer charged with enrolling soldiers' to *scrībere* 'draw, write; register, enrol'

If Lat. *sūbulō* were of IE origin it would, therefore, be analysable in one of the following ways:

i) as a Latin formation in *-ō, -ōnis*, formed to a nominal base, which is the object of the activity considered. In this case one would expect to find a noun **sūbulus/*sūbula* 'flute' attested in Latin. Lat. *sūbulō* is in fact totally lacking in derivatives and compounds. It is semantically unrelated to other Latin nouns in *sūbul-/sŭbul-*; these are:

131

subulcus-i 'swineherd' (*sus* + **bulcus,* cf. *bubulcus* 'one who drives or tends cattle, ploughman')

sūbula-ae 'shoemaker's awl' (*suo* + *bula* < *-*dʰla* instrumental suffix)

sūbulō-ōnis 'stag at the stage when it has unbranched, straight, pointed horns' (*sūbula* + possessive *ō*)

ii) as a Latin formation in *-ō, -ōnis* to a verbal base. This theoretical possibility can be rejected on two counts. The first objection is chronological: the known deverbal "noms des métiers" in *-ō, -ōnis* are late, Imperial formations, while *sūbulō* is attested as early as Ennius. Secondly, if *sūbulō* were a deverbativum, this would presuppose the existence not only of a verb **sūbulāre/*sūbulere* 'play the flute', but also of a corresponding noun for 'flute'; there is no evidence for the existence of either form.

iii) as a loanword from an IE language, cf. Lat. *toculliō*, which, like *sūbulō*, is an isolated form in Latin, but is to be explained as a borrowing from Gr. **τοκύλλιον* or **τοκυλλίων* (to *τόκος*); *latrō* < Gr. **λάτρων*; *arrabō* < Gr. *ἀρραβών*, itself a borrowing from Semitic, cf. Hebrew *'ērābōn*; *sīpō* < Gr. *σίφων*. This theoretical possibility is ruled out since there is no form corresponding to *sūbulō* in any IE language.

iv) as a hybrid formation, cf. Lat. *auliō* 'flute player' < *αυλ* + *iō* (C.G.L. II 26,36: *auliones : αὐληταί*). Lat. *sūbulō* cannot be a Greco-Latin hybrid since a term of similar form for 'flute player' exists neither in Greek nor in any other IE language. Monteil 1970:177 suggests that *sūbulō* ("dont le radical serait étrusque") could be an Etrusco-Latin hybrid; this suggestion must be taken seriously.

That Lat. *sūbulō* cannot be analysed as IE suggests that it is a loanword from a non-IE language.

132

The (guarded) suggestion of Breyer (following Bertoldi; see Breyer 1984:496-498, cf. Gaide 1988:214,222) "daß etr. *sup(e)lu bzw. der zugrunde liegende Wortkern *sup(e)- auf lat. sībil- zurückgeht" should be rejected once and for all; Breyer herself goes on to comment: "...doch scheint die Zurückführung von lat. sūbulō auf etr. śuplu aus kulturhistorischen Gründen die einzig vertretbare Entlehnrichtung darzustellen." Indeed any connection with sībil- (sībilus, sībilāre) is phonologically impossible and semantically most unlikely. The derivation Etr. suplu < Lat. subulo in Fleischhauer 1964:26 must be a simple mistake. More disturbing, especially as it was made so recently, is the objection of Bonfante 1985:203, who rejects the possibility that Lat. sūbulō is an Etruscan loanword on the grounds that it contains a voiced stop (he holds *Tiberius* and *Suburra*, however, to be of probable Etruscan origin!): "We must discard, first of all, all words that have a voiced stop (g, d, b): Etruscan had only voiceless stops (k, t, p)". But Lat. -b- can in fact be readily derived from Etr. -p- in terms of either of two theories. Common to both is the view that the difference between the sound values of some Semitic and Greek letters invalidates the assumption that, since the Etruscans got their alphabet from the Greeks and Gr. π = /p/, Etr. p must also = /p/ (cf. Rix 1976:178; Sampson 1985:100).

The first theory, chiefly that of Devine 1974, is that Etr. -t-, -c-, -p- tended to voice in contact with liquids and nasals (cf. Lat. *Pergomsna* for Etr. *percumsna* etc.). Hence Etr. -p- > Lat. -b- in sūbulō would have occurred in the environment of -l-. The second theory, that of Rix 1985a:ʃ18, is that the Etruscan phonemes /t, k, p/ were pronounced as voiceless fortes at the beginning of a word and as voiceless lenes medially: "Stimmlose Lenes sind aber von den stimmlosen Fortes [t, k, p] und von den stimmhaften Lenes [d, g, b] des Lateinischen phonetisch gleich weit

entfernt; die lateinische Transkription mit b, d, g ist also durchaus angemessen".

A further objection of Bonfante 1985:207 is that no Latin noun in *-ō, -ōnis* need be Etruscan: "Nor do I see clearly why the Latin words in -ō, -ōnis (ludiōnes has a d!) should be Etruscan. The suffix -ō, -ōnis (habeo [sic!], etc., Nāsō) is very frequent in Greek (Strābōn; Platōn) and in Germanic." This objection is met below in a discussion of *-u* in Etruscan.

2. The Etruscan evidence

The assumption that *sūbulō* is in fact of Etruscan origin, on which scholarly opinion is almost unanimous, is based on:

a) the testimonies of Festus and Varro, given above. Lat. *sūbulō* is simply the rendering of the Etruscan word for 'player on the double pipes'. The word is Latinized, but not fully absorbed into Latin, which has its own words for the 'double pipe' (*tībia*) and the 'double pipe player' (*tībīcen*).

b) the frequent depiction in Etruscan art (wall paintings, vases, bronzes, mirrors) of the double flute player, e.g. in the Tomb of Inscriptions (Tarquinia, 540-530 B.C.) and the Cardarelli tomb (Tarquinia, 520 B.C.)[3]. Hence it is natural to assume that there was a word in Etruscan for 'player of the double pipes'. The simple or single flute is also well represented in Etruscan art and the possibility that '*sūbulō*' in Etruscan was a general term for 'flute player' should be left open; the Romans may have learnt the Etruscan word from or about *sūbulōnes* who played the double flute.

c) the Etruscan personal name *suplu/śuplu*, which is attested as a family name but which must have been an old cognomen

(see below). There are fourteen known attestations of the name, of which two are of archaic date. Thirteen of these names are recorded in ThLE:

1. AV 2.5 (VI/V)

   mi lareceś śupelnaš̌ θạfna

2. Ru 2.7 (arc.)

   mi supḷus

3. Vs 1.181 (IV/III)

   suplu (the complete text, which is fragmentary before and after *suplu*, is not given)

4. Vt 1.145 (III)

   mi. ma laris śuplu

5. Cl 1.86 (225-200)

   θanχvil: śuplini: larθialiśa: caeś śentinates: puia

6. Po 4.4 (II)

   3lθ. c. ls. velśu / lθ c / lθ. śuplu

   4aθ. śuplụ. lṣ. hasmuni

7. Vt 1.108 (rec.)

   lart: ẹnsni: śuplnal

8. AS 1.502 (rec.)

   ᵃvel: suplni

9. Cl 1.2382 (rec.)

   arnza: śupluniaś

10. Cl 1.2383 (rec.)

    arnza: śupluniaś

11.Ru 2.25 (rec.)

 mi : larza : supḷuş

12.Cl 1.1967 (rec.)

 mastr[e] śuplu[ś] lau[tni] ar[nθal]

The formation of *śupelnaš*, f. *śuplini* (with anaptyxis),
supḷni, *śupḷnal* is etymologically related to that of
śuplu/suplu (both are family names), but is morphologically
different. The formation is that of an individual name (on
which, see below) + patronymic suffix *-na*; it is a genuine
gentilicium. On the ending *-u* in Etruscan see below.

A fourteenth attestation, also of recent date, occurs in a
recently discovered inscription (Cl 1.2384): *aθ: śuplu:
lautni: velθiś. a(rn)θ śuplu* is a freedman (*lautni*) of a
velθi, who adopted his slave name *śuplu* as his new
gentilicium, cf. Cl 1.2511 *aθ. tiφile*, a descendant of an
earlier slave *tiφile* (= Gr. *Δίφιλος*)[4] .

To these fourteen attestations should now be added TLE 447,
an examination of which was prompted by Van der Meer's
(1987:101) supposition that Etr. *suvlu* in this inscription
equals Lat. *sūbulō*. The inscription is found on a small
bronze statuette of a woman (prov. Montalcino, c. 150 B.C.),
read as follows by Maggiani (REE 49, 40):

> *θa: cencnei / θuplθaś*
> *1. cazni- / śuvluśi ẓanạ menaχe*

Maggiani provides a good photograph of the inscription, from
which it seems clear that *θa ....θuplθaś* was inscribed by a
different hand than *1....menaχe* (i.e. there are two
inscriptions), and that *śuvluśi* (a hapax in Etruscan texts)
should be reread as *śupluśi*; this proposal has been fully

136

accepted by Helmut Rix (: personal communication). These two inscriptions are to be interpreted as follows :

i) Dedication (first line): 'θa(nia) Cencnei (dedicated this) to θuplθa (a female demon of the underworld)'

ii) Production inscription (second line): *cazni-* (- = one unidentifiable letter) can only be read as *cazniş* (as in the reading given by Rix: AS 6.1); *zana* here designates the statue; *śupluśi* is a locative to the genitive of *śupluś*; *menaχe* is the preterite passive form to *men-* 'produce' (: active ending -*ce*). The translation of the inscription depends on the interpretation of *cazniş*, which could be ablative or genitive. The form could be an ablative since ablative and genitive have the same form when an /i/ precedes the genitive ending -*s* (i.e. when the stem is in -*i*), cf. Vc 1.92 abl. *tetnis* < **tetnis(i)s*; in this case the translation of the inscription would be: 'the statue was produced by L. Cazni in the (workshop) of Śuplu'. The use of a cognomen (*śuplu*) as an individual name is precedented, cf. Fa 2.1 + 6.2 (c. 650): *mi qutun lemauśnaś ranazu zinace*, 'I am the quton of Lemauśna. Ranazu produced (me)'. Alternatively *cazniş* could be a genitive dependent on *l(arθale)...śupluśi*, cf. Pe 3.3 (III/II) *auleśi: meteliś: ve: veδial: clenśi*; in this case the translation would be: 'the statue was produced in the (workshop) of L. Cazni Śuplu'. If this second interpretation is correct, and it is favoured by the date of the inscription, then *śuplu* is attested here as a <u>cognomen</u>.

3. <u>The Etruscan source of sūbulō</u>

In the absence of an IE etymology for *sūbulō*, and in the light of the evidence of the glosses and Etruscan onomastics, *sūbulō* is one of the surest Etruscan loanwords in Latin. This conviction underlies the following discussion

of the function of the ending -u in Etruscan and the
morphology of the Etruscan source of the Latin word.

Firstly, however, one phonological problem should be
mentioned, namely the difference in quantity between Etr. ŭ
(sŭplu) and Lat. ū (sūbulō). Since there is no Latin
precedent for **sŭbulō > sūbulō (cf. *mŭkslos (Gr. μυχλός) >
mūlus with compensatory vocalic lengthening for the loss of
two consonants), Lat. sūbulō presupposes an Etruscan form
in *sūp-. In Neo-Etruscan there are no phonemic or even
phonetic oppositions of vowel quantity. However, in archaic
times vowels in the initial syllable were longer: the long ū
vowel of sūbulō shows the Latin word to be a pre-fifth
century borrowing from Etruscan[6].

In Etruscan -u is the ending of A) verbal nouns and B) the
oldest type of cognomen. A) and B), which are closely
connected, are discussed below:

A) Verbal nouns (see Rix 1985a:§§13,53; Pfiffig 1969:§134).
Verbal nouns are formed in Etruscan by the addition of -u (<
*-ua ?) to the verbal root (e.g. tur-, ces- etc.), the
preterite stem (e.g. alic-, zinac-) or a verbal abstract
(e.g. zilaχnu). From intransitive verbs are formed verbal
nouns (nomina agentis) of an active significance (a); from
transitive verbs are formed passive participles (which can
produce substantives), present (b) and past (c), and active
participles (d), which yield nomina agentis. These four
types are exemplified below:

a) zil-   'direct, preside'
   zilu   'he who directs or presides'[7]
   zilaχ   'presidency, magistracy'
   zilaχnu 'he who has occupied the presidency, president'

138

lup-   'die'
lupu   'he who dies, is dead, dead man'[8]

mar-   '?'
maru   'an official'

b) *mul-*   'to present'
    mulu   '(the thing) being presented, a present'

    tur-   'give'
    turu   '(the thing) being given, gift'
    cf. *turuce* 'gave as a gift'

c) *al-*   'give'
    alice   'gave'
    aliqu   '(the thing) given, gift'

    zinace   'produced, manufactured'
    zinaku   '(the thing) produced'

    ⁎ceriχe 'was constructed'
    ceriχu   '(the thing) constructed, construction'
    cf. *ceriχunce* 'built as a construction'

    ces-   'lay' (or 'lie' ?)
    cesu   '(the thing) laid' (or 'lying' ?)[9]

    cf. *ilucu* "il rituale da compiere"
    (tr. Rix 1985c:24; the finite verb is not attested)

d) *tenu* (= *tenθas*) 'geleitet habend'

    zic-   'write'
    zicu   'the one writing, writer'
    (Cl 1.320, *zicu = Scribonius*)

139

```
ac-        'make'
acil       'thing made, opus'
*acil-     'make'
acilu      'the one making, maker; potter'
```

B) Cognomina (see Rix 1963:esp. 153ff.)

Cognomina in *-u* are the most important and the oldest type of Etruscan cognomina, with attestations from the sixth century onwards, e.g. arc. *mutu, clevsu*. Their use as gentilicia influenced the formation of gentilicia in *-u*, attestations of which are all recent; the formation of these gentilicia by the addition of *-u* to praenomina/individual names (e.g. *velθur-u, vel-u, θucer-u, śertur-u*) is comparable to the typical formation of gentilicia (the old patronymics) in *-na* (praenomen + *-na*, e.g. *velθur-na*).

The cognomina on the other hand are based on appellatives (verbal nouns – nomina agentis, discussed above): "Ein semasiologisch geeignetes Appellativum wurde als individuelles Bezeichnung, also als Individualcognomen einer Person verwendet; der zunächst persönlich gemeinte Beiname wurde dann vererbt und damit zum Familiencognomen mit der schon oft erwähnten Möglichkeit einer Weiterentwicklung zum Gentile"[10]. Rix gives an as example Etr. *maθu*, which appears as an appellative in Pe 8.4 (rec.), but is elsewhere attested onomastically (three times as a cognomen and once as a gentilicium), cf. also Etr. *aθnu*, an appellative in Pe 1.1213 – *larθ śelvaśl aθnu* 'Larθ the '?' of (the god) Selvans' – and a personal name in Cl 1.1750. Nomina agentis are admirably suited for use as cognomina and it is as such that Etr. *suplu* is to be explained: "In dieser Umgebung kann schließlich auch die alte, von Schulze bestrittene Gleichung von *śuplu* und dem aus dem Etruskischen entlehnten lat. *subulo* 'Flötenspieler' Glaubwürdigkeit beanspruchen; das nur als Gentile belegte [but see now above on TLE 447] *śuplu*

müßte dann altes Cognomen sein" (Rix 1963:190, cf. De Simone 1987:38).

On the evidence of the formation of Etruscan nouns in -*u* the base of the nomen agentis (> cognomen) *suplu* is to be explained as 1), 2), 3), 4) or 5):

intransitive verb

1) *sūpl-   'perform'

   sūplu   'he who performs, musician', specialized as
                'flute-player'

2) *sūpel-   'perform' (cf. *śupelnaś*)

   *sūpelu   'flute-player' (supra vide)
   (> *sūplu*, i.e. 1) < 2))

transitive verb

3) *sūpl-   'play (an instrument)'

   sūplu   'player, musician', specialized as
                'flute-player'

4) *sūpel-   'play (an instrument)' (cf. *śupelnaś*)

   *sūpelu   'flute-player' (supra vide)
   (> *sūplu*, i.e. 3) < 4))

5) *sūp-   'play (an instrument)'

   *sūpil   'thing played, instrument', specialized as
                'flute' (cf. *ac*-, *acil*)

   *sūpilu   'flute-player'
   (> *sūplu*; 5) > 2),4) ?, see below)
   (Since *sūpilu is a nomen agentis, one must assume the
   existence of a denominative verb *sūpil- formed from the
   nomen actionis (→ nomen rei actae) *sūpil 'playing'/
   ?'blowing' (→ concrete meaning 'instrument, flute'), so
   that *sūpilu is the 'player, blower; flute-player').

141

A Latin form *sūblō (< Etr. sūplu, options 1) and 3) above)
would develop through the regular anaptyxis of a vowel
between b and l to sūbulō, cf. tabula < tabola (CIL I
583.15) < *tablā (tableis, CIL I² 585.46). Since, however,
Śupelnas is our earliest attested form, options 2), 4) or 5)
are more likely. Etr. sūplu retains then the vocalic length
of the initial syllable (which carries the initial stress
accent), not known in Neo-Etruscan, but which also shows in
the syncope of e (sūplu < *sūpelu) the effects of the
initial stress accent (cf. supra, ƒI.6.). Hence borrowing
from Etr. sūplu would be chronologically restricted to a
time (c. 500-450 B.C.) postdating the height of Etruscan
cultural influence on Rome; for these reasons it is safer to
reject options 1) and 3). Options 2), 4) and 5) should be
explored; the evidence and therefore the arguments here are
onomastic.

Etr. Śupelnaš is, as stated above, a true gentilicium,
formed from an individual name by the addition of the
patronymic/possessive suffix -na, cf. acrienas (gen., AT
2.6, VI) < acrie + -na (the individual name acries (gen.) is
attested in Vs 1.138 (rec.) cae: petrunie: acries 'C. P. son
of A.').

There are two categories of individual names: old individual
name (→ praenomen) and cognomen. An old individual name may
after the introduction of the gens system of nomenclature
and the consequent reduction in the number of praenomina be
found as a cognomen, cf. Lat. Tullus (praenomen: Tullus
Hostilius, the third king of Rome; gentilicium: M. Tullius
Cicero; cognomen: L. Volcacius Tullus, consul 66 B.C.).
Hence a nomen agentis which is attested as a cognomen (e.g.
TLE 447: Śupluśi!) or as a cognomen in the function of a
gentilicium may earlier have existed as an old individual
name, which was as such a base for a gentilicium. After the
introduction of the gens system, the individual name itself

could have been used as a gentilicium ('Vornamengentilicium'); the cognomen itself could also have become a gentilicium.

The possibility exists, therefore, that from the gentilicium śupelnaś one can isolate an old individual name *sūpelu (which may have meant 'flute-player'): *sūpelŭ + -na > sūpelna-. Since AV 2.5 is dated to VI/V B.C. the loss of -ŭ- cannot easily be ascribed to the historic syncope of short vowels in non-initial syllables of the first half of the fifth century; indeed the retention of -e- in śupelnaś speaks against this and favours a sixth century date for the inscription.

The prehistoric loss of /e/ in the third syllable of a word between a post-vocalic liquid and /n/ (of the suffix -na) is known (see Rix 1985a:∮13), e.g.:

uʋelnⵏasⵎ   <   uʋele* (gen. uʋeles) + -na
Vs 1.74 (VI/V)

rumịlnas   <   *rumile ('Romulus') + -na
Vs 1.35 (VI)

rutelna   <   rutile + -na
Vs 1.45 (VI)

haⵏpⵎirnas   <   *hapire (> rec. hapre) + -na
Vs 1.68 (VI)

Examples of the retention of /e/ after a non-liquid are acrie-nas   (AT 2.6, VI), vinuce-nas (Vs 1.126, arc.), hⱼerme-nas (Vs 1.152, arc.), larece-nas (Vs 1.51, VI), tarχvete-nas (Vs 1.3, VI).

On the model of prehistoric *uoele* + *-na* > *uoelna-* etc. one could assume that *supelna-* derived from an old individual name *supele* (which has nothing to do with *suplu*) + *-na*. Since neither an old individual name nor a praenomen nor a cognomen *supele* is at any date attested, such an assumption would have no historical support.

More probable is that *supelna-* derives from *supelŭ* + *-na* with the prehistoric loss of /u/ between post-vocalic /l/ and /n/. The loss of /u/ under these conditions is not otherwise attested, but this is not particularly troubling since a) the retention of /u/ under these conditions is likewise not attested and b) less than one tenth of Etruscan texts are archaic. Moreover the hypothesis that *supelna-* derives from *supelu-na* is supported by the attested forms rec. *suplu* etc., for which one can assume the loss of /e/ in the fifth century : *suplu* < *sŭpelu*. If the reading of the archaic inscription Ru 2.7 - *suplus* - is correct, this would confirm the existence of an individual name *suplu* in Archaic Etruscan. This name could be an abbreviated form for *supelu*, cf. *vlus* (Cl 1.1998, 1.2583) for *velus* (see Bonfante 1988).

A third but unlikely possibility should also be mentioned, namely that *śupelna-* derives from an individual name *supel* (cf. *venel*) + *-na*. *supel* is not attested, cf. on *supele* above. Hence of the three theoretically possible morphological explanations of the form *śupelnaś* -

śupelna-   <   *sūpelu-na*
           or   *sūpele-na*
           or   *sūpel-na*

- the first is the most probable.

On the basis of *śupelnaš* the archaic appellative (→
individual name) *sūpelu* can be reconstructed, which is the
probable source of Lat. *sūbulō*. In this case it is not
necessary to hypothesize an Etruscan form *sup⁽ᵘ⁾lu* nor to
assume that an Etr. *sūplu* yielded Lat. *sūbulō* through
anaptyxis. Instead:

Etr. *sūpelu* > Lat. *sūbelo* > *sūbulō*

Here -*ĕl*- develops regularly to -*ŭl*- in open medial
syllable, cf. *Siculus = Σικελός* etc. The adaptation of
sūbelo to Latin morphology will have introduced the
Etruscan word into Latin as an -*ō*, -*ōnis* noun (it is certain
that *hemō, hemōnis* was known to pre-fifth century Rome). It
is possible that the Romans knew not only Etr. *sūpelu* but
also *supelna-* (cf. *velθuru - velθurna*); this may have
facilitated adaptation in -*ō*, -*ōnis*[11]. It is not necessary
to assume with Monteil that the Latin word is a hybrid.

Further analysis of the form *sūpelu* is possible, viz. that
it is derived from or is a variant form of a *sūpilu*, the
morphology of which was explained above. A fifth century
development /i/ > /e/ (conditions: /a/ or /e/ in the
following syllable; no /z/ precedes) has been recognized for
Etruscan (Rix 1985a:§9), e.g. arc. *ita* > rec. *eta*, arc.
piθe- > rec. *peθe*; /i/ remains for instance in *avil, cicu,*
zilaθ. Etr. *rutelna* (VI) < *rutelena* < *rutile* (Ta 6.1, VII)
-*na* suggests either a) that /i/ > /e/ occurred also in pre-
fifth century Etruscan or b) that *rutile* had a variant
unattested form *rutele*. Even if a) were true, the
development could not simply be invoked ad hoc in a case
where the following vowel is /u/; *sūpilu* > *sūpelu* could
only be assumed upon the analogy of a form such as pl.
sūpiler > *sūpeler*. Option b), i.e. that *rutele* existed
next to *rutile* and *sūpelu* next to *sūpilu*, is the simpler
and more satisfactory account. The instability of *i/e* is

further demonstrated by *uóile* (Cr 3.1, mid VII), gen. *uóiles* (Cr 2.64, VI) next to gen. *uoeles* (Vs 1.98, 1.108, VI/V).

Since a variant form may only have existed in the gentilicium and not in the nomen agentis (cf. *acilu*, never **acelu*) - i.e. **sūpilu-na* > **sūpilna*, **sūpelna* - a further possibility arises, viz. that the Latin word is a direct borrowing from Etr. **sūpilu*: <u>Etr. *sūpilu* > Lat.</u> <u>*sūbilo/*sūbelo > *sūbulō</u> (see above on *-ĕl- > -ŭl-*, also Sommer-Pfister 1977:∮55, and compare Lat. *monumentum* next to EL. *monimentum*).

The account given here of the Etruscan origin of Lat. *sūbulō* is satisfactory at the morphological and phonological levels, and is the most attractive account available. It falls short of certainty only at the semantic level since it is strictly impossible to demonstrate that Etr. **sūpl-* meant 'play' or 'perform' or that Etr. **sūp-* meant 'play'.

That Lat. *sūbulō* is an Etruscan loanword must now be in very little doubt. It is one of the two earliest attested (Enn.) "noms de métiers" in *-ō, -ōnis* (the other is *agasō*) and must have formed part of the vocabulary of Rome from at least the end of the sixth century. The same is almost certainly true for Lat. *lucumō* (see below). Lat. *sūbulō* is to all intents and purposes attested only once in Latin, namely in the line from Ennius' *Saturae* preserved by Varro and Paul. Fest. It cannot have been a well-known word and certainly never came to be used as a synonym of *tibicen*. Although the Etruscan word is adapted to Latin phonology and morphology, it was probably always regarded as a foreign term; it should strictly be classed as a foreign word rather than as a loanword.

(It should perhaps remain open to question whether such Latin words of Etruscan origin have not influenced the

formation of the four earliest attested (Pl.) Latin "noms de métiers" in -ō, -ōnis; this could in part explain why the type is not productive. Alternatively the lack of productivity of the suffix for "noms de métiers" is perhaps due to the pejorative significance of the majority of the Latin formations in -ō, -ōnis. Moreover one would expect words for 'mule-driver' etc. to have existed in sixth century Rome and their existence (alongside *hemō) may have influenced the adaptation of the Etruscan word.)

4. Some other Latin terms in -ō, -ōnis

Breyer 1984 supposes Etruscan origin or influence for another seventeen Latin terms in -ō, -ōnis. These nouns cannot be discussed in detail here, but a few notes may be made. The unreliability of Breyer's results is indicated by her assumption of Etruscan origin or mediation for the native Latin terms *agō* (Breyer 1984:300, cf. Gaide 1988:144-5), *buccō* (Breyer 362-3, cf. Gaide 122-3), *fullō* (Breyer 398, cf. Gaide 208, Rix 1963:191), *linteō* (Breyer , cf. Gaide 109-110), *postiliō* (Breyer 897). Breyer's proposal (33⁻-8) that Lat. *agāsō* is connected with Etr. *ac-* 'make' is semantically dubious. Moreover one cannot easily accept *agāsō* as an Etruscan loanword because Etruscan did not have long vowels in non-initial syllables (except in loanwords such as *prumāθe* < Gr. *Προμᾱθέυς*). Intervocalic -s- indicates foreign origin, but the source language remains *sub iudice* (cf. Gaide 219). The best etymology for Lat. *helluō* (Breyer 410, Gaide 139) still appears to be that of Paul.*Fest*.p.88L (*heluo dictus [est] inmoderate bona sua consumens, ab eluendo; cui aspiratur, ut aviditas magis exprobretur; fit enim vox incitiatior*). From the verb *ēluō* we would expect a derivative *ēluō, -ōnis* or, by the *littera* rule, *elluō, -ōnis*. We might consider whether *elluō* has not been reshaped to *helluō* to make it 'sound' Greek (? perhaps with contamination with (h)elleborōsus (< Gr. *ἐλλέβορος* + *osus*)

'in need of hellebore, insane'). *Sub iudice* remain the
etymologies of *caupō* (Breyer 83-6; 249-50, Gaide 217-8),
cōciō (Breyer 647, Gaide 221), *ōpiliō* (Breyer 317-8, Gaide
210-11), *mūtō* (Breyer 449-52, Gaide 253) and *tolennō* (Breyer
526, Gaide 252). For *vespillō* neither Breyer 335-6 nor Gaide
217 refer to Calvert Watkins, A Latin-Hittite Etymology, *Lg*
45, 1969, 235-242, who argues that the Latin term is cognate
with Hitt. *wašpaš* 'clothes'. Lat. *histriō* need not be
considered here, if, starting from Etr. *hister* (attested
only in Latin; perhaps the plural of *histe*), the Romans
created this form on the model of *ludiō*, cf. Liv.7.2.6
*vernaculis artificibus, quia ister Tusco verbo ludio
vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum,* V.Max.2.4.4 *quia
ludius apud eos* (sc. the Etruscans) *hister appellatur,
scaenico nomen histrionis inditum est*[1][2]. Lat. *lucumō* is by
common assent the Latinization of an Etruscan personal name,
which was originally a title meaning 'king' (see Breyer 699-
701); the use of *lucumu* as a cognomen in Neo-Etruscan (see
AH 1.11) may be compared to the use of *Rex* (i.e. *rex
sacrorum*) as a Roman cognomen (cf. below under *SATELLES*).
The official title *maru* used by the Etruscans and the
Umbrians, and attested as the cognomen of the poet Vergil
(: *Marō*), was, despite Olzscha 1961:484-5, in origin an
Etruscan title, which in Umbrian replaced the native title
uhtar (see W. Borgeaud, Fasti Umbrici, Ottawa 1982, 43-44,
cf. E. Campanile; C. Letta, Studi sulle magistrature
indigene e municipale in area italica, Pisa 1979, 86: "in
una fase più antica gli Umbri subiscono l'influsso etrusco,
riflesso nell'assunzione dei marones"); indicative of
Etruscan origin is also the occurrence of the title in
Lemnian (: *maraš-m*, see Rix 1968:222, Agostiniani 1986:25).
Lat. m. *lēnō* is usually explained as a secondary formation
to f. *lēna* (see WH), which may be a borrowing from Gr. ληνίς
(perhaps reshaped to *lēna* to avoid confusion with the adj.
lēnis). For Gaide 220 the etymology of *lēnō* is "completèment
inconnue", whereas Breyer 423-4 prefers an Etruscan origin

on the basis of the recent cognomen f. *lenui* (Cl 1.1923).
From *lenui* one can reconstruct m. *#lenu*; *#lenu*, in origin a
nomen agentis of unknown meaning, as the source of Lat. *lēnō*
is arguable only if we assume that the borrowing was early
(cf. above on the long vowel in the initial syllable of
sūbulō). The Romans probably knew another Etruscan nomen
agentis in *-u*, namely *ɸersu*, of which a derivative survives
in Lat. *persōna*; only if the Romans knew *#persō* (< Etr.
ɸersu) can one explain the *ō* of *persōna*. The origin of *ɸersu*
is disputed (see De Simone 1970:293-98, Rix 1976:182,
Szemerényi 1975:954-57)[13]. Hence *lucumō*, probably *#persō* and
perhaps *lēnō* are parallels for the borrowing of *sūbulō* from
an Etruscan nomen agentis in *-u*.

Notes

1.   Gaide 1988:208; see also 17-35; cf. Leumann 1977:§322.
     Karl Hoffmann (Ein grundsprachliches Possessivsuffix,
     MSS 6, 1955, 35-40), who recognized the possessive
     value of this suffix, left open the 'Farbe' of the
     laryngeal, i.e. *-Hen-*, *-Hon-*, *-Hn-*. Gaide considers
     its reconstruction as scarcely possible and refers
     only to the theory of J. Haudy (La dérivation en indo-
     européen, *IG* 8, 1981, 3-11), in which *-H₁e/on-*
     represents the instrumental singular ending in *-H₁*
     plus the "suffixe d'appartenance" *-e/on-*, with which
     she is rightly not satisfied (: "Cette théorie,
     difficile, n'est pas nécessaire .... Il ne semble pas
     que J. Haudry ait traité des noms de lieux ou des
     autres séries motivées"). It can, however, be
     demonstrated that the laryngeal of the suffix was *h₃*.
     Eric Hamp (Palaic ḫa-a-ap-na-aš 'river', *MSS* 30, 1972,
     35-37) in consideration of forms in Indo-Iranian,
     Baltic, Hittite, Celtic and Italic, reconstructs a
     simplex form *#Hₐap-* 'running water' and a derivative
     in *-Hon-*, *#Hₐap-Hon-* '(that) having running water;
     river'. The Celtic forms - OIr. *aub* (< *#abō*), acc. sg.
     a*binn*, Wel. *afon*, Corn. and Breton *avon* - are of most
     interest since their underlying stem must be *#abon-*,
     the *-b-* of which is to be analysed as a phonetic
     product of *#-pH-*, cf. Lat. *amnis* which could be
     derived from *#abnis*. Hamp, who refers to the parallel
     provided by PIE *#peh₃*, does not himself assign a
     colour to the laryngeal, but since '*T* + *h₃* → *D*' the
     PIE possessive suffix must have been *-h₃on-*, *-h₃en-*,

-*h₃n-*, cf. *pi-ph₃-e-ti > late PIE *piboti > Skt. píbati, Lat. bibit (see Mayrhofer 1986:143-144). Hence *h₂ep-h₃on- > *h₂ap-h₃on- > *h₂abon- > abinn, (Stratford-upon-)Avon etc.

2. Vendryes, *MSL* 13, 1905-6, esp. 387-389.
3. See Thuillier 1985:123; M. Moretti, Nuovi Monumenti 95ff. (n. 809). There are numerous examples in Thuillier 1985.
4. For parallels see Rix 1963:353. *arnza: śuplunia ś* (Cl 1.2382, 1.2383) 'Arnza, (son) of Suplunia' too is probably not free born, but the son of a slave.
5. See Rix 1985a:§4. A parallel to *śupluśi* is the production stamp AT 6.2, 6.3 *serturiesi* "(hergestellt) in der (Werkstatt) des Serturie".
6. See Rix 1985a:§§ 8,9 on the quantity of the Etruscan vowel. For the conditions under which short vowels in Latin are lengthened see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§83.
7. On *zilu*, of which there is just one attestation (Stele Ducati 137, Bologna, 450-420 B.C.), see Rix 1984a. The rarity of *zilu*, formed directly to the verbal base, and translated by Rix as "quello che dirige o presiede", is probably to be explained by the fact that the man died in office.
8. The suggestion of A. W. F. Holleman (*Liverpool Classical Monthly* 12.1, Jan. 1987, 12) that Lat. *lupus* 'wolf' is to be connected with Etruscan *lupu* 'dead' is untenable: "The phenomenon [i.e. Ennius' use of *lupus femina* for the she-wolf] becomes much less puzzling if indeed lupus was a derivative from, or rather the Latinization of, Etr. lupu, for this word too, in the funerary inscriptions, is used both for women and for men". The connection lacks a semantic motivation. In an earlier article (Lupus, Lupercalia, lupa, *Latomus* 44, 1985, 609-614) Holleman argues unpersuasively that the festival of the *Lupercalia*, which may have been of Etruscan origin and in which the *luperci* dressed in wolf skins and represented dead ancestors, provides sufficient evidence for the Etruscan origin of Lat. *lupus*. The Latin word has a perfectly good IE etymology, and Holleman's theory should be categorically rejected; he presents it also in *AC* 55, 1986, 324-27 (non vidi).
9. Pfiffig 1976 (cf. Pfiffig 1969:§134) considers *ces-* to be intransitive ("liegen") and *cesu* (on the basis of the alternation between *lupu* "verschieden" and *lupuce* "verschied") to have the function of a finite verb. Hence he translates for instance Ta 1.205 *larθ: velχas: θui: cesu* as "Larth Velchas hier liegt". This conveys the sense of the inscription, but its basic meaning need not involve an intransitive verb (: 'Larth Velchas (is the one) lying here'). Instead the basic meaning can be rendered by a transitive verb (: 'Larth Velchas (is the one) having been laid

here'); that *ces-* is transitive is favoured by comparison with the Roman burial formula *hic situs*.

10. Rix 1963:192. It is also possible that some cognomina in *-u* may have been deadjectival, e.g. *cicu* = *'crassus'* (?), cf. *crespe* = *'crispus'* (see Rix 1963:190).

11. Borrowing from **sūpelna* itself, for which a somewhat ad hoc phonological explanation might be offered - **sūpelna* > Lat. **sūbeln-* > **sūbuln-* (cf. **pércelsus* > *perculsus*) > **sūbulōn-* (with adaptation to Latin morphology) - must be rejected for semanto-morphological reasons: an Etruscan gentilicium and *-na* noun cannot develop into a Latin common *-n* stem noun.

12. cf. Gaide 1988:223, who argues that *histriō* is an Etrusco-Latin hybrid. Szemerényi 1975 argues that Lat. *hister - histriō - histricus* are borrowed via Etruscan from Gr. ἴστωρ - ἱστορίων - ἱστορικός; his theory (which cannot be reported here in detail) implies a theatrical or pre-threatrical use of the Greek terms of which there is no trace in historical Greek. Serious objections to Szemerényi's theory are i) the assumption that Gr. *-τωρ* > *Etr. -ter*, not otherwise attested, is highly questionable, ii) the adj. *histricus* used by Pl.*Poen.*4 (*imperator histricus*); 44 (*pro imperio histrico*) is probably a pun on *histriō*, but a derivative of *Histria* or *Histri* (cf. *Gallicus, Punicus*) with military overtones.

13. Two attestations of φersu are known (Ta 7.4, 7.11; 550-500), both beside paintings of masked men in the Tomba degli Auguri. It is generally held that φersu 'masked performer' is a borrowing from Gr. πρόσωπον 'mask'; one must assume i) that the final sequence *-πον* is removed (cf. *Εὐρώπα* > *evru*), perhaps because the Etruscans interpreted it as a postposition (Helmut Rix: personal communication; see Rix 1985a:≀35 on the Etruscan postposition *-pi*), and ii) the development πρόσω- > **prosu-* > **persu*. Szemerényi assumes that *persōna* is borrowed via Etruscan from πρόσωπον, but rejects that either form is connected with Etr. φersu. He assumes πρόσωπον > **persōpna* > *persōna*, but provides arguments for neither Gr. *-πον* > Etr. *-pna* nor Etr. */-ōpna/* > Lat. *-ōna*. There is no reason to suppose that the Etruscans would analyse πρόσωπον as πρόσωπ-ον and then replace *-ov* with the possessive suffix *-na*, cf. Gr. λήκυθον > Etr. **leχutum* > *leχtum-*. The alternative option is to assume that Etr. φersu 'performer, (specialized as) masked performer' is a native term, from which **φersuna* 'that which belongs to a masked performer, mask' was derived by the addition of *-na*. S. Underhill Wisseman, The Archaeological Evidence for the Etruscan Games, Diss., Bryn Mawr 1981, 285-290, discusses masked performers in Etruscan art.

This chapter presents the case for the Etruscan origin of Lat. *populus*. In an introductory section the primary significance of the Latin word is considered; it is concluded that this was probably 'army' and not 'people'. It is important to establish the original meaning of *populus*, not only because semantic as well as morphological and phonological factors play a role in assessing the possibilities of IE or Etruscan origin, but also because if *populus* 'people' is, in the words of Momigliano (*JRS* 1963) "of Etruscan origin, this would indicate a considerable influence of Etruscan political notions in Rome". Since the evidence for an original meaning 'army' is persuasive but not absolutely conclusive, in subsequent sections of the chapter an original meaning 'army' is regarded as very likely but the possibility of an original meaning 'people' is left open. A second main section deals with the earliest attestations of *populus* and *pūblicus*; the earliest known form of the noun in *popl-*, which is confirmed by onomastic evidence, forms the base of subsequent discussion; the theory, which has been rejected recently, that *pūblicus* arose from contamination with **pūbicos* is reaffirmed. In a third section the possibility of an IE origin, viz. that *populus* is a reduplicated noun, is considered and found unsatisfactory on semantic, phonological and morphological grounds. Finally, the Etruscan evidence is considered; previous reconstructions of an Etr. **puple* or **puplu* on the basis of onomastic evidence are rejected, but the source of Lat. *populus* is tentatively identified in a new etymology of the toponym *pupluna*.

1. The original meaning of *populus*

Some of the few occurrences of Lat. *populus* in Old Latin texts indicate a meaning 'army' for the noun, but this could be a survival of the original or a secondary meaning of *poplo-*. The most frequently cited evidence is *pilumnoe poploe* (= CL. *pilumni populi*, with *-oe > -oi > -ī*) from the Carmen Saliare (Paul.*Fest*.p.224L), a ritual hymn sung by the Salii, priests in the service of the war god Mars or Quirinus, who performed ritual dances in war dress: *pilumnoe poploe in carmine saliari Romani, velut pilis uti assueti: vel quia pracipue pellant hostis*. One can also cite a line from Ennius' tragedy *Achilles*; when Agamemnon wishes to address those under his command, he calls on the herald to quieten them: *exsurge, praeco; fac populo audientiam*, 'Up, herald; get me a hearing with the troops' (tr. Warmington 1967:219). The usual meaning of *populus* in Old Latin texts is 'people', e.g. Ennius, in his poem to Scipio Africanus, tells how after Scipio's victory at Zama in 202 B.C. the Roman people offer him rewards and wish to set up monuments in his honour: *quantam statuam faciet populus Romanus/ quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas loquatur?*, 'How great a statue, how great a pillar, will the Roman people make, such as will tell of your great deeds?' (tr. Warmington 1967:399).

Other factors, however, suggest that the original meaning of *populus* was 'army'. We may begin with the question of what word for 'people', if any, was replaced by *populus*.

The PIE word **teutah₂* '(Menge),Volk', formed to the root **teu-* 'swell', is confined largely to the Western branches of IE (Italic, Celtic and Germanic), where it is widely attested, e.g. Osc. *touto* 'civitas', Marr. *toutai*, S.Pic. *toúta, tútas*, Umb. *tōta-m*, Ven. *teuta*; OIr. *tuath* 'tribe, people, country', Wel. *tud* 'people, country'; OHG. *diot*

153

'people', OE. *þēod*. It is also attested in Pers. *tōda* 'mass, mob' and in the Baltic languages: Latv. *tàuta* 'people', OLith. *tautà* 'people', OPruss. *tauto* 'land'. The word is noticeably missing from Greek, which attests, however, the derivative Τευταμίδαο (Hom. *Il*.2.843); Latin preserves the form but not the meaning in *tōtus* 'all, whole' (see Szemerényi 1962), cf. also Lat. *tumēre*, *turgēre*. Noticeable also is the fact that a word for 'people' formed to the PIE root *pel-* 'fill; full' survives only in Latin (*plēbēs*), Greek (πλῆθος) and Germanic, which is the only language group to attest both nouns for 'people' (< *teu- and *pel-). Germanic preserves *teutah₂ initially for 'people' (OHG. *diot*, Goth. *þiudas* 'nation', Germ. *Deutsch(land)*) and employs *pĺ-go-* for 'army' (see below). From this we can infer that *teutah₂ and *plē-dʰ-/ *pĺ-go- were very similar in meaning, that the individual IE languages as a rule continued only one of the two forms and used only one word for 'mass, people'.

In Latin this one word was *plēbēs* (5th declension; the younger form *plēbs* (consonant stem) is attested since Hemina) 'multitude, people', which underwent a restriction in meaning to the exclusion of the patricians only after the rise of the patrician class, either in the late monarchy, or more likely, in the early Republic, when the distinction between a plebeian and a patrician class became strong. Lat. *populus* existed at least in the sixth century, if not earlier, i.e. at a date when *plēbēs* was the general term for 'people' and when another term would have been superfluous; for this reason *populus*, irrespective of whether it is of IE or non-IE origin, is more likely to have originally meant 'army' than 'people'.

Under a probably late fourth or early third century re-organization traditionally ascribed to Servius Tullius the adult male citizenry (= the army) was divided into five

154

(infantry) *classes* on a timocratic basis, i.e. the five *classes* were graded according to wealth and the capacity, therefore, of individual citizens to purchase more or less elaborate arms (see *CAH²* VII.2, 1989, 103-4 (A. Momigliano); 163-168 (A. Drummond)). From our knowledge of the voting order in the *comitia centuriata* in the later Republic we know that the first *classis* was made up of 70 *centuriae*, the second to fifth *classes* together of 100 *centuriae*; in addition there were 18 *centuriae* of *equites*, who voted first, four of musicians and craftsmen and one of *proletarii/ capite censi*. The five *classes* had, therefore, almost all the voting units. Since even in the later Republic the first class was referred to as the *classis* and the other classes as *infra classem*, there is good reason to believe that the 'Servian organization' is a re-elaboration of an earlier, pre-republican system, in which there was a distinction only between *classis* (the hoplite infantry) and *infra classem* (auxiliary, light-armed troops); the cavalry were the richest individuals (a set number) of the *classis*. The *classis*, that is the 'hoplite' *classis*, in early Rome was quite possibly introduced in the late sixth century, perhaps by Servius Tullius (see D.W. Rathbone, The *census* qualifications of the *assidui* and the *prima classis*, forthcoming in a memorial volume for P.W. De Neeve).

Historians on the whole agree that *populus* was the original *classis* of *assidui*, viz. those with the wealth qualifications to arm themselves, who in return had major voting rights in the then crucial assembly the *comitia centuriata*; this is what in Greek terms we would call a 'hoplite democracy'. The existence of the term *populus* beside *classis* may be explained only if the terms are not synonymous; an account of the *populus* which stresses that it was comprised of the *equites*, the *classis* (the richer *assidui* = the hoplites) and the poorer *assidui* (= the light infantry) may be preferred (see Rathbone:op.cit.). Lat.

155

plēbēs, on the other hand, meant the whole citizen body, even when first patricians and later senators pretended to be above it, cf. Gr. δῆμος 'the (whole) citizen body', which the upper classes also often used to mean 'the (lower class) people'. After the attempt by the patricians to define themselves as an élite, *plēbēs* acquired a new 'popular' meaning, as, for instance, in *tribuni plebis* (when opposed to *patricii*), but still, in sense, meant 'the whole people'. Hence from the start *populus* meant both '(hoplite) army members' and '(hoplite) assembly members', so that the 'shift' in meaning to 'people' (as in *SPQR*) in the sense of the politically active citizen-body is not surprising; it had probably taken place by the end of the fourth/ early third century, i.e. following the Struggle of the Orders and the expansion of the Roman army to include poorer citizens as armed men.

By the time of Plautus and Ennius *populus* is used to mean 'people, nation', that is the state in its legislative and judicial power (cf. Serv.*A.*1.148: *et quidem 'populum' totam civitatem, 'vulgum' vero plebem significari putant*), and as a general term 'populace, multitude'. It is, however, found as a distinct term from *plēbēs* in the formula *populus plebesve*; the *populus – plēbēs* contrast is earlier than the *patricii – plēbēs* distinction. Views on the original meaning of the phrase *populus plebesve* differ. Momigliano (p. 104) represents those who believe that the phrase separates the notion of 'army' (*populus*) from that of 'citizen body' (*plēbēs*) and "may go back to a time at which few, if any, plebeians managed to enter the *classis*", i.e. he makes the equation *plēbēs = infra classem*, for which there is no direct evidence. Drummond (p. 166) represents another line of thought, when he argues that the pairing may "be a later pleonasm deriving from the use of 'populus' and 'plebs' for the centuriate and plebeian assemblies respectively." Contextual evidence suggests in fact that *populus plebesve*

156

is shorthand for 'voters of the *comitia centuriata*' and 'voters of the plebeian assembly', cf. Cic.*Balb*.33 *quod populus plebesue sanxit*, Cic.*Fam*.8.8.5; we may assume that the formula is of early date since it contains the form *plēbēs* rather than *plēbs*.

The *dictator* in the Republic, appointed when serious wars arose (but also to deal with political and civil crises), was in earlier times called *magister populi* (cf. Cic.*Rep*.1.40.63, *Fin*.3.22.75, *Leg*.3.3.9; Liv.2.18.5; Var.*L*.5.82), cf. Drummond (p.191): "the office was specifically military in purpose". Since he appointed a deputy called the *magister equitum* to control the cavalry, the *magister populi* must have been in charge of the infantry. The title *magister populi* was invented, probably after the 'hoplite' reform, when the infantry was the key section of the army. The title does not confirm that *populus* originally meant 'infantry army', for, strictly speaking, the *equites* were part of the *populus* and under the command of the *magister populi*, although they were in practice commanded by his subordinate; *populus* meant 'the (whole) army'. One may only speculate whether the *magister populi* was originally the vicarius of the king or a title of the king himself.

Robert Palmer 1970:217 cautiously suggests that, if there is any truth in the emperor Claudius' identification of Servius Tullius with the Etruscan hero *Macstarna* (ILS 212), then Servius Tullius himself once held the title of *magister populi* either at some troubled period during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus (when the king was absent from Rome, aged, or injured, cf. D.H.3.65.6, who relates that Tarquinius Priscus put Servius Tullius at the head of the Latins and other allies against the Sabines) or just before his own kingship (when Tarquinius Priscus was dead and Servius Tullius held office as *magister populi* shortly

before being chosen as king). Most scholars accept that *macstrna* was the Etruscan equivalent for *magister*, probably as in *magister populi* (see Cristofani 1985b:126, Pallottino 1979:7; cf. the office *macstrev-* (see §1.7.)), but it is not clear whether the Etruscan tradition has 'forgotten' the hero's identity and retained his title or whether there was a man called *Macstrna* after the title (cf. the Roman cognomina obtained from the names of the higher magistrates such as *Aedilis, Censor* (see Kajanto 1965:316-17)).

