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0) List of abbreviations

“Ann”: Annali publicati dall’Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica, Roma

“Bull”: Bullettino dell’Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica, Roma

CG: Classical Greek

CII: Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum

CIL: Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum

CL: Classical Latin

CSE: Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum

IDoHP: International Dictionary of Historic Places of Southern Europe by Trudy Ring, Noelle Watson and Paul Shellinger

ILLRP: Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae

LSJ: Liddell – Scott - Jones, Greek-English Lexicon

OLD: Oxford Latin Dictionary
1) Introduction

a) Praenestine Mirrors: Some General Observations

“Mirrors are a rich source of information. They provide an insight into the Etruscan mentality of the period.” So notes Van Der Meer (1995) in his monograph on Etruscan mirrors and on a possible Interpretatio Etrusca for Greek mythology and religion. Indeed, engraved mirrors permit the attentive observer to construct an idea of how people experience religion and traditional mythology on a daily basis. They can additionally demonstrate how cultural differences between societies – even though these separate societies can be strongly linked through commerce and alliances – can influence stories that have existed for centuries and that have already become what we might call a classical canon by the time the pictures on the hand mirrors in question were engraved. The Etruscan mirrors which Van Der Meer discusses can be situated in a time frame between the sixth and second century BCE, which corresponds to three separate periods scholars distinguish in Etruscan history, namely the Archaic period (580 - 480 BCE), the Classical period (480 - 320 BCE), and the Hellenistic period (320 – 27 BCE).

In this thesis, however, I have chosen to focus on a linguistic analysis of the inscriptions on the bronze hand mirrors from Praeneste, a city in East Latium, currently going by the name Palestrina. There are two major issues we should bear in mind when approaching the subject. Firstly, we should adopt a critical approach to the chronology of the bronze hand mirrors. For now it suffices to mention that I will follow the most conventional chronology proposed by

---

1 I have adopted this particular division of time periods from Bartoloni (2012, p. 12-16) in her descriptive overview of Etruscan history. An attentive observer will note that these periods only appear to coincide fully with the traditional chronology of Greek society. Indeed, one of the three periods only corresponds partially to the conventions of Greek history, i.e. the Archaic period. The Archaic period, when studied from a traditionally historical and archaeological point of view is thought to start in 800 BCE and end in 580 BCE. Snodgrass (1980, p. 13-23) describes its beginning to denote a structural and – although shortly afterwards – intellectual evolution of Ancient Greece. During the time frame of 800 – 580 BCE, though, the history of Etruria is divided into two other *età*, namely the first Iron Age and the Orientalizing period. The former is characterized in Bartoloni (2012, 83) by the initiation of the process of “La Formazione Urbana”, while the latter is exemplified by the number of contacts between Etruria and the East, referring to the Phoenicians and the Greeks.
Matthies (1912) and followed by most scholars, who date these bronze hand mirrors from the 4th century BCE onwards on the basis of both stylistic and linguistic elements. Therefore, following the Etruscan and traditional time periods sketched above, they can be situated in the Classical and, primarily, the Hellenistic period – significantly more recent than the Etruscan bronze production.

Secondly, regarding the number of hand mirrors in existence today, we can note that there is some debate about the number of authentic Praenestine mirrors that have survived for us to research. Because of the quality of some of the engravings, the complexity of the iconography and linguistically interesting inscriptions, the Praenestine and Etruscan bronze hand mirrors appeal greatly to the interest of scholars. However, their quality and unique features have most certainly also attracted the interest of antiquarians and art forgers. The latter two have generated a traffic in both authentic and counterfeit hand mirrors, making it a challenging task for historians and linguists to estimate the number of truly authentic Praenestine bronze mirrors.

We can discern three main reasons for this challenge. Firstly, it is indeed certainly not impossible to distinguish a falsification from a genuine mirror when one is granted access to the object itself. However, sometimes all that is available for study is a drawing or sketch, since the actual object may be inaccessible—due either to its whereabouts being unknown or else to being held within a private collection. Secondly, the lucrative trade in hand mirrors has driven antiquarians into selling more recent Etruscan bronze mirrors as rarer Praenestine mirrors, in order to attract more customers and to increase price and profit. Thus, many

---

2 Some other scholars who date the mirrors from the 4th century onwards are De Bellis (2005) and Adam (1980).

3 There are different types of forgeries antiquarians might have committed which we can discover when granted access to the item itself. Two of the most common methods for forgeries are casts – with possible varying degrees of quality – and pastiches. The former might be debunked by chemical analyses or because of their poor quality. As an example for the latter, we might refer to the Etruscan mirror no. 21 from CSE. France 1, Paris – Musée du Louvre, fasc. III. Indeed, it consists “of an authentic Greek mirror from the 5th century B.C., modern (before 1825) engravings, an ancient decorative handle attachment mounted backwards, and a portion of a Roman balance added to the handle”. (De Puma, 2001)
mirrors might have been mistakenly placed on record as originating from Praeneste, thereby incorrectly raising the number of such mirrors on record. Finally, we should note that the original excavation site of some of the mirrors was never recorded, at least not to the level of precision that is nowadays considered the norm. This information should encourage us to interpret with caution any deductions we might make about commerce in the area – which are based on the origin of our hand mirrors. Generally, we can say that the number of mirrors remaining from Praenestine production lies somewhere between 185 and 225. However, this includes counts of non-engraved mirrors which are, admittedly, of importance for the general characteristics of the mirrors itself and their production, but do not have any specific value for our linguistic analysis. (Adam 1980, p. 14 - 15)

b) The “city” of Praeneste

The city of Praeneste itself justifiably receives its fame in modern times mostly for several exceptionally well-preserved artefacts, such as the Nile mosaic of Palestrina (National Archaeological Museum of Palestrina), the Ficoroni Cista (National Etruscan Museum of Villa Giulia, Rome) and the Praeneste fibula (Prehistorical Ethnographic Museum Luigi Pigorini, Rome). The city also occupies a most privileged position when considering the quality and quantity of remaining documentation in the form of inscriptions. More than 350 inscriptions on memorial stones provide information on the Praenestine society of the Republic period, presenting basic onomastic formulas (i.e. first name, gens, matrimonial alliances, etc.). Based on this information, Coarelli (1992, p. 253) estimates the population of

---

4 A lack of precise data about the context of the discovery is usually connected to common archaeological practices in the 18th and 19th centuries. Through major, collaborative projects like CSE and a generalized pursuit to apply chemical analyses on the mirrors, researchers are attempting to remedy these uncertainties; however, it might take a while before we can truly identify all forgeries. (De Puma, 2001)

5 The latter two, the Ficoroni Cista and the Praeneste Fibula, both know an extensive bibliography on their own linguistic significance. The fibula’s infamous history in itself exemplifies, once again, the importance of chemical analysis and a systematic upkeep of archaeological data.

Praeneste to have been around 15,000 inhabitants during the Republican time period, which is the period relevant to the subject discussed in the present thesis. It should be borne in mind that evaluating the degree of urbanization or the size of the population of cities or towns in the area and during that time is a particularly challenging task, as precise data on which estimations can be based are rare.7

**c) The religious and economic importance of Praeneste**

Despite its relatively small number of inhabitants – at least when compared to a city such as Rome during that period – the city of Praeneste was nevertheless of great importance from an economic and (more importantly), a religious point of view. Firstly, we can exemplify the economic importance of the city by citing what the International Dictionary of Historic Places (hereinafter referred to as IDoHP) of Southern Europe calls the “higher standard of living and finer appreciation of the arts” characteristic of the Praenestine inhabitants, in particular when compared to their Etruscan neighbours. (IDoHP 2013, 519) This desire to collect luxury and extravagant goods is already discernible in the Barberini and Bernardini tombs from the sixth and seventh century BCE onwards8, i.e. long before the time the mirrors themselves were produced. Most noteworthy to us should be the engraved faces influenced by Middle Eastern patterns decorating bowls and the miniature Greek statuettes adorning the top of bronze cists. Indeed, these influences provide proof of close and frequent commercial contacts between the early city of Praeneste and the East in the form of both Greek and Phoenician societies. The

---

7 Even in the work of Beloch (1886, p. 412) that, despite its early date, is still generally considered to be the most authoritative source regarding the demography of the city of Rome itself, the author does not venture to propose a concrete number. Instead, he provides a reasoned estimate for the Roman population during the reign of Sulla (end of the 2nd – beginning of the 1st century BCE) of approximately 400,000 inhabitants. We can reasonably assume that the Roman population must have been significantly smaller during, for example, the period of the first Punic War (3rd century BCE), which is closer to the time frame of the inscriptions of Praeneste in the Republican age. However, we can obviously not compare the urbanization process of the vastly expanding city of Rome to that of the city of Praeneste. However, this does not imply that Praeneste itself is not worthy of its title as “city”. K. J. Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-romischen Welt (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1886), 412.

8 The dictionary quotes the archaeologist Luisa Banti: “these [the luxury objects found in the tombs] were the personal belongings of individuals who loved being surrounded with art objects, people who wanted to enjoy the sight of beautiful, finely wrought objects in their afterlife.” (IDoHP 2013, 519)
IDoHP (loc. cit.) additionally mentions how foreign craftsmen were invited to establish local workshops and to instruct local artisans in the techniques of their original cultures. Because of this artistic production, the city stimulated economic activity and commerce through export, instead of remaining on the receiving end of transport from the East and the Greek South of Italy.

Secondly, when mentioning the religious importance of the city, it is my aim to refer in particular to the importance of the oracle of the goddess Fortuna Primigenia – deriving from the Greek Πρωτογενεία – the patron divinity of the city. The oracle itself, employing the casting of divine lots as a way to forecast the future, was situated in the temple of the goddess on top of the hill overlooking the city of Praeneste (where current Palestrina still remains), and its popularity stretched as far as the city of Rome during the Middle and Late Republic. The sanctuary of Fortuna is subject to some discussion regarding its chronology and age. Traditionally, the building of the monumental marble temple of Fortuna, as it was known until much later, is attributed to the Roman consul and dictator Lucius Cornelius Sulla.
(138 BCE – 78 BCE). However, Zevi convincingly argues, by referring to a passage by Cicero, that the chronology of the sanctuary must have predated Sulla’s time. The latter describes the different procedures of divination in *De Divinatione* (a dialogue between him and his brother Quintus) and briefly mentions the *sortes* employed in Praeneste. Cicero additionally praises the “*fani pulchritudo et vetustas Praenestinarum*” or the beauty and age of the Praenestine temple. Based on this information, Zevi maintains that, if the temple is already being commended for its antiquity (*vetustas*) during Cicero’s life, it is highly improbable that it was built during the life of Sulla. For, Cicero was born only thirty years after Sulla himself and lived during Sulla’s reign. (1979, p. 11-12) Although it is impossible to establish whether the temple itself had already been constructed during the exact time during which our mirrors were made, it can be reasonably assumed that the tradition of the oracle in Praeneste predated the construction of the marble sanctuary and that we can therefore suppose that it attracted numerous visitors from all across the area even in that time.

Consequently, we should take note that, during this period, many cultures and languages apart from Praenestine Latin came into contact with one another because of the abovementioned socio-economic exchanges. Hereby I would like to refer mostly to Etruscan and to Greek societies and additionally, but to a lesser extent, to other Italic societies in the area, resulting therefore in a necessity to explore in chapter three what we will be calling the multicultural or multilingual status of the city itself.

---

13 Zevi (1979, p. 11) deplores that the importance given to Giorgio Gullini’s work on Praeneste’s sanctuary in which the latter proposes the traditional chronology, has blocked a new evaluation for a long time, even though this was arguably necessary.

14 Cicero only devotes one paragraph to the casting of lots as he does not deem it a valuable way of divination. He states: “tota res est inventa fallaciis aut ad quaestum aut ad superstitionem aut ad errorem.” (Cic. Div. 2.85-86)
2) **Methodology**

a) **Research Question**

After briefly situating our study object in time and space in the introduction above, it is now fitting to provide an overview of the specific research question which I wish to propose in this thesis and the exact way in which we should proceed from this point forward. As hinted in the beginning of my introduction, my research question consists of *a focus on exploring the engravings on bronze hand mirrors of Praeneste from a linguistic perspective, while concentrating primarily on the different linguistic influences – originating from multilingualism in the area – to which the engraved theonyms have been submitted. The inscriptions themselves consist of theonyms or the proper names of divinities*\(^{15}\) – *in this case including heroes and other characters from traditional mythology – which demonstrate and clarify the scene depicted on the mirrors themselves.*

Apart from one unique case which consists of a short dialogue conducted by two anonymous, non-mythological characters, the discs do hardly contain any full sentences and are thus predominantly of etymological, phonological and orthographical interest. Therefore, even though we do possess one example of syntactic structure granted by the one dialogue, there is not enough evidence to draw any conclusions regarding syntax. This might be one of the reasons why the Praenestine mirrors and their inscriptions have not received the attention they deserve.

\(^{15}\) Even though the theonyms are proper names of divinities, they do not traditionally belong in onomastic research but rather in lexical research. As Bakkum states, “although they are onomastic elements in the strict sense of the word and are therefore primarily referential, theonyms refer to individual entities that are thought of as having an everlasting lifespan, and can therefore not be bestowed upon newborn members of the group while other dies.” Theonyms are part of a group’s cultural heritage and can be taken over by other by other groups or may even be translated. (Bakkum 2009, 202 – 205)
b) Historic Contextualization

It is highly regrettable that the Praenestine mirrors have not currently been subject to the same amount of in-depth research as, for example, some of Praenestine’s other epigraphical records. Apart from De Bellis’ two recent works on Praenestine mirrors and cists, most of the linguistic or epigraphic secondary literature on this subject specifically can hardly be considered up to date.\(^\text{16}\) Firstly the Archaic Etruscan mirrors in fact have received much more attention by scholars than the Praenestine mirrors; because of the fact that they belong to an older time frame and because many more are remaining to this date, they have been the object of many more monographies such as the Interpretatio Etruscae by Van Der Meer (1995). When the Praenestine mirrors are being researched in current days, they are usually considered and studied as a part of the corpus of the Etruscan mirrors, but rarely on their own. They are nevertheless incorporated smoothly into the CSE in which they are placed next to the Etruscan mirrors – though their original culture of provenance is signalled. I find it regrettable, however, that the authors prefer not to explore the possible distinctions between the two, thereby somewhat disregarding the existing differences both in iconography and in shape.\(^\text{17}\)

Apart from the reason mentioned above, it is also unfortunate that there is a lack of integration and exchange between the two different perspectives from which academics have approached the Praenestine mirrors and mirrors in general. For traditionally, two separate tendencies concurrently exist in academia on the subject of our proposed study object; the first selects as focal point the archaeological, historical and stylistic data accumulated on ancient mirrors, the

\(^\text{16}\) The most recent work on the subject is completed by De Bellis 2004 and De Bellis 2005; the earlier works I’m referring to are Mathies (1912), Lambrechts (1969) and Adam (1980).

\(^\text{17}\) Not only are there particular scenes and themes which are more common to Praenestine mirrors, e.g. scenes which depict groups of bathers, there is also a difference in shape. (for an example of the common bathing scene: CSE Cambridge, 1993, fig. 12) The mirrors from this particular area are, unlike mirrors originating from Etruria, distinctively pear-shaped in contrast to the more circular Etruscan mirrors.
history behind the area, and the artistry of the engraved images,\textsuperscript{18} whereas the second prefers to place emphasis on performing a linguistic analysis of the engravings itself and refers – regrettably – only obiter to the historical relations between the different communities at the time.\textsuperscript{19} The two tendencies usually refrain from intermingling with one another, although I strongly opine that both would benefit significantly from mutual support and collaboration. Indeed by looking at the linguistic side of the engravings and employing it as evidence, the former historic approach could explore further the everyday, religious experience of the people in Praeneste and could, by comparing the content of the engravings, employ them as an additional point of comparison regarding the cultural topos of the Etruscan mirrors. If the latter linguistic approach, on the other hand, incorporated more historical data concerning the extent of the commercial contact between several societies in the area, it could underpin and contextualize some of the linguistic statements made regarding bilingualism or multilingualism and the way in which it came into existence.

