

IV. — *Race Mixture in Early Rome*

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

THE doctrine whose chief expounder is Sergi,¹ to the effect that the Ligurians formed the primitive population of Rome, and constitute the basis of the present blood of the Italian people, holds further that a new race, of different physical characteristics, entered the peninsula early and mingled with the original inhabitants. The newcomers were Indo-Europeans from the north.

A reply to some of Sergi's views has been made in full by Ridgeway,² chiefly on the ground that physical characteristics may readily be changed by changed environment. His general conclusion is that language "is really the surest of all known tests of race." Ridgeway's doctrine regarding the origin of the Romans is given at length in his pamphlet "Who were the Romans?"³ He concludes:⁴ "There is not only the evidence already cited to show that the Sabines were racially distinct from the aboriginal Ligurians, but many proofs can also be adduced to show that the Patricians were Sabines, the Plebeians the aboriginal Ligurians conquered by the former, whilst it can also be made probable that Latin, the language of the Roman empire, was the tongue not of the Sabine conquerors, but of their Plebeian subjects; in other words, that Latin is Ligurian."

In this paper I wish to maintain: (1) that there was a racial difference between patricians and plebeians, (2) that the tradition has not been disproved that the patricians were composed of an amalgamation of Romani, Sabines, and Etruscans, (3) that the plebeians were in the main Ligurians, (4) that Latin is the language of the followers of Romulus, i.e. of those called above Romani, somewhat modified by con-

¹ *The Mediterranean Race*, 1901.

² President's address, British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1908.

³ *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III, 1907.

⁴ P. 10.

tact with the other elements of the population, (5) that there is no adequate evidence that the Ligurian language was Indo-European.

The arguments are drawn from three main sources: (1) tradition, (2) legal and institutional development, (3) language. I shall only very briefly summarize the well-known evidence of tradition and institutions. The object is to see what may be adduced in support of the conclusions of archaeology and anthropology.

The Romans had a definite tradition that in the reign of Romulus the body of citizens was divided into three tribes.¹ That the division rested upon racial distinctions is nowhere positively stated, but there is much contributory evidence to support such a view. By far the majority of modern historians and constitutional writers believe it. The strongest recent opponent is Botsford.² He advances two arguments, neither of them new, but forcibly expressed: (1) the low political vitality of the tribes points to their artificiality, (2) the frequent use of a threefold division in Greece and Italy. The occurrence of these tribal names elsewhere than at Rome, especially the *Luceres*, does not make against the idea of racial difference, but assists it by sustaining the tradition of the early extension of Etruscan power through Latium and Campania. It may be that the followers of Romulus were artificially divided into three tribes, but there must have been a redistribution of the citizen body, for the tradition cannot be neglected that early in the reign of Romulus the Sabines shared with the Romans the control of the city, and that later the Etruscans also gained the supremacy.

The following is the tradition concerning the Sabines: (1) the rape of the Sabine women, (2) war between Romulus and Titus Tatius, (3) settlement of Sabines on the Quirinal, assuming civic rights as a tribe under the name *Tities*, (4) Numa Pompilius, the religious reformer, becomes king, (5) the reign of Ancus Martius. Some confirmation is found in the difference in burial customs in the two parts of the

¹ E.g. Livy I, 13, 4-8; Cic. *Rep.* II, 7, 13.

² *The Roman Assemblies*, 1909.

city, and in the fact that the inhabitants of the Quirinal were called *collini*, those of the Palatine *montani*.

Etruscans: (1) one tribe was called Luceres, a word derived from the Etruscan *Lucumo*,¹ (2) they assisted Romulus against Titus Tatius,² (3) held the ascendancy during the reigns of three Tarquins. They were the architects, builders, and carpenters of early Rome, and Kiepert³ assigns many public works to the sovereign Etruscans. It is known that they tried several times to enlarge their territory southward, successfully in the case when they succeeded in cutting off Falerii.⁴

The senate was composed originally of 100 members,⁵ enlarged to 200 by the admission of the Sabines.⁶ This number was further increased to 300 by the first Tarquin.⁷ The discrepancies in the tradition are but slight. Cicero⁸ says that Tarquin doubled the number of the senate, and Dionysius thinks the senators added were from the whole people, not from the Etruscans. But Livy seems to make the matter clear by stating that the new section of senators were *factio haud dubia regis*, i.e. Etruscan supporters of the usurper. The increase in the *gentes* means the same thing. That the additions were due to the admission of these two nations is most explicitly stated by the sources, and not "dimly hinted at," as Botsford says.

These three tribes are patricians. The plebeians and clients had other origin. Ridgeway is supported in this contention by many eminent authorities. Botsford's denial⁹ flies too much in the face of tradition. Romulus subdued the earlier inhabitants of Rome, who are called Aborigines, a word which became a tribal name applied to the original dwellers in Latium.¹⁰ Dionysius calls them Greeks, and leagues them with the Pelasgians.¹¹ He denies connection

¹ Varro, *L. L.* v, 55; Müller-Deecke, *Die Etrusker*, 337 ff.

² Varro, *ib.* 46; Dionys. II, 37.

³ *Lehrb. d. alten Geogr.* 421.

