

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. VI

HELSINKI 1969 HELSINGFORS

## CONTENTS

Kaarle Hirvonen	Cledonomaney and the grinding slave woman, Od. XX, 91—121 . . . . .	5
Jorma Kaimio	The nominative singular in -i of Latin gentilicia	23
Iiro Kajanto	Tacitus on the slaves. An interpretation of the an- nales XIV, 42—45 . . . . .	43
Saara Lilja	On the nature of Pliny's letters . . . . .	61
Olli Makkonen	Waldterminologie im Latein . . . . .	81
Päivö Oksala	Das Geschlecht des Attis bei Catull . . . . .	91
Tuomo Pekkanen	Finnicus Afnius . . . . .	97
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica . . . . .	101
Jaakko Suolahti	Legatio libera . . . . .	113
Holger Thesleff	Genitive absolute and Platonic style . . . . .	121
Toivo Viljamaa	Ciceros Bildersprache und die Quellenfrage von Tusc. disp. I, 26—81 . . . . .	133
Maarit Vuorenjuuri	Vocative singular addressing the chorus in Greek drama . . . . .	147

# THE NOMINATIVE SINGULAR IN -I OF LATIN GENTILICIA

J o r m a K a i m i o

## The appearance of the form

The doublet ending *-i* of the nominative singular of gentilicia is often very difficult to distinguish, this form being similar to the genitive form. The decision as to the use of either nominative or genitive can be made when several names occur together, some of them disclosing the endings of the others, when the name has a syntactic position in the sentence, e.g. *N.N. dedit, N.N. N.N. curaverunt*; and furthermore, in inscriptions whose nature demands a certain case, e.g. in milestones and coins. In epitaphs, however, of which our main material consists, the decision often remains uncertain. Within greater close inscription groups, the frequency of epitaphs in the genitive can be concluded from the feminine forms, but the detached cases often have to be excluded from this scrutiny as being uncertain.

The oldest great inscription group with the ending *-i* consists of the *cippi* of Praeneste (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 64—357, 2445—2483). These *cippi* cannot be exactly dated, but artistic and archeological criteria argue that the oldest belong perhaps to the third century B.C.<sup>1</sup> The onomastic *formulae* are similar to the Roman *formula* with the exception of the feminine praenomen, which appears 32 times; there is no certain evidence for the appearance of *tribus* which is possible after 90 B.C., when Praeneste received Roman citizenship. Neither are there any traces of the Latinization of the nomenclature, consequent chiefly upon Sulla's policy.<sup>2</sup> Dialectal features have to be distinguished from archaisms.<sup>3</sup> Some late features in the onomastic *formulae*, e.g. the wider use of the cognomen, may indicate that the *cippi* extend to the beginning of the first century B.C.<sup>4</sup> The endings of male gentilicia can be divided as follows:

<sup>1</sup> See DESSAU CIL XIV p. 328—329.

<sup>2</sup> A. DEGRASSI Epigraphica IV, *Mem.Acc.Linc. S. VIII Vol. XIV* (1969) 113—116.

<sup>3</sup> See A. ERNOUT, Parler de Préneste, *Mem.Soc.Ling.* 13 (1905—06) 295.

<sup>4</sup> ERNOUT *art.cit.* 294 dates approximately up to the third cent., LOMMATZSCH CIL I<sup>2</sup> p. 391 up to the third and second, perhaps up to the first cent. B.C.

Freeborn: -i	70 ×	<i>Liberti</i> : -i	8 ×	
	-io	62 ×	-io	16 ×
	-ius	28 ×	-ius	2 ×

The possibility of the genitive is not taken into consideration, but will be investigated later in this paper; only a rather small number of the endings *-i* is due to the genitive.

The *cippi* of Caere form a group almost equal in number (about 300), although one third of the inscriptions is Etruscan.<sup>1</sup> The dating of the Caere *cippi* is not less difficult. MENGARELLI has excavated the greatest part of them in this century, but in fact archaeology affords very little assistance.<sup>2</sup> MENGARELLI, however, noticed that the tombs in front of which the *cippi* were found were usually quarried in the fourth century B.C. and that both Etruscan and Latin *cippi* were found side by side.<sup>3</sup> On that basis he dated the oldest Latin *cippi* as belonging to the fourth century B.C. On the other hand, the *cippi* are considered as existing as late as the Claudian age on ground of a discovered  $\text{t} = V$ ,<sup>4</sup> though the letter is surely *L*.<sup>5</sup> I am convinced that MENGARELLI'S dating<sup>6</sup> is some centuries too early. Especially the onomastic *formulae* show clear features from the second and first centuries B.C.: the cognomen coming into common usage, the lack of Etruscan influence and, above all, the praenomen of *liberti* which since the first century B.C. was identical with that of *patronus*:<sup>7</sup> at Caere the praenomina are identical 37 times, and only four or five times they are different.<sup>8</sup> The nominative endings for men can be divided as follows:

Freeborn: -i	75 ×	<i>Liberti</i> : -i	32 ×	
	-ius	7 ×	-ius	7 ×

Again, the possibility of the genitive will be considered later in this paper.

<sup>1</sup> The inscriptions are published in CIL I<sup>2</sup> (1931—1986, 2546—2627, 2721—2763) by LOMMATZSCH, in *N.Sc.* 1915 and 1937 by R. MENGARELLI and in *St.Etr.* 34—36 (1966—68) by M. CRISTOFANI, who has prepared for CIE the first complete publication.

<sup>2</sup> The reconstruction of the archeological material excavated by MENGARELLI is attempted in *Mon.Ant.* 42 (1955) by G. RICCI.

<sup>3</sup> MENGARELLI *N.Sc.* 1915, 364, 1937, 359, *Atti II<sup>o</sup> Congr. naz. st. rom. I* (1931) 415—420, *St.Etr.* 11 (1937) 92—93.

<sup>4</sup> MENGARELLI *N.Sc.* 1937 365, E. VETTER *Glotta* 28 (1939) 129.

<sup>5</sup> Autopsy 13. 6. 1969; *L. Seterna L.I.* is required also by the fact that the freedmen of the *cippi* nearly always have the praenomen of their patrons.

<sup>6</sup> Accepted by DEGRASSI ILLRP II p. 211, A. J. PFIFFIG *Ausbreitung d. röm. Städtewesens in Etruria*, Firenze 1966, 11—12, and many others.

<sup>7</sup> VITUCCI *Diz. Epigr.* VI 910—911.

<sup>8</sup> Noticed already by E. FIESEL *Das Grammatische Geschlecht im Etruskischen*, Göttingen 1922, 83.