In confirmation of the primary (known) significance 'army' for *populus* consideration may now be given to: Lat. *populārī, -āre (dē-)*; Umb. *poplo-*; *poplifugia*; *Juno Populon(i)a*; *Poplicola*; words for 'army/people' in other IE languages.

Various scholars have used the verb *(dē)populā-* 'devastate, lay waste' to argue that the original meaning of *populus* was i) 'people' or ii) 'army' (cf. WH II,339f.). The most common argument for i) is that if *populus* = 'people' then an apparently satisfactory explanation of *dēpopulā-* as 'de-people, de-populate' (cf. Germ. *entvölkern*)[1] presents itself. EM suggest that *populā-* might be a back formation to *dēpopulā-*. A.J. Pfiffig suggests (see Breyer 1984:300) that *populārī* means "zum Volkseigentum machen". The argument for ii) is expressed by De Simone 1981:100, who argues that *populā-* is a denominative verb with the meaning "«agire come una armata» () «devastare»)", for which he finds a parallel in Germ. *verheeren* from *Heer*.

It is not uncommon for the same word to be used for 'people' and 'army', where the 'army' is simply the 'people at arms'; these words, known in a number of languages, are discussed below. A consideration, however, of the nature of denominative verbs and the relationship between *populā-*

and *dēpopulā-* seems to assure an original meaning 'army' for Lat. *populus*.

Denominative verbs, that is to say verbs built on a noun base, can be categorized into two main groups, namely essiva and factitiva (see Steinbauer 1989:esp. 154ff.). To a base noun *x*, the essivum is of the nature 'to be an *x*, to behave as an *x*' and the factitivum of the nature 'to make an *x*'. The following denominative verbs exemplify the distinction:

Essiva

iūdex	judge	*iūdicāre*	to be a judge, behave as a judge, judge.
medicus	doctor	*medicāre*	to be a doctor, heal, care.
mīles	soldier	*mīlitāre*	to be a soldier, serve as a soldier.
minister	servant	*ministrāre*	to be a servant, attend, wait on.
philosophus	philosopher	*philosophārī*	to be a philosopher, philosophize, study philosophy.

Factitiva

dōnum	gift	*dōnāre*	to make a gift, present, endow.
fābula	conversa-tion, talk	*fābulāre*	to make a conversation, converse.
iocus	joke	*iocārī*	to make a joke, joke.
laus	praise	*laudāre*	to make a commendation, commend, praise.
ōsculum	kiss	*ōsculāre, -ārī*	to make a kiss, kiss.

Before the meaning of *(dē)pulā-* can be tested against the semantic structure of denominative verbs, the primacy of the forms *populā-* and *dēpopulā-* must be considered.

The earliest attested form is *populā-* in Naevius (lived c.270-201 B.C.) apud Non.90.24: *transit Melitam Romanus insulam integram/ urit populatur vastat, rem hostium concinnat.* There are two other pre-classical attested uses of the verb. The first is in a fragment of the play *Chryses* by Pacuvius (220-130 B.C.) apud Non.39.31: *atque ut promeruit pater mihi patriam populavit/ meam,* 'and, as is well deserved, my father laid my country waste' (tr. Warmington 1967); Nonius had clearly misunderstood the text because he cites it in support of the meaning *'populi amorem conciliare'* for *populā-.* The second other pre-classical use is in a fragment of the play *Astyanax* by Accius (170-c.85 B.C.) apud Non.471.11: *qui nostra per vim patria populavit bona* (on the destruction of Troy), 'who ravaged our ancestral heritage by violence' (tr. Warmington).

There are two pre-classical uses of *dēpopulā-.* The first is in a fragment of the play *Ambracia* by Ennius (239-169 B.C.) apud Non.471.11: *agros audaces depopulant servi dominorum domi,* 'the naughty slaves lay waste (at home) their masters' fields' (tr. Warmington); the reading of *domi* is uncertain. The second occurs in a fragment of the comedy *Ascotus* by Caecilius (d.186 BC) apud Non.471.11: *iamdudum depopulat macellum,* 'he has long been pillaging the butchers' shops' (tr. Warmington 1967).

Both verbs are regularly attested from Cicero onwards, but *populā-* is the commoner form; neither is attested in Terence or Plautus. Although *populā-* is the earliest attested form, there is no strong chronological argument (based on the date (and number) of attestations) available on the primacy of *populā-* over *dēpopulā-,* since the earliest attestation of

160

dēpopulā- comes just a few decades later and because there are only five known pre-classical uses altogether. Only one pre-classical attestation of derivatives of either verb is known : *dēpopulātor* 'one who sacks or plunders' at Caecil.*com*.191. Both *dēpopulātor* and *dēpopulātio*, 'the action of ravaging a country, a plundering expedition', are less commonly attested than the corresponding derivatives in *populā-*. There is no form in *dē-* corresponding to *populābilis* (Ov.), 'that can be ravaged or laid waste'.

The prefix *dē-* combines with verbs or substantives, adding one of the following senses: a) privation (only with substantives), b) motion down or away from, c) reversal of a process or d) thoroughness or completeness, e.g.: a) *deartuāre* 'dismember', *decollāre* 'behead'; b) *dēfluere* 'flow down', *dēcubāre* 'get down (from a bed)'; c) *dēscrescere* 'grow small in size, decrease', *dēdiscere* 'unlearn, forget'; d) *dēamāre* 'love utterly', *dēosculārī* 'kiss warmly', *dēfatīgāre* 'tire out, exhaust'.

Category a), to which Mignot and EM would assign *dēpopulā-* ('de-people'), has just a small number of (denominative) verbs. Two of these, both late formations, have abstract or at least non-concrete meanings: *dēvenustāre* (Gel.) 'mar the beauty of', *dēvirgināre* (Petr.) 'deprive of virginity'. The meanings of the remaining verbs, all except one attested in classical authors (or pre-classical: *deacināre*) are concrete; the verbs describe the physical removal of an object from another object, to which it intrinsically belongs: *deacināre* (Cato) 'de-pip' (grape or other berry), *dearmāre* (Liv.) 'de-arm, deprive of arms', *deartuāre* (Pl.), *decollāre* (Sen.), *dēfloccāre* (Pl.) 'de-wool, rub the nap (of cloth)', *desquāmāre* (Pl.) 'de-scale'. A verb to be added to this list is *despoliāre* (Pl.) 'de-arm, despoil', formed to *spolium* 'skin. hide; (usu. pl.) arms, equipment'. Lat. *despoliāre* deserves special mention because *spoliāre*, which

has the same meaning, is a back-formation to this verb; this is clear from the fact that *spoliāre* cannot be analysed as an essive or factitive denominative of the types described above. EM cite *despoliāre*, *spoliāre* as a model for the possible back-formation of *populāre/-ārī* from *dēpopulāre/-ārī* 'de-people'. The occurrence of a back-formation here is, however, unlikely because there is no one 'object' to which '*populus*' intrinsically belongs and from which it could be removed; attested *patientes* with the verb *dēpopulā-* include public forests, fields, provinces and countries. Moreover *populā-*, unlike *spoliāre*, can be explained as a denominative verb, to which *dēpopulā-* is a secondary formation.

Under the assumption that *populā-* is the primary of the two verbs, four options can be offered for its base meaning, only one of which can be correct: <u>essivum</u> 1. 'be an army', 2. 'be a people'; <u>factitivum</u> 3. 'make an army', 4. 'make a people'. Lat. *populā-* is nowhere attested in a context in which it might possibly mean 'be a people, exist', 'make an army, conscript' or 'make a people, populate'. Since the meaning of *populā-* clearly develops to 'plunder, devastate, lay waste', the only plausible option is 'be an army', for it is in the nature of things that an army attacks and in so doing destroys.

In our earliest attestation of *populā-* from Naevius, the Roman who crosses over – in 256 B.C. – to the unimpaired island of Malta is Marcus Atilius Regulus. Naevius' use of *urit populatur vastat* in asyndeton to describe Regulus' destruction of the island shows that 'devastate, lay waste' is the secondary or generalized meaning of *populā-*. *vastat* 'he destroys' sums up the preceding two verbs which describe the way in which Regulus destroys the island and (some of) its inhabitants, namely by fire (*urit*) and by slaughter (*populatur*). The semantic progression involved is 'be an

162

army, behave as an army' > 'kill; destroy, plunder'. Pfiffig's suggestion (*populā-* = 'make something the property of the people') matches none of the four options given above. A semantic progression from 'make something the property of the people' to 'devastate' is not very probable. There is no literary source to support his suggestion. Moreover, the concept 'make public property, place at the disposal of the community; appropriate to the state, confiscate' is expressed in Latin by derivation from the possessive adjective *pūblicus: pūblicāre*, cf. Cic.*Rep*.2.33 *silvas maritimas omnis pūblicavit quas ceperat.*

The formation of the verb *dēpopulā-* is to be explained as the combination of the prefix *dē-* with the verb *populā-*. As such it must belong to one of the categories b), c) or d) exemplified above for verbs in *dē-*. Lat. *dēpopulā-* does not fulfil the semantic conditions of b) (motion down) or c) (reversal); it is to be assigned to category d). To this category there belongs a number of 'fighting verbs'; the prefix *dē-* intensifies the action: *dēbellāre* 'fight out, fight to a finish'. *dēcertāre* 'fight out an issue, fight to a finish', *dēproeliārī* 'fight fiercely', *dēpugnāre* 'fight out an issue (either in war or in a quarrel)'. Lat. *dēpopulā-*, formed to *populā-* with its meaning already developed to 'devastate', must, therefore, mean 'devastate utterly'.

The sole parallel to Lat. *populus* in another IE language is Umb. *pŏplo*, earlier *pŭplu*. Attested forms are: acc. *puplum, puplu, pupluper* (IgT. Ib), acc. *poplom, poplo*, gen. *popler*, dat./loc. *pople*, abl. *poplu, popluper* (IgT. VIa,b, VIIa). The Umbrians learnt to write around 500 B.C., borrowing their alphabet from the Etruscans. IgT. I-Va are written in a modified Etruscan (i.e. plus *řʼ* and *ç*) or 'national' alphabet, IgT. Vb-VII in the Latin alphabet (i.e. an alphabet containing the letter *o*). Umbrian had the sounds

/ŏ, ō; ŭ, ū / but initially only the letter *u* to express these sounds. In IgT. I-Va, therefore, *u* can represent any one of the four sounds /ŏ, ō; ŭ, ū/. Hence *esuna* (national alphabet) and *esona* (Latin alphabet) both represent /ēsōna/; likewise *puplum* (national alphabet) and *poplom* (Latin alphabet) both represent /poplom/. Umb. *pupl-* is not necessarily more closely related to Etr. *pupl-* than is Lat. *popl-*. The length of the root vowel must be short since long *ō* develops to *ū* in Umbrian (see Meiser 1986:49ff.).

The attestations of Umb. *pupl-/ popl-* occur in two sections of the Iguvine Tables which describe the *lustratio* or purification of the *popl-* (Ib 10-45; VIb 48 - VIIa 54); it is clear from the context that *popl-* here means 'army'. During the purification ceremony the *adfertor* pronounces banishment against any enemies (Tadinate, Tuscan, Narcan or Iapudic) who may happen to be present and makes imprecations against these enemies of Iguvium to the 'Mars triad' *šerfe martie*, *prestota šerfia šerfer martier* and *tursa šerfia šerfer martier*. The favour of these same gods is implored for the '*popl-* of the state of Iguvium and for the state of Iguvium' in a prayer in which the young men under arms and those not under arms are mentioned (*hostatir anhostatir*); the formula *pople totar iiouinar tote iiouine* occurs frequently, especially in IgT. VIIa. The *adfertor* gives the command *armanu kateramu* (Ib 19-20)/ *arsmahomo caterahamo* (VIb 56); this is a double imperative meaning 'order yourselves in ranks', literally 'arrange yourselves in order and get into squadrons' (cf. Meiser 1986:§§56,4, 65,1, 65,5; 85). This military command provides the conclusive evidence that Umb. *popl-* means 'army'; it is supported by the imprecations against enemies addressed to gods of war which form part of the *lustratio* (cf. supra). In the formula '*pople totar iiouinar tote iiouine*' *pople*, a "concetto omogeneo", describes a section of the state of Iguvium; it is the view of Prosdocimi 1978:44 that this section is the

"parte della cittadinanza atta alle armi", an ancient meaning shared by Umb. *poplo-* and Lat. *populus* (see also Penney 1988:736 for the same view).

A derivative of Umb. *pupl-* is the adjective *pupřiçes* (gen.), which is an epithet of the god Pomonus. Meiser 1986:215 analyses the adjective as *popřiko-* < *poplo-* "Heerbahn" + suffix *-iko-*, so that *Poemōns Popřiss = 'Poemonus des Heerbahns'; the characterization of a god of vegetation by this epithet may seem striking, but, as Meiser notes, Roman *Mars* also played a role "im Kult des römischen Bauern".

The *pŏplĭfugia* (n. pl.) was a festival held at Rome, probably on 5 July, in memory, it is reported, of the flight of the people upon Romulus' death (see D.H.2.56.5; Plu.*Cam.*33f., *Rom.* 29, cf. Ov.*Fast.*2.491ff). A different version of the origin of the *poplifugia* is given by Plut. *Romulus*: shortly after the sack of Rome by the Gauls when Rome was still weak, an expedition was launched against the city by many of the Latins. At night when the Latins, stationed not far from Rome, were sleeping, the Romans came in arms and mastered their enemy. The *poplifugia* celebrates this victory. Plutarch gives a second version of these events in *Cam.*34; it is the version said by Plutarch to be adopted by most writers: Camillus and his men surround the Latins, who have barricaded their camp on all sides with a great wooden palisade. Shortly after daybreak the Romans fire fiery darts along the trenches which quickly set the wood alight. The Latins are thus forced out, in fact put to flight, and defeated. Varro's account in *L.*6.18 is a mixture of the two main accounts, viz. the flight of the people on the death of Romulus and the defeat of the Latins. Macr.3.2.14 explains *poplifugia* as the celebration of the routing of the Roman *populus* by the Etruscans (!): *cum ... populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit - unde Poplifugia vocantur.*

Robert Palmer 1970:230 imagines what the ceremony of the *poplifugia* would have consisted of: "On 5 July the Roman infantry (*populus*) marched out and made ritual feints against ancestral enemies whom they ritually put to flight. Unlike the feast of the Regifugium, the Poplifugia is plural and must be construed as more than just one feint. A *poplifugium* is not the flight of the Roman people but a routing by the Roman infantry." Better put, the *poplifugia* (a compound containing the genitive *popli*) must celebrate the routing of the Latin army. The nature of this festival is unknown. The point here must be that in inventing etymologies for this ancient festival name some later Roman antiquarians assumed *populus* must be given its archaic sense of 'army'.

Pop(u)lōn(i)a is a cult title of Juno, which is explained by Rix (forthcoming a) as a derivative of *poplo-* 'army': *poplo-* + *-h₃no-* > *Pop(u)lōna* (cf. infra). This is consistent with the view that *Juno Populōna* was Juno in her capacity as mistress of the army, cf. Robert Palmer 1970:4: "If we devote more attention to Juno's role in diplomacy and statecraft in the following pages we are merely attempting to restore a balance and to order the priority of functions. For Juno's cult by women has been so amply treated that we have lost sight of the lady in the war chariot brandishing a spear and holding a shield."

The cult of *Juno Populōna* is old. Mention of *Juno Populōna* in the Ius Papirianum (apud Macr.3.10.5-7) dates her cult to the regal period. That the epithet *Populōna* should be based on *poplo-* 'army' is, therefore, chronologically plausible. Confirmation for the etymology 'mistress of the army' comes from a section of the prayer to Juno devised by Martianus Capella (2.149): *Poplonam plebes, Curitim debent memorare / bellantes.* The translation given by Palmer is: "peoples ought to call on the warriors Curitis and Populona"; I would

166

prefer to take *bellantes* with *plebes* because *plebes* should
be the whole civil population but *bellantes* restricts it to
the section in the army: 'peoples at war ought to call on
Populona (and) Curitis'. One may wonder whether *curitim*
could not be *curi⟨a⟩tim* 'by curiae'. Robert Palmer 1970:50
notes also that in the war against Mezentius and Turnus,
Aeneas is joined by his Etruscan allies (Verg.*A*.10.172-173):
*sescentos illi dederat Populonia mater/ expertos belli
iuvenes*; he believes that the *mater Populonia* must be
reminiscent of *Juno Populona*, as well as alluding to (play
on words) the Etruscan town.

The compound *Poplicola* is a rare cognomen given to two
members of the Valerii family – *Publius Valerius Poplicola*
(father and son) – in the first years of the Republic.
Versnel (in Stibbe 1980:129) suggests the meaning
"Volksbauer" (cf. Kajanto 1965:256: "people's friend") but
in view of their many military pursuits, for which the
Valerii Poplicolae received their fame, 'Heersbauer' (i.e.
'Pfleger des Heeres') is more appropriate. The elder
Poplicola is said to have triumphed over Tarquinius, the
Veientani and the Sabines, and to have fought against
Porsenna; his son is said to have fought in the battle at
Lake Regillus. The etymology offered for the cognomen by
V.Max.4.1.1 is at least consistent with an original meaning
'army' for *populus: P. Valerius, qui populi maiestatem
uenerando Poplicolae nomen adsecutus est*; it is, however, a
popular etymology.

Words for 'army' in the IE languages (see Buck 1919,
1949:§20.15; IEW 615-616) are either: a) directly inherited
from PIE **koro-s, *korio-s* 'Krieg, Kriegsheer' (the root is
directly connected to **kar-* 'revile'), e.g. Goth. *harjis*
'Heer', Latv. *kar'š* 'Krieg, Heer', Lith. *kãras* 'Kreig',
OPers. *kãra-* 'Kreigsvolk, Heer, Volk', Gr. κοίρανος
'Heersführer, König, Heer', MIr. *cuire* 'Schar, Menge', OHG.

heri 'Heer, Menge', or b) based on notions such as: i) '<u>armed</u> <u>(force)</u>', e.g. med. Lat. *armata* 'armed force' > Fr. *armée*, Sp./ Port. *armada* 'fleet'; ii) '<u>enemy</u>', e.g. Lat. *hostis* 'stranger' > 'enemy' > med. Lat. 'military service, army', which survives in Rom. *oaste*, cf. OIt. *oste*, OFr. *ost* (Buck 1949: "Although the direct transition 'hostile army' to 'army' in general is, of course, possible, the more likely development was through use in such phrases as *convenire in hostem, exire in hostem*, etc., where *in hostem* meant orig. 'against the enemy' but was easily construed 'into military service' and consequently 'into the army'"); iii) '<u>expedition</u>', e.g. OE. *fierd* 'expedition > army'; iv) '<u>camp</u>', e.g. Byz. Gr. φοσσᾶτον 'camp' > 'army', Hitt. *tuzzi* (a derivative of *teutā) 'camp; army', cf. late Lat. *fossātum* 'ditch, moat', the OSp. *(fonsado)* and OPort. *(fossado)* continuants of which also mean 'army' (one must reckon with a semantic progression 'Wallgraben' > 'Lager (mit Wallgraben), Kastell' > 'Heer' – Strunk 1964:78); Dutch *leger* 'army' < 'lying place, military camp' (cf. Germ. *liegen* 'lie', *legen* 'lay', *Lager*, Engl. *lair*).

It is against this background of words for 'army' directly inherited from PIE or secondarily formed in the IE langages and the semantic progressions involved that Lat. *exercitus* and *populus* should be considered.

Lat. *exercitus* 'army' belongs clearly to the second group. It is based on the notion 'training' (: *exercēre* 'to practise, exercise'); the semantic progression involved is: 'training' (esp. 'military training') > 'body of trained men, army'. The first attestation of *exercitus* 'army' is in Naevius: *Marcus Valerius consul partem exerciti/ in expeditionem ducit.* The meaning 'training' is still seen in Plautus (e.g. *Rud.*296: *pro exercitu gymnastico et palaestrico hoc habemus*); this shows that the semantic development 'training' > 'army' took place in, or, since

original and derived meanings can co-exist for a long time, before the third century. In preceding centuries the Latin word for 'army' can then have been *populus*.

Lat. *populus* 'army' can in theory: i) be directly inherited from PIE; ii) be a Latin formation to an inherited PIE root; iii) have the developed meaning of a word (whether inherited from IE, a Latin formation to an IE root or a loanword) for 'enemy', 'camp' etc.; iv) be borrowed from an IE or non-IE word for 'army'.

Buck 1919:9 judges the military application of terms for 'people' ('the people' > 'the people (in arms)' > 'the army': "a specialization inherent in the situation of a time of war") as in general "the natural and reasonable assumption, unless there is specific evidence to the contrary". The securest example which he cites is the Germanic group of words represented by Engl. *folk*, which derive from the same root as Lat. *plēbēs*, viz. PIE *pel-* 'fill'. Derivation from this root together with the prevailing meaning 'people' indicate 'crowd, people' as the original meaning and the meaning 'army' attested in a number of the Germanic languages as secondary: PIE *pĺ-go-*, OE. *folc* 'Schar, Heer, Volk', OHG. *folc* 'Haufe, Kriegshaufe, Volk'. To this can be added Hebrew *'ām* 'people, army'. Another example (from Buck 1949) might be Gr. στρατός 'army, host' (which is also attested as 'crowd, people', e.g. Pindar *P*.2.87; 11.7-8)/ Gr. στρατιά 'army' gen. 'host, company, band'.

It is generally held that the Greek nouns belong to the PIE root *ster/stŕ-* 'ausbreiten, ausstreuen': στρατός = OInd. *stŕtá-* 'spread out, extended' (cf. Lat. *sternere*, p.p.p *strātus*, Engl. *street*). This suggests that the development of στρατός to 'army' was through 'crowd, people'. The possibility of a development through 'camp, encamped army'

might also be left open, cf., for instance, Hom. *Il*.16.73, where contextually στρατός = 'camp': νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται, " 'jetzt aber kämpfen sie um das Lager' .....Daß hier offenbar wirklich das 'Feldlager' gemeint ist, geht auch aus dem sonstigen hom. Gebrauch von ἀμφιμάχεσθαι hervor" (Strunk 1964:87). Strunk himself, however, argues persuasively that στρατός is in origin a -*to*- formation to the zero grade of PIE *ster- 'niederstrecken, überwinden' (> OInd. stṛ-; stṛta- 'niedergestreckt'), while Gr. στρωτός-ή-όν 'spread, laid' is derived from PIE *sterh₃- 'hinstreuen, ausbreiten' (> OInd. stṛ-; stīrṇá 'ausgebreitet'). The semantic progression will have been : '*niederstreckbar' > '*Feindesheer' > 'Heer' > 'Volk' (103: "Für den jüngeren Teil der Wortgeschichte ist aus der vergleichenden Etymologie heraus lediglich damit zu rechnen, daß στρατός zunächst die Menge der Krieger bezeichnet hat und die gelegentliche nachhomerische Sinngebung 'Volk' erst daraus verallgemeinert worden ist").

Buck 1919 also allows that "any word for 'army' may be used figuratively to denote 'a great number'" (e.g. the transferred use of *exercitus* 'army' as 'multitude, host'). Buck 1949 makes the same point but with a shift in emphasis: "Several of these words (for 'army') are used secondarily for 'people, crowd'". To the examples noted above (OPers. *kāra*-, MIr. *cuire*, OHG. *heri*) are to be added: Lat. *hostis* 'army' > OFr. *ost* > Engl. *host*; Germ. *Schar* 'a division of the army, company of soldiers' > gen. 'crowd, throng'; and, most likely, Gr. στρατός.

Another example may be Gr. λᾱ(F)ός. In the Iliad the word (usu. pl.) means '(foot)soldiers'; in the Odyssey it almost always means 'men, people', the sense in which the word is used by later writers, where λᾱοί refers to the 'civil population', 'the people assembled' and 'the multitude'. Juret 1940 assumes that the term originally designated "les

hommes de guerre, sens qui domine chez Homère ... et qui explique les autres nuances' and later 'la masse des inhabitants d'une région ...". He is followed by other scholars, notably Alfred Heubeck (Gedanken zu Griech. λαός, Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani, Brescia 1969, II, 535-544), whose argument is based on a need to explain the concurrence of λᾱός and δῆμος in Mycenaean times. One might immediately object that the meaning 'soldiers' prevails in the Iliad precisely because it is a poem about peoples at war and that 'people' might perfectly well be the original meaning.

A derivative of λᾱός is attested in Myc. ra-wa-ke-ta (lawagetas), 'leader of the λᾱός, commander'. Military attributions for the ra-wa-ke-ta have been supposed on the basis of a meaning 'army' for λᾱός, a meaning which cannot be independently established; on the Mycenaean form compare, for instance, Lejeune 1969 (: "peut-être chef militaire") and Chantraine (: "probablement un chef militaire"). Certainly ra-wa-ke-ta indicates the holder of an important position in the state and is to be differentiated from wa-na-ka, 'sovereign, king'. Both titles were borrowed at a pre-Homeric date into Phrygian, where they are attested in a dedication to the ruler Midas (text M-01a in C. Brixhe; M. Lejeune, Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes, I. Texte, Paris 1984): midai lavagtaei vanaktei (dat.), 'to Midas, 1. and v.'. Since it is a Phrygian protocol to list titles in ascending order, one may assume that the rank of ra-wa-ke-ta was high but second to that of wa-na-ka; a significance 'leader of the army' would be consistent with this but is not proved by the Phrygio-Mycenaean evidence. Support for the meaning 'leader of the army' comes from a Hittite form related with λᾱός, viz. the directive laḫḫa, 'ins Feld, in den Krieg' (see E. Neu, Der Anitta-Text, Wiesbaden 1974, 60). There is, however, no conclusive evidence available.

To sum up, a consideration of the historical Latin and Umbrian evidence makes attractive the idea that Lat. *poplo-* underwent a progression in meaning from 'army' to 'people', a semantic progression for which there are typological parallels to hand in other IE languages. There are convincing arguments that the original meaning of Lat. *poplo-* was 'army'; the possibility cannot be ruled out completely that *poplo-* originally meant 'people' and was employed in the sense of 'folk army' and then 'hoplite army' until replaced by *exercitus* 'trained, professional army'.

2. The earliest attestaions of *populus* and *pūblicus*

The earliest forms of Lat. *populus* and its derivative *pūblicus* are now considered. The earliest epigraphic attestations of *populus*, which go back to 260 B.C. (CIL I² 25. the *Columna Rostrata*), are in *popl-* and mean 'people'. The antiquity of the word is demonstrated by the title *magister populi*, which dates back to the regal period, the cognomen *Poplicola*, the form *poploe* in the Carmen Saliare and the ceremony of the *poplifugia*, which dates back at least to the 390s B.C. *Poplicola*, *poploe* and *poplifugia* also show forms in *popl-*. The first epigraphic attestation of a form in *popul-* is from 123/122 B.C. (CIL I² 583, the *lex Acilia repetundarum*). That the form in *popul-* was known from c. 200 B.C. is clear from the plays of Plautus, in which *popul-* is the frequent form, but in which *popl-* is also attested (e.g. *Men.*451: *poplom*, *Cas.*536: *popli*, *Ps.*126: *poplo*). POPLO (CIL I² 725; Sullan era) is clearly an archaic form preserved in the official language.

The earliest epigraphic attestations of *populus* and *pūblicus* are tabulated below in chronological order :

	populus	*pūblicus/pūblicē*	
260 B.C.	*poplom*		CIL I² 25
189 B.C.	*poplus*		CIL I² 614
186 B.C.		*in poplicod*	CIL I² 581
179 B.C?	*poplo*		CIL I² 40
159 B.C.		*poplicae*	CIL I² 586
132 B.C.		*poplico/poplicas*	CIL I² 638
123/2 B.C.	*ΓοΓVL* *populove*	*publico,pobliceis*	CIL I² 583
117 B.C.		*poplici* *poplicum* *inpoplicum* (x3) *poplico* *publ.*	CIL I² 584
113/2 B.C.	*popul(ō)* *popolum*	*ΓοΓLICO* *poplice* (x2) *inpoplico*	CIL I² 582
111 B.C.	*populo* (x6) *populum* *populi* (x4) *populei*	*publicus, um* *publiceis* (x2) *publico* *publice* (x3) *publica* (x2) *publicano* *puoblicum*	CIL I² 585
III/II (after 268 B.C.)		*poblicai*	CIL I² 397
II?		*poublicom*	CIL I² 402
II?		*poublic*	CIL I² 403
?		*poblice*	CIL I² 1526
?		*de. peq. pob.*	CIL I² 1690
I	*poplo*		CIL I² 725

This evidence may be interpreted as follows:

poplos* > populus

CIL I² 25 *poplom* and the Plautine forms in *popul-* beside *popl-* show that *poplos* had developed to *populus* by the end of the third century; in the archaizing language of official inscriptions the development was resisted for about a century. No absolute date can be given for the development, since, given the archaizing nature of inscriptions, the spelling *popl-* of 260 B.C. might also have represented a pronunciation /popol/ or /popul/. The anaptyxis of *ŏ* (> *ŭ*) before velar *l* is regular (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§87), e.g. *pōclom* > *pōcolom* (CIL I² 439) > *pōculum*, *saeclum* > *saeculum*; hence, *popl-* > *popol-* > *populus*. The one known form in *popol-* (*popolum*, CIL I² 582, *lex Bantina*) could possibly be an archaizing form and attest the intermediate stage *popolos*, but this is unlikely because *popul(ō)* occurs in the same inscription; *popolum* should most likely be attributed to scribal error, or possibly to scribal variation in the spelling of the anaptyctic vowel.

That the attestations in *popl-* might be the product of syncope, as suggested for instance by Baudoux 1943:143 (i.e. *poplus* < *popelos*, *popolos* (or *populus*) (for *popelos* >*popolos* > *populus*, cf. *porcelos* (cf. Lith. *paršẽlis*) > *porcolos* > *porculus*) (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:113)), can be rejected; epigraphic and literary evidence shows that the form *popl-* is old and predates *popul-* (a development *popelos* > *popolos* > *poplos* > *popolos* > *populus* cannot be countenanced).

pŏplicos* > pūblicus

The development of EL. *pŏplicos* > CL. *pūblicus* is by general consensus attributed to the influence of *pūbes*, 'the adult male population' (e.g. Liv.1.16.2: *pubes Romana*), cf. EM: "*pūblicus*, qui pourrait être une contamination de

*pūbicus (non attesté, cf. cīvicus) et de poplicus".
Benveniste 1955 proposes that *pūbicē "les adultes en corps"
combines with poplicē "tout le peuple en corps" to form
pūblicē "au nom (ou aux frais) de l'État":

pŏp(u)lus :   poplicē
                              > pūblicē
pūbes   :   *pūbicē

The earliest epigraphic attestation *in poplicod* (CIL I² 581,
S.C. de Bacchanalibus) has a general meaning 'in public'
(which contrasts with *in preivatod* 'in private' in the same
inscription), also found in Pl.*St*.64, *Rud*.572. That *poplicē*
and *pūbicē* will have had roughly the same meaning of
'amongst the people, publicly' will have brought about their
contamination.

De Simone (in Stibbe 1980:91, n.92) disagrees on the grounds
that the contamination of *poplicos** and *pūbicos* would
presuppose that *poplicos** originally denoted "ciò che e
proprio all'insieme dei cittadini, ipotesi chiaramente
insostenibile". But the objection is not cogent. As a
derivative of *poplo-*, *poplicos** will have originally meant
'pertaining to the army, military', a meaning which was
lost, when the meaning of *poplo-* developed from 'army' to
'people': the adjective *poplicos** 'pertaining to the people'
subsequently underwent contamination with *pūbicos*. Since
the Roman name of the state, *rēs pūblica*, is likely to have
existed from the beginning of the Republic, it can be
confidently assumed that the adjective *poplicos** dates back
to at least the late sixth century. At this date it will
have meant 'pertaining to the army'. Since one of the
earliest attested meaning (Enn., Pl.) and probably the
original meaning of *rēs* is 'property, wealth' (cf. Av.
raēvant 'rich', OInd. *rai-* 'property, wealth'), *rēs pūblica*
designated originally 'property of the army', later

175

'property of the people; state'; the semantic progression may have involved a stage, in which *rēs* meant 'condition, state' (cf. *rēs secundae*), i.e. *rēs pūblica* = 'condition of the people, constitution, republic (as opposed to monarchy), state', cf. Pl.*Poen*.524 *praesertim in re populi placida atque interfectis hostibus.*

De Simone argues that the development *pŏpl- > pūbl-*, which he dates to the second century, is independent of contamination with **pūb-* and has an intermediary stage *poubl-*, cf. *puoblicum* (presumably for *poublicum*), *poublicom, poublic* and the cognomen *Poublilia* (CIL 42; c. 200-150), *Poulilio (= Poublilio ?)* (CIL 572; III/II). The proposed development *pŏpl- > poubl- > pūbl-* cannot be accepted because a short vowel cannot develop to a diphthong. *poubl-* cannot be an older form of *pūbl-*, but is only a reverse spelling (cf. *Loucios > Lūcius*); *poubl-* with diphthong [ou] either did not exist or was a stage in the blending of *popl-* and *pūb-*.

Wachter 1987:384ff. follows De Simone "der den Übergang *popl- > publ-* mit Recht als zu jung für diese istitutionalistische Erklärung hält". Wachter's main argument against the proposed contamination is that it is insufficient to explain the numerous (sic!) spellings "mit modernem *b* neben altem *o*, die man kaum alle wird als halb archaisierend erklären wollen". He proposes the phonetic development: *pŏpl- > poβl- > po^{u}βl- > pūbl-* ("Aus *Popl-* wurde durch Stimmhaftwerdung und Sonantisierung *Poƀl-*, wobei das *b* teils besser (wie in Italienisch), teils weniger gut hörbar war (wie in Spanischen), und endlich durch eine Art Pseudo- Diphthongierung die form *Po^{u}ƀl-*, wobei wegen der labialen Einrahmung kurze *o* noch geschlossener als sonst gewesen sein dürfte"). This proposal is completely ad hoc and must be rejected. Only six forms in *pobl-* are known

altogether (incl. the abbreviation *pob.* in CIL I² 1690; for a list see Wachter n.884); one must assume that they are the result of uncertainty as to pronunciation or scribal error, or are indeed false archaisms.

Contamination with *pūb-* is the only valid explanation for *pūblicus*. That this contamination actually took place in two stages is suggested by four metrically guaranteed Plautine forms in *pūpl-*: *Rud.*572, *St.*614 *pūplicum*, *Mer.*986 *pūplicu*, *Trin.*1057 *pūplicis*, cf. Cic.*Leg.*3.3.6: *AES. ARGENTUM AURUMVE. PUPLICE. SIGNANTO.* Hence one may assume the overall development:

> pŏplicos*
> > pūplicos*   >   pūblicus
> *pūbicos

The exact progression of the development is not clear. Lat. *pŏplic-* may have been directly modified to *pūplic-* and then to *pūblic-* under the influence of *pūbic-*; *pŏplic-* may have been directly modified to *pūplic-* under the influence of *pūbic-*, which in turn acquires *l* from *pūplic-*. Certainly it cannot be assumed that *pūbic-* is directly modified under the influence of *pŏplic-* because it would not then be possible to explain the forms in *pūpl-*. It is also possible that the forms *pobl-* and *poubl-* arose from the contamination of *pŏpl-* and *pūb-*, or that they constitute orthographic attempts to represent a stage in the development of *pŏpl-* to *pūbl-*.

We must add a note here on the Latin onomastic evidence. The praen. *Pūblius* is "zu allen Zeiten ziemlich verbreitet; von allen männlichen Römern hiessen gewöhnlich ca. 10 % *Publius*" (Salomies 1987:46); in inscriptions of Imperial date the name is attested as a gentilicium and as a cognomen (ib.:162.165, cf. above on *SPURIUS*). The most

important attestation comes from the *lapis Satricanus,* which is dated to shortly before c. 500 B.C.: <u>*popliosio*</u> *(valesiosio).* This form demonstrates that the earliest form of the praenomen was *Poplios,* as is confirmed by Fal. *popli(o), poplia* (Giacomelli 1963:212-13) and Gr. *Πόπλιος,* later *Πούπλιος, Πούβλιος* (Salomies 1987:45; Fraser and Matthews 1987:382). Onomastic evidence confirms, therefore, the antiquity of the nominal form *popl-.* One may add that the praenomen is not attested in the Sabellic languages. *PUPLECE* in three Umbrian grave tile inscriptions from Todi *(MA PUPLECE* (Ve. 232b), *CA PUPLE²CE MA FEL* (Ve. 232c), *TUPLEIA PU²PLECE* (Ve. 232d)) is a borrowing from Lat. *Pūblicius* (Umb. *fel* for Lat. *fil(ius)* also shows Latin influence). Indeed it is questionable whether the inscriptions are in fact Umbrian (see Meiser 1986:3, 4-5).

We may assume that the phonetic development *pŏpl- > pūbl-* in the personal name followed that of the adjective (or adverb) *pŏplicos* > *pūblicus.* CIL I² 1526 (*POPLILIO* next to *POBLICE*) and CIL I² 834 (*POPLICIO* next to *POPULI* and *PUBLICE*) show the development in the personal name to be later than in the adjective/ adverb. The origin of the praen. *Pūblius* is discussed below.

3. <u>The possibility of Indo-European origin</u>

The following section deals with the possibility of IE origin for Lat. *populus,* which is upheld by a number of scholars, cf. André 1978:54: "L' existence du redoublement est unanimement admise, bien que les etymologies diffèrent". Typical is the argument of Juret 1940, who, in accordance with the view that *populus* originally meant 'army', sees a connection between Lat. *populus* and Gr. *πόλεμος* 'combat, war'; he sees the concept of war which he defines for *πόλεμος* (: "la guerre avait essentiellement pour but une razzia") paralleled in Lat. *populārī,* both words being, in

his view, derived from the same root *pol-, reduplicated in the case of *populārī* < *po-pol-* or < *po-pl-* or < *po-pel-. This argument is invalid. In the IE languages the present has *i-* reduplication (: δίδωμι, ἀποδιδράσκω, *bibō*, *gignō*, *sīdō* < *si-zd-ō*, *sistō*) and the aorist and perfect *e-* reduplication (: λέ-λοιπα, *ce-cin-ī*, *pe-pul-ī*). In some Latin verbs this *e-* is assimilated to the vowel of the root, e.g. EL. *cecurrī* > CL. *cucurrī*, EL. *memordī* > CL. *momordī*. This cannot have occurred, however, in the case of *populārī* since Latin verbs which are reduplicated in the present have non-reduplicated perfect forms (*gignō - genui*), whilst those which are reduplicated in the perfect have non-reduplicated present forms (*dō - dedī*); no verb shows reduplication in both the present and perfect. In any case Lat. *populā-* is a denominative verb and the question of reduplication must be directed at the base noun *populus*. The EL. forms *poploe* and *popliosio* demonstrate that the consonant group *-pl-* is old (not the result of syncope) and to some extent obviate this question of reduplication.

The main argument offered, however, in favour of an IE origin for Lat. *populus* is, as Rix 1984b:n.7 puts it, that "il tipo morfologico a reduplicazione K_e-*KR-o* è abbastanza frequente nelle lingue indoeuropee". A reduplicated noun of this type is PIE *bʰe-bʰr-o* (to the root *bʰer-*, 'cut', cf. Lat. *ferīre*) > Lat. *fiber*, OHG. *bibar*. Rix supports an IE origin for Lat. *populus*, which was, in his view, inherited from PIE or borrowed from another IE language, but allows that "l'*etymon* non può essere definito con sicurezza".

Before considering the two PIE roots with which Lat. *populus* is commonly connected, it will be useful to record a few general points on nominal reduplication in the IE languages; the best treatment here is Tischler 1976 (see also André 1978. Leumann 1977:381-382 and W. Euler, Indoiranisch-Griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren

179

Indogermanische Grundlagen, Innsbruck 1979, 68-70). Leaving aside pet names, there are two formal or morphological types of nominal reduplication, each showing two semantic categories. The two formal types are <u>full</u> reduplication, which involves doubling of the whole root, and <u>partial reduplication</u>, where the root is only partially 'doubled'. The semantic motivation for the reduplication is the strengthening of the concept expressed by the base word: one can differentiate between <u>iterative</u> and <u>intensive</u> formations. Under iterativa Tischler differentiates between directly onomatopoeic forms, mostly animal names, which imitate the repeated sound, the song or cry, of the animal (e.g. Germ. *Wau-wau* 'dog', Lat. *upupa* 'hoopoe', OInd. *kiki-* 'peacock', cf. also Gr. βάρβαρος 'one who says *barbar*, foreigner', OInd. *gárgaraḥ* 'whirlpool') and, less productive, indirectly onomatopoeic forms, in which "nicht Schalleindrücke, sondern von anderen Sinnesorganen wahrgenommene Ereignisse durch Lautwiederholungen dargestellt werden" (e.g. OInd. *rērihá-* 'leckend'). Intensiva are forms, in which the feature or action of the base word is increased or intensified; intensiva, especially with partial reduplication, do not constitute a distinct type in the IE languages (e.g. Gr. πέπλος 'any woven cloth' < *pe-pl-o-* to the root *pel-* 'cover', OInd. *mahāmaha-* 'very powerful'). While in verbal formation, reduplication often lost its original semantic significance and became a mechanical means of formation, the same is not true for nominal formation; in this case nouns of a plural, dual or collective meaning such as Gr. δίδυμοι 'twins' are formed, and the type is infrequent (cf. Tischler: "... die nominale Reduplikation (als vom Affekt befreites Bildungsmittel) [ist] dem Indogermanischen ... von Haus aus fremd"). There are a number of reduplicated nouns in Latin, where the motivation for reduplication is not clear, e.g. *furfur* 'husks of grain'.

Since Lat. *populus* does not show full reduplication and does not have an apparent plural or dual meaning, the possibility must be taken into consideration that it is a partially reduplicated form and is iterative or intensive; this possibility must be tested against the PIE roots with which *populus* has been connected. These are *pel-* and *kʷel-*.

i) *pel-, *plē-* 'pour, fill; full'; the derivatives, referring to abundance and multitude, include Lat. *(com-)pleō, plēnus, plērus, plēbēs (> plēbs)*, Umb. *plener*, Hom. πλεῖος, Gr. πλήθω, πλῆθος. The similarity in meaning of Gr. πλῆθος 'a great number, multitude, esp. of people; people; the commons' and Lat. *plēbēs* 'the general body of citizens', both from PIE *plē-dʰ-*, suggests that the PIE word too is likely to have referred to the 'fullness or mass of people'. Assuming this to be true, there is no obvious motivation for creating another noun for 'people' to the same root. The formation of a noun 'army' to a root *pel-* 'fill' lacks semantic motivation; the formation is not paralleled in any other IE language.

There is, moreover, a phonological objection to the hypothesis of a reduplicated *pe-pl-o-* > Lat. *poplo-*: PIE ĕ = Lat. ĕ (*bʰĕrō* > *fĕrō* etc.). The environment of the change of ĕ > ŏ (*pep-* > *pop-*) fulfils none of the conditions known for this change in Latin (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§53,2) and could only be assigned to ad hoc assimilation. The same argument applies to the Umbrian form. It also applies to other PIE roots *pel-*: *pel-* 'stoßend oder schlagend in Bewegung setzen, treiben', cf. Lat. *pellō < *pel-nō*; *pel-* 'fold', cf. Lat. *duplex*; *pel-* 'verdecken, verhüllen', cf. Lat. *pellis*.

Partial reduplication with *o*-vowel is a known type, but this is a "Sonderfall der slavischen Sprachen und des

Litauischen" (Gerhard Meiser: personal communication), cf. Bulg. *бóбър*, Lith. *bãbras*, Pol. *bóbr* 'beaver' (for a survey of the Slavic forms see F. Sławskiego (ed.), Słownik Prasłowiański, Tom I, 1974, 290f.). Tischler 1976:24 comments that "vereinzelt und wohl sekundär sind Fälle (sc. of partial reduplication) mit Reduplikationsvokal *o*". He cites three forms (: "alle wohl ursprünglich mit Reduplikationsvokal *e*"); these are: Gr. *κοσκυλμάτια* to *σκύλλω*, Lat. *poples* (see below), Russ. *pópelъ*, which is secondary to *pépelъ*. Proto-Lat. *po-pl-o- (> *poplo-*) may be reconstructed only if it is assumed that the vowel of reduplication is secondary.

Two forms deserve individual attention; these are Gr. *πόλεμος* 'war, combat' (cf. Frisk, II 574f.; IEW 801) and Lat. *pōpulus* 'poplar' (cf. WH, II 340), both derivatives of PIE *pel- 'schütteln → zum Zittern bringen → erschrecken'. The older form is *pōpulus*, which shows the primary meaning of the root ('schütteln') and full reduplication: *pol-pol-o- 'that which swings and swings' > *pōpolo- (with compensatory lengthening) > Lat. *pōpolo-*, cf. OCS. *topolъ* (see Arumaa 1976:∮167), which shows the dissimilation of *p-p* to *t-p* and the dissimilatory loss of *-l-* before *-p-* without compensatory lengthening. Gr. *πόλεμος* is related to *πελεμίζω* 'swing, shake, cause to quiver or tremble' (the internal vowel *-ε-* in both forms must be the reflex of *h₁*, which disappears without trace in Latin); it is a *-mo-* formation to the *o*-grade of the root *pel-, in origin probably a nomen actionis with the meaning 'swinging (of a weapon)' (cf. Frisk: "urspr. vom Schwingen der Lanze"). The existence of full reduplication in Lat. *pōpulus* constitutes an argument against the assumption that Lat. *populus* is also in origin a reduplicated noun to *pel-. Gr. *πόλεμος* permits the reconstruction of a nomen agentis *polós 'the one who swings (a weapon)', for which one could assume a reduplicated (collective?) form *pe-pl-o-s '?army'. Since one cannot

182

easily assume a variant *po-pl-o-s for Proto-Latin, the -o-
of popl- (> populus) remains the obstacle to the assumption
of IE origin.

ii) *kᵂel- 'move, turn; circle', cf. Gr. πέλομαι. Lat.
populus (< *kᵂe-kᵂl-o-) has been judged to be a derivative
of *kᵂel- with the meaning 'circle of people' (see André
1978:54 for bibliography). Since, however, a) PIE *kᵂĕ- >
Lat. quŏ- > cŏ- (e.g. *pekᵂō > *quequō > coquō, *kᵂelō >
colō, Proto-Ital. *kᵂel(h)o-h₃no-s > *kᵂelōnos > colōnus
(see Rix 1989b:235)) and b) PIE *-kᵂl- would give Lat. -kl-
(-cl-) since the labial element of *kᵂ is lost in Latin
before all consonants (e.g. *sokᵂios > socius), the expected
development of the proposed form into Latin would be: *kᵂe-
kᵂl-o- > Lat. *coclo-.

PIE *kᵂ gives Sab. p in all positions (e.g. *kᵂis (cf. Hitt.
kuis) > Osc. pis (Lat. quis); *kᵂetuor- > Umb. petur 'four';
Osc. PÚMPERIAÍS, derived from *pompe 'five' < Sab. *kᵂonkᵂe
< Proto-Ital. *kᵂenkᵂe < PIE *penkᵂe). The Latin form could
then only be explained as a borrowing from Sabellic,
probably from Umbrian, cf. the dialect word Lat. lupus
(: Gr. λύκος, PIE *ulkᵂos):

	PIE	*kᵂe-kᵂl-o-
>	Proto-Sab.	*kᵂo-kᵂl-o-
>	Umb.	*po-plo-
>	Lat.	po-plo-

This etymology is not subject to the same phonological
objection encountered by PIE *pe-pl-o- > Lat. poplo- since
Proto-Sab. e appears as o between labio-velars. It is,
however, unsatisfactory on two counts. Firstly, Lat.
populus, whether it originally meant 'army' or 'people', as
a borrowing from PIE *kᵂe-kᵂl-o would be semantically
unparalleled amongst realizations of the PIE word in other

183

IE languages, which Tischler 1976:8 describes as an iterativum (indirectly onomatopoeic): OInd. *cakrá-*, 'Wagenrad, Scheibe, Kreis', Av. *čaxra-* 'Rad', Gr. *κύκλος* 'Kreis', Gr. pl. *κύκλοι/κύκλα* 'Räder', OE. *hwēol*, Engl. *wheel*, Toch. A *kukäl*, B *kokale* 'Wagen'. This would mean then that the word for 'wheel, circle' had developed in Umbrian to 'army'. Secondly, Lat. *populus* has a cognate form in only one other IE language, namely Umbrian. If Lat. *populus* is regarded as a borrowing from Umbrian, this would mean that the word under discussion is directly attested in only one IE language, which makes an IE origin very uncertain[2].

