

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. VIII

HELSINKI 1974 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

Paavo Castrén	About the Legio X equestris . . . . .	5
Anne Helttula	On itum ambitum datum: a formula of ius sepulchri . . .	9
Paavo Hohti	Freedom of speech in speech sections in the histories of Herodotus . . . . .	19
Maarit Kaimio	Music in the Homeric hymn to Hermes . . . . .	29
Jorma Kaimio	The Etruscan genitival forms . . . . .	43
Iiro Kajanto	On the idea of eternity in Latin epitaphs . . . . .	59
Saara Lilja	Theriophily in Homer . . . . .	71
Bengt Löfstedt	Bemerkungen zur Sprache des Jonas von Bobbio . . . . .	79
Teivas Oksala	Was bedeutet honoratum . . . Achillem bei Horaz (Ars 120)? . . . . .	97
Tuomo Pekkanen	Adam of Bremen 4,14: Wizzi, Mirri, etc. . . . .	105
Reijo Pitkäranta	Stilistischer Kommentar zur "Passio Septem Martyrum"	127
Erkki Salonen	Über einige Lehnwörter aus dem Nahen Osten im Griechischen und Lateinischen . . . . .	139
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica, XV–XXVII . . . . .	145
Jaakko Suolahti	L'anno della nascita di Gesù . . . . .	173
Rolf Westman	Ein überdecktes Wort in Solons Salamiselegie . . . . .	187

CORRIGENDA

- p. 4 edentum l. edendum  
 p. 9 n. 2 l. 2 p. 00 l. pp. 15 f.  
 p. 33 n. 4 l. 4 λύγ l. λύγ  
 p. 34 l. 16 p. 00 l. p. 33  
 p. 41 l. 12 αὐδα[v l. αὐδα[v  
 p. 43 title -s/al l. -ś/al  
 p. 43 l. 18 p. 00 l. p. 44  
 p. 74 l. 5 (Il. 8,188-190) l. (Il. 8,188-190).  
 p. 89 n. 3 l. 1 Vitas l. Vitae  
 p. 101 l. 3 τύρν l. τύρν  
 p. 107 n. 1 in nn. 1 and 5-6. l. p. 105 n. 1 and p. 106 nn. 4-5.  
 p. 110 n. 1 n. 27 below. l. p. 115 n. 1.  
 p. 115 n. 2 n. 25 above l. p. 112 n. 2  
 p. 118 l. 27 p. 109 above): l. p. 109 above);  
 p. 119 l. 33 4,14:38 l. 4,14:1  
 p. 119 n. 38 l. 1 38 l. 1  
 p. 119 n. 38 l. 2 (see n. 1 above) l. (see p. 105 n. 1)  
 p. 122 l. 29 delete line following the quotation  
 p. 122 l. 32 p. 109 l. p. 108 f.  
 p. 123 n. 4 l. 3 p. 106 fn 2 l. p. 109 n. 3  
 p. 129 l. 18 ff. l.  
 Z. 15 *eam* (sc. multitudinem) rebaptizationis sauciaret machera  
 Homoioteleuton Antithese Homoiotel. Homoiotel. korrespondierende  
 Metaphern  
 Z. 16 *stolarum baptismatis (taetrae) nigredinis turparet inluvie*  
 und dazwischen Antithese  
 Z. 17 *vino carnis suae purificans*  
 korresp. Chiasmus  
 Metaphern mit Alliteration  
 und Homoioteleuton *fecerat dealbatam*  
*prelo exprimens crucis*  
 p. 135 n. 2 vgl. S. 00.1. vgl. S. 131.  
 p. 140 l. 14 99. l. 99."  
 p. 141 l. 3 šammu l. šamnu  
 p. 141 l. 24 SIM l. ŠIM  
 p. 141 n. 1 transfer note to p. 142, n. 1  
 p. 142 l. 13 vor<sup>1</sup>. l. vor<sup>2</sup>.  
 p. 142 l. 27 l l. 2  
 p. 148 l. 30 delete line following "...Zeit zu schreiben." and  
 insert after l. 23 "die Dative Grania,"  
 p. 188 n. 1 l. 6 A. 4 l. A. 2  
 p. 189 n. 3 l. 2 (o. 188,2 4) l. (o. 188,2)

## THE ETRUSCAN GENITIVAL FORMS

in *-s/al* and *-sa/-alisa*

J o r m a K a i m i o

1. In this paper, I shall make a comparison between the Etruscan genitival (or possessive) forms in *-ś* and *-sa* (the Southern orthography is *-s* and *-śa*); in the lexemes, which instead of *-ś* form a genitive in *-al*, the variants are *-al* and *-alisa*. My intention is first to determine whether the forms represent two different morphemes or are two variants of the same morpheme, and, if the second suggestion is correct, whether their variation is unconditioned or conditioned, and if the latter, how it is conditioned. I do not take into account the forms in *-sla*, which are obviously genitive formations of forms in *-sa*, but which, appearing in positions functionally different from the forms to be studied here, can only seldom help the comparison.