⁴ Deecke, *Die Falisker*, 21, 62. ⁵ Dionys. II, 12; Plut. *Rom.* 13; Livy I, 8.

⁶ Dionys. II, 47; Plut. *Rom.* 20; Livy I, 13 indefinite.

⁷ Dionys. III, 67; Livy I, 35.

⁸ *Rep.* II, 35.

⁹ *Political Science Quarterly*, XXI, 498 ff.

¹⁰ Cic. *Rep.* II, 5; Dionys. I, 14; also 15, 16, 20, 72, etc.

¹¹ I, 11; also 13, 20, 31, 40.

between the Aborigines and the Ligurians.¹ But he states several times that Ligurians lived in Latium, and even on the site of Rome.² The evidence of Dionysius is quite contradictory on this point, but the clear connection of the Ligurians with the Siculi³ inevitably links them with the Aborigines also.

In the north of Italy Dionysius uses the name Aborigines regularly to denote the primitive inhabitants. It is remarkable that he seldom employs the name Ligurians. But he says⁴ that the Ligurians once occupied a large part of Italy, and the Ligurians of historical times occupied the part of northern Italy assigned by Dionysius to the Aborigines. He also represents the Aborigines as constant enemies of the Umbrians,⁵ and⁶ cites Philistus of Syracuse to the effect that Ligurians, under Sicelus, were driven out of Italy by their enemies the Umbrians and Pelasgians. These are indications, although not so certain as Ridgeway believes, that the Ligurians and the Aborigines were the same people.

Students of Roman jurisprudence long ago pointed out a certain dualism in procedure and sanctions obtaining during the monarchical and early republican periods. The following table, given by Ihering,⁷ bases the dualism upon a combination of two systems, religious and secular, one based upon *fas*, the other upon *vis* or *ius*.

	RELIGIOUS	SECULAR
	<i>fas</i>	<i>ius, vis</i>
Symbol	<i>aqua et ignis</i>	<i>hasta (quiris), manus</i>
Representative	Numa	Romulus
Marriage	<i>confarreatio</i>	<i>coemptio</i>
Contract	oath, <i>sacramentum</i> , <i>sponsio, foedus</i>	public pledge, <i>mancipatio, nexum</i>
Procedure	<i>legis actio sacramento</i>	self-help, <i>vindicatio</i> , <i>manus iniectio</i>
Penalty	<i>homo sacer</i> , punishment for purification	<i>vindicta publica</i> , punishment for recompense

¹ I, 10, 13.

² I, 10; also 40, and 22; Festus, p. 320 M; Varro, *L. L.* v, 101.

³ Modestov, *Introduction à l'Histoire Romaine*, 124-129.

⁴ I, 10. ⁵ I, 16, etc. ⁶ I, 22. ⁷ *Geist des römischen Rechts*, I, 310.

Ihering himself sees in this dualism no proof of mixture of races, but maintains that it may arise in one state viewed from different standpoints.¹ And yet he feels that the religious features do somewhat contradict the warlike attitude of the people dependent upon *vis*, and admits that there may be a trace of some early amalgamation.² Much argument has centred about the two forms of marriage, *confarreatio* and *coemptio*. Ihering holds that the two are equally old, and Indo-European in origin.³ Cuq⁴ and Muirhead⁵ think that *coemptio* arose through *mancipatio* after the enactment of the XII Tables, and that *usus* was the ordinary form of plebeian and mixed marriages before that time. But this cannot be so, for the forbidding of mixed marriages by the XII Tables must have meant only a reversion to *usus* instead of *coemptio*, and hence the storm immediately raised against this iniquity, followed by the passage of the Lex Canuleia.

It is usually held that the religious element in the early law was derived from the Sabines, and *confarreatio* seems to be connected with their admission to citizenship.⁶ Cuq⁷ points out that the presence at the ceremony of the Flamen Dialis indicates Sabine influence. Ridgeway⁸ has made it extremely probable that the *flamines maiores* were of Sabine origin. The following are also of importance in connection with the Sabines: (1) the sacra of the *sodales Titii*,⁹ (2) Mars worshipped separately on the Palatine and the Quirinal, (3) double brotherhood of the Salii and the Luperci, (4) two sanctuaries each of Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, and Fides.

Voigt¹⁰ and Rein¹¹ have shown that the formation of Roman law and the procedure in some criminal cases involved a mixture of three different systems. The general question of a dual development in both civil and criminal procedure during the republic is fully treated by Greenidge.¹²

¹ I, 89-312.² 310.³ Cp. also his *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, 46 ff.; Sohm, *Institutes*, 452 ff.⁴ *Institutions Juridiques*, I, 62.⁵ *Roman Private Law*, 63.⁶ Dionys. II, 25.⁷ *Op. cit.* I, 61.⁸ *Who were the Romans?* 11.⁹ Tac. *Ann.* I, 54; Dionys. II, 52.¹⁰ *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, I, 12.¹¹ *Das Criminalrecht der Römer*, 24.¹² *Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, 4-9, 50-54, 297-304.

