Defining the Etruscans: Language and DNA

The Etruscan Language and its Italic Context

John Penney

'The Etruscan people become linguistically (and thus historically) identifiable as such around 700 BC, when the oldest Etruscan inscriptions appear on pottery found in southern Etruria' (Haynes 2000, 1). The importance of language in forming our ideas of the Etruscans is not to be denied. Whether this was true for ancient peoples such as the Romans, for example, cannot be determined, since the sources make little of linguistic matters, as opposed to, say, the dominance of Etruscans in religious matters. Nor is it possible to establish what part language played in the Etruscans' conceptions of their own ethnicity: there is simply no evidence. For us, however, considerations of language go hand in hand with investigations into the origins of the Etruscans and the development of their remarkable culture. This is in no small part due to the fact that the language of the Etruscans is so different from that of neighbouring peoples. From this stems the appeal of the Etruscans as a mysterious people: their archaeological and cultural connections can be traced, or at least (for the early period) adumbrated, but the language keeps them apart.

It is nonetheless possible to recognise a certain amount of interaction between Etruscan and other languages of ancient Italy. It seems clear that there was a fair degree of bilingualism or plurilingualism: our best evidence relates to Etruscan and Latin (Adams 2003, 159–84; Kaimio 1975). The study of Etruscan in its Italic context therefore has two main dimensions. There is the question of how Etruscan came to have an Italic context in the first place, which touches on Etruscan origins, and a further question concerning the extent to which the languages of Central Italy, including Etruscan, show mutual influence. In the long term, of course, by the end of the 1st century BC, Latin emerges victorious and the other languages disappear, at least from the epigraphic record, but this is a slow process and for earlier centuries we have to posit rather the co-existence of the various languages and regular contact between the groups of speakers. These are circumstances in which some degree of linguistic convergence might well be expected.

For some 700 years, following the adoption of the Greek alphabet and the appearance of the first inscriptions, Etruscan was a written language: the latest inscriptions may date to the Augustan period. Some 10,000 inscriptions have survived and these constitute the primary source for our knowledge of the language, glosses in ancient authors providing occasionally useful supplements. The inscriptions come mainly from Etruria and adjacent regions (including Rome) but are also found wherever the Etruscans established themselves overseas, in Corsica, Carthage and southern France. Overwhelmingly the inscriptions are funerary, inscribed on stone or tile, or painted on the walls of tombs, but there are also inscriptions on objects recording gifts or dedications, ownership inscriptions and

artists' signatures. Few texts are of any serious length, but there are at least two which seem to be legal documents, and two that are ritual calendars, one on a tile from Capua and one a linen book re-used to bind an Egyptian mummy. Bilingual texts are rare: the gold tablets from Pyrgi in Etruscan and Phoenician have texts that are similar in content but do not correspond precisely, and the funerary texts from the 1st century BC in Etruscan and Latin are essentially interesting for the treatment of personal names and their socio-linguistic implications (Rix 1956; Benelli 1994; Adams 2003, 169–79). No complete picture of the language (except perhaps as regards onomastics) is afforded by the surviving documents, and understanding of the texts other than simple funerary monuments is in many cases still far from complete, but enough is clear for some conclusions to be drawn.

Etruscan is not an Indo-European language: this is generally, though not quite universally, acknowledged (Beekes 1993). This at once distinguishes it from its immediate neighbours: Latin, with closely related Faliscan, and the Sabellian languages (Oscan, Umbrian, South Picene, and others) are all of Indo-European origin, probably all belonging to a single Italic sub-branch.[1] The co-existence of Italic and Etruscan in Central Italy throws up many questions concerning prehistory. It is acknowledged that Italic represents the language introduced into Italy by incoming Indo-European speakers, though no reliable date can be given for their arrival (Rix 1994b). Whether Etruscan is also an import or is rather to be seen as the language of previous inhabitants of Italy is a vexed question, one that is obviously connected with the whole question of Etruscan origins, debated since Antiquity, some believing that the Etruscans came from the East, others that they were indigenous. Language has its part to play in this debate.

The Aegean connection

It is generally agreed that there is a connection between Etruscan and the scanty remains of a language known from a few inscriptions found on the island of Lemnos in the northern Aegean, and it is worth explaining why there is such unanimity. The principal monument is an late 6th century stone stele, no doubt funerary, showing the head of a warrior, with his shield and spear, and carrying two inscriptions of some 33 words. (A few other short or fragmentary inscriptions indicate that this is indeed a text in the local language and not just the memorial of a passing stranger.) There are two striking points of similarity with Etruscan. The first is the sequence *mav śialχveis avis*, reminiscent of Etruscan formulae for giving age at death, e.g. Ta. 1.169 *avils maχs śealχls* '(at the age) of *x* and *y*ty years' (where *avil* is 'year', *maχ* is 'four', 'five' or 'six', and *-alχ* is the marker for the tens).[2] The second is the sequence *holaiesi φokiaśiale seronaiθ*, probably a dating formula: the endings of

the first two words can be readily paralleled in Etruscan, cf. Ta 5.2 *larθiale hulχniesi*. These forms in -*si* and -*le* are case markers. They are formed by adding a locative ending in -*i* to a genitive ending, either -*s* or -*l* (underlyingly *-*la*): so -*s-i* and *-*la-i* > -*le*. These case-forms, which have been labelled 'pertinentive' (Rix 1984, 227; 2004, 953),[3] have a number of functions but their origin in a locative derived from a genitive remains clear in several uses: cf. Ta 5.4/5 *zilci velusi hulχniesi* 'in the magistracy of Vel Hulχnie', where *zilci* is the locative (in -*i*) of a word meaning 'magistracy', so 'in the magistracy' and the ending is repeated on the genitives *velus* and *hulχnies*, so 'in (that) of Vel Hulχnie'. A further example: AT 1.108 *zilaχn[ce] spureθi apasi* 'he was magistrate in the city of his father', where *zilaχnce* is a verb 'was magistrate', *spureθi* is a locative (< *spura-i*) with a postposition -*θ(i)* 'in the city' and *apasi* is pertinentive (to *apa* 'father', gen. *apas*) 'in (that) of (his) father'. Similar in origin would be the use of the pertinentive for artists' signatures, e.g. AT 6.2 *serturiesi*, on a strigil, which no doubt began as 'in the (workshop) of Serturie', but may have become simply an expression of agency.[4]