It is interesting to note that Eric Hamp (*AJPh* 75, 1954, 186-89) derives Lat. *poples* 'the knee joint, the knee' via Osco-Umbrian from PIE **kʷe-kʷl-o-*. The semantic progression involved, namely 'that which turns' > 'knee joint', is partially paralleled by the realization of the PIE word in Lith. *kãklas* and Latv. *kokls*, 'that which turns' > 'neck', where it also designates a part of the body. (Interesting too is the fact that the Lith./Latv./Lat. words for 'wheel' are cognate: *ratas, rats, rota*). If Hamp's etymology, which is attractive but not certain (why *-es, -itis,* and not *-os, -ī* ?), is correct, it would constitute another objection to the assumption that PIE **kʷe-kʷl-o-* > Lat. *poplo-*, since the PIE word survives in *poples*. Gordon Messing's suggestion (in: *Studies presented to Joshua Whatmough*, 'S-Gravenhage 1957, 173-78) of borrowing from Umb. **poplets* < O-U. **poplehts* < PIE **po-plekts-* 'the bender, that which is bent' (cf. Lat. *plectō*, Gr. *πλέκω*) is unlikely; there is no cognate or semantic parallel available. Messing's idea, however, that *poples* was borrowed from Umbrian as a technical term of battle - the back of the knee was a sensitive point, not covered by defensive armour, where a wound could put a warrior out of action - might, however, provide a clue to the origin of the word; it suggests a connection with Lat. *populus* 'army', i.e. it is possible

that the origin of Lat. *poples*, which has no secure etymology, is the same as that of Lat. *populus*.

Another argument put forward in favour of an IE origin (as opposed to an Etruscan origin) for Lat. *populus*, and one which leads on to a discussion of the Etruscan evidence, is that since the socio-political terminology of Etruscan is well known (cf. above on Etr. *spura-*, *meθlum*, *cilθ*) there can be no place in Etruscan for a **puple/*puplu* 'people'.

Etr. *rasna*, of which there are nine recent attestations, has been generally interpreted as 'Etruscan' following the report of Dion. Hal.1.30 that *Rasenna* was the name of an Etruscan leader from whom the Etruscans derived their name, while the Romans called them *'Ετρουσκοι* or *Τουσκοι* from the country they once inhabited. Rix 1984b argues that "da un significato 'etrusco' risultano problemi grammaticali o interpretativi più o meno gravi per tutti i testi nei quali occorre l'etr. rasna"; he interprets *rasna* as the equivalent of Lat. *populus* 'people'. The most important piece of evidence is Vs 1.179 (IV/III) ... *meχlum: rasneas [3]clevsinsl [:] zilaχnγe*, cf. Ta 7.59 (350-325) *...zilaθ: amce: meχl: rasnal...*; Ta 1.184 (III) *...zilaθ [. meχ-.] rasnas...*

Following the traditional interpretation of *rasna*, *meχl-rasneas clevsinsl* would be 'nominis etrusci Clusini/della lega etrusca chiusina' (cf. Cristofani 1985b:129-130, who interprets *zilaθ meχl rasnal* as 'praetor nominis Tusci'), which makes no sense since the Etruscan 'lega' was not limited to the people of Chiusi. If, as Rix argues, *meχ-rasneas = rēs populi = rēs pūblica*, the translation of Vs 1.179 would be 'rei-autem populi Clusinae praeturam egit', which poses no semantic difficulty. The parallel expressions on cippi *tular śpural* 'boundaries of the community'/ *tular raśnal* 'boundaries of the people' recommends the equation

rasna = *populus*, which excludes an Etruscan origin for Lat. *populus* 'people'.

Rix attempts further to weaken the case for the Etruscan origin of Lat. *populus* 'army' by accounting for the distinction made by Dion. Hal. on the assumption that that Gr. Τυρσηνοί, Umb. *Turskum* (nomen) and Lat. *Tuscī* are transformations of the original Etruscan name while *rasna*, like *populus*, originally designated that part of the population of Etruria which had political responsibility, i.e. that part which also furnished the military. It is in III/II BC, when the right of citizenship was conceded even to the πενέσται, that the word serves to designate "tutta la popolazione libera dell'Etruriae". The original meaning of both *rēs pūblica* (popl- : CIL I 586.8) and *meχ- rasnal* will have been, according to Rix, "patrimonio delle milizie"; the semantic progression from "patrimonio delle milizie" to "stato" presupposes "un cambio politico rispetto alla facoltà di disporre sul patrimonio militare. È ovvio cercare questo cambio nel passaggio dalla monarchio allo stato republicano, verificatosi, in date diverse tanto a Roma quanto nelle singole città-stato dell'Etruria. Ma a questo punto il glottologo deve lasciare il campo agli storici" (p. 467).

The equivalence of Etr. *meχ* to Lat. *rēs* and Etr. *rasna* to Lat. *populus* 'people' is convincingly demonstrated, but it is difficult to assume that *rasna/ meχ- rasnal* had the same progression of meaning as the corresponding terms in Latin. The date of the semantic shift from 'army' to 'people' proposed for *rasna*, which is surprisingly late, as well as the occurrence of the semantic shift itself, could only be confirmed if the meaning of *rasna* in the *liber linteus* (LL XI.f5: *rasna. hilar*), which is of recent date but goes back to a probable fifth century model, could be shown to be 'army'. Comparison between *rasna.hilar*; Cl 8.5 *tular: hilar:*

186

and Fs 8.3 *tular. śpural. hil*, together with the occurrence of *hamφeθiś* at LL XI.f4 and *hamφes* at LL XI.f6, suggests rather that the discourse here could be about common land or *ager pūblicus* (see Pfiffig 1969:272).

One might suggest that perhaps *zilaθ meχl rasnal*, which is equivalent to Lat. *praetor rei publicae*, is perhaps a calque on the Latin formula; Etr. *meχ- rasnal* (two substantives, nom. + gen.) could have been based on Lat. *rēs populi*. This would account for the the fact that *meχ rasnal* occurs only in combination with *zilaθ*.

If *populus* is of Etruscan origin, then only the meaning 'army' and not 'people' comes into question for the Etruscan source. If indeed Lat. *populus* comes from Etruscan and from the very first meant 'army' (which is the more probable interpretation), the Etruscan source was almost certainly a military word, very probably 'army'.

4. The Etruscan evidence

The possibility that *populus* is of Etruscan origin may now beconsidered in detail. *Populus* is frequently used by Livius and other writers for the twelve confederate cities of Etruria, e.g. Liv.1.8.3; 4.23.5; 9.37.12; D.S.14.113; Flor.*Epit*.1.12.17. This usage would hardly of itself suggest an Etruscan origin for *populus*, but if on other grounds it should seem probable that *populus* is Etruscan, then the preference for the word in writing of Etruria would slightly increase rather than lessen the probability.

Pallottino (Etruscologia, 1984[7], 489-490) argues for Etr. **puple* (> Lat. *populus*) on the basis of a correspondence of root seen in other nouns and personal/divine/mythological names: "è possibile dall'esame dei nomi propri ricostruire radici etrusche non testimoniate in appellativi". On the

analogy of such pairings as the appellatives *avil*, *clan*, *ziχ*, *θesan*, *mlac*, *σuθi*, *spur-* beside praen. *avile*, cogn. *claniu*, cogn. *zicu*, theon. *θesan*, mythological figure *mlacuχ*, gent. *σuθiena-*, praen. *spurie*, Pallottino reconstructs from the personal names *pupli*, *puplie*, *puplina*, *fufle*, the theonym *fufluns* and the toponym *pupluna*, *fufluna* an appellative **puple*.

The relationship between an appellative and a personal name is normally that the appellative is primary and used to describe a person. The attestations of the Etruscan personal name in *pupl-* are partly gentilicia, derived with the suffix *-na* from the individual name. If one wishes to reconstruct an appellative from a gentilicium, one must demonstrate the passage from the gentilicium via the individual name to the appellativum and thereby make clear the motive for the use of the appellativum as an individual name. Pallottino makes no attempt to demonstrate this. The three types of proper name employed by Pallottino for the reconstruction of an Etr. **puple* are discussed below.

First a similar argument must be mentioned. Devoto 1932 suggests that Lat. *populus* is derived from Etr. **puple*, which is found in *puplie*, *pupluna* and *fufluns*: **puple* means, in his view, "crescere" and *fufl-* is related to *pupl-*. Comparison is made between the names *hercule fufluns vesuna svutaf* inscribed on an Etruscan mirror (Van der Meer 1987:fig. 21), and Umb. *vesune puemunes pupřiçes* 'to Vesona of Pomonus Poplicus' (IgT. IV 3-4, cf. IV 10,12,25-26). Devoto supposes that by analogy with *Pomona matura* (cf. *Pomonus Poplicus*) *poplicus*, which he renders as *popdicus*, means 'mature', an apt epithet for a god of fruits and agriculture, and that as Umb. *tuder* developed from Etr. *tular* (sic! - see §I.7.) so Umb. *popdicus* developed from Etr. *pupl-*, which means, therefore (i.e. following his first supposition) 'crescere'.

Devoto's argument is that as there is an obvious correspondence between Umb. *vesune* and Etr. *vesuna* (see §I.7.: the Etruscan theonym is borrowed from Umbrian), there is also a correspondence between Umb. *popdicus* and Etr. *fufluns*. *Popdicus* goes back to an Etruscan *pupl-*, which, Devoto 1932:248 believes, is the alternative form of *fufl-*, as exemplified by attestations of the toponym *pupluna/fufluna*: "*Pupřiko* risalirebbe dunque a un *PUPL-*etrusco: un nucleo *PUPL* sarebbe alla base del compagno umbro di Vesona, come un nucleo *FUFL* stà alla base del compagno della Vesona etrusca. È lecito vedere in questo l'alternanza etrusca *PUPL-FUFL*, l' alternanza stessa che abbiamo visto nel toponimo". Devoto's theory is invalid since a connection between *pupl-* and *fufl-* cannot be demonstrated (see below). Furthermore, the generally held development in Umbrian of *l'* > *d* > *ř* on the basis of which Devoto translates *pupřiçes/pupřike* as *popdicus - popdicus* is not attested in Umbrian - has been disproved by Meiser 1986:206ff.,esp. 214-216; Meiser argues that, since only intervocalic *-d-* > *-ř-* and since the *l'* of *poppliko-* was never intervocalic, *poppliko-* developed directly to *pupřiko-*; there was no intermediate stage *popdiko-*. One may add that the connection which Devoto makes between Etr. *pupl-* and the designation *popdicus* for the god of vegetation is his single argument for the meaning 'crescere', which is not suggested by *puplie* or *pupluna* to which he also refers.

In the reconstruction of an Etr. *puple* Pallottino and Devoto employ three (onomastic) sources of evidence:

In Etruscan texts there are 23 attested <u>personal</u> <u>names</u> with the base *pŭpl-*; all except two (as indicated) are of recent date. The <u>praenomen</u> *puplie-s* (gen.) is attested in one inscription of archaic date: Vs 1.29 (VI/V). In recent inscriptions *pupli* (< *puplie-*) is attested three times as a praenomen (Cl 1.2079, 1.2080, 1.2344) and three times as a

189

'Vornamengentilicium' (Cl 1.750, 1.2177, 1.2178). The abbreviated form *pup* is attested in the bilingual inscription Pe 1.313, where it renders the Latin abbreviation *P.* for the praenomen *Pūblius*: *pup velimna* = *P. VOLVMNIVS*. The 'Vornamengentilicium' *pupiliś* in Cl 1.2296 shows anaptyxis. The praenomen is attested as a cognomen in Cl 1.2179 *pup[liś]*. In Archaic Etruscan there is one attestation of the <u>gentilicium</u>: OB 3.1 (VI) *pupliana*, which we may interpret as a phonetic variant of **pupliena* (: **púpliena* > **pupliəna* > *pupliana*) on the model of *spuriana - spuriena-* (see §II.1.). Attestations of recent date are *puplina* (Cl 1.430, 1.431, 1.432, 1.433, 1.2109), *puplinal* (Cl 1.894, 1.907, 1.2456), *puplinas* (AT 1.23, 1.24), *pupline* for *puplinei** (Cl 1.2180), *puplnal* (Pe 1.1163); *puplnal* without *-i-* is curious (cf. infra).

Since the formation of individual names with the suffix *-io-* is an Italic phenomenon (e.g. Lat. *Gaius*, Osc. *statis*; see §II.1.), Etr. *puplie-* is generally considered to be of Italic, specifically Latin, origin (see Rix 1956:158, 1963:345,349ff.; Steinbauer 1983:222-223). Additional arguments brought forward are that the archaic attestation *puplies* comes from a cemetery at Orvieto, where many inscriptions bear names of Italic origin (: Vs 1.29 *mi puplies tatanas* 'I (am the tomb) of Puplie Tatana'; one notes that the gentilicium is native, formed to the praenomen *tata-*) and that the use of the name for freedmen is consistent with foreign (i.e. Latin) origin (: Cl 1.2079 *pupli petinate(ś) lautni* 'Pupli, freedman of Petinate', Cl 1.2080 *pupli: petinateś: lautni*; the same freedman is intended in these inscriptions so that *pupli* is found in effect just once for a freedman). Etr. *puplie-* as a borrowing from EL. *Poplio-* poses no problems; indeed it finds a number of parallels among Etruscan praenomina in *-ie* of Italic origin, cf. above on Etr. *cavies, vipies* etc.

Other scholars prefer Etruscan origin for the Roman praenomen, cf. De Simone 1981:101: "... *Poplios* ... e *Spurius* sono chiaramente di origine etrusca"; Salomies 1987:45: "anscheinend etruskisch". Etr. *puplie-* as the source of EL. *Poplio-* with Lat. *ŏ* for Etr. *ŭ* (cf. Etr. **pŭrze-na*, gent. to *purze-* (Vs 1.160) > Lat. *Pŏrsenna*) is also possible; the borrowing would find a parallel in Etr. *spŭrie* > Lat. *Spŭrius*, which demonstrates, however, that we might also expect Lat. ***Puplio-* from Etr. *puplie-*. As a native individual name in *-ie puplie-* would find a number of parallels in Etruscan, cf. above on Etr. *θamrie-*, *maclaie* etc.

The possibility cannot be ruled out that *puplie-* was formed to Etr. *pupl-* in Etruria either by native speakers or by Italic immigrants. An Italic origin must, however, be preferred, not least because the name is poorly attested in Archaic Etruscan. The form *puplnal* without *-i-* may provide an argument consistent with Italic origin. The absense of *-i-* is curious because it cannot be the result of syncope, cf. above on arc. *spuriena-* > rec. *spurina*. The pair rec. *puplinal* – *puplnal* finds a parallel in the gentilicia rec. *apinal* – *apnas*, which also shows the 'loss' of *-i-*; attested forms are Vs 1.41 (VI/V) *apịnas*, which we must attribute to the transitional period between Archaic- and Neo-Etruscan, AS 1.316 (rec.) *apinal* (metronymic), Cl 1.1244 (rec.) *apịṇal* (metronymic), Cl 1.1245 (rec.) *apini*, Ta 1.83 (II) *apnas*. From the gentilicium rec. *apina-* it is possible to reconstruct arc. **apiena-*, whose phonetic variant *apiana-* is attested in Fs 1.4 (arc.) *mi avileš apianaš*; from **apiena-* we may extract the praenomen **apie*, which may be an Italic borrowing (cf. Lat. *Appius*). From the gentilicium arc. *apenas* (Vs 1.98, 1.120) we may extract a praenomen *ape-*, which may be taken as an Etruscanized form of **apie* on the model of native praenomina in *-e* such as *avile*; there is also a praenomen *vipe* (e.g. in Vs 1.233) beside *vipie-*,

which is of Italic origin (see p.108). Rec. *apina-* is from arc. **apiena*; rec. *apna-* from arc. *apena-*. Hence *puplnal* (? < **puplena-*) may indicate the existence of a praenomen **puple*, which may be interpreted as the Etruscanized form of *puplie-*, in which case we must assume that *puplie-* is of Italic origin. It is also possible that Etruscanization first took place in the gentilicium, i.e. **puplena-* was formed on the model of **avilena*, *apena-*, *velena-* etc.; a praenomen **puple* may perhaps have been avoided if this was homophonous with an Etruscan appellative. Further study of pairs of the type *apina- - apna-* is a desideratum.

If *puplie-* is of Latin origin, this does not make it less likely that Lat. *pŏplo-* 'army' was borrowed from Etruscan. We may assume that the praenomen Lat. **Poplios/* Etr. *puplie* was in origin a substantive with the meaning 'belonging to an army, fighter, warrior'.

There are 19 attestations of the Etruscan theonym *fufluns* in inscriptions (on mirrors, vessels of various types (cups, drinking horns, vases), bullae and the bronze liver of Piacenza) dating from the early fifth century. These are: Vc 4.1 (early V) *fuflun(s)l paχies velclθi*; Vc 4.2 (early V) *fuflunsul paχies velclθi*; Vc 4.3 (early V) *fuflunsl paχ(ies)*; La S.1 (475-450) *eşia arţame[s] fu(flu)nus menarva*; Vc S.12 (late V) *semla fufluns apulu*; Vc 4.4 (V) *[fuflunsl pJaχies*; Cl S.9 (350-325) *semla fufluns areaθa sime*; OI S.24 (IV) *helenaia fufluns arifaθaJ*; Vs S.21 (300-250) *aminθ eiasun fufluns araθa castur*; Vs S.15 (late IV/early III) *svutaφ vesuna fufluns h(e)rcle*; Cl S.13 (III) *laran fuflun[s] [σeθJḷạnş mariσ*; Um 4.1 (III) *fuflunz*; Um 4.2 (III) *fuflunz*; Pa 4.2 (rec.) *fufluns(l), fuflu(n)s(l)*; Pe 7.2 (rec.) *apulu fufluns*; Ve 4.3 (rec.) *mi fu[flunsll*; OB 7.1 (IV/III; fake?) *fufluns apulu*; OB 7.2 (rec.; fake?) *apulu fufluns*. To these attestations we may add the tile

inscription Vs 6.4 (late III/ II) *[a]v: fuflunzl*, where
fuflunzl appears to have the function of a gentilicium after
the abbreviation *av* for the praenomen *aule*.

The etymology of Etr. *fufluns* has recently been discussed by
Meiser 1986:215-216 and by Rix:op. cit., who argue that it
is a borrowing from a Sabellic, probably Umbrian, theonym,
cognate with Lat. *flōs*. One attestation of *fufluns* comes
from Praeneste and two from Todi; this suggests some form of
Etruscan presence in Latium and Umbria and would be
consistent with the theory that an Italic divinity
*foflūns/ *fuflūns was adopted by the Etruscans or formed
part of a Sabellic substratum in Etruscan.

For PIE we can reconstruct the verbal root **bʰlē-* (<
*bʰleh₁-) together with the *o*-grade **bʰlō-* (< **bʰloh₁-*)
"blühen" (see IEW 122), reflexes of which are to be seen,
for instance, in Goth. *blōma*, ON. *blōm*. The enlarged form
*bʰlōdʰ-, known from several IE languages including MIr.
bláth, is also present in Lat. *flōs* (< **flōdʰs* < **bʰlōdʰs*
< **bʰloh₁dʰ-s*) and in its derivatives (e.g. *flōreō*) and
Sabellic cognates (e.g. Osc. dat. sg. *fluusaí* 'Flōrae'). A
form **bʰel-* (without laryngeal) may be reconstructed on the
basis of OIr. *bile*, MIr. *bileóc* and a form **bʰol-* on the
basis of Lat. *folium* (see Rix (forthcoming a)).

Rix argues that the ending *-uns* of *fufluns* is the reflex of
the Italic suffix *-ōnos/-ūnos* (*-o-h₃no-*, *-u-h₃no-*) with
which theonyms are built from etyma in final *-o-/-u-*, cf.
Bellōna, Pomōna (cf. above, §III.1.). As a theonym borrowed
from Sabellic, Etr. *fufluns* finds many parallels (see
§I.7.); as a theonym in *-Vns* it finds specific parallels in
Etr. *neθuns* < Umb. **Nehtūns* and Etr. *selvans* < Umb.
*Silvāns. Rix assumes a <u>proto form **bʰo-bʰl-o-*</u> 'cio che
fiorisce, germina, cresca; la vegetazione; l' altero; l'
edera' (to **bʰol-*), which develops > <u>Proto-Sab. **foflo-h₃no-*</u>

(with -$\breve{V}h_3no-$ > -$\bar{V}no-$) > *foflōn(o)s_ 'signore della
vegetazione, degli alberi, dell' edera' > Umb. *foflūns_
(perhaps with assimilation to *fuflūns_) > Etr. fuflūns_
(the length of the vowel $\bar{u}$ in Etruscan is clear from the
fact that it is never syncopated). Rix also holds the
Etruscan individual name rec. *fufle* to be of Umbrian origin;
attested forms are the cognomen *fufle*, with which he
compares the Latin cognomen *Flōrus*, the filiation *fufl[e]ś*
and the gentilicia f. *fufalnei* (with anaptyxis), m. *fuflnies*
(references are given below). He argues that "le regole
morfologiche dell' etrusco non permettono di stabilire una
relazione tra *fufluns* e *fufle*".

Meiser 1986:215-216, on the other hand, reconstructs from
*$b^h l\bar{o}$- plus the nominal suffix *-$d^h lo$- a substantive
*$b^h l\bar{o}$-$d^h lo$- > *$fl\bar{o}$-βlo- > (with dissimilation) *$f\bar{o}\beta lo$-
"Blühort; Garten", from which a theonym ("Herr des Gartens")
is formed by the addition of the possessive suffix -h_3no-
(as Rix).

Both etymologies are controversial because they assume the
reconstruction not only of a theonym, of which there is no
trace in Sabellic, but also of additional forms, namely an
individual name *Foflo-* and a noun *$f\bar{o}\beta lo$- (cf. Lat. *hortus*,
Osc. *húrz* 'garden'!). Rix's etymology is in addition
problematic because he operates with '*o* reduplication', a
rare phenomenon, of which there is no certain example in the
Italic languages (see above).

The decisive factor in favour of Sabellic origin is the long
vowel in *fuflūns* (see Rix 1985a:ƒ9). For this reason one may
suggest that the theonym is either an Italicized form (i.e.
fuflun → *fuflūns* on the model of *neθūns*; Rix 1981:125 does
not entirely exclude the possibility that *fufluns* is derived
from an Etruscan name in -*n*, cf. the native theonyms *θesan*,
laran, *turan*) or a hybrid form (composed of Etr. *fufl-* +

194

Sab. -ūns on the model again of *neθūns*, cf. the hybrid *culś-anś-*). The second alternative may be preferred since a) **fuflun* is not attested, and b) to a base noun *fufl-* we may derive the individual name *fufle* on the model of the praenomen arc. *avile* from *avil* 'year'.

The following attestations of the Etruscan <u>toponym</u>, all coin legends, are known; their date, following Rix, Etruskische Texte, is IV/III unless otherwise indicated: from **Castella Marittima** NU N.15 *pupluna*; from **Populonia** NU N.17 *[pupJJuna* (2+ ex), NU N.19 (II) *puplſunaJ* (2 ex), NU N.21 (rec.) *puplụſnaJ*, <u>NU N.22 *pupluna* (ca. 100 ex)</u>, NU N.26 (rec.) *puflſunaJ*, NU N.27 (III) *[pupJluna*, NU N.29 (late IV/III) *mi puſpJuna les (?)J* (2 ex), NU N.30 (III) *pufluna vetalu* (2+ ex), NU N.31 (III) *fufluna vetalu χa*; from **Sovana** NU N.16 (350-250) *[puJpluſnaJ*, NU N.18 *puſpJflunſaJ* (2 ex), NU N.20 *puplana* (4-7 ex), NU N.28 *mi: pupluna: les:* (2-11 ex) from **Val d' Orcia** NU N.23 *[pupJlunſaJ*, NU N.24 *pupſlunaJ*, NU N.25 *[puJflunſaJ* (9 ex).

To sum up, all coins are of recent date, even if precise dates have not been agreed upon (see H.H. Scullard, The Etruscan Cities and Rome, London 1967, 145; Cristofani 1976:211; 1985b:127). They come for the most part from Populonia. Attested forms are *pupluna* (100+ ex), *puplana* (4-7 ex), *pufluna* (14 ex) and the unicum *fufluna*. The reading *fufluna* of NU N.31, now lost, is disputed. It is generally agreed that, if the reading is correct, it results from a deliberate allusion to the theonym *fufluns* and does not necessarily attest to a relationship between the two names. The other forms are discussed below.

Rix (forthcoming a) derives the toponym from its θεὸς ἐπώνυμος, a god whose origin is, in his view, Sabellic, formed from *poplo-* 'army'. From *poplo-* + *-h₃no-* he derives a pair of theonyms: f. *Pop(u)lōna*, which is attested in

Latin, and m. *Poplōnos, which "da presupporre per il sabellico, maschile come in umbro i teonimi Poemōno- e Vōfiōno-". In Italic *Poplōnos + -iā → Populōnia; in Etruscan *puplūne (< Sab. *Poplōnos) + -na → puplūna (the long vowel ū appears certain, cf. supra on fuflūns).

This etymology for pupluna is not convincing, not least because the theonym *Poplōnos/*puplune is attested in neither Italic nor Etruscan, nor is there any literary or pictorial evidence for the existence of such a god. Indeed if there had been a Sabellic deity *Poplōn(o)s, one would expect the Etruscan borrowing to have been *pupluns (cf. neθuns, selvans). In theory the base of pupluna could have been Lat. Poplōna (: in Etruscan *puplūna + -na > puplūna), but this is unlikely, not only because of the lack of literary/ pictorial evidence for the cult of a Poplōna in Etruria. but also because Poplōna is not a deity but the epithet or title of Juno (note: there is no attestation of uni from Populonia). A more plausible argument would be that Etr. *puplūne came from Lat. *Poplōnos, cf. Lat. *Marcos > Etr. marce. It is, however, more natural to assume that the Romans learned the name of the Etruscan city, which has a history going back to at least the tenth century, from the Etruscans (: pupluna > Populōnia) rather than that the two names had separate formations; in learning the name of the Etruscan city the Romans probably made it homophonous with the name of their own goddess (this is all the more likely if the Romans knew that the same word was at the base of both the toponym and the cult title), cf. Battisti 1959:389,390: "La tradizione onomastica latina è seriore di circa un secolo rispetto a quella etrusca....Il punto di partenza incontrovertibile risiede nel fatto che il nome che noi conosciamo è quello che ci fa trasmesso dall' etrusco ...". The decisive factor in Rix's etymology is the apparent long vowel ū in puplūna; if we assume that the toponym is in origin Etruscan, we are obliged to offer an account of the

196

long vowel, cf. infra. One may add that even if the Etruscan toponym was formed from an Italic theonym, this does not exclude the possibility that the base of the Italic theonym was an Etruscan loanword.

It is on the basis of *puplu-* (extracted from *pupluna*) that WH are prepared to consider Etruscan origin for *populus*. It has been suggested that the toponym is a derivative of **puplu* (: **puplu + na > pupluna*), which is interpreted either as an appellative (see Battisti 1959:396) or a gentilicium (cf. Colonna 1977). Colonna argues that, while Etruscan toponyms derived from gentilicia are not rare (e.g. Saena (cf. OB 2.11 (450-425) *θeinaś*), Felsina (cf. AS 1.185 (rec.) *felsinei*), this method of forming toponyms cannot be invoked for the oldest Etruscan settlements such as Tarquinia and Populonia whose 'foundation' predates the introduction of the gens system (: "queste città traggono origine dal sinecismo di villaggi sparsi nel territorio, avvenuto agli inizi dell'età del ferro, ossia agli inizi del IX o al più tardi nel corso del IX secolo..."). Further, the formation of gentilicia in *-u* is a phenomenon of Neo-Etruscan. The suggestion that *pupluna* derives from a gentilicium in *-u* may then be rejected on pragmatic (: sociolinguistic) grounds. Similarly the suggestion that it derives from an appellative **puplu*, which one would have to analyse as a nomen agentis in *-u* to a verbal base **pupl-* (cf. *zic-*, *zicu*), must be rejected on phonological grounds, since the ending *-u* shows a short vowel, so that we would expect the occurrence of at least some syncopated forms **puplna*, even if we allowed that the spelling of the remaining forms was archaizing, cf. rec. *cupuna: χurunal* (Cl 1.539), *cupna: χurnal* (Cl 1.540).

Pupluna is commonly thought of as "die unter den Auspizien des Fufluns stehende Stadt" (WH, cf., for example, M. Cristofani, *LIMC* III,1, 531: "Il nome di *Fufluns* è connesso

con l'etrusco *puple* dal quale derivano nomi personali e il toponimo di Populonia (*Pupluna/Pufluna/Fufluna*)"; M. Grant, A Dictionary of Classical Place Names, 1986, 518: "*Fufluns*, the Etruscan deity after which the place (sc. Populonia) was called"), even though, as has long been recognized, the coins of Populonia which bear the legend '*pupluna*' do not represent *fufluns* (cf. Battisti 1959:389, 401) and there is nothing to suggest that the cult of *fufluns* was specific to Populonia, or even practised there; moreover, as the coins of Populonia show, the 'Stadtgott' there was *seθlans* (cf. Simon 1985:163: "....was durch die Eisenindustrie in jener Gegend zu erklären ist. Die Vorderseite zeigt seinen bärtigen Kopf mit der Handwerkermütze, die Rückseite seine Werkzeuge, Hammer und Zange"). It may be noted that the (almost) constant orthography of *fufl-* (theonym) versus *pupl-* (toponym) is a serious objection to an etymological connection between them. Indeed the difference in the initial letter is alone sufficient to demonstrate the diverse origin of the two names; there exists for Etruscan no rule by which initial *fu-* > *pu-* or initial *pu-* > *fu-* (see Rix 1989a:1293-4 and (forthcoming a) on the forms arc. *pulumχva* (Cr 4.4, 4.5; = Punic *hkkb-m*) 'stars' and rec. *fulumχva* (Pe 8.4) of obscure meaning). Following in the steps of Devoto 1932, whose methods and results he accepts, De Simone 1981:100 has again brought *poplo-* (which he considers an Etruscan loanword) into connection with Etr. *fufluns*. It is important to make clear, therefore, that in the etymology of *fufluns* no argument can be found for either the IE or Etruscan origin of Lat. *populus*.

The connection has rested heavily on the (now invalidated) phonetic rule *p* > *ph* > *f*, which appears in the standard works on the Etruscan language. The rule is formulated by De Simone 1970:179: "Zu beachten ist auch, daß die Verbindungen *pr*, *pl*, *pn* (wohl über *ph*) zu *fr*, *fl*, *fn* weiterentwickelt werden können". For *pr* > *fr* he cites *Hafure*

beside *Hapre* and *Sefrials* beside *Sepre*; for *pl* > *fl* the pairs *θuf(u)lθa* : *θuplθa*, *Fufle* : *Fup(le)*, *Fufluna* : *Pupluna*; for *pn* > *fn* *θafna* beside *θapna*. He considers *pufl-* as the "Zwischenstufe" between *pupl-* and *fufl-* in order to make sense of the attestations of the toponym, i.e. *pupluna* > *pufl(una)* > *fufluna*.

A collection and chronological ordering of the attestations of *θafna* and *θefarie*, which cover a period of approximately 600 years, demonstrates the flaw in the supposed development *p* > *ph* > *f*, namely that the development is not from stop (through aspirated stop) to fricative but, conversely, from fricative to stop in the environment of *n*, *l*, and *r*. To these attestations are added those of the individual name *fufle* and the gentilicium derived from it; since Cl 1.1807 *aθ: herine: vipinal: fufle:* and Cl 1.1808 *ar: herine(:) vi(:)pinal: fup(le)* record the same man (note: *aθ = ar = arnθ*), we may be sure that *fup* is an abbreviation for the cognomen *fuple**.

θafna

θavhna	Cr 2.5 (700-675)
θah(v)na	Cr 2.6 (700-650)
θahvna	Cr 2.20 (675-650)
θahvna	Cr 2.29 (VII)
θafna	Cr 2.51 (mid VI)
θafna	Vs 2.7 (VI)
θafna	AV 2.5 (VI-V)
θapna	Co 3.1 (V-IV)
θafna	Cl 2.26 (IV)
θapna	Po 2.21 (350-250)
tafina	Fa 2.14 (IV-III)
θapna	Vc 2.42 (III)
θapicun(4x), *θapintaś*	
θapintaś	Po 4.4 (II)

θapna, θapnaç, θapneśtś

θapnzac (2x)　　　LL X.22, X.f1, XI.3

θefarie

θihχaries　　　　Cr 2.7 (700-650)

θefariei　　　　Cr 4.4 (c.500)

θefarie　　　　　Cr 4.5 (c.500)

[θ]efrinai　　　Ta 7.60 (350-325)

θefri　　　　　　Pe 1.306 (175-150)

θefriśa　　　　　Pe 1.307 (150-125)

θefriś　　　　　　Pe 1.1220 (rec.)

θepri　　　　　　Pe 1.1086 (rec.), 1.1147 (rec.)

θeprie　　　　　　Cl 1.1840 (rec.)

θeprina　　　　　Cl 1.490 (rec.)

θe(p)rinal　　　Cl 1.37 (rec.)

θeprinaśa　　　　Cl 1.2100 (rec.)

θeprinei　　　　Cl 1.40 (rec.), 1.1841 (rec.)

θepriniś　　　　Cl 1.2620 (rec.)

θepṛiu　　　　　　Pe 1.1000 (rec.)

θeprinal　　　　Cl 1.39 (rec.)

fufle

fufalnei　　　　AH 1.48 (IV-250)

fufle　　　　　　Cl 1.1807 (rec.)

fufl[e]ś　　　　Pe 1.1161 (rec.)

fuflnies　　　　AH 1.41 (rec.)

fup(le)　　　　　Cl 1.1808 (rec.)

De Simone 1970 explains the fact that _θafna_ and _θahvna_ occur in Archaic Etruscan and _θapna_ only in Neo-Etruscan thus: "Es ist deshalb möglich, daß _θapna_ - etwa wie _Sispe_ und _Partinipe_ - als umgekehrte Schreibung, die wohl den Wandel _pn > fn_ zur Voraussetzung hat, zu verstehen ist. Gegen diese Annahme spricht aber die Form _Tafina_ (Narce), die wohl dissimilatorisch zu erklären ist: _θapna > *θaphna > *Taphna > Taf(i)na_. vgl. im Griechischen Fälle wie Πωσφορος,

Αντεσφορος". Colonna 1973-74 follows De Simone and refers to the attestations of *θapna* "forse come un purismo di ritorno" conserved only in North Etruria[3].

The validity of the development *-f- > -p-* before the resonants *r, l, n* (rather than *-pl- > -fl-* etc.) is further demonstrated by Greek borrowings in Etruscan in which a development *-pl- > -phl- > -fl-* is not attested, although the supposed distributional requirements are fulfilled, e.g. *aplu, euturpa, pemφetru* (see Rix 1976a:177).

The restriction of the sound change to northern Etruria by Steinbauer (1983:221-222; cf. Rix 1985a:§22) is based on the fact that the attestations in *-pn-* etc. (all recent) are all from northern Etruria, whereas recent attestations in *-fn-* etc. are known from both northern and southern Etruria. (Steinbauer: "Die Schriftsprache bzw. ein Teil der Bevölkerung hielten über einen längeren Zeitraum am alten Standard fest, wodurch Unsicherheit beim Gebrauch der Zeichen >f< und >p< im oben genannten Kontext entstanden"). The paucity of recent attestations from southern Etruria should leave open the question of the (geographical) limitation of the sound change.

To the objections given at the start of this section can now be added the implications of the phonetic development *-fl- > -pl-*; if the two names really were connected we might justifiably expect the sound change to be mirrored in both. The resistance shown by *fufluns* to the sound change must be due to its (partial) Sabellic origin; likewise the sound change arc. *f- >* rec. *h-* known from a central-northern area of Etruria around Chiusi, from where two rec. attestations of *fufluns* are known, is not known for the theonym, cf. arc. *vhulvena-s >* rec. *huluna* (Rix 1985a:§22); *fufluns* was always felt to be a foreign god. As for the toponym there is unfortunately no early attestation to establish the

relationship between *pupluna* and *pufluna*. Since the attestations of *pufluna* come from northern Etruria Populonia there can be no question here of the operation of the geographically restricted sound change proposed by Steinbauer. Rix (forthcoming a) suggests that *pufluna* was the result of a neutralization of *f* and *p* before liquids and nasals, which took place from the fourth century onwards in northern Italy. It is also likely that, like *fufluna*, *pufluna* attests to contamination of *pupluna* and *fufluns*. Since the personal name shows the sequence *pupl-* to be archaic, it seems fair to adopt one of these solutions and to regard *pupluna* as the primary form.

If we reject any connection between *fufluns* and *pupluna*, we are obliged to consider anew the etymology of the toponym; the non-syncope of -*u*- must be explained. A solution can be offered.

The Etruscan plural/ collective suffix $\chi va/\chi^v a$ develops to -*cva* or to -*va* under the following conditions (see Rix 1985a:§27):

$$-\chi va \quad > \quad -cva/ \begin{bmatrix} \text{spirants} \\ s, \ \theta \end{bmatrix} \_\_$$

$$-\chi va \quad > \quad -va/ \begin{bmatrix} \text{palatals} \\ e, \ i, \ š \end{bmatrix} \_\_$$

The ending is preserved after a liquid or a nasal (e.g. *flerχva*, *fulumχva*). Examples for -*χva* > -*va* are: *zusle-va* (pl. of *zusle*) < *zusle-χva*, *hupni-va* (pl. of *hupni*) < *hupni-χva*. Hence from Etr. *pupl-* one can reconstruct a possessive adjective to the plural of *puple* '?army': *pŭple-χva-na* > *pŭpl(e)-v(a)-na* > *pŭplŭna*; one observes the syncope of short vowels in medial syllables and the

202

development of consonantal _u_ > vocalic _u_, which is not syncopated, on the model of _muluvene_ > _mulvene-_ > _mulune_ (no **_mulne_).

Any difficulty in this etymology lies not in phonology or morphology but in semantics, since the meaning of *_pŭple_ cannot be deduced internally in Etruscan, but must be drawn from Lat. *_poplos_ 'army' (or, less probably, 'people').

The form *_puplexva_ is either plural ('armies') or collective, in which case it may have meant something like 'battle' or 'war', cf. sg. _fler_ 'hostia', coll. _flerχva_ 'ritual ceremony'; _pupluna_ may then have designated the site where armies met, or more arguably, where a (particular) battle took place, cf. the German place names _Kriegsdorf, Kriegsheim, Kriegsstadthof_.

We know that the site of Populonia was inhabited by two villages which amalgamated in the later seventh century, increasing the prosperity of the site (see M. Grant, A Dictionary of Classical Place Names, 1986, 518). This invites the reflection at least that an Etr. *_puple_ may originally have meant something like 'village', 'community' or 'people'.

The most important aspect of the etymology offered here for _pupluna_ is the reconstructed base noun *_puple_, the reconstruction of which is not possible from the individual name _puplie_, which is of probable Latin origin, nor from the theonym _fufluns_. An Etr. *_puple_ (nom.-acc. sg.) borrowed into Latin would yield a form /poplo/ or /puplo/ (cf. Etr. _aule_ > Lat. *_Aulo-, Aulus_).

Breyer concludes her entry on Lat. _populus_ by stating that it is "völlig ungewiß" whether the Latin word was borrowed from Etruscan or Italic (i.e. Sabellic). There is

no sound IE etymology for Lat. *populus*; Sabellic origin can be ruled out as a source except possibly as an intermediary between Etruscan and Latin. Consideration of the primary meaning of Lat. *populus* and of the structure and possible meaning of Etr. *pupluna* make an Etruscan origin possible. Since the etymology cannot be completely satisfactory at the semantic level, it is not 'völlig gewiß' that *populus* is a borrowing from Etruscan; the etymology is, however, satisfactory at the morphological and phonological levels.

Notes

1. See Pantzerhjelm-Thomas and Skutch 1912:202. Xavier Mignot, Les verbes dénominatifs latin, Paris 1969, 377, also translates the verb as "dépeupler". Noticeably there is no discussion of *populā-* in his text, which indicates how problematic a satisfactory explanation of *populā-* is. Steinbauer 1989:24,n.6 does not discuss *populā-* in any detail since the verb does not occur in Plautus, but points out that Mignot's translation must be incorrect.

2. It is extremely uncommon that a given PIE word is preserved in the majority of the IE languages. While it is theoretically possible that a word may only be preserved in one IE language (the structure may be indicative of IE origin), it is generally held that a word counts as IE if corresponding forms are attested in (at least) two daughter languages (different language groups : ideally one *satem*, one *centum* language) and borrowing from one language into the other is excluded, e.g. Gr. *πράσον*, Lat. *porrum*, *porrus* < *prso-* (Steinbauer 1983:69-70).

3. See Colonna 1973-74:136: "La tendenza alla pronunzia aspirata (vedi *tafina*, da *θaphna* per dissimulazione) e spirantica della labiale interna, a contatto con la nasale, è comunque anteriore alla diffusione della scrittura, essendo registrato in blocco da tutte le iscrizione di età arcaica, comprese le più antiche (1-5). La scrittura *θapna* si afferma soltanta nel IV-III secolo (8), forse come un purismo di ritorno, spiegabile per un vaso di precipua, anche se tutt'altro che esclusiva, utilizzazione sacrale." cf. Colonna 1984:312: his theory that Etr. *θapna* is a borrowing from Lat. *dapna* is invalidated.

In this and the following chapter the theory is presented that both Lat. *satelles*, a loanword from the regal period, and Lat. *līctor*, a 'semi-calque', probably of early Republican date, derive from Etr. *zatlaθ*. This chapter deals with Lat. *satelles*. A survey of the word's use in Latin texts suggests a foreign, possibly Etruscan, origin for *satelles*. Since there is no serious IE etymology to be considered, the possibility that *satelles* is of Etruscan origin is discussed.

1. The use of *satelles* in Latin texts

Recently we have become increasingly familiar with terms such as *satellite broadcasting* and *satellite stations*, in which Engl. *satellite* is to be understood as "a man-made object placed (or designed to be placed) in orbit around an astronomical object (usu. the earth)". Before the twentieth century there was only one instance of the use of *satellite* in this sense - W.H.G. Kingston tr. Verne's Begum's Fortune xiii. 180 (1880): "A projectile, animated with an initial speed twenty times superior to the actual speed, being ten thousand feet per second, can never fail! This movement, combined with terrestrial attraction, destines it to revolve perpetually round our globe....Two hundred thousand dollars is not too much to have paid for the pleasure of having endowed the planetary world with a new star, and the earth with a second satellite." The September 1936 edition of the science magazine *Discovery* reports on "the scheme for building a metal outpost satellite and propelling it in a fixed orbit 600 miles above the earth's surface". This sense of *satellite* derives from the word's use for 'a small or secondary planet which revolves around a larger one'. It was Kepler who in 1611 first applied Lat. *satellites* to the

secondary planets revolving around Jupiter. But the original meaning of Engl. *satellite* is that of "an attendant upon a person of importance, forming part of his retinue and employed to execute his orders. Often with reproachful connotation; implying subserviency or unscrupulousness in service". The word is very rare before the 18th century: the occurrences include 1548 Hall, Chron., Rich. III 52b "environed with his satellytes and yomen of the crowne"; 1656 Blount, Glossogr., "satellite, one retained to guard a man's person; a Yeoman of the Guard; a Serjeant, Catchpole, one that attacheth"; 1864 Kirk, Chas. Bold. II.IV.iii.384, "Tyrants, encompassed by their armed satellites." (Quotations from OED)

This original meaning of Engl. *satellite* continues that of Lat. *satelles*, from which it is borrowed. What is notable about the Latin word is how little variation in meaning it exhibits. The OLD defines it thus: 1. one of a bodyguard or escort to a prince or despot, a henchman, attendant (often contempt.): 2. a (usu. violent) partisan, supporter; (w. gen.) an accomplice (in crime).

The context in which *satelles* is used is almost invariably military (or violent), the tone contemptuous and the satellites those of a tyrant-king, of whom the 'oldest' example is the Etruscan king from Chiusi, Porsenna, whose *satellites regii* seize Mucius Scaevola after he has made an unsuccessful attempt on the life of the king (Liv.2.12.8). The earliest extant use in Latin is Pl.*Mil*.78, where Pyrgopolynices, a mercenary captain of king Seleucus, bombastically calls his own attendants *satellites* as if he were king. We also know of the satellites of Alexander, his brother Arrhidaeus, Hannibal, king Hieronymus, the tyrant king Hiero, the Spartan tyrant Nabis, king Perseus and the Parthian Pharasmanes, all of whom were foreign:

Alexander

Curt.6.7.32   Dymnus is brought into the royal apartment by the *satellites* of Alexander.

Arrhidaeus

Curt.10.7.14   *et Meleager, thorace sumpto, capit arma, novi regis* (= Arrhidaeus) *satelles*.

Hannibal

Liv.23.12.11   *Himilconi ceterisque Hannibalis satellitibus*.

Hieronymus

Liv.24.7.7   *fuga satellitum* (sc. of Hieronymus), *ut iacentem videre regem, facta est.*

Liv.24.32.5   ...*ne proderent patriam tyranni* (= Hieronymus) *ante satellitibus et tum corruptoribus exercitus.*

Liv.25.29.3   *satellites regii* (sc. of Hieronymus) *Hippocrates atque Epicydes.*

Hiero

Liv.24.5.4   *satellites armatos* (sc. of Hiero).

Nabis

Liv.32.39.8   *tyrannum* (= Nabis) *ibi cum omnibus copiis opperientem invenerunt. Progressus armatus cum satellitibus armatis est in medium fere interiacentis campi.*

Liv.35.35.11   *satellites tyranni* (= Nabis) *in media fere acie consistebant.*

Perseus

Liv.42.15.7   *turba amicorum ac satellitum* (sc. of Perseus).

42.15.10   *amicorum et satellitum turba* (sc. of Perseus).

42.16.2   *ad corpus regis* (= Perseus) *primo amici, deinde satellites ac servi concurrerunt.*

42.16.4   *quidam ex satellitibus* (sc. of Perseus) *secuti latronum vestigia, cum usque ad iugum...*

42.39.2   *magnus comitatus fuit regius* (sc. of Perseus) *cum amicorum tum satellitum turba stipante.*

42.51.2   *cum purpuratorum et satellitum manu profectus Citium est.*

Pharasmanes

Tac.*Ann*.6.35   Wounded, Pharasmanes is protected by the bravest of his guards – *fortissimis satellitum.*

cf. :

Plin.*Pan*.23.3   The emperor Trajan is praised because he made himself accessible to all and had no party of satellites (*satellitum manu*) to attend him.

Nep.*Paus*.3.2   The contempt with which the general is served is centred on his aspirations for a regal style of living: *apparatu regio utebatur, veste Medica; satellites Medi et Aegyptii sequebantur.*

References of a more general nature also link *satellites* with one tyrant-king, e.g.:

Liv.34.36.4   ...*vulgo tamen omnes fama ferebant, vanis, ut ad ceteram fidem, sic ad secreta tegenda <u>satellitum regiorum</u> ingeniis.*

Liv.34.36.7   *mercennarii milites* (sc. of Nabis) *et pretia militiae casura in pace aegre ferebant et reditum sibi nullum in civitates videbant, infensas <u>non tyrannis magis quam satellibus eorum</u>.*

Lat. *satelles* elsewhere designates the 'supporters' or 'accomplices' (rather than 'bodyguards, henchmen') of tyrannical Romans. In Flor.*Epit.*2.12(4.1.3) (II AD) the followers/ accomplices of Catiline, who was charged with overthrowing the whole State (i.e. he was aiming for power comparable to that of the kings), are designated as *satellites*. These accomplices were such men of high family as a Curius, a Porcius, a Cethegus etc.: *hos omnis <u>inmanissimi facinoris satellites</u> habuit.* Catiline's *inmanissimum facinus* is clearly treason, as Quint.*Inst.*7.2.54 confirms : *pro <u>reo tyrannidis</u> adfectatae; ubi sunt arma? quos contraxi <u>satellites</u>?* (cf. Cic.*Cat.*1.7, given below). To the satellites of Catiline can be compared those of the tyrannical decemvir Appius in Liv.3.56.2 (mid V B.C.), accomplices also of a treacherous act: *cum diem Appio Verginius dixisset et Appius stipatus patriciis iuvenibus in forum descendisset, redintegrata extemplo est omnibus memoria <u>foedissimae potestatis</u>, cum ipsum <u>satellitesque</u> eius vidisset.* Tacitus also uses *satelles* to describe the followers or guards of <u>Romans</u>, always in a negative, damning sense:

Ann.6.3   *an potius discordiam et seditionem a*
               <u>satellite</u> Seiani quaesitam, qua rudis animos
               nomine honoris ad corrumpendum militae morem
               propelleret?

