

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. V

HELSINKI 1967 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Leiv Amundsen	Horace, Carm. 1. 3.	7
Gerhard Bendz	Par similisque	23
Eric Berggren	A new approach to the closing centuries of Etruscan history: A team-work project	29
Axel Boethius	Nota sul tempio capitolino e su Vitruvio III, 3. 5.	45
Patrick Bruun	The foedus Gabinum	51
Iiro Kajanto	Contributions to Latin morphology	67
Heikki Koskenniemi	Epistula Sarapammonis P.S.I. 1412 particula aucta	79
Saara Lilja	Indebtedness to Hecataeus in Herodotus II 70—71	85
Georg Luck	Die Schrift vom Erhabenen und ihr Verfasser . .	97
Dag Norberg	Le début de l'hymnologie latine en l'honneur des saints	115
Jaakko Suolahti	The origin of the story about the first Marathon-runner	127
J. Svennung	Zur Textkritik des Apologeticus Orosii	135
Holger Thesleff	Stimmungsmalerei oder Burleske? Der Stil von Plat. Phaidr. 230 bc und seine Funktion	141
Rolf Westman	Zur Kenntnis der ältesten Handschrift von Ciceros Orator	157
Erik Wistrand	On the problem of Catalepton 3	169
Heikki Solin	Bibliographie von Henrik Zilliacus	177

CONTRIBUTIONS TO LATIN MORPHOLOGY

Iiro Kajanto

I. DEVAS CORNISCAS: DATIVE PLURAL AND GENITIVE SINGULAR OF A-STEMS

A boundary-marker, found in Rome's Trastevere, bears the following brief inscription (CIL I² 975 = VI 96 cf. 30691 = DESSAU 2986 = DEGRASSI, Inscr. Lat. reipubl. 69):

DEVAS
CORNISCAS
SACRVM

The stone is today lost, but the copies made of the inscription are reliable.¹ The form of the letters, as well as the characteristic form *devas* for *divas*, proves that the inscription is from the republican period. *Devas Corniscas* is an obvious reference to the divinities recorded by Festus/Paulus, p. 56, *Corniscarum divarum locus erat trans Tiberim cornicibus dicatus, quod < in > Iunonis tutela esse putabantur.*

The inscription and the passage from Festus/Paulus have given rise to two statements. The first is that since *devas Corniscas* must be a plural, it can only represent the dative; and hence there exists an otherwise unknown dative plural of *a*-stems in *-as*.² Another example of the same form is seen in the inscription, ANABESTAS, cut on a column found on the Palatine (CIL I² 969 = VI 21 = DESSAU 2984 = DEGRASSI 43).³ The second statement asserts that *Corniscae* were deified *cornices*.⁴

¹ Bibliography in CIL VI 96.

² A. HEHL, *Die Formen der lateinischen ersten Deklination in den Inschriften* (diss., Tübingen 1912) 46; F. SOMMER, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg 1948) 332/3; LEUMANN—HOFMANN—SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik* 1, 281 (München 1963).

³ Cf. G. WISSOWA, s.v. Anabestae, *RE* 1,2015; STEUDING, s.v. Anabestas, *Roscher's Myth. Lexicon* 1,329.

⁴ E.g. *RE* 4,1633, s.v. Corniscae; K. LATTE, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München 1960) 139.

Both statements are challengable. To take *devas Corniscas* for a dative plural leads to difficulties. This explanation presupposes a dative plural of *a*-stems in **-ais*, postulated for the primitive Italic. The form is preserved in Oscan,¹ but in Latin it developed to *-eis* so early that no examples of *-ais* are found in Latin documents. Nevertheless the dative *-as* is usually derived from **-ais* as an analogical phenomenon to the dative singular $-\bar{a} < -\bar{a}i$, amply documented in archaic inscriptions.² This does not bear closer scrutiny, however. The dative singular $-\bar{a}$ was the Sandhi form of $-\bar{a}i$,³ whereas the supposed termination **-ais*, probably $< *-\bar{a}is$, must have had a short diphthong since all long diphthongs shorten before a consonant.⁴ There is no parallel for a development $\bar{a} < \bar{a}i$. It does not help the matter to take *-as* for a Praenestian form as ERNOUT does,⁵ because $\bar{a} < \bar{a}i$ was likewise unparalleled in Praenestian Latin. ERNOUT's argument that *-ais* had here preserved the long diphthong on the analogy of the other cases with the doublets $-\bar{a} / -\bar{a}i$ is untenable. A few scholars think that $-\bar{a}s$ represents an old Indo-European locative plural in $-\bar{a}s(u)$,⁶ but this is equally improbable; the locative plural $-\bar{a}su$ has not been documented in Italic. Again, since *devas Corniscas* cannot be a locative, one would have to postulate a locative functioning as a dative proper and this is not very probable.⁷

Moreover, these explanations have one weakness in common: they do not explain why a primitive or dialectic form should be found on a Roman boundary-stone in a not too remote past.