It is thus possible to interpret the Lemnian sequence *holaiesi φokiaśiale seronaiθ* on the basis of Etruscan: *seronaiθ* could be a locative form *serona-i* with a postposition -*θ* (the formation being like that of Etr. *spureθi* cited above), perhaps 'in the magistracy', parallel to Etruscan *zilci* above; the other two words will be a man's name in the pertinentive, repeating the locative ending on the genitive forms. This degree of fit seems to rule out any possibility of coincidence, and a link between Etruscan and Lemnian seems assured.

The nature of the link is disputed. Some would argue that the Lemnian remnants are simply Etruscan, the language being brought here by settlers from Italy. The chief proponent of this view is Carlo De Simone, who has adduced various arguments. The first comes from personal names. A new Lemnian inscription on a loom-weight was read as *la tita* (De Simone 1996), with *la* taken to be an abbreviated woman's praenomen (*larθia*). Abbreviations of praenomina are found in Etruscan, as in Latin and elsewhere, within the gentilicial system of nomenclature where the emphasis on the inherited family name led to a drastic reduction in the number of praenomina in use and therefore the possibility of using abbreviations without danger of ambiguity; but this system is foreign to the Aegean, so must be an import. It was soon shown, however, that the inscription was rather to be read from left to right, yielding *atitas* (Beschi 1996), and the attempt still to find an abbreviated praenomen here, so *a(vlas) titas* (De Simone and Chiai 2001, 57 fn.35), smacks of desperation.

A further argument concerns the writing system: the Lemnian alphabet is said not to be typical of the region (for instance the letter Ψ stands for χ, when the letter X might rather be expected) but to show similarities to Etruscan alphabets, particularly that of Caere (De Simone 1995); but the independent development of the Lemnian alphabet has been clearly demonstrated by Malzahn (1999). Furthermore, as well as word-dividers, there are supposedly traces of dots used for syllabic punctuation, characteristic of southern Etruria (De Simone and Chiai 2001), but there is room for debate here when the surface of the stone is in any case badly pitted and when there seems to be little consistency in the use of the supposed

marks. At all events, there remains a major problem with the attempt to claim that the Lemnian writing system is essentially Etruscan, and brought from Etruria. The Etruscan language had only one rounded vowel (so nothing comparable to, say, the Latin distinction between /o/ and /u/) and in all Etruscan alphabets this is written with upsilon, the omicron of the model Greek alphabet being simply discarded in practical use; Lemnian too seems to have only one rounded vowel, but this is written with omicron.

If the Lemnian language is not imported from Etruria, then the undoubted connections with Etruscan must be interpreted in another way, and it seems more likely (given that there are actual differences between the two) that these are related languages, descending from a common ancestor, for which Proto-Tyrrhenian has been proposed as a suitable label. If one supposes that this ancestral language was originally spoken in the Eastern Mediterranean region, would this support the long-held and still widely popular view that the Etruscans came from Asia Minor? (Beekes 2003; see also Perkins in this volume).[5]

Additional material has been put forward by Dieter Steinbauer (1999, 356–86), who offers etymological arguments for an Aegean connection in the form of Anatolian loanwords in Etruscan. His examples include some Lydian forms, e.g. Pe. 8.4 *araś peraś-c* is compared with Lydian (1, 7) *aaraλ biraλ-k* 'courtyard and house', but the meaning of the Etruscan cannot be guaranteed. Assured in meaning is -*c* 'and', which is compared with. Lydian -*k* 'and', which derives from IE *-kʷe, the source also of Latin -*que*, which might perhaps be as likely a source for any borrowing. Etruscan *cel* 'earth' is compared with Lydian *kλida-* 'earth', but the agreement only in two consonants makes the example less than compelling. Some other items are given a more general Anatolian provenance: *maχ*, Lemnian *mav*, already encountered as a numeral, is compared with Hittite. *meu-*, Luw. *māwa-* 'four'; the Etruscan and Lemnian forms can be linked given Etr. *muvalχ* 'xty', but do they mean 'four' or perhaps rather 'five'? The argument for the latter is based on a distinctive letter for /m/ used in the region around Cortona and borrowed by the Umbrians; this is identical to the symbol for 'five' and may indeed be precisely that, adopted to represent /m/ because that is the first sound of *maχ* (Rix 1969).

The Etruscan word *spanti* denotes a large flat dish, and Steinberg connects this with Hittite *išpantuzzi* 'libation-vessel' and the verb *išpand-* 'libate': but the root that lies behind the Hittite forms is IE *-spend-, which survives into Italic (cf. Latin *spondeō*, etc.) and there is an Umbrian word *spanti-* that may be derived from this and be the source of the Etruscan term (though there is some debate as to the direction of the loan, see de Simone 1991, 132–4, Untermann 2000, 689–90). Steinberg also identifies a suffix -*il*, which he takes to mark an agent noun, and proposes various connections such as *avil* 'year' with Luwian *awi-* 'come' (semantically possible) and *aril*, written beside a depiction of Atlas, with Hittite *arā(i)-*, Luwian *ari(ya)-* 'raise; check', so 'raiser'; but this interpretation of -*il* depends on analysis of *acil* as 'maker' rather than 'work', e.g. in an artist's signature *ruvfies acil* (Ta 6.12), where the name would appear to be in the genitive, making 'work of Ruvfie' the more likely interpretation.