Therefore, as we aim to come to a deeper understanding of the etymology of the names on Praenestine mirrors, I would like to append this to my research question: namely that, although the main objective of this thesis consists of performing a linguistic analysis of the theonyms engraved on the mirrors - herein following the tendency of De Bellis e.a. -, I am convinced that a placing in the historic and stylistic context\textsuperscript{20} is imperative if one is to comprehend the subject thoroughly. So, before starting the linguistic analysis of the engravings itself, we need to start our discussion by exploring the concept of bilingualism, how we can apply this to the city of Praeneste and how the Praenestine speech\textsuperscript{21} adapted to

\textsuperscript{18} Examples of this first tendency which study the mirrors from a more historic point of view are: Adam (loc.cit.) and Van Der Meer (1995).

\textsuperscript{19} Examples of this tendency, linked to this particular practice are as mentioned above: De Bellis (2004), De Bellis (2005), Mathies (1912), Lambrechts (1969).

\textsuperscript{20} Hereby also intend to look briefly at the Etruscan mirrors as well; however, I will refrain from going into a deeper analysis of the latter. Indeed, we will only focus on the elements that are pertinent to our chosen subject.

\textsuperscript{21} In this context and the rest of my thesis, I venture to employ the word Praenestine speech and the regional standardized language of Praeneste instead of some other, more problematic and ambiguous concepts and terms,
the influences it underwent through multilingual, or better yet multicultural, contacts. In order to properly discuss this concept we will need to dwell on non-linguistic grounds first, i.e. by looking at how historic factors come into play and, subsequently, we will continue by discussing the different languages with which Praenestine Latin has come into contact from a more linguistic perspective.

c) A Linguistic Analysis

Following our discussion on bilingualism in Praeneste, we will start the linguistic discussion of the actual engravings on the mirrors. Taking into account the historical context in which the mirrors were created, we will perform a close examination of all the theonyms on the mirrors themselves. Firstly, it will be necessary to present some general remarks regarding some peculiarities that some mirrors share, such as the presence of cases and incongruities between engraved image and theonyms, and regarding chronology.

Subsequently, we will discuss in detail all the forms of theonyms presented on the mirrors. We will deal with the sixteen Praenestine mirrors that are engraved with Latin inscriptions in the order of their siglum in the CIL. We will consider whether these are of Latin/Italic, Greek or Etruscan origin, and will argument the derivation of these words as appropriate. In addition to considering the theonyms on the mirrors, we will look at any additional word or form that might be displayed on the mirrors to see whether these can inform us about the historical such as dialect and accent. In the case of Praeneste, Adams (2007) does note in his introduction on the terms “dialect” and “accent” that “ancient commentators do indeed attach geographical names to regional practices in Latin” and adds the example of Praenestine Latin. (11) However, if we look at the time period in which the mirrors, in particular, can be situated, we observe that Rome, even though we are already in the age of the Roman republic, has certainly not reached the apex of its dominance in the region and that, if we follow Adams’ reasoning, we must therefore proceed with caution to refer to Praenestine Latin as a dialect. Indeed, the existence of a dialect implies the concurrent presence of a standard language from which the dialect is derived. However, I would like to nuance the observations Adams makes in his introduction. Although I agree that when employing the term “dialect”, we suppose the existence of a standard language, we do traditionally utilize the same term to refer to Archaic Greek speech variants, e.g. the Ionic and Doric dialects, which do not derive from a Greek standardized speech either.
context. If applicable, we will mention any complexity or irregularity regarding iconography or similarity between images on the Praenestine mirrors and Etruscan mirrors.

Finally, we will conclude our linguistic discussion by summarizing the data we obtained from the mirrors, by looking at the frequency of words that are of Etruscan or of direct Greek influence which, therefore, should enable us to evaluate the extent to which Etruscan and Greek have directly influenced the Praenestine language scene.
3) Language Contact and Multilingualism in Praeneste

a) The Concept of Bilingualism/Multilingualism

As I mentioned in the section on research design, I will be performing a linguistic analysis of the theonyms on the bronze hand mirrors from Praeneste, i.e. both originally Latin and Greek names of deities. Already in the introduction, we saw that we can consider Praeneste to be an international market attracting different cultures and their corresponding languages. Therefore, we can justifiably deem it to be a multicultural or multilingual city. However, we cannot and should not a priori assume that the terms “multicultural” and “multilingual”, which I will employ frequently in my proposed linguistic analysis, are free from ambiguity. Even though one can arguably consider bilingualism to be of the greatest interest to linguists, anthropologists, historians and literature students alike, and though the subject is therefore often the object of extensive research, there is not one unique or conventional way to approach the concept. In the introduction to his book on bilingualism, Adams (2003) firstly provides a definition for the concept borrowed from Weinreich and then continues to analyse this definition while adding further nuances to it. The definition of Weinreich states that bilingualism is “the practice of alternatively using two languages,” (Adams 2003, 3) with the person using these two languages being bilingual. Adams notes that it stands without any doubt that there are different types of bilingualism on different levels, ranging from mere recognition of vocabulary and syntax to an almost native fluency. In his book however, Adams has opted to adopt an ‘all-embracing’ definition of bilingualism, thereby including all speakers who can perform, however imperfectly, in a second language. (Adams 2003, p. 1 – 9)

Now we turn to the interpretation of the term bilingualism or multilingualism which we will be employing as we apply it to the Praenestine language scene. Indeed, it is important to note
that the bilingualism in the Praenestine environment, or at least as expressed on the mirrors, has come into existence in a different manner from that in which, for example, Greek developed as a common second tongue for Roman citizens and the elite from the Middle Republic or Hellenistic Age onwards. Indeed, in their introduction Adams and Swain deem it to be highly likely that, in the case of Greek, ‘the phenomenon of code-switching\(^{22}\) [is] a sign of their [the Romans’] claim to the cultural-political authority of the classical Greeks.’ (Adams 2002, p. 16) However, this can be discerned mainly in a literary context, the latter being far removed from the context of the non-literary sources we will be discussing, namely the bronze mirrors. In the city in question, people must have undeniably had a varying level of knowledge of other languages besides Praenestine Latin; these levels might, as Adams stated (loc. cit.), range from approximating fluency to the recognition of basic structures and vocabulary. However, and as we will discuss more thoroughly in the following part, this was primarily in order to accommodate contacts with the merchants, immigrant craftsmen, and travellers – we could consider them to be pilgrims in more modern terms – travelling in particular to the temple or oracle of Fortuna as we mentioned above. In this treatise, I will not elaborate on a potential literary or political bilingualism in the city, as these aspects are not reflected properly in the mirrors I will be discussing. Therefore, when I will employ the notion of bilingualism from this point onwards in my thesis, I intend a more restricted meaning of the concept, i.e. only in terms of an economic and religious multilingualism.

---

\(^{22}\) Code-switching or the practice of alternating between two or more languages or varieties of language in conversation. (Oxford Dictionaries online: http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/code-switching; consulted on 23/03/2016.)
b) The Origin of Multilingual Influence on the Praenestine Inscriptions

a. Approaching History from a Linguistic Perspective

Now, it is as a matter of fact impossible to conduct a substantiated investigation resulting in what should be a reasoned conclusion, without looking at the historical context of the city itself and the engraving and use of these bronze mirrors as cultural *topos* during that time. Additionally, if we adopt the assumption that the theonyms on the mirrors demonstrate that languages other than Latin have influenced the local speech variant of the region, then I argue that it is not sufficient to merely recognize this fact. In order to have a more thorough understanding of our subject, we should consider the ways in which these ‘non-linguistic issues, such as political, social, cultural, and religious factors’ (Taylor 2002, 299-300) were introduced to the linguistic, multicultural scene of Praeneste. Moreover, this is certainly important since the bilingual performance can be identified almost solely as part of a religious and commercial context and can, consequently, not irrefutably establish an author’s or an artist’s bilingual capacities (cf. infra). However, it can provide us with a clearer view about the extent to which influences regarding religion or cult between separate cultures are also reflected in language.

In his article on bilingual inscriptions of Italic provenance – though focusing on a different period, i.e. contact between Latin and Greek in Italy as transmitted by Christian and Jewish communities from the third to the sixth century AD – Leiwo (Leiwo 2002, 168 - 194) distinguishes four specific concerns the study of bilingualism should consider, when only a textual bases provides support for an inquiry. The four concerns or problems which influence

---

23 I have chosen to employ and adopt the division proposed by Leiwo in particular for two reasons which are closely linked together. Firstly, even though the article examines inscriptions from a different period and with a different subject (though, also from Italic origin), it discusses its subject from a similar perspective. Namely, it considers bilingual contacts and their effects on – Leiwo’s case bilingual – epigraphy. Secondly, I aim to remind the reader of the close relation between the historical information provided and the linguistic intentions of my thesis. In order to achieve this, I opted to refer to linguist theory and utilize a division linked to these theories rather than follow a more traditional and historic approach.
the choice of language in inscriptions and which, in the case of our mirrors, might also cause possible borrowings and interferences between different languages to occur consist of the following: firstly, the genre of the inscription and the specific language this type of inscription traditionally requires; secondly and thirdly, the material context in which the inscription has been established, namely the language preference of the artist or stonecutter and the provenance of the material itself - in our case the bronze for the hand mirrors, versus the marble for the inscriptions treated by Leiwo (loc. cit.); and, finally, the consideration regarding whether ritual words or aphorisms appear that might dictate a certain language or that might emerge as fixed terms and concepts. In the next paragraphs, I will proceed to briefly discuss how these four concerns or problems as mentioned above apply specifically to the context of Praeneste. I will cluster these four concerns into two separate groups, as follows: the first group I recognize is comprised of the second and third concern that both deal with the material and extra-textual reality, and the other group refers to the first and fourth issue which have a reference to the context of the text itself in common. Further on I will shortly elaborate why I have opted for this grouping.

b. Extra-textual concerns

Starting with the first group, I have chosen to link the second and third concern, namely the language preference of the artist or engraver and the provenance of the bronze for the hand mirrors. I argue that these two concerns are particularly related as both refer to the context in which the bronze mirror was created. These two concerns are in contrast to the other two concerns, which deal exclusively with the influence other cultures and languages might have had on the content of the inscription itself (cf. infra). In the previous part, I have called the focus of the former two concerns the extra-textual reality, as it does not interfere with the content of the engraved images or the text but with the mirror as a historical artefact. In this part, I would like to ponder one specific question that can provide an adequate reply for at
least one of the two concerns Leiwo (loc. cit.) discussed: namely “did any formal contact\textsuperscript{24} resulting in mutual exchange of commodities – such as bronze mirrors, cists, ceramics, etc. –, and, more importantly, artists and engravers expediting the production of bronze mirrors specifically, take place between Praeneste and its neighbouring societies and societies across the Mediterranean?”

Indeed, this close threefold contact between Etruscan, Praenestine and Greek merchants is necessary if we will later argue that these particular languages have influenced each other greatly, linguistically speaking. On the one hand, we already noted in the introduction on the city of Praeneste above that merchants not only frequented the city in order to trade in luxury goods, but that craftsmen from the East migrated to the area and moved there permanently in order to start new workshops as well. (supra.) Therefore, Greek and Middle Eastern culture and style most certainly left a decisive footprint on the art and culture of the Praenestine area. When considering Etruscan artists and engravers on the other hand, we can look at evidence from different secondary sources. Even though De Bellis refers to Schippke in that “già Schippke aveva affermato che gli etruschi favecano i loro specchi per gli etruschi e i prenestini per i prenestini”, (De Bellis 2005, 15) we might consider this statement to be true only after a particular point in the history of Praeneste. Overall, we can find significant evidence that suggests the opposite, namely that import and export between the two was fairly common. The evidence we possess on this subject involves a closer look at the archaeology and stylistic characteristics of both Praenestine and Etruscan mirrors. This we can briefly summarize thus: firstly, Adam states that it is safe to distinguish a group of around 25

\textsuperscript{24} When formulating my question, I strongly emphasized the necessity of a formal character of contact between Praeneste, the Doric Greeks in Magna Graecia and the Etruscans in Etruria. With the term formal I intend that I aim to look for proof of systematic contacts, such as mutual export and import over a certain period of time, and not ephemeral or random contact which might inevitably lead to the presence of a very small number of Etruscan or Greek items in Praeneste and vice versa.
Etruscan mirrors found in the Praenestine necropolis which contradicts Schippke’s statement that Etruscan artists only made their mirrors for Etruscans. More archaeological finds of Praenestine bronze items in other Italic settlements in Latium act as supporting evidence for the extensive commerce between Praeneste and the surrounding areas.

Secondly, regarding style, we can observe that a laurel-branch motif, originating from Praenestine production centres, recurs in some mirrors of the Tarquinia region. This duplication of style indicates close connections between the production centres of these two particular areas.

If Leiwo’s argument (loc. cit.) is valid when he states that the origin of the artist – in this case the engraver of the mirror –, has any repercussion on linguistic influences, we may certainly argue that the extra-textual context of the Praenestine mirrors would facilitate Etruscan and Greek linguistic influence on the Praenestine dialect and its inscriptions. Herewith we have shortly discussed the extra-textual concerns or questions that affect the context of our Praenestine mirrors in particular.

---

25 “Il faut ajouter à cette série [the series of Praenestine mirrors] les 25 à 35 miroirs de fabrication étrusque retrouvés dans la nécropole de Préneste, qui aident à préciser la datation des objets prénestins proprement dits: sont archaïques et datables du Ve siècle.” And “il s’agit de notre n° 1, qui est manifestement l’oeuvre d’un Etrusque, mais peut avoir été fabriqué à Préneste même.” (Adam)

26 We might also imagine that these mirrors were either property of an Etruscan family who immigrated or that it was given as a gift to a befriended Praenestine family. All suggestions point towards close ties between Praeneste and Etruria and equally contradict Shippke’s statement.

27 “La realtà degli scambi col mondo italico, presupposti dai bronzi di provenienza prenestina (e ceretana), e confermata, restando nell’ornato muliebre, dalle numerose fubule, sia di bronzo sia di ferro, rinvenute in altre località del Lazio non troppo lontane da Palestrina, non in tombe ma in depositi votivi di santuari, dove e ovviamente più facile rinvenire traccia della frequentazione di stranieri, in questo caso a donne: ad Anagni – S. Cecilia, a Valvisciolo e a Satiricum.” (Giovanni Colonna in Baglioni 1992)

28 A number of mirrors from the Tarquinia region show an encircling band of laurel branches; this motif frequently occurs on pear-shaped Praenestine mirrors. Moreover, Tarquinian and Praenestine mirrors sometimes show the same compositions and mythological themes. Therefore, there must have been close contacts between the workshops of the Etruscan and the Latin city. Praeneste was probably the production centre which introduced laurel mirrors at about 380 BC. Until the city finally fell into the hands of Rome in 338 B.C. After that date Latin, instead of Etruscan, inscriptions appear on Praenestine mirrors. (Van Der Meer)

29 Leiwo’s treatment of the provenance of the marble used for the inscriptions he discusses, is closely related to any potential traces of writing on the marble in the language of the area from where the marble originated. This does not apply to our mirrors. Even though a full description of the composition and origin of the bronze used for the mirrors would take us too far, we can refer to a full discussion on bronzes in Craddock (1978).
c. Textual concerns

For the second cluster of four concerns that Leiwo distinguishes, I have opted to include both the first and fourth concern. Namely, I will briefly treat the genre of language, namely the type of language the mirrors might require and the fixed terminology they use. We may group these two concerns together, as both involve the cultural topos of bronze hand mirrors and the inscriptions that are conventionally engraved onto them.