Ann.12.49   *erat Cappadociae procurator Iulius Paelignus,*
               ignavia animi et deridiculo corporis iuxta
               despiciendus, sed Claudio perquam familiaris,
               cum privatus olim conversatione scurrarum
               iners otium oblectaret. Is Paelignus auxiliis
               provincialium contractis tamquam
               reciperaturus Armeniam, dum socios magis quam
               hostis praedatur, abscessu suorum et
               incursantibus barbaris praesidii egens ad
               Radamistum venit; donisque eius evictus ultro
               regium insigne sumere cohortatur sumentique
               adest auctor et <u>satelles</u>.

Ann.14.59   *talem eum centurio trucidavit coram Pelagone*
               Spadone, quem Nero centurioni et manipulo,
               quasi <u>satellitibus</u> ministrum regium,
               praeposuerat.

Ann.16.22   *'ut quondam C. Caesarem', inquit, 'et M.*
               Catonem, ita nunc te, Nero, et Thraseam avida
               discordiarum civitas loquitur. Et habet
               sectatores vel potius <u>satellites</u>, qui nondum
               contumaciam sententiarum, sed habitum
               vultumque eius sectantur, rigidi et tristes,
               quo tibi lasciviam exprobent....'

Hist.1.84   *'...si Vitellio* (the emperor) *et <u>satellitibus</u>*
               eius eligendi facultas detur, quem nobis
               animum, quas mentis imprecentur, quid aliud
               quam seditionem et discordiam optabunt?....'

Compare the following passages from Cicero:

Att.14.5   ...*vides tamen tyranni* (= Caesar) <u>*satellites*</u> *in imperiis*...

Ver.2.3.21   *qui* (= Verres) *primum certos iustituerit nomine decumanos, re vera ministros ac* <u>*satellites*</u> *cupiditatum suarum, per quos ostendam sic provinciam per triennium vexatam atque vastatam, iudices, ut eam multis annis multorum innocentia sapientiaque recreare nequeamus.*

Mil.90   ..., *ille* (sc. Clodius) *denique vivus mali nihil fecisset, qui mortuus uno ex suis* <u>*satellitibus*</u> *Sex. Clodio duce curiam incenderit?*

Phil.2.112   *cur armatorum corona senatus saeptus est, cur me tui* (i.e. of Antonius) <u>*satellites*</u> *cum gladiis audiunt, cur....?*

Transferred usage of *satelles* (poetry and prose) is for the most part consistent with its use in historical prose with reference to tyrants and those who behave tyrannically: one 'commander' is referred to; the sense is contemptuous or negative, e.g.:

Plin.Nat.   The term is used figuratively and
11.17(§53)   without contempt; the subject is nonetheless kingly (the king-bee): *circa eum* (sc. <u>*regem*</u>) <u>*satellites*</u> *quidam lictoresque adsidui custodes auctoritatis*; it is interesting that *satellites* and *lictores* are here coupled.

Pl.*Trin*.833   Charmides speaks disparagingly of the <u>*satellites*</u> of Neptune (= the winds and storms) 'who would have horribly dissundered and dispersed my wretched self'.

Hor.*Carm.*   The *satellites* ('guards/ sentinels') are
3.16.9   those of one mistress, Danaë. The tone is contemptuous, for Jupiter knows he can get to Danaë by bribing her doorkeepers:
aurum per medios ire satellites
et perrumpere amat saxa, potentius
ictu fulmineo

Cic.*Fin*.2.37   *.....adiunctis virtutibus, quas ratio rerum omnium dominas, tu voluptatum <u>satellites</u> et ministras esse voluisti....*

Cic.*Inv*.1.2   *ita propter errorem atque inscientiam caeca ac temeraria dominatrix animi cupiditas ad se explendam viribus corporis abutebatur, perniciosissimis <u>satellitibus</u>.*

Only in Hor.*Ep*.1.1.17 is *satelles* used in a positive sense, as the poet swears to be *virtutis verae custos rigidusque satelles.*

Before making some concluding remarks on the use of *satelles* by Roman authors, it should be noted that most attestations of the word in Latin are plural, i.e. *satellites*, not *satelles*; this is of importance for the etymology. It is not possible to establish just how many individuals may have comprised a king's '*satellites*'. They are described as a *turba* or *manus* and are contrasted in Liv.32.39.8 with *omnibus copiis*. The number of satellites can be inferred, if at all, only for a given context; the satellites probably formed, however, a relatively small section of the king's

forces since they can be individually named: two of the satellites of Hieronymus and one of Hannibal are named (Liv.25.29.3; 23.12.11, see above), cf. Liv.25.28.7: *satellites Hannibalis, deinde Hieronymi, Hippocrate atque Epicyde*. Still the number is large enough to surround a gathering of Spartans in Liv.34.27.5, where we need to allow for a looser use of the term: *cum suspectos quosdam civium (sc. Nabis) haberet, eductis in campum omnibus copiis - Dromon ipsi vocant - positis armis ad contionem vocari iubet Lacedaemonios atque eorum contioni satellites armatos circumdedit*.

I know of only eight examples of the singular *satelles* and in one of these (from Ovid) the singular is used for the plural: in addition to the occurrences in Curt.10.7.14, Tac.*Ann*.6.3; 12.9 (cf. supra), the following may be noted:

Cic.*Cat*. 1.7   C. Manlius is described as *audaciae satellitem atque administrum tuae* (sc. of Catiline). (Here *satelles* might be translated as 'accomplice' (cf. Flor.*Epit*.2.12(4.1.3))

Hor.*Carm*.2   . . . . *nec satelles Orci*
18.34   *callidum Promethea*
        revexit auro captus

Liv.34.25.8   *satelles a praefecto missus*

Liv.34.41.7   *Nabidis dominationis satellitem factum populum Romanum*

Ov.*Met*.14.354 Circe was on the point of confessing her desire to Picus when his swift-speeding horse

and thronging retinue (*circumfususque satelles*) prevented her approach to him.

The original link with tyranny/kingship, a form of power odious to republican Rome, accounts for the contemptuous use of Lat. *satelles* and the fact that it suffers relatively little change in meaning. There is a semantic depreciation in the pejorative use - the two OLD definitions are distinct ('bodyguard/henchman' > 'supporter/accomplice') - but the use of Lat. *satelles* remains almost always to some degree contemptuous/negative and the satellites are always those of one 'commander', be he a king, tyrant, usurper, god of the sea or a king-bee. From a consideration of the literary sources the original meaning of *satelles* seems assured as 'one of a small personal armed guard of a king'.

The apparent history of Latin literary usage from extant authors is:

A. from Plautus onwards: frequent of attendants of Hellenistic kings/tyrants (chiefly Livius: nineteen uses of *satelles* in books 21-45 (Hellenistic), but only two uses in books 1-10 (Liv.2.12.8 (Etruscan context), Liv.3.56.2 (Early Republican Rome)).

hence

B.1. from Cicero onwards: also of 'tyrannical' individuals,

B.2. including, in the imperial period, 'bad' emperors.

Hence it is not apparently significant that Livius once used *satelles* of the 'tyrannical' Porsenna, and once of the 'tyrannical' Appius.

The Romans, however, clearly had no need to borrow δορυφόρος (the Greek equivalent of *satelles*), a classic mark of a tyrant from Herodotus on (e.g. Hdt.1.59, cf. Arist.*frag*.516:

214

.Periander of Corinth was the first tyrant to have δορυφόροι). Since in the sixth century Rome was in contact with the Greek world (one thinks of Aristodemus, tyrant of Cumae), and by the fifth century (terminus ante quem) Greeks called the bodyguards of a tyrant δορυφόροι, it is likely that the Romans already had *satelles*, and from a separate source. This is consistent with the word's original link with kingship/tyranny, which dates the existence of *satelles* in Latin to the regal period.

Hence Liv.2.12.8 (re: Porsenna) may in fact be of considerable significance since the Etruscan kings had bodyguards (and there must have been an Etruscan word to describe them). In another passage (1.49.2) Livius relates that Tarquinius Superbus had refused Servius Tullus the rite of burial and had executed three senators whom he believed to have supported Servius Tullus; fearing retribution he employed a bodyguard: *conscius deinde male quaerendi regni ab se ipso adversus se exemplum capi posse, armatis corpus circumsaepsit*. There is reason to suspect that the bodyguard of Tarquinius Superbus, an Etruscan like Porsenna, was comprised of satellites. The same story is told by D.H.4.41.3: καὶ πρῶτον μὲν φυλακὴν κατεστήσαντο περὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώπων θρασυτάτων ξίφη καὶ λόγχας φερόντων ἐπιχωρίων τε καὶ ἀλλοδαπῶν. οἳ νυκτός τε περὶ τὴν βασίλειον αὐλιζόμενοι αὐλὴν καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐξιόντι παρακολουθοῦντες ὅπηι πορεύοιτο, πολλὴν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιβουλευσόντων ἀσφάλειαν παρείχοντο. These three passages at least raise the suspicion that Lat. *satelles* may be of (sixth century?) Etruscan origin, introduced into Rome by the Etruscan kings.

Three facts suggest that *satelles* is a <u>loanword</u> in Latin:

1. It has no cognate forms in other IE languages. Attempts to connect *satelles* with *sedere/ sodalis/ solium* have no linguistic justification[1]. The suggestion of Ligurian origin

has no firmer foundation than the supposition of an IE etymology: Alessio 1944:104 and Devoto 1968:48-49 refer to -*ello*-, a morphological characteristic of Ligurian, e.g. *Vercelli, Entella, Statielli* (cf. Devoto 1968:49: "Durch das indirekte Kriterium des Suffixes könnte als ligurisch erwiesen sein: *satelles* 'Leibwächter'"); our word, however, is not **satellus* but *satelles*. One cannot assume that *satelles* is reformed from **satello*- < **sater-lo* or **saten-lo*- (cf. *puer-lā > puella, *gemen-lo-s > gemellus) because **sater*- and **saten*- do not exist. Gloss. IV Plac. E 54 *satelles ... de satisfaciendo dictus* is just a play on words.

2. It is almost totally unproductive of derivatives and compounds; only a late derivative *sătellĭtĭum* 'envoy, escort' is known.

3. *Satelles* in Roman authors has a significant degree of association with the functionaries of foreign, non-Latin speaking powers. It must be relatively rare for a native word to be used with such a specifically foreign connotation, when contact is such that the foreign word must be known to the natives.

2. The Etruscan evidence

Since then satellites may have been introduced into Rome by the Etruscan kings, and since *satelles* is evidently a loanword in Latin but has no IE etymology, the possibility presents itself that it is an Etruscan loanword. De Simone's (1970:285,n.233) note "daß die satellites von den etruskischen Königen eingeführt wurden (so Ernout) ist wohl kein Argument zugunsten der etruskischen Herkunft des Wortes" obscures the issue: the facts so far considered do not of themselves entail an Etruscan origin of *satelles*, but they do raise the question of such an origin.

An Etruscan origin would be assured if there were an
actually attested Etruscan word which could be demonstrated,
phonologically, morphologically and semantically, to be the
source of Lat. *satelles*; such a word exists in Etr. *zatlaθ*,
which occurs in the inscription Vs 7.25 (325-300) *zatlaθ:
aiθas* from the Tomba Golini II in Orvieto. This theory is
not new, cf.   Breyer 1984:485: "Für <u>zatlaθ</u> als etr.
Entsprechung zu lat. <u>satelles</u> spricht zunächst seine
morphologische Deutbarkeit als Nomen agentis, gebildet mit
dem Suffix <u>-aθ</u> ...; ferner die Möglichkeit, wenn auch nicht
Sicherheit, es in der Verbindung mit <u>aiθas</u> als 'Dienstmann,
Gefolgsmann des Hades' (Prof. Pfiffig brieflich) zu
übersetzen"; one may note also the remarks of Bonfante
1985:207 (: "*Satelles* is very likely to be Etruscan for
historical reasons"), of   Palmer 1954:48 (: "Morphological
and semantic criteria also suggest that *satelles* 'bodyguard'
is an Etruscan loan-word: the institution of the bodyguard
was introduced into Rome by Etruscan nobles, tradition
associating it in part with Tarquinius Superbus") and of
Moritz Regula, Lateinische Etymologien, *Sprache* 3, 1957, 189
(:   "...*satelles*, dessen Bedeutung etruskische Herkunft
erschließen läßt, im Ausgang an *comes* angelehnt ist"). But
the meaning of Etr. *zatlaθ* and its naturalization in Latin
have not been satisfactorily explained. It is a main aim of
this chapter to show that an internal Etruscan account of
the structure and meaning of *zatlaθ* is available; this
account is based on the relationship of *zatlaθ* to two other
Etruscan words, viz. *zati* and *zatlχne* from a ritual formula
in the *liber linteus*.

Pfiffig 1969:(see ‡‡138,143,172;p.310) provides a starting
point. He explains *zatlaθ* ("Begleiter") as a nomen agentis
built in *-aθ* (cf. *zil-aθ* 'praetor') to **zatil*, the
substantivized aorist past participle of **zat(i)*
("begleiten"); **zatil* finds a parallel in *acil* "Werk, das
Gemachte" (opus < operatum) to *ac-* "machen". Hence he

assumes that *zatlaθ* is the syncopated form of an arc. *zat-il-aθ*. He interprets *zatlχna* (of which *zatlχne* is an inflectional form) as an adjective derived from *zatlaθ* with the meaning "was zum Begleiter gehört, begleitend"; since, in his view, *zilχ* (with syncope) < *zil-aχ* (with a change in aspirate) < *zil-aθ*, he is able to assume the development *zatl-aθ* > *zatl-aχ* > *zatlχ-*, to which *zatlχne* is formed by the addition of a suffix *-ne* . This suffix, in Pfiffig's opinion, is the sign of a "Mediopassivum verbaler Modalis", cf. *θezine* "zum Geschlachtetwerden = zur Schlachtung". To sum up, according to Pfiffig:

```
*zat(i/e) + il         >    *zatil
*zat(i/e) + il + aθ >       zatlaθ + *zatlaχ
*zatl(a)χ + ne         >    zatlχne
```

Base form	Nomen agentis	>	Later form	Denom. verb in
*zat(i/e)	zatlaθ		*zatlaχ, *zatlχ	zatlχ- e.g. zatlχne
cf. zil(i/e)	zilaθ		*zilaχ, arc. zilac (rec. zilc, zilχ)	zilaχ- e.g. zilaχnuce

There are two serious objections to this account. Firstly, the derivation of *zilχ* from *zilaθ* and therefore of *zatlχ-* from *zatlaθ* is impossible; *zilaθ* is a nomen agentis with the meaning 'praetor', while *zilχ* < arc. *zilac/ *zilaχ* is an abstract in *-ac/χ* (cf. in the *liber linteus cemnac* beside *cemnaχ* and *flanac* beside *flanaχ*) meaning "presidenza, magistratura" (see Rix 1984a:284).

Secondly, the assumption that the nomen agentis *zatlaθ* is derived from a noun *+zatil*, the meaning of which Pfiffig does not consider (: 'das Begleitete'??!), is very difficult to accept. Nomina agentis are usually derived from verbs; they designate the person (or, sometimes, the object) who/ which performs the action of the verb, e.g. Engl. *bake* → *baker*, *write* → *writer*, Germ. *backen* → *Bäcker*, *tragen* → *Träger*, (*Briefträger*), *tun* → *Täter*, Gr. ἀρόω → ἀροτήρ, Lat. *dare* → *dator*, *cantāre* → *cantātor*, *defendere* → *defēnsor*. The denominal derivation of nomina agentis is known, but it is a rare phenomenon, e.g. OE. *bōcere* 'scribe, one professionally connected with a book (*bōc*)', OE. *hafocere* 'hawker, one professionally connected with a hawk (*hafoc*)', ME. *kitchener* 'one employed in the kitchen of a monastery'.

An alternative interpretation of *zatlaθ* beside *zatlχne* is one based on the analysis of *zilaχce, zilaχnuce, zilaχnce, zilaχnve, zilaχnθas* as denominative verbs derived from *+zilaχ* (see Rix 1985a:§43) and of *zilaθ* as a nomen agentis from the verb *zil-*. Hence:

$$+zat(i)l + aθ \quad\quad > \quad zatlaθ$$
$$\text{syncope}$$
$$+zat(i)l + aχ + ne \quad > \quad zatlχne$$

Base form	Nomen agentis	Nomen actionis	Denom. verb
zat(i)l	*zatl-aθ*	*+zatl-aχ*	*zatlχ-ne*
cf. *zil*	*zil-aθ*	*+zil-aχ*	*+zilaχ-ne*
		arc. *zilac*	

This scheme is more satisfactory, not least because it is simpler. The form *zati* is still to be considered.

As we shall see from the discussion below of LL VIII.11-14 *zati* must be a noun. The form may be a base form (i.e. nom.-acc.) or locative. As a base form in *-i zati* would find parallels in *ǒuθi* 'grave, tomb' and *θi-* 'water'. As a locative in *-i*, which is the more probable interpretation (see below), *zati* finds parallels in *zilci* 'in the praetorship' to the base form *zilc* and *celi* 'on the earth' to the base form *cel* (for this interpretation of *celi* (LL IV.14, IV.21, V.10, V.16, V.17, VIII.3, IX.18, XI.1, XI.2, XI.2) see Rix (forthcoming b):n.20; the base form *cel*, which is attested with the meaning "Erdmutter" (see Simon 1985:156), means 'earth' and 'Earth as a goddess', cf. Lat. *terra*, *Terra*). From a locative *zati* we can reconstruct a base form **zat*; a base form ***zate* cannot be reconstructed, since this would yield a loc. ***zatei* or ***zate* (cf. loc. *faśei* beside loc. *faśe* in the *Liber Linteus* (see Rix 1985a:§14) to the base from *faśe-* seen in the derivative *faśena*).

Until now a noun **zat* (loc. *zati*) has not come into discussion, only a base form **zat(i)l*. One must ask if *zati* could be the locative of a noun **zatl* (? < **zat(i)l*). There are two ways in which *zati* could have come to stand for **zatli*:

1) *l* in Etruscan is normally velar, but the existence of palatal *l'* is shown by the fact that after *l* an antevocalic *i* or *e* is often not written in Greek loanwords (Rix 1985a: §16), e.g. *Μελέαγρος* > *melacre* /mel'akre/, **Οἰλιάδᾱς* > *vilata-s* /u̱il'ata/; palatal *l'* must also be assumed for Etr. arc. *velelia* > **vellia* > rec. *veilia* (with *l>i*) > *vela* /u̱el'a/ (with the monophthongization of *ei* > *e*; the *i* following *l'* is not written). Hence for *zati* one may suggest that one of the following two developments have taken place:

a)   *zatli   >   *zatl   >   zati

        loss of *i* after   *l* > *i*

        palatal *l*

b)   *zatli   >   *zatii   >   zati

        l > *i*   simplified

2)   The patterning of the words in LL VIII.13 may have induced a scribal error: *zati* contrasts with *ruze*:

    A   B   A   B   A

  θezi-ne ruz-e nuzlχ-ne zat-i zatlχ-ne

Since *l* is not otherwise lost before *i*, 2) is the more likely account, but neither is particularly convincing. It seems, therefore, that a satisfactory account of the evidence must start from a noun *zat* and a base form *zat(i)l*, which must be verbal, if we derive from it the nomen agentis *zatlaθ*, and at the same time perhaps also nominal, if we derive from it an abstract in *-ac/χ*. *zilac* appears to be derived from a verb *zil-* 'preside', but other forms in *-ac/χ* are denominatives, cf. Vc 7.27 *velznaχ* < *velzina-aχ* 'from Volsinii'. Vc 7.33 *rumaχ* < *ruma-aχ* 'from Rome', LL VIII.10, XII.12 *zamθic/ zamtic* < arc. *zamaθi-ac* "das aus Gold" (Helmut Rix: personal communication) to arc. *zamaθi* (Cl. 2.3) 'gold'. The possibility that a substantive *zat* could be a back formation from a verb *zat(i)l-* (cf. Lat. *pugnus* 'fist' > *pugnāre* 'to box, fight' > *pugna* 'fight') is rather nebulous and could not be demonstrated for Etruscan. If *zatlaθ* and *zatlχne* are connected with *zat* then they must be derived from a base form *zatil*, since an enlargement *-il-* (but not *-l-*) is known for Etruscan. Before a scheme is offered which accounts for the morphological relationship between the three words, their meaning in context should be considered.

zatlaθ: aiθas is inscribed on the back wall of the Tomba
Golini II (see Conestabile 1865:Tav. I; II). Of the four
walls it is unfortunately the back wall which upon discovery
of the tomb was found to be the most seriously damaged.

3 back wall

The two side walls show representations of banqueters (side
2) and of musicians and banqueters (side 4); on each side of
the entrance way (side 1) there is a biga and a charioteer,
not in military dress, and above the doorway a snake
frieze, covering the breadth of the upper wall, which
appears to be partnered by a similar frieze on the back
wall, of which only a small trace remains. Of the painting
remain, to the far left, the heads of two armed men (both
are helmeted, the upper part of the shield of one of them is
visible) and, to the far right, the legs of another two
armed men (they wear greaves; one shield is to be seen; they
are shoeless). We may, however, be sure that we have either
the whole inscription or two whole words of a fuller
inscription, since they are enclosed by the heads of two

222

figures (warriors/ soldiers/ guards/ gladiators?). The armed figures have a dignified, sedate posture and the context, which is not one of battle, is taken to be one of military array or, more likely, of funeral games and the figures *"gladiatori funebri"* (M. Pallottino, *SE 24*, 1955-56, 58), cf. Conestabile 1865: "I resti pur troppo scarsi, che testè accennai, sembrano poter dar luogo a supporre che in origine su quella parete si vedesse dipinta una scena, o relativa alle occupazioni e alla carriera militare di un qualche individuo più distinto della famiglia, a cui spettava la tomba, ovvero forse allusiva ai funebri ginochi e combattimenti usati dall'antichità, e particolarmente riconosciuti siccome parte dei costumi di Etruria".

aiθas (gen. of *aita*) is a borrowing from Gr. ῝Αιδης; *zatlaθ aiθas* is, therefore, the '*zatlaθ* of Hades'. That the name of Hades, the ruler of the underworld, should appear amongst scenes of funeral entertainment is not surprising. We do not know whether the Etruscan "gladiatori funebri" fought under the auspices of a particular god, as, for instance, in Rome a leading gladiator might perform for the emperor and another for his wife; in mediaeval England knights at the joust would carry the colours of a particular noblewoman. Thus *zatlaθ aiθas* would be the gladiator fighting in the name of Hades(?).

The figure indicated by the words *zatlaθ aiθas* is not a mythological character, but it is conceivable that he is a gladiator representing a mythological figure known as *zatlaθ aiθas*. If this figure could be identified, the meaning of *zatlaθ* might be revealed.

Greek ῝Αιδης, son of Kronos and god of the underworld, was seldom worshipped, and was comparatively rarely represented in art. Almost the only story told about him is that he abducted and married Persephone. For his eleventh labour

Herakles was sent down to the underworld to bring back
Kerberos, which he achieved, in most versions of the story,
without conflict with Hades. There is, however, an older
story, known to Homer, in which Herakles fought with and
wounded Hades himself, cf. Hom.*Il.*5.395-397: τλῆ δ᾽ ʼΑΐδης ἐν
τοῖσι πελώριος ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν, εὖτέ μιν ωὖτὸς ἀνήρ, υἰὸς Διὸς
αἰγιόχοιο, ἐν Πύλωι ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ὀδύνηισιν ἔδωκεν. (see
H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Mythology, 1953, 215;
n.136). That the Etruscan scene illustrates this story would
only be plausible if the picture made it crystal clear that
it was Herakles and the label explained the less well-known
version (viz. 'Herakles striker of Hades' or similar); this
is not the case. Moreover, it is very improbable that the
great Herakles should be referred to by such an anonymous
phrase as *zatlaθ aiθas*.

Hades is depicted (and named) four times in Etruscan art:

1. *eita ꝗersipnai*   wall painting
    (350-325)   Tomba Golini I
    Vs 7.14, 7.15   Conestabile Tav. XI

1. *aita*   scarab
    (late IV)   A.I. Charsekin, Zur Deutung
    OI G.59   etruskischer Sprachdenkmäler,
                               Frankfurt, 1963, 81 n.20, Taf.
                               XII Abb.19
    (the figure is of poor quality. Description: 'Auf dem
    Käfer ist Hades, das Szepter in der Hand, zu sehen.
    Neben ihm Cerberus').

3. *aita ꝗersipnei ceɾun*   wallpainting
    (325-300)   Tomba dell'Orco
    Ta 7.63, 7.64, 7.65

4.   *hinθial teraδiaś turmś aitaś uθuze*

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>mirror with representations of</td></tr>
<tr><td>(late V)</td><td>Odysseus, Hermes, Hades and</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vc S.11</td><td>Tiresias, fig. in V. Fischer-
Graf, Spiegelwerk-stätten in
Vulci, Berlin 1980, 72,43.</td></tr>
</table>

The identity of a *zatlaθ aiθas* cannot be deduced from any of these representations.

As Pfiffig 1975 explains, the oldest pictorial testimony of a being which must be understood as a "Totengeleiter" is the young winged demon bearing a dead body on a painted terracotta plate from Caere, dated to c. 530 B.C. But "Totengötter" as rulers of a "Totenreich in der Unterwelt" appear only in the fourth century and are identified as Hades and Persephone. Their iconography has been Etruscanized: in the Tarquinian wallpainting and in the Tomba Golini I *aita* wears a wolf cap; snakes are another notable feature - ringing the couple in Tarquinia, winding round Hades' sceptre in Tomba Golini I and forming friezes in Tomba Golini II. These characteristics of the Etruscan Hades have led Pfiffig to suggest that assimilation to one of two Etruscan gods has taken place:

i)   *Veltha*. On two Hellenistic ash-urns Veltha, the earth-demon, is seen; on one he is wearing a wolf cap, on the other he has the head of a wolf and carries a snake as his sceptre. Other figures protect themselves against him with sword and stone. He is also represented in the 'Vanth-group' holding in his right hand "ein von Schlangen umwundenes Szepter" (Pfiffig 1975:177ff., 313ff.,323). It seems possible that in the painting in Tomba Golini II a gladiator is assigned the role of slayer of the earth-demon; such a role is at least consistent with funeral games, which are generally considered to be the subject of the painting.

225

ii) *Calu*. AV 4.1 (b) (mid V) opens with a dedication *mlax* *θanra calusc*. Pfiffig 1975 suggests the assimilation of Persephone to Thanr, the Etruscan goddess of birth and death, and that of Hades to the death god Calu, both often being named in grave inscriptions. There is no known representation of Calu, although Simon 1985:155 suggests that the ash-urns thought by Pfiffig to show representations of Veltha may perhaps show Calu, but the dedication to him of a bronze wolfhound (fig. in Simon, op. cit.) provides a very loose connection with the wolfcap of *aita*; the inscripton on the wolfhound is *ś(elanśl): caluśtla* (Co 4.10) 'of Silvanus, this of Calu'.

Comparison has also been made between *zatlaθ aiθas* and *satelles Orci* in Hor.*Carm*.2.18 (see M. Pallottino, *SE* 24, 1955-56, 58). Here the *satelles* is generally held to refer to Charon, who as guard over the entrance to the Underworld might not be inappropriately designated as 'the henchman of Hades', but who both in form and function is quite different from the (gladiatorial) figure seen in the Tomba Golini II[2]. Mythology then offers no clear indication of the identity (and, therefore, meaning) of *zatlaθ aiθas*.

There is a final and, especially in view of the mythological evidence, a perhaps more likely interpretation. A wall painting bearing the name *aiθas* may be expected also to bear the figure of Hades himself, presumably in central position and now lost. But, even if this were not the case and the wallpainting showed only such military figures as we can detect, facing each other, it remains quite possible that *zatlaθ aiθas* means 'a *zatlaθ* of Hades', in the sense of 'one of a small personal armed guard of Hades'; there is a painting of Hades and Persephone in Tomba Golini I (cf. supra). The use of the word will thus have been transferred from the Etruscan kings to the King of the Underworld (or used simultaneously of kings and of 'regal' gods?). This is,

therefore, a semi-mythological scene in which one of the
characters - whose label survives - is a guard of Hades.

zati _zatlχne_ occurs in a line of the _liber_ _linteus_
concernedwith the slaughtering (_θezine_) of a sacrificial
animal (_fler_). The relevant passage is LL VIII.11-14. The
translation of the text surrounding _zati zatlχne_ given below
incorporates the results of Rix (forthcoming b), who
demonstrates that _une_ means 'tibi', _puθs_ 'positus' and
śacnica 'fraternity'. The meaning of _θaclθ_ _θarţei_ is
unknown; the forms are locatives. _śacnicśtreś_ is the
ablative of _śacnica_ + _-tra_. _θez-_ occurs frequently in the
liber _linteus_ and has a general meaning 'to sacrifice',
which is, in context, often equivalent to 'to slaughter'; it
occurs with _fler_ 'offering', _flerχva_ 'ritual ceremony', _cal_
'offering' and _tar_ 'offering'. It is not clear what the
grammatical category of _θezine_ is; it appears to be the
locative of an adjective in _-na_ to the verbal base form _θezi_
(_θezine_ < *_θezi-na-i_). The sense of the word is, however,
clear: it expresses the notion of necessity; a translation
'feriendus (est)' may be offered for _θezine_, but equally
possible would be 'ad feriendum'.

LL VIII.11-14

11.   _flere_ . _neθunsl_ . _une_
                numen   Neptuni, tibi

12.   _mlaχ_ . _puθs_   _θaclθ_ _θarţei_ _zivaş_ _fler_
      o bone, posita in   _xy_   viva hostia

13.   _θezine_ . _ruze_ . _nuzlχne_ . _zati_ . _zatlχne_
      ferienda

14.   _śacnicśtreś_
      a fraternitate

227

The sequence *ruze nuzlχne zati zatlχne* must qualify the action contained in *θezine* in a more specific way by describing either a preliminary to the slaughter or the method of slaughter to be used or both. The most frequent suggestion in the literature, however, is that the expression names the animals to be sacrificed. Goldman translates *zati zatlχne* as "Hauswurz", based on Lat. *sadum/sedum* (Paul.*Fest.*p.462L: *sedum, alii sadum appellant herbam...*) 'name for various succulent plants (kinds of houseleek and stonecrop)', but also allows that animals might be intended by both expressions (i.e. by *ruze nuzlχne* and *zati zatlχne*). *zati* is translated by Olzscha 1962:121 as "Schaf" and by Stoltenberg 1956:57 as "Schwein": *ruze nuzlχne zati zatlχne*, "ein Schaf auf dem Kleintieraltar, ein Schwein auf dem Schweinaltar". Pfiffig's (1969) translation of *×zat(i)* as "begleiten", *zatlaθ* as "Begleiter" and *×zatlχna* as "was zum Begleiter gehört, begleitend" has already been disputed. These renderings are clearly based on the secondary meaning 'follower, companion' for Lat. *satelles* and are unjustified. They are to be rejected because "begleiten" makes no sense in the context of the ritual prayer offering in the *liber linteus* and, more importantly because, although *zatlaθ* in isolation could derive from a verb meaning "begleiten"[3], a connection cannot be made between *zatlaθ*, *zatlχne* and *zati* on the basis of an original meaning "begleiten". Indeed in his own work on the *liber linteus* Pfiffig 1963:58 does not attempt a version of *zati zatlχne*, translating LL VIII.13-14 thus: "zum Geschlachtwerden mit (ruze nuzlχne) (und) (zati zatlχne) für die Priesterschaft ...."; in Pfiffig 1969:248 the lines are omitted altogether. More recently he has suggested "Dienstmann, Gefolgsmann des Hades" for *zatlaθ aiθas* (see Breyer 1984:485).

An interpretation of the words *ruze nuzlχne zati zatlχne* must account for the fact that *nuzlχne* and *zatlχne* are

verbal forms expressing necessity. The most likely interpretation of *ruze* and *zati* is that they are nouns which express either the object of the actions *nuzlχne* and *zatlχne*, the locations where these actions are to be performed or the instruments with which they are to be carried out; the locative case in Etruscan is used variously "zur Angabe von Ort, Zeit, Instrument, Art und Weise" (Rix 1985a:∮28). Since *fler* is singular and is not determined by a numeral (cf. TC 11 *ci zusle*, literally 'three sacrificial animal'), we may assume that *ziva∫ fler θezine* designates the slaughter of one animal. Both *ruze* and *zati* could not then be animal names; if the type of animal to be slaughtered is indicated, then this will be contained in the first of the two nouns, i.e. in *ruze*. The likelihood is then that *zati* is the locative of a noun **zat* (cf. supra).

That both the verbs *nuzlχne* and *zatlχne* have more specialized meanings than *θez-* is implied by the infrequency of their appearance. Indeed *zatlχne* is a hapax. The sequence *ruze nuzlχne* also occurs in LL IV:

LL IV.4-6: *hatec. repinec. meleri. sveleric. svⅠec. anⅠ* [5]*c∫. mele. θun. mutince. θezine. ruzⅠeⅠ* [6]*ⅠnuzlχneⅠç. ∫pureri. meθlumeric. ena∫*

LL IV.16-19: ... *hatec. repinec* [17]*meleri. sveleric. svec. an. c∫. mele. θun* [18]*muṭince. Ⅰθẹzịṇe.Ⅰ ṛụẓẹ. ṇuzlχnẹc ∫pureṛi* [19]*meθlumẹric. ena∫*

Since the normal word order of Etruscan is *S - O - V* (see above, P.118f) *θezine* 'is to be sacrificed' is likely to be preceded in the sentence by the designation for that which is to be sacrificed. More specifically we expect that this designation is contained in the sequence *hatec ...svec*, which is followed by the relative clause *an ... mutince*. Since the whole section *hatec ... mutince* does not contain a

known general term for 'sacrificial offering' (cf. supra on Etr. *cal, tar, fler*), it may be assumed that the sacrifice to be made is stipulated in this section and need not be specified with the term *ruze*. Hence we may reject the translation of Stoltenberg 1956, in which he interprets *ruze* ('sheep') in these passages as the object of *θezine*: "Opfere hin ein Schaf und auf dem Kleintieraltar für Stadt und Burg von Ena". Stoltenberg's translation of *-c* 'and' (*nuzlχnec*) in joining *ruze* and *nuzlχne*, 'sacrifice a sheep and on the altar', is also unsatisfactory. The obvious way to translate *θezine ruze nuzlχne-c* is by linking the two verbal forms *θezine* and *nuzlχne-*, i.e. 'is to be sacrificed and (*ruze*) [ACTION]ed' = 'is to be sacrificed by [ACTION]ing (it) (*ruze*)' or 'is to be sacrificed having [ACTION]ed (it) (*ruze*)'.

If in LL IV *ruze* does not designate an animal sacrifice, then the same applies to LL VIII. The most likely interpretation of *ruze* is then that it, like *zati*, is a locative. From the nomen agentis *ruzu-*, which is attested as an individual name *ruzus* (gen.) in Vs 2.20 (late VI-450), we may extract the verbal root *ruz-* (see above, p.138). The formation of appellatives, which are often attested only as individual names, from other appellatives by the addition of an element *-e* is a known phenomenon of Etruscan, cf. praen. *avile* to *avil* 'year', praen. *cele-* (which is attested in Cl 1.1091 in the filiation *celeθa* 'the (daughter) of *cele-*' and elsewhere as a 'Vornamengentilicium') to *cel* 'earth', praen. *uθile* to *uσil* 'sun', *flere* 'numen' to *fler* 'hostia'. The derivation of appellatives from verbs by the addition of *-e* is difficult to illustrate, but an example may be won from an analysis of the form *θezeri* beside *flereri* in the *liber linteus*. The postposition *-ri* 'pro' is added to the locative case ending (see Rix 1985a:§35), so that *flereri* 'pro numine' may be analysed as < *flere-i-ri*. Hence from *θezeri* < *θeze-i-ri* we can reconstruct the base form *θeze*✻ 'a

sacrifice', which is a verbal noun in -e derived from θez-
'to sacrifice'. We may then assume that ruze (< *ruze-i) is
the locative of a nominal base form ruze*, which is a
derivative in -e of the verb ruz-. As a locative in -e, ruze
finds several parallels in the liber linteus such as faše <
fašei (see above), une < *unei < *una-i (see Rix
(forthcoming b)) and pl. zušleve < *zušlevei < *zušleva-i.

An interim partial translation of _fler θezine ruze nuzlχne_
zati zatlχne can now be offered: 'a hostia is to be
sacrificed; it is to be [ACTION]ED on/with a ruze* (and)
[ACTION]ed on/with a zat*'.

In the context of ritual sacrifice in the liber linteus the
verbal form zatlχne is, as we have established, in some way
concerned with the slaying of the fler. Neither it nor
nuzlχne can describe a ritual sprinkling of wine (Etr.
vinum) or water (Etr. θi-) over the head of the animal or a
ritual scattering of salted corn meal (expressed with Etr.
faše-). The meaning of zatlχne can be reconciled with that
of zatlaθ if the latter meant originally, let us say,
'striker'/ ?'sword-striker', later specialized as 'armed
guard'. Hence the base verb could mean 'strike' and zatlχne
'is to be struck (to death), slaughtered' (cf. Germ.
schlagen, erschlagen) or similar; the meaning 'strike' may
be considered as a working hypothesis.

Unfortunately we do not know whether the zatlaθ in Tomba
Golini II carried a sword, but, as he carries a shield, this
is likely. If he did, it does not necessarily follow that
the appurtenance of the 'striker' was originally the sword,
which is a refined weapon. The possibility that it was the
club or the axe must be left open, as must the possibility
that the zatlaθ was not originally associated with a
particular weapon. Archaeological evidence would, however,
be consistent with an original meaning 'axe-striker; axe-

man' for *zatlaθ*. The axe was a weapon of war from Villanovan times, and may have been replaced as the *zatlaθ*'s weapon only later by the sword, examples of which are known in Etruria from the first half of the eighth century (see Saulnier 1980:32ff.).

On the grave stele of Avele Feluske from Vetulonia, which is dated to the last decades of the seventh century (Pallottino 1975:fig.30) a (double) axe is brandished by a warrior with a round shield and a long-crested helmet[4]. The stele of Larθi Aninie from Fiesole (early VI B.C.) shows a warrior brandishing a (single-bladed) axe (Giglioli 1935:pl. 69,3).

We may now consider the possibility that *zati* is related to a verb meaning 'strike'. The function of *zati* is either locative, in which case *zati* may be 'on that on which a sacrificial animal is struck/ sacrificed', i.e. 'on an altar of some sort', or instrumental, in which case *zati* may be 'with that with which a sacrificial animal is struck/ sacrificed', i.e. 'with a weapon of some description'. Since it is unlikely that either *ruze* or *zati* indicate the location of the sacrifice, because this is contained already in *puθs θaclθ θartei*, and further unlikely that another location should be indicated with *zati* after the action contained in *nuzlχne* has been carried out, the most satisfactory interpretation of *zati*, as of *ruze*, is that it is a locative with the function of an instrumental. This interpretation makes the better connection with *zatlaθ* as originally 'one who strikes (with a sword, axe etc.)'.

A sword is the more likely weapon for the *zatlaθ* in Tomba Gollini II, but this does not exclude the possibility that *zati* in the *liber linteus* means 'with an axe', a weapon with which it is easier to kill an animal than with a sword and one which has a longer history than the sword.

Religious rites in general and ritual sacrifice in particular are not a common theme in Etruscan art. The evidence available is discussed by Ryberg 1955:6-19 (with plates). The chief (and earliest) evidence of animal sacrifice comes from reliefs on: 1. the Certosa situla, where a bull and a ram appear in the *pompa*: "two more men complete the procession ..., the second equipped with a sword, which, if any doubt remained, would identify the scene as a sacrificial procession. The dog walking behind the axe-bearer is not being conducted, ..."; 2. the Sedia Corsini, where two attendants lead in a bull, the first holding a rope which forms a noose around the bull's neck, the second holding a rope which appears to be attached to the *dorsuale*, a broad band around the bull's middle, and was probably used to restrain the animal: "the first attendant has an axe, the second a situla"; 3. a bronze lamina from Bomarzo, which shows the preparation of a sacrifice to Hercules by satyrs of "a hoofed animal, probably a stag, though its tail is distinctly bovine": "one (sc. satyr-attendant) has a knife and a shallow dish, the other carries an axe ..., while the last holds a knife and a bundle of spits (?)"; 4. a sixth century sarcophagus from Chiusi: "three attendants conduct a bovine victim. Opposite them at the left is a row of three other attendants, each with a knife in his right hand ...". To this evidence we may add that of a small round bronze from the third or second century, found on the right bank of the Tiber and now in the Vatican (fig. in Cristofani 1985b:151). The obverse side shows the head of an Etruscan *haruspex* with characteristic pointed hat, and the reverse side his tools: an axe, single-bladed as are those in the reliefs, and a knife. Hence from Etruscan art we can identify the axe, the knife and the sword as the implements of animal slaughter.

In Greek art (especially vase painting) and in Roman (especially reliefs) religious rites provide a familiar

theme. In the Greek representations the tools of slaughter appear seldom, the knife occasionally and the axe rarely (Ryberg 1955:5). In representations of sacrifice in Roman art (see Ryberg 1955 (with plates)), where a special theme is the *suovetaurilia*, the single-bladed axe figures predominantly, in the *suovetaurilia* carried by the victimarius who leads in the bull, but the mallet/ club (to stun the animal) and the knife also appear. The sacrificial scene which Ryberg 1955:85 (see pl. XXV, fig. 39a) describes as "the most complete extant example of the 'ox-slaying'" comes from the Altar of Manlius in Rome: "In the space above the victim stand a togate flute player and a victimarius carrying a mallet over his shoulder and a shallow dish of *mola salsa* (?) in his hand .... the moment chosen for representation is just before the actual slaughter of the victim, when the axe and the knife are poised for the kill. The animal is here turned in the opposite direction, toward the right, in order to give to the priest the position best adapted for the pouring of the libation. The head is held down by attendants kneeling at either side, one of whom is about to plunge a triangular knife into the bull's neck. At the same time the popa, his body twisted to the left and right knee flexed, holds the axe poised above his head, ready to swing. The victimarius at the right looks up awaiting the blow, while the other concentrates on the vulnerable point into which he will thrust the knife." Roman art confirms, therefore, the axe and the knife as the chief implements of slaughter and the use of a mallet to stun the animal; it appears that the axe may only have been used for the bull.

One might, therefore, advance a translation of *zati* as 'with a (single-bladed) axe', since we have evidence that the axe was a tool used in animal sacrifice. The religious associations of the axe, discussed below (see ʃVI.3.), also strengthen the possibility that *zati* means 'with an

axe'. In the extant written prescriptions for the performance of sacrifices in Greek, Latin and Umbrian the tools of slaughter are never mentioned; these prescriptions consist of a ritual calendar from Cos (nr. 251 in E. Schwyzer, Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora, Leipzig 1923); certain passages in the *de Agri Cultura* of Cato such as Cato.*Agr*.134 (the sacrifice before the harvest to Ceres of the *porca praecidanea*); the *acta fratrum arvalium* and the Iguvine Tables. The *liber linteus*, like these prescriptions, is highly formulaic (see Rix:1985c; (forthcoming b)). Hence we might be suspicious of the interpretation 'with an axe', if *zati* occurred in a common formula. The fact, however, that the phrase *zati zatlχne* is a hapax and expresses, therefore, an act not otherwise recorded is consistent with an interpretaion 'is to be struck (to death) with an axe'. The type of animal to be slaughtered is not directly indicated. If, however, the axe was used in Etruria, as apparently in Rome, only in the slaughter of the bull, one may wonder if *zivaś fler ... zati zatlχne* 'hostia viva securi percutenda (est)' is not a paraphrase for 'a bull is to be sacrificed'.

A satisfactory semantic account of the '*zat-* triplets' is therefore given by the proposed meaning **zat-* 'strike': *zatlχne* 'is to be struck (to death)', *zati* 'with that with which one strikes', *zatlaθ* 'one who strikes'. It is essential now that we consider the morphological relationship between these three words because only when that is demonstrated can the use of *zati* and *zatlχne* to posit the (original) meaning of *zatlaθ* be accepted.

Two morphological accounts of the '*zat-* triplets' are offered below; the following phenomena of word-formation are employed:

1. From a word of category *x* is derived, through
   suffixation, a word of category *not -x*, e.g.:

   work (vb.)   →   *worker* (nomen agentis)
   verstehen (vb.) →   *verstehbar* (adj.)

   good (adj.)   →   *goodness* (noun)
   schön (adj.)   →   *Schönheit* (noun)

   König (noun)   →   *königlich* (adj.)
   Kleid (noun)   →   *kleiden* (vb.)

   hier (adv.)   →   *hiesig* (adj.)
   damals (adv.)   →   *damalig* (adj.)

The suffix may be null (e.g. *dirty* (adj.) → *dirty* (vb.);
idle (adj.) → *idle* (vb.)), that is to say, from a word of
category *x* is formed a categorically different word without
a derivative element being added. Of relevance here are
verbs formed from nouns with ∅-suffix, and nouns formed from
verbs with ∅-suffix. Some examples are:

denominative verbs		deverbative nouns	
bridge	'(make a) bridge'	*bore*	'(one who) bore(s)'
fine	'(impose a) fine'	*drink*	'(a fluid which one) drink(s)'
lecture	'(give a) lecture'	*groan*	'(act,instance of) groan(ing)'
loan	'(make a) loan'	*look*	'(act,instance of) look(ing)'
mother	'(behave as a) mother'	*mince*	'(that which is) mince(d)'
oil	'(apply with) oil'	*sprout*	'(that which) sprout(s)', 'branch'

joke   '(make a) joke'   *yawn*   '(act,instance of)
                                            yawn(ing)'

of particular relevance are:

α) denominative verbs of the type *axe* '(chop with an) axe',
hammer '(strike with a) hammer' (cf. Germ. *Hammer* →
hämmern), *knife* '(cut with a) knife', *saw* '(cut with a)
saw', *scythe* '(cut with a) scythe' and *torpedo* '(attack
with a) torpedo', in which the verb is (semantically)
dependent on an instrument noun; the concept 'saw'
(instrument), for instance, is implied in the verbal
concept 'saw'. Further, from denominative verbs, whose base
noun designates a device or tool, only personal nomina
agentis can be derived, e.g. *Trommel* → *trommeln* → *Trommler,
Ruder* → *rudern* → *Ruderer.*

β) deverbative nouns of the type *sprout, mince, clip,
rattle,* which show <u>concrete</u> senses.

γ) the fact that deverbative nouns are much less numerous
than denominative verbs.

The only words of category *x* which are derived through
suffixation from words also of category *x* are: i)
<u>augmentatives</u>, e.g. It. *aquila* 'eagle' → *aquilone* 'kite';
ii) <u>diminutives</u>, e.g. Lat. *corōna* 'wreath' → *corōlla*
(< *corōn-la)* 'small wreath, garland', Germ. *Dorf* 'village'
→ *Dörfchen* 'little village', *husten* 'cough' → *hüsteln* 'give
a slight cough'; iii) <u>hypocoristics</u>, e.g. Gr. *Εὐριπίδης* →
Εὐριπίδιον 'sweet little Euripides'

(Separate processes are compounding (e.g. *red* + *hot* → *red-
hot; brick* + *layer* → *bricklayer)* and multiple suffixation
(e.g. *audī-tōr-ium))*.

2. From a word of category *x* (derived from a word of
category *y)* a word of category *y* can be derived, e.g.:

category $y^{(1)}$	→	category x	→	category $y^{(2)}$
canere (vb.) 'sing'	→	*cantus* (noun) 'singing, song'	→	*cantāre* (vb.) 'sing'
gerere (vb.) 'bear, carry'	→	*gestus* (noun) 'movement of the limbs'	→	*gestāre* (vb.) 'carry with one'
ducere (vb.) 'lead'	→	*ēdux* (noun) (< *eks-duk-) 'one who leads out'	→	*ēducāre* (vb.) 'lead out of childhood, raise, educate'
PIE *med- 'think over' (Lat. *meditārī* Gr. μέδομαι)	→	*medicus* (subst.) 'one who thinks in particular about health, doctor'	→	*medicāre* 'be a doctor, heal, cure'

As these examples show, $y^{(2)}$ can have the same meaning as $y^{(1)}$, or it can have a more specialized meaning than $y^{(1)}$.

3. When two words have the same meaning, the longer form usually survives the loss of the shorter form, e.g. *canere* – *cantāre* 'sing': *cantāre* survives in the Romance languages (It. *cantare*, Fr. *chanter*); *canere* is lost.

4. Nouns which are in origin verbal abstracts (nomina actionis) often acquire concrete meanings; they become in effect nomina rei actae, e.g. *tegō* 'I cover' → *toga* 'covering, clothing, a particular outer garment', *molō* 'I mill' → *mola* 'milling, a millstone'.