The Raetic connection

These further Anatolian connections are not very convincing, though the relationship between Etruscan and Lemnian remains secure. Before concluding that this still makes an eastern origin for Etruscan most likely, a further language with Etruscan affinities must be noted. This is Raetic, a language attested in some 200 very short inscriptions from the Alpine region to the north of Verona. Despite their brevity, a number of linguistic patterns can be recognised which point to a relationship with Etruscan (Rix 1998; Schumacher 2004, 294–318). For instance, in examples such as: WE-3 *laspasi eluku*, NO-3 *ut^{i}iku φeluriesi φelvinuale*, SZ-14 *φelipuriesi eluku slepile*, BZ-4 *pevaśniχesi upiku …*, PA-1 *et^{2}suale ut^{2}iku …*, one may note the collocation of forms ending in *-ku* with forms in *-si* and *-le*: the latter immediately recall Etruscan pertinentives, and the sequences as a whole can be paralleled by archaic Etruscan examples, such as Fs 6.1 *mi zinaku larθuzale kuleniieśi* and Cr. 3.7 *mi spurieisi teiθurnasi aliqu* (see above), where the forms in *-ku/-qu* are predicates. Other points of similarity include patronymic formations, where Raetic masc. *-nu* and fem. *-na* may be compared with Etruscan gentilicia (deriving ultimately from patronymics) in masc. *-na*, fem. *-na-i*; or apparent lexical isoglosses such as Etruscan *zinake* 'made' beside Raetic *zinake*, *zinaχe* 'dedicated',[6] or Raetic *akvil* 'gift' beside the second element of the Etruscan compound woman's name *θanaχvil* or the word *tinscvil* 'dedicatory offering'.

The correspondences with Raetic seem entirely convincing, but it is important to note that there are differences between the languages too (for instance, the patronymic suffixes are similar but not identical), so that Raetic cannot just be seen as a form of Etruscan. As in the case of Lemnian, we have related languages belonging to the same family, so should we suppose that Proto-Tyrrhenian may have extended rather widely in prehistoric times? Certainly the introduction of Raetic into the argument, with the ensuing geographical complications, makes the notion of a straightforward migration of Etruscans from Asia Minor seem a little too simple. And it is not in the end clear that we can be sure that the Etruscans did come from outside Italy, at least in any period of which we can hope to give a historical account, whatever the romantic attractions of scenarios such as displacement in the wake of the Trojan War (Beekes 2003).

Linguistic convergence: Etruscan and Italic

What is clear is that Etruscan and Italic languages were both spoken in Central Italy for many centuries and that there was prolonged contact between them. In such circumstances one may well expect a degree of linguistic convergence, and there is some evidence of this. All the languages of Central Italy developed a strong initial stress accent, which provoked the weakening and often the loss of short vowels in internal syllables: some Latin examples might be **ré-faciō > reficiō* (no longer with initial stress in Classical Latin), **ré-tetulī > rettulī*, etc. In Etruscan there are enough early inscriptions for the changes to be roughly datable. The weakening of internal vowels can be recognised from the late sixth century: tell-tale evidence comes from variant spellings, e.g. a man's name *avile* is consistently spelled thus in the earliest inscriptions but then from *c.* 500 we find also *avele* and *avale*, indicating that the vowel of the middle syllable had weakened to the point of being no longer clearly identifiable. By *c.* 450 the vowel has disappeared and the spelling of this name is now *avle*. Such meagre evidence as we have from early Latin, Faliscan and Sabellian inscriptions suggests a similar chronology for these languages too. Certainly the phenomenon cannot be dated too early since borrowings from Greek are also affected, cf. Latin *māchina* as the outcome of (non-Attic) Greek *māk^{h}anā* and Etruscan *hercle* as the reflex of Greek *Hēraklēs* (this being in turn borrowed into Latin, whence the exclamation *(me)hercle*). This is definitely an areal phenomenon, and for the Italic languages it represents a considerable change from the inherited Indo-European accent (a free pitch accent), but it is impossible to know how it started and there are no solid grounds for supposing it to be an originally Etruscan feature.

Another feature that all the Italic languages have in common is the development of a sound /f/, not known to Indo-European, and this sound is also found in Etruscan. Some would claim that the sound was adopted from Etruscan (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002, 80), but this cannot be substantiated: the /f/ of the Italic languages primarily continues inherited voiced aspirate stops (as in IE **b^{h}er-* > Lat. *ferō* 'carry', etc.) and the required changes are phonetically perfectly plausible (see Stuart-Smith 2004) so that no external influence is necessary. It is further to be noted that /f/ in Etruscan itself has a limited distribution: it is rare overall, and particularly so word-internally, leading to suggestions that it arose as a conditioned variant of other consonants. (One may note that there is no indication from the spelling of the texts that this sound occurred in Lemnian and Raetic, but the remains are too scanty for this to be a reliable argument.) It is not unthinkable, therefore, if one wants to posit a joint development, that it was Italic that led the way. But it should be noted that the consonantal inventories of Etruscan and Italic are not otherwise obviously similar: Etruscan seems to lack the voicing distinction found in Italic, /p/ ~ /b/, /k/ ~ /g/, /t/ ~ /d/, etc., and has a series of consonants written as *θ, φ* and *χ* whose phonetic quality is uncertain but which do not obviously correspond to anything in the Italic system. This should caution us against supposing too great a degree of convergence at the phonological level. Phonological convergence between neighbouring languages is, itself, a well-attested phenomenon: a classic instance is that of Armenian and Georgian, unrelated languages that have finished up with virtually identical phonemic inventories (Deeters 1927). A further cautionary example might be a particular sound-change, confusion of *f* and *h*, occurring both in Etruscan and Faliscan: this has been taken to be an areal feature, but the phenomenon is late in Etruscan and confined to the north, so a connection is unlikely (Wallace and Joseph 1991).