The extant remains of Latin and of the other Italic dialects are of such recent date in comparison with that of the invasion of Italy by the Indo-Europeans, that it is difficult to tell just what was the condition of their speech at the time of the founding of the city. In endeavoring to ascertain whether, or how far, the languages of the Aborigines, or of the predecessors of the Indo-Europeans in Italy, have influenced those of the Italic peoples, we are confronted by the fact that these have either utterly disappeared, or like Etruscan and Ligurian, are but slightly known. It is, therefore, impossible to set Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian side by side with the earlier languages of Italy in order to see what influences may have passed from one to another. And yet there are many changes in the speech of the Romans which certainly occurred after they arrived in the peninsula, and which are difficult to explain on any other theory than that of race mixture. The changes in Latin inflection have in many particulars been of greater extent and of more remarkable character than those in other Indo-European languages.

The history of Latin accent is noteworthy. After the Italic peoples wandered from their original Indo-European home, the old system of free accentuation gave way before a newer system, whereby all words acquired an accent on their initial syllable. This, however, took place before they reached Italy, for the phenomenon is shared by the Germanic and Keltic groups, showing that at the time of the shifting of accent the three groups still formed a unit. This startling innovation finds its readiest explanation in the assumption of an amalgamation of these Indo-European tribes with other tribes of central Europe. Thus it would follow that the Romans who settled on the Palatine under Romulus were already of mixed blood. Vendryes¹ sums up this matter as follows: "si les rapports de deux ou plusieurs dialects peuvent s'expliquer par un développement identique, parallèle mais indépendant, ils s'expliquent plus aisément encore par l'hypothèse que ces divers dialects auraient subi isolément des influences semblables. Or une pareille hypothèse ne

¹ *L'Intensité initiale en Latin*, 48.

peut jamais être écartée; elle subsiste alors même qu'on n'aurait aucun témoignage historique pour la justifier. Elle explique mieux que toute autre les innovations du vocabulaire et peut expliquer même les similitudes du système phonétique ou morphologique. Les ancêtres des Germains, des Latins et des Celtes ont dû rencontrer une foule de populations diverses avant de parvenir dans les régions où l'on trouve leurs descendants établis à date historique. On conçoit donc qu'ils aient subi des influences semblables, sans avoir jamais formé une unité dialectale." Vendryes then cites from an article by Hirt,¹ who is outspoken in maintaining an early mixture: "Kelten, Italiker und Germanen hätten sich Völker unterworfen, die Betonung der ersten Silbe kannten, und deren Betonungscharakter expiratorisch war. Die unterworfenene Bevölkerung lernte indogermanisch, behielt aber ihre Betonung bei." Later in his work Vendryes² is even less willing to admit connection between the accent systems of the three Indo-European divisions: "cet accent est une innovation du Latin. Les tentatives faites pour le rattacher à l'accent germanique et à l'accent celtique paraissent vaines; il est plus vraisemblable qu'il est dû comme eux à l'influence d'une autre langue non indo-européenne." Until some further evidence is discovered, it is by far the most reasonable and simple hypothesis to adopt the explanation of Hirt. He assumes a single influence upon the united three groups, which is much easier than to assume a similar influence working upon three detached peoples, and producing exactly the same effect, or substantially the same effect.

The system of initial accentuation persisted in Latin even into the second century B.C. And it is noteworthy that another principle, that of the penultimate law, came into activity just at the time Latin was spreading to conquered tribes throughout Italy. Possibly the native tribes, in their effort to speak Latin, transferred to it their own system of accent, a peculiarity often noticed among those who attempt to speak a foreign language. The new accent, that of the Ligurian plebeians and of other natives of Italy, extended

¹ *I.F.* IX, 290.

² *P.* 100.

even to the Romans who spoke Latin as their inherited tongue. This is, indeed, not the common explanation, and it may not be the correct one, but the coincidence of time and circumstance is at all events striking. Some confirmation of this hypothesis may be found in the fact that Greek also experienced a very similar shifting in the position of its accent, the sole difference being that in Latin the length of the penultimate syllable determined the position of the accent, while in Greek it was the length of the final syllable.¹ However, the explanation given would appear almost a certainty if we could assume with the anthropologists that the Pelasgians, or pre-Hellenic inhabitants of Greece, were of the same race as the Ligurians, or pre-Roman inhabitants of Italy. Roman tradition of alliance and union of Aborigines and Pelasgians has already been given.

Curious, too, is the fact that at an early period in Italy the inherited musical accent changed to stress. The scanty remains of Latin prior to 200 B.C. scarcely allow of an accurate determination of the date of this change, but such remains as we do possess show that the vowels preserved their primitive quality and quantity to a remarkable degree until about the time of the second Punic war. From 200 to 100 B.C. there is a most rapid change in this regard. The only plausible explanation is that the shifting in the nature of accent took place about 250 or 200 B.C. This again is the time of the beginning of the spread of Latin through the peninsula.²

In morphology there is probably nothing in the inflection of the noun, pronoun, or adjective that cannot be traced directly to phonetic development, or to some other ascertainable cause. But the history of the verb shows some striking innovations, very difficult to explain. (1) The fact that practically the whole system of primary endings has been lost, leaving only the secondary endings to do duty in all tenses, is not satisfactorily explained on purely phonetic

¹ For other explanations of this phenomenon in Greek see Wheeler, *Der griech. Nominalaccent*; Bloomfield, *AJP.* IX, 1.