SOMMER has tried to overcome these difficulties by suggesting that DEVAS CORNISCAS was a cutters' mistake for DEVAIS CORNISCAIS. One manuscript gives the form DÉVAS. SOMMER holds that this may represent an omitted »I» which later was inserted into the wrong place.⁸ It is improbable, however, that both words should have been written incorrectly, only the

¹ R. V. PLANTA, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte* (Strassburg 1897) 2,99.

² MOMMSEN, sub CIL I¹ 814; F. RITSCHL, *Opuscula Philologica IV* (Leipzig 1878) 290; PLANTA, *op. cit.* (fn 1) 100; A. ERNOUT, »Le parler de Préneste d'après les inscriptions», *Mém. sociét. linguist. Paris XIII* (1905/6) 324; LEUMANN—HOFMANN—SZANTYR, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 281.

³ F. SOLMSEN, »Zur Geschichte des Dativs in den indogerm. Sprachen», *Zeitschr. f. Vergl. Sprachforsch.* 44 (1911) 204 f.

⁴ SOMMER, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) § 84.

⁵ *Op. cit.* (fn 2) 324, accepted, e.g., by L. R. PALMER, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 61.

⁶ J. SCHMIDT, *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* (Weimar 1889) 50; SOMMER, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 332 f.

⁷ Cf. E. HERMANN, »Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Deklination», *Göttinger Nachrichten* 1919, 220.

⁸ *Kritische Erläuterungen zur lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg 1914) 102 f.

first corrected, and the corrected letter put in the wrong place.¹ E was probably only a variant of the letter E.

Anabestas (CIL I ² 969) is far too uncertain to serve as another example of a dative plural in *-as*. The word was cut on »columella ex lapide Albano», and dug out on the Palatine together with No. 970 *Marspiter*, No. 971 *Remureine*, and DESSAU 61, elogium of *Fert[o]r Resius*. The form of the letters suggests the first century A.D.² LOMMATZSCH, ad No. 971, argued that all these tituli were imitations of antiquity and not genuine, while DEGRASSI, Inscr. Lat. reipubl. 447, thinks that they may have been copies of the original ones which for some reason had become unserviceable. However that may be, the divine names recorded in them are somewhat puzzling. *Anabestas* and *Remureine* are not found elsewhere, while *Marspiter* is well-known. Furthermore, the grammatical form of the names is not at all self-evident. It is reasonable to suppose that *Anabestas*, *Marspiter*, and *Remureine* were all in the same case. Now *Marspiter* is very probably a nominative, for Priscianus 6,39 records a genitive *Marspiteris*. It is thus probable that the name, like *Diespiter*, a similar formation, was declined in the normal way. A divine name cut in the nominative on a column which does not bear other writing is enigmatical, but we do not know the whys and wherefores of the stone. *Remureine* is also probably a nominative since it is unlikely to find the vulgar dative/genitive *-n(a)e* on an official Roman stone of that period. The conclusion is thus forced on us that *Anabestas* is a nominative.

Since it is unlikely that *-as* was a dative plural, another interpretation suggests that it must have been a genitive singular.³ Three objections can certainly be raised against this interpretation: first of all, *sacrum* normally required a dative in votive inscriptions; secondly, no examples of a genitive in *-as* have so far been found in inscriptions; and thirdly, Festus/Paulus explicitly states that *Corniscae divae* were a group of deities. I shall discuss all these objections in turn.

In votive inscriptions *sacrum* denoted an object »consecrated to» a divinity, and the name of the deity was naturally in the dative, e.g. *Hercolei sacrom* CIL I ² 607 (ara), *Iovei sacr(um)* 688 (ara), and *Menerva(i) sacru* 365 (lamina aenea). Among the considerable number of tituli sacri in CIL VI there is only one example of *sacrum* with a genitive, 101 *sacrum deum dearum | voto*

¹ Cf. HERMANN, *op. cit.* (fn 7, p. 68) 221.