A degree of cultural convergence is beyond doubt, and a good example of this is to be found in the system of personal names. The shift from patronymic adjectives to gentilicia is a feature of all the central Italian cultures (and spreads even to Messapian). Given the paucity of early evidence, especially on the Italic side, absolute and relative chronologies are hard to establish and the point of creation for the system unknowable, but this seems clearly to be an areal phenomenon rather than the product of separate but parallel innovations (Rix 1972). It is not only a social and cultural but also a linguistic matter, since it is clear that Italic influenced Etruscan in the morphology of

names. The Etruscan suffix *-ie*, extracted from Italic praenomina and gentilicia in *-ios* (many of which were borrowed as such) became productive in Etruscan (Watmough 1997, 37–47; Hadas-Lebel 2004, 259–69), especially in extended gentilicia in *-naie* (archaic) or in *-nie*, e.g. *tarχunie*, showing cumulation or contamination of Etr. *-na* and borrowed *-ie*. More remarkable is the creation of special forms for women's gentilicia. Etruscan apparently had no gender distinctions but special forms were developed for women's gentilicia. So to names in *-na* a feminine *-na-i* > *-nei* was created: the *-i* is thought to have been borrowed from Italic *-ī- < IE *-ih₂-*. A feminine suffix *-ia* also occurs in names, and this is undoubtedly from Italic (cf. Hadas-Lebel 2004, 270–82). As a later phenomenon, the Italic diminutive suffix *-lo-*, appearing in borrowed pairs of praenomina such as *tite* and *titele*, was extended to Etruscan bases, e.g *arnt(i)le* beside *arnθ* (Hadas-Lebel 2004, 282–6).

Possible borrowings from Umbrian

Within Etruria, a handful of early inscriptions have been found written in a Sabellian language that appears to be an early form of Umbrian and is known as 'Palaeo-Umbrian'. These inscriptions may perhaps be no more than strays, but they have been taken to suggest a relatively recent occupation by the Etruscans – perhaps coming from Anatolia or the Aegean – of what had been Italic territory (Meiser 1996, 198–202). Be that as it may, the probable presence of Umbrian speakers in the midst of the Etruscans, as well as on their eastern borders, would help to explain why there seem to be identifiable Umbrian elements in the Etruscan language. An Umbrian rather than a non-specific Italic origin can be fully demonstrated only when the form in question shows characteristic Umbrian sound-changes. For instance, the name *raufe, ruvfe* must have been taken from Sabellian since it shows the typical Sabellian treatment of internal IE *-dʰ-* as *-f-* (the same item occurs as a loanword in Latin *rufus*); but specifically Umbrian are the names *vuvzies, vuσia < *Loukios, *Loukiā* with Umbrian palatalisation of Italic *k* before a front vowel and change of initial *l-* to *v-* (whereas *luvce, lauci* etc. are borrowed from Latin (cf. class. *Lūcius*)).

A classic instance of such borrowing from Umbrian might be the following. A Palaeo-Umbrian inscription from Tolfa contains the name *setums < *septn̥mo-* (cf. Latin *Septimus*); varieties of this occur in Etruscan, e.g. Ta 1.99 *setumes*, AT *setumi*, Cl 1.52 *setume*, Pe 1.971 *sehtumial* (Meiser 1996, 197–8). What is involved here is a sound change whereby Italic *-pt-* (preserved in Latin) becomes *-ft-* in the first instance in all Sabellian langues; this then proceeds in Umbrian, and only in Umbrian, to *-ht-* and then to *-t-* with accompanying lengthening of the preceding vowel. This same change allows the identification of *neθuns* 'Neptune' as an Umbrian loan (*pace* De Simone 1991, 136; see Rix 1981, 123–4, Meiser 1986, 9, Steinbauer 1999, 449).

More problematic is *nefts*, an Etruscan kinship term that is very likely to be a loan from the Italic word that is continued by Latin *nepōs* 'grandson, nephew'. The Italic word would have had an alternating stem *nepot-, *nept-* (for this one may compare the Latin derivative *neptis* 'granddaughter'). The latter stem-form, with the Sabellian sound change *-pt- > -ft-*, would give *neft-*, but in this instance the further Umbrian

development is not found. Was this then borrowed into Etruscan from a branch of Sabellian that retained *-ft-* (e.g. South Picene), as Steinbauer (1993, 288–93) prefers, or should one follow Meiser (1996, 200) in taking it to be an early loan, predating the Umbrian change of *-ft-* to *-ht-*? A difficulty here is that the Etruscan word is not attested before the early 3rd century. Hadas-Lebel (2005) argues that this is a late borrowing as a word for 'grandchild', connected with a desire to stress a long citizen pedigree at a time of social upheaval.