We find bronze mirrors in the Mediterranean from the 2nd millennium BCE onwards, specifically in Egypt. In this context, mirrors were used for both religious and everyday use and were essential objects found in most Egyptian tombs. The custom of utilizing these mirrors in different ways was then spread throughout the Mediterranean Sea: “By 1000 BCE, humans were making mirrors all over the world. Traders such as the Phoenicians and Etruscans sailed the waters of the Mediterranean and beyond, … Many cultures modified the traditional bronze Egyptian mirror to create their own versions.” (Pendergast 2003, 1-29) In this way, the cultural topos was imported into Campania, the Italic peninsula and Etruria. However, the Etruscan mirrors can be distinguished from these other mirrors in one key aspect, namely their design, which included both an engraving of a mythological scene and the epigraphic evidence. This epigraphy found on a number of mirrors documents the Etruscan names of the characters appearing in the narratives, but also it also occasionally

---

30 “Generally made of copper until around 2100 BCE, then of bronze – and sometimes of gold or silver – Egyptian mirrors were both secular and religious objects. They were often used for such familiar purposes as applying makeup” Mirrors were also closely related to mythology and Egyptian gods such as Hathor who is portrayed as a cow-headed goddess with a mirror being enclosed by her horns. (Pendergast 2003, 4)
31 “Mirrors were an essential element in tombs. … They Egyptians may have believed that the mirror helped preserve the Ka, the double discovered in the mirror’s depths, and allowed it to make a transition to another life.” (Pendergast 2003, Loc. Cit.)
32 Regarding types of Greek mirrors, we can say that one particular type that is often recurrent is the Caryatid Mirror, i.e. a bronze mirror disc supported by a female figure – possibly goddesses, such as Aphrodite, temple attendants and musicians. For more information on these Greek mirrors: see O. Keene Congdon 1981.
33 “Not only do these designs make the Etruscans’ mirrors quite different from those produced by other Mediterranean civilizations, especially the Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans, but they also supplement our understanding of Etruscan culture and taste.” (Pendergast 2003, Loc. Cit.)
identifies the mirror’s engraver and the individual who owned, used, or dedicated it. (Carpino 2003, 3-9)

If we consider how different Etruscan mirrors are from other Mediterranean mirrors and if we consider the similarities in design and epigraphic evidence, i.e. similar mythological scenes and theonyms34, this explains their inclusion with the CSE. Now, if we return to the question: what language do we expect on these mirrors when comparing them with inscriptions on other mirrors, we can say that even though the mythological content is borrowed from the Greek culture, the way of utilizing this content and the language of the inscriptions is certainly Etruscan. Therefore, regarding the textual elements on the mirrors, if we follow Leiwo we might conclude that the concerns we might have regarding the bilingualism of texts are fulfilled for Etruscan and – only to a lesser extent – Greek.

---

34 The epigraphic evidence on Praenestine mirrors sometimes includes the names of the mirror’s engraver and its owner as well, but much less often than e.g. on Praenestine cists.
c) **Languages involved in the Multilingualism of Praeneste**

The multilingualism which can be found in Praeneste consists of the ability of certain people to be able to utilize several different languages in a commercial – both with societies located in- and outside of the Italic peninsula – and religious context. The different languages we may discern are Etruscan, Greek, and finally, an amalgam of Archaic Italic languages, such as Oscan, and Archaic Latin – including but certainly not limited to its Praenestine speech variant, namely the tongue in which the engravings on the hand mirrors are manufactured.

Now, we should briefly take a closer look at these abovementioned languages and add further nuances – where necessary – as not all of these languages are entirely free from ambiguity. Indeed the way in which we can understand the concept of these languages, certainly the Greek of the Archaic period we are discussing, is certainly not straightforward. Finally, as we will be focusing solely on theonyms in our next paragraphs, it will be advantageous to our argument to look briefly at the pantheon the different languages and cultures possess, and, in the cases of Etruscan and Italic, to which linguistic influences they were subjected.

**a. Etruscan**

When we attempt to fully discuss and comprehend the aspects of bilingualism on the Praenestine language scene, the first language we must take into account is most definitely Etruscan. Commercial contacts between the two cultures, i.e. Praeneste and Etruria were facilitated by their spatial proximity. Colonna gives one possible first example of Etruscan linguistic influence on Praenestine Latin which can be found in an early version of the Praenestine alphabet in which F stands for /w/. This feature is part of “scrittura etruscheggianti” borrowed by Praenestine writers in a time when “Etruschizzazione” was at
its apex. Additionally, as mentioned before, the mirrors of Praeneste have often been studied as part of the CSE, and we also established the fact that many artists and engravers must have travelled between the two areas, thereby incorporating the Etruscan language and culture into their fabrications.

Map of Etruria, Rome and Praeneste (Palestrina); find-spots and frequency of mirrors with epigraphic-mythological representations (Van Der Meer 1995, 10)

Even though the Etruscan language has been subject to numerous linguistic studies, we are still unable to understand the language to its fullest extent. There are three main reasons for

---

35 “Se così stanno realmente le cose, la testimonianza varroniana su uno stadio primitivo dell’alfabeto latino in cui F notava /w/ ne esce notevolmente ridimensionata. Il riferimento sarebbe a scritture etrusceggianti, quali tra VII e VI secolo si sono effettivamente avute nel Lazio, come provano vetusia e karkavaios. E non è un caso che queste iscrizioni vengano rispettivamente dalla Praeneste dell’orientalizzante antico e dalla Roma dell’età tardo-arcaica: ossia dalle città più etruschizzate del Lazio e nel momento storico in cui, rispettivamente, l’etruschizzazione ha toccato il suo apice.” (Giovanni Colonna in Baglioni 1992)

36 Both in the part dedicated to the Etruscan language and epigraphy by Benelli in the introduction to Etruscology (Bartoloni 2012, 419-446) as well as in the monography on Etruscology (Pallottino 2006, 405-505) the authors refer to the fact that the Etruscan language has probably been one of the most researched aspects of the Etruscan culture. The authors additionally remind the reader of the fact that, besides official academic research, there has been a parallel tradition – this tradition can almost be considered pseudo-scientific, even though some of its members are well-educated linguists – which has attempted to clarify the mystery which we can consider the Etruscan language. Benelli writes that “e, se a volte alcuni funambolismi o ingenuità ad opera di dilettanti possano far sorridere, colpisce il numero non trascurabile di studiosi dalla solida preparazione glottologica che si avventurano in percorsi interpretative che non superano il livello di puro e semplice gioco di parole”. (Bartoloni 2012, 419) Apart from these authors, two other main authors should be mentioned who have worked extensively on the Etruscan language: Christofani 1973 and Rix 1991.
this. Firstly, even though Etruscan literature must have existed at the time the Etruscan culture was at its apex, no true literary sources remains for us to study at the present time. It is accepted that all literature was already lost by the time Latin became the lingua franca in the Italic peninsula. The second motive or reason why the Etruscan language remains not fully understood even today is namely: that there are few to no bilingual texts in existence. (By bilingual texts, I mean Etruscan texts with parallel translations in Latin or another language of which we do have a complete understanding, or glossaries.) Thirdly and finally, according to Pallotino, the nature of the language itself inhibits a clear understanding of the many Etruscan texts that we do have. As a matter of fact, it is stated by the same author that the language cannot be allocated to any linguistic group known to scholars (for a discussion of all three motives: see Pallotino 2006, 407) However, Eichner (2012, 9-32), Rix (1998), and Schumacher (2004) argue that Etruscan would belong to a Tyrrenian language family, also consisting of Lemnian and Rhaetic.

However, apart from the uncertainties and doubts we still entertain regarding the language, both semantically and syntactically, we should not assume that the large amount of research performed in the past was not successful in teaching us anything substantial about the language either - unlike what is usually presumed about the language. We are capable of carrying out relevant studies on Etruscan itself and the influence of Etruscan on other languages, as we possess a large number of inscriptions on funerary and religious matters which can often be well understood because of their simplicity and the repetition of the

37 One of the few examples of such a source consists of the so-called “Pyrgi tablets”. In this document we can have at our disposal three tablets – or better yet, thin golden plates –, namely, one tablet with a text in Phoenician and two other tablets that contain an Etruscan version of the text. Even though the Etruscan version is longer than the Phoenician text and doesn’t provide a full and literal translation, both texts recall the same event, namely the dedication of a gift, probably by the king of Caere, to one particular goddess who is sometimes identified as Astarte. This document has helped clarify an important amount of vocabulary and has provided us with a significant example of Etruscan syntax and morphology. (Bonfante 2009, 12-13)

38 We can refer to a citation by Dionysus of Halicarnassus who, in his Antiquitates Romanæ, stated that Etruscan is a language which is: “… οὐδὲν ἄλλῳ γένει … ὀμόγλωσσον” (Dios. Hal. I, 30)
vocabulary.\textsuperscript{39} Firstly, from all research already performed in the past, one chronological and morphological development should be borne in mind, as it can be expected that chronology will be of great importance to interpret the results of the present study. The Etruscan language has undergone one far-reaching shift that subdivides its linguistic history into two periods, i.e. the Archaic Phase (7th – 5th century BCE) and the Recent Phase (4\textsuperscript{th} – 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE). This shift essentially consists of a syncope of a great number of – usually weak\textsuperscript{40} – vowels, resulting in assimilation between the residual consonants and a generalized monophthongization.\textsuperscript{41} If we are able to find traces of theonyms of Etruscan origin that did not, at the time of production of the mirrors, undergo a syncope of vowels when borrowed into the Praenestine speech, we may safely presume that this represents a more antique or archaicised version of the name.

Additionally, the Etruscan language has borrowed a significant number of religious and mythology-related words, such as theonyms, from the Greek language and can therefore be an important source of information which can assist us to understand how Greek language elements – on which we will focus in the subsequent part – has been assimilated into Etruscan.\textsuperscript{42} As we will be focusing on the engraved theonyms on the Praenestine bronze hand

\textsuperscript{39} Therefore, when it comes to texts or inscriptions of a funerary and religious nature – and the mirrors can most definitely be considered to be of religious nature as well – we can certainly draw some reasoned conclusions on the subject.

\textsuperscript{40} “La neutralizzazione delle opposizioni può essere avvenuta solo nel caso che la sillaba interna fosse atona e che quindi la vocale indistinta del V sec. Residuo di una più antica vocale distinta, si sia ridotta a zero nella pronuncia.” (Christofani 1973, 42-43)

\textsuperscript{41} One example of syncope with subsequent assimilation would be the Archaic name Raquven\v{u} which develops into Ravn\v{u} and eventually into Ran\v{u}. (Bartoloni 2012, 427)

\textsuperscript{42} The Etruscan and Greek languages and cultures have demonstrably been in close contact with one another. Apart from the borrowing in vocabulary, the Etruscans have adopted the Greek alphabet, because of which the Etruscan version of the alphabet allows us to transliterate Etruscan texts. The alphabet has, obviously, clear affinities with the Latin alphabet as well. It is very far removed from other, more Eastern alphabets such as cuneiform and hieroglyphs, even though close relations existed between the Etruscans and these Eastern cultures as well. (Pallotino 2006, 406) Also interesting is the fact that there are traces of the Etruscan language in Greece itself. Indeed, on the island of Lemnos we can find a stele containing an epigraphic inscription in a language close to Etruscan. (Christides 2005, 171-172) For more information on the Etruscan stele of Lemnos, see: Agostiniani, de Simone 2011 and de Simone 1996.
mirrors, I will briefly pause to illustrate the different ways in which the names of Greek gods and heroes have been transferred and transformed into the Etruscan language and culture.\(^{43}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etruscan</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tinia</td>
<td>Zeus</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turan</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
<td>Venus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>Hera</td>
<td>Iuno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menerva &gt; Menrva</td>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethuns</td>
<td>Poseidon</td>
<td>Neptunus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artumes or Aritimi</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>Diana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplu</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herekele &gt; Hercle</td>
<td>Herakles</td>
<td>Hercules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achile &gt; Achle</td>
<td>Achilleus</td>
<td>Achilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplace</td>
<td>Asklepios</td>
<td>Aesculapius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phersipnei</td>
<td>Persephone</td>
<td>Proserpina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative table: Etruscan Gods and their Classical Greek and Latin antecedents\(^{44}\)

The comparative table above shows examples of the three different ways in which Etruscan has converted names of Greek gods and heroes into their own language. In the final column, the Classical Latin names of the gods and heroes were added in order that one may clearly discern that the Etruscan pantheon – except for three cases, namely Jupiter, Aphrodite, and Diana – is similar and related to the traditional pantheon of Classical Latin religion. This can only be expected as both the Etruscan and Latin religion are, generally speaking, either derivative of Greek tradition or stems from the same local Italic myth.

\(^{43}\) “Questa distribuzione dei teonimi non può stupire, quando si pensi all’importanza che l’acculturazione di segno greco ha avuto sulla società etrusca a partire dal pieno VIII secolo a.C. Come si spiega che una cultura che ha avuto tanta influenza nei più diversi campi delle attività, come quella ellenica, non ne abbia avuto praticamente alcuna in quello dei nomi degli dei?” (Bartoloni 2012, 401)

As I mentioned, there are three different ways in which the Etruscan theonyms came into their existence linguistically, often evolving from an earlier Greek tradition.

A) We can clearly discern the process of what is conventionally called mythological syncretism in the first two examples, which consists of Olympic Zeus or Etruscan Tinia, and the Olympic Aphrodite and Etruscan Turan. Syncretism is the process of identifying one god to be the equal of a divinity from a different origin. The Etruscan names of both gods are of a purely Etruscan origin;\(^\text{45}\) however, the way in which their characters, functions, and mythology are perceived by the Etruscans is clearly influenced by Greek tradition. Even though a certain original and Etruscan core remains,\(^\text{46}\) the Etruscan god Tinia and the Olympic Zeus are predominantly considered to be the same character and are presented in the same way visually.\(^\text{47}\)

B) The following three examples that I have chosen to employ demonstrate the second way in which theonyms and the characters of gods transformed from Greek mythology into an Italic setting. These examples, just as in the case of Zeus and Tinia in the previous paragraph, have undergone a similar process of syncretism or equalization between the Etruscan divinity and their Greek antecedent. Therefore, their interpretation and mythological backstory find an origin in Classical Greek mythology.\(^\text{48}\) However, the theonyms themselves are of a clear Italic

---

\(^{45}\) The fact that the origin of the theonyms themselves is solely Etruscan also explains the remarkable discrepancy between the Etruscan and the Classic Latin name. The speakers of Latin apparently prefer the Italic name and aren’t influenced by the names of Etruscan gods.

\(^{46}\) For a discussion on the remaining Etruscan core of Tinia or Zeus in particular, see Simon 2009, 45.

\(^{47}\) “L’iconografia del dio non si distingue in nulla da quella del greco Zeus: il dio compare di solito come un personaggio di età matura, d’aspetto solenne e paterno, regalmente vestito e sempre accompagnato dalla raffigurazione della sua arma specifica, ossia del fulmine. Frequentissima è anche, a partire dall’età tardo-classica, la sua imagine imberbe, una caratteristica che lo accomuna ad altre immagini divine di solito raffigurate in età arcaica barbate, come Fufluns [i.e. Dionysos].” Bartoloni 2012, 405.

\(^{48}\) In her review, Stevens refers to the difficulty in methodology regarding the question: “when is a mythological representation really Etruscan?” She mentions how in core scenes from Greek myths, characters can be supplemented by what we might consider originally Etruscan gods: in the Birth of Menerva, she is flanked by two Etruscan birth goddesses or martial gods. (Stevens 2009, 347) So, the stories and the mythological background can be fully or only partially adopted by the Etruscan culture.
origin instead of being of Etruscan descent. In these cases – such as Menerva vs. Minerva49, Nethuns vs. Neptunus – the names of the divinities correspond in Latin and Etruscan.50 Of course we should not ignore taking into account the idiosyncratic morphological rules of both languages. Thus, both the first and second group of originally Etruscan or Italic examples I have given above can be considered to be a type of Italic “translation”51 of the Greek mythological and traditional conception of the god in question.

C) The final six examples that I have chosen to add to the comparative table above demonstrate the third way in which the names for Etruscan gods were borrowed directly from their Greek antecedents. The examples again can be subdivided into two noticeably separate groups: namely the first three which consist of names of proper divinities, and the latter three which can be considered heroes or – at least in the case of Persephone – non-traditional Olympic deities. On the one hand, the first three examples, namely Apollo, Artemis and Herakles, are virtually the only existing cases of clear-cut import divinities. Especially the case of Artemis is quite interesting and complex, as her Latin counterpart cannot possibly be traced back linguistically to the same origin. Most researchers argue that she is clearly imported often mentioning the engraved stone anchor which the merchant Sostratus from Samos dedicated to both Aplu and Artumes in the Temple to Apollo at Gravisca. (Nielsen and Rathje 2009, 263)52 On the other hand, the latter three examples refer to heroes and non-

49 Some scholars have suggested that the name for the goddess Minerva was not ofItalic origin, but, as in the first two examples, of Etruscan origin. I follow Rix who argues that the theonym is from Italic origin: Menerua. (Rix 1981, 111)
50 This correspondence between the Latin and Etruscan theonyms has caused scholars to suppose that the Etruscans did not adopt the Greek theonym directly. Instead, it was argued that Iuni, for example, was borrowed from the Latin Iuno. Linguistic research has invalidated this point. (Simon 2009, 45)
51 I use the term translation loosely in this context. Indeed, a perfect translation would suppose that the cultural background and tradition would utterly coincide. However, as myths are transformed into different cultures one can reasonably expect different interpretations to occur, therefore making seamless overlap highly improbable and nearly impossible. Moreover, we have to keep in mind that the original Etruscan deities, i.e. before the process of syncretism, were sometimes very different from the Greek antecedents with whom they became associated later on. (Stevens 2009, 347) Therefore, we can reasonably assume that some of these dissimilarities are still noticeable after syncretization.
52 Nielsen and Rathje (loc.cit.) additionally mention that Ingrid Krauskopf disproves of this explanation and that she instead is of the opinion that “there was no previous goddess in Etruria whose position could have been taken
traditional Olympic deities. These have been imported directly from the Greek and generally correspond with the Classical Latin names as well. We can explain the fact that the borrowing is so obvious and flagrant in these cases by referring to the fact that these heroes are not the object of significant and popular cult practices in Etruria, but their presence on Etruscan mirrors and vases can be explained by their importance in traditional Greek mythology. (Nielsen and Rathje loc.cit.) As we saw in the first two ways of how Greek influenced Etruscan theonyms, the mythology itself is usually almost integrally imported from Greek, and thus the act of simultaneously borrowing the theonym can easily be accepted. Therefore, when we will be looking at the Praenestine mirrors themselves, we may expect that the names of heroes and non-traditional Olympic deities and heroes will be closer to their original Greek form, unless a regional cult that can be linked to that of the Greek hero in question existed in the Praenestine area.