The *ollae* found in the vineyard of S. Cesareo CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1015—1195 form the third large group. These *ollae*, which in vulgar language have much of dialectal and Greek influence, probably date from the second century B.C.<sup>1</sup> The masculine nominative endings can be divided as follows:

Freeborn: <i>-i</i>	45 ×	<i>Liberti: -i</i>	11 ×
abbreviated	24 ×	others together	5 ×
<i>-ius</i>	7 ×		
<i>-is</i>	7 ×		

The Roman republican coins should be separated into the next large group. In the names of *monetales* *-i* is extremely common from the third century B.C. to the end of the Republic. I counted 102 forms in *-i* from the 370 coins from *Appendix nummorum* of CIL I<sup>2</sup>, many even lacking the name of the *monetalis*.

The situation is much less clear in the republican *instrumentum domesticum*, *terra sigillata* and brick stamps. On one hand the genitive is much more probable, on the other, the names are nearly always abbreviated. Anyway, the ending *-i* when compared with the other abbreviations and the ending *-ius* does not have as clear a position as it does in the above-mentioned groups.

Most of the scattered forms are found in Etruria, i.e. *-i* appears there as often as in all the other inscriptions of CIL I<sup>2</sup> together, if we exclude the above-mentioned groups. The largest number, about 40, comes from Clusium, 7 from Perugia, 3 from Volaterrae and Tuscania, 1 from Visentium and Saena. The inscriptions date in all probability from after 90 B.C., when all Etruscans had become Roman citizens and the Romanization of Etruria had begun. Almost without exception, these inscriptions are either Etrusco-Latin bilinguals or include Etruscisms, i.e. are written in a mixed language.

Apart from the coins, there are some inscriptions with the ending *-i* which can be dated exactly. The oldest of them, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 607, is a votive altar erected by *M. Minuci C.F. dictator*, i.e. in 217 B.C. In *Sen. Cons. de Bacch.* CIL I<sup>2</sup> 581 from 186 B.C. the names of scribes have the ending *-i*. An important piece of evidence against the vulgarity of the form is its appearance in the epitaph of a certain Scipio, the quaestor of 167 B.C., CIL I<sup>2</sup> 12. In addition to these, *-i* appears in the names of prominent persons CIL I<sup>2</sup> 658, a votive basis from 122 B.C., and 661, a milestone from 117 B.C.; elsewhere the names of consuls are always written with *-ius*. The only *Fastes* with *-i* are the *Fastes* of Antium,

<sup>1</sup> MOMMSEN CIL I p. 210.

I. I. XIII: 3; these oldest of the *Fastes* found, probably from 67—55 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> regularly write the names of consuls with *-i*. This may as well be explained by the unofficial nature of the *Fastes* as by their age. In a *tabula ahenaea* discovered in Rome, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 709 from 89 B.C., which includes the decision of Cn. Pompeius concerning Roman citizenship, the largest number of the names, 41, has the ending *-i*.

A group, important in the developing of nominative endings, is formed by the tables found at Capua, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 672—688, which tell us about the building works of magistrates. The following table describes the appearance of endings:

	Year (B.C.)	Freeborn		<i>Liberti</i>	
		<i>-i</i>	<i>-ius</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-ius</i>
I <sup>2</sup> 672	112/1			2	
673	112/1			1	4
674	110	2	4		
675	108		12		
ILLRP 708	108	2	10		
I <sup>2</sup> 677	106			7	6
678	106	1	5		
ILLRP 712	105		12		
I <sup>2</sup> 679	104		12		
681	98			1	
ILLRP 723b	?	9	2		
	Together	14	57	12	27

In the later tables *-i* does not appear.

The inscriptions of the following list, which all include the form *-i*, cannot be dated: CIL I<sup>2</sup> 987 (Rome, two *lib.*), 979 (Rome, *lib.*), 990 (Rome, freeborn), 999 (Rome, *lib.*), 1002 (Rome, *lib.*, *ibid.* freeborn has *-ius*), 1247 (Rome, three *lib.*), 1263 (Rome, three *lib.*, one freeborn, *ibid.* also *-ius*), 1291 (Rome, *lib.*, also *-ius*), 1316 (Rome, two *lib.*), 1333 (Rome, *lib.*), 1358 (Rome, *lib.*), 1367 a and b (Rome, *lib.*, all freeborn *-ius*), 1394 (Rome, *lib.*), 1411 (Rome, *lib.*); 1425 (Ostia, three *lib.*), 1426 (Ostia, three), 1436 (Nemus Dianae, freeborn), 1455 (Praeneste, two), 1450 (Praeneste, freeborn and *lib.*), 1453 (Praeneste, freeborn), 1536 (Atina, freeborn), 1569 (Minturnae, freeborn), 1617 (Puteoli, *lib.*), 1618 (Puteoli, three freeborn, two *lib.*), 1763 (Antium, freeborn), 1835 (Trebula Mutuesca, *lib.*), 1884 (Amiternum, *lib.*), 1890 (Nursia, freeborn), 1894 (Hadria, two freeborn), 1898 (Hadria, two freeborn), 1899 (Hadria, three freeborn), 1902 (Interamna, *lib.*), 2108 (Spoletum, three *lib.*), 2131 (Ariminum, freeborn and *lib.*), 2268 (Hispania), 2269 (Hispania,

<sup>1</sup> DEGRASSI II XIII: 1, p. 159.

freeborn, *ibid.* two *-ius*), 2270 (Hispania, two freeborn, four *lib.*), 2435 (Capena, freeborn). But many new inscriptions including the same ending are found after the publication of CIL I<sup>2</sup>.

The ending *-i* of the nominative singular extends as far as the imperial age, even if only exceptionally. In most volumes of CIL, the cases are enumerated in the grammatical index. In CIL VI, I went through one thousand epitaphs and found two forms in *-i*, which will give a fairly accurate picture of the appearance of the form in later inscriptions.

As for the chronology, one can say that the oldest examples of the nominative ending *-i* that we know of date from the end of the third century B.C. This does not necessarily mean that the ending in question should have arisen at that time: the epigraphic material from the earlier time is sparse. The chronology does not exclude even the possibility of the endings *-i* and *-ius* being coeval. The form is, even considering the increasing number of inscriptions, most common both before and after 100 B.C.<sup>1</sup> In the Iulio-Claudian time the ending rarely appears, although the exact dating of inscriptions is often difficult. Concerning the appearance of the ending one should mention that it seems to belong to certain inscription groups and has in this way probably been dependent on the epigraphic practice of certain localities.

### Phonetic explanation

It is of the greatest significance for the explanation of the nominative in *-i*, if we can regard it as a result of a phonetic development from *-ios* in Latin or in dialects which have had an influence on Latin. If this phonetic development is possible, it is also the easiest way of explaining the rise of the form; the factors to be presented later have then established that this phonetic variant has in some cases become even more frequent than the original form in the republican inscriptions. There are two conceivable courses of development, either *-ios* > *-is* > *-i* or *-ios* > *-io* > *-i*.<sup>2</sup> However, the latter development and especially its last phase would be without any parallel in Latin and it may be regarded as phonetically impossible.<sup>3</sup>

Of the explanations of the ending *-is* in Latin, the Indo-European Ablaut

<sup>1</sup> DEGRASSI *Epigraphica* III, *Scritti vari di antichità* III, Padova 1967, 139–140, Area sacra di S.Omobono, *ibid.* 265.