² LOMMATZSCH, ad No. 971.

³ Cf. B. MAURENBRECHER, *Philologus* 1895, 623 fn 3; HERMANN, *op. cit.* (fn 7, p. 68) 220/21.

suscepto dedicavit | *C. Paetius Rufus* (tabella marmorea). It would thus be warrantable to regard *devas Corniscas* as a dative plural. But there is one point which has not been given sufficient attention: the inscription was found on a boundary-stone, not on a votive offering and the stone was evidently used to mark the sacred enclosure of the deity.¹ Many divinities were not honoured with a temple, but instead a small area, perhaps with an altar, was consecrated to them. Such a place was usually called *sacellum*, cf. Gell. 7, 12 *sacellum est locus parvus deo sacratus cum ara*, and Festus/Paulus p. 319 *sacella dicuntur loca dis sacrata sine tecto*. The term *locus* or *lucus sacer* was used in a similar sense and a number of stones with *locus sacer* (CIL VI 823. 31071), *locun sanctum sacrum* 822, *locu sacru* 31072, have been found in Rome. The name of the divinity was naturally set in the genitive, cf. CIL VI 114 *lucus sacer deae Satrianae*.² The word *sacrum* was also used in the same sense, cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 471 *apud Cloacinae sacrum*. That this was an »enclosure«, not a temple, is evident from Plin. *nat.* 15, 119 *in eo loco, qui nunc signa Veneris Cluacinae habet*. A close parallel to *devas Corniscas sacrum* is CIL VI 30986a (basis quadrata marmorea) *Nympharum sacrum*. | *M. Pompusidius Pudens et Lolliia Primigenia fecerunt* | *k(alendis) Septembr. Tertullo et Sacerdote cos.* (= A.D. 100) *et eum* | *diem feriarum instituerunt omnibus annis*. Since *feriae* were constituted, *sacrum* probably denoted an enclosure, not a single votive offering.³ A few inscriptions also record the fencing of a sacred enclosure, DESSAU 5428 *m[ag.] et flamin(es) Montan(or)um montis Oppi* — — *sacellum claudend(um)* — — *coeraverunt*; cf. 5427. All this makes it possible to explain *devas Corniscas sacrum* as the sacred enclosure of *Diva Cornisca*.

The second objection is more weighty. Although examples of a genitive in *-as* are found in Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, etc.,⁴ and although *paterfamilias* survived in Classical Latin, the only unequivocal example from epigraphy is an occasional *familias*, CIL I² 582, 12.⁵ All the proper names of the *a*-declension had a genitive *-ai* from the earliest times; one may count 18 genitives in *-ai*, and not a single one in *-as*, among the inscriptions dated to the period before 200 B.C. (CIL I² 1—580). *Devas Corniscas sacrum* cannot be

¹ This was pointed out by WISSOWA, *Roscher's Myth. Lexicon* 1,930: »offenbar zur Begrenzung des Areals dieser Gottheiten»; cf. also E. DE RUGGIERO, *Diz. epigr. ant. Rom.* II 1225; S. M. SAVAGE, *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* XVII (1940) 40.

² This was the family deity of the *gens Satria*, RE 2A, 188 (ZWICKER).

³ For *feriae privatae*, cf. WISSOWA, *Religion u. Kultus der Römer* 2 (München 1912) 433 f.

⁴ SOMMER, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 325; F. NEUE—C. WAGENER, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* I³ (Leipzig 1902) 9/16.

⁵ HEHL, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 7. *Coera pocolo* CIL I² 442 is more likely a mistake for *Coerai* than for *Coeras*.

very old, as is shown by the form *sacrum* for the more archaic *sacrom*.¹ Yet the nature of the monument helps us to meet this objection. The official language was notoriously more tenacious of archaic forms than the common speech, and the inscription on a boundary-stone marking the enclosure of a divinity of the State Cult was no doubt an official document. Another factor may have been the desire to show clearly that the case was a genitive. *Corniscai*, which at this period represented both the genitive and the dative singular, would have been taken for a dative in connection with *sacrum*. This would have confused the meaning — »a votive offering to Cornisca» instead of »the sacred enclosure of Cornisca».