² For somewhat contradictory evidence on this point, see Sommer, *Handbuch*, 98.

grounds. Too many things in the history of Latin sounds stand in the way of this explanation. It is, however, just the kind of generalization likely to occur when one is learning a foreign language, nor is it altogether fanciful to assume that this loss is due to the Aborigines who were learning Latin. (2) The same cause may have effected the loss of reduplication. The form *fhefhaked* on the fibula from Praeneste shows that reduplication was still in vogue when the Italic groups separated dialectically. (3) A somewhat parallel loss was that of augment, but that may be due simply to shifting of accent. (4) One of the strangest innovations in verbal inflection is that of the composite formation of the imperfect indicative. This may well be compared with the composite inflection of the Gallic Latin future and conditional.¹ The establishment of this peculiar form might easily account for the disappearance of augment. (5) The creation of the passive system in *-r* still strikes one as remarkable, even after the plausible explanations of Windisch or Zimmer. (6) And finally, the great extension of the sigmatic aorist sign to almost the whole series of perfect and aoristic tenses is an analogical extension unparalleled in the history of the verb.

These are simply examples of striking analogical extensions, or innovations, and are but indications of mixture. Unfortunately there is nothing to show from what source any of them arose. Some few things, however, in the Latin language were said by the Romans to be due directly to Sabine influence. The chief of these is the substitution of *l* for original *d*, said to occur in *lingua*, *Capitolium*, and *lacrimae*. It probably also occurs in *oleo* (cp. *odor*), *solium* (cp. *sedeo*, *sodales*), *Novensiles* (cp. Marsian *Novesedes*), *consul* and *consulo* (if from **con-sedeo*, *-sod-*). The word *Quirinus* was said, probably correctly, to be Sabine (Ridgeway's interpretation of the form is not conclusive). If Sabine represented original *k_u* by *p*, probably *lupus* is a Sabine word.² These borrowings are so slight that Ridgeway is undoubtedly right in denying that Latin is derived from an early form of Sabine.

¹ Cp. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue Française*, 86.

² Cp. Walde, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v.

Much less can be said of Etruscan influence upon the language. Schulze has argued for the Etruscan origin of the names *Rammes* and *Tities*, Schulze and Deecke for that of *Luceres*, and Schulze and Lindsay for that of *Roma*. Schulze also maintains Etruscan influence in certain suffixes, particularly those involving *-n-*; Soltau believes that *Romulus*, *Remus*, *Numa*, are Etruscan.

It is difficult to say how far the Ligurian of the plebeians influenced the *lingua Latina* of the patricians. It is impossible to agree with Ridgeway that the *lingua Latina* is a descendant of Ligurian. His contention that the language of the patricians would have been called *lingua Romana* or *lingua Sabina*, in accordance with his view that they did actually speak a Sabine dialect, is untenable, since the language of Rome was in reality the dialect common to all the flat-land of Latium, in distinction from that of the hill-country of the Oscans and Umbrians farther to the east.

But what do we know of the Ligurian language? To sustain the hypothesis of Ridgeway we must prove, (1) that Ligurian is an Indo-European language, (2) that in inflection it can have been the ancestor of Latin, and not of Oscan or Umbrian, (3) that it represented original *ky* by *q*, in distinction from Oscan, Umbrian, Greek, and Gallic. I cannot believe there is adequate proof of any one of these three.

Our knowledge of Ligurian is gained from three sources, (1) words cited by ancient writers, (2) names of persons and places, (3) extant inscriptions.

The words cited by ancient writers as Ligurian, and with meanings attached, amount to just six. These are *Bodincus* (or, as Polybius writes it, Βόδεγκος), the name of the river Pados, having the meaning *fundo carens*; *magum* (or *magus*), valley; *asia*, rye; *σιγύνναι*¹ = οἱ κάπηλοι; *βαλαροί*² = οἱ φυγάδες; *σαλιούγκα*, the name of a plant.

The word *Bodincus*, the name of the river Po, is said by Pliny,³ on the authority of Metrodorus, to be a Ligurian word, having the meaning *fundo carens*. Pliny seeks to fortify his interpretation of the word by citing the name of the town

¹ Hdt. v, 9.² Paus. x, 17, 9.³ N. H. III, 122.

Bodincomagum, "ubi praecipua altitudo incipit." If this is the correct meaning, and there is no valid objection to it, the stem syllable *bod-* is probably related to *fundus*, *πυθμήν*, etc.,¹ from I.-E. **bhudhno-* or **bhudhm(e)n-(o)*. The double substitution of the voiced mute for the aspirate makes it exactly parallel to Ir. *bond*, *bonn*, and proves almost certainly that the word is Keltic, as was pointed out long ago by Zeuss-Ebel.² The combination with the suffix *-magum* (or more commonly *-magus*) strengthens this conclusion. The number of names of places in Gaul compounded with *-magus*³ proves this a Keltic word, and parallel to Ir. *mag*, *magen*, "campus, locus." The word *asia*,⁴ meaning "rye," was used by the Taurini, and is probably a Ligurian word, or possibly Iberian. The following note by Windisch⁵ on this word is interesting: "Diefenbach erinnert an bask. "*asia* semen" (Orig. Europ. S. 235), Stokes (Rev. Celt. II 407) an skr. *sasya* Saat, Feldfrucht (cymr. *haidd* Gerste). Solche Fälle veranschaulichen, wie unsicher es mit der Deutung vereinzelter Sprachreste bestellt ist."