<sup>2</sup> The latter is only presented by E. HÜBNER, *Hdb. d. Alt.wiss.* I<sup>2</sup>, München 1892, 668, and W. LINDSAY, *Die lat. Sprache*, Leipzig 1897, 142.

<sup>3</sup> See C. PROSKAUER, *Das auslautende -s auf lat. Inschr.*, Diss. Freiburg 1909, 34–35.

variation could explain the origin as being earlier than the other explanations provide. There exists in the *-io* -stems an old Indo-European variant *-i-* in the nominative and accusative. There is not, however, any support for the existence of this variation in Latin.<sup>1</sup> If we take *-ios* as the basic form, we have to investigate whether the syncope > *-is* is possible according to the Latin phonetic laws. LEUMANN's answer is clear: it is question of provincialism;<sup>2</sup> SOMMER, too, supposes the same origin for the syncope.<sup>3</sup> The Latin analogies are the firmest arguments for the explanation of the form on a Latin basis: the forms *alis* and *alid* for *alius*, and the parallel suffix *-aris* for *-arius*.<sup>4</sup> The forms of *alius* have been explained by means of various hypotheses: an Indo-European parallel formation, an analogy, a phonetic development; however, it is probable that the form *alis* is quite late.<sup>5</sup>

In other Italic dialects the loss of *-o-* is characteristic of *-io*-stems. Oscan offers the richest material, having the following endings in the nominative singular: *-is*, *-iis*, *-iis* (Oscan alphabet), *-ις*, *-ιες* (Greek), *-is*, *-ies* (Latin).<sup>6</sup> In Umbrian, the ending without rhotacism is *-is*, in Paelignian and in other lesser dialects *-is* and *-ies*.<sup>7</sup> The differences in the endings must be explained by the two suffixes, *-io-* and *-īo-*, the former of which mainly belongs to prae-nomina, the latter to gentilicia; in this way *-io-* may originate in *-i-io-*, i.e. in gentilicia derived from praenomina including *-i-*.<sup>8</sup>

There are two ways of explaining the lack of *-o-* in these Italic nominatives: it is question either of the Indo-European Ablaut form mentioned above, or of the Italic syncope of the final syllable. Only v. PLANTA<sup>9</sup> has taken the former possibility seriously; the syncope affords a much simpler explanation. When we consider the great influence of dialects on early Latin, above all on the language of the lower classes in which the ending *-is* in the main appears,<sup>10</sup> one is quite justified in seeing the Oscan influence in this form.

<sup>1</sup> R. v. PLANTA, Grammatik d. osk.-umbr. Dialekte, Strassburg 1897, II. 127—133, considers that the decision in Oscan between Indo-European Ablaut and Italic syncope is impossible and regards the former as possible in Latin, too, but his theory is not accepted.

<sup>2</sup> M. LEUMANN, Lateinische Grammatik I, *Hdb. d. Alt.wiss.* II 2.1<sup>2</sup>, München 1936, 94.

<sup>3</sup> F. SOMMER, Handb. der lat. Laut- und Formenlehre, Heidelberg 1914, 337.

<sup>4</sup> F. G. BENSELER, De nominibus propriis et Lat. in *-is* pro *-ius* et Gr. in *-ις*, *-ις* pro *-ιος* *-ιος*, terminatis, Diss. Leipzig 1870, 159, F. RITSCHL, De declinatione quadam Latina reconditiore, *Opusc. Phil.* IV, Leipzig 1878, 461—466.

<sup>5</sup> See LEUMANN, *op.cit.* 94, SOMMER, *op.cit.* 337; as for the appearance, see *Thes. L.L.* I 1623.

<sup>6</sup> v. PLANTA *op.cit.* 127.

<sup>7</sup> v. PLANTA *op.cit.* 128.

<sup>8</sup> v. PLANTA *op.cit.* 128—131.

<sup>9</sup> v. PLANTA *op.cit.* 131—134.

<sup>10</sup> SOMMER *op.cit.* 337.



Apart from this, Greek influence can be detected in the form *-is*. It is well-known that Greek often transcribes the Latin ending *-ius* by *-ις*, e.g. *Αὐρηλις* for Aurelius. Under the influence of Greek, the ending *-is* again became common in Latin Christian inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> MOMMSEN discerned Greek influence in the language of the *ollae* of S. Cesareo (there is one Greek inscription and one written in Greek characters), and combined the diverging nominative forms with it (see p. 25).<sup>2</sup> One objection can, however, be raised against Greek influence in republican inscriptions. In the Greek dialects, *-ις* for *-ιος* begins to appear in the third century B.C., probably as a result of contraction.<sup>3</sup> However, the Greek transcription *-ις* for *-ius* does not appear earlier than the first century A.D.<sup>4</sup> Thus, it is unlikely that the early epitaphs should have been influenced by the same factors as it was in the Christian times.

In any case, the nominative *-is* for *-ius* is documented in early Latin, although obviously more seldom than *-i*. Now, it is a decisive question as to whether the loss of *-s* in this ending is possible according to Latin phonetic laws. Our knowledge of the weak pronunciation of the final *s* is based on the one hand on the metre of early poets,<sup>5</sup> on the other on early inscriptions. The phenomenon is peculiar in that the final *s* is restored to its position even during the republican era,<sup>6</sup> and has then preserved its place very tenaciously in vulgar Latin and in some of the Romance languages.

C. PROSKAUER has studied the loss of the final *s* on the grounds of epigraphic material. She has observed that *s* weakened only after *o*; the cases after other vowels are analogous. Further, she considers that the restitution of *-s* can be connected with the change of *-o-* to *-u-*, so that the normal endings are *-o* and *-us*.<sup>7</sup> There are only a few certain cases of the loss of *-s* after a long vowel. If we consider PROSKAUER's material, no longer complete, we shall notice that *-s* has vanished almost exclusively in the ending *-ios* of gentilicia. She presents many inscriptions, in which the gentilicia end in *-io*, but in other words the final *s* has been preserved.<sup>8</sup> Her explanation of this state of affairs is complicated: not only the vowel before *s*, but the preceding sound, too, has

<sup>1</sup> See BENSELER, *op.cit.* 149—155.

<sup>2</sup> MOMMSEN CIL I p. 210, after him HÜBNER *art.cit.* 668.

<sup>3</sup> SCHWYZER—DEBRUNNER, Gr. Grammatik I, *Hdb. d. Alt. wiss.* II.1.1, München 1939, 472, LEUMANN, *op.cit.*, 94.

<sup>4</sup> BENSELER *op.cit.* 150.

<sup>5</sup> PROSKAUER *op.cit.* 37, LEUMANN *op.cit.* 175.