A reconsideration of the passage from Festus/Paulus is also requisite. His statement that the *locus*, i.e. *sacrum* or *sacellum*, of *Corniscae divae*, was found *trans Tiberim* was right, but there is a considerable difference between Festus/Paulus and our inscription in that the latter records only one *diva Cornisca*. Since the inscription is an authentic contemporaneous document, whereas the literary reference, originally taken from Flaccus (Augustan age), is from the excerpts of Paulus (8th century), the inscription should be given priority.

In my opinion, the etymology of *Cornisca* from *cornix*, though generally accepted,² is wrong, and the plural form found in Festus/Paulus was due to this erroneous identification. Many scholars quote in support of the etymology the following votive inscription from Rome, cut on a small pedestal (CIL I² 976 = VI 30858 = DESSAU 2987 = DEGRASSI 70):

CORONICEI
T. TERENTIVIS L.C.L. DONOM
MERETO DEDET

This is explained as *Cornici*, with an anaptyxis.³ Anaptyxis was, however, extremely rare in Latin in the combination RN.⁴ Moreover, if *Cornisca* really was the name of deified *cornix*, why should a votive offering be consecrated to a *cornix*? Surely this would have seemed ludicrous. *Coronicei* (with a nominative **Coronix*?) must be put down as an unidentifiable divinity. The formative

¹ CIL I² 1—580 (»vetustissima») has four examples of *sacrom*, not a single one of *sacrum*. On the other hand, *donum/donu* gives 8 examples among the »vetustissima», *donom/dono* 18.

² Cf. A. WALDE—J. B. HOFMANN, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch³ s.v. *cornix*: *Cornisca* < * *cornic-sca*.

³ CH. HÜLSEN, »Miscellanea epigrafica», *Römische Mitteilungen* 1895, 64/5; LATTE, *op. cit.* (fn 4, p. 67) 139.

⁴ A. W. GROOT, Die Anaptyxe im Lateinischen (in: *Forschungen zur griech. u. lat. Grammatik*, edited by P. KRETSCHMER and W. KROLL, 6. Heft) 83.

-usco / *-isco* was found in Osco-Umbrian in ethnics and place-names,¹ e.g. *Falisci*, *Volsci*, and *Pollusca*, *Graviscæ*. It is possible that *Cornisca* is comparable to these and similar names which are found in ancient Italy. I dare not pronounce anything about the etymology of its stem. The derivation suggested by Festus/Paulus has no more value than most ancient etymologies. But since he (or Flaccus) thought that *Cornisca* denoted a deified *cornix*, and since *cornices* usually appeared in a group, he posited an erroneous plural form *Corniscaæ*. The cult of *Cornisca* had probably vanished long before the antiquarians of the Augustan age began to take an interest in ancient divinities.

In summation, the above analyses suggest the following revisions of current notions:

- a. There was no dative plural of *a*-stems in *-as* in Latin
- b. There were no *divae Corniscaæ*, only *diva Cornisca*
- c. The etymology of *Cornisca* as from *cornix* is probably erroneous.

2. IVNO REGINA MATRONA: NOMINATIVE PLURAL OF A-STEMS

In Pisaurum (modern Pesaro) has been found a number of votive inscriptions (CIL I² 368—81 = DESSAU 2970—83 = DEGRASSI 13—26) which probably date to 184 B.C., the period of its foundation as a Roman colony.² One of the most debated linguistic problems concerning these inscriptions is the alleged nominative plural *matrona*, CIL I² 378:

IVNONE REG
MATRONA
PISAVRESE
DONO DEDROT

and 379:

MATRE
MATVTA
DONO DEDRO
MATRONA
M' CVRIA
POLA LIVIA
DEDA

¹ V. PLANTA, *op. cit.* (fn I, p. 68) 37. 73/4.

² See DEGRASSI, *Inscr. Lat. reipubl.* I pp. 46/7.