2. *The views of modern research.* It has been the consensus of opinion for a long time that the morpheme *-ś/-al* indicates the genitive in Etruscan. As to *-sa/-alisa*, the views of its significance have been connected with the larger complex of problems of the so-called *rideterminazione morfologica* in Etruscan. In the thirties, there was a strong disagreement between Pallottino on the one hand, who saw the forms in *-sa* mostly in the same light as those in *-ś*, and Buonamici and Nehring on the other, who preferred to see a semantic difference between the forms (see below, p. 00). Modern research has unanimously accepted the view of Pallottino, although some disagreement as to the exact nature of the morpheme *-sa* still persists. It may be sufficient to outline here the two most recent theories presented by H. Rix and A.J. Pfiffig.

Rix discussed the relation of the forms in *-ś* and *-sa* in *Das etruskische Cognomen* in so far as it was of importance with regard to the cognominal cases.<sup>1</sup> First, he rejected the possibility of a dialectal or geographical difference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Etr. C., 56–62.

He sees that there must have been a functional difference between *-ś* and *-sa*, but the function of *-sa* must have been very close to that of the genitival ending *-ś*. However, *-sa* appears only in personal names, and exclusively in the indication of kinship directly connected to the praenomen or gentilicium. When the genitival name part was dependent on an appellative, the ending *-ś* is usual in Northern Etruria. This means that *-sa* does not indicate every possessive relationship, as *ś* does, but is exclusively used of the person. The hypothesis that *-sa* would belong to word formation and would not represent a case becomes feasible, as does the comparison with the formative *-ios* in the Italic languages.

The views of Pfiffig are much sharper. For him, the forms in *-sa* are undoubtedly possessive adjectives. In his first paper on the question, he once more adapts an attitude towards the semantic value of the forms in *-sa*.<sup>1</sup> In *Die etruskische Sprache*, he emphasizes the purely nominative nature of the forms in *-sa*. These formations are based on genitive forms of names, enlarged by the possessive pronoun *-śa*. Pfiffig presents parallel "hyostatized" genitive forms, which had become nouns and could be declined: *unial-θi*, *papals*, *tetals*. An important argument put forth by Pfiffig is just this possibility of forming genitives of the *-sa*-formations; he presents the series *sepie* – gen. *sepiesś* – possessive adjective *sepiesa* – gen. *sepiesla*.<sup>2</sup>

3. It may be stated at once that this paper does not present views greatly different from those of Rix and Pfiffig. Rather, I am trying to establish a methodological foundation for the study of the two forms' relation.

It is clear that the method to be outlined here is adapted to the special conditions of the Etruscan language and the material at our disposal. The first solution concerns the question of whether the forms in *-ś/al* and *-sa/alisa* are two different morphemes or variants of the same morpheme, and this solution must be founded on the semantic values of the forms.

Here we have the old controversy of Buonamici & Nehring and Pallottino: does *arnθalisa* mean "the grand-son of *arnth*", or, like *arnθal*, "the son of *arnth*". The dispute has now been settled and the former view no longer has any defenders.<sup>3</sup> As such, the whole dispute is possible only as far as the patronymika are concerned. In the metronymikon, someone could still suggest that *capznal* means "the son (daughter) of *capznei*", whereas *capznalis* would

<sup>1</sup> 'Zur "rideterminazione morfologica" im Etruskischen', *Die Sprache* 8 (1964), 154–163.

<sup>2</sup> Pfiffig, *Etr. Sprache*, 119–122, 200–206.

<sup>3</sup> See Pfiffig, *Die Sprache* 8 (1964), 154ff., Rix, *Etr.C.*, 24.

be "the grand-son (-daughter) of *capznei*".<sup>1</sup> But what could be the meaning, according to this theory, of the gamonymika in *-sa*, what difference of meaning would there be between *perisal* (CIE 1164) and *perisalisa* (CIE 1159, 1162), or *pumpuś* and *pumpusa*<sup>2</sup>?

In any case, the solution is clear: as the semantic value of the forms *arnθal* and *arnθalisa*, *pumpuś* and *pumpusa*, is the same, the forms cannot represent two different morphemes, but are variants of the same morpheme.

4. After this, we can go on to study the nature of the variation of the two forms. It can be unconditioned or conditioned, but with regard to our material, we cannot make a decision between these two possibilities in any way other than by studying the influence of all possible conditioning in the occurrence of the variants; only if the result of all these studies is negative, can we consider the variation unconditioned in so far as our material allows for conclusions in this respect. The possible conditioning processes can be divided in two groups: (a) grammatical conditioning, including (1) phonological, (2) morphological and (3) syntactical conditioning, and (b) extra-grammatical conditioning, including on the one hand psycholinguistic conditioning, which cannot be studied in the present case, on the other, sociolinguistic conditioning, of which only the geographical aspect is of major importance in this paper; for the social and functional aspects, the material is too scarce. Furthermore, we must take into account the diachronic differences, which very naturally arise from a body of material that extends over several centuries.

#### 41. Grammatical conditioning

411. *The phonological conditioning.* This conditioning is effective if the variation of the forms is dependent on the phonemes which precede or immediately follow the morpheme. For instance, the variation of the Etruscan genitival endings *-ś* and *-al* is mainly phonologically conditioned (in addition, the gender of the word, i.e. morphological conditioning, is effective). Could this conditioning also regulate the occurrence of the variants *-ś/-al* and *-sa/-alisa*? The answer must be in the negative. Firstly, without any further investigation one can state that this condition would be improbable, due to the fact that the

<sup>1</sup> In fact, both forms occur on the urn and the tile of the same Clusine woman, CIE 636–637.