<sup>6</sup> PROSKAUER *op.cit.* 10, 38.

<sup>7</sup> PROSKAUER *op.cit.* 31, 38.

<sup>8</sup> PROSKAUER *op.cit.* 15.

influenced the preservation of *-s*, which has mainly vanished when *-o-* is preceded by a vowel.<sup>1</sup> If we separate the gentilicia into a group of their own, the loss of the final *s* in other cases is, as far as one can see, equally common after all vowels, even irrespective of the length of the vowels. That was also to be expected, because the preceding vowel can hardly have had any greater influence on the voicing and colour of *-s*. The rest of the material demonstrates with the metre that the final *s* has to some extent weakened during the republican period, but the loss cannot have had any value of a phonetic laws.

How then is the gentilicium ending *-io* to be estimated? The old theory of HAMMER insists that it is personal names that best reflect the familiar pronunciation, whereas other words preserve the scholastic spelling.<sup>2</sup> The hypothesis is absurd, when one considers traditionalism peculiar to onomastics. As far as I can see, it is simply a question of epigraphic practice, if such a general expression can be used. The origin of this practice is quite uncertain: the problem is, in fact, almost the same as that of the ending *-i*. The explanation may be phonetic and go back to earlier times or it can be due to an abbreviation. It is most important to notice that the spelling *-io* is rather a traditional practice, which has preserved its old vocalism, but it need not rigorously reflect the pronunciation of its time. It is natural that this practice is firmly established in personal names, which are often the sole element of old inscriptions, whereas in the other words the final *s* is written.

As to the nominative in *-i* and to its possible phonetic explanation, we have no certain way of determining the length of the transition stage *-is*<sup>3</sup> However, it is possible in theory that this form can have developed on account of the weak pronunciation of final *s* to *-i*; this may have happened at Praeneste for example, where the form in *-i* is frequently documented, and where it is clear evidence for the loss of the final *s*. The difficulties are, however, nearly unsurmountable. First, the form in *-is*, which can probably be attributed to the influence of Oscan and other Italic dialects, is very rare, and does not appear even once at Praeneste, for example. Secondly, the phonetic loss of the final *s* is equally rare, if we do not take into consideration the ending *-io* established in epigraphic practice. However, the final outcome *-i* is nearly ten times more common than the former simpler form. It can be noticed that the form in *-i* is in theory phonetically deducible, although in a very difficult way. However, the factors to be presented later may have made a rare form common.

<sup>1</sup> PROSKAUER *op.cit.* 32—33.

<sup>2</sup> HAMMER, Die lokale Verbreitung frühester romanischen Lautwandlungen in Italien, Halle a. Saale 1834, 22.

<sup>3</sup> Generally considered long, but see v. PLANTA, *op.cit.* 133.

## M O R P H O L O G I C   e x p l a n a t i o n

The most interesting explanation of the form in *-i* would be to consider it an old *casus indefinitus* of an individual name, which has acquired the function of the genitive in the Italic dialects.<sup>1</sup> This theory requires us to examine on one hand the origin of the Latin gentilicium, and on the other the origin of the Latin genitive ending.

The gentilicium *Marcus* is a patronymic adjective derived from the individual name *Marcus* with the suffix *-ios*, which indicates a belonging to something.<sup>2</sup> This kind of name formation is almost without parallel, the Italic *tria nomina* system being completely without parallel in Indo-European onomastics;<sup>3</sup> the normal Indo-European onomastic *formula* is composed of an individual name, a patronymic, and possibly an indication of a home place. The contrast between Italic and Indo-European systems, however, becomes less severe, because we can trace the development of the Italic system from the Indo-European in Italy, and we can also find many modern parallels. *Marcus*' son *Quintus* has given *Quintus Marcus* as his name, 'Marcian Quintus', then the patronymic adjective has gradually become hereditary, perhaps, as REICHMUTH has supposed, because the power of the *pater familias* extended as far as the grandchildren.<sup>4</sup> The necessity of forming a new patronymic with the genitive plus *filius* has then arisen. As the last stage, the cognomen has been assumed in order to separate branches of *gens* or individuals.

We may well consider the earliest patronymic to have had a variant, *Quintus Marci*. In this case *Marci* would be an important link in the scrutiny of the ending *-i* of the Latin genitive. That ending, appearing outside the Italic languages only in Celtic, is currently considered to be the Indo-European ending of the *casus indefinitus*, which indicates a belonging to something, and which has acquired the function of the genitive in these languages. The examples presented by HIRT still express a meaning close to the *casus indefinitus*: the genitive with *esse* and, above all, the expressions *Gnaei puer*, *Caecilia Metelli* = 'die metellische Caecilia'.<sup>5</sup> The hypothetical type *Quintus Marci*, where

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted for this theory to my friend, TUOMO PEKKANEN, Ph.D.

<sup>2</sup> F. SOLMSEN—E. FRÄNKEL, *Indog. Eigennamen*, Heidelberg 1922, 139—140, FRÄNKEL RE XVI 1656—1658, K. MEISTER, *Lat.-gr. Eigennamen I*, Leipzig—Berlin 1916, 81—83, G. BONFANTE, *The Origin of the Latin Name-system*, *Mél. Marouzeau*, Paris 1948, 46, J. REICHMUTH, *Die lat. Gentilicia*, Diss. Zürich 1956, 85.

<sup>3</sup> SOLMSEN—FRÄNKEL *op.cit.* 135—137, E. PULGRAM, *The Origin of the Latin Nomen Gentilicium*, *Stud.Cl.Phil.* 58—59 (1948), 163—164, REICHMUTH *op.cit.* 12.

<sup>4</sup> REICHMUTH *op.cit.* 87—88.

<sup>5</sup> H. HIRT, *Indog. Grammatik VI: Syntax I*, Heidelberg 1934, 117—119, see also LEU-MANN *op.cit.* 268—269.

*Marci* would have exactly the same meaning as the adjective *Marcios*, would be an excellent example of the use of *casus indefinitus*. As far as I can see, it is quite likely that the first patronymic associated with an individual name would have had a dual formation: *Marci* next to the adjective *Marcios*. Now, however, we have to decide whether the gentilicia with the ending *-i*, of which the first examples date from the third century B.C., can be relics of this original formation.

The date of the rise of the gentilicium cannot be exactly determined; the *fibula* of Praeneste has nothing but individual names, as is the case with the persons in the mythology of the foundation of Rome, but the Roman kings after Romulus already have the gentilicium.<sup>1</sup> In all likelihood the rise of gentilicium can be dated at about the sixth century. Not until about three centuries later do we have richer epigraphic name material. Can the doublet *Marci* have been preserved for so long beside the form *Marcios*? As far as I can see, the frequency of the form *Marci* in the last centuries of the Republic is greatly due to the epigraphic practice, to its applicability to concise inscriptions. We have no evidence that such epigraphic practice could have made the form common in earlier times; it is probable that the number of inscriptions was relatively small in earlier times. We have already noticed the solidity of the onomastic tradition, but another feature characteristic of Latin onomastics is unification: one example is the quick Latinization of the Etruscan ending *-na* to the form *-nius*. This background makes it improbable that the doublet *-i* could have preserved its position for so long. We cannot suppose that it would be later than *-ios*, because when the gentilicium became hereditary, its connection with individual names was not more conspicuous, and then a *casus indefinitus* of individual names would no longer have been possible. It is also noteworthy that there is not a single literary example or grammarian's mention of the ending *-i*; the former can naturally be attributed to the normalization of manuscripts.