Finally, it is relevant to append one single reflection regarding the two different diachronic attestations of some of the Etruscan theonyms which we can find indicated in our sources – namely as displayed in the cases of Menerva > Menrva, Achile > Achle, and Herekele > Hercle in the first column. The difference between the two attestations usually consists of a development for which we can refer back to our first remark on the information we do possess about the Etruscan language. By this I mean to refer to the fact that, at a certain point in time, probably around the 5th Century BCE, Etruscan vocabulary tended to be subject to syncope, i.e. the loss of internal, usually weak vowels. This explains the diachronic loss of internal [i] and [e] that can be seen in respectively Achile and Menerva.

by Apollo’s sister.” Therefore, no syncretism as we explained in the first case, could have taken place. However, she does not take into account that Classical Latin did find a goddess whose place Artemis could have adopted, namely Diana. If her argument was correct, either Classical Latin would have assumed Artemis as theonym as well – this is what happened in the case of Apollo, or Etruscan could have followed its second option, i.e. employ Diana as they did with Menerva or Nethuns.
The influences of the Greek language on Etruscan bring us to the point where we must now consider the Greek element in the Praenestine multilingual language scene. It will be interesting to investigate later whether and if one Ancient Greek dialect influenced the theonyms in the Praenestine speech variant directly or whether they were affected by the Greek dialects indirectly. By this I mean that one could expect Greek to have influenced Praeneste’s speech in two ways: either through direct contacts with the Doric dialect of the South of Italy, or through the Greeks contacts with the Etruscans which in turn influenced the language variant of Praeneste. Additionally, we must disambiguate the concept of “Greek” language – namely which variant of Greek – that is employed in this thesis.

b. Greek

While discussing what we know about the Etruscan language and the pantheon it possesses, we already acknowledged that Greek had a far-reaching impact on Etruscan culture both linguistically and culturally, i.e. regarding its mythology. This far-reaching nature of Greek influence should not surprise us at all.

On the one hand, in the Greek-speaking world traces of bilingualism are rare and exceptional. Rochette (2010, 282) mentions a long list of Ancient Greek authors from the fifth century BCE onward, such as Herodotus, Plato and Sophocles, who all recognize a conventional distinction between Greek and the language of the “barbarians” without further specification.53 As other languages were dismissed as being what Sophocles calls “the mere chirping of birds” (Soph. Trach. 1060), the Greek world remains primarily monoglot – certainly until the Hellenistic Age. Rochette (loc.cit.) finally mentions that “Great Greek travellers such as Herodotus and Hecataeus do not feel the need to learn the languages of the

53 The author mentions how Plato “takes issue with a classification that divides humanity into two parts, τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, the Greeks, on the one hand, and on the other all the other peoples that are referred to with a single name, “barbarians,” even though they do not all speak the same language (ἀσύμφωνοι).” (Rochette 2010, 282)
peoples they visit, since they are convinced that Greek is universally understood and that they
will always find people who are capable of translating the texts in which they are
interested.”54 (Rochette 2010, 282)

On the other hand, we conventionally place the start of the process of Hellenization in Rome
and its surrounding areas around the time of the beginning of the Punic Wars, i.e. from the
third century BCE onwards, generally in the period during which our mirrors are thought to
have been created. (Gruen 1992, 223 - 271) Additionally, even though Greece and the
Hellenistic kingdoms were conquered by Rome in the third century BCE, Rome’s encounter
with the Greeks resulted in an even more profound Hellenization of Rome. As Horace puts it:
“Graecia capta ferum cepit uictorem” that is to say, a conquered Greece in turn conquered its
fierce victor. (Hor. Epist.II 1, 156-157) Therefore, since the Greek language is omnipresent in
these areas for both reasons mentioned above, Greek merchants and visitors to the sanctuary
of Fortuna Primigeneia had no specific need to become fluent in the Archaic Latin language
aside from – perhaps – a limited vocabulary and knowledge of syntax. Because of the
conservation of their own language by visitors and merchants and because of the perceived
cultural supremacy of Greek, we can imagine that this Greek language and its culture had a
profound influence on, and left a large number of linguistic traces in both the Latin as well as
the Etruscan language.

Now, during the general time frame we are discussing, which runs from the Classical until the
Hellenistic Period for the Praenestine mirrors and which may be drawn back until the late
Archaic Period – that is if we include Etruscan mirrors as well – we would err if we were to
consider the Greek language to have consisted of a single common and standard ancient

54 However, since the mirrors are to be placed in a more commercial context in which social interaction is
decidedly necessary, it is highly improbable that merchants would not have obtained an everyday knowledge of
Praenestine or Archaic Latin. We can reasonably assume that merchants must have been able to speak in a form
of pidgin language, which usually occurs in situations of trade and commerce.
Greek. Until the third century BCE, concurrently with the period of the production of bronze mirrors, the Greek linguistic landscape consisted of a “mosaic of dialects” existing simultaneously.\(^{55}\) (Christides 2005, 158) Additionally, even though the Greek language was at that time subject to a reform leading to further standardization under the reign of Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic kingdoms, the other dialects did not suddenly cease to exist. As a matter of fact, the popularity of the so-called Koinè or “common” speech\(^{56}\) – its later status might be compared to the current omnipresence of English – may have caused the dialects or speech variants to be driven into extinction, but only gradually.\(^{57}\) So, there are at least three dialects that we need to take into account when we are looking into a potential influence of Greek on Archaic Latin in the particular time frame we are discussing; these variants are Ionic Greek, Doric Greek, and the already mentioned Koinè.\(^{58}\)

\(^{55}\) As mentioned above, the term dialect is commonly used to describe the Archaic Greek speech variants. In this case, the term is a direct translation from the Greek: “μωσαϊκό διάλεκτον”.

\(^{56}\) The Koinè, which I have translated as Common Speech from the Greek word κοινός (LSJ: common public, universal), should not at all be confused with the term Common Greek. This term is conventionally employed to denominate a Greek dialect that flourished shortly before the 2\(^{nd}\) millennium BCE in an area of Northern Greece. Rodríguez Adrados describes the dialect as “[it] did not display an absolute unity and contained its own archaisms and innovations and choices, linking it, at certain points, to other Indo-European dialects.” (Rodríguez Adrados 2005, 17)

\(^{57}\) Και αυτή η γενίκευση της χρήσης της θα οδηγήσει τις άλλες διάλεκτους σιγά σιγά [emphasis placed by author] σε εξαφάνιση. (Christides 2005, 159)

\(^{58}\) Because I’m adding the common speech or Koinè, one might argue that the term “variants” I am using to describe the three dialects is misplaced and deceiving. The Koinè’s purpose is, indeed, to eliminate differences between previous dialects as a standardized tongue and to promote cohesion in all Greek-speaking parts of the Mediterranean. However, since the former dialects do not cease to exist in favor of the Koinè and for lack of a better word, I chose to employ this term.
Firstly, we must discuss the ways in which Latin might have been influenced \textit{directly} by the Doric and Attic-Ionic dialects as spoken in the Greek colonies of South Italy. These Greek colonies covered a vast coastal area of South-Italy and Sicily, and are better known and usually referred to as Magna Graecia or, in Greek, \textit{Megalē Hellas}; the first colony established by this colonization movement was Pithekoussa\footnote{On the name and nature of Pithekoussai: “The colonists came from the cities of Kalchedon and Eretria, in Euboia, and called the island Pithekoussai, or Island of Monkeys. Why this name? Probably because of the marginal character of this far outpost, in wild country that evoked the distant lands where monkeys roam.” (Cerchiai 2004, 36 – 62) Additionally, the same author mentions that ancient historians did not consider Pithekoussai to be a colony in the strict sense of the word: “it did not, for instance, bear the name of any of its founders, unlike Cumae, … Pithekoussai seems to have been established by groups who, like the early American pioneers, went West to see their fortune. They imbued it with the character of an “open city” that concentrated its energies largely on the production of craft goods and trading, and attracted an influx of people of all kinds.” (Cerchiai 2004, 36 – 62) It is this kind of contact and trade that facilitates linguistic contact and influence.} - modern Ischia - around 770 BCE.\footnote{“It was economically, politically and geographically diverse, … and united only by the fact that all Greek colonies were coastal in location. It was non-Italic in culture, language and political structure, possessing a well-}

(Bartoloni 2012, 1-16; Cerchiai 2004, 36 – 62) The coastal area of Magna Graecia is of particular interest because of its difference and uniqueness when compared to other regions of archaic Italy. The deciding factor for the uniqueness mentioned above is, according to Lomas, “the cultural difference, the Greekness of the region, and its physical and cultural location.”\footnote{Map of Greek Colonial Expansion in Italy. Copyright: http://www.napoliunplugged.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Colonie_greche.jpg}
Similarly as in mainland Greece, Magna Graecia was not a unified entity, but was organized in city-states or poleis whose structures were well-established long before the Roman conquest. Additionally, the different colonies or city-states were not dependent on the same *Metropolis* or original polis from which the colonization movement originated. Yet, the *Metropoleis* in question are of great importance to us since the dialect of the Metropolis usually dictates which dialect the colony adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>Metropolis</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Subcolony*62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pithekoussai</td>
<td>Kalchedon, Eretria</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td>Neapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>Kalchedon, Aeolian Cumaie</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td>Katane, Leontini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td>Akrai, Kasmeneai, Kamarina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Mylai, Himera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle</td>
<td>Kalchedon, Cumaie</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara Hyblaia</td>
<td>Megara Nisea</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Selinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Laos, Pixunte, Skydros, Poseidonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroton</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Skylletion, Terina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaulonia</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris</td>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Rhodos and Creta</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi Epizephyrioi</td>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td>Medma, Hipponion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Achaia Selinous</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>Doric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyele-Elea</td>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaiarcheia</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thruii</td>
<td>Panhellenic colony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Athens, Peloponnesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

established Greek urban tradition.” (Lomas 2005, 3) In this way, it also resembled the area of Etruria which was also characterized by a multitude of different city states and was non-Italic in culture or language.

61 Before the Roman conquest of Campania, the area did not know many or severe conflicts with the Romans in particular. “Diplomatic relations with Rome were mixed, but not uniformly hostile. With the exception of the aftermath of the Punic Wars, when reprisals for disloyalty during Hannibal’s invasion included the introduction of direct rule by Rome, there was remarkably little interference in the life of the Campanian cities.” And “Rome’s attentions during that period were attracted by the intermittent hostilities in Etruria, Gallic raids and civil war, postponing Rome’s annexation of Magna Graecia.” (Lomas 2005, 1-17)

62 In this column, I opted to include the colonies whose *Metropoleis* are the other, original colonies of the first column. The aim of the table is to illustrate the presence of the different Greek dialects in Italy, but if we do not include these “subcolonies” one can’t fully demonstrate the extent of their presence, as their number would not be properly represented. These subcolonies speak the same dialect as their metropolis or the original colony.
The Greek Colonies of Magna Graecia including their Metropolis and Dialect spoken in Chronological order of establishment

From the table above we firstly learn that in Magna Graecia there were 38 important Greek colonies and “subcolonies” – or secondary colonies founded by original colonies – that used the Greek language. These 38 colonies are equally distributed between the island of Sicily and the Italian Peninsula. Moreover, we perceive that the number of colonies using the Ionic dialect in Sicily and the number of Ionic colonies on the mainland is equal; the same applies to the Doric colonies. Secondly, regarding the dialects used in the entire region of Magna Graecia, i.e. both in Italy and in Sicily, we can state that roughly one third (34 %) of the colonies discussed – both colonies and subcolonies – have a Metropolis that used an Ionic dialect. Conversely, the majority of colonies, namely 60 % of colonies in Magna Graecia, have a Doric-speaking Metropolis. Two of the 38 colonies were founded by multiple Greek poleis together, employing different dialects; therefore, we cannot simply deduce that either of these colonies prefer the use of one particular dialect over another. Finally, regarding the subcolonies discussed above, we can notice that there are almost as many subcolonies as there are colonies: 18 subcolonies versus 20 colonies. We observe as well that colonies with a Doric Metropolis are much more likely to found subcolonies of their own and that they have, therefore, a noticeably larger number of subcolonies than the colonies of Ionic origin. Indeed, 57 % of Doric colonies are of secondary origin, whereas this only holds for 39% of Ionic colonies.


The predominance of Doric is even more visible in Sicily, where the city of Syracuse controlled the island politically and linguistically from the fourth century BCE onwards. Therefore, even though colonies of Ionic origin were founded on Sicily, the colonies itself were compelled to speak a Doric dialect. (Rodríguez Adrados 2005, 176)

However, we should take into account which polis has given the impulse to found the panhellenic colonies in the first place. This may give us some insight into which dialect they would most likely have adopted. Firstly, it was Perikles, the Athenian strategist, who gave the impulse to found Thurii (Guarducci 2005, 262–263). This would give us reason to believe that the colony used the Attic-Ionic dialect. Secondly, I would like to point out that, even though Cerchiai states that the Athenians and Peloponnesians founded the colony of Herakleia (Cerchiai 2004, 13), Guarducci asserts that Heraklei was founded by Taranto, “che nel 433 a.C. fu sua fondatrice.” This explains the dominance of Doric that can be found on the “Tavole Greche di Eraclea.” (Guarducci 2005, 191-193)
When comparing the two dialects, we can discern a number of linguistic differences that may help us identify which dialect has influenced the Praenestine Latin form of divinity, if of course any direct Greek influence will be found. We can characterize the Ionic dialect, which is traditionally described to be one of the most innovative Greek dialects, by the following phonologic and morphologic particularities:

- [a:] > [e:] (standard spelling η – Η); traditionally considered to be the most Ionic innovation of all
- Early loss of ϕ / [w]; includes compensatory lengthening of ει and ου before sonant plus ϕ
- Secondary lengthening of e, o gives ει/ [ĕ], ου/ [ŏ]
- Eastern Greek assimilation of [t] to [s] before [i]
- “Metathesis of Quantity”: shortening of an open long e-vowel before an o- or a-vowel, followed by synizesis and, when the second element was originally short, a form of compensatory lengthening

On the other hand, we can characterize Doric dialect as follows:

- Retention of original long [a:] 
- [a:] + o-vowel results in [a:] rather than [o:]
- Weakening of intervocalic [s] to [h]
- The vocalization of syllabic resonants with a (*[r] > αϱ, ρα etc.)

Regarding the linguistic contacts in the sphere of religion, we can find several distinct instances in which the Greek pantheon – which is the CG pantheon from the first comparative table above – has influenced the Latin pantheon. As Watkin mentions: “the infiltration of

---

66 Colvin states that “this is an unhelpful generalization (based on the change of ti > si in Eastern Greek) , and reflects cultural prejudices which can be traced back to the Greeks themselves .Each of the dialect areas was innovative in particular ways .…” (Colvin 20120, 207)


68 Even though the Attic dialect is part of the Ionic dialect group, Attic does not entirely adhere to this rule. It retains the original [a:] when it is placed after [i, e, r]. (cf. Αναξαγόρας (Att.) vs. Αναξαγόρης (Ion.)) It should be noted that the Ionic dialect of Euboea, which is because of its geographic location naturally close to the Attic dialect, nonetheless shares the Ionic shift of the original [a:] > [e:]. (cf. προεδρίην: privilege-of-front-seats) (Horrocks 2009, 37 – 41) Euboea’s dialect should be kept closely in mind when considering the Greek influences on Latin as Euboea founded some of the earliest colonies such as Pithekoussai and Kyme. Some of its peculiarities: initial aspiration, Attic-style [tt] and [rr] instead of Ionic [ss] and [rs], and lack of compensatory lengthening. (Horrocks, loc. cit.)