In general the word *matrona* is explained as *matronā(s)*,¹ but opinions differ as to its origin. Some argue that it was a relic of the original termination of the nominative plural of *a*-stems, *-ās*, which had been replaced by *-ai* so early that no examples of it can otherwise be found in Latin.² Others hold that it was an Umbrian feature, since in Osco-Umbrian the nominative plural of *a*-stems had retained the original ending *-as*.³

Objections can be raised against both these interpretations. Although the authority of DEVOTO is on the side of the Umbrian interpretation, it is probably wrong. Is it conceivable that Latin colonists, drawn from among the peasants and poorer classes of Rome⁴ and having just arrived in a remote country, had learned so much of the Umbrian language so as to assimilate a case ending? Latin and Osco-Umbrian were mutually unintelligible as is shown by the fact that the Romans needed interpreters to understand Oscan⁵ and naturally also Umbrian. In more general terms, although the Italic dialects may have left traces upon some phonetic peculiarities found in republican inscriptions, it is improbable that the morphological structure of Latin had suffered the influence of Osco-Umbrian. Morphemes were precisely the last things to be borrowed from another language. DEVOTO, who stresses the influence of the substrata upon Latin, has gone too far in the hunt of dialecticisms. The one morphological peculiarity upon which DEVOTO lays much weight, the nominative plural of *o*-stems in *-s* — *libertis, magistreis, hisce ministris*, etc.⁶ — was demonstrably due to the influence of the Latin third declension.⁷

The other alternative, according to which *-as* was a relic of the archaic ending, is likewise very improbable. In contrast to the genitive singular, no certain traces of the termination *-as* have so far been found in the nominative plural. Two passages from the atellanae of Pomponius (Sullan age) are usually cited as literary examples of the termination but on closer scrutiny both are

¹ SOMMER, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 329; LEUMANN—HOFMANN—SZANTYR, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 1,276.

² K. MEISTER, »Altes Vulgärlatein«, *Indog. Forsch.* XXVI (1909) 82/9; B. GEROLA, »Il nominativo plurale in *-as* nel latino e il plurale romanzo«, *Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift* LVI (1950) 328.

³ G. DEVOTO, »Contributo alla teoria del sostrato osco-umbro«, *Rev. ling. rom.* IX (1933) 233; *Storia della lingua di Roma* (Bologna 1940) 198; V. PISANI, *Grammatica latina*² (Torino 1952) § 320.

⁴ MEISTER, *op. cit.* (fn 2) 76.

⁵ Cf. L. R. PALMER, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 7, and Liv. 10, 20,8 *gnarosque Oescae linguae exploratum quod agatur mittit* (scil. the Roman general).

⁶ *Storia* (fn 3) 192/3.

⁷ F. SOLMSEN, »Der Infinitiv Praesentis Activi u. die i-Diphthonge usw.«, *Indog. Forsch.* IV (1894) 248.

found unreliable. *Quot laetitiaſ insperatas modo mi inrepsere in ſinum*, *Comic. Rom. Fragm.* 141 = Non. Marcell. 500, 32, *laetitiaſ insperatas* no doubt contains the ſubject, but it is unneceſſary to explain it as an archaic nominative plural or even to attribute it to the influence of Oscan². It is much more natural to analyze the ſentence as »a contaminated construction in which the firſt element is an accuſative of exclamation.»³ The other example, *Comic. Rom. Fragm.* 151 = Non. Marcell. 84, 1, is uncertain from the point of view of textual criticism. The manuſcripts of Nonius give the paſſage in the form, *ego quaero quod edim haſ quaerunt quos cacent contrarius eſt*. This is manifeſtly corrupt, and L. MÜLLER reads the paſſage thus: *ego quaero quod edim; heisce quaerunt quod cacent: contrariuſt*.⁴ Although *haſ* was reſtored by W. LINDSAY — *ego quaero quod comedim, haſ quaerunt quod cacent: contrariumſt*⁵ — the reading *haſ* is probably wrong. The verb *cacare* has an obscene meaning here, documented in another atellana, Novius 6 (in *Comic. Rom. Fragm.*) *quod editiſ nihil eſt; ſi vultis quod cacetiſ copiaſt*, and explained by a Pompeian inſcription, CIL X 8145 *hanc ego | cacavi*, written below a big penis formed from ſtone, and by Priap. 69 *aestimato | quot pondo eſt tibi mentulam cacandum*. The expreſſion *cacare* = *mentulam cacare* ſuggeſted the vice of *paedicatione*, which was normally practiced between male perſons. This juſtifies the ſubſtitution of *heisce* or *hiſ* (Ribbeck, *Comic. Rom. Fragm.*) for *haſ*.⁶ It is thus improbable that Pomponiuſ had any genuine nominative plural in *-aſ*. The firſt examples of a nominative plural in *-aſ* begin to appear in epigraphy towards the middle of the firſt century B.C., CIL I² 2685 (Minturnae) *haſc(e) mag(iſtraſ) V(eneri?) d(onum) d(ederunt)*, and 2520, a magical tablet from Rome, lineſ 5 ff. *tradaſ illunc | febr̄i quartanae tertianae cottidianae, | quaſ cum illo lucent*, etc. The inſcriptionſ from Minturnae date from 90—50 B.C., while 2520 is prior to ca. 40 B.C. It was only during the Empire, and eſpecially in its later period, that *-aſ* became more common.⁷ The above makes it unlikely that its origin and generalization could be attributed to the ſurvival of archaic formſ in the Vulgar language and/or to the influence of the Italic dialectſ.⁸