Further, if *-i* were a *casus indefinitus*, it ought to be genus-indifferent; however, we have no examples of feminine gentilicia ending in *-i*. But it must be noticed that after the loss of feminine praenomen the distinguishing of sexes needed an other indication: under those circumstances the doublet *-i* would soon have been displaced by the ending *-ia*. Further, the forms in *-i* ought to be indeclinable, but we have no examples of it in the dative; however, this could be

<sup>1</sup> PULGRAM *art.cit.* 168—171, REICHMUTH *op.cit.* 13.

due to the paucity of our material and to the difficulties in the decision of the case.

One of the most interesting morphological features of gentilicia is the oldest genitive form of *-io*-stems in *-i*, not in *-ii*, as one would expect.<sup>1</sup> This has been documented from epigraphic material, of which the gentilicia naturally form a great part. No satisfactory phonetic explanation for this genitive has been presented. The genitive of the indeclinable *casus indefinitus* gentilicium in *-i* would afford one new possibilities of explanation: besides the nominative, this form was retained in the genitive, in which it prevails even in early times. This is explainable, in that in the genitive the form of the adjective in *-ios* has been so similar to *-i* that the claim of normalization has not been as strong as in other cases.

Our hypothesis, which considers the forms in *-i* as being old doublets in the gentilicium formation, is very uncertain, especially when we ask how the doublet can have been retained for centuries without trace. In any case it is certain that this form was not regarded at the time of our inscriptions as the genitive of an individual name. However, I should not consider the hypothesis quite unfeasible. In the task of explaining the origin of one epigraphic practice which has become common under the influence of other factors, we must perhaps be content with quite as unsatisfactory explanation: some stone cutter may have adopted for practical reasons a form which had either fallen into disuse or had been rare in a complicated development, as in the phonetic decision above.

### The Etruscan interference

The greatest number of *-i* endings comes from regions where the influence of Etruscan is discernible: from Etruria itself and from Praeneste.<sup>2</sup> Of our greater groups the ollae of S. Cesareo include dialecticisms, but no Etruscisms have been observed. The scrutiny of the evidence for the Etruscan interference must, however, begin from the masculine ending *-i* of Etruscan itself.

The suffix *-i* in Etruscan is for the most part due to the influence of the Italic *-io*-suffix. Expressly, the gentilicium suffix *-ni* will have developed from the *-na*-suffix characteristic of Etruscan under the influence of Italic.<sup>3</sup> Of the

<sup>1</sup> As for the attempted explanations, see LEUMANN *op.cit.* 268.

<sup>2</sup> See ERNOUT *art.cit.* 294, 314.

<sup>3</sup> So already G. HERBIG, *Indog. Sprachwissenschaft und Etruskologie, Ind. Forsch.* 26 (1910)

other names ending in *-i* the greatest number were borrowed from Italic.<sup>1</sup> The normal substitute in Etruscan for the Indo-European ending *-os* is *-e*; thus the gentilicium suffix *-ios* often has the form *-ie* in Etruscan; moreover, *-i* is documented. The variant can be explained in two ways: it either reflects the Italic variation *-ios/-is*, or it has developed in Etruscan itself *-ios* > *-ie* > *-i*.<sup>2</sup>

There are some bilingual inscriptions which offer the most suitable starting point for our investigation: CIE 1290: *au.fapi.larθial* | *A. Fabi Iucnus* (*oss.*, Clusian), and CIE 2965: *a.trepi.θanasa* | *Ar. Trebi Histro* (*teg.*, Cl.). The correspondence of gentilicia is in both cases complete except for the phonetic variation. The name *fapi* is documented in Etruscan only here, and is certainly the Etruscan form of the Latin *Fabius*.<sup>3</sup> Also *trepi*, which appears more often in Etruscan as *trepu*, is of Italic origin.<sup>4</sup> The uniformity of the Latin and Etruscan forms is so clear that it is reasonable to attribute the Latin form to the influence of Etruscan. In the Latin parts of bilinguals, *-i* appears in addition to those in CIE 1469, 2106, 2647, 4832 and TLE 462, all from Clusium. In these, the correspondence of endings is not, however, so clear, and the influence of Etruscan is improbable.

The other Latin forms in *-i* in Etruria can be divided into two groups according to the following facts: 1) does the form correspond to the Etruscan masculine ending of the same gentilicium, or 2) is the suffix changed by the Latinization or is the gentilicium without any Etruscan equivalent. In the latter case there is no reason to see in the ending *-i* the influence of Etruscan. Of the former group, the first example is the cognomen of the *gens Caecina*, *Tlaboni* CIE 22 and 154, the Etruscan equivalent of which is *tlapuni*, CIE 21, 36, 37. This name does not fit the Etruscan cognomen system,<sup>5</sup> but *tlapuni* is already an extension that has been italicized from *\*tlapu*, and the Latinization

---

367–370, afterwards H. RIX, *Italische Einflüsse in etr. Personennamen*, *St. Onom. Monac.* IV (1961) 623–625, and *Das etruskische Cognomen*, Wiesbaden 1963, 296–297. Although the theory as a whole is acceptable, HERBIG, and partly RIX, founded it on misleading statistics. They count the frequencies in the archaic inscriptions of Orvieto and the late ones of Clusium: the former have nearly only *-na*, in the latter *-ni* is equally common; thus, its spread is late and due to foreign influence. However, it must be noticed that *-ni* never gained a footing in southern Etruria, like Orvieto: the comparison ought be carried out alongside the archaic inscriptions of North-Etruria.

<sup>1</sup> Examples by RIX, *Etr. Cogn.* 258–260, 264–265.

<sup>2</sup> HERBIG *art. cit.* 375–376, RIX *op. cit.* 219.

<sup>3</sup> *φisi* = *Fisius* CIE 3063, *cazi* = *Cassius* CIE 378, both in bilinguals, do not appear elsewhere in Etruscan, RIX, *Personennamen auf etr.-lat. Bilinguen*, *BNF.* 7 (1956) 160–161, *Etr. Cogn.* 259.

<sup>4</sup> RIX *op. cit.* 219.