69 “a running together of the two vowels, involving a semi-vocalic pronunciation of [e]” (Horrocks 2009, 38)

70 Sources: see 52.
Greek divinities into the various native italic pantheons can be observed nearly everywhere, over extended periods of time.” (Watkins 1995, 35) It is certainly remarkable, but not surprising, that the oldest attested Greek loanword in Latin was *kurois* or “sons” in religious context, namely as the Dioscuri. The Greek heroes Castor and Pollux, sons of Zeus, are already found in Lavinium by the late sixth century: “*Castorei poldouueikue kurois.*”71 The vocalism *u* of *kurois* demonstrates that the source of the borrowing must be an Ionic colony in Magna Graecia, probably Kyme. (cf. the Ionic form κοῦροι and not the Doric κόροι because of secondary lengthening72; see Ionic c) supra.) The ending of kurois is either an Old Latin dative plural or a Greek one. (Watkins 1995, 35-36)

Finally, we should note that even though “the area in this period was characterised by intense conflicts between Greeks and Oscans with all its attendant disruptions to the life of the regions,” (Lomas 2005, 1-17) only during the third century did the Roman conquest of Southern Italy and Sicily end the flourishing period of Magna Graecia. And even this did not fully put an end to the presence of the Greek dialects in these areas. The Roman conquest started in Campania and Apulia, continuing into Sicily later on. Despite the Greek general Pyrrhos’ efforts, the last city on the Italian peninsula, Tarentum, fell in 272 BCE. After this, the important Sicilian cities of Agrigentum and Syracuse fell in 262 and 212 BCE respectively. However, although Sicily and Southern Italy had fallen, the Greek language was maintained in the area and only succumbed to Latin much later. Additionally, because of the fact that Hellenism played such a central role in the life of Roman elite, the province of Magna Graecia retained its high profile even much later – i.e. throughout the Roman Late

---

71 ILLRP 1271 a; Wachter 1987, 85; Meiser 1998, 4.
72 Radke, however, notes that the Doric <ω> has been transcribed into <u> as well. This means that we can’t exclude that the source of the borrowing was a Doric colony instead of an Ionic colony. As the cult center of the two heroes/gods was originally in Sparta, we can argue that the Doric colony in question was Taranto (colony of Sparta itself). (Radke 1964, 215)
Republic and Empire. (Lomas 2005, 1-17; Rodríguez Adrados 2005, 207; Cerchiai 2004, 25-34.)

Secondly, we repeat that the Attic-Ionic and Doric Greek dialects also influenced Latin indirectly through Etruscan and other Italic languages. It is hardly necessary to reiterate the extent to which Greek influenced the Etruscan pantheon and other vocabulary that was borrowed. Regarding the dialects and the different trajectories the Greek language may have followed, we can say that the Etruscan language was not influenced by either the Ionic or Doric dialects, but that it came into contact with different cities at different stages in time, and hence influenced by both. It is possible to follow this evolution by looking at the chronology of art and ceramics found in Etruria. Now, commercial contact between Etruria and Greece was predominantly based upon contacts with, originally, Euboean merchants (Ionic-Attic; beginning in the early eight century BCE), subsequently with Corinthian merchants (Doric; beginning around 700 BCE) – testimony is the development of a Etruscan-Corinthian ceramic production in Etruria and the amount of Corinthian produce found in Etruria – and lastly, commerce was dominated by Attic traders (Attic-Ionic; middle of the fifth century BCE). (Bartoloni 2012, 1-17) The colonies of Magna Graecia (Doric and Ionic) never ceased to be in close contact with Italic and Etruscan traders either: “some ancient settlements – such as Pithekoussai and Cumae – were deliberately chosen for their position along the route leading to mineral-rich Etruria and Sardinia.” (Cerchiai 2004, 8)

Thirdly and finally, we should briefly refer to the already mentioned Koinè of Alexander the Great. Despite the defeats of Athens against Sparta (404 BCE) and Macedonia (338 BCE) and despite the resistance by a common Doric dialect, Attic became the lingua franca in Greece. Its success was facilitated by the adaptation of Attic Greek into what is called Great Attic by
the Macedonian court in the fifth century BCE. This Great Attic Greek language was adapted and became what we call Common Greek or Koinè. The characteristics of Koinè can be summarized as follows: regarding general characteristics, we can refer back to the characteristics of Ionic (supra), but – as can be expected – it simultaneously displays some characteristics particular to Attic. Most important of the latter characteristics is the retaining of [a:] when it is placed before [i, e, r]. (see footnote 54)

Specific about this language is that not just the literary Attic or Koinè was successful in spreading throughout the entire Greek-speaking world, but also the spoken form of this language was similarly diffused from the fourth century BCE onwards. If the bilingualism of Praeneste is, as we argued before, primarily a bilingualism of a commercial nature, this spoken variety of the Koinè is more likely to have been the origin of influence on the mirrors: certainly after the fifth century when it became the lingua franca in the Greek speaking world and in particular, in Magna Graecia. As a matter of fact, after the conversion of Attic and Great Attic into Koinè within Attica, the Ionian cities of the islands, Asia Minor, and Macedonia, it was exported soon afterwards into Italy, Sicily and the West. (Rodríguez Adrados 2005, 175 – 196; Horrocks 2009, 79-146)

We should certainly keep all three of these dialects in mind while discussing the influences of other languages on Praenestine mirrors. Indeed, if we can discover a relatively higher level of influence by one of the three regional variants, this could tell us more about the amount and extent of the contacts that existed between Praeneste and the other areas. In addition,, some of

73 Rodríguez Adrados refers to this as a paradox: for Athens “failure in the political field translated into success in the linguistic field.” (Rodríguez Adrados 180)
Horrocks mentions that it has been argued in the past that the Koine is, in fact a creolized version of Attic which originated as an Attic pidgin of the Athenian empire in the fifth century BCE. However, he also argues that it should be noted that the Koinè was a well-established language of commerce, diplomacy and officialdom. (Horrocks 2009, 80-82) As a language of commerce, it would lean itself well to export into other non-Greek speaking areas such as Rome and Etruria (hereby causing one language to be influenced by the other). Horrocks also demonstrates this by exemplifying how, during the Roman republic, Roman senatusconsulta were written in Koinè Greek; e.g. the senatusconsultum dated 170 BCE located in the city of Thisbae in Boeotia. Though it is possible to discern that this text is, in fact, a Greek translation of a Latin original.
74 Horrocks 2009, 80-83
these dialects can be closely related to a particular time scheme; for before the Koinè became so omnipresent, Greek colonies employed Doric (mostly) and Ionic in Magna Graecia. Therefore, a closer relation with one of these dialects might advance or postpone the chronology or provide us information on the style of the language -archaicising or not- of the mirror in question.

c. The place of Praenestine Latin in its linguistic context

Until now, we have looked at the Etruscan and Greek languages in more detail and have elaborated on their main historical/religious and linguistic characteristics. However, the main language and the final language we should discuss – and which should be considered the substratum of the language contact in Praeneste – is, as we said before, a dialect\textsuperscript{75} of Latin or Praenestine Latin.

By way of introduction, we should mention the description Adams makes of Praeneste and its endemic dialect. Adams mentions that the city of Praeneste had its foundation in a mythical period and a “long civilisation, some of it strongly under the influence of the Etruscans. Inscriptions survive from an early period and there has been a long tradition of regarding the Latin of the place (not least that attested in the inscriptions) as distinctive.” (Adams 2007, 120) Firstly, Adams also recognizes the Etruscan linguistic and historical contact with the city of Praeneste, and we will certainly take this into account when we investigate the mirrors in the following sections. Further, upon examining the description of Praenestine Latin by Adams, we notice that the author, and authors before him, have considered the Latin dialect distinctive of conventional Roman Latin. If so, what makes Praenestine Latin so distinctive?

\textsuperscript{75} For the issues with the terms speech variety and dialect see supra. In order to facilitate understanding and to follow traditional perceptions of Praenestine Latin, I will employ the expression dialect from here on.
Adams continues by providing us with examples of classic sources in the authors provide us with arguments by which they consider the Praenestine dialect to be distinct from Roman Latin. There are two main areas in which, as is suggested, Praenestine Latin differs from Roman Latin: namely lexicon and phonology. For lexical distinctions, the same author already refers to inscription CIL 60 which has an interesting use of the word *natio*. In fact, the Praenestine interpretation (= birth) had retained its archaic/etymological sense whereas in Rome it had already undergone a semantic change by the time of Plautus. (OLD = breed, stock, kind, species, race) This can be explained by stating that it is a common phenomenon that an old usage is maintained in one place, usually a rural or provincial area, whereas it is lost or evolves in another area, typically in a more open and dynamic urban society such as the Roman metropolis. (Adams 2007, 107)

Regarding phonology, we find evidence for the monophtongization of *ai* in Praenestine inscriptions. This feature is a general non-urban feature and is therefore widespread outside the city of Rome; it therefore cannot be properly considered to be an exclusive characteristic distinguishing ‘Praenestine’ Latin from other dialects. (Adams 2007, 119 - 123) In his article Sturtevant focuses on this feature and explains that, already “in the time of Varro, then, as well as in the time of Lucilius, *e* was a familiar rustic variant for the urban diphthong *ae*.” (Sturtevant 1916, 109 - 111) The same author also mentions that Faliscan, Volscian, and Umbrian similarly simplified the diphthong *ai* to *e*. They additionally took this simplification one step further by abridging other diphthongs in a way that is foreign to urban Latin.76 (Sturtevant loc. cit.) Thus, even though Praenestine inscriptions provide us with only very little evidence for phonological and distinctions in spelling that distinguishes it from Roman Latin and other dialects, Adams (loc. cit.) discusses how the literary evidence he studied

76 “In this respect several of the old dialects of Latium agreed with the four Italic idioms just mentioned as against Roman usage, c.g. Praenestine losna (C.J.L. I, 55) = Itia from *louksniz; Plotina (C./L. XIV, 3369) = Plauti;za; Ces(K[a] (C./L. XIV, 3193) = Caeszula. It is therefore a dialectic peculiarity which antedates the establishment of the Roman dialect as the standard language of Latium.” (Sturtevant 1916, loc. cit.)
confirms that Praenestine Latin was a dialect to Roman ears and that it did have a particular linguistic standing. Indeed, the previously mentioned differences in lexicon and phonology were exploited in comedy, pinning down its reputation as a rural and inferior dialect – at least when compared to the Roman urban language.\(^\text{77}\)

Regarding the general linguistic character of the Praenestine inscriptions, we should furthermore mention the chronological subdivision Wachter makes in his monography on Archaic Latin inscriptions, in which he dedicates an entire chapter to the Praenestine inscriptions from different periods. (Wachter 1987, 101 – 277) In his conclusion, he distinguishes three different stages in the development of the dialect. Namely, he firstly separates the time of Bronze objects, including the mirrors, (originally: “Bronzegegenstände”; before 250 BCE), which is characterized by several vowel changes, such as monophtongization, epenthese and excrescence, and Latin anaptyxis. This is followed by the time of older dedications (originally: “Weihinschriften”; between 250 BCE and 150 BCE). During this period, apocope is the most distinctive characteristic and monophtongization becomes more common. Lastly, the author differentiates the time of late inscriptions influenced by Roman Latin (originally: “späten, von Rom beeinflussten Inschriften; between 150 BCE and 82 BCE). During this period, we see a recovery of the apocopes of the previous period, and overall we can observe a levelling harmonization (Ge. Nivellierende Angleichung) of phonology and orthography to the Roman Latin norms. Wachter also states that the bronze cists are not limited to the first period only, unlike what its name suggests. (Wachter 1987, 276 – 277)

\(^{77}\) Thereby providing proof that Praenestine Latin wasn’t taken seriously in the city of Rome. For examples of this, see the usage Praenestine Latin in the comedies of Plautus (121) Moreover, a “whole audience is invited to participate in the joke, and there must have been a widespread sense that Praenestine Latin was different from that of the city, and inferior.” (Adams 2014, 121)
Regarding the religious character and the pantheon of Latium – and Praeneste in particular –, we can briefly refer back to the first comparative table, (supra. p. 25-26) which includes a column presenting the CL pantheon. The pantheon of the earlier time period evolved steadily into the CL pantheon: diachronically speaking, there are traces of a narrative and mythological framework by the sixth century BCE; by the fourth century BCE – i.e. by the time of our mirrors – we can find a core pantheon to which more divinities and rituals are added. 78 (Smith 2011, 36 - 38) In his chapter on archaic Roman religion, the same author discusses the possible impact and cultural/ religious influence Etruscans and other Italic people may have had on the archaic Roman pantheon. He suggests that “the most important role of the Etruscans, and the Campanians to the south, may have been in mediating the tremendous impact of Greek, Phoenician, and other eastern ways of thinking.” (Smith 2011, loc. cit.) Finally we should keep in mind that the city of Praeneste fell into Roman hands in 338 BCE, and we should look whether this event had any influence on the contacts between Praeneste, Magna Graecia and Etruria. (Van Der Meer 1995, 11)

In the following part, we will be discussing the mirrors themselves and we will be able to explore whether the statement by Smith is also true linguistically for Praenestine mirrors – namely, that Etruscan and the Greek spoken by the Campanians did not influence the Praenestine Latin dialect. Because of spatial proximity, we may want to investigate whether the Etruscan language did more than merely mediate Eastern languages and linguistically influenced the Praenestine pantheon.

78 “The deduction one can make, though, is that in the Roman world, and indeed across central Italy, patterns of behaviour had developed by later in the sixth century that are sophisticated and demand to be read intelligently, and with some knowledge of a narrative mythical framework. There is no doubt that in the fourth century and after, Roman religion developed, imported new deities, elaborated its ritual calendar, and to some extent reinvented or maybe invented archaic rituals; […]” (Smith 2011, 36 - 38)
4) Linguistic analysis

   a) Preliminary Remarks

After presenting the different languages and the bilingualism of the Praenestine area, we can begin our linguistic discussion of the inscriptions on the mirrors themselves. We will be looking specifically at the names of gods and heroes and the possible Greek or Etruscan origins of these theonyms. Any other information that the inscriptions might contain, such as the name of the owner or the person who dedicates the mirror, will also be taken into considered briefly. The inscriptions themselves are ranked according to their place in the CIL. Regarding the inscriptions we should consider four preliminary remarks.

Firstly, most of the theonyms are presented in a nominative case, as could be expected. In the introduction, I mentioned that there are no syntactical structures – except on mirror CIL P 547 which does contain a sentence and on which, for this reason, the engraver does employ different cases – and therefore, we expect that there are no syntactic relations existing between the different words on the mirrors which need to be demonstrated by the use of cases. However, there are several exceptions to this assumption; in a couple of cases, the engraver did not use the nominative case to write the theonyms, namely in Dio vem and Prosepnai (CIL P 558), Iovei (CIL P 551), and Alixentrom (CIL P 553). We will have to examine each of these examples separately in order to see whether we might be able to explain the different case by looking at the mythological scene depicted – if something is given to someone, we might expect a dative form even if the verb is not presented on the mirror itself – or whether we can truly consider these forms incorrect. If the form can be shown to be incorrect and out of context, we might be able to argue that the engraver himself did not possess a full working knowledge of Latin and its case system but perhaps applied names by copying the theonyms from other sources depicting the same name in the particular case.
Secondly, regarding the direction of the script, we can see that the names are usually written from left to right — as is the case in Greek inscriptions — and in only a small number of cases from right to left — i.e. the Etruscan tradition. Wachter (1987, 110) describes how there are two rules artists and engravers consider when writing the name of a figure on an object: (a) the name must be written close to the head of the figure to which it belongs and (b) the direction of the script should be parallel to the direction in which the figure is looking as is customary on Grecian vases. Using these two rules, the author indicates that the surprising direction of the few inscriptions that are written from right to left is not to be explained by an Etruscan influence. For, the inscriptions we find that are written from right to left all belong to an image of a mythical figure who, as expected, looks to the left. In any case, the direction of the script in itself is not a good indicant of Etruscan influence as Latin inscriptions were written from right to left as well, starting from at least two hundred years prior and slowly evolved to a left to right script under Greek influence. (Wachter 1987; 110)

Thirdly, the names of the gods/heroes of three mirrors, namely CIL P 554 – 556, do not match the figures in the engraved drawing to which they should belong. According to Wachter, (Wachter 1987; 112) this suggests that the engraver — not necessarily the author of the drawing — was not Greek, since if the engraver had been Greek, he would have had sufficient knowledge about these particular Greek heroes and gods. Hereby Wachter confidently assumes that any Greek artist had knowledge of the entire Greek mythological corpus — a dubious assumption at best. We should take into account, however, that some of the figures in question are not widely known, as we will see below; some of them, or at least the stories depicted, cannot be considered to be part of the standard mythological corpus. For

---

79 For these two rules, Wachter refers to Matthies who: “Für die Fälle, wo Namen in linksläufiger Richtung angebracht sind, hat […] unter Anführung griechischer Parallelen vor allem auf Vasen überzeugende und, wie meine Nachprüfung ergeben hat, auch für die bei ihm nicht berücksichtigten Xisten gültige Argumente in Richtung einer Erklärung gegeben, wie dies sich prägnant etwa in folgende zwei Regeln fassen lässt …” (supra)

80 In the list below signaled by *

81 Die in diesem Falle kaum Griechen gewesen sein dürften. (Wachter 1987; 112)
that reason, we should not assume that every Greek artist would know or be able to recognize them. We are either dealing with an engraver – who is both the drawer and the applier of the inscription – who does not know Greek mythology thoroughly enough and who may confuse different mythological stories or, there was miscommunication between the drawer and the engraver. In conclusion, we may not want to concur with Wachter’s assumption on the relation between mismatch of theonym and depicted god/hero on the mirror, and the origin - Greek or otherwise - of the artist(s) involved in the making of the mirror.