*Σιγύναι*⁶ = *οἱ κάπηλοι*, is without I.-E. parallel, nor has it other known affinity. The word *σαλιούγκα*,⁷ the name of a plant, identified by Linnaeus as the *Valeriana Celtica*, was used in Ligurian territory. This word has been doubtfully held cognate with Lat. *salix*, Ir. *sail* (gen. *sailech*), and Stokes also suggests⁸ Gallic diminutive *Salicilla*, Brit. *Saliciduni*. As the willow and the valerian belong to very different species, and do not bear the slightest outward resemblance to one another, relation would seem impossible. However, ancient and medieval botanists were interested only in the medicinal qualities of plants, and as those of the willow and the valerian are in a measure alike, it may be that the valerian received its name from the willow. If so, the word is clearly Gallic, for the suffix *-unc-* is a Gallic suffix, and we

¹ Walde, s.v. *fundus*.

² *Gramm. Celt.*, p. 807.

³ A very incomplete list is given by Zeuss-Ebel, p. 4.

⁴ Pliny, *N.H.* XVIII, 141.

⁵ Gröber, *Grundriss der roman. Phil.* I, 373, n. 2. ⁶ Hdt. v, 9.

⁷ Dioscorides I, 7.

⁸ *Urkeit. Sprachschatz*, 292.

must therefore hold it as a Gallic word, introduced occasionally into Latin.¹ *Βαλαροί*² = *οἱ φνγάδες*, used by the Kyrnioi (not Cretans, as Liddell and Scott say), was a Corsican word, applied to a tribe living in Sardinia. It would seem, therefore, to have Ligurian connections.³ The name is applied also to a Sardinian people by Livy, Strabo, Pliny, and Seneca. As the name Balarus occurs in Lusitania, and the Balearic Islands were settled by an Iberian tribe, it is reasonable to call this word Iberian. The etymology offered by Pausanias on common tradition, from the Greek *βάλλειν*, is generally rejected, although it might receive some color from the meaning of *βάλλειν* in Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 622-623. Thus, of the six words, three are Keltic, two are probably Iberian, and one is unknown.

The extant inscriptions, numbering 37, come from two tribes, the Salassi and the Lepontii. Both clearly have Ligurian connection, but ancient writers were in much doubt as to whether they should be called Ligurian or Keltic. Cato thought both tribes belonged to the Taurisci,⁴ and Strabo held that the Taurisci were Kelts.⁵ Polybius⁶ says that the Taurisci were in alliance with the Keltic nations, the Insures, and the Boii. Stephanus of Byzantium gives the curious information that the Taurisci were also called Taurini, according to Polybius, Book III. This is probably merely a blunder, as the Taurini were in the estimation of the ancients the truest of Ligurians.⁷ We have little further information regarding the nationality of the Lepontii. The Salassi are definitely stated by Dio Cassius to be Kelts.⁸ With this should be compared the doubtful authority of Julius Obsequens.⁹ Pliny does not make his own opinion clear, although he seems to imply that they are not Ligurians, since he mentions them next after the Taurini, whom he calls *antiqua Ligurum stirpe*.¹⁰

¹ Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 17; Pliny, *N.H.* XXI, 43.

² Paus. x, 17, 9.

³ Cp. Hülsen, Pauly-Wissowa, II, 2817.

⁴ Pliny, *N.H.* III, 134.

⁵ VII, 2, *Ταυρίσκους, και τούτους Γαλάτας*; ib. 3, 2 *τούτους δὲ και τὰ Κελτικά, οἱ τε Βόιοι και Σκορδίσκοι και Ταυρίσκοι.*

⁶ II, 28, 4; 30, 6.

⁷ Pliny, III, 123; Strabo, IV, 204; Polyb. III, 60, 8.

⁸ Fr. 74 *Σαλάσσους Γαλάτας.*

⁹ *C.I.L.* v, 750-751.

¹⁰ III, 123.

Of the 37 inscriptions, 23 are collected by Pauli¹ and 14 by Kretschmer.² Those in Pauli numbered 1-10 are from Salassian territory, those numbered 11-23 and all by Kretschmer are from Lepontine country.