<sup>2</sup> One can observe the urn inscription *veiani pumpusa* (CIE 4818) and on the tile of the same person *veiani pupus* (CIE 4817). Similarly variation in two cases of the same name in CIE 2025–2026 and 2919–2920.

variant *-sa/-alisa* seems to be an extension of *-ś/-al*, by using the element *-sa*.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, we can present numerous names with both the forms in *-ś* and *-sa*, or *-al* and *-alisa*: all male praenomina and very many common gentilicia and cognomina. This fact still leaves two possibilities open: the original phonological conditioning could have been obscured by the influence of analogy, which would be the explanation for the biform names, or the phonological conditioning would depend on the phonemes which follow the morphem.

As to the former possibility, we must state that there is no one single gentilicium group separated by a common ending which would not be affected by both variants. In this respect, the gamonymika of Clusium offer the richest material. I have tabulated the occurrence of the two variants in names with different endings as follows:

Ending	<i>-na</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>-ie</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-i</i>	Other	Together
<i>-sa</i>	84	62	13	14	77	61	24	5	340
%	25%	18%	4%	4%	23%	18%	7%	1%	100%
<i>-s</i>	19	13	6	4	36	17	7	2	104
%	18%	13%	6%	4%	34%	16%	7%	2%	100%
Relation <i>-sa/-ś</i>	82%/18%	83%/17%	75%/25%	79%/21%	77%/23%				

One can observe that there are no really significant differences in the occurrence of the two variants. The ending *-ś* occurs somewhat more frequently in names in *-s* than in other large name groups ending in *-na*, *-ni* and *-u*. But the differences are so slight that this possibility of phonological conditioning for the variation must be excluded.

The other possibility — that the variation would be conditioned by the phonological context which follows — is difficult to determine as the forms appear mostly at the end of the inscriptions. Thus, of the Clusine gamonymika in *-sa*, 342 are at the end of the name forms, and in only 29 cases (8%) does another name part follow; with the forms in *-ś*, the figures are 90 at the end, 12 (12%) in the middle. When a word follows, it begins after forms in *-ś* with a vowel in four cases, and with a consonant in eight cases, after forms in *-sa* with a vowel in three cases, with a consonant in 26 cases. In another body of material, the Clusine patronymika,<sup>2</sup> the forms in *-sa* are at the end of the name form in 20 cases out of a total of 24, and those in *-ś* occur at the end in 36 out of a total of 56. Consequently, as far as our very small amount of material

<sup>1</sup> See Pfiffig, *Etr. Sprache*, 201.

<sup>2</sup> The praenomina forming a genitive in *-al* are excluded from these figures, i.e. the names which are discussed are *vel*, *aule*, *velθur*, *larce* and *seθre*.

allows for any conclusions in this respect, no phonological conditioning of this kind exists; but one could perhaps discern a tendency to favour the variant *-sa* at the end of the name form; and in the gamonymika, where *-sa* is the normal variant, *-s* may sometimes have been used for avoiding the hiatus before a word beginning with a vowel.<sup>1</sup>

412. *The morphological conditioning.* Morphology is understood here in its widest sense: all factors dependent on the lexeme, which are not phonological, but which condition the occurrence of the variants, are regarded as belonging to the category of morphological conditioning. The defective knowledge of the Etruscan language also renders the search for morphological conditioning difficult; that is why we have to discuss the probability for the existence of such conditioning in general. But before this, I would like to discuss two specific possibilities: conditioning dependent on the gender of the lexeme, and the significance of the semantic areas of the lexemes.

The Etruscan gender differentiation is late and ingenuine, but it is significant, for instance, in the occurrence of the variants *-ś* and *-al* of the genitive ending. But as to the variants *-ś/-al* and *-sa/-alisa*, no influence of the gender can be seen. It is true that the occurrence of *-sa/-alisa* is less frequent in the metronymika than in the gamonymika and the patronymika, but this is probably an onomastic feature, connected with the general formation of the name form, rather than a linguistic phenomenon dependent on the changing gender of the lexeme.

What is more important is that the forms in *-sa/-alisa* are, as far as we know, found exclusively in personal names. There is the form *sacnisa* (*-śa*) in the mummy of Zagreb (VII 10) and in probably five South Etruscan inscriptions;<sup>2</sup> but nothing seems to indicate the genitival nature of this word, and we cannot connect it with the forms discussed here.<sup>3</sup> It is, however, difficult to say whether, with the material at our disposal, we can claim that a form like *apa-sa* from the appellative *apa* = "father" was incorrect; this is and must remain uncertain. But our material points to morphological conditioning, connected with the semantic areas of the lexemes, in the occurrence of the two variants, in that *-ś/-al* occurs as well in appellatives as in personal and geographical names, while *-sa* can probably be found only in personal names.

<sup>1</sup> In all known cases, the following word begins with *a*.

<sup>2</sup> TLE 91, 159 and 879 from Tarquinii, and 303 and 305 from Vulci.

<sup>3</sup> Pfiffig, *Etr. Sprache*, 142, sees in it a participle formation; cf. Rix, *Etr.C.*, 60 n. 98.