Fourthly and lastly, we should briefly refer to the chronology of the mirrors. Matthies’ (1912) work in which he subdivides the Praenestine mirrors by recognizing stylistic groups and linguistics, is still accepted as the leading source for chronology. In the discussions on the mirrors below we will mention the group to which Matthies has assigned the mirror in question if possible. The groups in which our 17 mirrors can be placed are: “Vorläufer” or precursor (end of the fifth century BCE), A and B (both first half of the fourth century BCE), D and E (both second half of the fourth century BCE), and F (beginning of the third century BCE).
b) Inscriptions (CIL I² 547 – 559; 2497 – 2499; D - 1204)  

**CIL I² 547 and Add. 203. Matthies Group E**


*opeinōr* devincam · ted

I: Most editors *Opeinod*, Wachter and De Bellis *Opeinor*

In this mirror, we find a short dialogue between a boy and girl playing a board game. The girl on the left side of the mirror says: “I will beat you” (*devincam ted*) upon which the boy replies: “I expect you [to do so]” (*opeinor*). Most editors discuss the verb form *Opeinod* or *Opeinor* as related to the active verb *opinor* (OLD: to be of the opinion, to suppose, to imagine); however, as this is not a theonym or is not possibly influenced by language contact, I will not expand on the subject. The second part of the dialogue, *devincam ted*, does not pose any difficulties morphologically or phonologically. None of the editors discuss the personal pronoun *ted* or the accusative object as being in postposition with regards to its verb *devincam*. This does not coincide with the SOV structure we would expect in archaic Latin.

We regretfully do not have any additional testimonies on the mirrors  at our disposal to explore the sentence structure of the so-called “prenestino parlato”  , hence the fragmentary nature of available examples precludes a more profound analysis of the subject.

---

82 For an extensive bibliography of each of the inscriptions, see De Bellis (2005).

83 There are more sentences and a dialogue to be found on the Praenestine cisti such as on the well-known Cista Ficoroni. The one dialogue, then, presents a scene of different cooks preparing a meal: “1) confice piscim 2) coenalia 3) cofeci 4) feri porod 5) made mire cie 6) misc sane 7) asom ferro.” In lines, 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7, we find more than a simple verb but as on the mirror, all but one of the corresponding object (1) and adverbs (4, 5, 6) are in postposition. Only in the last case, line 7, do we find an object in the expected position, namely before the verb.

84 A term proposed by De Bellis in order to contrast this type of speech with the other mirrors that are characterized by the presence of names and the lack of verb forms. (De Bellis 2005, 31)
castor amucos polouces

The mirror shows a representation of a relatively obscure part of the story of the two Dioskouroi or sons of Zeus, Castor and Pollux, during their journey with the Argonauts and their strife with Amucos, who wanted to prohibit the travelers from obtaining water on his island. The end of the episode represented on this mirror – namely, by the enchainment of Amucos to a tree - is not attested in any of the sources we have. We find other versions of the story in Theocritus (22, 27-134) and Apollonius of Rhodes (2, 1-134) in which Amucos is killed. As Amucos is spared in this particular version of the story, De Bellis argues that it is most likely inspired by the Greek satire Amucos by Sophocles, of which we only possess some fragments. (2005, 35) Even though this particular story must therefore be of Greek origin, the cult of the Dioscuri is shared by the Greeks (both in the mainland and in Magna Graecia alike), the Etruscans and other Italic peoples. Indeed, these particular heroes and the popularity of their cult demonstrate the “unità culturale fra Lazio, Grecia, Magna Grecia ed Etruria.” (De Bellis 2005, 34-39) As we mentioned before, we generally expect heroes to be in their traditional Greek form, unless a prestigious regional cult existed for the hero in question. Since we do note a distinct popularity of the Dioscuri in the region, we expect that

85 For more information on the representation of the story of Amicos see Marchese (1944).
86 Even in the city of Rome, the temple of Castor and Pollux on the Roman forum was dedicated as early as the 5th century BCE.
87 Therefore … we may expect that the names of heroes and non-traditional Olympic deities and heroes will be closer to their original Greek form, unless a regional cult that can be linked to that of the Greek hero in question existed in the Praenestine area. Supra p. 28
88 When we refer to the Greek form, it means that it is the conventional form of the theonym in the traditional Greek pantheon. However, as we do find traces of Greek on one of the oldest Latin inscriptions to the heroes, we may assume the Greek heroes were transferred to Latium through Magna Graecia and not through Etruria. (see: “The Greek heroes Castor and Pollux, sons of Zeus, are already found in Lavinium by the late sixth century: “Castorei poldoukeükeue kurois.” The vocalism u of kurois demonstrates that the source of the borrowing must be an Ionic colony in Magna Graecia, probably Kyme.” (supra))
the name of the hero was most likely adapted to a Latin name, or was replaced by an Italic name.

Regarding the first two theonyms Castor and Amucos (< Ἀμύκος), we can see that both have undergone a direct Latin transliteration of the Greek epic form – i.e. in contrast to a possible local form – without any phonological alteration or evolution. Indeed, the name, Castor, – unlike the name of his brother Pollux – never underwent any changes before it was adopted into the Latin pantheon even though the figure was the object of a popular cult. The Greek ending of Amucos did not change to the Latin ending –us until the third century BCE. (De Bellis 2005, 34)

The Greek name Πολύδευκες could not simply be used as a Latin noun and slowly evolved into Pollux or Polluces - as still attested in Plautus Bacc. 894 and Varro ling. 5, 37. We may trace back the evolution of the theonym as follows: Pollux < Polluces < Pol(l)ouces < *Podlouces (through assimilation) < *Poldouces (metathesis of ld to dl) < *Poludeuces (syncope of [u] and evolution of [eu] to [ou]. The lack of the gemination of the [l], is striking and occurs often on mirrors (cf. poloces (CIL I² 549), pilipus (CIL I² 552), melerpanta (CIL I² 554), etc.). Most of the gemination in the archaic period signals a conscious choice to introduce a grecism into the text, such as in sicilicissitat (Plautus, Menaechmi 12).

Thus The three theonyms on this mirror were borrowed directly from their original Greek epic forms. As expected, the name of the popular hero Pollux was adapted into a Latin form whereas Castor and Amucos, the latter being a secondary character in myth, retained their exact Greek form.

89 “In Latinis litteris veteribus nomen quod est, inscribitur ut Πολύδευκες Polluces, non ut nunc Pollux.”
90 For a discussion on gemination in archaic Latin, see Fontaine 2006.
CIL I² 549 and add. 903, CIL 55 (and p. 554), CIL XIV 4095. Matthies Group A


poloces losna amuces

As in the previous mirror, we see the hero Pollux and Amukos, but without Pollux’s brother Castor. Here the two characters are accompanied by the Latin goddess Luna, interpreted by De Bellis as a representation of the Dioscuri’s sister Helen.⁹¹ (2005, 44-45) For a discussion of the form poloces see above. The /ou/ of polouces of the previous mirror represents an earlier stage of the evolution of the theonym, namely before monophthongization. However, this does not necessarily mean the other mirror is to be dated earlier, as it might reflect an archaicized style.

The form Losna is of particular interest because of the placement of a sibilant [s] before the nasal [n]. Scholars disagree on the origin of the form and give different explanations - some more convincing than others - for the placing of [s]. Losna itself is a derivation of the Indo-European root *le/ouk-snh2 and the Proto Italic *louksn-. (Meiser 2006, 62; Walde, 833) We would regularly expect the sibilant to disappear in the cluster -Vsn-, resulting in compensational lengthening of the vocal. (Meiser 2006, 79) A possible Etruscan origin is argued by Lattes (1893, 51) who refers to different Etruscan examples in which there is an assimilation of the Etruscan <c> before a nasal. However, this is an unlikely explanation as the original [k] of *louksn assimilated before the sibilant: *louksn > *loussn > *lousn > *losn. Then, Ernout (1905, 333) argues that the lack of assimilation between [s] and [n] is a result of a Praenestine dialectal evolution. However, if we compare this to the probably synchronic epithet of Fortuna: Primigenia (not *prism-), this argument is not truly convincing. Lastly,

⁹¹ The egg on the mirror would be referring to the birth of the three children of Leda and Zeus. Additionally, De Bellis refers to a different version of the myth of Helen according to which she was born by falling of the moon. (loc. cit.)
Vine (1993, 116-131) compares the -Vsn - cluster to some unexpected superlative -Vsm - clusters in Oscan and Umbrian. In these languages, we find synchronically the forms maimas and nuvime versus esmik, casnar etc. He suggests that either the same evolution occurred in Praeneste or that the -Vsn - is a result of an archaicized spelling. As multiple interpretations are possible and equally valid, we must be cautious when incorporating this theonym in our future analysis.

In the case of amuces, it has been argued that we can see an Etruscan influence in finding the [e] instead of the expected [o] of the nominative ending. When Greek theonyms are borrowed into Etruscan, an -e ending is usually employed in order to replace the Greek original -os. Therefore, scholars argue that the final addition of an -s to the nominative ending –e in this particular example is the ultimate result of an Etruscan nominative which was, in its turn, adapted into Latin by adding the nominative -s. (Matthies 1912, 52; Jordan 1879, 36)

Alternatively, it is possible to consider the -es ending the result of an analogy with the ending of poloces (De Bellis 2005, 42; Wachter 1987, 128), certainly when we consider the parallel placement of the two theonyms on the mirror itself.

On this mirror, we can see that the artist does not directly copy the names of the Greek epic counterparts of the theonyms as in the mirror discussed above. Both forms poloces (see above) and amuces (see above) are further evolved from polouces and amucos and therefore, even more removed from their Greek original. A possible Etruscan influence could be argued primarily for amuces.
This mirror is not of any particular relevance to our etymological discussion as all three of the theonyms are of Latin origin and are not influenced by any other language, Greek or Etruscan. The <d> in *cudido* (we expect *cupido*) and the lack of <c> in *vitoria* (we expect *victoria*) are not to be explained by any sound change but rather because of negligence or ignorance of the artist. (De Bellis 2005, 46-49) It does, however, serve to caution since this may imply that the engraver lacked the necessary language proficiency to spell correctly and, hence, that erroneous spelling may well account for certain variants in the other mirrors as well.

---

92 Even though the name Cupido is a direct translation (Lehnübersetzung) of the Greek Eros, we can’t argue a specific Greek influence on this mirror. In Latin, the noun is feminine, but the personification is masculine. (Bakkum 2009, 202)
**CIL I² 551, CIL I 56, CIL XIV 4097. Matthies Group B**


*ino iovei hercele*

On this mirror, we see Iuppiter on an Etruscan altar\(^{93}\), while on the right side his wife Iuno touches his arm and his son Hercules stands on the left. As the latter is looking to the left, the name *hercele* is written from left to right. The most complex elements of about the inscriptions on this mirror are the forms *iovei* and *hercele*, and the cases they are in. *Iuno* (cf. cists CIL I² 563 and 564) does not pose any issues for us and is the expected CL form for the Greek goddess Hera, wife of Zeus. The theonym does not seem to be influenced linguistically by its Greek or Etruscan – Uni – antecedent at all.

The form *iovei* is of clear Latin origin and is conjugated in dative case, which can possibly be explained by the position of the theonym on the mirror. *Iuno* and *hercele* are turning towards *iovei* who, in most interpretations,\(^{94}\) is reconciling the two.\(^{95}\) Also, the name itself is not engraved on the mirror itself but on the “untersten Platte des altarähnlichen Baues, auf dem der Gott sitzt.”\(^{96}\) Therefore, it has been assumed that the mirror was dedicated to *iovei*, which might also explain its dative case. (De Bellis 2004, 342) Anyway, it should not be assumed that the engraver would resort to a dative instead of a nominative if this is appropriate in the inscription itself simply because of a lack of proficiency in Latin. The name of Iuppiter does recur, as can be expected, in several inscriptions under oblique forms and in other cases, such

---

\(^{93}\) It has been compared to, and recognized as an Etruscan altar of Marzabotto by Bonfante. (1997; 33)

\(^{94}\) De Bellis (2004, 340) cites Lanzi, Jahn and Gerhard. She additionally cites Reifferscheid (1867) who considers the scene “una vera e propria unione sessuale.”

\(^{95}\) Peruzzi states that *iovei* should be considered a dative of direction. He concludes that: “si deve concludere che le tre diciture hanno il cómpito di assecondare il moto raffigurato, cioè che il nome è conforme al comportamento del personaggio.” (Peruzzi 2001, 407)

\(^{96}\) Matthies 1912; 53
as diesptr (CIL I² 564), iovos (CIL I² 563) and dioves (CIL I² 558), giving artists many examples of different cases to copy if they are not sufficiently fluent in Latin.

The most complex inscription of the mirror is the theonym *hercele*, written in the opposite writing direction. Firstly, we do not have any certainty regarding the case in which *hercele* is conjugated. It can either be a nominative of which the original final -s is omitted, (Peruzzi 2001, 406) an accusative while omitting the final -m, or a dative of which there is a monophtongization of the final -ei to -e. (De Bellis 2004, 342) Personally, I follow Peruzzi and consider it more likely that *hercele* is a nominative since this would present a parallel between *iuno* and *hercele* who both turn to *iovei*. Additionally, in the case of the accusative, we do not expect an erroneous deletion of the final -m on Praenestine mirrors, as such a form is correctly represented on two other mirrors and is therefore not likely to occur in Praenestine inscriptions (*alixentrom* CIL I² 553 and *dioves* CIL I² 558). In the case of the dative we would similarly not expect an error, as the correctly formed dative *iovei* is inscribed next to *hercele* on the same mirror. Finally, even though the theonym *hercele* in itself is unique in Praeneste,97 we find exactly the same version – without final –s – on an Etruscan mirror in Atri. (De Simone 1968, 70-79) Therefore, many scholars (Matthies 1912, 52; Lattes 1892, 53; Ernout 1905, 306; Biville 1995, 391) have argued that this form is originally Etruscan. De Bellis, (loc.cit.) and Wachter (1987, 134) however, maintain that the epenthesis of the vowel [e] instead of the regular Latin [o] or [u] can be explained by a striving for vocal harmony between the three different vowels, but they do not expound further on why this epenthesis only occurs in this single, particular case and not on the two other Praenestine cists that bear the name of Hercules or any other Latin inscription. We can conclude that there is thus a relatively strong indication of an Etruscan origin or influence for *hercele*.

---

97 On the Praenestine cists, we find *hercles* and *Fercles*. On other Praenestine inscriptions, we only find the hero once more as *hercole*. (dedication 61)
CIL I² 552, CIL XIV 4098. Matthies Group D


\[painsscos^1 \text{ marsua}vibus^2 \cdot pilipus \cdot cailavit\]

1: De Bellis: Painiscos
2: Matthies: vifis

On this mirror, we find for the first time a signature of the inscriber named \textit{vibus pilipus}, a compound name consisting of two elements of respectively Oscan and Greek\(^{98}\) origin.