Other possible examples of early loans, preceding known sound changes, have been claimed. *Putlumza* (Ta 2.31) 'drinking cup', is probably a reformation of a borrowed Italic *pōtlom*, cf. Latin *pōculum*. All Italic languages share the change *-tl- > -cl-* seen in the Latin form, so this looks like a very early loan (Meiser 1996, 201). *Lautn*, probably 'family', may be a borrowing from an Italic word built on the root *h₁leudʰ-* (seen in Latin *līber* 'free' and *līberī* 'children', Paelignian *loufir*, etc.) – (cf. Rix 1994a, 113–15, 2005, 564); it would have to have been taken into Etruscan when the internal *-dʰ-* had not yet given labio-dental *-f-* or (in Latin) labial *-b-*: such a stage is not actually attested in any extant Italic language and must lie far back in the past.

Other likely or possible Umbrian (at least Italic) loans in Etruscan (see Meiser 1986, 8–9; Steinbauer 1993; Rix 2005, 363–4; etc.) include: *cletram*, a piece of ritual apparatus, from Umbrian *kletram* (acc. sg.) – it is characteristic that the word for an object should have been borrowed in its accusative form; *lusχnei* 'moon', possibly a remodelling of Italic *louksnā*, cf. Lat. *lūna* (but see Steinbauer 1999, 438 for doubts); *cela* 'tomb-chamber' perhaps to be linked with Latin *cella* 'chamber' (if the word derives from the IE root *kel-* 'hide', the direction of borrowing is clear – the Etruscan word is taken from Faliscan according to Watmough 1997, 126–7); *uśil* 'sun', with the name *usile*, plausibly a reflection of an Italic *ausel-*, cf. Lat. *Aurelius* with Festus 22(L) *Aureliam familiam ex Sabinis oriundam a Sole dictam putant* (the connection is rejected, however, by De Simone 1991, 137–8).

For other items the direction of borrowing, and even the Italic connection may be debatable. It is worth including a few of these to illustrate the degree of uncertainty that attends such investigations, the caution needed in assessing the evidence and the disparity of scholarly opinion. Etruscan *tular* 'boundary' has been linked with Umbrian *tuder* 'boundary' (surviving in the modern name of the Umbrian city Todi). There are phonological difficulties, as Meiser (1986, 231–8) notes, but Untermann (2000, 771–2) thinks a loan one way or other is still possible; Steinbauer (1999, 482) is firm that *tular* is not a loan; Rix (2005, 564) includes *tular* in his list of probable loans from Umbrian. A far more secure connection is that of Etruscan *ais* 'god' with Marrucinian *aisos* (nom. pl.), Oscan *aisu<s>is* (dat. pl.), and the Umbrian adjective *esunu* 'divine', but there is no agreement as to whether this is an Etruscan word borrowed into Italic or an Italic word borrowed into Etruscan: see Meiser 1986, 252–3 (even-handed), Steinbauer 1993, 298–300 (for an Italic origin), Untermann 2000, 68–70 (inclining to an Etruscan origin).

The complexity of loan relations may further be illustrated by *lauχme, lauχumes* (a personal name with a derived gentilicium *lauχmsni* etc.) and *lucumu* as a cognomen: are these to be linked with Lat. *Lucumō*, a personal name but,

according to Servius, originally the Etruscan word for 'king'? Does *lauχumneti* in the text of the linen book (LL IX f2) belong here as 'in the *regia*' (Meiser 1996, 195)? An Italic origin, from the root **leuk-* shine' has often been suggested (most recently by Meiser *apud* Rix 2005, 564 fn.12, starting from Umbrian **loukumō* 'the most brilliant'); Agostiniani (2003) wonders if there might rather be a connection with Italic **loukos* 'sacred grove', but notes that in either case the *-χ-* is unexpected. Can any safe conclusion be drawn?

A persistent danger is that our knowledge of the Etruscan vocabulary is not always secure enough to make it certain that we are dealing with the same word in Etruscan and Italic and not just words that have a superficial similarity of sound and form. For instance, it has long been argued that Etruscan *sacni* is to be connected with Italic **sak-* (found in Latin *sacer* 'sacred', etc.), but the meaning is uncertain. The forms *sacni-ca, sacni-cla, sacni-cleri* etc. appear in the text of the linen book, with postposed demonstratives, and they have been taken by Rix (1991b, 681–3) to refer to a sacred brotherhood (like the Umbrian Atiedian Brethren), on whose account various sacrifices are made. The form *sacniśa* – with a variant *saniśa*, pl. *saniśva* – appears in funerary inscriptions, with reference to both men and women, and Rix takes this to indicate a member of the brotherhood (see also Wylin 2000, 279–85 and, for a less convincing view, Facchetti 2002, 59, 69). On the other hand, from the instances in tomb inscriptions, Steinbauer (1999, 462 and *passim*) argues that *sacni* means something like 'citizen': the sacrifices of the linen book are made on behalf of the citizenry, just as they are on behalf of the city, and the status of individuals is proclaimed after their death; there would then be no connection at all with L. *sacer*, etc. It is to be hoped that new finds with further attestations may help to resolve the issue.

It may be noted that the only secure instance of an Etruscan loanword in Umbrian is the magistrate's title seen in nom. pl. *marone*, cf. Etruscan *maru*, but our limited knowledge of Umbrian must be borne in mind.

Etruscan and Latin

Relations between the Etruscans and the Romans were also not without linguistic consequences. Constant contact from the archaic period onwards is assured, not least by the direct evidence of a few archaic Etruscan inscriptions from Rome. Another important manifestation of this is the borrowing of the alphabet from the Etruscans, and the adoption of their system of numerical notation. The Etruscan notation used subtractive numerals, hence IX for '9' and XXIIIX for '27', which is reflected in the language, as for instances in some dates from the linen book: *ciem cealχuz* (LL X. 2) is '27' (*cealχ* is '30', *ci* is '3' and *-em* the subtractive marker, so literally '30 less 3'); *eslem zaθrumiś* (LL VI.14) is '18' (*eslem* belongs with *zal* '2', *zaθrum* is '20'). Latin *duodēvigintī, undēvigintī* '18, 19' are most probably to be explained as calques on Etruscan (Lejeune 1981).