The Salassian inscriptions, all on silver or gold coins, are :

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. iaṅkovesi, iaṅkove | 6. prikou |
| 2. kasios | 7. kasiloi |
| 3. senos | 8. ana tikou (or tikouana) |
| 4. ulkos (or vukos) | 9. pirakoi |
| 5. ašeš | 10. řutiřio |

The Lepontine inscriptions are :—

- | | |
|---|---|
| 11. slaniai : verkalai : pala
tisiui : pivotialui : pala | 20. u
tu |
| 12. řunalei : makō | tu |
| 13. ařoni : ila
. aiṅ
. mationa
. aniuī : p
. řionei : p
. ion | k^A^A |
| 14. pivonei : tekialui : lala | 21. alios |
| 15. alkovinos
ařkoneti | 22. ritukalos |
| 16. minuku : komonos | 23. tiusivilios |
| 17. komoneos
varsileos | 24. atios |
| 18. akur
. ořki
. ũklk
. tiu
. lioiso
. vař
. ial
tarise | 25. atis |
| 19. vitilios
vitilios | 26. cese |
| | 27. eu |
| | 28. kia |
| | 29. kri |
| | 30. . . . onis |
| | 31. sabi |
| | 32. vasamos |
| | 33. vasekia |
| | 34. veřoma |
| | 35. latumarui sapsutaipe vinom
nařom |
| | 36. lutou iu
inovea
tuni |
| | 37. iocui utonoiu riřadi |

The alphabet in which the inscriptions are written is proved by Mommsen and Pauli to be the North Etruscan, which made its way among the Gallic peoples in the extreme north of Italy, and from them to the two tribes under discussion.

¹ "Inschriften des nordetruskischen Alphabets," in *Altitalische Forschungen*, I.

² *K.Z.* xxxviii, 97 ff.

The chief characteristic is that voiced mutes do not occur, but the unvoiced mutes do duty for both. The two exceptions are in nos. 31 and 37. Kretschmer suspects 31 on that account. One may also suspect 37 both for that reason, and because of the remarkable form *utonoiu*, which is unlike anything else in the whole set.¹ Numbers 26 and 34 are also suspected on account of the peculiar form of the letter E, written //, whereas elsewhere it is written \exists E . Number 26 is suspicious besides on account of the form C, which occurs only in the Gallic territory eastward from Lake Como. A second feature is that doubled consonants are always written single, as in the early Latin alphabet. The use of this alphabet is the first point linking these inscriptions with Gallic. It should further be noted that in 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 32, 33, 35, 36, and part of 20, the writing is from right to left, in the others from left to right.

As to the date of the inscriptions, Pauli shows on various grounds that nos. 11-23 are not far from 150 B.C., while 1-10 are probably slightly earlier. Kretschmer dates nos. 25, 26, 30, found in the cemetery in Persona at Ornavasso, about 89-80 B.C., while 24, 27-29, 31-36, in the cemetery of San Bernardino, also at Ornavasso, at 234-88 B.C. Both are determined from coins found buried in the two places.

The inflectional forms should be compared with those of Gallic inscriptions of Italy and Gaul. The latter are tabulated by Rhÿs.²

A-Declension :

Nom. *pala* (11, 13? 14?), *mationa* (13), *vasekia* (33), *vesoma* (34), *inovea* (36), *kiã* (? pronoun? 28), *tikouana* (? 8). Cp. Lat. and Gall.

Gen. *slaniai*, *verkalai* (11), *sapsutai* (35). No examples of this case in Gall., but cp. Lat. -*ãi*.

O-Declension :

Nom. *kasios* (2), *senos* (3), *ulkos* (4), *alkovinos* (15), *komonos* (16),

¹ I have not seen a transcription of the original letters of 37, first discovered by Tagliabue, and published in *Bollettino storico della Svizzera Italiana*, xv (1893), 106.

² *The Celtic Inscriptions of France and Italy*, 1906, 75-76.

komoneos, *varsilios* (17), *vtilios* (19), *alios* (21), *ritukalos* (22), *tiusivilios* (23), *atios* (24), *vasamos* (32). Neuter *vinom nasom* (35, borrowed from Latin). Masc. in Gallic always in *-os*, as in early Latin. No nom. neut. extant in Gallic, but acc. always in *-on*. One Gallic acc. masc. in *-om* i.e. *Brivatiom*. Probably also nom. are *rutirio* (10) and *mako* (12) without final *s*, but see below under consonant declension.

Gen. *tisiui*, *pivotialui* (11), . . . *aniui* (13), *tekialui* (14), *latumarui* (35), *iocui* (37). In Gallic gen. always in *-i*.

Nom. plural, *kasiloi* (7), *pirakoi* (9). These are called gen. sing. by Pauli, but as they stand on gold coins, which elsewhere have the nom., they are better explained as nom. plural, the names or titles of kings or magistrates. In Gallic there are five instances of nom. plural, three in *-i*, two in *-oi*. Possibly *iankovesi* (1) is nom. plural.

I-Declension :

Nom. *atis* (25), *sabi* (? 31). Gallic nom. in *-is*.

Consonant Declension :

Nom. *ases* (5), *prikou* (6), *minuku* (16), *lutou* (36), *utonoiu* (? 37).

All of these paralleled in Gallic.

Gen. *sunalei* (12), . . . *tionei* (13), *pivonei* (14), . . . *onis* (? 30). Without parallel, as the gen. does not occur in extant Gallic.

It is possible that *rutirio* (10) and *mako* (12) are nom. of this declension, for which there is much Gallic parallel.

It is quite probable that *aškoneti* (15) is pres. ind. of a verb, with *alkozinos* as its subject. Perhaps the verb means *facit*.