(Wachter 1987, 143-145; Peruzzi 1965, 275; De Bellis 2005, 59-62) Additionally, the presence of the signature in itself should already alert us to the possibility of a Greek origin for the artist, as an Italic inscriber would usually remain anonymous – in comparison to the other Praenestine mirrors where we only find one other case of an artist’s signature and three personal names besides theonyms. The verb \textit{cailavit} (perfectum indicative of \textit{caelo}; OLD = to engrave in relief upon metals, to carve, to engrave) also demonstrates that the inscriber and the caster of the bronze are not necessarily the same person. (Mansuelli 1964, 133; De Bellis 2005, 60) It provides additional support for the hypothesis that the artist must be of Greek origin. In the only other case of a Praenestine mirror containing an artist’s signature, the artist does not employ the verb \textit{cailavit} - a Latin translation of \textit{ἔγραψεν} - or any similar verb, but uses the phrase: “\textit{hoc est opus} + genitive.” (CIL P 2497)

The two divinities on the mirror are \textit{painsscos}, or Paniscos representing the god Pan, and \textit{marsua}s, or the satyr Marsuas\(^{99}\) usually accompanied by his pan flute. The epenthesis of /i/ in the former is probably due to inversion of the original [ni] in [in]. (Matthies 1912, 49) The gemination of the sibilant can be traced to Doric Greek in which gemination often takes place

\(^{98}\) As we have seen before, the Greek and Oscan communities of the South of Magna Graecia were in constant contact with each other through war. We can therefore trace back the origins of the artist to Magna Graecia. Wachter argues that the name of the artist can be explained thus: pilipus slave of the Oscan gens \textit{vibis}. (Wachter 1987, 143-145)

\(^{99}\) The story of Marsuas is told in Metamorphoses VI.383–400.
after τ, κ, χ, and μ. This is another reason why we may most likely trace back the origin of the Greek artist to Magna Graecia. Marsuas itself is an exact Latin transliteration of the Greek Μαρσύας.

We can deduce, in this mirror, a definite and strong influence of the Doric Greek language – of Magna Graecia in particular. In contrast to mirror CIL I² 498, in which we also found theonyms that are close to their Greek counterparts, we find that here the artist has preferred to employ specific forms that are closer to their Greek than their Latin equivalents.
Regarding the name *mirqurios* we should note that both the variation of the grapheme <q> for <c> and the ending -os instead of -us are signs of Latin archaism. (De Bellis 2005, 65) More complex, however, is the alternation of the vocal /e/ to /i/. Even in Praeneste, this theonym can be found as *mercuris* on cist CIL I² 563. Usually the /i/ is given a dialectal status (Leumann 1977, 45) or considered of Oscan origin (Adams 2007, 89; Meiser 2006, 81), but this explanation is not satisfactory. Adams (2007, 89-92) gives a clear and extensive analysis of the two variants and discusses why the two are in existence synchronically. He questions the Oscan origin of /mirc/, but argues to the contrary that it appears to be a non-Roman form and that further specifications can’t be given for “It is unfortunate that the evidence for the god’s name at Rome in the early period is so poor.”\(^\text{101}\) Even though its origins are still unknown, it is clear that this form is not influenced by any Etruscan (*Turm*) or Greek variant (*Hermes*) but possibly by a different and as yet unidentified Italic language.

The second mythological figure presented on the mirror is Paris (Ἀλέξανδρος in Greek) or *alixentrom*, written with ending –om or the archaic accusative form of -um. Finding an accusative is somewhat surprising as the mirror shows Mercurius talking to Paris, by which we would expect a dative indirect object *alixentro*. Even though the choice of accusative is

\(^{100}\) A different reading of *alixentrom* has been *alixentros* (Conway and Lattes) as they consider the <M> to be the Etruscan /s/. This reading is highly unlikely as the Latin /ss/ is present in *mirqurios*.

\(^{101}\) De Bellis (2004, 63-68) agrees that the form isn’t influenced by other languages and even goes further than that. She states that “dunque, come a Praeneste, anche I romani antichi –e non I rustici- dicevano Mircurius. She refers to the Latin etymology of Mercurius by Velius Longus in his De orthographia: mium et commircium quoque per i antiquis relinquamus, apud quos aequae at Mircurius per i dicebatur, quod mirandarum rerum esset inventor, ut Varro dicit. Nostris iam auribus placet ut et Mercurius et commercia dicantur.” (Vel.Lon. GLK VII, 77, 12)
unexpected, the phonology of the name can be somewhat explained by Latin phonological rules. The vocal change of /a/ to /e/ is the result of vowel reduction in closed syllable (cfr. Κασσάνδρα > Cassentra; Meiser 2006, 70) The next change, from /e/ to /i/, is more problematic, however, as it goes against what we might expect in Praeneste where the opposite occurs quite frequently. (cf. CIL P 555) Wachter suggests that it is the result of “kontrastive Schreibung”, namely in order to emphasize the /e/ of the third syllable. (Wachter 1987, 122) The presence of the dental [t] in the consonant cluster -tr- instead of [d] has traditionally been compared to Etruscan forms (Alakstantre, Alesentre, Aliksantre, Elaksntre, Elaksantre; De Simone 1968, 40 and 56-58; De Simone 1970, 10-12 and 34).\(^{102}\) However, already in Quintilian, we find that: “quid t litterae cum d quaedam cognatio? Quare minus mirum si <in> vetustis operibus Urbis nostrae et celebribus templis legantur ‘Alexanter’ et ‘Cassantra.’” (inst. 1.4.16) Just as in CIL P 549, there are possible explanations for the form alixentrom that may partially exclude any Etruscan influence. However, some of the vocal changes do remain problematic and therefore, we should take a careful approach to this form when including it in our final discussion.

\(^{102}\) De Simone demonstrated how the Etruscan form alscentre (attested during the first half of the IVth century; in contrast to elac/ksantre) could be the result of different borrowings of the Praenestine form alixentros. In this case, the influence originates from Praenestine Latin into Etruscan. (De Simone, Loc. cit.) However, Martelli (1995, 165-178) rebukes this opinion by following the particular Etruscan forms. “Si capovolgerebbe, in tal case, l’ipotesi che nel nome prenestino si ravvisino le tracce di un passaggio in etrusco.” (Martelli 1995, 165-178)
As signaled in the preliminary remarks, there is a difference between the story that the engraved image portrays and the story the theonyms placed beside it suggest. On this mirror we see two men, oinomavos (Oinomaos) and melerpanta (the hero Bellerophon), and a winged horse, named ario. The image on the mirror seems to refer to the passage in Iliad 6.160 in which Bellerophon is falsely accused by the wife of Proetus of having raped her. However, there are no sources that link the name Proetus to Oinomaos. The latter is the father of Hippodameia and king of Pisa in Elis; he was beaten by Pelops in a chariot race that was to decide whether Pelops could marry his daughter Hippodameia. (Soph. Electra, 504
and Oenomaus, Fr. 433, Eur. Orestes, 1024-1062)

Scholars disagree on the exact identity of oinomavos, but what we can say is that it is a Latin transcription of the original Greek Οἶνομαος – yet still closer to the Greek than the classical Latin Oenomaus. The epenthesis of the semi-vocal /u/ can be explained by analogy to other Latin transcriptions of Greek originals such as menolavi (CIL I 1604) and nicolavos (CIL I 683) in which the /u/ is a remnant of an original digamma <Ϝ>. (De Bellis 2005, 72)

Wachter, however, argues that it “einen erst im Latein hineingeratenen Uebergangslaut

---

103 ἄντειμα κρυπταδίη φιλότητι μιγήμεναι: ἀλλὰ τὸν οὗ τι πεπόθ’ ἀγαθὰ φρονεόντα διάφρονα Βελλεροφόντην. ἡ δὲ ψευδαμένη Προῖτον βασιλῆα προσηύδα: ‘τεθναίης οὐ Προῖτ’, ἢ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην, οὐ δὲ ἔθηλεν φιλότητι μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐθελούση.”

104 The name oinomavos might have been a nickname of the king Proetus, somehow related to wine (οἶνο-). (De Bellis 2005, 72-73) In a different passage of the Iliad (6.215) Bellerophon is told to visit Οἶνος and the artist might have had this visit in mind and confused the names oinomavos. (Roulez 1860, 205) Finally, as the original story of Bellerophon isn’t well attested, (Kretschmer 1951) there might have been a different story that has not been handed down to us.
In any case, Etruscan influence can be excluded because of the presence of three <o>’s in the theonym, which the Etruscan alphabet does not contain. The same explanation goes for Ario; namely, it is a Latinized version of the Greek Ἀρίων which cannot have been influenced by Etruscan. As in the theonym of Apollo, the final –n is lost in the Latin transcription.

The most problematic of the three theonyms on this mirror is most certainly melerpanta or Bellerophon. There are two linguistic problems we should discuss in the case of this particular theonym, which might give us an idea of the origin of the form: namely the evolution of the [o] > [a], and of the initial [b] > [m].

The first linguistic problem has received most attention, and there are several explanations for this evolution. On the one hand, there is a first group of scholars that is convinced that there is an Etruscan influence by an Etruscan *Pelerpanta. (Ernout 1905, 316; Mancini 1999, 323) However, if we accept the Etruscan form *Pelerpanta, it is impossible to explain the second evolution of initial [b] > [m]. Indeed, this evolution can be perfectly explained if we instead suggest a Greek origin, namely Bellerophon. In Eustatius (ad Il. 289, 35) we find the form Ἐλλεροφόντης which suggests that the original initial sound was a semi-vocal digamma <Ϝ>. As Curtius shows with the following example, this digamma often results in μ: μολπίς vs. Φελπίς and μελδόμενος vs. Ἱελδόμενος. (Jordan 1879, 47-48; Curtius 1879, 589-596)

On the other hand, a second group of scholars argues that the form can be explained through direct borrowing from Greek into Latin. Jordan proposes an alternative Greek form *Μελεροφάντης – which would be a possible ‘äelodorische’ Form with subsequent syncope of /o/. (Jordan 1879, 48) Alternatively, Peruzzi proposes that it results from a dialectal, coastal
variation of Greek in Italy, in which a Greek <o> would have been pronounced as open /å/ and was therefore misinterpreted by Latin-speakers as <a>.\(^{105}\) (Peruzzi 1978, 159)

As the forms of the two other theonyms on this mirror show a direct affinity with Greek, it is more plausible that the form *melerpanta* is directly influenced by a certain Greek – Doric or coastal – dialect as well. Moreover, since the presence of the <o>’s in *oinomauos* exclude any possible Etruscan origin, it is not likely that the other theonym on the same mirror would be a close borrowing from Etruscan.

\(^{105}\) Some examples given of this are: *cassis* < κοττίς, *lancea* < λόγχη, *cattilus* < κότυλος, *patera* < ποτήρια.
*CIL I² 555 and Add. p. 904, CIL XIV 4101. Matthies Group Vorläufer.*


taseos luqorcos pilonicos taseiofilios¹

¹ tasei·filios (Jordan, Beazley, Vetter)

As already mentioned in the discussion on mirror 554 above, the inscription and the actual image of the myth presented on the mirrors do not always coincide. Indeed, either the artist – engraving both image and inscription – or the (subsequent) engraver of the inscription seems to have confused different mythological tales. Beazley (1949; 8) explains how the youth depicted on this mirror is probably Telephos who is seizing Orestes as a hostage, while the third figure on the mirror would then represent Agamemnon. The inscription, however, lists luqorcos (Luqourgos), the man taseos and his son pilonicos. This might refer to the story of the Thracian king Lykourgos slaying his son Dryas, also at an altar; but this does not explain the presence of taseos and pilonicos. As the story of a father slaying his son on an altar recurs several times in mythology, the artist may have known the general situation of some stories, but, again, appears to have been misinformed about the details.

For luqorcos and pilonicos, we can briefly mention that any deviation from the original Greek epic form can be mostly ascribed to transcription. For luqorcos we find the use of <q> instead of <κ>¹⁰⁶ and <c> instead of <γ>. The <o> may be a transcription of <ω>, archaic or dialectic spelling, or <ου>, the classically expected epic or Koinè form. We would expect a transcription of <ou> in the latter case. However, Wachter mentions that because of the “monophtongierten Aussprache der alten echten Diphtonge ou in Praeneste”, this vocal is “ja

¹⁰⁶ The use of <q> instead of <k> in archaic Latin is common when placed before /o/ and /u/. (Meiser 2006, 48)
auf gewissen Bronzegegenständen auch schon durch o wiedergegeben. (Wachter 1987, 112-113) For pilonicos, <p> is employed to represent the Greek <φ>. (Wachter loc.cit.)

Lastly, we should note that it is remarkable to find the final form taseiofilios or tasei·filios on a Praenestine inscription. The character to whom the name Taseos refers cannot be clearly identified.¹⁰⁷ It may perhaps be a hyperdoric form for Theseus, namely Thaseus, or it could refer to the island of Thasos. In both cases adental occlusive is as expected employed to transcribe the aspirated dental θ in Greek. Scholars strongly disagree on the form which tasei(o)- which seems to be a genitive on -eio or -ei. This has been explained by referring to the archaic Latin genitive ending –osio. (-osio > -oiio > -eio)¹⁰⁹ The ending would result in –io because of [sj] > [jj]/ V_V, but would not sufficiently explain the presence of <e> before –io. (Wachter 1987, 112-114) Additionally, it might be considered a patronimicon in the same expression as Priameia coniunx. (De Bellis 2005, 82-83) However, in this case the placement of the form becomes problematic; Wachter already mentioned that patronimica, even in the age of the Lapis Satricanus, do not stand on the first position. (Wachter 1987, 114) More likely is then the reading of Tasei·filios. The genitive of Tasei can be explained by analogy to forms like Nerei and Orphei, which are part of the Latin – though more poetical – declension for Greek words. (De Bellis 2005, 82) This would also hint to the plausibility of reading Taseos as Theseus.

Regarding filios, in their discussion of Praenestine Latin as a dialect, Clackson and Horrocks (2011, 124-125) mention that one of the innovative features vis-à-vis Roman Latin was the

¹⁰⁷ The transliteration is not problematic: a dental occlusive is usually employed to transcribe the aspirated dental θ in Greek.
¹⁰⁸ Hyperdorism is unique but also found on an argive: Olympia B 2198. Here we might perhaps suppose a lyric source rather than a local name. (Webster Glotta 1960, 255-258)
¹⁰⁹ Bakkum (2009) refers to an explanation of the –io and –oiio endings by Ribezzo who states that they came into existence because of a “(PIE) confusion between the genitive /-ī/ and possessive adjectives in /-io/[sic].” However, Bakkum also states that this “derivation is impossible, but this theory assumes a long coexistence of several productive morphemes for one category, in the case of the io-stems even of a genitive that was homomorphemic with the nominative.” For the Faliscan examples of genitives on –io and –oiio, he states that these forms are “simply masculine praenomina and gentilicia, or are based on misreadings.” (Bakkum 2009, 130)
fact that the “original /i/ was lowered to /e/ prevocally, as also in Faliscan and Faliscan Latin.” They refer to Coleman’s (1990, 1-25) citation of the form fileai or ‘daughter’ on the Cista Ficoroni. (CIL P 561) This vocal change also occurred before consonants: fabrecia, gemeni, ameni, comeni, segnino, antestia, etc. (De Bellis 2005, 114) However, in this case the /i/ was retained in its original form. It is not possible to explain this form by tying the evolution from /i/ to /e/ to a particular period, as the form filea is found synchronically on a Praenestine dedication. (CIL P 60, early third century BCE) Thus, we are unable to hypothesize a general vocal change of /i/ to /e/ in the area.

Even though the forms on this mirror are problematic, it is possible to deduce a strong Greek influence within it. As mentioned before, the apparent confusion of different possible mythological tales for the image does not necessarily imply that the artist of the mirror would not be of Greek origin. Not all stories depicted on the mirrors are part of a well-known canon such as the Homeric epics, and knowledge of more obscure tales should not be taken for granted, even for Greek artists.
The theonyms engraved on this mirror have traditionally been considered not to correspond to the engraved image. On this particular mirror, we see the sea goddess Thetis giving Aiax a chest plate while Alcmene mother of Hercules, and a satyr are placed as audience. Wachter and others (Wachter 1987, 142-143, Matthies 1912, 83, Vetter 1953, 337) consider the image “befremdlich” and Vetter even states that “Die Beischriften beruhen auch hier auf einem Missverständniss.” The image that one might expect instead is the well-known presenting of the armor forged by Hephaistos to Achilles by his mother Thetis. However, as De Bellis says, (2004, 85-87) it is highly unlikely that there would be any confusion about the characters of such an iconic passage of the Iliad. Instead, Coarelli (1973, 272) argues that the scene refers to the tragedy of Aiax in which Odysseus is presented the armor of Achilles instead of Aiax. The presence of Alcmene is to be linked to Radamantos, the judge on the Island of the Blessed. She represents the hero’s transition into the afterlife.