Despite such contact, and despite the increasing encroachment of Latin under the Republic, only two Etruscan words (other than names) are of probable Latin origin (Rix 2005, 564): *macstrevc*, a military or cult official, seems to derive from **macstre* = Latin *magister* and the name *macstrna* (Lat. *Mastarna*) also belongs here; *tiu/tiv* 'moon' may be taken from Lat. **dīo-* < **diwiyo-*, a derivative from the root **dyew-/*diw-*

found in *Iuppiter, Iovis* (compare also the further derivative *Diana* < **Diwiyānā*).

More numerous, but still not plentiful, are the Etruscan loanwords in Latin (cf. Ernout 1930, De Simone 1988, Breyer 1993, Rix 1995, Watmough 1997, Briquel 1999, Rix forthcoming). In several instances Etruscan is simply the intermediary for a borrowing from Greek, cf.: *sporta* 'basket' from Etr. *spurta*, itself from Gr. *spurida* (acc. sg.) – again a word for an object borrowed into Etruscan in the accusative, and showing a characteristic voiceless /t/ for the Greek voiced /d/ ; *lanterna* 'lamp' from Gr. *lamptēr* (the remodelling in *-na* suggesting Etruscan mediation) *cotōneum* 'quince' from Gr. *Kudōnion*, again with /t/ for Greek /d/; *catamitus* 'catamite' from Etr. *catmite* from Gr. *Ganumēdēs*; *scaena* 'stage' from (non-Attic) Gr. *skānā* (Rix 1995, 76); *persōna* 'mask, character', probably to be linked with Etr. *φersu*, a label for a masked figure in a painting, which may be a loan from Gr. *prosōpon* (this presents some problems that may not be insoluble, cf. Watmough 1997, 66–7 and especially Rix 1995, 75–6); *histriō* 'actor', said by Roman authors to come from Etr. *(h)ister*, which is plausible enough – a Greek origin is claimed (Rix 1995, 74–5, following Szemerényi) but is not assured, cf. Watmough 1997, 65.

Some 14 true Etruscan words (Rix 1995) are borrowed, such as *tina*, a type of wine-jar, borrowed from Etruscan *θina* (etymologically an adjective in *-na* formed from *θi* 'water' (and therefore not a loan from Gr. *dīnos*; cf. Steinbauer 1993, 298 fn.55); *satelles* 'attendant, bodyguard' is from Etruscan *zatlaθ* (see Watmough 1997, 103–33); *sūbulō* 'flute-player' comes from Etruscan *suplu* (attested as a cognomen and also used as a gentilicium) cf. Watmough 1997, 53–68). Besides these rather marginal items, an Etruscan origin has also been claimed for *populus* (archaic *poplo-*), originally 'army, citizen army' – also found in Umbrian: see Watmough 1997, 69–102 for a full discussion; but note also Rix 1995, 82–3, with a determined attempt to find an Indo-European origin for the word.

A major difficulty in establishing with any certainty that a word has been borrowed from Etruscan into Latin lies in the fact that the Etruscan inscriptions, consisting largely of personal names, have preserved only a very limited number of general lexical items. There are therefore disappointingly few known Etruscan words that we can hope to recognise in Latin. Attempts have been made to extend the list of loans on the basis of supposedly characteristic phonological or morphological features (so especially Ernout 1930), but these can only be established in the first place on the basis of remarkably few forms that can plausibly be taken as loans on independent grounds, and there is a great danger of circularity.

Another difficulty, which is not to be under-estimated, is that our knowledge of Latin and of Indo-European connections may not suffice to allow definite conclusions. For example, Latin and Etruscan share a suffix for forming ethnics: cf. Latin *Tīburtēs, Tudertēs, Ardeātēs, Samnītēs*, with *-ātēs* becoming productive as in *Antiātēs*. The corresponding Etruscan forms are all gentilicia, but as examples where the derivation from the name of a city or region is clear one may note *velχite* (Volci), *nulaθe* (Nola), *manθuate* (Mantua), *curθute* (Cortona), *latiθe/laθite* (Latium). Rix (1995, 85–6, and already 1957) argues that the places from which the Latin ethnics are formed are all close to Etruria or other areas of Etruscan settlement and that this points to an Etruscan origin for the type and therefore an

Etruscan origin for the suffix. One may have doubts about this argument, given that the Etruscans are to be found in so many parts of Italy from the Po valley to Campania, but there is an etymological argument that may weigh more heavily. The Etruscan forms can be analysed as being derived with a suffix *-e* from locatives with a postposed *-te/-ti/-θe/-θi* of the type *zilc-ti* (syncopated from **zilci-ti*) beside *zilci* 'in the magistracy'; note also archaic *hamai-θi* 'at Hamae', *spureθi < *spurai-θi* 'in the city'(cited above) and *lauχumneti* possible 'in the *regia* (see above) < **lauχumna-i-ti*. This is undoubtedly an elegant account, but Steinbauer (1999, 126–7) pertinently objects that the Etruscan examples are all from gentilicia and that the true Etruscan ethnic formation seems rather to have been in *-aχe*, seen in *rumaχe* (Roma) beside gentilicial *rumate*. He argues that the suffix is Italo-Celtic, being attested in Oscan *saípinaz* (citizen of Saepinum), Venetic *śainati-* and *Trumusiati-*, Gaulish *Elusātēs* (people of Elusa), so that in fact it is the Etruscan forms in *-te* that are borrowed. This evidence is not especially compelling. The Oscan form will have the same explanation as the Latin, whatever that may be; the Venetic forms are divine names and not certainly ethnic in origin; but one might add a further Gaulish instance, G-153 *ναμαυσατις*. (citizen of Nîmes)