We must take into account that there was possibly a grouping of the lexemes which is no longer discernible by the modern scholar, but which would condition the occurrence of the variants. The only way of determining this possibility is based on the number of uniform and biform names, i.e. names bearing both variants and those occurring with only one of the variants. The richest material is again offered by the Clusine gamonymika. The total number of different names occurring as gamonymika (with an ending which is legible, of course) at Clusium is 241, of which, however, 160 occur only once. Of the names appearing at least twice, 30 show both morphemes. According to a pure probability calculation, of the 81 names with more than one occurrence c. 42 ought to be biform, if the variants appeared totally independently of the lexeme. But the difference is easily explained by the fact that the practice has often been uniform inside great families, to which the names appearing several times often belong. Even if this study has been strongly against the possibility of morphological conditioning, except that connected with the semantic areas of the lexemes, it may be worth mentioning the most common uniform names in the Clusine gamonymika: of the names always ending in *-ś*, *caeś* occurs six times,<sup>1</sup> in names exclusively with *-sa*, we have *umranasa*, *tlesnasa*, *purnisa*, *arntnisa* and *cumnisa* six times each.

413. *The syntactical conditioning.* If the occurrence of the variants is conditioned by the syntactical complex to which they belong, we can establish as certain syntactical conditioning. It can be of two degrees: the substitution of one variant by the other can in certain positions cause incorrect sentences, or the substitution can be possible in certain positions, but the occurrence of one of the variants is more probable. In our special case, the fact that the question can be examined only in the context of name forms, not in complete phrases, causes difficulties. A syntactical analysis of a name form is arbitrary — we may think of our own names — and in the case of our scanty knowledge of the Etruscan language almost impossible, unless we proceed along the lines of the historical development of the name form.

The same parts which are most relevant to our problem are the patronymikon, the metronymikon, the gamonymikon, and, by freedmen, the indication of the master; but also the direct name parts, the gentilicium and the cognomen, can in Etruscan bear genitival endings. Because of the local

<sup>1</sup> But one has to note SE 4, 377–382: *larθ:sentinates:caesa*, *larθ: sentinate:caesa*, and *vel:sentinate caesa*.

differences in the name forms, we must begin this discussion with a geographically ordered description.

4131. *Clusium*. The normal form of the patronymikon is the praenomen of the father with the ending *-ś/-al* – this naturally presupposes that the name was not abbreviated. A substitution of the ending by *-sa/-alisa* is, however, totally possible. According to my calculations, the former variant appears 193, the latter 60 times in this position. In the cases in which the gentilicium or the cognomen of the father has taken the place of the praenomen,<sup>1</sup> the use of the two variants seems to be parallel with that in the normal type: I know 11 instances of *-ś* and two of *-sa*. The patronymikon is sometimes extended using the appellative *clan* = "son" or *sex* = "daughter"; in this position, the ending *-ś* occurs probably four times,<sup>2</sup> while two instances of *-sa* can be presented: *vel: arntni: aθalisa: clan* (CIE 1753) and *velia: tutne(i): crampesa: śex* (SE 23, 112). The reading of the former case is not totally certain,<sup>3</sup> and in the latter case, Rix considers that the appellative was added to distinguish the patronymikon from a gamonymikon.<sup>4</sup>

In its use of the two variants, the metronymikon is in a way parallel to the patronymikon. The normal form of the metronymikon is the gentilicium of the mother with the ending *-al/-ś*; a substitution of the ending by *-alisa/-sa* is again possible, but much rarer than in the patronymikon. Again according to my calculation, which by no means pretends to be exact, *-al/-ś* appears some 730 times and *-alisa/-sa* 41 times. The use of the appellative *clan/śex* occurs in 56 metronymika, and in this type, the substitution of *-al/-ś* by *-alisa/-sa* seems to be impossible. There is only one obvious exception, *pulialisa.sec* (CIE 2611), but the omission of the beginning of the name does not allow for a definite interpretation.

The normal type of the gamonymikon is the gentilicium (or the cognomen) of the husband with the ending *-sa*, but *-ś* is also commonly used; the figures are 375 for *-sa*, 97 for *-ś*.<sup>5</sup> In this particular case, we can probably suggest a slight

<sup>1</sup> The use of the gentilicium seems to belong mostly to freedmen, see Rix, *Etr.C.*, 355; the cognomen appearing as patronymikon is mostly impossible to distinguish from the genitival cognomen as a direct name part.

<sup>2</sup> CIE 598, 1613, SE 12,324 and possibly CIE 2097; in the three last mentioned cases, a cognomen is used instead of the praenomen.

<sup>3</sup> Rix, *Etr.C.*, 61; the inscription was read differently by Danielsson.

<sup>4</sup> Rix, *Etr.C.*, 61, 80; the explanation is not comprehensive, as the patronymikon *crampesa* would also be exceptional.

<sup>5</sup> We may especially note a few gamonymika, in which more than one name of the husband is given, and the ending changes: CIE 1299–1300 *tiusa vetusal* and 2438 *marcnaś:śalisa*.

chronological difference in the use of the two variants in that the cases with *-ś* are, on the average, later than those with *-sa*. Some comparisons between the two groups seem to point towards this conclusion: (1) the *tegulae*, which, as a group, belong to the latest phase of the Clusine epigraphy, are represented by 45% (*ossuaria* 46%, *ollae* 9%) in the *-ś* group against the 27% in the *-sa* group (*ossuria* 67%, *ollae* 6%); (2) the female name form without the praenomen, which must also be considered as a late feature, is more common in the group with *-ś* (33%) than in that with *-sa* (24%); (3) the female ending *-ia* of gentilicia, a third, on the average, late feature, is more frequent with gamonymika in *-ś* (30% against 45% of *-nei* and 25% of other endings in *-i*) than with those in *-sa* (13% against 50% of *-nei* and 37% of *-i*).<sup>1</sup> The addition of the appellative *puia* = "wife" results in the exclusive use of the *-ś* variant in the gamonymika; nine cases are known.<sup>2</sup>