Two words deserve special notice. The enclitic *-pe* (35), connects one gen. with another, and certainly means 'and.' It is therefore to be equated with *-que*, *τέ*, corresponding to the Keltic division which represents original *ky* by *p*. This includes the greater part of Gaul. Unfortunately the few remains of Gallic we possess do not show us a word for 'and,' although Rhys,¹ following Stokes, thinks *etic* on an inscription from Alise has this meaning. Yet the root *kye* occurs in Ir. *na-ch* 'quavis,' and in Cymr., Corn., Bret. in the form *-p*. The word *pala* (11 bis, probably 13 bis, 14 written *lala*) is taken by all investigators to mean 'grave.' It should

¹ Op. cit. 7.

therefore be derived from prim. Kelt. **qalo* 'dig,' as in Ir. *to-chlainm* 'I dig,' Cymr. *palu* 'fodere,' Corn. *pal* 'spade,' *palas* 'dig.'¹ It is found in Latin a few times from Plautus down with the meaning 'spade,' and is probably related to *pastinum*,² although it is quite likely that *pastinum* is derived from *pala*. It is by no means improbable that the word was brought to Rome by the Umbrian Plautus from the neighboring Senones. If Kiepert³ and Müllenhoff⁴ are right in thinking that some of the Gallic tribes entered Italy by the Great St. Bernard pass, and particularly the Boii, Lingones, and Senones, we have a reasonable explanation of the *-p-* in these two words, for those tribes belonged to the Gallic division having this peculiarity. Further evidence is seen in the name *Eporedia*, a Roman fortress, later colony, established among the Salassi. This word is Keltic, meaning *equorum domitores*,⁵ where *epo-* equates with *equos*.

The majority of the words in the inscriptions seem to be proper names, and in the nom. or gen. case. Many are compound forms, or those made by suffixes. They are paralleled in most instances by names occurring in Gaul, where the same forms of composition are the habit. Many of these parallels are collected by Pauli.

1. Iantumarus(?); Bellovesus, Sigovesus, Maglovesus.
 2. Cassibratius, Cassivellaunus, Vercassivellaunus. 3. Senones, Senomacilus, Senocarus, Senicco. 5. Asia. 6. Brigovix. 7. Casillus. 9. Biraco, Biracius. 10. Rotalus. 11. Verco, Vercilla, Vercaius, Vergaius; Diso, Dizo, Disocnus; Biveio (also 14). 12. Sunucus, Magonus, Magunus. 13. Matugentius, Matumarus, Matuco, Matto. 14. (see 11); Decibalus, Decomo, Deico (ei > ē or ī). 15. Alcmona; Ascitelus, Ascia, Ascula. 16, 17. Comagus, Comavus, Comiacus; Varsa. 19. Vittianus, or Vindillus. 21. Alio, Alico, Aleinus. 22. Ritumara. 23. (Pauli reads . . . tiu Sivilius), Siuna, Siv . . . 24. Adianto, Adiatullus, Adiatumarus, Adiatunnus. 25. Atismara. 26. Cesonius. 29. Crielo. 31. Sabis,

¹ Fick, *Wörterbuch*, II, 57.

² Walde, 442.

³ *Lehrb. d. allg. Geogr.* 398.

⁴ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, II, 256.

⁵ Pliny, *N.H.* III, 123.

Sabidius. 32. Clutamos, Uxama (also 33); Vassorix, Vasso, Vassio, Dagovassus. 35. Latobici, Latobrigi, Latobius, Latuo; Matumarus, Atepomarus, Maritalus; Sapaudia, Sapaudus; Sudeta. 36. Lutarius, Lutetia, Luteva.

Thus of the 12 (possibly 11) words occurring on Salassian coins, 4 are not wholly legible, 6 have exact or close Gallic affinity, 2 (possibly 1) are unknown. Of the 4 unclear words 3 seem Gallic in appearance. Of the 42 legible words on Lepontine inscriptions, 2 are Latin (*vinom*, *našom*), 28 are almost surely Gallic, while 12 are difficult or impossible to identify.

Our knowledge of Ligurian names of persons and places is derived from scattered notices in Latin inscriptions and literature, but chiefly from three Latin inscriptions, from Veleia,¹ from Genua,² and from Nicaea.³ These are largely collected by D'Arbois de Jubainville⁴ and Müllenhoff.⁵ Of the twelve formative suffixes commonly occurring in these words, seven are common Indo-European property, three are frequent only in Gallic and Ligurian, while only two are not found in Gallic. These suffixes are:

(1) I-E:

-eio; Multeius, Venireius, Lereianus.

-an, *-ane*; Bormanus, Comberanea.

-on, *-oni*; Matavonium, Labonia, Caferoniana, Ulamonius; also *-uni*,

Dectunines, Ulamunius. Also *-ō*, *-ōn*, Velaco, Paulo, **Απρων*.

For *o* in Gallic see Walde, s.v. *salmo*.

-in, *-ini*; *-en*, *-eni*; Albinus, Taurini; Ardena, Secenia.