Two possible accounts of our three Etruscan forms, in which the phenomena illustrated above are employed, are given below. The first assumes *zat- 'to strike' as the starting point of the paradigm. *zat- is the base of an instrument noun *zat, loc. *zati* 'striking instrument' (cf. Fr. *hâcher*

238

'crop, cut up' and the deverbal noun *hâchoir* 'chopping-knife, mincer'; *hâcher* is not subject to the existence of a '*hâchoir*') and of a nomen actionis/rei actae *zatilᵃ* 'striking, strike', to which a denominative verb *zatilᵝ* 'strike' is formed with zero suffix. The longer of the two synonymous verbal forms, *zatilᵝ* survives at the expense of *zat* and provides the base for the nomen agentis *zatlaθ*. The substantive *zatlax-* (< *zatilax*) 'strike' is derived from *zatilᵃ* or *zatilᵝ*; it survives with the loss of the shorter form *zatilᵃ*. These arguments are represented below:

zat	→	*zatilᵃ*	→	*zatilᵝ*
(vb./verbal base)		(nom. actionis/nom. rei actae)		(denom. vb.)
'strike'		'striking, strike'		'strike'

zatilᵝ	→	*zatilaθ*	→	*zatlaθ*
		(nom. agentis)		
		'striker'		

zatilᵃ	or	*zatilᵝ*	→	*zatilax* → *zatlax*
—				
				(noun)
				'strike'

to *zatlax-* is formed *zatlxne* (vb.), 'ad percutendum'(?)

to *zat* is formed a 'base noun' *zat* (loc. *zati*) 'that with which one strikes', cf. the PIE root nouns, formed by the addition of the case endings directly to the verbal root, e.g. *ped-* 'to step', *ped-s* (> Lat. *pēs*) 'that which steps, foot'. A parallel in Etruscan may be identified in *zix* 'writing, scroll' to the verb *zic-* 'write'.

Another possible account is one which assumes *zat* (loc. *zati*), originally 'axe', as the starting point. In addition

to the models of word-formation given above one can mention
Lat. *os* (noun) → *orāre* (denominal verb) → *orātor* (nomen
agentis), cf. below *zatilα → *zatilβ → zatlaθ:

*zatα   →   *zatβ   →   *zatilα
(noun)   (denom. vb.)   (nom. actionis/rei
'axe'   'axe'   actae)
(loc. *zati*)   'the axing, axe'

*zatilα   →   *zatilβ   →   *zatilaθ > zatlaθ
                     (desubst. vb.)   (nom. agentis)
                     'axe'   'axe-r'

*zatilα   or   *zatilβ   →   *zatilaχ > *zatlaχ

to *zatlaχ- is formed zatlχne

Both accounts explain satisfactorily the structure of our
three Etruscan terms and the relationship between them.
Neither can be fully tested against Etruscan evidence; but
the structure of some of the forms is paralleled in attested
forms of *zil- 'preside' and ac- 'make':

*zatilα, cf. zil (< *zilil (with haplology) 'presidency(?)';
        acil 'opus'
*zatilβ, cf. *acil 'make'; this verb can be reconstructed
        since it must have been the base of the nomen
        agentis acil-u
zatlaθ, cf. zilaθ 'president'
zatlaχ-, cf. zilaχ- 'presidency', attested in zilaχce etc.

Of the two accounts the second may be preferred because of
the parallel with desubstantival verbs of the type *saw*.

3. The Etruscan source of *satelles*

It remains to consider the phonological and morphological questions raised by the assumption that the Latin word derives from the Etruscan. Only when these are answered satisfactorily can the Etruscan origin of *satelles* be accepted with complete confidence.

Almost all of the attestations of the Latin word are plural (see above): *satellites* (= a group of armed personal guards to a king), and it is not unlikely that the Romans learned the word in its plural form. The *zatlaθ* in Tomba Golini II is one of such a group of armed men; *zatlaθ* is attested relatively late and is very probably a syncopated form (whether we accept *zat-* or *zatl-* as the (historical) verbal base form) of an earlier *#zatilaθ* (pl. *#zat(i)laθar, -er, -ur*), which would have been the source of the Latin word: since we believe *satelles/satellites* to have been used at Rome since the regal period, the Etruscan source will have been earlier than the syncope of the first half of the fifth century. Hence comparison can be made between the Etruscan and Latin forms:

*#z	a	t	i	l	a	θ	–	ur
s	a	t	e	ll	i	t	–	es
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8

If we consider first the vowels, the replacing in Latin of Etr. *a* (2) by *a*, Etr. *i* (4) by *e* (see below) and of Etr. *a* (6) by *i* (with the regular development $a > \vartheta > i$ before dentals in open medial unaccented syllables, cf. *incĭdere* beside *cădere)* is unproblematic.

The phonetic value of *z* (1) in Etruscan is [tˢ] (see Rix 1985a:ƒ20; one may add that the value [tˢ] is also assured by the occurrence of *z* in Osc. *húrz* (Ve. 147) < Proto-Sab. *#γort(o)s* < PIE *#ǵʰortos*). The substitution in Latin of *s-* for Etr. *z-* is to be expected in the first place because

Early Latin has no letter z/ sound [tₛ]. Further, z is sometimes found for s in Etruscan, especially in inscriptions from Volsinii (e.g. *fuflunzl* (Vs 6.4) for *fuflunsl*, *zemni* (AS 1.407) for *semni*, *ʒalvies* (AH 2.1) for *salvies*, *zerturi* (Pe 1.1053) for *s/śerturi*, *celez* (Vs 1.267) for *celes*).

Etr. *t* (3) and *θ* (7) are rendered in Latin by *t*. Rix 1985a:§§18,19 argues that the phonetic value of *θ* in Etruscan was probably [t'] except internally next to liquids where it represented /þ/; /þ/ in this position is perhaps based on a prehistoric spirantization of /t/. A dialect phenomenon in Etruscan highlights the similarity in the sounds represented by *θ* and *t*: *t* for *θ* is sometimes found in Etruscan inscriptions, and occurs in nomina agentis in *-aθ*, of which there are attested variants in *-at*: *zilat* (Cl 1.2251+) for *zilaθ*, *sneṇaṭ* (Vc S.27) for *snenaθ* (Um S.4+), rec. *[t]euṛat* (Pe 8.4) < arc. *#tevarat* for rec. *#teuraθ* < arc. *tevaraθ* (Ta 7.7, 7.8)[5]. Hence beside Etr. *zatlaθ* we can reconstruct a form *#zatlat*. Etr. *θ* > Lat. *t* presents no problem in any case since Early Latin not only does not know the sound [t'] (but [t] is similar) but also does not have the letter *θ*.

A plural ending in *-ar*, *-er*, *-ur* (8) was unknown in Latin; the Romans will then have adapted the Etruscan ending to their own morphological system.

The main obstacle to accepting that Etr. *#zatlaθ-* is the source of Lat. *satellit-* is Lat. *-ll-* for Etr. *-l-*. Pfiffig's (1969:§22) arguments for a phonemic difference in consonant length in Etruscan are not satisfactory. These are: a) that the following geminations in Etruscan are known: Cl 1.911 *callia*, Cl 1.1077 *uillinal*, Cl 1.1696 *causĺinióóa*, Cr 3.14 *θannursiannaś* *mulvannice*, Cr 0.4 *turannuve*, Pe 8.4 *tanna*, Ve 3.7 *aville*, Vt 1.147 *presntedóa*

242

and b) Latin inscriptions from Etruria show forms such as CIE 682 *Vibinnia* (cf. Etr. *vipina*), CIE 787 *Seppia* (cf. Etr. *θepia*), Cl 1.2546 *Pabassa* for Etr. *papaθa* (see Cl 1.2543). The list of Etruscan forms showing double consonants given by Pfiffig is not complete; Cr 2.22 *kasalienna*, Ve 3.11 *vipiiennas* can be added, and the possibility cannot be excluded that one or two other forms with -CC- may exist.

To have in the mass of our Etruscan material so few instances of -CC- does not invoke confidence in a proposition that Etruscan had long consonants. What Pfiffig fails to point out is that for the most part the forms which he cites are not only hapaxes but also appear to be orthographic variants of more frequently attested forms in -C-, cf. *calia* beside *callia*, where one may suspect influence from Lat. *Gallia*; *vilinal* beside *uillinal*; *θanursienas*, *θanarsienas* beside *θannursiannaš*; *mulvanice*, *mulvanike* beside *mulvannice*; *turanuve*, which occurs twice in the same inscription as *turannuve*; *avile* (> Lat. *Aulus*) beside *aville*. The motivation for the double spelling in these cases is not clear, but there are no grounds for assuming it to be phonemic: arc. *θannursiannaš*, for instance, may be interpreted as the phonetic variant of the gentilicium arc. *θanursienas* (cf. *spuria-* beside *spurie-*), which is derived from a praenomen *θanursie-* by means of the suffix -*na*.

The geminations in *presnteθθa*, *caušliniθθa* and *PABASSA* are, on the other hand, morphological. The forms are to be analysed as genitives in -*s* of a praenomen plus a demonstrative pronoun *σa* /ša/ and to be interpreted as articulated filiations, e.g. *caušlinis-θa* > *caušliniθθa* 'the (daughter) of Caušlinei' (see Rix 1985a:§41). Only in these exceptional cases are morphological geminations represented orthographically (in Early Latin texts too double consonants were not orthographically represented);

normally they are simplified, e.g. *velθuruσa* 'the one of Velθur; the son of Velθur' (= *velθurus clan*) or 'the one of Velθur, the daughter of Velθur' (= *velθurus seχ*), *papaδa*, *pres/śnteδa*, cf. gent. *velθura* < *velθur-ra*, formed to the individual name *velθur*. The form *tanna* is perhaps to be analysed as *tan* (acc. of the demonstrative pronoun arc. *ita*, rec. *ta*) + *-na* (possessive suffix) (so Helmut Rix: personal communication).

One cannot argue that the *-l-* of *zatlaθ* is the orthographic variant of a phonetic long consonant nor that it represents the single spelling of *-l-l-*, when there is no morphological explanation available for **zat(i)l-laθ*.

Breyer 1984:1040 includes *satelles* together with *arillātor*, *camillus, cella* and *persillum* in a section "Wortkern (oder ganzes Wort) sicher oder möglicherweise etruskischer Herkunft oder Vermittlung (jedoch nicht aus dem Gr.)". On Etr. *cela* < Lat. *cella* see Introduction.

The arguments of M. Durante, Una sopravvivenza etrusca in latino, *SE* 41, 1973, 193-200 (followed by Breyer 1984:350-352) and P. Martino, Arbiter, Roma 1986; Il nome etrusco di Atlante, Roma 1987, that Lat. *arillātor* 'broker, huckster' is of Etruscan origin are not convincing (see Helmut Rix, *IF* 95, 1990, 281-283; Rex Wallace, *Lg* 65/1, 1989, 187-188). *aril* (Vc S.2, OI G.26), inscribed next to a figure who supports the sky on his shoulders, is by common assent the Etruscan name for Gr. Ἄτλας. Since *-il* is not agent suffix, it cannot be assumed that *aril* '?' is Latinized as an agent noun in *-ātor*; since there is no evidence for a common noun **aril* in Etruscan, it can equally not be assumed that Latin borrowed **aril*, formed a denominative verb **aril(l)āre* to it, which yielded an agent noun *arillātor*. An Etruscan etymology is semantically and morphologically

unfounded; the etymology of *arillātor* must remain *sub iudice*.

Breyer 1984:366-368 and Bonfante 1985:208, following Serv.*A*.11.558, assume Etruscan origin for Lat. *camillus* m. 'boy attendant of a priest', f. *camilla*. Var.*L*.7.34 (: *hinc Casmil[l]us nominatur Samothrece<s> mysteris dius quidam amminister diis magnis. verbum esse graecum arbitror, quod apud Callimachum in poematibus eius inveni)* connects *camillus* indirectly with Gr. καδμῖλος, κασμῖλος 'cult ministrant', which we may accept as the source of *camillus*, if we assume Lat. *＊cammilus* (with assimilation, cf. *amminister* for *administer*) > *camillus* (with a metathesis of consonantal length, perhaps under influence from Lat. *ancilla* 'maidservant').

Lat. *persillum*, which designates a kind of stirring implement or ladle, is a hapax: Fest.*Paul*. p.238L *persillum vocant sacerdotes rudiculum picatum, quo unguine flamen Portunalis arma Quirini unguet*. The etymology of the word is by commom assent dubious. Most recently Meiser 1986:76, following Buecheler, has tentatively related *persillum* to Umb. *persondro* "Fett": "wenn aus *＊per-sondʰ-lo-* oder *＊per-sendʰ-lo*; auffällig ist jedoch die Vertretung von *o* bzw. *e* durch *i*". Breyer 1984:468-469 supports the theory of Emilio Peruzzi, *RFIC* 104, 1976, 144-148 (*non vidi*), who derives *persillum* from Etr. *perśie*, although "i particolari del prestito non sono precisabili". The Etruscan form occurs in Pe 3.1 (V/IV) *ªeta: kavθaś: aχuiaś: perśie ᵇavle numnaś turke* 'this *perśie* belongs to (or: is for) Kavθa Aχuia; Avle Numna gave (it)', which is inscribed on a "manico di bronzo di una patera di grandi dimensioni (patella lata)" (Buffa, NRIE 419; fig. 18; 19 in Van der Meer 1987). Etr. *perśie* is a common noun in *-ie* derived from an element *perś-*, which is also found in the personal name *perśu*: Vt 1.133 (II) [-]-. *perśu. ls. [c]ei[cna]l. .. '... perśu* son of Laris and of

245

Ceicnei'; since the beginning of the inscription has not
survived it is not possible to tell whether *peróu* is a
gentilicium in *-u* to an unattested praenomen (in origin an
appellative) *peró* or a cognomen in *-u* (in origin a nomen
agentis) to a verb *peró*. Peruzzi assumes that *peróie*
designates the bronze handle, which has the form of a small
shovel with a longer handle and smaller pan, on which it is
inscribed. Seeing that the gift of a handle would not be
made without the patera to which it belongs, it seems more
likely that *peróie* designates the patera; as a vessel name
in *-ie peróie* finds a parallel in Etr. *ecisie* (cf. supra,
*II.3.). There are no good grounds for assuming that Lat.
persillum is an Etruscan loanword.

Hence there is no example of Etr. *-l-* > Lat. *-ll-*. The
double consonant of *satelles* must, it seems, be accounted
for by development within Latin. However, it cannot be
attributed to the *littera rule* for, since *zatilaθ* is
syncopated to *zatlaθ*, the quantity of the vowel *-i-* must
have been short. Highly improbable also is that a reversal
of the *mamilla rule* should have occurred[6].

Before considering in what form the borrowing of *satelles*
from Etruscan may have taken place, the argument, expressed
by Breyer 1984, following Ernout 1929, that "außerdem gehöre
satelles zu einer Gruppe von Wörtern auf *-es, -itis*, die
etr. Herkunft verdächtig seien" should be discussed. Many
of these words have dubious or unknown etymologies and it
has been suggested that they are of Etruscan origin.

Certainly not all words in *-ĕs, -ĭtis* are of (possible)
Etruscan origin. Some are obviously IE grafts, formed by the
addition of an element *-t-* to a stem in *-ĭ-*, which is the
reduced grade of *ei-* 'go' (Lat. *īre*), e.g. *pedes* 'foot
soldier' < *ped-i-t-* 'by-foot-goer', *comes* 'companion' <
kom-i-t- 'with-goer', *eques* 'cavalry man' < *ekʷ(o)-i-t-*

246

'by-horse-goer' (cf. It. *andare a cavallo* 'ride'). Others are compounds in *-sti-* (< *-sta-* < *-sth₂-*, the reduced grade of *steh₂-* 'stand'), e.g. *antistes* < *anti-sti-t-*, *praestes* < *prae-sti-t-*. Further, of certain IE origin are: *dives* 'rich, rich man', *hospes* (< *ghosti-potis*, cf. OCS. *gospodъ* 'Lord, God') and *tudes* 'hammer, mallet', originally "das Gestoßene" (see Meiser 1986:238, cf. *tuditāre* 'strike repeatedly' from *tud-* 'strike'). Lat. *cocles* 'one-eyed person, the cognomen of Horatius, who kept the Etruscans from the Sublician bridge' is a borrowing from Gr. Κύκλωψ, most probably through Etruscan mediation (De Simone 1970).

The following words in *-ĕs*, *-ĭtis* have no certain etymology, but it does not follow that they must be Etruscan: *ales* 'having wings, bird', *ames* 'pole for supporting bird-nests', *caeles* 'dwelling in heaven, divinity', *caespes* 'sod, turf', *fomes* 'wood for kindling fire', *gurges* 'swirling mass of water', *indiges* 'obscure title applied to certain deities', *līmes* 'strip of uncultivated land used to mark a division, object set up to mark a boundary of land', *merges* 'sheaf of corn', *mīles* 'foot soldier', *palmes* 'vine-branch or shoot', *poples* 'knee-joint, knee; back of the knee, hough', *sospes* 'safe, sound; cult title of Juno at Lanuvium', *stīpes* 'tree trunk', *tarmes* 'woodworm or maggot', *tērmes* 'bough of a tree; name of specific tree, perhaps the wild olive', *trāmes* 'footpath, track', *vēles* 'light-armed footsoldier'.

A notable sub-group of Latin words in *-ĕs*, *-ĭtis* consists of military terms: *eques*, *mīles*, *pedes*, *vēles* and perhaps *poples*. Hence *satelles* may be considered as one of a series of Latin words in *-ĕs* of unknown (possibly Etruscan) origin and as one of a 'military' sub-group of Etruscan loanwords in Latin. That *satelles* belongs to this semantic category, otherwise exemplified by *populus* and perhaps by *classis*[7], favours its Etruscan origin. The existence of an Etr. *mīlaθ* (> Lat. *mīles*) and an Etr.

*vēlaθ (> Lat. vēles), in the absence of IE etymologies for these terms, is also probable but cannot be demonstrated. Lat. vēles is glossed as Etruscan by Isid.Orig.18.57, cf. Plin.Nat.7.201. Varro's (L.5.89) etymology of mīles as 'thousand-man' cannot be supported: there is no PIE root *mil-; Lat. mīlle 'thousand' is a derivative of PIE *ĝhes-lo- 'thousand' (see Mayrhofer 1986:107) or, more likely, 'hand' (see Helmut Rix, Uridg. ĝheslo- in den südidg. Ausdrücken für '1000', forthcoming in Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea memoriae A.J. Van Windekens dicata). Lat. mīl-it-is cannot be compared to com-it-is 'with-goer' because we have no idea what a '*mīl-goer' could be. From the gentilicium f. rec. milṇei (AS 1.27) one can reconstruct arc. *mīl-e-na-i.

We may now consider the form in which satelles may have been borrowed from Etruscan. It is true that many unliterary borrowings are in the acc. sg., e.g. Gr. σπυρίδα > Etr. spurta > Lat. sporta, but this cannot be the case here. In Etruscan nom. and acc. sg. have the same form, namely in our case zatlaθ (<*zatilaθ). It is not possible to interpret the Lat. acc. sg. as 'satellit (<*zatilaθ) + ending -em'. In Latin short vowels in open medial unaccented syllables develop (in the positions relevant to our argument) as follows:

ă, ĕ, ĭ, ŏ, ŭ > ə > ĭ before dentals and gutturals
　　　　　　　　> ə > ŭ before velar l (i.e. before -la, -lo, -lu, -lC, and not before palatal -li, -le, -ll-).

Since it < aθ is the characteristic development of an open unaccented syllable, the Latin -it- cannot be from Etruscan final -aθ, which would yield Lat. *-at. This fact reinforces the possibility that the word entered Latin in the plural form. It is also unlikely that *-at- > -it- is a development

in the Latin word, i.e. *zatilaθ > *satellat(+ em) > satellitem. If one assumes a development *-at- > -it- in Latin itself, then the original Latin form would have been *satĭ/ĕlat(-em) from which is expected *satulitem or - with syncope - *satlatem > *sallitem. Palatal double -ll- (Etr. *zatil- > Lat. satell-) cannot be assumed to account for the ĕ of satelli- since it is most improbable that the Etruscan word had double ll (nor indeed is there any indication that [ll] is an allophone of /l/ in Etruscan).

Once an explanation can be found for the -ll- of the stem satellit- (pl. satellites), it is not difficult to find an explanation for the nom. sg. satelles. It may, for instance, have been formed by the addition of -s to the stem satellit-:

*satellĭt-s > *satelliss > *satellis > satelles

(for -ts > -ss > -s, cf.: *ped-s > *pets > pess > pēs (to a stem *pĕd-), *lūdsi > *lūtsi > lūssi > lūsi).

There is no precedent in Latin for final -s (< -ss < -ts) after a short vowel outside of a group of nouns in -ĕs, -ĭtis. The nom. sg. satelles may then have been directly modelled on words in this sub-series :

pedĕs	:	pedĭtēs
x		satellĭtēs
x = satellĕs.		

Such a hypothesis, namely Etr. *zatilaθ-ur/ar/er > Lat. satellites, to which the singular is formed on the analogy of other nouns (particularly the military terms) in -ĕs, -ĭtis, would appear satisfactory but for the question of Etr. -l- > Lat. -ll-.

Starting from the plural form *zate/ilaθ-ur we can posit the following development:

Etr. pl.   *zatilaθ-ur
Lat.   > *satelad-ĕs[8]
          > *satladĕs
          > *satĺdĕs   (Sommer-Pfister 1977:§§67,86)
          > *sateldĕs   (Sommer-Pfister 1977:§§67.86)
          > *satellĕs   (op. cit. §132, IV.2, cf.
                            *saldō > sallō, *Poldūcēs >
                            Pollūces > Pollūx)

This proposal entails the assumption that the inherited nom. pl. *-ĕs ending of the consonant stems in Latin has not yet been replaced by *-ēs (< *-ei̯-es, e.g. *ciu̯ei̯-es > civēs, cf. Old Indian agnayas to agni- 'fire') of the i-stems (cf. PIE *pĕd-es 'feet', Skt. pā́d-as, Gr. πόδ-ες, Lat. ped-ēs). Since original *-ĕs is preserved in Osc. humuns (< *homon-ĕs) 'hominēs', meddíss (< *meddik-ĕs) 'meddicēs', Umb. frater (< *frater-(e)s) (with loss of ĕ by syncope), it follows that *-ĕs was maintained in proto-Italic and was present in proto-Latin. No absolute chronology is available for the substitution of -ēs for *-ĕs in the Latin consonant stems. It is then theoretically possible that the ending was still *-ĕs in the sixth century, when the borrowing is most likely to have occurred. Lat. satellĕs, in origin a plural, will have been treated as singular (cf. mīlĕs, comĕs etc.). The plural satellītēs will have been formed on the model of existing nouns in -ĕs, -ītis:

        pedĕs   :   pedītēs
        satellĕs :   x   x = satellītēs

If the nom. pl. ending -ēs had already replaced *-ĕs, then it must be assumed that *satellēs (< *satelad-ēs) was reshaped into a singular satellĕs; doubt as to whether

250

satellēs indicated a group of armed guards or one of these armed guards may have contributed to this, cf. the English use of *guard/Guards*. The borrowing of a plural noun into another language as a singular form is known, e.g. It. pl. *maccheroni* > Fr. sg. *macaroni*; Engl. pl. *cakes* > Germ. sg. *Keks* 'biscuit'; Engl. *burial, pen, riddle* etc. are extracted from *-s* singulars interpreted as plurals. The possibility should remain open that the borrowing was made through the form of the accusative plural, for which the ending in the Latin consonant stems was also *-ēs* (< *ens* < *-ns*), although it would be less easy here to assume reshaping to a nominative singular.

A similar solution for *satellĕs* from Etruscan singular *zate/ilaθ* can be offered:

Etr. sg.   *zatilaθ
Lat.   > *satelad-ĕs
             > *satladĕs
             > *satĺdĕs
             > *sateldĕs
             > satellĕs (to which pl. *satellites* was
                          formed by analogy, as above).

Here the Etruscan word is adapted to Latin morphology by the addition of *-ĕs* on the analogy of *ped-ĕs, mīl-ĕs* etc. This variant is less probable since the borrowing is likely to have occurred in the plural, for which a satisfactory etymology can be derived. Linguistic and non-linguistic data confirm *satelles* as one of our securest Etruscan loans in Latin.

In conclusion we may consider possible meanings for *ruze nuzlχne*. Since *θezine* is a directive for the slaughter of a sacrificial animal and *zati zatlχne* appears to designate the killing of this animal with an axe, the possible meanings of

ruze nuzlχne 'is to be [ACTION]ed with a ruze', which must describe a preliminary to the slaughter, are limited. Two speculations on the meaning are offered in the hope that one or the other may be confirmed by a new inscription: 1. 'is to be hit with a mallet'; 2. 'is to be bound with rope'. For 1. we note that animals were often first stunned to facilitate the slaughter itself. For 2. we may refer to the scene on the Sedia Corsini (cf. supra), where a bull is bound by ropes held in the hands of two attendants; we might then suggest that the personal name *ruzu-* finds a parallel in the Roman cognomen *Restio* (see Kajanto 1965:322).

Notes

1. See Breyer 1984:484,n.4. Van Windekens 1956 agrees that Lat. *satelles* may be of Etruscan provenance (201: "*-es, -itis* est peut-être de provenance étrusque"), but his arguments that the Etruscan word is of Pelasgian origin cannot be sustained. Lat. *satelles* does not "correspond parfaitement à (Gr.) σάτιλλ(α)" (attested just once in Hsch.: σάτιλλα·πλειάς τὸ άστρον). A curiosum is Arm. zat-'offer, sacrifice' (the original meaning seems to be 'separate'); there can be no connection between the Armenian word and Lat. *satelles*.
2. R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, A Commentary on Horace Odes, II, 1978, 371 consider "*satelles* an unsuitable word for so rough a retainer, but it might be defended as an instance of sardonic humour". They prefer the less widely held view that *satelles* = Mercury, which is based on the reading *revinxit* 'untied' for *revexit* in 1.36. While in figure Mercury is less alien to that portrayed in the Tomba Golini II there is no reason to view him, a messenger between the Upper and Lower worlds, as particularly associated with Hades.
3. It does often happen that a word originally meaning 'one who goes with, follows, accompanies; companion, follower, attendant' comes to be used for an armed bodyguard (e.g. the ἑταῖροι of Homeric and Macedonian kings, the *comites* of Roman emperors, Engl. *Companion of Honour, Companion of the Bath* etc.), that is to say in certain cases 'companion' = '(armed) guard'.
4. The stele bears the inscription Vn 1.1 (VII) [mi aḷuvileś feluskeś tuśnutaḷ [apa/]panalaś mini muluvaneke hirumi[n]a φersnaḷaş' 'I (am the stele) of A. F. (the son) of T. and of A.; H. Φ. dedicated me'. Saulnier 1980 interprets the inscription thus: "Elle

(the stele) est dediée à Avele Feluske Tusnutie, c'est-
à-dire Avelus Feluskus le Vainqueur (ou le Valeureux),
par son campagnon d'armes Hiruminia Phersachs, c'est-à-
dire Hirminius de Pérouse". Saulnier's translation of
tuśnutal as 'vainqueur' is incorrect. The form must
rather be a filiation (so Colonna 1977:187-191), cf.
the gentilicium *tuśnutina-* in Vt 1.57 (600-550) *mi
velθuruś kana tuśnutinas* 'I am the *monumentum* of
V.T.'. Colonna 1977 prefers to see in the last word of
the inscription not a true ethnic (so Saulnier and
Olzscha 1961:478-479: "Perusino") but a cognomen of the
type Coriolanus ("Siegerbeiname"); in his view *Hirumina*
is the son of *Avele*.

5. See Steinbauer 1989:66; he interprets *snenaθ* as "Magd"
    and *tevaraθ* as "Schiedsrichter".
6. For the *mamilla rule*, which is the simplification of a
    double consonant due to a following accented syllable
    (e.g. *mammilla_ (: mamma) > mamilla, *currūlis
    (: currus) > curūlis), see Sommer-Pfister 1977:ſ119.1.
    Szemerényi 1989:50 suggests that the double -*ll*- of
    sollemnis could be attributed to an "Umdrehung des
    mamilla - Gesetzes..., indem das regelrecht entstandene
    solémnis als vor dem historischen Akzent aus *sollémnis*
    entstanden aufgefaßt und diese angeblich ursprüngliche
    Form 'wieder hergestellt' wurde."
7. Lat. *classis* is of Etruscan origin according to M.
    Durante, Il Latino Prelettario, in: Alle Origine del
    Latino,1980, 75.
8. Etruscan *θ* > Lat. *d* is otherwise attested and presents
    no problem, e.g. Etr. *lautniθa* 'liberta' > Lat.
    Lautnida (Cl 1.2094, 1.2095); Etr. *titi* > Lat. *Tidi*
    (Cl 1.2450).

The lictors in republican Rome were the close attendants granted to a magistrate as a symbol of his official dignity, without whom he could not go abroad. Bearing bundles of rods, from which an axe projected (*fasces*), they walked before the magistrate in a line, one after the other, calling out to the people to make way (*summovere*) and reminding them to obey (*animadverti iubere*) the magistrate. The office of the *lictor* goes back to the regal period when the lictors attended the kings.

1. The Etruscan institution of the lictor

It appears that the Romans adopted the custom of having lictors along with the other *insignia imperii* from the Etruscans (see Gladigow 1972, Lambrechts 1959:29); ancient Latin and Greek literary sources are in full agreement in recognizing the Etruscan origin of the Roman *insignia imperii*, which include the lictors and their *fasces* with an axe, the *sella curulis*, the ivory sceptre surmounted by an eagle, the golden crown, the *toga praetexta*, the *toga picta*, the *tunica palmata* and the *paludamentum*. The information given in the sources on these *insignia* is given below:

D.H.2.29.1

Under Romulus the punishment of wrongs committed by citizens against one another was carried out by twelve men who carried the rods and axes (ῥάβδους τε καὶ πελέκεις ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν δώδεκα φερομένους); they scourged in the forum those whose offences merited it and beheaded others who were guilty of the severest crimes.

Etruscan ambassadors bring to Tarquinius Priscus the insignia of sovereignty of the Etruscan kings: a crown of gold (στέφανον χρύσεον), an ivory throne (θρόνον ἐλεφάντινον), a sceptre with an eagle perched on its head (σκῆπτρον ἀετὸν ἔχον), a purple tunic decorated with gold (χιτῶνα πορφυροῦν χρυσόσημον) and an embroidered purple robe (περιβόλαιον πορφυροῦν ποικίλον). D.H. records that according to some historians the ambassadors also bring the twelve axes (τοὺς δώδεκα πελέκεις), taking one from each city. It seems, he relates, to have been an Etruscan custom for each king of the several cities to be preceded by a lictor bearing an axe together with the bundle of rods (ῥαβδόφορον ἅμα τῇ δέσμῃ τῶν ῥάβδων πέλεκυν φέροντα), and whenever the twelve cities undertook any joint military expedition, for the twelve axes to be handed over to the man who was invested with absolute power (εἰ δὲ κοινὴ γίνοιτο τῶν δώδεκα πόλεων στρατεία, τοὺς δώδεκα πελέκεις ἑνὶ παραδίδοσθαι τῷ λαβόντι τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχήν). Other authorities maintain that even before the reign of Tarquinius twelve axes (πελέκεις δώδεκα) were carried before the kings of Rome and that Romulus instituted this custom as soon as he received sovereignty. D.H. is prepared to believe that the Etruscans were the originators of this practice, that Romulus adopted its use from them, and that the twelve axes (τοὺς δώδεκα πελέκεις) were brought also to Tarquinius Priscus together with the other royal ornaments, just as the Romans in his day gave sceptres and diadems to kings in confirmation of their power. He points out that, even without receiving those ornaments from the Romans, these kings make use of them. Tarquinius may then have received the insignia from the Etruscans or have adopted their usage himself; he always wore, D.H. relates, a crown of gold and an embroidered purple robe; he sat on a throne of ivory holding an ivory sceptre in his hand, and the twelve lictors, bearing the axes and rods, attended him when he sat

in judgement and preceded him when he went abroad. All these
ornaments were retained by the kings who succeeded him, and,
after the expulsion of the kings, by the annual consuls with
the exception of the crown and the embroidered robe, which
were looked upon as vulgar and invidious. Only when the
consuls returned victorious from a war and were honoured
with a triumph by the senate did they wear the gold crown
and the embroidered purple robes.

Flor.Epit.1.1.5

neque pace Tarquinius quam bello promptior; duodecim namque
Tusciae populos frequentibus armis subegit. inde fasces,
trabeae, curules, anuli, phalerae, paludamenta, praetextae,
inde quod aureo curru, quattuor equis triumphatur, togae
pictae tunicaeque palmatae, omnia denique decora et
insignia, quibus imperii dignitas eminet, sumpta sunt.

John the Lydian (J.Lyd.), de magistratibus populi 1.8

Πρὸς τούτους ἡγοῦντο τοῦ 'Ρωμύλου πελέκεις δυοκαίδεκα πρὸς
τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν γυπῶν, ὧν εἶδεν ἀρχόμενος θεμελιοῦν τὴν
πόλιν.

John of Zonara, Epit. Historiarum 7.8

καὶ τὴν στολὴν πρὸς το μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἤμειψεν· ἡ δὲ ἦν
ἱμάτιον καὶ χιτὼν ὁλοπόρφυρα καὶ χρυσόπαστας στέφανος τε
λίθων χρυσοδέτων καὶ σκῆπτρον δίφρος τε ἐλεφάντινα, οῖς καὶ
μετὰ ταῦτα οἵ τε ἄλλοι καὶ οἱ τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἔχοντες
ἡγεμονίαν ἐχρήσαντο καὶ τεθρίππῳ ἐν τοῖς ἐπινικίοις
ἐπόμπευσε, καὶ ῥαβδούχους διὰ βίου δώδεκα ἔσχε.

Liv.1.8.2-3

quae (sc. iura) ita sancta generi hominum agresti fore ratus
si se ipse (Romulus) venerabilem insignibus imperii fecisset
cum cetero habitu se augustiorem, tum maxime lictoribus
duodecim sumptis fecit. alii ab numero avium quae augurio
regnum portenderant eum secutum numerum putant: me haud

paenitet eorum sententiae esse quibus et apparitores hoc genus ab Etruscis finitimis, unde sella curulis, unde toga praetexta sumpta est, et numerum quoque ipsum ductum placet et ita habuisse Etruscos, quod ex duodecim populis communiter creato rege singulos singuli populi lictores dederint.

Macr.1.6.7

Tullus Hostilius, rex Romanorum tertius, debellatis Etruscis sellam curulem lictoresque et togam pictam atque praetextam, quae insignia magistratuum Etruscorum erant, primus ut Romae haberentur instituit.

Plin.Nat.8.74(195)

praetextae apud Etruscos originem invenere.

Plin.Nat.9.63(136)

nam toga praetextae et latiore clavo Tullum Hostilium et regibus primum usum Etruscis devictis satis constat.

Plin. Nat.33.4(11)

When Roman generals went in triumph a *corona ex auro Etrusco* was held over their heads from behind.

Posidonius ap. D.S.5.40

The Etruscans devised marks of honour for the generals who led them, assigning to them lictors (ῥαβδούχους), an ivory throne (δίφρον ἐλεφάντινον) and a toga bordered with purple (περιπόρφυρον τήβεvvαν). The majority of these insignia were imitated by the Romans, who perfected them and introduced them into their civilization.

Sal.Cat.51.38

arma atque tela militaria ab Samnitibus, insignia magistratum ab Tuscis pleraque sumpserunt. (subj. = *maiores nostri*).

REGNIQUE CORONAM insigne, non re vera coronam, quam Tusci reges numquam habuerunt, ergo species est pro genere.

MANDATQUE INSIGNIA aut mittat insignia, id est omnia ornamenta regalia, aut re vera 'mandat insignia', id est magna, ut castris succedam, capessam regna Tyrrhena. alii 'insignia' pro fascibus accipiunt, qui ad Romanos a Tuscis translati sunt; aliud est enim 'insigne' singulari numero, aliud 'insigne', in quibus vestis et sella regia accipi potest.

Maeoniaeque decus quondam Vetulonia gentis
bis senos haec prima dedit praecedere fasces
et iunxit totidem tacito terrore secures;
haec altas eboris decoravit honore curules
et princeps Tyrio vestem praetextuit ostro
haec eadem pugnas accendere protulit aere.

Maecenas, cui Maeonia venerabile terra
et sceptris olim celebratum nomen Etruscis.

Triumphal and consular adornment and that of all the rulers was transferred to Rome from Tarquinii; specific mention is given to the fasces (ῥάβδοι), axes (πελέκεις), trumpets (σάλπιγγες), sacrificial rites (ἱεροποιίαι), divination (μαντική) and all music publicly used by the Romans.

arma a Samnitibus, insignia ab Tuscis, leges de lare Lycurgi et Solonis sumpseramus.

ipse oratores ad me regnique coronam
cum sceptro misit mandatque insignia Tarchon,
succedam castris Tyrrhenaque regna capessam

The information on the insignia in these sources is tabulated below (see Table, p. 280-281). Besides those sources which assign the insignia generally to the Etruscans a large proportion (see especially D.H.3.61) associate their introduction to Rome with Tarquinius Priscus. Another tradition assigns to the reign of Tullus Hostilius, as a result of his victories over the Etruscans, at least the *sella curulis, toga praetexta, toga picta* and the lictors, and another to Romulus the *fasces* and twelve lictors. One can easily account for these variations in that the Romans had already had contacts with the Etruscans and borrowed some of their insignia during the reigns of the first four Roman kings, but that it was in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, himself an Etruscan, that the insignia were introduced into Rome on a larger scale and then maintained by his successors; certain insignia may have been anachronistically attributed to the reigns of Romulus and Tullus Hostilius, but a date no later than the reign of Tarquinius seems certain. Certainly we can say that the insignia were introduced to Rome at some time in the regal period, not necessarily all· at once; the presence in archaic Rome of leading Etruscan families certainly facilitated the adoption of these and other cultural practices. Important for our purposes is that the sources indicating the Etruscan origin of the Roman lictors and their instruments are good and unanimous.

Material evidence from Etruria confirms that the *lictor* and *fasces* were originally Etruscan phenomena. In 1898 in the so-called *tomba vetuloniense del 'littore'* a bundle of iron rods was found, surmounted by a double-bladed axe; the rods

and axe are dated to the seventh century (Cristofani 1985a:fig.3.15.30; Pallottino 1975:fig.31). The absolute uniqueness of the object has raised doubts about its authenticity. De Francisci 1954-55:34, without stating it explicitly, suggests that pieces originally separate have been arranged together, but this suggestion has been refuted and the authenticity of the fasces has been widely accepted (cf. Benedetti 1960:460; Lambrechts 1959:197,n.1). The 'fasces of Vetulonia' demonstrate then that the fasces were known in Etruria from the seventh century (terminus ante quem); they furnish archaeological confirmation of the report of Silius Italicus that the fasces were invented in Vetulonia. A number of bipenni (double-bladed axe heads) for comparison with that of the fasces of Vetulonia are listed by Benedetti 1959:240, to which should be added two seventh century model bipenni from the 'tomba monumentale di poggio Gallinaro' in Tarquinia (Cristofani 1985a:fig.9.12). Representations of the demon *Charun* bearing a double-headed axe are known from Hellenistic wall paintings in the Tomba degli Anina and Tomba 5636 in Tarquinia (fig. in Cristofani 1985b:209).

Representations of lictors in Etruscan art (sarcophagi and urn reliefs; wall paintings) are almost exclusively Hellenistic (see Lambrechts 1959). The lictors form part of the funeral cortège of a magistrate (*zilaθ*), who appears as a living person and is conducted to Hades by the lictors who attended him in life. The representations of these processions are very stereotyped and have relatively few divergences (see Lambrechts 1959:189ff.): a number of lictors, varying between one and four (usually two), walk before the chariot (usually a biga) and magistrate, who is sometimes preceded by musicians; sometimes a demon figures in the representation. For artistic reasons and because of limited space the true number of magistrate's lictors (twelve?) was quite likely not shown. The lictors carry

rods, whose bindings are often clearly visible (see
Lambrechts 1959:pl.IV,3; XI,12; XVIII,21a; XIX,22), in their
left hand and rested on their left shoulder (see Gladigow
1972:306; the Roman lictor holds the fasces in this position
too). In both Etruscan and Roman representations a separate
rod (*commoetaculum*) or two rods often appear in addition to
the fasces (Ryberg 1955:24).

The one earlier and hence most important representation of a
lictor in Etruscan art is found on a sarcophagus relief
from Chiusi, now in the Palermo Museum (Thuillier
1985:fig.52). It is dated to the second quarter of the fifth
century by Colonna 1976:188 (followed by Thuillier
1985:140). The relief shows a representation of a sporting
event: prizes are to be presented to the winning
participants in gymnastics and music. To the right is a
raised platform, under which are the prizes (leather wine
bottles) and on which are sitting in discussion two
magistrates, each with a *lituus* and, to their right, a
scribe, to whom the victors present themselves. To the far
left is a standing figure, holding in his right hand a long
pointed stick, held downwards as if he is guarding the
bottles, and in his left, held upwards, two rods.

Colonna interprets these rods as *fasces* and the man carrying
them, therefore, as a lictor. De Francisci 1954-55:34,n.80
is of the same opinion: "l'ultimo personaggio a sinistra
tiene un fascio". Lambrechts 1959:197 has considered the
identification uncertain (: "...d'une figure...considerée,
avec beaucoup d'incertidude, comme licteur"). Thuillier
1985:442 points out "mais il ne s'ensuit pas pour autant que
toutes les verges accolées soient des faisceaux". He
disagrees with Colonna's interpretation of the figure on the
far left as a lictor, considering him instead to be a judge
of the events with a long stick to intervene between the
combatants and with rods such as those held by a judge on

another Chiusine cippus[1]. In an attempt to reconcile the
two views (: judge or lictor) he poses the question whether
the magistrates may have used their lictors as judges. We
might recall that the "Spielgeber" in Rome also had lictors
(see Gladigow 1972:301) and the remark of Lambrechts
1959:192 that "quelquefois (nᵒs 12, Tarquinia, et nᵒs 18,
Volterra) ils ne portent qu'un gros bâton, autre attribut
courant du licteur, destiné a fendre la foule. Mais ils
peuvent avoir à la fois faisceau et bâton, le premier dans
la main gauche, le second dans la droite (nᵒs 18, 22f, nᵒs
22g, 23, 32 de Volterra) ou tous deux dans la main gauche
(nᵒs 34, 35 de Volterra)".

Overall the interpretation of the figure as a lictor seems
the more likely. That the *fasces* he carries contain no axe
is not problematic since we can see here a parallel to the
situation in republican Rome, where the axe is removed
within the city boundary; absence of the axe is the norm in
Etruscan representations because the scenes depicted on them
take place in the city, cf. Lambrechts 1959:196-197: "On
sait que les faisceaux, en particulier, traduisaient à Rome
le suprême pouvoir judicaire et militaire, l'*imperium*. Est-
ce à dire, comme le pensait Rosenberg, que les hauts
magistrats républicains étrusques détenaient l'ancien
pouvoir royal, total et absolu, sans autres limites que
l'annalité et la pluralité des titulaires? Sans doute aux
premiers temps de la république, comme à Rome. Mais à
l'époque de déclin qui est celle des *zila𝜃* de nos
inscriptions et représentations, ce n'est plus
vraisemblable, ni à l'intérieur, ni à l'extérieur. En
matière militaire et de politique extérieure surtout, les
liens fédéraux entretenus avec Rome devaient limiter
efficacement l'autonomie des magistrats. D'ailleurs, sans
contester que l'*imperium* militaire leur eût un jour
appartenu, en songeant à la *tabula* ou aux *pugillares*, au
scrinium, aux *volumina*, à la chaise curule etc., c'est

plutôt l'image d'un pouvoir civil et administratif que nous croirons devoir retenir de nos représentations d'époque «étrusco-romaine». Pareil pouvoir, n'était-il pas le seul que permettaient encore les rapports contraints avec Rome? Nous aimons en tout cas comprendre dans le sens d'une restriction de pouvoir l'absence de hache dans les faisceaux étrusques."

2. The etymology of _lĭctor_

The Latin word _lĭctor_, as well as the institution, has been considered to be of Etruscan origin (see WH, I, 799). But an Etruscan source has not been identified, and a Latin etymology is to hand. Roman and Greek etymologies connect _lĭctor_, an agent noun in _-tor_, with the verb _lĭgare_ 'tie, bind, bind together'; it is assumed that the _lĭctor_ is named either 1. after his duty to bind criminals to the stake or 2. from the fact that the _fasces_ were bound:

1. Gel.12.3 _Valgius Rufus in secundo librorum, quos inscripsit de rebus per epistulam quaesitis, 'lictorem' dicit a 'ligando' appellatum esse, quod, cum magistratus populi Romani uirgis quempiam uerberari iussissent, crura eius et manus ligari uincirique a uiatore solita sint, isque, qui ex conlegio uiatorum officium ligandi haberet, 'lictor' sit appellatus; utiturque ad eam rem testimonio M. Tulli uerbaque eius refert ex oratione, quae dicta est pro C. Rabirio: 'Lictor', inquit 'conliga manus.' Haec ita Valgius. Et nos sane cum illo sentimus; sed Tiro Tullius, M. Ciceronis libertus, 'lictorem' uel a 'limo' uel a 'licio' dictum scripsit: 'Licio enim transuerso, quod "limum" appellatur, qui magistratibus' inquit 'praeministrabant, cincti erant.' Si quis autem est, qui propterea putat probabilius esse, quod Tiro dixit, quoniam prima syllaba in 'lictore', sicuti in 'licio', producta est et in eo uerbo, quod est 'ligo', correpta est, nihil ad rem istuc pertinet._

Nam sicut a 'ligando' 'lictor', et a 'legendo' 'lector' et a 'uiendo' 'uitor' et 'tuendo' 'tutor' et 'struendo' 'structor' productis, quae corripiebantur, uocalibus dicta sint. <u>Plut.quaest.Rom.67</u> διὰ τί 'λικτώρεις' τοὺς ῥαβδούχους ὀνομάζουσι; πότερον ὅτι καὶ συνέδεον τοὺς ἀκολασταίνοντας...; τὸ δὲ δεσμεύειν 'ἀλλιγᾶρε' λέγουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ 'Ρωμαίων, οἱ δὲ καθαρεύοντες ἐν τῶι διαλέσθαι 'λιγᾶρε' (sim. Plut.*Rom*.26). One may compare the following passages from Livius, who obviously felt *lĭgāre* and *līctor* to be cognate: <u>1.26.7</u> '*I, lictor, colliga manus*'. *accesserat lictor inciebatque laqueum*; <u>2.5.6</u> *stabant deligati ad palum nobilissimi iuvenes*; <u>8.7</u> '*I, lictor, deliga ad palum*'; <u>28.29.11</u> *deligati ad palum virgisque caesi securique percussi*.

2. <u>Paul.*Fest*.103L</u> *lictores dicuntur quod fasces virgarum ligatos ferunt. hi parentes magistratibus delinquentibus plagas ingerunt*, cf. <u>Liv.3.36.4</u> *centum viginti lictores forum impleverant et cum fascibus secures inligatas praeferebant*.

On the model of *cantātor* 'one who sings, singer' from *cantāre* 'to sing' and *mercātor* 'one who trades, trader' from *mercāre* 'to trade' one would expect, however, a nomen agentis **ligātor* 'one who binds, binder' to be derived from a verb *ligāre* 'bind'. *Līctor* cannot be a derivative of *ligāre*.

A further problem is the length of the root vowel: *līctor* has long *ī*, *lĭgāre* has short *ĭ*. A lengthening of the root vowel in the past participle (and likewise in the nomen agentis) when the root ends in a voiced stop (*b,d* or *g*) is well known in Latin (: Lachmann's Law; see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§83,6), e.g.:

lĕgere	**lĕg-tos* > *lēctus*	cf. *lēctor*
ăgere	**ăg-tos* > *āctus*	cf. *āctor*

```
 tangere    *tag-tos > tāctus
(cf. făcere  *fac-tos > făctus, not *fāctus)
```

Lĕgere, ăgere and tangere are third conjugation. A third
conjugation verb *līgere has been assumed by EM (: "Cette
étymologie supposerait l'existence d'un verbe radical non
attesté, *ligere à côté de ligāre."). Following EM one may
suggest that līctor < *līg-tor is a derivative of a verb
*līgere.