In the name forms of freedmen, two main ways of indicating the master can be distinguished: the gentilicium of the master in the genitive, in which cases the identification of the persons with freedmen often causes difficulties, and, secondly, the same together with the appellative *lautni*, *lautniθa*. In both cases, the genitival ending used is *-ś/-al* and a substitution by *-sa* seems impossible. Of the former type we have some thirty reliable instances<sup>3</sup> without any occurrence of *-sa*; of the second type, I calculated 86 instances of *-s* and two of *-sa*. Also in the two exceptional cases, an alternative solution can be considered: Vetter and Rix take into account both in *eris lautnta viliasa* (CIE 1744) and in *θana lautnita.mutiesā* (CIE 2484) the proper name in *-sa* as belonging to the husband, who at the same time was the former maste.<sup>4</sup>

In the direct name parts, there is a rather frequent occurrence at Clusium of gentilicia with an element *-ś*, which seems to be the same genitival ending which we are discussing here.<sup>5</sup> So, too, several cognomina – undoubtedly originally patronymical – have the ending *-sa*. This difference in the use of the variants in direct name parts is quite clear; certain cognomina with the variant *-ś* are very rare.<sup>6</sup> In place of the gentilicium, Rix gives 16 instances of forms in *-sa*, but all of them seem to be original cognomina.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These arguments could partly also be used for a suggestion that the variant *-s* is relatively more more common in inscriptions which were written somewhat carelessly.

<sup>2</sup> We may also note the gamonymikon *papasla puia* (CIE 1765), where the name of the husband was *papasa*.

<sup>3</sup> See Vetter, JÖAI 37 (1948) Beibl., 95ff.

<sup>4</sup> Vetter, JÖAI 37 (1948) Beibl., 79, 109, Rix, Etr.C., 61.

<sup>5</sup> See Rix, Etr.C., 57, with further references.

<sup>6</sup> For the instances, see Rix, Etr.C., 55–56, cf. also 284–286.

<sup>7</sup> Rix, Etr.C., 59–60.

The situation at Clusium can be presented as follows: in the patronymikon, gamonymikon and metronymikon, there is a possibility of choice between the variants *-ś/-al* and *-sa/-alisa*. The case is not, however, similar in all three categories; in the patronymika and metronymika, *-ś/-al* is predominant, but in the gamonymika *-sa* predominates. The possibility of choice disappears as soon as the appellative indicating the relationship is added: in these cases, only *-ś* is used. Of the use of the variants in direct name parts, we can state that *-ś* appears in gentilicia and *-sa* in cognomina. In the names of freedmen, only *-ś* occurs, and this can depend either upon the relationship to be indicated, or on the fact that originally an appellative had always been present.

4132. *Saena*. The territory of 'Saena'<sup>1</sup> is the only in Northern Etruria besides Clusium which can provide enough material for any conclusions.<sup>2</sup> The use of the variants is by and large parallel to that of Clusium. *-sa/-alisa* appears in the patronymika 19 times against 16 of *-ś/-al*, in the metronymika 7 times against c. one hundred of *-al* and in the gamonymika 12 times against 14 of *-ś*. Consequently, the relation of the figures for both variants is in the patronymikon and the gamonymikon somewhat different from that at Clusium, but the material is too sparse for further conclusions. In the seven cases, in which an appellative is added to the indirect name part (four metronymika and three gamonymika), *-al/-ś* is always used. In direct name parts, *-ś* occurs sometimes in gentilicia and *-sa* probably six times<sup>3</sup> in cognomina. Finally, there are, as far as I know, one or two indications of masters by freedmen at Saena with the appellative *lautni* and the genitive in *-ś*.<sup>4</sup>

4133. *Other North Etruria Areas*. The rest of the material from Northern Etruria can be presented briefly. At Volaterrae, *-sa* is found once in the patronymika,<sup>5</sup> twice in the metronymika,<sup>6</sup> and twice in the gamonymika.<sup>7</sup> Equally, Arretium gives no patronymikon in *-sa*, but three gamonymika with that variant (CIE 376, 432, SE 40,400) - the only gamonymika known from Arretium -

<sup>1</sup> For this, see Rix, *Etr.C.*, 18-19.

<sup>2</sup> As to Perugia, see below p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> See Rix, *Etr.C.*, 30-34.

<sup>4</sup> CIE 316 and 4622, for which, however, see Rix, *Etr.C.*, 361.

<sup>5</sup> SE 40, 399; observe also the genitival *mi:ma:veluś:rutlniś:avlesla* (CIE 101). There are fewer than ten completely written patronymika at Volaterrae.

<sup>6</sup> CIE 126 and 128; the metronymika in *-al* are numerous.