-el, *-eli*; cp. Lat. *ilus*, *ulus*, *ilis*; Claxelus, Tulelasca, Vinelasca, Precele, Solicelos, Quiamelius.

-nt-; cp. pres. part. forms; Vediantii, Brodiontii, Druentia, Περγάντιον, Ταυροέντιον, Ioventio; cp. Gallic Vocontii, Brigantio.

-ic, *-uc*, *-ec*, *-ac*; Adunicates, Meticanio, Albucius, Alebece, Libici, Belacus, Velacus, Benacus.

(2) Limited to Ligurian and Gallic:

-auno; Ingauni, Velauni, Ligauni; Gallic Catuvellauni, Segovellauni, Ἰαλαννοί.

¹ *CIL*, XI, 1147.

² I, 199.

³ v, 7963.

⁴ *Les Premiers Habitants de l'Europe*, II, 46-195.

⁵ *Op. cit.* III, 179 ff.

-*ub* ; Oxubii, Esubiani, Vesubia ; Gallic Mandubii, Esubii.

-*inc*, -*enc* ; Bodincus, Βόδεγκος, Savincates, Labincus ; Gallic Abrincatui, Agedincus.

(3) Limited to Ligurian :

-*anio* ; Gentile names, Meticiano, Peliano.

-*asc*, -*esc*, -*usc* ; Bergamasco, Vinelasca, Vinelesca, Caruscum, Tarusco.

This last suffix, in its various forms, especially -*asc*, is by far the most distinctive suffix in Ligurian names. It seems to denote 'origin, relation,' and is probably to be compared with -*isk*- of several I.-E. languages.

In the matter of sounds Müllenhoff holds that the combinations *oa* (e.g. *Vergoanum*), *ia* (e.g. *Briagontinus*, *Quiamelius*), *ie* (e.g. *Iemerii*, *Berigiema*, *Attielius*), are not Gallic. This seems to be true of *oa*, but the others occur, e.g. *Diviciacus*, *Valetiacus*, *Giegeius*, *Iera*, *ieuru*. Müllenhoff, Kretschmer, Ridgeway, and others lay much stress upon the occurrence of *qu* in Ligurian words. And yet there are very few such examples. I know only of *Quiamelius*, *Quadiates*, *Quariates*, *Quariat(ium)*, *Quadiatium*. The modern names *Quarlasco*, *Quassasco* also occur in Ligurian territory. The finding of *qu* has been regarded as important, since it had long been assumed that *qu* was not a Gallic sound, for the Gallic branches of Keltic represented original *ky* by *p*. But inscriptions in recent years have made it clear that *qu* was used extensively in the central section of Gaul,¹ e.g. *Equos*, *Outios*, *quimon*. With these should be classed *Sequani*, *Sequana*. The use of *qu* covered the territory of the Sequani, thence along the Sequana to its mouth, and south to the Garumna. In the list of tribes enumerated by Livy² as setting out for Italy through the order of the king of the Bituriges, it is noteworthy that the majority belonged to this section. Almost all the Gallic tribes in this list substituting *p* for original *ky*, e.g. Senones, Lingones, Cenomani, Boii, can be definitely located in Italy north and east of Liguria. It is natural, then, to locate the *q* tribes, e.g. Sequani, Aulerci,

¹ Cp. Nicholson, *Keltic Researches*, App. II ; Rhys, *Celtae and Galli* passim.

² v, 34.

Bituriges, in the part of Italy where *q* occurs, that is, in Liguria.

The net result of the study is that by far the greater part of what is called Ligurian is strictly Gallic, and what is not Gallic is not Indo-European. The language of the country of the Ligurians became largely Gallic, after the coming of Gallic tribes to Italy. In places, e.g. among the Salassi and Lepontii, it was of the *p* type, elsewhere of the *qu* type. It follows that Latin is not derived from Ligurian, but is the speech of the Romani, who belonged to the second stratum of the Indo-European invaders of Italy.

In summing up, it seems necessary to conclude that the results gained by the anthropologists and archaeologists, to the effect that the basis of the blood of Italy is Ligurian, is in strict accord with Roman tradition. This is supported by the evidence offered by legal and institutional development that two or three systems are confused. From the standpoint of linguistics, the inference is fair that the Sabines influenced the Roman language only slightly, that the Etruscans influenced it still less. How far the Ligurian plebeians exerted an influence is inferential, but morphology inclines one strongly to the belief that their influence was potent. Further, it seems unquestionable that the plebeian language, Ligurian, was not Indo-European, in harmony with the doctrine of anthropology that the Ligurian blood was not Indo-European.

It may be tentatively suggested that the following were some of the results of the fourfold origin of the Roman *populus*: (1) from the Sabines came *confarreatio*, *flamines maiores*, *sodales Titii*, *Salii* and *Luperci*, *Mars*, *Jupiter*, *Juno*, *Minerva*, and *Fides* of the Quirinal, one hundred senators; (2) from the Ligurians the system of clients and plebeians¹; (3) from the Etruscans, architecture, *haruspices*, one hundred senators; (4) from the Romani the Latin language and the Roman civilization, except as modified in the particulars specified by the other elements of the population.

¹ Cic. *Div.* 1, 23; Dionys. v, 39, etc.