However, Latin does not offer a precedent for a lost verb
*līgere beside līgare. The problem of the etymology was
solved by Kent 1928:(see especially p. 187), who, on the
model of dĭcāre 'speak, indicate, devote' beside dīcēre
'speak, declare' and ēdŭcāre 'nurture, rear' beside ēdūcēre
'lead, bring up, nurture', the verbs in each set having
similar meaning, was able to assume a lost third conjugation
verb *līīgo, *līīgere, *līīxi, *līīctus 'bind', of which līctor
is a derivative (: "Length has been extended throughout the
(lost) verb, and from its participle to similar derivatives
as is the case with other verbs of this type").[2]

Līctor has, therefore, a satisfactory Latin etymology, which
is in accordance with the Roman interpretation. The
institution of the līctor is nevertheless clearly Etruscan,
even if the name is not directly borrowed with it. Under
the probable assumption that the Romans knew the Etruscan
title, one possibility is that līctor is a calque
linguistique of the Etruscan name; this would mean that the
'Etruscan lictor' too was called 'the binder'. A second
possibility, mentioned by EM, is that līctor has a folk
etymology. By folk etymology is understood a change in the
spelling or pronunciation of an unknown or unclear word (or
word element) in order to make it look or sound similar to a
familiar word or words, e.g. Germ. vrīthof 'an enclosed
place' is connected with Friede 'peace' and reshaped to

Friedhof 'cemetery'. Loanwords are often subject to reinterpretation by folk etymology because they are unanalysable in the adopting language. Hence there is a possibility that *līctor* is a re-shaping in Latin by folk etymology of a lost Etruscan term with a similar sounding root (***likaθ* or similar) which did not mean 'binder'. The literal meaning of Lat. *līctor* 'binder' would not have any semantic connection with the Etruscan title, but would probably not be totally adventitious, since the etymology would have been influenced by the binding of criminals which was a duty of the lictors. A third possibility is that the Romans deliberately avoided using the Etruscan title and created a new title from the function 'binding'.

The difficulty with each of these possibilities, though less so with a possible folk etymology, is that the 'binding' performed by the lictor is a very limited function to assume as the intention of the name-giver for quite an important functionary. One notes then that there is in Latin no etymological connection between the title *līctor* and the instrumenta, that is the *fasces* (*securis + virgae*), carried by the functionary. In the Greek renderings of Lat. *līctor*, on the other hand, namely ῥαβδοῦχος, ῥαβδοφόρος, ῥαβδονόμος, the title is based on the rods or ῥάβδοι carried by the lictor; the Greek titles indicate that the Roman lictor was characterized by the carrying of rods, not by his function to bind. Indeed, as Gladigow 1972:305 notes, "der Liktor ist als Träger des *fascis* definiert; ohne die *fasces* verliert er seine Qualifikation".

3. The instrumenta and functions of the lictor

The following discussion of the instrumenta and functions of the *līctor* reveal something of the original nature of the institution, which will be valuable in identifying the possible Etruscan source of Lat. *līctor*. Since the Romans

borrowed the custom of the lictors from the Etruscans, it follows both that the Etruscans had lictors and that their functions and attributes were continued at least in part but probably in full (since we have no evidence to the contrary) in those of their Roman counterparts. Greek and Roman literary sources provide no information on Etruscan lictors. It is, however, a fair inference that the duties of the Roman lictor will have been very much the same as those of the 'Etruscan lictor'.

Lat. pl. *fasces* is a specialization of *fascis* 'bundle of twigs, wood, straw etc.'. The term is used to designate the bundle of rods with an axe carried by the lictors originally before the king and then in the Republic before a magistrate, cf. Cic.*Ver*.5.15.39 *fasces ac secures*, D.H.2.29.1 ῥάβδους τε καὶ πελέκεις, Liv.3.36.5 *virgae securesque*, Lucr.3.996 *fasces saevasque secures*. The fasces were a symbol of the king's power with which criminals were scourged (*verberatio*) and beheaded (*securi percussio*) (cf. Liv.2.5.8; 26.15.8). From the early Republic the axe was removed within the city boundary; only the lictors of dictators continued to carry the axes in Rome.

Both the axe and the rods have religious associations. In discussing the single- and double-bladed axe in the Eastern and Mediterranean sphere, De Francisci 1954-55:34-35;36 describes both as symbols of religious power: "L'ascia...è arma e strumento di lavoro; ma essa è stata anche come oggetto votivo e rituale e con significato simbolico a indicare la potenza della divinità che si trasmette in colui che la impugna o di colui per cui si impugna.... Diversa invece è l'area d'origine della bipenne, sebbene anch'essa debba essere stata dapprincipio un oggetto pregno di potenza magica, divenuto poi segno della potenza divina e oggetto religioso attribuito specialmente alla Potnia minoico-micenea. Essa, oltreché a Creta, dove appare già nel Minoico

Antico II (2800-2400), si incontra in Asia Minore, è largamente rappresentata nel mondo egeo-anatolico e forse anche in quello mesopotamico: e sempre come simbolo religioso di potenza connesso con diverse divinità." He concludes that: "La bipenne della cosiddetta «tomba del littore» si deve quindi considerare come un oggetto, avente valore religioso, introdotto nel sepolcro di un personaggio illustre e potente della città. E lo stesso significato credo debba attribuirsi anche alla bipenne impugnata da Avile Feluske, rappresentato nella stele funeraria, pure proveniente da Vetulonia, in quanto il suo gesto più che di minaccia sembra di offerta alla divinità come dimostra l'indice teso. E non può non fare impressione il fatto che tutti questi documenti provengano dalla stessa città, e da un centro in cui sono manifesti specifici influssi culturali provenienti dall'Egeo, mentre analoghe testimonianze non si incontrano in altre zone dell'Etruria". Saulnier 1980:62-63 assigns the stele of Avele Feluske "au goût égyptisant", cf. Gladigow 1972:n.84: the axe "ist im mediterranen Bereich die heilige Waffen par excellence".

All our double-bladed axes date from the orientalizing period (fasces of Vetulonia, axe of Avele Feluske, model axe heads from Tarquinia, and those listed by Benedetti 1959), two of them from a city said to have special cultural links with Egypt. The fasces of Vetulonia is also "a model reduced in size for funerary purposes" (length: 25.0 cm, length of rods: 14.5-17.0 cm, length of axe: 26.2 cm) (Pallottino 1975:131; measurements given by Colonna in Cristofani 1985a:251). Clearly the double-headed axe has been used in Etruria as a weapon. Its religious associations are also clear and in an age that is orientalizing, in a city particularly so and in a context arguably religious the double axe has been used for a model fasces. One cannot, however, on such limited evidence argue that the double-bladed axe was intrinsic to the fasces - in other fasces

from Etruria one would not be surprised to see a bundle of rods surmounted by a single-bladed axe, the axe type known in representations of Roman fasces (Gladigow 1972:fig.2;3).

On the rods one may cite Gladigow 1972:306: "Die *fasces* (here = rods) als Herrschafts 'symbol' gehören in eine Reihe mit ähnlichen, im Mittelmeerraum und im Alten Orient verbreiteten Insignien, deren Bedeutung von der Verbindung von Einzelstäben oder Ruten ausgeht".

The whippings performed by the lictors in Rome also had a sacral significance; this is indicated by the fact that the *verberatio* was performed before the execution (cf. Gladigow 1972:311: "Das Schlagen ist aufgrund seiner sinnlichen Eindrücklichkeit ein weitverbreiteter kathartischer Ritus ...die (zunächst) durch Liktoren vollgezogene verberatio vor der altrömischen Execution [dient] nicht der 'Verschärfung' der Strafe, sondern sakrale Beistrafe ist") and by the phrase *expiatio per verberationem* and the use of *castigatio* for *verberatio* (see Gladigow 1972:311).

How much emphasis should be placed on these religious associations is not clear. They are, however, consistent with what we know of the sacral duties of the Roman lictor. For republican Rome a distinction can be made between the function of lictors as state attendants (: *lictores qui magistratibus adparent*) and as religious attendants (: *lictores qui sacris publicis adparent*). They appear, for instance, in both functions on the *ara pacis augustae* (see Ryberg 1955:39-48).

The religious or priestly lictors attended the Flamines and the Vestal Virgins, i.e. those Roman "Priesterämter, deren kultische Fixierung in einem extremen Maße aufrechterhalten wurde" (Gladigow 1972:298), cf. CIL VI 1852 *lictor curia[t(ius) a] sacris publicis*; CIL XIV 296 *lictor*

dec(uriae) curiatiae, quae sacris publicis adparet. The lictor appears in his role as priestly attendant in late Republican reliefs of public sacrifice, which are discussed by Ryberg 1955. Typical is her comment on fig.15a-b: "the priest is attended by two lictors, each carrying a bundle of fasces and also a shorter rod, probably a *commetaculum*". The lictors on these reliefs do not perform the slaughter of animals. The role of the priestly lictor was to clear the way for the priest with the *commoetaculum* (Fest.p.49L *genus virgulae, qua in sacrificiis utebantur)* and perhaps also to make the cry 'exesto' (Fest.p.72L *exesto, extra esto. sic enim lictor in quibusdam sacris clamitabat: hostis, vinctus, mulier, virgo exesto; scilicet interesse prohibebatur)*; since, however, as Gladigow 1972:303 argues, the "Opfersituation" is not clear, "läßt sich auch nicht entscheiden, ob es sich um ein offizielles Opfer eines römischen Magistrats handelt, an dem die Liktoren selbstverständlich teilnahmen, oder um das Opfer eines jener Priester, denen Liktoren zur Verfügung standen".

The duties of the state lictors have already been mentioned: *ligare, summovere, adimadverti iubere, verberatio, securi percussio.* The *securi percussio* was performed in Rome in regal times and in the early Republic by the *lictor*, while "außerhalb von Rom wurde weiterhin die magistratische Form der Hinrichtung durch einen Liktor praktiziert" (Gladigow 1972:307). Later executions were performed in Rome by *carnifices,* on whom rested a "Blut-Tabu" and who, because they were regarded as dishonourable, were not permitted to live in the city, nor allowed a ritual burial. The lictors, on the other hand, were highly respected. Gladigow's explanation (1972:308;309) of this difference is that the executions performed by the lictors had a 'sacral form': "Die Modalitäten der magistratischen Hinrichtung entsprechen in wesentlichen Punkten denen der Tötung eines Opfertieres, woraus MOMMSEN mit Recht den Schluß gezogen hat, daß diese

Form der Todesstrafe in der frühen Zeit als eine Opferung des Täters zu verstehen sei .... Wenn die Hinrichtung als ein Opfer vollgezogen wurde, geschah sie im sakral geschützten Raum und war damit keinerlei Gefährdungen durch das vergossene Blut ausgesetzt ...wir dürfen mit einiger wahrscheinlichkeit voraussetzen, daß in der alten durch Liktoren vollgezogenen Todesstrafe (profanrechtliche) Strafe und (sakralrechtliche) Sühnung von Tötungsdelikten zusammengefallen sind". Hence it appears that the distinction between secular and religious lictors is a fine one.

Our literary sources relate that the Etruscan kings (*lucumones*) had lictors. The functions of the Etruscan kings were it seems, like those of their Roman counterparts, not only military and political but also religious (cf. Gladigow 1972:301: "In der Frühzeit des römischen Gemeinwesens kann politische Macht offensichtlich nicht ohne eine sakrale Komponente und die Eigenschaft des *sacrum* nicht ohne eine politische Valenz gedacht werden. Im sakralen Königtum, dessen Zeremoniell die Römer von den Etruskern übernommen haben (*fasces*, Liktoren, Triumph) gehen beide Komponenten noch gleichmäßig von einer Person aus"). Liv.1.8.2-3; 5.1 refers to the election of an Etruscan king (*rex*) by the twelve peoples (*quod ex duodecim populis communiter creato rege singulos singuli populi lictores dederint*) and to the election of a priest (*sacerdos*) at the Fanum Voltumnae in 403 B.C. on the occasion of the gathering of the states (*sollemnia ludorum*). There is reason to believe that in regal times this priest was chosen from amongst the *lucumones* of the various Etruscan cities. Heurgon 1957:89 connects the two Livian references and argues that, since the election of a king was annual and coincided with the *sollemnia*, the *rex* of Liv.1.8 = the *sacerdos* of Liv.5.1: "Le chef de la ligue étrusque porte désormais, en latin, le nom

de *sacerdos*, et ce sera encore le titre que portera, au Bas-Empire, le président des jeux de Volsinies".

In the Roman Republic the political and military powers of the king were conferred on the consuls and his religious duties were entrusted to a priest who bore the official title *rex sacrorum* or *rex sacrificulus*, less formally shortened simply to *rex*, cf.Paul.*Fest*.p.423L *sacrificulus rex appellatus est, qui ea sacra, quae reges facere adsueverant, fecisset*; Liv.2.2.1 *et quia quaedam publica sacra per ipsos reges factitata erant, necubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificulum creant.* The "ritual programme" of the *rex sacrorum* is described briefly by J.A. North (*CAH²*, VII.2, 1989, 611): "he held a sacrifice on the Kalends of each month, announced the dates of the festivals of the month on the Nones, and appeared in the Comitium on certain fixed days (24 March and 24 May) and sacrificed there". The *rex sacrorum* belonged to the college of the *pontifices* but was subordinate to the *pontifex maximus*; he was barred from holding any political office and did not belong to the senate. A comparable division of the kingly functions may have taken place in Etruria, cf. Lambrechts 1959:201: "C'est au cours des VI-V siècles que l'Étrurie, solidaire des remous constitutionnels italiques, abolit ses royautés, plus exactement sans doute, les confine à un rôle religieux pour les remplacer politiquement par des oligarchies patriciennes, puissantes et tenaces, auxquelles apparaissent longtemps réservés tous les droits et pouvoirs, notamment l'accès au sénat et aux principales fonctions sacerdotales et politiques"; Pallottino 1975:129: "the title assumed by the ancient monarch may not have been abolished when the state changed from a monarchy to an aristocratic republic; it was substantially emptied of its political content and preserved alongside the new republican magistrates, as a religious institution" (cf. also Heurgon 1957:68). This assumption is based on the interpretation of

two Etruscan texts. LL IX.f2 *lauχumneti eisna* 'in regia sacrificium' indicates the performance of a sacrifice in the residence of the *lucumo*; *lauχumneti* < **lauχumu-na-i-ti* 'in that which belongs to the *lucumo*' is a locative in -*ti* to a nominalized possessive adjective in -*na* formed to **lauχumu* 'king'. Etr. **lauχumuna* finds a parallel in Lat. *regia* (a derivative of *rex*). The building which in the Republic bears the name *regia* was originally the home of the last kings of Rome, the Tarquins (it is possible that the the name *regia* was modelled on Etr. **lauχumuna*); in the last centuries of the Republic the *regia* was the official residence of the *pontifex maximus*, but since the *regia* "fu fabbricata *ex novo* alla fine del VI o al principio del V sec. a. C. ...ne consegue che il nome *regia* le deve essere venuto dall'essere stata ocupata, prima che dal pontifice massimo, dal *rex sacrorum*" (A. Momigliano, Il *rex sacrorum* e l'origine della repubblica, Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico, Roma 1969, 395; the equation *lauχumneti* = *in regia* was made by E. Vetter, *Glotta* 13, 1924, 145). In Ta 1.17 (200-150), the epitaph of the priest *laris pulenas, tarχnalθ. spurem. lucairce* '(he) was *lucumo* amongst the community of Tarquinia' (the translation of Heurgon 1957:68 (: "rex du populus Tarquiniensis") can now be improved; see above, *§*II.4.) appears to indicate that the Etruscan title for 'king' was in later times used in a sense similar to *rex (sacrorum)* at Rome.

To sum up, the king in Rome had religious functions including the performance of sacrifices, which were carried out in the Republic by the *rex sacrorum*. The lictor in Rome has sacral functions which he exercises in the performance of executions in attendance on a magistrate and probably also of animal sacrifices in attendance on magistrates and certain priests. Since in regal times the king combines the duties of politician and priest we may assume that his twelve lictors were both executioners and sacrificers or, to

put it another way, the sacrificers of both condemned men and animals. The situation in Etruria was arguably parallel to that in Rome. The theoretical possibility that the 'Etruscan lictors' were simply 'binders' is rejected since it is highly unlikely that the Romans would then have used the title for a role largely involving punishment and execution/sacrifice.

4. The connection of *lictor* with *satelles*

In the previous chapter it was argued that *zati* means 'axe' and that *zatlaθ* is an agent noun related to it; the inference that the *zatlaθ* originally carried the axe is a fair one. The axe, which was used to behead both men and bulls, may be connected with both the *zatlaθ* and the *lictor*, but of the two terms only *zatlaθ* has a cognate (*zati*) which illuminates its meaning. Both are in origin one of a small number of attendants on the Etruscan kings. Further, the lictor has religious duties, while the *zatlaθ* has at least religious associations. From the use of the axe in sacrifice it cannot be inferred that the *zatlaθ* was a sacrificial functionary as well as a king's bodyguard who killed with an axe, but the possibility that this was so can be neither proved nor disproved.

This use of the axe does, however, raise the possibility that the Etruscan lictor was the *zatlaθ*. We might then assume (at least as a working hypothesis) that the *zatlaθ* of an Etruscan king was an axe-bearing attendant with security and sacral functions. In 'regal' Rome these attendants were called *satellites*. At the beginning of the Republic the word *satelles* was tarred with the same brush as *rex*; because it was both considered anti-republican and had associations with the Tarquins it disappeared from 'official' Latin and was preserved mainly as a pejorative term. The 'office' of the *satellites* still, however, existed, though a change in

274

the emphasis of their functions had taken place; they had
sacral and legitimate civil police functions. Since
'binding' had been one of the *zatlaθ*'s lesser duties, the
Romans were able to coin the word *līctor,* a neutral term
with no royalist overtones. Lat. *līctor* would then be a
'semi-calque' of *zatlaθ*.

Notes

1. Thuillier 1985:444,n.84: "Encore que, une fois de plus,
    cette interprétation (i.e. the rods = fasces of lictor)
    elle-même ne nous semble pas nécessaire: sur un autre
    cippe de Chiusi, conservé à Palerme, on peut voir
    exactement les mêmes «verges» tenues par un arbitre
    apparemment banal, qui est situé tout près d'un
    discobole (cippe n⁰ 147 de Paribeni)."
2. Apart from *līchen*, a borrowing from Gr. λειχήν, Latin
    has only one other form in *līc-*, namely *līcium* (plus
    its derivatives). It is interesting to note that
    Gel.12.3 records (and rejects) the etymology of Tiro,
    who derives *līctor* from *līcium*, which like *līctor* is a
    purely Latin formation (there is no form corresponding
    to *līcium* in any other ancient IE language). The
    original meaning of *līcium* has been judged to be
    'transverse fibre, weft'; accordingly līcium has been
    interpreted as a –*i̯o*– formation to the full grade of
    the root **leik–* 'bend' (**līkʷ*i̯*om* > *līcium,* cf. *oblīquus*
    'sidelong, slanting'; *licinus* 'bent or turned upwards'
    is derived from the nil-grade **lik–*) (see IEW and WH).
    The semantic aspect of this interpretation is
    unsatisfactory, not least because another word for
    'weft', attested since Plautus (*Mer.*518), is known in
    Latin: *subtēmen (subtegmen)* < *sub+texo-men* to *subtexere*
    'weave on the underside'; the Latin word for 'warp',
    attested since Var.*L.*5.113, is *stāmen,* cf. Gr. στήμων
    (Hes.+).

    Lat. *līcium* is glossed as *filum*/μίτος 'thread', which
    is certainly the common usage of the word (e.g.
    Amm.14.6.9; Ov.*Fast.*3.267; Plin.*Nat.*8.196); one can
    compare the transferred use of the word for the threads
    of a spider's web (e.g. Plin.*Nat.*11.82) and for the
    threads of life spun by the Fates (e.g.
    Stat.*Theb.*8.382). The word is also often found in the
    context of magic or medicine, where the meaning is
    often 'string, cord' (e.g. Plin.*Nat.*29.114; cf.
    Petr.135.5 *ut solvit ergo licio pannum*).

The strongest connection of the word is with weaving, e.g. Amm.14.6.9 *tunicae ... varietate liciorum effigiatae*; Ov.*Fast.2.575 tunc cantata ligat cum fusco licia plumbo*; Plin.*Nat.8.196 plurimis vero liciis texere quae polymita (= damask) appellant Alexandria instituit, scutulis dividere Gallia*; cf. the Late Latin derivative *līciatorium* 'a weaver's beam'. The evidence comes not only from Latin but also from the modern European languages in which Lat. *līcium* is continued as a technical term of weaving: Germ. *Litze* 'heddle', *Litzenstab* 'heddle rod'; Fr. *lisses de liage*, It. *licci della legatura*, Port. *liços de ligação*, Sp. *cuerpo de lizos de ligadura*, all 'binding harness' (a heddle (or leash) is 'the loop of thread, or other material, through which a warp end is passed so that it may be raised or lowered to open the shed to permit the passage of the weft'; heddle rod 'a rod with loops used on simple looms for making a shed opening'; binding harness 'the shafts that control the binding warp'. All technical terms and definitions here and below are taken from Dorothy K. Burnham, A Textile Terminology, 1980).

The Latin word for 'weave' is not inherited from PIE *ueb⁽ʰ⁾-: Gr. *ὑφαίνω*, Skt. *ūrṇā-vábhi* 'wool-weaver; spider', OE. *wefan*, OHG. *weban*, Toch. B *wāp-*. Latin has specialized *texere* 'build' for 'weave' (> Fr. *tisser*, It. *tessere*, Port. *tecer*, Sp. *tejer*). There is further evidence that Lat. *ligāre* was also used as a weaving term. This evidence comes again from Latin (*Ciris* 371 *ligans triplici diversa colore fila*; Ov.*Fast.2.572*, quoted above) and from the Romance languages in which some weaving terminology for the binding together of the warp and the weft etc. is derived from Lat. *ligāre* and its derivatives, e.g. Fr. *lier*, Sp. *ligar* 'to fix in place a warp end with a weft pick, or a weft pick with a warp end; bind'; Fr. *chaîne de liage*, It. *catena di legatura* 'binding warp'; Fr. *point de liage*, It. *punto di legatura* 'binding point'; Sp. *curso de ligamento* 'weave unit'.

Līcium cannot have been formed to *ligāre*; the problem is again one of the length of the vowel in the root syllable. Since *līctor* 'binder' is derived from an Early Latin verb *līgere* 'bind', the suspicion arises that *līcium*, a term used in weaving, may also have been formed to this lost verb. If this were true, one might argue that Tiro recognized a semantic connection between *līctor* and *līcium*, and, in the absence of a verb *līgere*, explains the former term via the latter. In order to pursue the hypothesis that *līcium* is a derivative of *līgere* the original meaning of *līcium* must be ascertained.

276

The existence of *līcium* in Latin goes back at least to the mid-fifth century, when it occurred in a legal formula of the XII Tables. According to Gel.11.18.9 thefts detected *per lancem liciumque* were punished as if the culprit had been caught in the act. This process had disappeared by the time of Gellius (16.10.8). Gaius *Inst.*3.192-3 reports that according to the XII Tables "one wishing to search must do so naked, girt with a *licium* and holding a *lancem*; if he finds anything, the law says that it is to be manifest theft. What, it has been asked, is the *licium*. Probably it is some sort of cloth (*consuti genus*) for covering the privy parts". Gaius rejects that the purpose of the platter (*lanx*) was to engage the searcher's hands and prevent him from palming anything off or to place on it what he finds. A third reference to the legal formula in the ancient sources is Paul.*Fest.*p.104L: *lance et licio dicebatur apud antiquos, quia qui furtum ibat quaerere in domo aliena licio cinctus intrabat, lancemque ante oculos tenebat propter matrum familiae aut virginum praesentiam.*

Various interpretations of the formula have been offered:
1. Cl. Freiherr v. Schwerin (reported and rejected by A. Nehring, *Glotta* 15, 1927, 272): the *licium* was a thread by which the otherwise naked searcher protects himself against demonic influences/ the *lanx* was an "Opferschale" to appease the offended "Hausgeist".
2. Goldmann (reported and better favoured by Nehring, loc. cit.): *lance licioque concipere* "mit Hilfe der (zauberabwehrenden) Fadens (Diebsgut) erkennen".
3. J.C. Rolfe (Loeb, on Gel.11.18.9): Searchers wore just a girdle so that they would not be suspected of smuggling anything into the house and claiming it had been stolen; they held a perforated plate before their face because of the presence of women in the household.
4. Rudolf Düll (Das Zwölftafelgesetz, München 1959, 92: "Die Schüssel diente zur Aufnahme der Sache und zur Behinderung des heimlichen Einbringen der Sache, das Bekleidungsverbot [Düll translates *licium* as a small "Schurz"] war zum Zweck des Vorbeugens des Einschleppens gedacht".
No interpretation, ancient or modern, reveals the original meaning of *līcium*. The probability is that the searcher was, as Rolfe says, almost naked to demonstrate that he brought no stolen goods into the house, but wore a small apron for the sake of modesty. Since a semantic progression 'apron' > 'thread' is unlikely while 'thread' > 'a thread of clothing' > 'small apron' is possible and can explain the reported use of *līcium* in the XII Tables, the most that can be said is that the meaning of *līcium* deduced from its use

in the XII Tables is consistent with the meaning
'thread' known from later authors.

The meaning 'heddle' is also known for Lat. *līcium*;
this is the meaning favoured as the original by WH and
in Der kl. Pauly. This meaning is demonstrated not only
by Germ. *Litze*, It. *licci della legatura* etc. (see
above) but also by Isid.*Orig*.19.29.7 *licia sunt, quibus
stamina ligantur, quasi ligia* (cf. Don.Ter.*An*.911 *licia
enim dicta sunt quasi ligia*); Philarg.Verg.*Ecl*.8.74
'licia' ... *quasi ligia, per quae ligantur stamina;*
Prudent.*Sym*.2.1106 *perfundunt quia colla comis bene vel
bene cingunt/ tempora taeniolis et licia crinibus
addunt* (the fillets attached to the hair of the Vestal
Virgins are compared to leashes of the loom, cf. F.
Walbank, 'Licia telae addere', *CQ* 34, 1940, 93-104, 99:
"if *licia* is 'warp' and *telis* 'loom' the comparison
falls flat") and Serv.*Ecl*.8.73 *licia circumdo: bene
utitur liciis, quae ita stamen implicant, ut haec
adulescentis mentem implicare contendit.*

No other word for 'heddle' is known in Latin. Lat.
līcium is distinct from the warp and the weft, cf. for
example the following passages from Hieronymus,
Potamius (which favours *licium* = heddle) and Tibullus:

Hieronymus, in Hieremiam libri VI, CC.74, Prologus,2:
stamina tibi atque subtegmina et licia praeparabo
(metaphorical use)

Potamius, PL. Supplement I, 1958, Sp. 206 :
  *stamine quo penditur, et subtegmine quo
  vestitur, et licio quo regitur*

Tib.1.6.77-80
  *at quae fida fuit nulli, post victa senecta
   ducit inops tremula stamina torta manu
  firmaque conductis adnectit licia telis
   tractaque de niveo vellere ducta putat*

This does not prove that *līcium* originally meant
'heddle', but it strongly argues against the theory,
chiefly of Walbank:op. cit. (also of Minors in his
commentary to Vergil's Georgics) that *līcium* = 'warp
thread'. The title of Walbank's article is a phrase
from Verg.*G*.1.285, translated by Page (see Walbank p.
95) as "to add leashes to the warp", by Richard Thomas
(Commentary on Georgics I and II, CUP 1988) as "for
putting loops on the warp" and by Walbank (p. 101) as
"to attach warp-threads to the loom". Since the loom is
being prepared for weaving, as Walbank demonstrates,
and since the warp cannot be threaded until the leashes
are in place, a more satisfactory interpretation, and
one consistent with the evidence of Isid. etc., is 'to

attach leashes to the loom', cf. also the passage from Tibullus given above.

Two meanings then are attested for Lat. *līcium*: 'heddle' and 'thread'; an obvious connection between them is that a heddle is a loop of thread. That the original of the two meanings was 'heddle' seems likely since :
1. Latin has a general term for thread in *'filum'*.
2. The semantic development/usage 'heddle' > 'thread' is unproblematic. *Līcium* ('heddle') may first have been used for the string/cord of a bag (which has the same shape as a heddle) and then generally for string/thread. Likewise *līcium* may have been used in the XII Tables because of its loop shape; *līcium* may also have been chosen for the legal formula in order to produce alliteration with *lanx*.

Since it is likely that *līcium* originally meant 'heddle' and not 'weft', its etymology should be reconsidered. Derivation from **leik-* 'bend' now seems plausible, if *līcium* is 'that which is bent, loop on a loom, heddle'. There is another possibility.

A heddle is a loop which is attached to the loom and through which the warp is attached to the heddle rod. Substitute 'bound' for 'attached' and a connection between *ligāre* 'bind' and *līcium* 'binder, loop that binds, heddle' seems apparent. *Līcium* cannot have been derived from *līgare*, but derivation from **līgere* is possible: **līc-io-* > *līcium*, or **līg-io-* > *līgium* (cf. *ligia*) > *līcium* (in analogy to *līctor*).

279

Table: Roman insignia imperii attributed in the literary sources to the Etruscans.

insignia imperii	in general	in the reign of Romulus	in the reign of Tull. Hostilius	in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus
lictor (12)	D.S.5.40	Liv.1.8.2-3 (12), D.H. 2.29.1 (12)	Macr.1.6.7	D.H.3.61.2; 62.1 (12), Zon.7.8 (12)
fasces	Serv.*A* 8.506			Flor.*Epit.*1.1.5
fasces and secures	Sil.8.484-5	D.H.2.29.1		D.H.3.61.2; 62.1, Str.5.2.2
secures		D.H.3.61.3, J.Lyd.1.8		
sella curulis	D.S.5.40, Serv.*A.* 8.506, Liv.1.8.3, Sil.8.486		Macr.1.6.7	D.H.3.61.1; 62.1, Flor.*Epit.*1.1.5 Zon.7.8
sceptre	Verg.*A.* 8.506, Sil.10.41			D.H.3.61.1; 62.1, Zon.7.8
vestes	Serv.*A.* 8.506			
toga praetexta	Liv.1.8.3, Plin.*Nat.* 8.74(195), Sil.8.847		Macr.1.6.7, Plin.*Nat.*9.63 (196)	Flor.*Epit.*1.1.5
toga picta			Macr.1.6.7	D.H.3.61.1; 62.2, Flor.*Epit.*1.1.5
tunica palmata				D.H.3.61.1, Flor.*Epit.*1.1.5
golden crown	Verg.*A.* 8.505 (Serv.*A.* 8.505), Plin.*Nat.* 33.4(11)			D.H.3.61.1; 62.1, Zon.7.8

280

trumpet	Sil.8.488			
triumph				Macr.1.6.7
insignia : not specified	Sall.*Cat.* 51.38, Symm. 3.11.3			

In this chapter the etymology of Lat. *fenestra* (Pl.+) 'window' is considered. Two introductory sections deal with the archaeological evidence on the window in archaic Italy and on the words for 'window' in the IE languages. The possibility of an IE etymology for *fenestra* is considered first and found unsatisfactory; an Etruscan explanation is then shown to be available.

1. Archaeological evidence

The oldest preserved windows in Greece are those in the so-called Pinotheke of the second propylaea and the Erechtheion. Windows in private houses were numerous by classical times, the amount of light and air controlled by wooden shutters. The Greeks took over the window from Minoan Crete. It is for this reason that Peruzzi 1980:73 (referring to Graham 1987) says "the window is characteristic of Mycenaean architecture".

Light in Cretan palaces was furnished by light-wells and most probably also by windows placed in shallow recesses of the outer walls. Interior windows were probably fairly common and it is possible that the upper storeys also received light from clerestory windows. House windows were common on the upper storeys at least. The evidence for this is the 'Town Mosaic', which represents the façades of a number of two- and three-storey town houses. Many of the windows on these façades seem to be divided into 'panes', as many as six to a window, some of which are coloured red. It has been suggested that some material like an oiled parchment was used, which would be translucent though not transparent. Fragments of wall-painting from Crete and Mycenaean Greece also show windows with women looking out of

them (see Graham 1987:165 and fig. 103). The shape of the window in the 'Town Mosaic' is that of a small door.

Doors provide not only entrance and protection but also, as do windows, allow light and air into a building. Where a number of doors are found together in the Cretan buildings their main purpose must be the admission of light and air, that is to say they serve as windows: "It must also be emphasised that the function of these rows of doors (i.e. in the pier-and-door partitions) was to provide and control the admission of light and air rather than to furnish so needlessly so many entrances and exits; they were in fact essentially shuttered windows, and by their use 'infinite gradations might be secured in regulating both temperature and ventilation'" (Graham 1987: 166). The use of the door as a window and the door shape of the window make it clear that in creating the window the Cretans took their inspiration from the door.

Archaeological evidence does not suggest that the Romans took over the window from the Mycenaeans. There is a high concentration of Mycenaean pottery in the Aeolian islands and Vivara. Fine painted pottery has been found as well as a considerable quantity of domestic pottery, which perhaps indicates the presence of Mycenaean residents. This is also true for several sites in the south of Italy and Sicily, the archaeological evidence taking the form of Aegean 'domestic' wares and the local production of Mycenaean pottery and, in Sicily, also of Mycenaean-related bronzes and grave types. Small Mycenaean coastal settlements with a simple level of technical and technological development in south-eastern Italy (Apulia, Calabria, and Basilicata) have been dated to the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries. Relatively complex buildings appear only in the thirteenth to eleventh centuries (see Bieti Sestieri 1988).

In Central Italy traces of Mycenaean activity are in comparison extremely scarce. Mycenaean artifacts have been uncovered at only three sites (see Smith 1987): **Luni sul Mignone** (Four fragments of apparently closed vessels and a rim sherd of a cup or bowl have been found; they are dated to LHIIIA/B(1), LHIIIB(2) and LHIIIC(3). A Capo Graziano sherd of the Early Bronze Age (from the Aeolian islands) has also been found.); **Monte Rovello** (One fragment of Mycenaean pottery has been found, possibly of LHIIIB date.); **San Giovenale** (One fragment of Mycenaean ceramic has been found, possibly of LHIIIB date.)

The main aim of Mycenaean sailors in the Mediterranean was the acquisition of metals (see Smith 1987:164; Bieti Sestieri 1988:26). The most important mining resources in mainland Italy – the Colline Metallifere in Tuscany and the Monti della Tolfa in northern Lazio – both belonged to the territory of ancient Etruria, in the south of which are located the three sites Luni sul Mignone, Monte Rovello and San Giovenale. The few Mycenaean sherds found at these sites "mark the sea route from the Aeolian archipelago to the mining district of Etruria" (Spivey and Stoddart 1990:48). The scarceness of these sherds indicates that "the intensity and duration of contact were not great; central Italy was at the end of a Mycenaean exchange network" (ibid.:81). Hence there is no archaeological evidence of any Mycenaean settlement in Central Italy nor of any Mycenaean presence in Rome/ ancient Latium. It is almost inconceivable that Mycenaean sailors, intent on the acquisition of metal ores, should have explained the concept and design of the Mycenaean window to the inhabitants of Etruria; it appears that they never had the opportunity of passing on such knowledge to the inhabitants of Latium/ Rome. The window in Italy will have had its own history.

Detailed excavations of Etruscan settlements have provided information on the ground plans of dwellings from the twelfth century onwards, but can tell us little about the superstructures of the earliest buildings (see Spivey and Stoddart 1990:77ff.), i.e. it is impossible to know whether or not they had windows. Excavation work on the Palatine of hut A (ninth century) provides the earliest information on the window in Central Italy. Prayon 1975:123 agrees with the results of S. Puglisi (*Mon. Ant.* 41, 1951, 69ff.) when he writes: "Die Lage der Aussparung (70cm) an der linken Langseite der Hütte entspricht exakt der Anordnung von Fenstern bei den Hüttenurnen".

That windows existed in the huts of the Villanovan period (900-750 B.C.) is not to be doubted since countless hut urns from Tarquinia and Latium show windows; as Reinhard Herbig 1929:20 writes: "Die Fenster sind meist auf die geschlossene Wand aufgemalt oder plastisch aufgesetzt. Aber auch wirkliche Durchbrechung - das Fenster als offen gedacht - kommt vor". Unlike the door, through which the ashes of the deceased were placed in the urn, the window was functionless; it is modelled so that the urn takes on the appearance of a real hut. The window was always to the left of the entrance and right-angled (see, for example, Prayon 1975:Taf. 76,1; 76,3: house urns from Grottaferrata and Tarquinia).

The rock-cut tombs in Cerveteri which imitate the architecture of real houses provide valuable information on the general arrangement of rooms, including the windows and doors. Internal windows are found in tombs from the early sixth century onwards. Prayon 1975:165 explains why windows are not found in tombs of an earlier date: "Bis in den Anfang des 6. Jahrhunderts sind Fenster in Gräbern unbekannt. Diese überraschende Tatsache ist vielleicht damit zu erklären, daß es sich bei den Vorbildern für die in Frage

285

kommenden Grabtypen A', B, und C' in der realen Architektur noch um frei stehende Haüser handelte, die den Ovalbauten entsprechend Fenster nicht in luneren zwischen den einzelnen Kammern, sondern in den Langwänden haben mögen. Man hätte sie im Grab nur als Scheinfenster darstellen können und ließ sie darum weg". One of the three main types of internal window was the "Rechteckfenster", found with the "dorische Tür Typ 1" in tombs dating from c.600 - c.530 B.C. such as the Tomba degli Scudi e delle Sedie (Prayon, Taf. 42,43). The two other main types were the "Lünettenfenster", found in tombs dating from c.600 - c.530 B.C. such as the Tomba dei Letti e Sarcofagi (Prayon, Taf. 21,1) and the Tomba della Casetta (Prayon,Taf. 12,1), and the "dorisches Fenster", found in tombs dating from c. 530 - c.450 B.C. such as the Tomba di Marce Ursus (Prayon, Taf. 13,2). The "Lünettenfenster" has the same shape as the "Lünettentür", and the "dorisches Fenster" the same shape as the "dorische Tür Typ 3".

The tombs then also show the right-angled window to be Etruscan. The Etruscan window did not have the shape of a 'small door' until c.600 B.C.; by this date Etruscan architecture may have been influenced by the nearby Greek colonies. The Etruscans are known to have borrowed from the Greeks some concepts and essentials of house construction such as the concept of rectangular houses, mud-brick walls and roofing-tiles (see W.H. Harris, The Beginnings of Etruscan Urbanization, in: *Secondo Congresso...*(see Rix 1989a for reference), 381, 385). It is probable that they also learnt something of the construction of windows from the Greeks, even if they had already independently invented the window (and had their own word for 'window').

2. Words for 'window' in Indo-European languages

The following section deals with words for 'window' in IE
languages[1]. Of all the basic architectural elements the
window is the youngest, naturally younger than the roof,
wall and door; in many cultures it seems to have appeared
later than stairs, plaster and drainage. Openings in the
'Indo-European house' (that is in the dwelling of speakers
of PIE) were restricted to two: the door, for which the PIE
word can be reconstructed[2] and, most likely, an opening in
the roof. There is nothing surprising in this. Windowless
buildings are still known today; one thinks of the igloo of
the Eskimos and round huts in Africa. The window was long
unknown in northern Europe and appeared in parts of
Scandanavia only in the sixteenth century A.D. As the
dwellings of the speakers of PIE had no windows, there is no
PIE word for 'window'. The daughter languages of PIE have
created words for window in a number of different but
limited ways.

The first windows were made on Crete and at Mycenae where a
relatively mild climate and a high level of civilization
that produced buildings of a large size gave rise to windows
for the purposes of lighting and ventilation. Unfortunately
we do not know the Mycenaean word for window; Peruzzi's
(1980) attempt to reconstruct it, discussed below, is
unconvincing. Since the Mycenaean window served two of the
same functions as the door (i.e. ventilation and lighting)
and was of a similar but smaller shape, it is possible that
the Mycenaean word meant, as does the Classical Greek
θυρίς, 'small door' (derived from θύρα, 'door'). The name
has survived in modern Greek παράθυρο, παραθύρι (cf. below,
Goth. augadaurō).

Another Greek word ὀπή (and μετόπη), 'opening, hole' is used
as a technical term of architecture with the meaning

287

'window', cf. the derivative ὁπαῖος -ἁ -όν 'with a hole or opening' (see in Liddell and Scott διὰ τῆς ὁπαίας κεραμίδος 'through the tile with a hole in it (for the smoke to escape)'). The PIE root of ὁπή is *h₃ekʷ- 'see', cf. Gr. ὄψομαι, Lat. *oculus* 'eye'. In a number of other IE languages the word for 'window' has been formed from this root. In Sanskrit there is *gavākṣa-* 'ox-eye' and the rarer *gṛhākṣa-* 'house-eye'. Gothic created the word *augadaurō* 'eye-door', cf. OHG. *ougatora*, OE. *ēagduruᵝ*. 'Eye' also forms part of the compound noun OE. *ēagþyrel*, ME. *(ey)thurl* 'eye-hole'. Seebold 1981 explains *augadaurō* and *ēagþyrel* as 'clarifying compounds': originally in Germanic the word for 'eye' was used alone to designate the window opening. In Slavic the word for 'window' (: Russ. Church Slavonic *okъno*) is a derivative of the word for 'eye' (OCS. *oko*).

In the Scandanavian languages a new compound was created, composed of the elements 'wind' and 'eye': ON. *vindauga* 'eye or small opening for the wind/air', Dan. *vindue*, Engl. *window* (loanword). The 'eye' element in the Scandinavian words represents the 'eye shape' of the window and the smallness of its size, which was essential not only for reasons of the cold and rainy climate but also for reasons of design[4]; *auga* is known in other Old Norse compounds with the meaning 'small round opening', cf. ON. *nálar-auga* 'Nadelauge', *kvarnar-auga* 'Mühlsteinauge'. The 'wind' element in the words emphasizes the function of ventilation which the window served; this is appropriate for small, smokey dwellings in which the opening of the door would have given sufficient light during the day, cf. OIce. *windloch*. In Sp. *ventana* (← Lat. *ventus* 'wind') the ventilation purpose is also emphasized, in this instance presumably because of the need for fresh air in a very hot climate.

Other words for window are connected with words for light: ON. *gluggr* 'opening for light' from Germanic *glū* 'glow'; Av. *raočana-* = Skt. *rocaná-* 'light'.

While some native words persist, for instance Dan. *vindue*, it is Lat. *fenestra* which has been widely adopted throughout Europe: Fr. *fenêtre*, Germ. *Fenster* (< MHG. *venster* < OHG. *venstar*), It. *finestra*, Rom. *fereastră*, Swed. *fönster*. It is also present in OSp. *piniestra* and ME. *fenestre* (< OFr. *fenestre*).

A survey of Indo-European words for 'window' suggests that the Latin word too may be connected with a word for 'door', 'eye', 'wind' or 'light' (or a combination of two of these). But *fenestra* is obviously not connected with Lat. *iānua* 'door', *oculus* 'eye'[5], *lūx/lūmen* 'light' or *ventus* 'wind', and there appears to be no word in any other ancient IE language with which fenestra can be cognate.

3. The possibility of Indo-European origin

If *fenestra* is IE, it appears to show a root *fen-* combined with a compound suffix *-es-tro-*. But this combination is inadmissable: neuter *-es-* + suffix is adjectival and only the suffixes *-to-* and possibly *-tri-* are attested (see Leumann 1977:§§331A, 314 on the types *tempestus* and *terrestris*). There remains the possibility of *-stro-*, *-stra-*, a variant on *-tro-*, *-tra-*, seen in *monstrum* (see Leumann 1977:§285); on this suffix and the source of *-e-* see below.

I begin by considering the root *fen-*. Lat. *f-* is the realization of the PIE voiced aspirates *bʰ-*, *dʰ-*, *gʷʰ-* (cf. infra). We should consider whether a PIE root in *bʰ-* etc. could have been the source of Lat. *fen-*. The PIE roots *bʰen-* 'hit, wound', *dʰen-* 'hit, thrust', and *gʷʰen-*

'swell' have not survived in Latin; they cannot be the source of *fenestra* for semantic reasons. Neither can *dʰen-* 'run, flow', which probably survives in Lat. *fōns,-tis* 'source'; *dʰen-* 'flat (of hand), surface (of the earth)', known in Vulgar Lat. *danea* 'area' (Reichenau gloss); nor *gʷʰen-* 'hit' (Lat. *dē-fendō, of-fendō*). Since *fenestra* cannot be connected with a PIE root that would be represented in Latin by *fen-*, the suspicion arises that it is a loanword.

Could *fen-* have been borrowed into Latin from another IE language? Nonius' (p. 36,11) derivation of *fenestra* (*fenestrae a Graeco vocabulo conversum est in latinum*, ἀπό τοῦ φαίνειν) has been rightly dismissed by EM as "un jeu de mots": Lat. *f-* only corresponds to Gr. *φ-* in words that have been directly and independently inherited from PIE (*ferō* : φέρω; *fama* : φήμη etc.). For the same reason we can reject the etymology of Isid.*Orig*.15.7.6, where *fenestra* is connected with Gr. φῶς 'light' (*fenestrae ... dictae eo quod lucem fenerent; lux enim Graece φῶς dicitur. vel quia per eas intus positus homo videt. alii fenestram putant dictam eo, quod domui lucem ministret, compositum nomen ex Graeco Latinoque sermone.* φῶς *enim Graece lux est)*, cf. Gramm. suppl. 215,13 (*fenestra dicitur eo, quod intus ferat lucem; fos enim graece lux latine*). Isidorus' etymology "....*lucem fenerent*" is also a play on words; the first attested use of the Latin verb *faenerāre* 'lend money at interest; invest' with the transferred meaning 'supply, lend' is Plin.*Nat*.2.13 (*sol) suum lumen ceteris quoque sideribus faenerat.*

Alessio 1941:547-548 suggests that *fenestra* could have been borrowed from Greek via Etruscan: *πνεύστρα (from πνέϝω, aorist ἔπνευσα) > Etr. *fnevstra > *fnestra > Lat. *fenestra*. *pn-(πν-) > *fn-* is theoretically possible as a prehistoric development in Etruscan (see Rix 1985a:ʃ22). Alessio points to the loan Lat. *nepos* > Etr. *nefts* as a precedent for IE

*p- > Etr. *f-*;   *nefts* was probably borrowed, however, from Oscan (see above, §I.7). Alessio allows that the major objection to his hypothesis is that there is no trace of Gr. *πνεύστρα*, the formation of which according to Greek word formation rules is in any case impossible (*πνευσ- is not a verbal root). It can be added that Gr. *πνεῦμα* 'breath' only means 'wind' in literary contexts. A word for 'window' would much more likely have been formed with *ἄνεμος* 'wind' than with *πνεῦμα*. Hence it is also extremely improbable that the Etruscans borrowed from an IE language the root *pnē-s* ((<*pnē(u)-s*), to which they themselves formed a substantive meaning 'window'.

The most recent attempt to ascribe an indirect IE origin to *fenestra* is that of Peruzzi 1980, who argues that the Latin word was borrowed from Mycenaean. A discussion of his arguments is warranted not least because the development Myc. *(σ)φ-* > Lat. *f-*, which he postulates, challenges the history of such words as *fōrma* (< *μορφή*), *fūr* (< *φώρ*), *fūcus* (< *φῦκος*), *fungus* (< *σφόγγος*) and *fidēs* (< *σφίδες*), for which an Etruscan intermediacy has been proposed (the etymology of these words cannot be discussed here).

General agreement in the literary sources that Arcadians settled on the Palatine in the thirteenth century and introduced writing into Latium[6] has prompted Peruzzi to look for words of cultural significance in Latin which can be attributed to Mycenaean rather than to alphabetic Greek. He recognizes (p.46) that "the possibility that the Latin language preserves elements which go back directly to the Mycenaean world can be warranted only by a Latin *mot de civilisation* that surely comes from Mycenaean, that is to say, corresponds to a Mycenaean form and does not correspond nor can be traced back to the respective form of Greek". Such a *mot de civilisation* is, in his opinion, Lat. *cuspis* 'the pointed head of spears/javelins/arrows etc.'. The

Mycenaean dual *QI-SI-PE-E*, which is accompanied by the sword ideogram and the figure two, is known from Pylos (Ta 716). From the dual form Peruzzi reconstructs the Mycenaean nom. sg. *kʷsíphos* > Lat. *cuspis*, Gr. ξίφος. His derivation of the Latin form is as follows: Myc. *kʷsiphídes* > Proto-Ital. *kusiphídēs* > Proto-Lat. *kusifídēs* > Sabine *kusipídēs* > Lat. *cúspidēs*.