<sup>7</sup> CIE 100 and 160; I know three gamonymika in *-ś* from Volaterrae.

and three metronymika (CIE 392, 428 and TLE 930). Furthermore, genitival gentilicia and cognomina occur, the former with *-ś*, the latter with *-sa* (CIE 411 and 418). The evidence for Cortona is almost non-existent: the gamonymikon in *larθi anei:αθ.petrusi* (CIE 449) besides two patronymika (CIE 409 and 452) and one gentilicium (CIE 444) in *-ś*.<sup>1</sup> The only relevant instance from Faesulae is the metronymikon in *l:tapsina:r:pumpnalisa* (CIE 9). *vl. afuna. vl. pesnalisa* (SE 39, 344–345) is probably from Rusellae.

4134. *Caere*. At Caere, the material is scanty, but shows very clear lines of differentiation. The use of the variants can be studied only in the patronymika, and even of these, most appear in abbreviated form. We have nineteen completely written patronymika – or, more correctly, eighteen patronymika and one avonymikon (CIE 5989); in all seven cases where an appellative is used, the genitival ending is *-s/-al*, e.g. *arrθal:clan* (CIE 6166);<sup>2</sup> in the twelve cases without appellative, the ending is invariably *-śa/-aliśa*, e.g. *larθi matuna. arθalisa* (CIE 6160).<sup>3</sup>

This clear distinction in the use of the genitival endings at Caere may also give a solution to the problematic forms in *-ls* occurring in the three metronymika of Tomba delle Iscrizioni: *crucrials* (CIE 5907 and 5908) and *pacials* (5920). In addition to these, Caere offers two metronymika with an exceptional *-c*-ending (CIE 5911 and 5975), one metronymikon in the form *ranθas(c) matunial clan* (CIE 5904) and one uncertain case *verciasa* (CIE 6180). Cristofani has lately interpreted the above-mentioned forms in *-ls* to cases of the agent and compared the use of this case in the metronymika to the Latin formation *Gellia natus*<sup>4</sup> (in which *Gellia*, however, is not an agent). As the Caeretan material shows that a genitival indication of relationship with *-al* is possible only in connection with an appellative, I consider it almost certain that the ending *-als* of these instances is simply a variant of *-aliśa*, and the variation is regulated by phonological and morphological conditioning in the way that *-ls* belongs to feminine words with a genitive in *-al*.

4135. *Tarquini*. With regard to the usage of Caere, it seems surprising that at Tarquini, no syntactical conditioning for the occurrence of the variants *-s*

<sup>1</sup> For the Clusine origin of CIE 462, see Rix, *Etr.C.*, 158–159.

<sup>2</sup> In addition, CIE 5904, 5914, 5989, 6064, 6081 and 6213.

<sup>3</sup> In addition, CIE 5905, 5910, 5918, 5932, 5955, 5968, 6073, 6130, 6159, 6167 and 6236.

<sup>4</sup> Cristofani, *AGI*, 56 (1971), 38–42.

and *-śa* seems to be distinguishable. Firstly, Tarquinii seems to be almost the only Etruscan city which shows a use of *-śa* outside relationship indications, in the function of a normal possessive genitive,<sup>1</sup> although it is true that the instances are not quite certain. I refer to the *cippus* inscriptions [---]*nas:veluśa* (CIE 5549), *veluśa* (5562) and *aninasa:vθ* (SE 37, 309). In the *cippus* inscriptions of Tarquinii, the use of the genitive is common, and an alternative interpretation for the names is difficult.

Also in other functions, it seems that the normal variant *-s* can always be substituted by *-śa* (with the exception of *-s* in gentilicia as direct name parts): in the patronymikon as well without (CIE 5401, 5403 and 5485) as with the appellative (5402, 5405 and 5423), in the gamonymikon (5546 and 5548) and in the metronymikon (5458).

From the other centres of the Tarquinian territory, only one certain instance of *-śa* can be presented. Musarna gives one case of *seθreśa* in a mutilated inscription (CIE 5820), in which its function remains uncertain. At Tuscana, as at Tarquinii, too, the genitive ending of forms in *-śa*, *-śla* is common, especially in the patronymika belonging to genitival name forms or indirect name parts. But this form is not relevant for our study, even if it can be used as an argument for the existence of forms in *-śa* at Tuscana, although these forms are not included in our material.

4136. *Other cities of South Etruria.* At Volsinii, there is one patronymikon *larθiališa[m?].clan* (CIE 5093) and one gamonymikon *murinaśa* (5170); in this region, too, another instance of *larθiališa* (CIE 5618) occurs, but otherwise only *-s* is used. Vulci affords one case of the patronymikon *veluśa* (CIE 5299). More important is the newly discovered inscription on a sarcophagus from Sorrina (Viterbo) *eca. mutan ... naslarceśa velθ avils LIII* (SE 39, 339–340). It seems certain that the form *larceśa* has the function of the normal genitive and is dependent on the appellative *mutan* = "grave". A further instance of the use of forms in *-śa* in purely genitival functions may be the *ciotola* discovered at Ariminum with the inscription *lauχmsa* (SE 39,361).

4137. What, then, is the answer to the question, as to whether the occurrence of the variants is syntactically conditioned or not. I think that the existence of syntactical conditioning is established; but the local differences are very great. There is Caere where it seems as though a substitution of one of the variants by the other would be in all positions impossible, and there is Tarquinii,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also below, p. 00.

where a substitution seems to be possible in all positions, if the lexeme is only a name. Between these two cities there is the practice of Clusium, where a substitution is in most cases possible, but where the frequencies of the two variants in different positions relate to each other quite differently, i.e. one variant suits one position better than another.