¹ E. LÖFSTEDT, *Syntactica* 2 (Lund 1933) 333.

² PISANI, *op. cit.* (fn 3, p. 73) § 320.

³ PALMER, *op. cit.* (fn 5, p. 68) 150.

⁴ Teubner, 1888.

⁵ Teubner, 1903.

⁶ LÖFSTEDT, *op. cit.* (fn 1) 333 fn 3 defends the reading *haſ* alſo on the ground that a feminine ſubject is natural in a play called *Proſtibulum*, but *proſtibulum* denoted a male prostitute, too.

⁷ LÖFSTEDT, *op. cit.* (fn. 1) 329 ff.; HEHL, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 37.

⁸ For the latter theory, cf. LÖFSTEDT, *op. cit.* (fn 1) 334, and SOMMER, *Kritiſche Erläute-*

One further difficulty handicaps the interpretation of *matrona* as *matronā(s)*: the alleged loss of *s* after a long vowel. This is unlikely, since *s* usually vanished only in the termination *-ōs*.¹ If the current explanation of *matrona* were correct, two unusual linguistic phenomena should be found in the same word: a nominative plural in *-as*, whether archaic or adopted from Umbrian, and the loss of final *s* after a long vowel.

Because of these difficulties, other explanations have been suggested. According to ERNOUT, the correct termination of the nominative plural in *-āi* had been shortened here similar to the termination of the dative singular, *-ā(i)*.² However, PETERSEN has pointed out that *-ā* can be the Sandhi form only of the dative singular, not of the nominative plural, as *-ā(i)* is traceable to the Indo-European, whereas the nominative plural *-ai* came into being only in Latin.³ To this one could add that if ERNOUT's explanation were correct, we should have more examples of a nominative plural in *-ā(i)* than the two cases from Pisaurum; dative singulars terminating in *-a* were common throughout archaic epigraphy. The interpretation proposed by PETERSEN is unfortunately no more convincing: the inherited doublets of the dative singular, *-a* and *-ai* (*-ae*) »brachten eine feste Assoziation der beiden Formen hervor, so dass auch als Nominativ pl. sich gelegentlich *matronā* neben gewöhnlichen *matronae* einstellen konnte.« He admits that case syncretism unlikely befalls two cases so opposite in meaning as dative singular and nominative plural, but he argues that *matronā* is explicable as »analogische Lautübertragung«, the passing of a single sound to an area where it originally did not belong.⁴ The theory is very improbable since no parallel cases from Latin can be cited.⁵ PETERSEN offers in support of his argument the fact that *matronā* was found as a nominative plural precisely in North Umbria where the dative singular in *-ā* was common. The statement is unfounded; dative singulars in *-ā* were so evenly distributed that no particular frequency can be established for North Umbria.⁶

rungen (fn 8, p. 68) 102. Criticism of the theories in LEUMANN—HOFMANN—SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik* 2,30 f. (1965).

¹ Cf. CAROLA PROSKAUER, *Das auslautende -s auf den lateinischen Inschriften* (diss., Strassburg 1909).

² *Op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 68) 324.

³ »Der lateinische Nominativ Pluralis MATRONA«, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforsch.* 65 (1938) 256.

⁴ *Op. cit.* (fn 3) 256 f.

⁵ PETERSEN, p. 257, quotes the anecdote of Vespasian, who replied to Florus' correction of *plostra* by *plaustra* by calling him Flaurus, but the anecdote is irrelevant here: Flaurus is an example of hyperurbanism.

⁶ HEHL, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 67) 29/30.