The suggestion of a Mycenaean origin for *cuspis* appears to Peruzzi to be convincing on morphological grounds: "on the one hand, *cuspis, -idis* is totally isolated in Latin and its connection with any foreign word calls for a non-Latin stem whose ending is identical or similar to *-id-*. On the other Gk. ξιφ-ίδ- is a derivative of the radical *ksiph-* 'sword' and part of a large lexical group spread from it: ξίφος (*-es-* stem) 'sword' (dim. ξιφ-ίδιον 'dagger' and 'bur-reed'), ξίφη (*-ā-* stem) 'plane-iron', ξιφίας 'sword-fish', ξίφιον (*-ιov*) 'corn-flag', 'sword-fish', a kind of stone, a kind of hawk etc. Since the derivation of Gk. ξιφ-ίδ- (and for that matter also Myc. *kʷsiph-íd-*) is no doubt a process which occurred within Greek, the conclusion is unavoidable: Latin *cuspidēs* is a borrowing from Mycenaean" (p.47-48).

It is not necessary to argue that Lat. *cuspidēs* was filtered through a Sabine tradition (p.13;43-44); the development could have been: Myc. *kʷsiphídes* > Proto-Ital. *kusipídes* > Proto-Lat. *kúsipides* > Lat. *cuspidēs*. However, the derivation of Lat. *cuspis* from Mycenaean is not at all certain. Szemerényi 1989:26 considers Peruzzi's derivation "aus lautlichen und morphologischen Gründen unannehmbar"; he derives *cuspid-* < *ku(r)spid-* < *kurispid-* (i.e. *curis* 'Speer' + *spid-* 'Spitze').

Where the formal and semantic similarity of a number of Latin and Greek words is undeniable but borrowing from Greek into Latin appears to be phonetically impossible, Peruzzi

sets up three linguistic postulates which can, in his opinion, be assumed as "clue(s) for the possible Mycenaean origin of certain *mots de civilisation*". His postulates, of which the second is relevant to his etymology of Lat. *fenestra*, are: i) elimination of the initial preconsonantal *s-* preserved in the corresponding forms of alphabetic Greek (e.g. Lat. *fidēs*, not **spidēs*, cf. σφίδες; *capis*, not **scapis*, cf. σκαφίς)[7]; ii) **rendering of Greek φ- as *f-* in initial position**; iii) rendering of Greek π as *b* (e.g. *tubus* : στύπος, *tuba* : στύπη). His second postulate is based on Lat. f. pl. *fidēs* (σφίδες) and *furca* (Gr. acc. sg. φόρκα). Internal *-φ-* is rendered as expected by Lat. *-p-*, e.g. Myc. **skaphálā* > Lat. *capula*.

In early loanwords from Greek the voiceless aspirates θ, φ, χ are represented in Latin by the corresponding voiceless stops *t, p, c*, since Latin does not distinguish between aspirated and unaspirated stops, e.g.:

θ > t : θύος > *tūs*, κλᾶθρα > *clātra*

φ > p : φιλήμων > PILEMO (CIL I² 681), Σκάρφεια > *Scarpea* (ILLRP 321a, 177 B.C.)

χ > c : βαχχᾶς > *Bacas* (CIL I² 581, 186 B.C.), χορδή > *corda* (*chorda*, Cic.)

In a number of the oldest Greek loanwords such as *calx* (< χάλιξ) and *purpura* (< πορφύρα) the Greek aspirates are always written as simple stops in Latin; Biville 1987:29 refers to a "traitement usuel dans la langue vulgaire jusqu'à 2 ès. p. C., où *p* est alors concurrencé par *f*: πορφύρα > *purpura* (Enn.) > fr. *pourpre*". By the mid-second century, however, the influence of Greek literature and culture resulted in the introduction of the aspirates in the Latin representation and pronunciation of Greek words, e.g. σφαῖρα > *sphaera*, CIL I² 626 (145 BC) ACHAIA; examples come from literature and official texts. The pronunciation was so

highly esteemed in polite speech that it became the fashion
to introduce it into a number of native Latin words and
names, e.g. CIL I¹ 380 (104 B.C.) *PVLCHER*. The phonetic
value of the Greek aspirates is always, until post-Classical
times, that of voiceless stops plus aspiration (i.e. *θ=t+h*,
φ=p+h, *χ=k+h*). Only later do they develop into spirants
(i.e. *θ=þ*, *φ=f*, *χ=χ*), the first transcriptions of *φ* by Lat.
f being found in Pompeian inscriptions of the first century
A.D., e.g. CIL IV 680 *DAFNE*, cf. CIL I² 2652 (prior to 88
B.C.) *Heliofo* (< 'Ηλιοφῶν).

A much earlier development of *φ-* > *f-* is not to be expected.
Peruzzi 1980:44 compares *φ-* > *f-* and *-φ-* > *-p-* to the
realization of the PIE aspirate *＊bʰ-* in Sabine: *＊bʰ-* >
Sabine *f-* and *＊-bʰ-* > Sabine *-p-*. He suggests that Mycenaean
elements in Latin may have been filtered through a Sabine
tradition, but it is not essential to his arguments that
this be true(!): "The pairs *σφίδες-fidēs*, *σκαφίς-capis* and
skaphálā-capula show a twofold correspondence of Gk. *φ*
(/ph/) which is identical with the treatment of IE *＊bh* in
Sabine. This does not imply, of course, that, if those Latin
words come from Greek, they must have been borrowed through
a Sabine intermediary or that their Sabine forms replaced
the local ones in Rome (though either possibility could be
envisaged from a cultural viewpoint). It simply means that
those Latin words, if they derive from Greek, indicate a
linguistic tradition identical with that attested by Sabine
in the treatment of IE *＊bh* - in other words (as is always
desirable in linguistic reconstruction), a development which
is not only theoretically possible, but also known to have
actually taken place in Central Italy."

His evidence for Sabine *-p-* is very shakey, consisting of
two words glossed as Sabine: *crepusculum* (Var.*L.*6.5: *id
vocabulum sumpserunt a Sabinis, unde veniunt Crepusci
nominati Amiterno*) and *alpus* (Paul.*Fest.*p.4L *album, quod nos*

dicimus, a Graeco, quod est ἀλφόν, est appellatum. Sabini tamen alpum dixerunt, unde credi potest, nomen Alpium a candore niuium vocitatum). Both explanations in the ancient sources can be doubted. *Alpus* may be not so much the explanation as the consequence of *Alpes.* Given such weak evidence it seems sensible to leave aside the question of Sabine intermediacy since *-φ- > -p-* is a regular development in Greek loanwords in Latin, and Sabine can no more explain *φ- > f-* than can Latin or Osco-Umbrian, where *f-* is also the realization of PIE *bʰ-.*

Indeed Peruzzi, in arguing for the Mycenaean origin of particular Latin words, is mainly concerned with the development of PIE *bʰ* in Latin. He follows the theory of Ascoli-Sommer. This theory, now over a century old, is based on an Italo-Greek unity that is no longer accepted, but it must be assumed (according to Peruzzi) that a contemporaneous phase /ph/ (< PIE *bʰ-) existed both in Greece and Italy. Thus Peruzzi 1980:45 feels able to argue that: "A loanword like *fides-σφίδες* would predate those which render *φ-* as *p-* in Latin for it occurred in the archaic phase II (intermediate between the reconstructed Indo-European and the documented tongues of Central Italy), when Greek /ph/ sounded identical with (or so similar as to be assimilated with) the Latin and Italic /ph/ which was later to become *f-* and *-b-* in Latin, *f-* and *-p-* in Sabine." Peruzzi fails to mention the theory of the Italian School, with which his own views are inconsistent.[8]

As *fenestra* is a *mot de civilisation* of obscure origin and since the window is characteristic of Mycenaean architecture Peruzzi 1980:73 claims that *fenestra* (like *furca* - both are features of the prehistoric hut in Latium) shows "the treatment of Greek *φ-* attested in Latin borrowings from Mycenaean". Besides *fenestra* the forms *fēstra, fĕnstra* and *fresta* are known (see below). Peruzzi argues that:

1. *festra > fenestra* cannot have been influenced by Gr. φαίνω (Nonius' etymology) since this would have been the result of erudition and prompted only by a form that already showed *n*.

2. *fenestra > festra* is "culturally untenable", *festra* being an ancient religious term (Macrobius - see below). A development (brought about by the initial stress accent) **fénestra > fenstra > fēstra* is, he says, formally possible, but that the initial stress accent should have affected *fenestra* "only in nomenclature of religion" is unacceptable (but see below).

Hence *fenestra* and *fēstra* must be, he concludes, doublets with the same antecedent, *fēstra* a learned archaic term in the language of religion, *fenestra* a popular, non-technical term. The antecedent must be a trisyllable, the first two syllables of which may coalesce into one syllable. Three trisyllables are theoretically possible: a) **fehestra*, cf. **nehemō > nēmō*; b) **feyestra*, cf. **treyes > trēs*; c) **fewestra*, cf. **suēueram > suēram* .

Peruzzi prefers **fewestra* in the light of a gloss of Hesychius φωστήρ . θυρίς and of the (very rare) use of Gr. φάος (< φάϝος) 'light' and its Argolic derivative φαυστήρ 'lamp, torch' (< **φαϝεστήρ*) for 'window'. Liddell and Scott cite only IG 4²(1).110.43 (Epid., IV B.C.) for φάος 'window' and for φαυστήρ "lamp or candelabrum, or perh. large window" IG 4²(1).109ii105,147 (Epid., iii B.C.). φωστήρ 'that which gives light' is not otherwise attested with the meaning 'window'. Peruzzi assumes (p.76) the development:

> acc. sg. **phawestḗra* (**φαϝεστῆρα*)
> **fawestḗra*
> **fewestḗra*
> **féwestḗra*

*féwestera

*féwestra

*fewéstra

↓

fēstra and fenéstra

"Latin fēstra", Peruzzi writes, "is the normal result of *fewestra, since -w- regularly disappears between identical vowels (e.g. lauātrīna > lātrīna and suēueram > suēram), and thus the religious language has maintained the genuine form *fewestra with a normal sound evolution. Unlearned usage, on the other hand, has developed from *fewestra a form fenestra, no doubt by some folk etymology (maybe according to fēnum 'hay' – the Latial hut was thatched and its walls made of wattle and straw daubed with mud)." Lat. fēnum, one might add, is also of obscure origin.

The derivation of fenestra from *fewestra is totally unconvincing (the window was not made of hay!). Arguments against Peruzzi's etymology are :

1) There was no contemporaneous phase /ph/ in Greek and Latin: φ- > f- is impossible; *phawestēra would have given Proto-Lat. *pawestēra.

2) Peruzzi gives no account of the reduction in length of ē > ĕ in *féwestēra> *féwestera (which cannot be the result of the initial stress accent).

3) Were a Mycenaean form (> Proto-Lat. *fewestéra) to have been borrowed into Latin in the thirteenth century, one would expect the word to have undergone the Proto-Italic sound development -ew- > -ow- (see Meiser 1986:§20,2.), cf. *teųtah₂ > Osc. touto; *h₁neuń > Lat. novem, cf. Gr. ἐννέα; *h₁leudʰero-bʰos > Ven. LOUDEROBOS, cf. Gr. ἐλεύθερος. That the development -ew- > -ow- is older than the loss of -w- between like vowels is demonstrated by *neuerikā > noverca 'mother-in-law', cf. Gr. νε(F)αρός, Arm. nor 'new'.

4) The assimilation of *a-e-é* > *e-e-é* in **faʍestēra* > **feʍestēra* is an ad hoc solution. The assimilation of vowels is very rare in Greek (though less so in Latin), occurring in only a very few frequently used words, e.g. the coin name Attic *ὀβολός* (< *ὀβελός*) (*o-ε-ó* > *o-o-ó*). Attic /e/ is otherwise maintained, even between two /o/, e.g. *ὄφελος*) (see Rix 1976b:∮19a).

5) There is no archaeological evidence for the presence of Mycenaeans in Latium (cf. supra). The stories of Arcadians in Italy on which Peruzzi bases his work are legends and probably attempted to explain the introduction of Greek culture into Italy in the eighth century B.C.[10].

It follows that no IE origin can be demonstrated for the root *fen-* in Lat. *fenestra*. It remains to consider the suffix *-(s)tra*.

PIE has a series of semantically related nominal suffixes, which produce instrument nouns / verbal abstracts: **-tro-/ *-tlo-/ *-dʰro-/ *-dʰlo-*. The <u>neuters</u> in **-trom* etc. "are used apparently indiscriminately in barytone formations (generally clearly derived from verbal roots) to indicate 'das Mittel oder Werkzeug zum Vollzug einer Handlung oder den Ort, wo sie vollzogen wird'" (Olsen 1988:3, quoting Wackernagel-Debrunner), e.g. **legʰ-trom* > Gr. *λέκτρον* 'where one lies down, couch, bed'. Further "the neutral formations may also be found with oxytonesis, in which case they usually serve as verbal abstracts, e.g. Skt. *dātram*. <u>Masculines</u> in **-tros* etc. (e.g. Gr. *δαιτρός* 'Zuteiler' vs. *δαιτρόν* 'Zuteilung') are rare, and obviously secondary in most cases, whereas quite a number of <u>feminines</u>, generally oxytone, and mainly, but not always, functioning as verbal abstracts, are found with the suffixes **-trah₂/ *-tlah₂/ *-dʰrah₂* and **-dʰlah₂*". The feminine formation is an original "suffix-accented collective formation" (Olsen 1988:3). The eight suffixes are found in Latin, where **-tlo-*

/ *-tlah₂ is "the exceedingly dominant suffix" (Olsen 1988:17. On the productivity of Lat. -culum (< -tlo-) see Olsen p.29; Greek on the other hand shows a clear preference for -τρο-, -τρᾱ-, cf. Olsen 1988:‡7).

Of the four feminine suffixes *-tlah₂ is indeed the most productive in Latin, where it often has a diminutive sense, e.g. lollīnguncula 'small squid', oppressiuncula 'slight squeeze', muliercula '(little, weak, foolish etc.) woman'. The three other feminine suffixes are much less productive, but examples are to be found in: a) -tra: porcetra; b) -bra: scatebra, palpebra; c) -bula: dicibula, manibula. As of direct inheritance from PIE Olsen records: a) -tra: mulctra, mulcetra (see below); b) -bra: calābra (secondary???), dolābra, terebra
c) -bula : fābula, fībula, sūbula; d) -cula: subucula. The paucity of these examples is not surprising in that the feminine suffixes usually produce verbal abstracts; five of these words are, however, instrument nouns (dolābra, fībula, mulctra, sūbula, terebra).

It is against this background of IE nominal suffixes that Latin words in -(s)tra and in particular fenestra should be considered.

Latin words in -(s)tra can be categorized as:

1. <u>Greek loanwords</u>, e.g.: anthropolatra, caliptra, exostra, geometra, mitra, orchestra, palaestra, petra, pharetra.

2. <u>Greek loanwords via Etruscan</u>, e.g.: ἔχιδνα 'viper' > Etr. *eχe/itra > Lat. *exetra > <u>excetra</u>; ἄφλαστον 'curved poop of a ship' > Etr. *aplst- > *apl(u)st- > Lat. aplust- (n. aplustre-is, aplustrum-i, n. pl. <u>aplustra-ōrum</u>, aplustria-ium)[11]; (??) λεπαστή 'limpet-shaped drinking cup' > Etr. *lepst- > *lep(e/i)st- > Lat. lepista, lepesta, <u>lepestra</u>

(so Herbig 1916-17:168-171). It is preferable to assume that Lat. *lepista/lepesta* (Naev.+) is an early direct borrowing from Greek with the weakening of *-α-* to *-i/e-* due to the initial stress accent, cf. Gr. τάλαντον > Lat. *talentum*. For *lepestra* see n.5.

3. Neuter plurals, e.g.: *castra, flustra, aptra.*

4. Feminine formations to the masculine nominal suffixes tero- and -astro-, e.g.: *ministra* (< *minis-tera*) to *minister* (<*minis-tero-*); *magistra* to *magister; filiastra* to *filiaster* 'stepson'

5. Products of the late Latin change in *(s)ta/(s)tra*[12], e.g.: *culcita* (Cato, Pl.)/ *culcitra* (Petr., cf. OFr. *coltre*) 'stuffed mattress/cushion for bed/couch'. Here one ought perhaps to include:

a. *lepestra,* which occurs in only one late Latin gloss (Philoxenus)

b. *genistra/*genestra*, whose existence is presupposed by It. *ginestra*, OFr. *genestre* and Log. *binistra* (attested are Lat. *genesta/genista*, 'names of various shrubs'). Variation in the internal vowel points to an Etruscan origin; *genesta/genista*, the origin of which is otherwise obscure, is possibly a loan from Etruscan (so Gustav Herbig 1916-17:171-172).

c) *lanistra* 'one who manages a group of gladiators, trainer' is only late attested through glosses (CGlL V,111,14; 111,15; 602,65). *Lanista* is glossed as Etruscan by Isid.*Orig.*10.159: *lanista, gladiator, id est carnifex, Tusca lingua appellatus, a laniando scilicet corpora,* cf. Don.Ter.*Eu.*257 *lanistae dicti, qui laniandis praesunt gladiatoribus.* The root *lăn(i)-* cannot be connected with Lat. *lāna/* Gr. λῆνος 'wool' and cannot be explained as IE, unless *laniāre* 'wound savagely, tear (up)' is connected with the root *lam-* (see IEW 674), which survives in OCS. *lomiti*

'break (to pieces)' (with regular *lam- > Slavic lom-; see Arumaa 1964:§43) and OHG. lam, Ice. lami 'lahm, verkrüppelt', in which case one could suppose an instance of the Proto-Italic sound development -my- > -ny- (see Meiser 1986:§20,9., cf. *gʷemie- > Lat. vēnī to Skt. a-gam-am). The supposed derivation of lanista from laniāre is probably a play on words; lanista, the gladiator trainer, is not '*the one who wounds savagely'. An Etruscan origin for lanista is favoured not only because lanista is glossed as Etruscan but also because Nicolaus Damascenus apud Athen. IV 153F (cf. Serv.A.3.67) expressly states that the gladiatorial combat (illustrated on Etruscan ash urns, sarcophagi and wall paintings) came to Rome from Etruria. One must add that Lat. lanius 'butcher' cannot be compared with an Etruscan personal name lani (so Gustav Herbig 1916-17:167), since of the supposed attestations of the name in Etruscan CIE 2342, 3254, 3276, 3277 and 3290 are fakes, and CIE 769 lani should be read as larni (= AS 1.450 lart: la(r)ni beside AS 1.449 larce: larni: and AS 1.451 lart. larni.) The sequence lani does occur once as an inscription on a vase of unknown date: Cr 0.56 lani. The meaning of lani here cannot be determined (personal name?, scribal error for larni?, vase name?).

6. **Iberian loanword** (??): caetra/cētra 'a small light shield'

7. **Secondary formations with -tra suffix**, e.g. porcetra

8. **Words of dubious/obscure origin**:
i) colostra 'the biestings': The frequent form is colostrum- i n. and it is possible that "le féminin est peut-être tiré du pluriel neutre colostra, -ōrum, le nom étant assez souvent attesté au pluriel" (EM). The origin of colo(s)- remains obscure. If the word is of Etruscan origin the Etruscan ending in -tra may have been normally interpreted as a neuter plural but occasionally as a feminine singular.

colustra is also attested: uncertainty as to the quality of
the vowel could also be explained as due to Etruscan.

ii) *mollestra* 'sheepskin': the word is attested just once in
Paul.*Fest*.p.119L (*mollestras dicebant pelles ovillas quibus
galeas extergebant*). A connection with Gr. μηλωτή or
μαλλωτής 'sheepskin', altered by association with *mollis*, is
likely, cf. also Gr. μαλλός 'fleece, lock of wool', Arm. *mal*
'male sheep, ram', Myc. *ma-ri-ne-u* 'god of woollens' (on
these forms see J.A.C. Greppin, *Glotta* 59, 1981, 70-75). The
suffix is obscure; it "semble indiquer un intermédiaire
étrusque" (EM).

iii) *scutra* 'a kind of shallow dish or pan': "N'a rien
commun avec scutula 'cylindre rouleau de bois' qui est
emprunté au gr. σκυτάλη. Terme technique, aucun
rapprochement sûr" (EM). A borrowing from Gr. χύτρα 'earthen
pot' has been suggested by Szemerényi 1989:116: χύτρα >
kutra > (variant form) *scutra*. This etymology is
semantically attractive, but the explanation of initial *scr*-
on the model of Lat. *scrōfa* 'sow' < Gr. γρομφα* (Hesychius
γρομφάς . ὗς παλαία) is dubious[13].

9. Inherited(?) IE words

Just two words are apparently to be assigned to this
category: i) *mulctra* (Verg.+) 'milking pail' (< *mĺǵ/molǵ-
trah2* (Olsen 1988:ƒ6.1.1))[14] is a variant of *mulctrum*
(Hor.+) (< *mĺǵ/molǵ-trom*). The root is clearly IE
(: *mulgeō*, ἀμέλγω 'to milk'), but the Latin pair has no
cognate in any other IE language except OHG. *mulhtra*, which
is a loanword from Latin. This raises the suspicion that
mulctra and *mulctrum* are both secondary formations in Latin:
the past participle in *mulct*- could have encouraged the
formation of substantives in *-(t)rom* and *-(t)ra*. On the
other hand, if one of the forms was inherited from PIE, this
form is much more likely to have been the neuter *mulctrum*;
as for *mulctra* one could then ask whether poetic licence
has not allowed a neuter plural to be re-interpreted as a

feminine singular. In either case it is clearly not certain
that *mulctra* shows in *-tra* a suffix directly inherited from
PIE.

ii) *mulcētra* 'heliotropum'. The derivation from *mulceō*
'touch softly' (< *mĺk-e-trah₂* ??) (see Olsen 1988:ʃ6.1.2)
is not certain; the root has, as Olsen notes, "no certain
external parallels". *mulcetra* is certainly not an instrument
noun; whether a plant name could be considered as a verbal
abstract is dubious. Hence it is questionable whether any
Latin word in *-tra* is inherited from PIE.

Since the dwellings of the speakers of PIE did not have
windows, an IE etymology of *fenestra* (f. sg., Pl.+) would
assign it to category 1 or 2 (already discounted) or to
category 7.

The main arguments against assigning *fenestra* to category 7
are a) phonological and b) morphological:
a) A suffix *-strum* in Latin is produced by the addition of
*-trom to verbal roots in *-d*:
 *rād-trom > rāstrum 'hoe'
 *rōd-trom > rōstrum 'snout or muzzle of animal; beak of
bird; beak of ship'[15].
b) The suffix **-trah₂* is added to
    1. (usually) the verbal root
    2. (very rarely) the verbal root plus thematic vowel,
        cf. **bhĺg-e-trom > fulgetrum*
            *uegʰ-e-tlom > vehiculum
The only instance of **-trah₂* with thematic vowel is the
doubtful case of *mulcetra* (*fulgetra* is a secondary formation
to *fulgetrum*; *porcetra* (= *sus, quae semel peperit*,
Gel.18.6.4) was perhaps formed to *porcus* under the influence
of *excetra* (EM)). *fenestra* corresponds to neither 1.
(**fen-estra) nor 2. (**fen-e-stra).

There is no example in Latin of a substantive in -*tra* formed from a *verbal root in -d* plus *-*trah*₂. One cannot hypothesize ***fened-trah₂* > *fenestra* because **fened*, even if it existed, could not be a verbal root. To ease arguments may be added the fact that no Latin word in -*tra* is of certain PIE origin and the suffix is not productive in Latin;and that there are only three Latin terms in -*estra*, of which two are Greek loanwords (*orchestra*, *palaestra*) and one of uncertain origin (*mollestra*). The probability that fenestra belongs to category 7 is not great.

4. The Etruscan origin of *fenestra*

Since the structure of *fenestra* is not understandable as IE, it can neither have been formed in Latin nor borrowed from another IE language. The likelihood, therefore, is that Lat. *fenestra* is a borrowing from a non-IE language. An Etruscan etymology has recently been rejected both by Peruzzi 1980:73 (: "recourse to Etruscan is unwarranted"; he gives no account of the Etruscan evidence) and by Breyer 1984:392-393; 1052. It is shown below that the root, the suffix and the structure of *fenestra* can in fact be explained as Etruscan. One may begin by considering the evidence for *fen(e)s-* in Etruscan.

In Etruscan there is no attested form in **fen-/*fin-*. An Etruscan proper name in *fnes-/ fniš-* is attested thrice: Vs 1.140 (rec.) *θania: fnesci: ar*; Cl 1.2644 (rec.) *θạnạ χeritnei fnescial*; Co 3.2 (IV) *au. velθuri: fniścial*. Gustav Herbig 1916-17:172-177 does not give a proper analysis of the Etruscan names. He overstrains the evidence when on the basis of these Etruscan names in *fnes-/fniš-* he derives from Etruscan not only Lat. *fenestra < *fnes-tra*, but also *fenestella* 'a small aperture in the wall of a building, vent, slit' and the cognomina *Fenestella* (name of a Roman historian of Augustan times; CIL XI 2144, XII 259)

< *fnes-tla and *Fenestellius* (CIL V 4941) < *fnes-tle/i
(note the doubts expressed by Baudoux 1943:119-120). Herbig
also considers it possible (but unlikely) that *fenestella* is
a Latin derivative of *fenestra* (< *fenestr-la*, cf. *agellus* <
agr-los); this is certainly the case. A connection need not
be made with Etruscan in order to explain the origin of the
Roman names; in *Fenestella* and the variant *Fenestellius* as
in *Fenesta* (CIL X 2541) we see the cognominal use of
fenestra and its derivative. *fenestra* may not seem
appropriate as a personal name; we may compare, however, the
cognomina *Ianua*, *Murus* (see Kajanto 1965:347). Laughable
cognomina were not unknown among the Romans; another example
is *Sulla* 'little calf'. Hence in considering here the
possibility of Etruscan influence on Latin we need
concentrate only on the base noun *fenestra*.

It is, however, worth pausing over the term *fenestella*.
Ov.*Fast*.6.578 records a story that *Fortuna* was wont to enter
the house of Servius Tullius by a small window and hence a
gate (location unknown) bears the name of 'little window':
*Fortuna ... nocte domum parva solita est intrare fenestra,
unde Fenestellae nomina Porta tenet.* Plut.*quaest.Rom*.36
("Διὰ τί πύλην μίαν θυρίδα καλοῦσι, τὴν γὰρ 'φενέστραν'
τοῦτο σημαίνει ...") records the same story and the
alternative explanation that on the death of Tarquinius
Priscus his wife Tanaquil, in addressing the people to
persuade them to appoint Servius Tullius as king, put her
head out of a window. The importance of the story is
twofold. Firstly, it indicates the existence of Lat.
fenestella and, therefore, *fenestra* in the regal period.
Secondly, as Herbig 1916-17 argues, since the *Portae Capena*
and *Ratumenna* have Etruscan names, the name of the *Porta
Fenestella* is likely to have an Etruscan origin too, cf. De
Simone 1987:30: "La presenza a Roma ha lasciata anche tracce
nella toponomastica. Sicuramente etrusco è il nome della
porta *Ratumena* (-nna) (cfr. *Ritumena, *Tarχumena, Tetumina*

ecc.), che aveva per i Romani una connotazione culturale decisamente etrusca, in particolare veiente."

We must now return to the attested Etruscan names in *fnes-*/*fniš-*. *fnesci* is, as the female praenomen *θania* in Vs 1.140 shows, a female gentilicium; the genitive form *fnescial*/ *fnišcial* is a metronymic (see Rix 1985a:§§31, 55). Our three inscriptions may be translated as follows: Vs 1.140 'θania Fnesci (daughter of) Ar(nθ)'; Cl 1.2644 'θana Xeritnei (daughter of) Fnesci'; 'Au(le) Velθuri (son of) Fnesci'. To the gent. f. rec. *fnesci* we can reconstruct a gent. m. rec. **fnesce*; since **fnesce* is not formed with a patronymic suffix (: *-ie, -na, -ra*), one must conclude that it is a 'Vornamengentilicium', i.e. a praenomen in gentilicial function. A parallel to the pair *f. fnesci : m. *fnesce* is provided by the 'Vornamengentilicia' *f. titi : m. tite* (cf. Cl 1.45 *larθi: titi...*, Cl 1.187 *larθ: tite...*; *tite* is attested as a praenomen in, for example, Vs 1.225). Since Etruscan has other individual names (both praenomina and cognomina) in *-ce* such as the praenomina rec. *lar-ce* (< arc. *lare-ce/lari-ce*), arc. *feluske-* (attested as a 'Vornamengentilicium' in Vn 1.1 *feluskeš*), we may analyse **fnesce* as **fnes* + the suffix *-ce*. Since praenomina are in origin appellatives, we may assume that **fnesce* is in origin an appellative derived from the verbal(?)/ nominal(?) form **fnes*. The suggestion then of Alessio 1941:545 that an Etruscan base form *fnes-* was amplified by two different suffixes to give on the one hand the personal name *fnes-ci* and on the other the substantive **fnes-tra* requires a small qualification: *fnesci* is the feminine form of m. **fnes-ce*; the suffix *-tra* is discussed below.

Since the Etruscan (and Roman) letters were vocalized in /e/, the letter *n* could stand for /en/, the letter *p* for /pe/, the letter *r* for /er/ and so on; hence we find the abbreviated spellings *hrcle* for *hercle*, *mnrva* for *menerva*,

306

ptrsa for *petrsa*, cf. Lat. *DCUMIUS* for *Decumius*, *PTRONIO* for *Petronio* (see Bonfante 1988)[16]. The possibility exists, therefore, that the *n* of *fnes-* stands for /en/, in which case we could reconstruct Etr. *fenes-*. The possibility is slight because it requires that each of our three names is an abbreviated form.

The ending *-estra* of an Etr. *f(e)nestra* finds parallels in the vase inscriptions *u̯neṡtra* (AH 3.1; late VII) and *mi cel θestra* (Cr 3.22; 525-500); *u̯nestra* and *cel θestra* are hapaxes of unknown meaning (: vase names?). Another parallel is probably *malestra* 'mirror' (> *malstra*), which is reconstructed on the basis of attested *malstria* (AH 3.3; 350-325).

We must turn now to the Etruscan ending *-tra*. It can no longer be maintained that "ganz gewöhnlich ist die Erweiterung des *-st-* Formans mit dem etruskischen *-r-* Suffix" (Gustav Herbig 1916-17:167). We will see that Breyer 1984:198 is incorrect in stating that "es gebe keine Beweise für die Herkunft der Endung *-(s)tra* aus dem Etr.".

We can account easily for the ending *-tra* in two groups of Etruscan words: 1. Greek names in *-δρα*, which are written in Etruscan with *-tra*, e.g. *Εὐάνδρα* > *evantra*, *Κασσάνδρα* *caontra*, *caotra*, *caótra*, *Κλεοπάτρα* > *clepatra* (see De Simone 1970); 2. Etruscan gentilicia in *-ra* formed from individual names in *-t(V)*, e.g. *vetra-l* (gen.), *θactra*, *óetra* (see Rix 1972:§3.254).

Otherwise Etr. *-tra* is, as Rix 1985a:§35 remarks, "ein ungelöstes Rätsel....Für eine Bedeutungsbestimmung reicht das Material nicht aus; außer einer sekundär flektierten Postpositionen könnte *-tra* auch ein enklitisches Pronomen sein". Pfiffig 1969:§169 maintains that *-tra* is a collective suffix, which is added to the genitive of names, pronouns

and substantives, e.g. *vipinal-tra* "Gesamtheit derer von Vipinei = die Kinder der Vipinei". Rix demonstrates, however, that *-tra* "kann nicht nur an verschiedene Kasusformen treten, sondern auch selbst in verschiedenen Kasusformen erscheinen; die beiden kombinierten Kasus sind teils gleich, teils verschieden", e.g.:

huzrna	–	*tre*	*hilχve*	–	*tra*
base form	–	loc.	loc.	–	base form
vipinal	–	*tra*	*śpureś*	–	*treś*
gen.	–	base form	abl.	–	abl.
cl	–	*tral*	*cn*	–	*tra(-m)*
gen.	–	gen.	acc.	–	base form

*males-tra (cf. supra) has the same meaning as *malena* (Um 2.3 (V), nom.)/ *malna* (OI 3.2 (400-350), base form) 'mirror'. *malena* is formed from a noun *male-* (base form) and the possessive suffix *-na*, cf. *śuθi* 'tomb', *śuθina* 'belonging to the tomb, tomb gift'. One may consider then whether the meanind of *-tra*, which is added to the genitive **males*, is not similar to that of *-na* (: ?'pertaining to' or similar).

Helmut Rix (: personal communication) is now of the opinion that *-tra* is the plural of *-ta*, as *-cla* is the plural of *-ca* (on the demonstrative pronouns *ta* < *ita* and *ca* < *ika* see Rix 1985a:§§38-40). Hence on the model of *aiseras θuflθicla* "der Gottheiten, die bei *θuflθa* sind" and *selvans sanχuneta* "Silvanus, der zu Sancus Gehörige" (Rix, op.cit.) one might reconstruct **aiseras sanχunetra* 'der Gottheiten, die zu Sancus Gehörigen'. In accordance with this theory one could, for instance, explain Etr. *vipinal-tra* as 'diejenige, die bei Vipinei sind; die Kinder der Vipinei'. If this

theory is correct, it is not able to explain all instances of *-tra* in Etruscan; one thinks, for instance, of **malestra*, a singular form.

The precise function of *-tra*, which perhaps varies in accordance with the case of the base word, cannot be determined. Important for an Etruscan etymology of Lat. *fenestra* is the fact that an ending *-tra* existed in Etruscan. If we review the possibilities considered above (: 1. collective suffix, 2. possessive (or sim.) suffix, 3. plural of *ta*), then we may note as working hypotheses: **f(e)nestra* (? gen. **f(e)nes* + *-tra*) = 1. (unlikely) 'the totality of the **f(e)ne*'; 2. 'belonging/ pertaining/ relating to the **f(e)ne*'; 3. plural of **f(e)nesta* 'das, das bei **f(e)ne* ist'. A propos hypothesis 3. it is interesting to note i) that Lat. *genesta* and *lanista* show the same final sequence *e/ista* and ii) the possibility that Lat. *fenestella* is a derivative of **f(e)nesta*, while sg. *fenestra* is from Etr. pl. **f(e)nestra*.

Another possible interpretation of an Etr. **f(e)nestra* is that it is a derivative in *-ra* to a nominal base **f(e)nest*, cf. *cap-ra*, *malehv-ra*, *neθσ-ra-*, **spur-ra*; **f(e)nestra* would then be 'that which belongs to the **f(e)nest*'. This interpretation is less satisfactory because we do not have evidence for an Etruscan suffix or enlargement *-t-* and cannot, therefore, analyse **f(e)nestra* as ***f(e)nes-t-ra*; this means that we cannot easily connect **f(e)nest-ra* with *fnesci*.

The advantage of an Etruscan etymology is that it may provide an account not only of Lat. <u>*fĕnestra*</u>, but also of other attested forms. These are:
<u>*fēstra*</u>, attested in Macr.3.12.8 (: *Antonius Gnipho, vir doctus cuius scholam Cicero post laborem fori frequentabat, salios Herculi datos probat in eo volumine quo disputat quid*

sit festra, quod est ostium minusculum in sacrario, quo verbo etiam Ennius usus est.) and Paul.*Fest*.p.80L (: *festram antiqui dicebant, quam nos fenestram)*; the form dates back to Ennius.

fenstra or *festra*, demanded by the metre for Pl.*Cas*.132, *Mil*.379, *Rud*.88, and Ter.*Hau*.481 (the Codd. have *fenestra*; see Leumann 1977:§237,2.a)). The quantity of the vowel *e* in *fenstra* is uncertain; one expects it to be long according to the rule *V̆ns- > V̄ns-* (see Leumann 1977:§125b).

frestra, attested once: Gloss.Plac.V.23.1 *f[r]estram : fenestram*; the form is continued in Port. *fresta*.

As to the chronology of the forms, the presence of *n* in *fĕnestra/fenstra* rules out the possibility that *fēstra* is the original Latin form: *fēstra > fĕnestra/fenstra* is not possible. Further, a development **fĕnestra > fĕnstra (> fēnstra) > fēstra* cannot be assumed. The second stage *fenstra > fēstra* is regular with the reduction of *n* in the sound group *nst* accompanied perhaps by lengthening of the preceding vowel, cf. *sēmenstris > sēmēstris* (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§143,2b). The first stage **fĕnestra > fenstra*, however, is problematic since in Latin only short vowels in open syllables (i.e. before a single consonant) are syncopated (see Rix 1967:esp. 156-157). There is only one exception to this rule, namely syncope before *s* plus tenuis, e.g. **sēmistertius > sēstertius*, **minuscellus > mīscellus*, *ministerium > mīsterium*. All the words so affected begin with *semi-* or *mini/u-* and it may be that abbreviation rather than syncope has taken place. Certainly there is no syncope in cases such as **scélestos > scelestus*. Hence there is no sound precedent in Latin for **fĕnestra > fenstra*. If then *fĕnestra* was the original Latin form, no satisfactory internal account can be given for *fenstra* or, therefore, *fēstra*.

In Etruscan the development *fĕnestra > *fĕnstra would be phonologically possible, but not *fĕnstra > *fēstra. In Etruscan syncope takes place in medial and final syllables, both open and closed (see Rix 1985a:§10), e.g. arc. θanaχvil > rec. θanχvil, Gr. ʹΗρακλῆς > Etr. hercle; hence arc. *fĕnestra > rec. *fĕnstra would be possible in Etruscan. A further loss of *n* in the Etruscan word is also unproblematic, cf. θanθi > θaθi-(θa), θanχvil >θaχvil, venza > veza, ancaria > acaria, crunscle > crusle/crusel (see Rix 1985a:§16). The new Etruscan word would, however, retain its short vowel in the initial syllable, i.e. *fĕnstra > *fĕstra.

The possibility that Latin borrowed from Etruscan the one form *fĕnstra, which gave rise to fĕnestra by anaptyxis (cf. saeclum > saeculum, τέχνη > techina, δραχμή > drachuma (Pl.), μνᾶ > mina) is uncertain since anaptyxis is limited to the environment of particular consonants and no direct parallel can be given for fenstra > fĕn-e-stra (see Leumann 1977:75,102-103; Szemerényi 1989:113). We must then start out from Etr. *fenestra or *fnestra, which gave Lat. fenestra by anaptyxis (: Latin does not tolerate initial *fn-*) and fenstra (> fēstra) by metathesis (cf. Alessio 1941:545).

Lat. frestra may be a borrowing from Etr. *fnestra with assimilation of the nasal to the following liquid. It is also possible that a form *frestra existed in Etruscan, where the combination *stop plus liquid* is much more common than *stop plus nasal* (see De Simone 1970:§§146,231). On the model of

Gr. ἔχιδνα   > Etr. *eχ(i)tra > Lat. excetra
Gr. γνῶμα   > Etr. *χrūma   > Lat. grōma/grūma[17]
Gr. ʹΑγαμέμνων > Etr. Aχmemrun

one can hypothesize a development Etr. *fnestra > *frestra >
Lat. frestra. The Romans would then have known two forms of
the Etruscan word: *fnestra and *frestra (> Lat. frestra),
the knowledge of the existence of which in the early
language has somehow come down to Placidus. fĕnestra will
have been established in the Latin vocabulary before
*fnĕstra developed to *frĕstra in Etruscan. Latin frestra
could, therefore, lend support to the hypothesis of an Etr.
*fnestra. The possibility must also be mentioned that Lat.
fēstra may have developed from frestra by
dissimilation.

It is not likely that an Etruscan form *fenestra could have
occurred as well as a form *fnestra, for anaptyxis in the
initial syllable is unprecedented (i.e. *fnestra > *fenestra
would not be a possible development) nor can syncope in the
first syllable be assumed (i.e. *fenestra > *fnestra).

The Latin and (hypothesized) Etruscan forms can be connected
in a number of different ways, as the examples below
illustrate. The Latin forms, for which there is no IE
etymology available, can be explained by recourse to
Etruscan. It is possible that one, two or three Etruscan
forms were borrowed into Latin:

e.g. i)   Etr. *fnĕstra   >   Lat. fĕnestra (anaptyxis)
                        and >   Lat. fenstra (metathesis)
                                      ↓
                                Lat. fēstra

                        and >   Lat. frestra (assimilat.)

ii) Etr. *fněstra   >   Lat. *fěnstra> fěnestra(?)*
         | ↓
         | Lat. *fēstra*
         ↓
     *frěstra   >   Lat. *frestra*

iii) Etr. *fněstra   >   Lat. *fěnestra*
         | and >   Lat. *fenstra*
         | ↓
         | Lat. *fēstra*
         ↓
     *frěstra   >   Lat. *frestra*

iv) Etr. *fěnestra   >   Lat. *fěnestra*
         ↓
     *fěnstra,   >   Lat. *fenstra*
     *fněstra[18] |
         | ↓
         | Lat. *fēstra*
         ↓
     *frěstra   >   Lat. *frestra*

v) Etr. *fěnestra   >   Lat. *fěnestra*
         ↓
     *fněstra   >   Lat. *fenstra*
         | ↓
         | Lat. *fēstra*
         ↓
     *frěstra   >   Lat. *frestra*

In conclusion one may note that the influence of the
Etruscans on Roman architecture is well documented. There
is, therefore, no semantic surprise in *fenestra*'s supposed
Etruscan origin: "Daß Neuerungen im   Haus- und Tempelbau
von Etrurien nach Rom gelangten, wußten wir schon längst;
den Weg, den bei *fenestra, fenestella* aus   Laut- und
Wortbildung erschließen, zeigt uns bei *atrium* die direkte
Überlieferung" (Gustav Herbig 1916-17:177). Paul.*Fest.*
p.12L, Serv.*A.*1.726 and Var.*L.*5.161 connect Lat. *atrium* with
the Etruscan town of Atria; Vitruvius calls *atria* "*cava
aedium tuscanica*". On the *atrium* in models of Etruscan tombs

313

see Pallottino 1975:176. Other architectural terms of Etruscan origin in Latin are perhaps *asser* 'rafter', *favissae* 'vaults' and *fala* (Paul.*Fest*. p.78L *falae dictae ab altitudine, a falado, quod apud Etruscos significat caelum*) '?scaffolding' (see L.R. Palmer 1954:48). That *fenestra* should belong to an attested semantic category of Etruscan loanwords in Latin does not confirm its Etruscan origin, but is entirely consistent with it.

Baudoux 1943:120-121 criticizes the fact that Gustav Herbig 1916-17 does not consider what an Etruscan root *fnes-* could have meant; Baudoux himself offers no solution, which is indicative of the difficulty involved. Alessio 1941:545-546 connects Etr. *fnes-* with the place name *Fensernia*: "Del resto una forma metatetica *fens-* per *fnes-* vorrei vedere nel nome di città etrusco-campana *Fenser-nia*, a mio parere da analizzare come *Aeser-nia* dal collettivo etr. *aiser-* «divinità»". He comments further that "il tipo «*finestra*» è ben documentato nella toponomastica italiana"; he knows of twenty-seven toponyms of this type, of which almost all are "localita poste in alto dalle quali si può ammirare un vasto panorama". Alessio draws no conclusion on the meaning of Etruscan *fnes-*. It would be appropriate for the name of a place at high level (or on an open plane) to have been formed to a base word meaning 'wind': *Fensernia* '?place of the winds' (Etr. pl. *fneser-* > *fenser-*), cf. *Aesernia* 'place of the gods'. The meaning 'wind' is satisfactory because it provides a satisfactory semantic connection between *f(e)nestra* and *Fensernia*; words for 'window' are commonly connected with a word for 'wind' (cf. supra). *Fensernia* itself (prob. modern *Sarno*; Michael Crawford: personal communication) was not at high level. An assumption that the praen. *fnesce* was formed to a word meaning 'wind' would be supported by the existence in Etruscan of the praenomina *uóile* to *uoil* 'sun' and *cele-* to *cel* 'earth'.

The survey of IE words for 'window' allows also the speculation that Etr. *fnes-* might mean 'door','eye' or 'light'. One idea, semantically attractive but unprovable, is that Etr. *fnes-* meant 'door' (cf. *Fenestella*) and that **fnes-tra* meant 'that relating to the door, little door, window'; the personal name may then have meant something like 'captain of the Gate' (cf. *Horatius!*). Comparison with Gr. θυρίς 'little door, window' suggests itself, as does the possibility that the Etruscan term, which replaced a native word, is a calque of the Greek word. We must assume then, however, that Etruscan had a word for 'door' distinct from *culš-* 'gate'. Roman cognomina such as *Oc(u)latus* 'having eyes', *Luscus* 'one-eyed', *Ocella, Ocellio* 'small eyes', *Paetus* 'squinting' and *Luminaris, Luminosus* 'bright, lucid' (see Kajanto 1965:224, 238-9, 288) prompt the speculation that *fnes-* meant 'eye' or 'light'.

In the absence of an IE etymology for Lat. *fenestra*, archaeological and linguistic evidence combine to suggest an Etruscan source. The existence of *fnes-* in Etruscan is one of the main arguments in favour of an Etruscan origin for *fenestra*; since the derivative **fnestra* is not attested, an Etruscan origin cannot be considered as certain as it is in the case of *satelles*, but the evidence is nonetheless strong.

Notes

1. In this section frequent reference is made to Buck 1949: ∮7.25 WINDOW. See also L.R. Palmer, The Homeric and the Indo-European House, *TPS* 1948, esp. 117-119, and Seebold 1981:∮∮ 157-160 on OHG. *ougatora*.
2. See Buck 1949:∮7.22; IEW 278-279; Sommer-Pfister 1977:∮127,2.c)β). Words for 'door' in the daughter languages enable the reconstruction of a PIE form pl. nom. **dʰuor-/* gen. **dʰur-* 'double door', cf. Gr. θύραι, Lat. *forēs* (Lat. *iānua* 'door, entrance', connected with Skt. *yā-* 'go', *yāna-* 'going, course', is formed to *Iānus* < **ieh₂-no*), Lith. *dùrys*, Skt. *dvárah̥* (with *d-* for *dh-*

under the influence of *dvāu* 'two'). In the context of Proto-Indo-European 'door' is obviously not to be understood as its modern counterpart (well-fitting wooden door, frame, handle and so on) but rather as an opening (in a tent?/ hut?), which permitted entrance and which could be closed over with a curtain or wooden planks. Likewise by 'IE house' (*dom-s, cf. Gr. δόμος, δεσπότης (< *dems-pot-) 'master of the house', Lat. *domus*, Latv. *nams*, Skt. *damaḥ*) a primitive type of dwelling is to be understood.

3. These forms, which must mean literally not 'door for the eye', but 'door (i.e. opening) in the shape of an eye', show, as does Gr. θυρίς, the priority of the door over the window, cf. Port. *janella*.

4. See L.R. Palmer, Descriptive and Comparative Linguistics, London 1972, 344, and Seebold 1981:143. This is a convenient point to note that the climate of Etruria in ancient times (at least between 900-300 B.C. on the evidence of pollen analysis) was of "a cold, damp, oceanic type" (Cristofani 1979:10).

5. Further, the earliest windows known in Latium were neither door- nor eye-shaped, but rectangular.

6. e.g. Strabo 5.3.2-3; D.H.1.74.2; Tac.*Ann*.11.14. See Peruzzi 1980, esp. 1ff.,12-13 and 28ff., and for the literary references, esp. n. 106.

7. It is not necessary to invoke borrowing from Mycenaean in order to explain loss of preconsonantal *s-* in Latin, if, for example, Szemerényi 1989:26-27 is correct in deriving Lat. *pīlum* from *(s)pid-slo-m 'spear'. Peruzzi's first and third postulates, which are problematic, are not discussed here.

8. Latin f is a labio-dental spirant and occurs in words in initial position and at the morpheme boundaries (e.g. *ef-ficere, fe-felli, far-farum*) of words inherited from PIE; in addition there is a number of Sabellic loanwords in -f- such as *rufus* in Latin. Spirantization of the mediae aspiratae is one of a number of specific Italic sound developments; Latin f is the realization of PIE initial *bh-, *dh- or *gʷh- (or of initial *ǵh in combination with *u*). Internally these aspirates are realized in Latin as the voiceless stop -b- (< *-bh-, or < *-dh- in combination with r,l,u), or -d- (< *-dh-) or as -*u*-/-gʷ- (< *-gʷh-). In the Sabellic dialects and Faliscan PIE *bh, *dh and *gʷh are realized as [f] in all positions. The course of development of PIE *bh, *dh and *gʷh in the Italic languages is disputed. There are two competing theories. The first is that of Ascoli-Sommer (see Sommer-Pfister 1977:§104,2a, Steinbauer 1979:48ff.), whereby:

PIE		Proto-Italic, Paleo-Greek		Proto-Lat.		Latin		
*bʰ-	>	ph-	>	f-	>	f-		
*-bʰ-	>	-ph-	>	-f-	>	-β-	>	-b-

PIE		Greek	Latin, Venetic	Osco-Umbrian, Faliscan
*bʰ-	>	φ-	f-	f-
*-bʰ-	>	-φ-	-b-	-f-

The theory (in modified form, i.e. without the joint Italo-Greek stage) still receives support from some scholars, most notably O. Szemerényi 1952-53, who assumes the development PIE *bʰ > Proto-Ital. *ph. Szemerényi invokes the operation of Bartholomae's Law, certain only for Indo-Iranian, in the etymology of certain Latin and Greek forms. The best evidence is Lat. *hasta* < *hastʰa* < *gʰazdʰa*; in this and the other forms discussed by Szemerényi the development from voiced aspirate to voiceless aspirate occurs when an *s* precedes; this may constitute a special condition under which the sound development takes place.