42. *The extra-grammatical conditioning.* With this conditioning regulating the variations, we must distinguish the psycholinguistic and the sociolinguistic features. With regard to the former, in particular, the material comprising, as it does, purely funeral inscriptions, which mainly consist only of the name of the deceased, is inadequate as a basis for study. We do not know anything of the individuals, whose language the inscriptions reflect, their stylistic tendencies, or emotional situations. But we can perhaps suppose that in the data we possess such factors have exercised very little influence; moreover, it would be profitless to begin to speculate how, for instance, in their lost works the Etruscan historians used the two variants discussed in this paper.

In general, the sociolinguistic factors which have possibly conditioned the variation are not better known. Of the three possible conditioning factors of greatest consequence, the social, the functional and the geographical, only the last can be studied on the basis of a sufficient body of material. With the material at our disposal, there is no solid basis for a social differentiation. The inscriptions of freedman naturally belong as a group to a lower social stratum from those of the freeborn; but as the name forms of the freedmen differ greatly of those of the freeborn, i.e. the syntactical context in which the forms occur is different, a comparison between these groups is not possible. Another possible basis for distinguishing social strata in our material is the kind of monument on which the inscription was written; the cheap *ollae* probably belonged to a lower stratum than the *ossuaria*; but also in our most substantial body of material, the Clusine gamonymika, the figures remain too small for any conclusions to be drawn.<sup>1</sup> As to the functional factors, almost all our inscriptions are epitaphs, i.e. always used for the same function. There could be some differences dependent on whether the inscription was exhibited outside the tombs so that people could read it or hidden inside the tombs. In the former case, it would be prepared more carefully, and this could possibly explain the strict distinction in the use of the two variants in the Caeretan inscriptions, most of which were on *cippi* in the tomb streets (or on the walls of

<sup>1</sup> The figures are enumerated above, p. 49.

the tombs of very eminent families). The possibility has also been pointed out of the more carelessly written tile inscriptions of Clusium favouring the forms in  $-\acute{s}$ .<sup>1</sup> But even in this case, the evidence is very uncertain.

The geographical or dialectal aspect has already been discussed to a certain extent in connexion with the syntactical conditioning. In the description of the use of the variants in different cities we noticed conspicuous divergencies. But now we have to discuss the question from a stricter point of view: could the variants be of different dialectal origin, or could one of the variants be of dialectal origin, the other being common Etruscan. The limitations of the material must again be taken into account, and, in a way, the question is significant only as far as the dialectal differences are reflected in our material. The probability of geographical conditioning is not great, because both variants seem to be found everywhere, with the possible exception of Perugia. But as the scanty documentation of the forms in  $-sa$  at Perugia may be rather important for our study, we should discuss it in detail.

CIE has altogether 14 instances of  $-sa$  and three genitives in  $-sla$ <sup>2</sup> for Perugia. As such, the figure is extremely small when compared with the total number of Etruscan inscriptions at Perugia; but, in addition, many of these instances originate, in fact, from Clusium, or belong to persons of Clusine origin, even if buried at Perugia. Rix<sup>3</sup> relies on three Perusine instances: *aule velimnaś θefrisa nufznal clan* (CIE 2758), where *θefrisa* is a patronymikon, *fasti.capznei.ve tarχisa.χvestnal* (CIE 3860), where *tarχisa* is a cognomen originating in patronymikon and attested to by the same family in *tlapu:lautni:capznaś:tarχisla:* (CIE 3750); and finally *la.cuiesa.petui* (CIE 3675), where Rix wants to see a cognomen *cuiesa*.<sup>4</sup> All inscriptions with a gamonymikon in  $-sa$  Rix considers Clusine, evidently on the grounds of names unknown at Perugia, but common at Clusium.<sup>5</sup> Of the two metronymika in  $-alisa$ , *ls.teti.ls.titalisa*

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 50 n. 0.

<sup>2</sup> *tlapu:lautni:capznas:tarχisla:* (CIE 3750), *avles' cneves' larisalisla* (4306) and *hermial.capznasl[a] man.seχis.capzna[s]* (3326). In addition, *θa.vipinei:venunia:taφusla* (SE 39, 351) is attributed to Perugia, but both the type of the urn and the name indicate a Clusine origin.

<sup>3</sup> Etr.C., 56.

<sup>4</sup> I would suggest, although with some hesitation, the interpretation *la. cuies(n)a. a.petui(al)* for this inscription (cf. *cuesnaś* 4195).

<sup>5</sup> *vipinei venunia purnisa* (4354), see Rix, Etr.C., 156 n. 12, *θana. tutn. fu.faltuśla marcnaśa* (4583), see Rix, Etr.C., 95–96, *ranazusa* (4526), see Vetter, *Jahrsh. Österr. Arch. Inst.* 37 (1948), Beibl., 110; as to *θan.p lautria:marcnisa* (4426), both *plautria* and *marcni* are Clusine names; [?] *tui.ath.latinisa* (4525) includes the name *latini*, unknown at Perugia; finally *seθra petrusa* (4413) is an extremely uncertain reading. In all these cases, the place of discovery is unknown.