Since all the attempts to explain *matrona* as a nominative plural have proved unsatisfactory, it is only left to consider it as a form of the singular. As far as I know, no previous scholar has discovered this very obvious solution.

In CIL I² 378 *matrona* is probably an epithet of *Iuno Regina*. Although *Matrona* is not found as an epithet of *Iuno Regina* elsewhere in Latin epigraphy, two passages from Servius reveal that it must have been one, ad Aen. 59 *Cui vincla iugalia curae: quia est Curitis, est Matrona, est Regina*; ad Aen. 8, 84 *Maxima Iuno: variae sunt eius potestates, ut Curitis, Lucina, Matrona, Regina*. Horace also refers to *Matrona Iuno*: *carm.* 3, 4, 59. Notice that in the passages from Servius, *Matrona* and *Regina* were juxtaposed. Hence it is probable that *Iuno Regina* had likewise been called *Iuno Regina Matrona* although only one epigraphical example has come down to us. The form is naturally the dative singular. The dedicators were recorded in the third line — the inhabitants of Pisaurum. Votive inscriptions dedicated by a community were not rare, cf. CIL I² 39 *Diuvei Ardeates*, 391 *Aninus vecus (= vicus) Valetudne donum dant*, 2218 *Seixomniaci Leucitici Polates*, etc. *Pisaurese* stands for *Pisaurenses*. Here we face a difficulty: how do we explain the fact that *Pisaurese* has lost the final *s* after a long vowel, while this explanation was rejected in *matrona*? Although there are sporadic examples of the loss of final *s* after a long vowel, e.g. CIL I² 2442 *Q. A. Aidicio Q.f., T. Rebinio Q.f. aidile moltatico*, where *aidile* should be *aidiles*, the cases are too few to be due to a phonetic law; they are probably cutters' mistakes, etc. Although this explanation could be urged here, too, it is unnecessary. Excellent photographs of the votive stones of Pisaurum have recently been published by DEGRASSI,¹ and No. 17 = CIL I² 378 shows that the stone is broken on the right. On the first line the last letters have vanished and after RE there are possibly »vestigia litterae G». On the second line the space between the final A and the fracture is too wide for any letters to have vanished. On the third line the final E comes so close to the broken margin that an S may well have been lost. This line should thus be written *Pisau(re)n)se[s]*.

In CIL I² 379 it is the last word, DEDA, which is of crucial importance. The word was formerly explained as a verbal form, *deda(nt)*,² but this is quite impossible. The verb *dedere* is not found in votive inscriptions. Moreover, why should a verb of dedication be in the subjunctive? It is not very probable, either, that DEDA was the name of the third dedicator.³ Women could not

¹ *Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae. Imagines* (Berlin 1965).

² RITSCHL, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 68) 407.

³ MEISTER, *op. cit.* (fn 2, p. 73) 72.

bear a single cognomen in early republican times, and by its form DEDA cannot be a gentilicium. The right explanation of the word is due to F. BÜCHLER. He saw that *deda* was the same as *dida*, a baby-word signifying »nipple of breast», and also »nurse». ¹ It is the latter meaning which is obvious here. If *deda* denotes »nurse», *matrona* cannot be a plural since nurses were not included in the category of *matronae*. The word *matrona* belongs to *M.' Curia*, and both appellatives, *matrona* and *deda*, were set in a chiasmus. ²

The results of the above analyses may be summed up as follows:

- a. There are no certain examples of a nominative plural in *-ās* prior to the middle of the first century B.C.
- b. *Iuno Regina Matrona* is documented as an object of cult in Pisaurum.

¹ In his comment on CIL I² 379, p. 407; cf. also V. PISANI, *Testi latini arcaici e volgari* (Torino 1950) A 27, p. 19. *Dida* was a rare word, cf. *Thes. l. Lat.* V: 1, 1014. — H. KRAHE, »Zu CIL. I² 379», *Indog. Forsch.* 55 (1937), 121/2, argued that *deda* was an Illyrian word but since the change *e < i* was a common one in the republican Vulgar Latin (in the votive inscriptions from Pisaurum, CIL I² 368 *Apolenei* = *Apolinei*, 373 *No[v]esede(bus)* = *Novesedib(us)*, 377 *Tetio(s)* = *Titio(s)*), it is much more natural to equate *deda* with the Latin *dida*.

² This was pointed out by KRAHE, *op. cit.* (fn 1).