

2009

Review of Jorma Kaimio, *The Cippus Inscriptions of the Museo Nazionale di Tarquinia*

Michael Weiss

Cornell University, mlweiss36@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/rasenna>

Recommended Citation

Weiss, Michael (2010) "Review of Jorma Kaimio, *The Cippus Inscriptions of the Museo Nazionale di Tarquinia*," *Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 8.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/rasenna/vol2/iss1/8>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the CES Electronic Resources at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Rasenna: Journal of the Center for Etruscan Studies* by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Jorma Kaimio. 2010. *The Cippus Inscriptions of Museo Nazionale di Tarquinia*. Materiali del museo archeologico nazionale di Tarquinia XVII. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider. xii + 217 pp. ISBN 978-88-7689-242-4.

Reviewed by Michael Weiss, *Cornell University*

Ancient Tarquinii is well known for its remarkable necropolis, which preserves many spectacular painted rock-cut tombs, but the humbler funerary monuments of this Etruscan town are the subject of this book. In this monograph Jorma Kaimio offers an edition of the published and unpublished *cippi*, both Etruscan and Latin, housed in the Museo nazionale di Tarquinia. In addition Kaimio presents a checklist and texts of the other known Tarquinian *cippi*.

The first chapter is devoted to the dating of the *cippus* inscriptions. In general the laconic *cippi* make no reference to known historical facts, although the presence of the titles *quattuorvir* and *quattuorvir iure dicundo* on some monuments suggest that those particular *cippi* post-date Tarquinii's acquisition of *municipium* status. Unfortunately we don't know precisely when that was. Most *cippi* have no archaeological context but the contexts of those that have been scientifically excavated suggest a date range between the 2nd half of the 4th century BCE and the early Imperial period. Kaimio then examines internal criteria for establishing the relative chronology of the monuments including the typology of the *cippi*, the language used, graphic and linguistic features, onomastics, and sociological and genealogical information. The upshot of these various approaches to dating is that most of the Etruscan texts date to the first half of the 2nd century BCE and the Latin texts date mainly to the 1st century BCE.

The next chapter provides the edition of the inscriptions, first the unpublished Etruscan and Latin texts, followed by the published Etruscan and Latin texts. The texts are presented with a photograph of a squeeze (in most cases), a drawing of the inscription, a transcription, and a brief commentary addressing provenance, the physical attributes of the *cippus*, issues of reading, the paleography, onomastics, and dating. I offer some comments on individual points.

Unpublished Latin inscriptions:

No. 17 records the slave name *Eleutheros*. Since the *cippus* is not particularly old — Kaimio dates it to the 1st quarter of the 1st century BCE — there is no chance the -os can predate the raising of -os to -us. Kaimio suggests rather implausibly that -os may be due to influence of the praenomen *Eros*. It is much more likely that -os is simply a Hellenizing spelling, as is frequently found in Greek names in the inscriptions of Rome.¹

¹ See Gordon and Gordon 2006: 282.

No. 19 has the apparently unique gentilicium *Geracius*, here in the form *Geracia*. CIL 8.6237 = ILAlg. 2.3.9026 from Ain Kerma in Numidia has the form *Geracilis*, which might be related.

No. 28 and 29 offer the gentilic *Umricia*, which Kaimio hesitates to connect with *Umbricius*, but this connection seems impeccable and unavoidable to me. *Umricius* is an attested variant form of *Umbricius*. For example, the *garum* king of Pompeii, *Aulus Umbricius Scaurus* appears at least once as *A(uli) Umrici Scauri* (CIL 4.5704). *Umricius* is also attested at CIL 8.19067 = ILAlg. 2.2.6026 (El Announa/Thiblis) and CIL 11.717 (Bologna). Connection of this gentilic with Etruscan *umrce* and *umre* and the ethnic name of the *Umbri*/*Ὀμβρικοί* seem quite likely. The ethnic adjective itself possibly occurs without *b* as a name on a 6th century Corinthian crater from Caere (*ομριφος*, Paris Musée du Louvre E 632), although that form has also been interpreted as the Dionysiac adjective ‘rainy’. In any case, the graphic omission of the labial stop, which must have been a predictable epenthesis, is not surprising. Cf. *Septemres* (Ostraka BuNjem 75).

No. 36, an unpublished *cippus*, known only from the museum inventory and now lost, appears to have the otherwise unknown gentilic *Saienus*. Kaimio considers reading *Salenus* or *Saenius* instead, but it is hard to see how *Saienus* could simply be a variant of *Saenius*, as Kaimio states. The reading must be emended to either *Salenus* or somewhat less plausibly *Saenius*.

Published Latin Inscriptions:

No. 95, already published as CIL 11.3470, describes *Plotia Sex(ti) f(ilia)*, as *otuma femna*, which Kaimio explains as partly older orthography, partly misspelling (p. 26), but it is very tempting to take both of these forms — occurring together as they do — as representing more popular modes of pronunciation. The form *femna* continued in Occitan is also the direct antecedent of French *femme*, and most forms of Romance with the exception of Romanian and Occitan reflect an intermediate *tt* for Classical Latin *pt*. Spellings of *optu/imus* without *p* are found at Rome (CIL 6.11831 *otume*, i.e. *optumae* and CIL 6.32828 *otimo*).

On pg. 193 Kaimio classifies the gentilic *legius* as of unknown origin. but it seems probable that this is a Sabellic name attested mainly in Samnium (CIL 9.4166, Cliternum; CIL 9.4477, AE 1992.391, Amiternum).

Published Etruscan Inscriptions:

In No. 57 Kaimio improves on previous editions and reads *ucer . laθeni /svalce . avil/ XXXXVI*. It seems clear from the photo of the squeeze that the praenomen is not *lucer*. If this reading is correct the praenomen might be connected with the Italic stem **okri-* ‘citadel, height’ (Lat. *ocris*, Umb. **ukar**). Kaimio connects the gentilic *laθeni* with *latini*

(*Latinius*) but this is problematic since the aspirate cannot simply be explained by reference to *latiθi* ~ *laθiti*, which is a case of a transfer of aspiration, not of spontaneous aspiration.

Overall the quality of production is high and I noticed few typos. The English, though recognizably non-native, is perfectly understandable. Kaimio has produced a solid edition, which should be in most specialist collections.

REFERENCE

GORDON, A. E. AND J. S. GORDON. 2006. *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*. VI. *Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae. pars VI, fasc. III. Grammatica quaedam erroresque quadratarii et alias rationes scribendi notabiliores*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Department of Linguistics
218 Morrill Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-4701
mlw36@cornell.edu