(CIE 4472) seems to be a product of Pauli's imagination only,<sup>1</sup> whereas *arnθ.tantle larstiialisa* (CIE 4073) seems to be correct and really from Perugia; but the Clusine name *larste*, not attested to elsewhere at Perugia, seems to indicate the person's Clusine origin.<sup>2</sup> The three patronymika in *-sa* are all suspect, according to Rix,<sup>3</sup> but even if the readings and the places of discovery of [---] *larθialisa tres* [...] *śec* (4134), *a.patlnis larθia [li]sa* (4406) and *larθia.caia.huzetnas.arnθalisa.cafati(al) śec* (3637) are somewhat uncertain, I see no good reasons for rejecting these instances.

But Perugia is the only Etruscan city, which has yielded at least comparatively rich epigraphic material without clear evidence of the use of the variant *-sa*. At Clusium, Saena, Arretium, Volaterrae, Tarquinii, Caere and Volsinii, the forms in *-sa* are clearly attested to, even if their occurrence is naturally related to the total amount of material. Isolated instances can also be found at Faesulae, Cortona, Musarna, Sorrina, Ariminum and possibly Rusellae.

Consequently, the geographical surroundings have conditioned the use of the variants, firstly, so that the existence and nature of certain syntactical conditioning has depended on this, and secondly, in the way that a Perusine origin has made, as far as our material shows, the use of the the variant *-sa* extremely improbable. The case of Perugia does not make a dialectal origin for the variant *-sa* probable, or, even if this had originally been a Clusine variant, for example, which had then spread to all Etruscan cities except Perugia, this is in no way apparent in our material or significant for the analysis of the variation.

43. *The diachronic differences.* In a study of variation on a diachronic body of material, the chronological aspect is present in the discussion of all conditioning. Here is concluded our presentation of the evidence, as to what way the time at which the epitaph was written has conditioned the use of the variants in it. We can state a diachronic difference as far as the early phase of the Etruscan inscriptions in concerned. There is no certain case of *-sa* in the Early Etruscan inscriptions, but *-ś* is richly documented. Within the context of the Late Etruscan material, however, no diachronic differences seem to exist; our documents do not allow us to discern the recession of either of the

<sup>1</sup> "Ultimum nomen *titialisa* fuisse ex litterarum vestigiis colligi posse mihi videtur"; the last three letters are missing from the copy.

<sup>2</sup> As perhaps also the habit of having two epitaphs, in this case on the urn with the metronymikon in the form *larstial* (4074) and on a stele with the inscription discussed above.

<sup>3</sup> Etr.C., 56 n. 88.

variants.<sup>1</sup> It is, however, to be noted that the dating of inscriptions within this period of three centuries rests on a very uncertain basis.

5. This, in my views, concludes the description of the relation between the variants *-ś/-al* and *-sa/-alisa*. Since our knowledge of the Etruscan language is as defective as it is, it seems to me that this description must suffice, and that further speculation as to the nature of the forms must remain speculation only. As for claiming, as Pfiffig does, that the forms in *-sa* are certainly possessive adjectives, we should take one of two possible routes: either we should first determine the word class of the adjectives in Etruscan so that the forms in *-sa* would fit it, or attribute in an Etruscan word list all lexemes in *-sa* to the word class of the adjectives, in which case the word class becomes determined simply by the total number of the lexemes attributed to it. Pfiffig undoubtedly thinks above all of the possibility of declining the forms in *-sa* e.g. in the genitive, i.e. he considers that a form which can function as lexeme for further declinational forms must be a word in the nominative, in this case an adjective. We could, of course, define the Etruscan word class of adjectives in this way, but the definition would give rise to difficulties. I can use the parallel instance of Pfiffig:<sup>2</sup> from the genitive of the name of the goddess *uni*, *unial*, we can form the oblique case *uni-al-θi* = "in the temple of Uni"; but on this evidence no one would suggest that the morpheme *-al* would indicate a substantive formation.

On the other hand, Rix, for instance, compares the forms in *-sa* with the Italic formations in *-ios*. This is, of course, less dangerous, since it does not claim anything of the structure of the Etruscan language. It could also in some way clarify the nature of the Etruscan form, but, in this case, we must state that the comparison is not very exact and the divergences inside the Etruscan language too great.

In any case, we may conclude this paper by presenting the results of our description especially in so far as they are related to the nature and function of the ending *-sa*: (1) As there is no semantic difference between the forms in *-ś* and *-sa*, they are not different morphemes, but variants of one morpheme. (2) Their occurrence is not phonologically conditioned. (3) Morphological conditioning exists only in that *-sa* is not found outside personal names. (4) Diachronic differences are only apparent in that in Early Etruscan inscriptions

<sup>1</sup> For the possible diachronic difference inside the Clusine gamonymika, see above. p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Etr. Sprache, 204.

only -ś is documented. (5) There are great differences in the syntactical use of the variants between different cities, but both variants occur everywhere except Perugia. (6) With a few Southern exceptions, -sa appears only in indications of kinship; in these, it is more popular in some relationships, especially in the gamonymikon, than in others, such as the patronymikon, and is quite rare in the metronymikon. In the indications of the master of freedmen, it almost never appears. (7) It also appears in North Etruria in the cognomen as a direct name part, in which position -ś seems to appear only at Perugia; on the other hand, only -ś is used in the gentilicia. (8) -sa mostly occurs as being dependent on the praenomen or gentilicium of the person, and only seldom on the appellative indicating the relationship.

---

\* I wish to express my thanks to my colleagues Jaakko Frösén and Martti Nyman for assistance in the methodological formulating of the paper.