<sup>5</sup> See RIX *op. cit.* 126, 317–323.

has retained the Etruscan suffix. The correspondence between the Latin and Etruscan forms is further evident in the names *Proeni* CIE 790, 791 — Etr. *pruini*, *Petroni* 788 — Etr. *petruni*, *Pederni* 1138 — Etr. *petrni*. The praenomen-gentilicia characteristic of Etruscan are also noteworthy: *Cai* CIE 930 — Etr. *cai*, *Vibi* 2207 — Etr. *vipi*.<sup>1</sup> The gentilicium *Vetdi*<sup>2</sup> of CIE 1606 has half-latinized phonetics from Etruscan *veti*, *Senti* 1433 — and perhaps 1058<sup>3</sup> — correspond to Etruscan *senti*. All these gentilicia of Clusium may be of Italic origin, although they are characteristic of Etruscan, too. A name certainly Italic in origin appears in CIE 834 in the gamonymic *Paperis*, where it has the Etruscan ending of the genitive, and in 2508 *Papiri*; the Etruscan form of this name, *papris* is documented in CIE 2606. *Rufi* CIE 3469 from Perugia, in Etruscan *raufi*, is an Italic name, too. Most inscriptions in this group are still half Etruscan.

In some cases, Etruscan gentilicia have changed their ending *-e* to *-i* by Latinization. Thus, *Reusti* 2693 has had in Etruscan an equivalent *\*reuste*, derivable from the feminine *reustial*.<sup>4</sup> *Larci* CIE 899 from Clusium corresponds to the Perugian *larci*, but at Clusium the normal form is *larce*.<sup>5</sup> *Avini* CIE 1653 appears in the Etruscan form *avines* TLE 346. *Mari* CIE 1145 is already partly latinized from the Etruscan forms *marie*, *\*mare*.<sup>6</sup>

The suffix substitution by Latinization brings the following forms in *-i* still farther away from Etruscan: *Arri* CIE 710 and 1469 — Etr. *arntni*,<sup>7</sup> *Vercili* CIL XI 7227 — Etr. *vercna*,<sup>8</sup> *Acili* CIE 1291 — Etr. *acilu*, *aclna*, *Crespini* 896 — Etr. *cespe* (= Ital. *Crispus*), *cespnie* Ga. 667,<sup>9</sup> *Volumni* 3372 — Etr. *velimna*.

There is no direct equivalent in Etruscan for the names *Gegani* CIL XI 2979, *Pisenti* CIE 1594, *Consili* CIE 2045<sup>10</sup> and *Pupi* CIL XI 7137. The ending *-i* appears in an appellative CIE 3721: *Ar. Lenso La. fili*.

Some Latin forms with the ending *-i* from Etruria are uncertain on account of the loss of the inscriptions: CIE 58, 681, 1059. In addition to these, *-i* may

<sup>1</sup> The *tegula* corresponding to CIE 2207, CIL XI 2229, has the inscription *L. Vibius L. f. Arn.*

<sup>2</sup> Autopsy 13. 5. 1968.

<sup>3</sup> The correction of Pauli in a lost inscription, but the form *Seini* of the copies is also possible.

<sup>4</sup> RIX *op.cit.* 211.

<sup>4</sup> RIX *op.cit.* 212, 261.

<sup>6</sup> RIX *op.cit.* 214.

<sup>7</sup> RIX *B.z.N.* 7 (1956) 167, *op.cit.* 259, considers that the Latinization is only due to the assonance, but a simplification of the suffix is also possible.

<sup>8</sup> W. SCHULZE, *Zur Geschichte der lat. Eigennamen*, *Abh.Ak.Gött. N.F.* 5, Berlin 1904, 101, C. EGGER, *Latinitas* 6 (1958) 66.

<sup>9</sup> RIX *op.cit.* 230 detaches *cespnie* from *Crispinus* too rigorously.

<sup>10</sup> Bormann CIL XI 2316 corrects to *L. Consi(o) L. f. Attico*, hardly necessary.

in some inscriptions also be the ending of the genitive: CIE 754 1140, 1527, 2581, 3552, 4108, 4183, 4837, CIL XI 7146.

The *cippi* of Caere require a treatment of their own. The ending *-i* appears 107 times in all, of which 23 cases are certain nominatives. The language of the Latin *cippi* in general includes fewer Etruscisms than the inscriptions of the transition period elsewhere in Etruria. The scarcity of Etruscan onomastic material at Caere puts limitations on a comparative investigation of the Latin and Etruscan suffixes. We can, however, observe from the Etruscan *cippi*, that the names ending in *-i* are not at all as characteristic at Caere as they are in northern Etruria. The development *-na* > *-ni* is on the whole lacking. Besides the name *muni* (TLE 53 and MENGARELLI N.Sc. 1937 n. 42), with *-n-* belonging to the stem, there is only one exceptional masculine ending *-nia(s)* CIL XI 7635.<sup>1</sup> Other masculine forms in *-i* at Caere are *caθis* Ga. 824, *utacli* XI 7638 and *cipis* NRIE 959. The last name appears twice in the form *cipies* (NRIE 912 and CIL XI 7621), the ending *-ie* of which is the normal equivalent for *-ios* in South Etruria. The variation might testify to the development *cipie(s)* *cipi(s)* > Lat. *Cipi* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2567—2569, 2730<sup>2</sup>).

Some of the Latin forms in *-i* have direct equivalents elsewhere in Etruria, *Aulni* I<sup>2</sup> 2727 — Etr. *aulni*, *Gavili* I<sup>2</sup> 1952—1954, 2575, 2576 — Etr. *cavili*, *Caesi* I<sup>2</sup> 1936 — Etr. *ceisi*, *Tet(t)i* SE 35 p. 551, 554 — Etr. *teti*, *Titi* I<sup>2</sup> 2621 — Etr. *titi*, *Faltini* I<sup>2</sup> 1946, 1947, 2574 — Etr. *haltuni*. However, nearly 4/5 of the forms in *-i* at the Latin *cippi* of Caere lack Etruscan equivalents. In these cases we can observe a suffix substitution, if the Etruscan form of the gentilicium is documented, or else we can conclude nothing from the possible appearance of the gentilicium in Etruscan.

In Faliscan, the nominative in *-i* is sometimes documented, but again the uniformity with the genitive causes difficulties. GIACOMELLI's opinion is that if no other clear influence of Etruscan can be observed in the inscription, *-i* must be considered the ending of the genitive.<sup>3</sup> As far as I can see, this view lays too much weight on the Etruscan origin of the nominative in *-i*. GIACOMELLI, too, must make one exception — in the name *neroni*, which often appears at Praeneste and must be considered Italic; she thinks that it has entered to Faliscan in its morphologic shape.<sup>4</sup> In many other forms in *-i*, too, the explanation of Italic influence is more likely than that of the genitive.

<sup>1</sup> A possible parallel in the cognomen *rutania*, CIE 515—516, see RIX *op.cit.* 240.

<sup>2</sup> MENGARELLI, LOMMATZSCH: M. Cipio L. Arg. 1. Au [—], autopsy 13. 6. 1969: M. Cipi. O.I. Arclau[s].