The second theory, favoured not least because it involves two steps less than the Ascoli-Sommer theory, is that of the Italian school (Sommer-Pfister 1977:§104,2b), whereby:

PIE	*dʰ	*bʰ	*gʷʰ
	↓	↓	↓
Early Proto-Ital.	δ	β	γʷ
	↓	↓	↓
Proto-Ital.	f-	f-	f-
Latin (medial)	-d-/-b-	-b-	-gʷ-/-u̱-
Sabellic, Faliscan	-f-	-f-	-f-
Venetic	-d-	-b-	? (not attested)

The main argument to have confirmed this theory as the much more probable is that of Rix 1957 (cf. Untermann 1968, Steinbauer 1979) based on the Greek transcription of the Oscan name for Samnium. The basis of the three Latin names *Sabīnī*, *Sabellī*, and *Samnium* must be *Saβeno-:

*Saβeno-   > Lat. *Saβīno- >   *Sabīnī*
*Saβen-lo- > Lat. *Sabellī*
*Saβen-jom >   *Saβnjom* > Lat. *Samnium*
                           > Gr. *Σαύνιον*
                           > Osc. *safinim*, cf.SPic. *safinas tútas* (TE.5)

The Greek transcription can only be understood, if, when the Greeks learned the place name, it contained not /-f-/, as in later Oscan sources, but /-β-/; Gr. -αυ- represents /aβ/ and shows that a voiced fricative stage existed in Oscan. Jane Stuart-Smith, The Development of Indo-European 'Voiced Aspirates' into Italic, A New Look, MPhil. diss., Oxford 1991, demonstrates that the sound change from voiced aspirate to voiced fricative, the possibility of which is challenged by Szemerényi, is not only a phonetically plausible development but is typologically paralleled in other IE languages; I repeat here one example from her impressive list: "dh is found as [ ] intervocalically in Bengali" (p.181).

9. The validity of Peruzzi's example is not clear. The normal development of PIE *su̯e- is to Lat. *so-*, e.g. *su̯esōr > sorōr*, cf. Skt. *svasar-*. There are, however, sufficient examples of loss of -u- between vowels (though none, it seems, of *u > ø /e - e*), e.g.:
        dē-u̯orsom > deorsum
        aevitās > aetās
        lavātrīna > lātrīna (cf. Peruzzi)
        uīu̯itā > vīta
        (Sommer-Pfister §94)
        weghomenos > uehemēns > uēmēns
        *kleyomenos > *kleyemenos > clēmēns*
        (Szemerényi 1989:48).

10. cf. Poucet 1989:293, 294: "Ces notices nous renvoient dans la lointaine préhistoire du Latium, vers le XIIIe-XIIe siècle, bien avant l'orientalisant récent. On ne peut pas, en bonne méthode, les considérer comme reflétant la réalité de l'histoire. Rien ne permet de penser que les Subapenniniques du Latium connaissaient l'écriture"; "L'essentiel est, pour l'historien, de ne pas prendre ces informations traditionnelles (on the origin of writing in Latium) pour argent comptant. Ainsi par exemple, le linguiste italien, E. Peruzzi....a tort de croire que des Arcadiens se sont réellement, historiquement, installés avec Évandre sur le Palatin au XIIIe-XIIe siècle, et qu'ils ont apporté aux

Subapenniniques de la région les lumières de la
civilisation grecque, en ce compris l'écriture".

11. De Simone 1970:275-281; Breyer 1984:755. Gr. δ > Lat. t
and Gr. α > Lat. u can only be explained through
Etruscan mediation.

12. De Simone 1970:281: "Die Formen auf -tra wie lepistra
und lanistra sind allerdings erst spät durch Glossen
belegt; mit Recht hat ferner J. B. Hofmann auf den
spätlateinischen Wechsel -(s)ta/-(s)tra hingewiesen.
Wird also die etruskische Herkunft von lat. lanista
durch die Glosse TLE 841 nahegelegt, so ist damit aber
wohl nicht gleichzeitig erwiesen, daß die Endung -tra
ebenso vom Etruskischen kommt."

13. It should be noted that Gr. χύτρα > Lat. *kutra might
(in theory) be a borrowing from 'Sicilian' Greek. See
Agostiniani 1991:33ff.: "È noto che secondo la
testimonianze di Gregorio di Corinto e di Giovanni
Grammatico le due parole χύτρα e χιτών prevedevano, nel
greco siceliota, l'occlusiva velare semplice, e non
aspirata", cf. Pratmakes for Πρατόμαχος. The step *kutra
> scutra remains problematic.

14. *-trah₂ > Lat. *-trā > -tră. The shortening is secondary
cf. the thematic ā-stems, where *-eh₂ > -ā- > -ă- in
nom. sg., tŏgā > tŏgă. The length is retained in Greek,
e.g. φαρέτρᾱ, ἡμέρᾱ.

15. Olsen 1988:§6.1.9; 6.1.10. Normally -d+t- > -dˢt- >
-tˢt- > -ss- (> -s-), e.g. *sedtos > sessus, *saldtos >
*salssos > salsus; but before 'r', -d+tr- > -st-, e.g.
*fraud-trom > *frūstrum, pl. frūstrā: see Sommer-Pfister
1977:§134.3a.

16. A similar phenomenon of abbreviated spelling is observed
in Ancient Greek inscriptions, where an omitted vowel is
the (first) vowel in the letter name of the preceding
consonant, e.g. ε omitted after θ in θ(ε)ότιμος; this
example is taken from an impressive collection by Rudolf
Wachter, Abbreviated Writing, Kadmos 39, 1991, 48-80.

17. Carlo De Simone, lat. grōma (grūma) 'Feldmeßinstrument',
Folia Linguistica 4, 1970, 121-124.

18. That is to say that fnes- results from the metathesis of
*fens-.

319

CONCLUSION

In the main chapters a number of new conclusions have been reached, some of which modify or expand existing theories. I sum up briefly here. The Roman praenomen *Spurius* was borrowed from the native Etruscan individual name arc. *spurie*. The Italic possessive suffix -*jo*-, which was introduced into Etruscan in gentilicia and individual names of Italic origin, was used in Etruscan on the Italic model to form personal names and common nouns; it seems fair to assume that Etrusco-Latin bilingual speakers, probably native Italic speakers living in Etruria, explained the function of the -*ie* (< -*jo*-) suffix and may have created some of the first Etruscan names and common nouns in -*ie*, including perhaps *spurie*. Lat. *sūbulō* was borrowed from an Etruscan agent noun arc. *sūpilu*. Lat. *populus*, originally 'army', is on semantic, phonological and morphological grounds unlikely to be IE. An Etruscan etymology is not unproblematic; the Etruscan individual name *puplie*, which has been used in support of an Etruscan etymology for *populus*, is probably of Latin origin. The putative Etruscan source of *populus* is identified in a new etymology of the toponym *pupluna*. Lat. *satelles* 'bodyguard' was borrowed from the Etruscan agent noun arc. *zatilaθ*, originally 'one who strikes' or 'one who axes'; the transmission of the Etruscan word into Latin is explained satisfactorily for the first time and a new interpretation is given of a short sequence in the *liber linteus*. It is further proposed that Lat. *līctor*, literally 'binder', was created at the beginning of the Republic to replace *satelles* as an official title. Lat. *fenestra* was borrowed from Etr. arc. *f(e)nes-tra*; both the root *fnes*- and the suffix -*tra* are known in Etruscan.

It has been necessary or advantageous to consider the etymologies of a number of other Etruscan and Latin lexemes

such as Lat. *mīles, persōna, spurium*; Etr. *ecisie, ruze, fufluns*. Here too some new interpretations are given.

Some of Breyer's conclusions on individual lexemes are discussed (see, for instance, §III.4) and found to be incorrect or questionable; one can conclude that the Etruscan contribution to the Latin vocabulary has been overestimated by Breyer. This thesis shows, however, that new results can be won from the detailed treatment of individual lexemes.

INDEX INSCRIPTIONUM

liber linteus (LL)   TLE 1
tabula capuana (TC)   TLE 2

Adria
Ad 2.1   REE 42,229

Africa
Af 3.1   TLE 724

Ager Hortanus
AH 1.11   CIE 5617
AH 1.41   REE 43,3
AH 1.48   CIE 5647
AH 2.1   CIE 10906
AH 3.3   TLE 752
AH 3.4   TLE 282

Arretium
Ar 1.52   NRIE 337
Ar 1.55   TLE 674
Ar 4.1   TLE 668

Ager Saenensis
AS 1.27   CIE 234
AS 1.185   NRIE 213
AS 1.259   NSc 1959,96
AS 1.316   CIE 200
As 1.339   CIE 324
AS 1.387   CIE 1125
AS 1.407   CIE 672
AS 1.449   CIE 768
AS 1.450   CIE 769
AS 1.451   CIE 770

```
AS 1.502          CIE 2811
AS 1.507          REE 50,16
AS 2.10           TLE 421


Ager Tarquiniensis
AT 1.1            TLE 195
AT 1.23           CIE 5705
AT 1.24           CIE 5706
AT 1.81           CIE 5774
AT 1.108          TLE 171
AT 1.171          TLE 165
AT 2.2            REE 51,172
AT 2.6            NRIE 728
AT 2.20           CIE 10449
AT 5.2            REE 51,31
AT 6.1            CIE 10504
AT 6.2            REE 41,128
AT 6.3            REE 41,127
AT 0.1            TLE 160
AT S.4            CII 2097


Ager Vulcentanus
AV 2.5            TLE 341
AV 2.10           NRIE 678
AV 4.1            TLE 359
AV 0.22           TLE 360


Clusium
Cl 1.37           CIE 1230
Cl 1.39           CIE 1232
Cl 1.40           CIE 1233 + add.
Cl 1.45           CIE 1238
Cl 1.86           NRIE 386
Cl 1.133          CIE 1302
Cl 1.134          CIE 1303
Cl 1.135          TLE 460
```

Cl 1.187	CIE 655	
Cl 1.320	TLE 472	
Cl 1.430	CIE 4694	
Cl 1.431	CIE 4695	
Cl 1.432	CIE 4696	
Cl 1.433	CIE 4697	
Cl 1.490	CIE 520	
Cl 1.539	CIE 570	
Cl 1.540	CIE 571	
Cl 1.564	CIE 594 + add.	
Cl 1.714	CIE 4871	
Cl 1.750	CIE 4831	
Cl 1.894	CIE 993	
Cl 1.907	CIE 1006	
Cl 1.911	CIE 4766	
Cl 1.934	CIE 1091	
Cl 1.935	CIE 1092	
Cl 1.1036	TLE 524	
Cl 1.1077	CIE 705	
Cl 1.1091	CIE 1981	
Cl 1.1169	CIE 1660	
Cl 1.1185	CIE 3115	
Cl 1.1244	CIE 1740	
Cl 1.1245	CIE 772	
Cl 1.1396	CIE 1912	
Cl 1.1696	CIE 972	
Cl 1.1750	CIE 4896	
Cl 1.1780	CIE 2333	
Cl 1.1807	CIE 2286	
Cl 1.1808	CIE 2287	
Cl 1.1840	CIE 2331	
Cl 1.1841	CIE 2332	
Cl 1.1914	CIE 2402	
Cl 1.1921	TLE 927	
CL 1.1923	CIE 2415	
Cl 1.1967	CIE 2459	

Cl 1.1998	CIE 2485	
Cl 1.2079	CIE 2550	
Cl 1.2080	CIE 2551	
Cl 1.2094	TLE 542	
Cl 1.2095	CIE 2564	
Cl 1.2100	CIE 2569	
Cl 1.2109	CIE 2580	
Cl 1.2169	CIE 2631	
Cl 1.2177	CIE 2640	
Cl 1.2178	CIE 2641	
Cl 1.2179	CIE 2642	
Cl 1.2180	CIE 4914	
Cl 1.2251	TLE 552	
Cl 1.2296	CIE 2666	
Cl 1.2344	CIE 2643	
Cl 1.2382	CIE 2812	
Cl 1.2383	CIE 2813	
Cl 1.2384	REE 46,124	
Cl 1.2413	CIE 2844	
Cl 1.2450	CIE 819	
Cl 1.2456	CIE 2885	
Cl 1.2511	CIE 2933	
Cl 1.2543	CIE 2958	
Cl 1.2546	CIE 832	
Cl 1.2583	CIE 2990	
Cl 1.2620	CIE 3016	
Cl 1.2644	CIE 3064	
Cl 2.3	TLE 489	
Cl 2.5	TLE 479	
Cl 2.22	CII 834	
Cl 2.26	TLE 488	
Cl 2.27	TLE 487	
Cl 3.1	TLE 482	
Cl 3.7	TLE 558	
Cl 4.1	TLE 748	
Cl 6.2	REE 46,122	

Cl 7.4	CIE 1812
Cl 8.5	TLE 515
Cl 0.8	TLE 526
Cl 0.9	TLE 527
Cl G.3	CII 2530
Cl S.9	CII 477 bis
Cl S.13	CII 477

Campania

Cm 2.8	Glotta 27,171,34
Cm 2.9	TLE 4
Cm 2.18	Glotta 29,223,1
Cm 2.36	Glotta 27,173,43
Cm 2.39	TLE 10
Cm 2.48	REE 42,292
Cm 2.58	Glotta 27,166,12
Cm 2.59	F. Slotty, Beiträge zur Etruskologie, Heidelberg 1952, 178.
Cm 2.60	TLE 19
Cm 2.61	REE 42,301
Cm 2.63	Glotta 27,165,11
Cm 2.72	RIGI 21,62,4
Cm 2.74	Slotty, Beitr 23,13
Cm 2.86	A. de Ridder, Catalogue des vases peints de la Bibliothèque Nationale, 2 Vol., Paris 1901-1902, 2,505,589
Cm 6.2	F. Weege, Vasculorum Campanorum Inscriptiones Italicae, Bonn 1906, 76

Cortona

Co 3.1	TLE 646
Co 3.2	TLE 746
Co 3.4	TLE 640
Co 3.7	TLE 653
Co 3.8	TLE 624
Co 4.10	TLE 642

Co 4.11	TLE 647
Co 8.1	TLE 632

<u>Caere</u>

Cr 1.67	REE 41,120
Cr 1.120	CIE 6102
Cr 1.157	CIE 6216
Cr 1.158	CIE 6217
Cr 2.1	TLE 869
Cr 2.2	REE 39,11
Cr 2.3	REE 42,216
Cr 2.4	SE 36,249,1
Cr 2.5	REE 45,28
Cr 2.6	REE 52,72
Cr 2.7	REE 39,76
Cr 2.15	REE 40,31
Cr 2.18	TLE 63(a)
Cr 2.20	TLE 64
Cr 2.22	REE 50,52
Cr 2.29	REE 36,254f
Cr 2.36	REE 52,16
Cr 2.43	Epigraphica 38,27
Cr 2.45	REE 40,35
Cr 2.51	REE 40,36
Cr 2.62	Epigraphica 38,30
Cr 2.64	SE 33,537
Cr 2.68	SE 33,502,11
Cr 2.69	REE 51,177
Cr 2.74	REE 46,102
Cr 2.76	REE 42,213
Cr 2.91	NSc 1937,391,36
Cr 2.115	TLE 66
Cr 2.116	NSc 1937,387,24
Cr 2.117	REE 54,18
Cr 2.139	NRIE 893
Cr 3.1	REE 40,30

Cr 3.4	TLE 940(a)
Cr 3.5	TLE 940(b)
Cr 3.6	TLE 940(c)
Cr 3.7	TLE 940(d)
Cr 3.8	REE 50,85
Cr 3.9	SE 45,192
Cr 3.10	REE 42,217
Cr 3.11	TLE 57
Cr 3.12	TLE 867
Cr 3.14	TLE 58
Cr 3.15	TLE 941
Cr 3.18	TLE 769
Cr 3.19	TLE 61
Cr 3.22	G. Colonna, Il commercio etrusco arcaico, Roma 1985, 270s
Cr 3.25	TLE 72
Cr 4.2	TLE 876
Cr 4.3	TLE 873
Cr 4.4	TLE 874, TLE ad 874
Cr 4.5	TLE 875
Cr 5.2	CIE 6213
Cr 6.2	REE 48,114
Cr 9.1	TLE 55
Cr 0.4	TLE 939
Cr 0.56	NSc 1937,393,44

Corsica

Cs 2.8	REE 41,165 a-b

Falerii et Ager Faliscus

Fa 2.1	TLE 28(a)
Fa 2.3	TLE 762
Fa 2.5	TLE 33
Fa 2.14	TLE 30
Fa 6.1	TLE 27

Fa 6.2	TLE 28(b)
Fa G.1	Zazoff, Skarab 40,41

Felsina

Fe 2.1	SE 49,85

Faesulae

Fs 1.1	CIE 1
Fs 1.8	TLE 679
Fs 8.2	TLE 675
Fs 8.3	TLE 676
Fs 8.4	TLE 683
Fs 8.5	TLE 689

Latium

La 2.1	SE 35,569
La 2.2	SE 33,506
La 2.3	REE 47,29
La 2.4	TLE 24
La 2.5	SE 22,310
La 2.6	SE 11,434 a
La 3.1	TLE 23
La 6.1	App 924
La 6.2	App 923
La 0.1	REE 44,23
La S.1	REE 43,19

Nummi

NU N.15	MAI (A. Sambon, Les monaies antiques de l'Italie, Chicago 1967) 54,59
NU N.16	MAI 54,65
NU N.17	MAI 54,60
NU N.18	MAI 52,53
NU N.19	CII 291 b
NU N.20	MAI 54,60 a
NU N.21	CII 291 a

```
NU N.22          MAI 70-72,115-119
NU N.23          NRIE 572
NU N.24          TLE 459
NU N.25          NRIE 571, 574
NU N.26          App 55
NU N.27          Deecke, Etr Fo 2,50,72
NU N.28          MAI 57,66, MAI 57,67
NU N.29          MAI 57,66
NU N.30          MAI 73,120
NU N.31          MAI 73,120
```

Inscriptiones Originis Australis

```
OA 2.3           REE 44,65
OA 2.26          De Ridder Cat. Vas Bibl. Nat. 2,625,1069
OA 2.50          REE 54,32
OA 2.57          App 32
OA 2.58          REE 41,173
OA 2.68          CII 3,403
OA 3.1           REE 42,335
OA 3.2           TLE 759
OA 3.5           TLE 740
OA 4.1           REE 46,140
OA 0.1           SE 21,391
```

Inscriptiones Originis Borealis

```
OB 2.7           REE 48,117
OB 2.11          REE 43,22
OB 3.1           TLE 763
OB 7.1           SE 15,377,7
OB 7.2           SE 11,439 f
```

Inscriptiones Originis Ignotae

```
OI 2.1           REE 45,29
OI 3.2           REE 39,71,1
OI G.26          SE 10,399,3
OI G.59          SE 35,573,7
```

OI S.2	REA 1918,77
OI S.24	CII 2501

Padana

Pa 3.1	TLE 709
Pa 4.1	TLE 718
Pa 4.2	TLE 719

Perusia

Pe 1.25	REE 42,265
Pe 1.306	CIE 3757
Pe 1.307	CIE 3758
Pe 1.313	TLE 605
Pe 1.399	CIE 3850
Pe 1.400	CIE 3851
Pe 1.401	CIE 3852
Pe 1.408	TLE 586
Pe 1.639	CIE 3358
Pe 1.873	CIE 3444
Pe 1.921	CIE 4587
Pe 1.1000	CIE 4304
Pe 1.1013	CIE 4315
Pe 1.1053	CIE 4355
Pe 1.1086	CIE 4374
Pe 1.1132	CIE 4404
Pe 1.1147	CIE 4119
Pe 1.1161	REE 39,23
Pe 1.1163	CIE 4553
Pe 1.1213	CIE 4446
Pe 1.1220	CIE 4045
Pe 3.1	TLE 622
Pe 3.3	TLE 651
Pe 5.2	TLE 619
Pe 7.2	SE 11,439,2
Pe 8.4	TLE 570
Pe 9.1	REE 41,40

Populonia

Po 2.12	NRIE 582
Po 2.21	TLE 375
Po 4.4	TLE 380

Rusellae

Ru 2.7	REE 44,7
Ru 2.25	TLE 362
Ru 4.1	REE 42,96

Spina

Sp 2.36	TLE 712

Tarquinia

Ta 1.1	TLE 112
Ta 1.6	CIE 5421
Ta 1.17	TLE 131
Ta 1.66	TLE 105
Ta 1.83	TLE 97
Ta 1.88	REE 52,13
Ta 1.174	TLE 118
Ta 1.196	TLE 732
Ta 1.203	CIE 5552
Ta 1.205	TLE 124
Ta 1.227	CIE 5580a
Ta 2.5	TLE 154
Ta 2.7	CIE 10296
Ta 2.27	CIE 10060
Ta 2.31	CIE 10210
Ta 3.1	CIE 10159
Ta 3.9	TLE 559
Ta 5.1	TLE 78
Ta 5.2	TLE 84
Ta 5.6	TLE 100
Ta 6.1	TLE 155
Ta 7.2	CIE 5416

Ta 7.4	CIE 5328
Ta 7.7	CIE 5331
Ta 7.8	CIE 5332
Ta 7.11	CIE 5335
Ta 7.18	CIE 5341
Ta 7.21	CIE 5344
Ta 7.24	CIE 5347
Ta 7.30	CIE 5527
Ta 7.60	TLE 87b
Ta 7.63	CIE 5364
Ta 7.64	CIE 5365
Ta 7.65	CIE 5366
Ta G.3	CIE 10034

Umbria et Ager Gallicus

Um 1.7	TLE 697
Um 2.1	REE 46,113
Um 2.3	TLE 695
Um 2.9	TLE 694
Um 3.2	TLE 696
Um 4.1	REE 41,100
Um 4.2	REE 41,103
Um 4.3	CII 92
Um S.4	TLE 691

Vulci

Vc 1.27	CIE 5286
Vc 1.28	CIE 5287
Vc 1.92	TLE 321
Vc 2.7	REE 53,5
Vc 2.10	SE 31,204,35b
Vc 2.15	SE 33,469,1
Vc 2.16	App 853
Vc 2.24	SE 36,204,2
Vc 2.26	REE 39,26
Vc 2.30	CII 2222(a)

Vc 2.42	CII 2210
Vc 3.6	TLE 331
Vc 3.10	TLE 328
Vc 4.1	TLE 336c
Vc 4.2	TLE 336b
Vc 4.3	TLE 336a
Vc 4.4	REE 51,32
Vc 7.25	CIE 5267
Vc 7.27	TLE 297
Vc 7.33	TLE 300
Vc 0.21	REE 45,16a
Vc 0.40	CIE 5253
Vc G.3	CII 2140
Vc S.2	CII 2145
Vc S.11	CII 2144
Vc S.12	CII 2468
Vc S.21	CII 2142
Vc S.27	CII 2141

Veii

Ve 2.4	NRIE 842
Ve 3.2	TLE 38
Ve 3.4	NRIE 869
Ve 3.5	TLE 34
Ve 3.7	NRIE 859
Ve 3.9	TLE 41
Ve 3.11	TLE 35
Ve 3.30	TLE 42 b
Ve 3.44	TLE 37
Ve 3.45	SE 13,464,11
Ve 4.3	Archeologia Laziale 4,231
Ve 6.1	TLE 49b

Vetulonia

Vn 1.1	TLE 363

Volsinii

Vs 1.3	CIE 4922
Vs 1.4	TLE 242
Vs 1.7	CIE 4926
Vs 1.13	SE 30,146,18
Vs 1.28	TLE 245
Vs 1.29	SE 30,144,14
Vs 1.35	SE 34,108,52
Vs 1.36	SE 34,106,49
Vs 1.41	CIE 4968
Vs 1.45	CIE 4952
Vs 1.46	CIE 4951
Vs 1.47	CIE 4950
Vs 1.51	TLE 246
Vs 1.52	CIE 4947
Vs 1.54	CIE 4945
Vs 1.57	CIE 4942
Vs 1.62	CIE 4937
Vs 1.68	CIE 4932
Vs 1.73	CIE 4964
Vs 1.74	REE 48,90
Vs 1.81	CIE 4988
Vs 1.83	CIE 4983
Vs 1.90	CIE 4980
Vs 1.95	TLE 252
Vs 1.98	CIE 5003
Vs 1.99	CIE 5004
Vs 1.101	CIE 5006
Vs 1.115	CIE 5001
Vs 1.120	CIE 5026
Vs 1.122	CIE 5028
Vs 1.126	TLE 251
Vs 1.138	CIE 5039
Vs 1.140	CIE 5041
Vs 1.142	CIE 5043
Vs 1.149	CIE 5050

Vs 1.152	CIE 5053
Vs 1.159	CIE 5060
Vs 1.160	CIE 5061
Vs 1.164	CIE 5066
Vs 1.170	CIE 4918
Vs 1.171	TLE 260
Vs 1.178	TLE 232
Vs 1.179	TLE 233
Vs 1.180	TLE 234
Vs 1.181	TLE 237
Vs 1.225	CIE 5155
Vs 1.231	CIE 5164
Vs 1.232	CIE 5165
Vs 1.233	CIE 5166
Vs 1.260	SE 35,545
Vs 1.267	CIE 5189
Vs 1.282	CIE 5192
Vs 1.301	REE 41,145
Vs 2.7	REE 40,10
Vs 2.20	CIE 10648
Vs 2.35	REE 50,104
Vs 2.48	TLE 263 b
Vs 4.3	SE 30,149,25
Vs 4.8	TLE 900
Vs 4.63	TLE 210, CIE 10831
Vs 4.64	TLE 210, CIE 10824
Vs 4.65	TLE 210, CIE 10822
Vs 6.4	SE 35,562
Vs 7.14	CIE 5090
Vs 7.15	CIE 5091
Vs 7.25	TLE 241
Vs 7.39	TLE 207
Vs 7.42	TLE 290bc
Vs S.15	CIE 10873
Vs S.21	CIE 10863

Volaterrae

Vt 1.55	TLE 385
Vt 1.57	REE 43,13
Vt 1.76	TLE 425
Vt 1.77	TLE 428
Vt 1.78	NRIE 251
Vt 1.80	REE 43,15
Vt 1.85	TLE 407
Vt 1.108	CIE 4614
Vt 1.133	REE 52,66
Vt 1.145	TLE 388
Vt 1.147	CIE 100
Vt 1.154	TLE 386
Vt 1.162	TLE 383
Vt 2.12	TLE 410
Vt 3.1	TLE 429
Vt 4.2	TLE 402

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agostiniani, Luciano

1981	DUENOM DUENAS : ΚΑΛΟΣ ΚΑΛΟ̄ : MLAX MLAKAS, *SE* 49, 95-111.
1982	Le 'iscrizioni parlanti' dell'Italia antica, Firenze.
1984	Le sequenza *eiminipicapi* e la negazione in etrusco, *AGI* 69, 84-117.
1986	Sull'etrusco della stele di Lemno e su alcuni aspetti del consonantismo etrusco, *AGI* 71, 15-46.

Alessio, Giovanni

1941	L'etrusco e due problemi etimologici latini, *Aevum* 1941, 545-558, esp. 545-549.
1944	Suggerimenti e nuove indagini sul problema del sostrato mediterraneo, *SE* 18, 93-157.

Allen, W.S.

1965	Vox Latina, Cambridge.

Ampolo, Carmine

1981	I gruppi etnici in Roma arcaica: posizione del problema e fonti, in Colonna 1981:45-70.
1986	Roma e Il Latium Vetus nel VI e nel V Sec. AC., *PCIA* 8, 393-467.

André, Jacques

1978	Les mots à redoublement en latin, Paris.

Arumaa, Peeter

1964, 1976	Urslavische Grammatik, Heidelberg, Bd. I: 1964, Bd. II: 1976.

338

Battisti, Carlo

1959   Sul Nome di Populonia, *Atti del Convegno di Studi Etruschi*, 385-412.

Baudoux, Louis

1943   Mots étrusques du vocabulaire latin, diss. Université Catholique de Louvain.

Benedetti, Carlo

1959   La tomba vetuloniense del 'Littore' I, *SE* 27, 229ff.

1960   La tomba vetuloniense del 'Littore' II, *SE* 28, 449ff.

Benveniste, Emile

1955   *Pubes* et *publicus*, *RPh* 81, 7-10.

Bietti Sestieri, Anna Maria

1988   The 'Mycenaean Connection' and its Impact on the Central Mediterranean Societies, *Dial. Arch.* 6, 23-51.

Biville, Frédérique

1987   Graphie et prononciation des mots grecs en latin, Paris.

Bonfante, Giuliano

1983   Il suono 'F' in Europa è di origine etrusca?, *SE* 51, 161-166.

1985   Etruscan Words in Latin, *Word* 36, 203-210.

1988   Note sulla grafia etrusca, *AGI* 73, 1988, 54.

Bonfante, Larissa

1986   (ed.), Etruscan Life and Afterlife, Detroit.

1990   Etruscan, British Museum Publications.

Breyer, Gertraud

1984   Etruskisches Sprachgut im Lateinischen, diss., Vienna university.

Buck, Carl D.

1919   Words for 'Battle', 'War', 'Army', and 'Soldier', *CPh* 14, 1-19, esp. 9-15.

1949   A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in The Principal Indo-European Languages, Chicago.

Campanile, Enrico

1985   Riflessioni sui più antichi testi epigrafici latini, *AIΩN* 7, 89-99.

Colonna, Giovanni

1973-74   Nomi etruschi di vasi, *Archeologia Classica* 25/26, 132-150.

1976   Scriba cum Rege Sedens, *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon*, Rome, I, 187-195.

1977   Nome gentilizio e società, *SE* 45, 175-192.

1981   (ed.) Gli Etruschi e Roma, Incontro di studio in onore di Massimo Pallottino, Roma 11-13 dic. 1979, Roma.

1984   Latin DAMNUS, *Opus* 3,2, 311-318.

Coleman, Robert

1990   Dialectal variation in republican Latin, with special reference to Praenestine, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 216, 1-25.

Conestabile, G.

1865   Pitture murali a fresco e suppellettile etrusche in bronzo, Firenze.

Cornell, T.J.

1976   Etruscan Historiography, *Annali della Scuola
                Normale Superiore di Pisa* 6, 1976, 411-439.

Cortsen, S.P.

1930   Etruskisches, *Glotta* 18, 171-199, esp. 171-
                178.

Crawford, Michael

1974   Roman Republican Coinage, Cambridge.

Cristofani, Mauro

1972   Sull'origine e la diffusione dell'alfabeto
                etrusco, *ANRW* 466-489.

1976   La leggenda di un tipo monetale etrusco,
                Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon, Rome, I,
                209-214.

1977a   L'iscrizione arcaica di Poggio Sommavilla
                riscoperta e riconsiderata, *Civiltà arcaica
                dei Sabini nella valle del Tevere* 3, 97-108.

1977b   Artisti etruschi a Roma nell' ultimo
                trentennio del VI secolo A.C., *Prospettiva* 9,
                2-7.

1978   Rapporto sulla diffusione della scrittura
                nell' Italia antica, *Scrittura e civiltà 2,*
                5-33.

1979   The Etruscans, A New Investigation, London.

1985a   (ed.) Civiltà degli Etruschi, Milan.

1985b   (ed.) Die Etrusker, Stuttgart/Zürich.

De Francisci, P.

1954-55   Intorno all'origine etrusca del concetto di
                Imperium, *SE* 24, 19ff, esp. 32-37.

De Simone, Carlo

1968a   Zur altetruskischen Inschrift aus Rom (*ni araziia laraniia*), *Glotta* 46, 207-212.

1968b   Die Greichischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen I (Einleitung und Quellen), Wiesbaden.

1970   Die Greichischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen II (Untersuchung), Wiesbaden.

1975a   Il nome del Tevere: Contributo per la storia delle più antiche relazioni tra genti latino-italiche ed etrusche, *SE* 43, 119-157.

1977   I rapporti greco-etruschi alla luce dei dati linguistici, *Interferenza Linguistica - Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia, Perugia, 24-25 aprile 1977*, 45-54.

1981   Gli Etruschi a Roma; Evidenza Linguistica e Problemi Metodologici, in: Colonna 1981, 93-103.

1985   L'Ermeneutica testuale etrusca oggi: prospettive e problemi, *AIΩN* 7, 23-36.

1987   Gli imprestiti etruschi nel latino arcaico, in: E. Campanile (ed.), *Alle origini di Roma, Atti del Colloquio tenuto a Pisa il 18 e 19 settembre 1987*, Pisa, 27-41.

1991   I rapporti linguistici tra gli etruschi e gli italici, in: E. Campanile (ed.), *Rapporti linguistici e culturali tra i popoli dell'Italia antica*, Pisa 6-7 ott. 1989, Pisa, 129-147.

Devine, Andrew

1971   Review of De Simone 1970, *JHS 91*, 166-171.

1974   Etruscan language studies and modern phonology: The problem of the aspirates, *SE* 42, 123-151.

Devoto, Giacomo

1932   Nomi di divinità etrusca, I Fufluns, *SE* 6,
                243-260.

1957   Gli Etruschi nel Quadro dei Popoli Italici
                Antichi, *Historia* 6, 23-33.

1968   Geschichte der Sprache Roms, Heidelberg.

Durante, Marcello

1981   La più antica iscrizione italica, in: E.
                Campanile (ed.), Nuovi materiali per la
                ricerca indoeuropeistica, Pisa, 105-106.

Ernout, Alfred

1929   Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin,
                BSL 30, 82-124 (reprinted in Philologica I,
                Paris 1946, 1-51).

1956   Aspects du vocabulaire latin. Études et
                commentaires, 18, Paris.

Fleischhauer, Gunter

1964   Musik des Altertums 2,5: Etrurien und Rom,
                Leipzig.

Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E.

1987   A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Vol. I,
                Oxford.

Gaide, Françoise

1988   Les substantifs masculins en ...*(i)ō*,
                ...*(i)ōnis*, Louvain/Paris.

Giacomelli, Gabriella

1963   La Lingua Falisca, Firenze.

Giglioli,

1935   L'arte etrusca, Milan.

Gladigow, Burkhard

1972   Die sakralen Funktionen der Liktoren. Zum
                Problem von institutioneller Macht und
                sakraler Präsentation, *ANRW* 295-314.

Gordon, A.E.

1983   Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy,
                Berkeley.

Gradenwitz, Otto

1904   Laterculi vocum latinarum, voces latinas et a
                fronte et a tergo ordinandas (curavit),
                Leipzig.

Graham, J. Walter

1987   The Palaces of Crete, Princeton 1962 (revised
                1987).

Herbig, Gustav

1916-17   Etruskisches Latein, *IF* 37, 163-187, esp.
                172-177.

Herbig, Reinhard

1929   Die Fenster in der Architektur des Altertums.
                Baugeschichtliche Studien, diss., Heidelberg.

Heurgon, Jacques

1957   L'État étrusque, *Historia* 6, 63-97.
1964   Daily Life of the Etruscans, London.
1966   The inscriptions of Pyrgi, *JRS* 56, 1-15.
1976   "prumts", "prumaθś" et les arbres
                généalogiques étrusques, *Scritti in onore di
                Giuliano Bonfante*, Brescia, I, 361-376.

Juret, A.C.

1940   Les Étymologies de βασιλεύς, de λᾱός et de *POPULUS*, *REA* 42, 198-200.

Kaimio, J.

1975   The Ousting of Etruscan by Latin in Etruria, Rome.

Kajanto, Iiro

1965   The Latin Cognomina, Helsinki.

Keyser, Paul

1988   The origin of the Latin Numerals 1 to 1000, *AJA* 92, 529-546.

Kent, R.G.

1928   Lachmann's Law of Vowel Lengthening, *Lg* 4, 1928, 181-190.

Lambrechts, Roger

1959   Essai sur les Magistratures des Républiques Étrusques, Bruxelles.

Lazzeroni, Romano

1963   Per la storia dei sostantivi derivati in "-ōn-" nelle lingue classiche, *SSL* 3, 1-48.

Lejeune, Michel

1969   A propos de la titulature de Midas, *Studi in onore di Piero Meriggi*, Pavia, 179-192.

1976   L' Anthroponymie Osque, Paris.

1981   Procédures soustractives dans les numérations étrusque et latine, *BSL* 76, 241-248.

Leumann, Manu

1977   Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, München.

Maltby, Robert

1991   A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies, Leeds.

McCartney, E.

1917   The military indebtedness of Early Rome to Etruria, *MAAR* 1, 121-167.

Marinetti, Anna

1983   Ľiscrizione da Poggio Sommavilla, *SE* 51, 167-170.

Mayrhofer, Manfred

1986   Indogermanische Grammatik, Bd. I.2 Lautlehre, Heidelberg.

Meiser, Gerhard

1986   Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache, Innsbruck.

Messineo, Gaetano

1983   Tesserae hospitales?, *Xenia* 5, 3-4.

Monteil, Pierre

1974   Éléments de phonétique et de morphologie du latin, Paris.

Olsen, Birgit Anette

1988   The Proto-Indo-European Instrument Noun Suffix *-tlom* and its Variants, Copenhagen.

Olzscha, Karl

1961   Confronti di parole-umbre, *SE* 29, 475-491.
1962   Interpretation der Agramer Mumienbinde, Aalen[2] (first published: Wiesbaden 1939).

Pallottino, Massimo

1937   Nuovi Sviluppi Del Metodo Induttivo Nello Studio Del l'Etrusco, *Scritti in onore di Alfredo Trombetti*, 305-312 (= Saggi II, 491-498).

1950-53   Qualche Annotazione in Margine al CIE, *SE* 21 (1950-51) 229-237 and *SE* 22 (1952-53) 179-195 (= Saggi II, 731-753, esp. 738ff.).

1975   The Etruscans (English edition based on the sixth edition of 'Etruscologia'), London.

1979   Lo sviluppo socio-istituzionale di Roma arcaica alla luce di nuovi documenti epigrafici, *Studi Romani* 27/1, 1979, 1-14.

1986   Stirpe e lingue nel Lazio e intorno al Lazio in età arcaica, Etruria e Lazio Arcaica, 179-183.

Palmer, L. R.

1954   The Latin Language, London.

Palmer, Robert E. A.

1970   The Archaic Community of the Romans, Cambridge.

Pantzerhjelm Thomas, S. and Skutsch, F.

1912   Zu *populus* und *populo(r)*, *Glotta* 3, 196-203.

Penney, John H. W.

1988   The Languages of Italy, *CAH*[2] IV, 720-738.

Peruzzi, Emilio

1980   Mycenaneans in early Latium, Rome.

Pfiffig, Ambros J.

1963   Studien zu den Agramer Mumienbinden, Wien.

1969   Die Etruskische Sprache, Graz.

| 1975 | Religio Etrusca, Graz. |
| 1976 | Einige Bemerkungen zu CIE 6213, *Scritti in onore di Guiliano Bonfante*, Brescia, II, 697-704. |

Pisani, Vittore

| 1981 | Ancora SPURIUS, *Paideia* 36, 62. |
| 1982 | SPURIUS, *Studi in onore di Arnaldo Biscardi*, Milano, I, 193-195. |

Poucet, Jacques

| 1989 | Réflexions sur l'écrit et l'écriture dans la Rome des premiers siècles, *Latomus* 48, 285-311. |

Prayon, Friedhelm

| 1975 | Frühetruskische Grab- und Hausarchitektur, Heidelberg. |

Prosdocimi, Aldo Luigi

| 1978 | Il lessico istituzionale italico tra linguistica e storia, in: La cultura italica, *Atti del convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia, 19 e 20 dic. 1977*, Pisa. |
| 1979 | Studi sul latino arcaico, *SE* 47, 1979, 173-221. |

Poultney, James W.

| 1959 | The Bronze Tables of Iguvium, Baltimore |

Radke, G.

| 1967 | Die italische Alphabete, *SG* 7, 401-431. |

Reichler-Béguelin, Marie-José

| 1986 | Les noms latins du type *mēns*, Étude |

morphologique (Collection Latomus, Vol. 195), Bruxelles.

Reichmuth, Johann

1956   Die lateinischen Gentilicia und ihre Beziehungen zu den römischen Individualnamen, diss. Universität Zürich, Schwyz.

Ridgway, David

1988   The Etruscans, CAH IV², 634-675.

Rix, Helmut

1956   Die Personennamen auf den etruskisch-lateinischen Bilinguen, *BNF* 7, 147-172.

1957   *Sabini, Sabelli, Samnium*, *BNF* 8, 127-143.

1963   Das etruskische Cognomen. Untersuchungen zu System, Morphologie und Verwendung der Personennamen auf den jüngeren Inschriften Nordetruriens, Wiesbaden.

1967a   Die lateinische Synkope als historisches und philologisches Problem, *Kratylos* 11, 156-165 (= K. Strunk (ed.), Probleme der lateinischen Grammatik, Darmstadt 1973, 90-102).

1968a   Eine morphosyntaktische Übereinstimmung zwischen Etruskisch und Lemnisch: Die Datierungsformel, *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde, Gedenkschrift fur Wilhelm Brandenstein*, 213-222.

1968b   Review of De Simone 1968, *Kratylos* 13, 166-172.

1969   Buchstabe, Zahlwort und Ziffer im Alten Mittelitalien, in: *Studi Pisani*, Brescia, II, 845-856.

1972   Ursprung des römisch-mittelitalischen Gentilnamensystems, *ANRW* 700-758.

1976a	Review of De Simone 1970, *Kratylos* 21, 175-183.
1976b	Historische Grammatik des Griechischen, Darmstadt.
1981	Rapporti onomastici fra il panteon etrusco e quello romano, in: Colonna 1981, 104-126.
1983	Norme e variazioni nell'ortografia etrusca, *AIΩN* 5, 127-140.
1984a	Una nuova ricostruzione della Stele Ducati 137 e la questione di magistrati etruschi a Felsina-Bologna, *Emilia Preromana, Rivista di Preistoria e Protostoria per l' Emilia Romagna* 9/10 1981/82 (1984), 281-286.
1984b	Etr. *meχl rasnal* = lat. *rēs pūblica*, *Studi in onore di G. Maetzke*, Rome, II, 455-468.
1985a	Schrift und Sprache, in: Cristofani 1985b, 210-238.
1985b	Das letzte Wort der Duenos-Inschrift, *MSS* 46, 193-220.
1985c	Descrizioni di rituali in etrusco e in italico, *L'Etrusco et Le Lingue Dell'Italia Antica: Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia, Pisa 8 e 9 dicembre 1984*, Pisa, 21-37.
1986	Etruskisch *culs** 'Tor' und der Abschnitt VIII 1-2 des Zagreber liber linteus, in: *Vjesnik Arheološkog Muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3. Serija - Vol. XIX, 17-30.
1989a	Per una grammatica storica dell'etrusco, *Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco, Firenze 26 Maggio - 2 Giugno 1985 (Supplemento di Studi Etruschi): Atti*, Vol. III, Roma, 1293-1306.
1989b	Lat. *patronus, matrona, colonus, pecunia*, in: *Indogermanica Europaea, Festschrift für*

Wolfgang Meid zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11.1989, Graz, 225-240.

1990 Inhalt und Funktion des Textes auf der Tontafel von Capua, in: Die Welt der Etrusker, Internationales Kolloquium, 24.-26. Oktober 1988 in Berlin, Hrsg. von Huberta Heres und Max Kunze, Berlin, 111-115.

(forthcoming a)Teonimi etruschi e teonimi italici.

(forthcoming b)Etrusco *Un, Une, Unu* 'te, tibi, vos' e le preghiere dei rituali paralleli nel Liber Linteus, forthcoming in *AC*.

(forthcoming c)Wonach haben die Römer ihre Beamten benannt?, forthcoming in *Dialog*, Bayerischer Schulbuch Verlag.

Ryberg, Inez Scott

1955 Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art, *MAAR* 22, Rome.

Salomies, Olli

1987 Die römischen Vornamen, Studien zur römischen Namengebung, Helsinki.

Sampson, Geoffrey

1985 Writing Systems, London.

Saulnier, C.

1980 L'armée et la guerre dans le monde étrusco-romain (VIII-IV s.), Paris.

Schulze, Wilhelm

1900 Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen, Berlin.

Schulze-Thulin, Britta,
(forthcoming)   Zur Wortstellung im Etruskischen, forthcoming
in *SE* 1992 or 1993.

Seebold, Elmar
1981   Etymologie, Eine Einführung am Beispiel der
deutschen Sprache, München.

Simon, Erika
1985   Etruskische Kultgottheiten, in: Cristofani
1985b, 152-167.

Smith, Thyrza R.
1987   Mycenaean Trade and Interaction in the West
Central Mediterranean 1600-1000 B.C., *BAR
International Series* 371, Oxford.

Sommer, F., revised by Pfister, R.
1977   Handbuch der   lateinischen Laut- und
Formenlehre I: Einleitung und Lautlehre,
Heidelberg.

Spivey, Nigel and Stoddart, Simon
1990   Etruscan Italy: An Archaeological History,
London.

Steinbauer, Dieter
1979   Die Vertretung der urindogermanischen Mediae
Aspiratae im Lateinischen, Magisterarbeit im
Fachbereich Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft
der Universität Regensberg.
1983   Review of Colonna 1981, *GGA* 235, 220ff.
1989   Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei
Plautus belegten Verben der lateinischen
ersten   Konjugation.   Unter   besonderer

Berücksichtigung der Denominative, Altendorf b. Bamberg.

(forthcoming)   Etruskische-ostitalische Lehnbeziehungen, paper given to the Arbeitstagung 'Oskisch-Umbrisch, Texte und Grammatik; Osco-umbro, testi e grammatica' der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und der Società Italiana di Glottologia vom 25.9./28.9.1991 in Freiburg. Quotations given are from the lecture handout.

Stibbe, C.M. et al.

1980   Lapis Satricanus. Archaeological, Epigraphical, Linguistic and Historical Aspects of the New Inscription from Satricum, The Hague.

Stoltenberg, H.

1956   Die wichstigsten etruskischen Inschriften, Leverkusen.

Strunk, Klaus

1964   Ai. *stīrṇá-/stŕta-*: gr. στρωτός/στρατός, *MSS* 17, 77-108.

Szemerényi, Oswald

1952-53   The development of the Indo-European mediae aspiratae in Latin and Italic, *ArchL* 4, 1952-3, 27-53, 99-116 and 5, 1953, 1-21 (= Scripta Minora II, 628-693).

1962   Principles of Etymological Research in the Indo-European Languages, II. Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck, 175-212 (= Scripta Minora I, 40-77).

1966   Linguistic Comments on the Pyrgi Tables, *SMEA*
                1, 121-127 (= Scripta Minora II, 853-859).

1975   The Origins of Roman Drama and Greek Tragedy,
                Hermes 103, 300-332 (= Scripta Minora II,
                945-977).

1987   Scripta Minora. Selected Essays in Indo-
                European, Greek and Latin, I-III, Innsbruck.
                Ed. by P. Considine; J.T. Hooker.

1989   An den Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes,
                Innsbruck.

1990   Einführung   in   die   vergleichende
                Sprachwissenschaft, Darmstadt (4. edition).

Thuillier, Jean-Paul
1985   Les Jeux Athlétiques dans la Civilisation
                Étrusque, Rome.

Tischler, Johann
1976   Zur Reduplikation im Indogermanischen, *IBS
                Vorträge 16*, Innsbruck.

Torelli, Mario
1976   Glosse   etrusche: qualche   problema   di
                trasmissione, *Mélanges offerts à Jacques
                Heurgon*, Rome, II, 1001-1008.

Untermann, Jürgen
1968   Merkmale der Wortgrenze in den altitalischen
                Sprachen, *Word* 24, 479-490.

Van der Meer, L.B.
1987   The Bronze Liver of Piacenza, Amsterdam.

Van Windekens, A.J.
1956   L'origine de lat. *satelles* 'garde du corps;
                satellite', *Orbis* 5, 1, 198-202.

Wachter, Rudolf

1987   Altlateinische Inschriften, Bern.

Wallace, Rex

1984   The Sabellian Languages, PhD. diss., Ohio
                    State University.

1989   The Origins and Development of the Latin
                    Alphabet, in: Wayne Senner (ed.), The Origins
                    of Writing, University of Nebraska Press.

Warmington, E. H.

1967   Remains of Old Latin (Vol. I: Ennius and
                    Caecilius; Vol. II: Livius Andronicus,
                    Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius; Vol. III:
                    Lucilius, The Twelve Tables), Cambridge,
                    Massachusetts.