Conclusion

Clearly there are many issues yet to be resolved, but the question may be asked: how impressive is the extent of mutual influence between Etruscan and the Italic languages? Opinion varies, from the view that 'the mutual linguistic influence between Etruscan and neighbouring Indo-European languages points to a lengthy period of proximity' (Haynes 2000, 2), to the view that the rather small amount of linguistic transference suggests that the Etruscans had not been neighbours of the speakers of Italic for very long (so Beekes 2003, arguing for a late Bronze Age migration from Asia Minor). In point of fact, secure examples of convergent development in phonology, morphology and syntax are few. No doubt the non-Indo-European structures of Etruscan made it more difficult for there to be grammatical convergence with the Italic languages, though a degree of shared phonological development may be recognised, as we have seen. Borrowing of vocabulary between neighbouring languages is not usually so constrained, but it is striking that the number of certain loanwords exchanged between Etruscan and Italic is none too impressive, given several centuries of contact, and the words are not usually part of the core vocabulary. One may contrast, for instance, the massive importation of Norman French words into English within a relatively short space of time after the Conquest or the recent avalanche of English (often American English) words in Modern French. Such things, of course, are largely determined by socio-historical circumstances, by political or cultural dominance, but our ignorance of early periods in the history of central Italy precludes any instant explanation along these lines. Allowance must also be made for the deficiencies in our knowledge of many of the languages involved. It might, however, be warily suggested that one factor that helped to limit convergence of Etruscan and Italic languages and exchanges of vocabulary may have been the speakers' consciousness that the languages were distinct, and perhaps even a concern on their part to keep them so. And here perhaps one might at last find some slight hint to the effect that speakers in ancient Italy did regard language as an ethnic marker, and that the Etruscan language was therefore for them too a part of the definition of what it was to be Etruscan.

Notes

1. The term 'Italic' is often used to refer specifically to the languages that I have here called 'Sabellian' (following Rix, Meiser and others); those who use 'Italic' in this restricted way usually believe that the Sabellian languages on the one hand and Latin and Faliscan on the other represent two separate branches of Indo-European. I have preferred to adopt the view that all these languages comprise a single branch, and the term 'Italic' in this paper will refer to that. This is not the place for a discussion of this troublesome question. A good orientation is provided by Rix 1994b.
2. All citations of Etruscan inscriptions are taken from Rix (1991a), but with a transliteration of the signs for sibilants that will be more familiar to most Etruscologists.
3. Steinbauer (1999, 174–5) argues that the forms are synchronically locative, but allows (1999, 71, 365) that they were created by adding the locative marker to a possessive adjective, which comes close to an agreement at least with respect to historical morphology. The view of Rix seems convincing.
4. There are, however, instances where the pertinentive form seems to mark the recipient, e.g. Cr 3.15 *mini spuriaza [teiθu]rnas mulvanice alśaianasi* 'Spuriaza Teiθurna gave me to Alśaiana' (*alśaianasi* being a pertinentive form) and several where it is not clear whether it marks the agent or the beneficiary, e.g. AT 3.1 *mi mulu kaviieśi* 'I am a gift from/for Kavie', Cr 3.7 *mi spurieisi teiθurnasi aliqu* 'I was given by/for Spurie Teiθurna', and Fs 6.1 *mi zinaku larθuzale kuleniieśi* 'I was painted by/for Larθuza Kulenie'.
5. The recent publication of results showing strong DNA matches between cattle from Tuscany and cattle from Turkey (Pellecchia *et al.* 2007) suggests that scientific evidence may eventually be able to help, but assessment of this is beyond my competence. See also Perkins, this volume.
6. There are complications concerning the spelling of the first sound of this word in Raetic (the representation with *z-* here is purely conventional); see Schumacher 2004: 309–12.

Bibliography

Adams, J.N. 2003, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.

Agostiniani, L. 2003, 'Etrusco *lauχumes* tra lessico e onomastica', in *Linguistica è storia/ Sprachwissenschaft ist Geschichte. Scritti in onore di Carlo De Simone/ Festschrift für Carlo De Simone*, eds S. Marchesini and P. Poccetti, Pisa, 21–32.

Beekes, R.S.P. 1993, 'The position of Etruscan', in *Indogermanica et Italica, Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. G. Meiser, Innsbruck, 46–60.

Beekes, R.S.P. 2003, *The Origin of the Etruscans* (Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 66, no. 1), Amsterdam.

Benelli, E. 1994, *Le iscrizioni bilingui etrusco-latine*, Florence.

Beschi, L. 1996, 'ΑΤΙΤΑŚ', *PP* 51, 132–6.

Bonfante, G. and Bonfante, L. 2002, *The Etruscan Language. An Introduction*, rev. edn, Manchester.

Breyer, G. 1993, *Etruskisches Sprachgut im Lateinischen unter Ausschluß des spezifisch onomastischen Bereichs*, Leuven.

Briquel, D. 1999, 'Les emprunts du latin à l'étrusque', *StEtr* 63, 291–313.

Deeters, G. 1927, *Armenisch und Südkaukasisch. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Sprachmischung*, Leipzig.

De Simone, C. 1988, 'Gli imprestiti etruschi nel latino arcaico', in *Alle origini di Roma*, ed. E. Campanile, Pisa, 27–41.