<sup>3</sup> G. GIACOMELLI, *La lingua falisca*, Firenze 1963, 131.

<sup>4</sup> GIACOMELLI, *op.cit.* 142, G. HERBIG, *Falisca*, *Glotta* 2 (1910) 109—110.



We have noticed that the Etruscan masculine nominative in *-i* is due mainly to the influence of the Italic suffix *-io*. The normal equivalent of *-ios* is *-ie*, but doublet *-i* is also documented. Many of the Etruscan *-i*-endings appear in the gentilicia borrowed from Italic. Thus, it is possible that the Italic names changed their ending *-ios* to *-i* on the lips of the Etruscans. By the change of the language of Etruria *-i* often appears in the Etrusco-Latin inscriptions, but the forms seldom have a direct equivalent in Etruscan. More often the names have undergone a suffix substitution by the addition of onomastic elements characteristic of Latin, e.g. diminutive formatives. Hence, at Caere in particular, where the Etruscan masculine in *-i* is badly documented, this is the case. When the name of an Etrusco-Latin inscription directly corresponds to the Etruscan form, as in the bilinguals above, the Etruscan form has probably exercised an influence. But where the name suffix has been changed, or the name has no Etruscan equivalents, it is dangerous to see Etruscan influence. It would be even more dangerous to consider the Etruscan influence as expansive.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, the Etruscans have been more or less on the receiving end with regard to the Italians from the third century B.C. Thus, as far as I can see, the explanation for the nominative in *-i* on the ground of Etruscan must be abandoned except for some cases in North Etruria and at Caere. The rest of the forms of Etruria and Caere, nearly all the forms of Faliscan and Praeneste, must be considered as belonging to the Latin or to the Italic tradition.

It would be possible to think of the Etruscan variation *-ie/-i* as reflecting the Italic variation *-ios/-i*, so that, for example in the bilinguals mentioned above the Latin form would be original, and the Etruscan form would have been influenced by it. There are, however, some chronological difficulties, and it must be noted that the Etruscan *-i* is most common in North Etruria where the Italic influence has come mainly from Umbrian; in South Etruria where *-i* could have exercised influence, the form in *-ie* is normal.

#### The tendency towards abbreviation

*SC de Bacch.* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 581, 186 B.C.) offers a good starting point, mentioning, at the beginning, the consuls *Q. Marcius L.f.*, *S. Postumius L.f.*, and, immediately after, the scribes *M. Claudii M.f.*, *L. Valeri P.f.*, *Q. Minuci C.f.* It is evident that

<sup>1</sup> Proposed by W. DEECKE, *Die etr. Bilinguen*, *Etr. Forsch. u. St.* V, Stuttgart 1883, 35, E. LATTES, *Intorno ai tipi delle epigrafi latine dell'Etruria*, *Rend.Ist.Lomb.* V: 6, (1872) 4, *Iscrizioni paleolatine dei fittili e dei bronzi di provenienza etrusca*, Milano 1892, 28, uncertainly by HERBIG, *Faliska* 110.

when the names of the consuls are complete, the less important scribes have their names in an abbreviated form.<sup>1</sup> The quality of our inscriptions makes the abbreviation explanation still more probable. The lack of space is self-evident in coins and bulls. Neither is there any greater space for the text in the *cippi* of Praeneste or Caere. Both groups include only the names of the deceased. In the *ollae* of S.Cesareo the date of death is also mentioned but greatly abbreviated; they, too, have quite a limited space for the text.

The tables of Capua, too, support the theory of abbreviation. As the table in p. 26 shows, the variation of endings cannot be explained chronologically, except for the final loss of the ending *-i*. The inscriptions themselves indicate the abbreviation to be one reason for the variation, e.g. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 674:

CORNELI.L.F.CORI	C.MAIVS.N.F.
NERIVS.M.F	M.VIBIVS.M.F.RV
	L.POMPONI.L.F.F
	L.OLIENV.S.L.F

or ILLRP 723 b:

N.VESVI.N.F	M.EGNATI.M.F
M.LOLI.Q.F	N.OPIVS.N.F
Q.SEXTI.C.F	M.TERONI.OV.F
L.LOLI.L.F	M.NERIVS.OV.F
C.STATI.M.F	CN.ARRI.CN.F
C.ARRI.V.F	

We notice that the shorter form is used mainly in the long names, either for aesthetic reasons or because of the lack of space.

Objections can be raised to the theory of abbreviation. First, it would make one expect abbreviations of other kinds, too, for example, the neglect of the whole ending *-ius*, and abbreviations in the feminine as well.<sup>2</sup> Besides, the abbreviation of two letters affords only little help in most cases: one would expect a longer abbreviation. In fact other abbreviations quite often appear in the *ollae* of S.Cesareo:  $24 \times = 29\%$  of all the male names. At Caere and Praeneste the number of other abbreviations is negligible. NEUE has considered the other abbreviations a sufficient proof for the theory of abbreviation, and

<sup>1</sup> LEUMANN *op.cit.* 94, SOMMER *op.cit.* 357, LINDSAY *op.cit.* 430, HÜBNER *art.cit.* 669, ERNOUT *art.cit.* 342, LATTES, *Iscr. paleolat.* 28.

<sup>2</sup> RITSCHL *art.cit.* 475—476.

he has convinced BÜCHELER, v. PLANTA and KÜHNER.<sup>1</sup> However, the share of other abbreviations remains very small compared with the ending *-i*, in fact about 1: 10. Thus, it seems evident that although the ending *-i* is mainly used because of its brevity, there must also be a philological explanation of its origin.

### S y n t a c t i c e x p l a n a t i o n

Both in the *formula* and on its own *-i* can in some cases be considered to be a genitive. The gentilicium of the onomastic *formula* of freedmen and slaves is sometimes considered to be in the genitive (in the latter the genitive became predominant at the beginning of the Empire). Oxé, studying the names of slaves, sees the type *Eros Aureli(us) L.s.* follow the earliest type *Marcipor*; after that the genitive begins to appear in the first century B.C.; the name of *patronus* was first inverted, but during the Empire, the form *Eros L. Aureli (ser.)* is normal.<sup>2</sup> The development outlined by Oxé becomes still clearer by means of VITUCCI's explanation that the genitive is due to a confusion owing to the abbreviated form in *-i*.<sup>3</sup> That would explain the inversion in the oldest genitive type. VITUCCI overlooks the genitive of gentilicium in the names of freedmen without giving any certain example. Inscriptions like CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1367, where all freeborn have the ending *-ius*, but the name of the only freedman is written *C. Publili C.l. Trupho* both in a and b, prove that the gentilicium of a freedman is sometimes considered to be a genitive. There are, however, only a few such cases. The question as to whether the ending *-i* of freedmen can to a greater extent be attributed to the genitive, can only be answered by statistics. If this speculation is true, the percentage of the endings in *-i* ought to be greater compared with certain nominatives in the names of freedmen than in those of the freeborn. The tables in p. 24—25 give the following picture: the freedmen of Caere, 48 altogether, have the ending *-i* 32 ×, *-ius* 7 ×, other certain nominative suffixes (*-na* etc.) 5 ×; the freeborn men, 108 altogether, have the ending *-i* 74 ×, *-ius* 7 ×, other suffixes 16 ×. The picture becomes still clearer in the *cippi* of Praeneste: There are only 26 freedmen, who have the ending *-i* 8 ×, *-ius* 2 ×, *-io* 16 ×; the corresponding numbers of freeborn are *-i* 70, *-ius* 28, *-io* 62 ×