De Simone, C. 1991, 'I rapporti linguistici tra gli Etruschi e gli Italici', in *Rapporti linguistici e culturali tra i popoli dell'Italia antica*, ed. E. Campanile, Pisa, 129–47.

De Simone, C. 1995, 'I Tirreni a Lemnos: l'alfabeto', *StEtr* 60, 145–62.

De Simone, C. 1996, *I Tirreni a Lemnos*, Florence.

De Simone, C. and Chiai, G.F. 2001, 'L'iscrizione della "stele" del guerriero di Kaminia (Lemnos): revisione epigrafica e tipologica dell'oggetto', *SMEA* 43, 39–65.

Ernout, A. 1930, 'Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 30, 82–124 (= *Philologica* I, Paris 1946, 21–51).

Facchetti, G.M. 2002, *Appunti di morfologia etrusca. Con un'appendice sulla questione delle affinità genetiche dell'etrusco*, Florence.

Hadas-Lebel, J. 2004, *Le bilinguisme étrusco-latin. Contribution à l'étude de la romanisation de l'Étrurie*, Louvain, Paris and Dudley, MA.

Hadas-Lebel, J. 2005, 'Les petit-fils étrusques', in *De Cyrène à Catherine: trois mille ans de Libyennes*, eds F. Poli and G. Vottéro, Nancy, 365–80.

Haynes, S. 2000, *Etruscan Civilization. A Cultural History*, London.

Lejeune, M. 1981, 'Procédures soustractives dans les numérations étrusques et latine', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 76, 241–8.

Kaimio, J. 1975, 'The ousting of Etruscan by Latin in Etruria', in *Studies in the Romanization of Etruria* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, vol V), Rome, 85–245.

Malzahn, M. 1999, 'Das lemnische Alphabet: eine eigenständige Entwicklung', *StEtr* 63, 259–79.

Meiser. G. 1986, *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*, Innsbruck.

Meiser, G. 1996, 'Accessi alla protostoria delle lingue sabelliche', in *La Tavola di Agnone nel contesto italico*, ed. L. Del Tutto Palma, Florence, 187–209.

Pellecchia, M., Negrini R., Colli L., Patrini M., Milanesi E., Achilli A., Gerorelle G., Cavalli-Sforza LL., Piazza A., Torroni A. and Ajmone-Marsan P. 2007, 'The mystery of Etruscan origins: novel clues from *Bos taurus* mitochondrial DNA', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 274, 1175–9.

Rix, H. 1956, 'Die Personennamen auf den etruskisch-lateinischen Bilinguen', *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 7, 147–72.

Rix, H. 1957, 'Sabini, Sabelli, Samnium. Ein Beitrag zur Lautgeschichte der Sprachen Altitaliens', *Beitraege zur Namenforschung* 8, 127–43.

Rix, H. 1969, 'Buchstabe, Zahlwort und Ziffer im Alten Mittelitalien', in *Studi Linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*, Brescia, 845–56.

Rix, H. 1972, 'Zum Ursprung des römisch-mittelitalischen Gentilnamensystems', in *ANRW* I.2, 700–58.

Rix, H. 1981, 'Rapporti onomastici fra il panteon etrusco e quello romano', in *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Incontro di studi in onore di Massimo Pallottino, Roma 11–13 dicembre 1979*, Rome, 104–26.

Rix, H. 1984, 'La scrittura e la lingua', in *Gli Etruschi. Una nuova immagine*, ed. M. Cristofani, Florence, 210–38.

Rix, H. 1991a, (ed.) *Etruskische Texte. Editio Minor*, 2 vols, Tübingen.

Rix, H. 1991b, 'Etrusco *un*, *une*, *unu* "te, tibi, vos" e le preghiere dei rituali paralleli del liber linteus', *ArchCl* 43, 665–91.

Rix, H. 1994a, *Die Termini der Unfreiheit in den Sprachen Alt-Italiens*, Stuttgart.

Rix, H. 1994b, 'Latein und Sabellisch. Stammbaum und/oder Sprachbund?', *Incontri Linguistici* 17, 13–29.

Rix, H. 1995, 'Il latino e l'etrusco', *Eutopia* 4, 73–88.

Rix, H. 1998, *Rätisch und Etruskisch*, Innsbruck.

Rix, H. 2004, 'Etruscan', in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient languages*, ed. R. Woodard, Cambridge, 943–66.

Rix, H. 2005, 'Lehnwortbeziehungen zwischen den Sprachen Altitaliens', in *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*, eds G. Meiser and O. Hackstein, Wiesbaden, 559–72.

Rix, H. forthcoming, 'Lo scambio lessicale tra l'etrusco e le lingue confinanti in Italia', in *Contatti linguistici e storia del latino*, ed. A. Marinetti.

Schumacher, S. 2004, *Die rätischen Inschriften. Geschichte und heutiger Stand der Forschung*, 2nd edn, Innsbruck

Steinbauer, D.H. 1993, 'Etruskisch-ostitalische Lehnbeziehungen', in *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik*, ed. H. Rix, Wiesbaden.

Steinbauer, D.H. 1999, *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*, St. Katharinen.

Stuart-Smith, J. 2004,. *Phonetics and Philology. Sound Change in Italic*, Oxford.

Untermann, J. 2000, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg.

Wallace, R.E. and Joseph, B.D. 1991, 'On the problematic *f/h* variation in Faliscan', *Glotta* 69, 84–93.

Watmough, M.T. 1997, *Studies in the Etruscan Loanwords in Latin*, Florence.

Wylin, K. 2000, *Il verbo etrusco. Ricerca morfosintattica delle forme usate in funzione verbale*, (Studia Philologica, 20), Rome.