<sup>1</sup> NEUE—WAGENER, *Formenlehre d. lat. Sprache* I<sup>3</sup>, Leipzig 1902, 119, BÜCHELER, *Grundriss der lat. Deklination*, Bonn 1879, 25, v. PLANTA *op.cit.* 140, R. KÜHNER, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lat. Sprache* I, Hannover 1877, 278.

<sup>2</sup> A. OXÉ, *Zur älteren Nomenklatur der röm. Sklaven*, *Rh.Mus.* 59 (1904) 114—117, 140.

<sup>3</sup> VITUCCI *art.cit.* 909—910.

(160 altogether). In the *ollae* of S. Cesareo the freedmen have *-i* a little more often, but the material of 16 names is too small to demand conclusions. The proportions presented indicate that we cannot explain the ending *-i* of freedmen by a genitive, at least not at the places concerned, because the relative frequency of the ending *-i* is smaller in the case of the freedmen than in that of the freeborn.

The other possibility is to consider the whole epitaph genitival. The decision is in most cases impossible, the type *C. Campati C. f.* can be genitive as well as an example of the ending *-i*. In such cases, we must rely on the law of probability. The question between the genitive and the nominative can be decided in our concise epitaphs only when cognomen is preserved complete. Thus, we can ascertain from Caere one certain genitive in CIL XI 3634: [*T*]arquiti *C. f. Galli*. At Praeneste the cognomen does not indicate a single genitival inscription, but when it is complete, it always indicates that the ending *-i* belongs to the nominative. Elsewhere the only possibility is to study the frequency of genitival inscriptions on the ground of the feminines and the forms in *-ius*. The Latin *cippi* of Caere can in this way show us 102 certain nominatives, one certain genitive (CIL XI 3634), 103 cases, where it is impossible to arrive at a decision. At Praeneste six women have a genitival epitaph, the *-ai*-forms of which are explainable also as datives. Against those we have about 230 certain nominatives and about 100 undecided cases. On the whole, genitival epitaphs are quite rare in the Latin republican epigraphy.

However, even these few examples indicate that there was the possibility of writing a genitival epitaph. Now, we could think that the writer of the epitaph did not begin to analyse, as to whether in the ending *-i* he wrote that of the nominative or genitive. Hypothetically we could go still farther and consider that the nominative in *-i* for its part influenced the rise of the genitival epitaph. The current opinion is that the name of the deceased was originally in the nominative, only later were the genitive and dative to become common.<sup>1</sup> The genitive in epitaphs does not, however, become explicable until the epitaph gets wider contexts, i.e. 'ossa', 'monumentum' or the like are thought of in connection with the name of the deceased. It is very difficult to find evidence that the nominative in *-i* would have influenced the expansion of the genitive before the use of those words. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1351 a: *Sex. Oppi T. l. Suri et Trebia Q. f.*

<sup>1</sup> R. CAGNAT, Cours d'épigraphie latine,<sup>4</sup> Paris 1914, 280, J. E. SANDYS—S. G. CAMPBELL, Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge 1927, 60.

*Tert(ia)*, where the name of the man is in the genitive, that of the woman in the nominative, could support this hypothesis, but the type is rare.

Apart from the genitive, the form in *-i* could also be the vocative. However, the epitaph with the name of the deceased in the vocative is quite badly documented, except in the *carmina epigraphica*. At Caere CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2551: *L. Atili C.f. Serane* is probably in the vocative.<sup>1</sup> It would also be possible to consider the ending of the cognomen Etruscan, corresponding to the gentilicia *Hatile*, *Pabate*, *Amerite* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1956, 1969, 2724) at Caere. This possibility, however, becomes unlikely by virtue of the fact that the deceased has belonged to the famous Roman senatorial *gens* of *Atilii Sarani/Serrani*. As such, a surprising discovery of a modest *cippus* belonging to a member of this *gens* at Caere would become still more surprising if his name had Etruscan features. For the further study of the possibility of the vocative CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2734: *A. Curvi A.Q.l. Pape* is important. If the cognomen is the Italic individual name *Papus*, the epitaph is perhaps again in the vocative. It is not totally impossible to consider the gentilicia with the ending *-e* mentioned above to be vocatives from nominatives in *-us*, although the Etruscan parallels, for example *Amerite-amriθe*, lead one to believe that the influence was Etruscan. The most surprising thing, although probably a mere chance, is that the over one hundred gentilicia in *-i* of Caere only once have a cognomen that cannot be in the vocative, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2569: *C. Cipi C.f. Rufus*; in all the other cases the cognomen, when documented, is either abbreviated or forms a vocative similar to the nominative.

In our other groups there is nothing that could indicate the form in *-i* to be a vocative, but many *cognomina* testify to the contrary.

## C o n c l u s i o n

It is evident that the ending *-i* of the nominative singular of gentilicia cannot be explained by means of one theory. It is a question of an epigraphic practice not only during the republican period, but partly later, too. The reasons for this practice are clear: because the form in *-i* was shorter, it was more useful in limited spaces, in some cases aesthetic reasons have also been the cause for the use of this form in longer names. Probably, too, the similarity of the form with the genitive, which was becoming more common in the epitaphs, had influence on its expansion. However, neither of those reasons seems convincing, when we search for the origin of the form.

<sup>1</sup> DEGRASSI ILLRP n. 838, LOMMATZSCH CIL I<sup>2</sup> Ind.

Apart from these, three theories of origin have been mentioned in this paper: the phonetic, the morphologic and the Etruscan interference. None of these seems to be sound. The phonetic explanation of the form is very complicated, the morphologic explanation would presuppose a long retaining of the doublet one has assumed as being in the formation of gentilicium. The interference of Etruscan may explain many cases in Etruria, but its influence outside Etruria is subject to query. The ending *-io*, as far as I can see, offers phonetically a good parallel: although the weak pronunciation of final *s* has been given as evidence, this ending forms the greatest number of the epigraphic examples. Thus, the phenomenon probably has a phonetic origin, but the epigraphic tradition has made the loss of *-s* common exactly in the ending of gentilicium. The ending *-i* must be understood in the same way: we can no longer analyse exactly the factors which have had influence on its rise; we can only state that this ending belongs to the tradition of certain close inscription groups.