Firstly regarding the form telis, or Thetis, we see that the first theta loses aspiration because of transliteration, which is as expected. The transition to [l] instead of dental [t] is more problematic. It can certainly not be ascribed to Etruscan influence, by which the two dentals of Thetis would both receive aspiration as <θ>. An error of the engraver can possibly be excluded, as an archaic Latin form Thelis is already found in Varro rust. 3, 9, 19. (De Bellis 2005, 86-87) Therefore, we either have to accept the existence of a Greek dialect form *Θέλις (Jordan 46), or we can follow Ernout (1905, 331) who suggests dissimilation of Θέτις to *Thedis and subsequently to Telis. The second hypothesis is the more likely, as a change of
/d/ to /l/, or the so-called Sabinic l, (Meiser 2006, 100) appears far more plausible than supposing a local form. Indeed, there are numerous examples of this nature, both in middle and initial position: e.g., Ulixes < Odysseus, lacrima < dakryma, melica and medica < mèdikè and lepista < dépastron.

Regarding the CL form Aiax, an equivalent Doric form Αἰακς (sic.) or Αἰάκης has been proposed. (Jordan, 1990, 96; Biville 1995, 488, Wachter 1987, 137) Migliorini supposes that Aiax is a hyper-hellenistic correction. He argues that the -x ending would be more appealing to a Roman, as it would sound more like a Greek form than if it were to have the Latin -as ending (Migliorini 1956, 44)

Lastly, Alcumena from the Greek Ἀλκμήνη is a regular borrowing, directly from the original Greek epic form. The epenthesis of /u/ in between /cm/ was already attested in several grammatici. (Mar. Victorin. Gramm VI 8, 6 and Prisc. Gramm. II 29, 5) The Etruscan form Alχumena strongly resembles this form but is itself most likely a result of Latin influence. (Wachter 1987, 142-143)

Unlike the previous two mirrors, the myth displayed on the mirror (or supposedly displayed) is well-known. However, the discrepancy between the image and the theonyms in this case is better explained by assuming that the depiction refers to a different myth than the one as which we would identify it at first sight, rather than assuming ignorance on the part of the engraver. In the two previous examples, the artist had clearly confused some of the details of lesser-known myths, and this is definitely not the case here. The forms of the theonyms on the mirror itself are similar to their Greek counterparts and the two forms are most likely of Doric origin, so here we may conclude that the subsequent interpretations of the image on the mirror are erroneous.
CIL I² 557 and Add. p. 904, CIL XIV 4103. Matthies Group A


victoria alixentros

In this particular mirror, we see the goddess of victory, Victoria, crowning Alexander/Paris. This may be related to his victory over his brothers Hector and Deifobos during the funeral games held by Priamos in honour of the same Alexander/Paris. In Euripides’ and Sophocles’ fragmentary tragedies “Alexandros”, Priamos holds funerary games for his son which he believes to have been left to die long ago, as prophecy has declared that this son will bring about the end of Troy. When Alexandros partakes in the games, he beats his two brothers and is only then recognized as the son of Priamos by Cassandra.¹¹⁰ (Lloyd-Jones 1996, 40)

Schilling (1982, 169) argues that the image depicted in this mirror refers to some Etruscan images on which Turan, Etruscan Aphrodite, is placed next to Paris after the so-called judgement of Paris. She is “victoire dans la seduction amoureuse.” (Schilling, loc. cit.) Additionally, we can find Paris being crowned by Etruscan Mean (Nike or Victoria) on the lower half of ES 181 on which –ironically– the reconciliation of Menle (Menelaos) and his wife Elinai (Helene) is depicted.

We also find the Latin goddess victoria as vitoria on CIL I² 550 (supra p. 50) and victoria on 2498 (infra p. 65). For a discussion of alixentros, see alixentrom on CIL I² 553. (supra p. 53)

Just as in CIL I² 553, we might ascribe Etruscan influence to alixentros, and we can additionally find that the iconography of the image is a copy of or at least closely linked to Etruscan examples.

¹¹⁰ For a discussion of the passages in Sophocles’ Alexandros, see Lloyd-Jones loc. cit.
The story depicted on this mirror is told in Apollodoros\textsuperscript{111}: Aphrodite falls in love with the beautiful young Adonis whom she would like to hide and keep for herself. She places him in a box and then entrusts the closed box to Persephone, the queen of the underworld. Unable to contain her curiosity, the latter goddess opens the box and is so enchanted by the beauty of the young boy that when Aphrodite wants to claim the box, Persephone refuses to return Adonis. Zeus is called upon to resolve the quarrel and decides that Adonis is to stay with Aphrodite for one third of the year, with Persephone for another third, and finally with himself for the remainder of the year. Even though there are 22 Etruscan mirrors depicting Aphrodite and Adonis as lovers, this particular part of the story is only depicted on this single mirror, which was found near Orbetello, Etruria. The mirror was possibly made in Cosa, a Roman colony near the latter Etruscan city, for a Latin client. (Van Der Meer 1995, 191-193) Therefore, it is justified to expect possible Etruscan influence in the theonyms as well.

While Zeus is presented as the judge on this mirror, Diovem is in accusative; whereas venos is presented in nominative and prosepnai in dative case. We can reasonably follow Peruzzi who states that “I casi diversi dal nominativo, […], servono a conferire dinamismo alla scena raffigurata.” (Peruzzi 2011, 407-413) In this case it is not possible to translate the three theonyms on the mirror as a sentence. Or we might say that because Venus is the main character here, she is placed in the nominative. Zeus, although depicted in the center of the

\footnote{Apollodoros Bibliotheca 3.14.4}
mirror\textsuperscript{112}, is the second character and receives the accusative position as he is in direct connection to the subject. The dative of the third character \textit{prosepnai} can possibly be explained as dative of direction in relation with Iuppiter, who is oriented towards Persephone. If we accept this explanation, we can follow Wachter’s translation: “Venus fleht zu Iuppiter wegen bzw. für Proserpina.” (Wachter 1987, 114-116)

Regarding influences from Greek and Etruscan, we must discuss the representation of \textit{venos} and the linguistic provenance of \textit{Prosepnai}. Firstly, scholars consider the representation of the crying goddess \textit{venos} who covers her head with a veil to have been greatly influenced by the Etruscan Turan who is characterized by her role in funerary matters - in Latin \textit{Venus Libitina}. (De Bellis 2005, 94) As Schilling argues: “Ils ont reconnu Vénus dans la déesse popularisée par l’imagerie des miroirs étrusques. […] Pas plus que les Etrusques, qui s’inspirèrent des Grecs sans les copier servilement, les Prénestins n’ont dû ignorer l’art de l’adaption. Mais, en tout état de cause, ils on provoqué de nouvelles associations d’ideées, quand ils gratifièrent la déesse latine d’une guirlande de legends, soustraite à Turan.” (Schilling 1982, 160-161) This strong influence of Etruscan myth can be linked to the possible Etruscan origin of the mirror and its artist from Orbetello.

Another close tie to Etruria can be found in the form \textit{prosepnai}, which Van Der Meer (1995, 191-193) calls a “curious combination of Latin Proserpina and Etruscan Phersipnai.” The exact evolution of the Greek Persephone into Latin Proserpina is not fully understood. However, the convention is that the Latin Proserpina came into existence through an Etruscan form \textit{Fersipnai} > \textit{*Fr̥ sipna(i)}.\textsuperscript{113} We can explain the evolution from \textit{Fersipnai} > Lat. \textit{Prōserpina} with an anaptyxis of [i] in the second to last syllable\textsuperscript{114}. The lengthening of the

\textsuperscript{112} Zeus’ placement in the center of a mirror is a common topos; see: CIL I² 551. In that mirror, Zeus is also placed in the center and in a case different from the expected nominative, namely dative.
\textsuperscript{113} For a full discussion of the scholarship on the onym see De Bellis 2004, 352 – 353.
\textsuperscript{114} We discussed in the part about Praenestine Latin and its different stages that anaptyxis took place during the oldest stage of the language evolution, namely the period of the bronze inscriptions. (supra; p. 39-42) The lack of
first vowel in the first syllable most likely originates from folk etymology\textsuperscript{115} of \textit{prōserpo} and \textit{serpere} (OLD: to creep forwards or forth, to creep or crawl along; and to creep, crawl). Now, the form \textit{prosepnai} found on this mirror seems to result from the combination of the Latin \textit{prose-} (of Proserpina) and the Etruscan \textit{–pnai}. Alternatively, we could also argue that the form is a mixture of the Latin prefix \textit{pro-} and the Etruscan \textit{–sipnai}. As we know that the mirror was most likely made by an Etruscan artist for a Latin client, the artist might have been confused as to the final syllables of the mirror.

\textsuperscript{115} Varro \textit{I.L.} 566

\underline{anaptyxis} in this mirror can confirm the proposed chronology of Matthies as “Vorläufer”, i.e. one of the earliest Praenestine mirrors.
CIL I² 559 and p. 832 and Add. 904, CIL XIV 4104. Matthies Group A


celisia loucilia [ata ret iunio setio at [[i]]os ret

mexio¹ [asia² acila

¹: metio: Jordan, CIL XIV, Lattes, Ernout, Vetter
²: cassia: Ernout 1905, cassia and cata: Vetter; the <f> stands for a <f> of which the vertical line is not fully drawn

Scholars strongly disagree regarding the explanation of this particular mirror as it contains many difficult forms and phonologic issues. Particularly complex is the first line, which is engraved along the mantle of the first of four characters, three women and one man. It certainly presents two personal names, Ceisia Loucilia and Iunio Setio; however, neither of these names has been found on any of the Praenestine cists.¹¹⁶ The fata and atios have also been interpreted in different ways, namely as either fata as an oracle (past particium of for) and atios as personal name (in parallel with the Sabine Attus) (Nicholls 1993, 22-23); as Praenestine forms for mother and father (Jordan 1981, 254); as priests by referring to the Volscan word athavus (Vetter 1953, 222); or, finally, as the goddess of destiny (fatai) and birds (atois) (Körte 1897, 197-201). The recurring form ret has been explained as an abbreviation for dedet, or of the verb reor (OLD: to reckon, to calculate, to believe).

The inscriptions that are important for us can be seen adjacent to the figures and are not perfectly understood either. In his discussion on the mirrors, Wachter does not refer to these inscriptions at all. Only the last inscription, acila, can be clearly understood as it corresponds to the Latin word ancilla; the lack of gemination (see CIL I² 548) and the loss of the nasal (see setio on the same mirror) are particular to the Praenestine dialect.

¹¹⁶ Though these refer mostly to the third and second century BCE, whereas the mirror is dated to the early fourth century because of stylistic parallels. (De Bellis 1997)
Regarding the name *mexio*, if we adhere to the reading of De Bellis (2004, 103) and Wachter (1987, 117) who transcribe the inscription as <x>, the most plausible explanation for the inscription is possibly: *mexio* < Maecsios < Maecisios (-isios derivation of Maecios). Read as *metio*, the form has been identified as Prometheus who is accompanied by Asia. In this explanation, the <f> before Asia is considered aspiration.\textsuperscript{117} (Guarucci 1877, 162-163) If we indeed accept this reading, the identification with Prometheus is not far-fetched. For the loss of the first syllable is not unseen in Praeneste (*conea* and *ceconia* in Peruzzi 1976, 45-51; De Bellis 2005, 101) and we already argued in *hercele* (see above, p. CIL I² 551) that loss of final –s in the nominative is possible on the mirrors. Additionally, as Prometheus is not only the bringer of fire in Greek mythology, but also has given humankind the power of prophecy,\textsuperscript{118} this could conveniently refer to the first line of the inscription, which is sometimes linked to oracles, priests, and the goddess of destiny and birds. Or, in order to explain the loss of ending in the nominative, Jordan 1881(75) argues that the form must have been derived from the Greek name Μητίων. The loss of final –n is already attested in *ario*. (CIL I² 554)

We may link this to the interpretation of *Fasia*. This form is more self-evident as “lady from Phasis”, a river in Kolchis, referring to Medea. If we look at mythology it becomes easier to except the name Μητίων, son of Erechtheus,\textsuperscript{119} as it is strongly linked to Athens and therefore to Theseus, lover of Medea. In this case, the first line of text on the mirror is not linked to the image presented on it.

We can conclude that, if we accept the assumptions above, no Etruscan influence can be traced for the two theonyms, which may be identified as either Prometheus and Asia, or Methion and Medea. Neither can we find any kind of Greek influence. Instead, we are

\textsuperscript{117} In Praenestine Latin, the value of <f> alternates between a bilabial and an aspiration (see cists *felena* 566 and *fercles* 564). In the other interpretation, the <f> is considered a bilabial. (De Bellis 2005, 103-104)

\textsuperscript{118} See Aesch., Prometheus bound, .

\textsuperscript{119} Paus. Description of Greece 2.6.6
presented with forms that are strongly rooted in Latin, and specifically Praenestine Latin (e.g. loss of gemination and nasal in *acilla*, and value of <f>).
CIL I² 2497 and Add. p.904. Matthies: NA

(Vaglieri “Not. Sc.” 1907 pp. 479-480, fig. 18 – Vetter 366p – Matthies p. 48 – Wachter § 68 – De Bellis p. 105-109, Table XIV a, XIV b, XIV c. 1, 2.)

\[\textit{noci opus}\textsuperscript{1} / \textit{l valeri}\]

\[\text{to[ ]doros}\textsuperscript{2}\]

\[\text{ancis}\]

\textsuperscript{1}: \textit{nocioru}: Wachtter

\textsuperscript{2}: to[ ]dofos: Vaglieri 1907, p. 479

On the first line of this mirror we see, for the second time, the signature of the artist who has engraved the inscription. The most plausible interpretation of the first line is given by Matthies (1912, 48) who reads: “Noci opus L. Valeri”, that is to say, the work of Nocus, slave or freed man of the Valerius family. The story portrayed on the mirror is most likely the conception of the Dioscuri; present are Tyndareos, human father of the Dioscuri and husband of Leda, Leda herself – albeit that she is not named - and a swan with wings spread apart, i.e. Iuppiter.

The figure next to the form To[ ]doros can clearly be identified as Tyndareos, but this orthography is not as one might expect. The vowel change from /i/ to /o/ in both first and second syllable is as Wachtter says: “das mittlere o etwas merkwürdig anmutet”. (Wachter 1987, 169-170) He attributes the first change to a Praenestine borrowing from the Greek Tundareos, in which the Greek υ is transferred to Latin o. The second change is not as easily explained, but may originate from either a pronunciation of [a] as /ǝ/ (Wachter 1987, 169-170), or analogy between the three vowels in the word.

The origin of the term ancis is largely obscure (Wachter 1987, 170). De Bellis proposes a borrowing from the Greek word ἀνακτες or ἄνακες, rulers. This epithet is sometimes linked to
The Dioscuri in Attica, Argolis and, primarily, Sparta. The ancis, or Dioscuri, are what combine the swan to Leda. The form can be explained by syncope of middle [a] and alternation between Greek ending -es and Latin ending –is as in pleoris, semunis and simunis in the Carmen Arvale. (De Bellis 2005, 108-109) Perhaps the Greek dualis form ἄνακε might have been considered a singular and given the Latin singular –is ending of the third declension.

On this mirror, Latinized versions of Greek forms have been employed in order to present gods and heroes. The abnormalities in the theonyms do not seem to be the result of a direct influence by a particular Greek dialect – after being originally borrowed from the original and epic Greek theonym – or Etruscan.

---

120 The Dioscuri are usually thought to be transferred from Greece into Italy through the Spartan colony of Taranto. This would explain why the primarily Spartan epithet for the heroes is used in Praeneste. The epithet in itself is a “designazione sostitutiva del nome Τυνδαρίδαι”. (Pugliese Carratelli 1979,18) The name of the hero Tyndareos and the Dioscuri’s epithet are therefore closely related.
This mirror presents a young man, *hiaco*, in a chariot pulled by a panther, a deer, a griffon and a lynx, while surrounded by three goddesses: *fortuna* and *menerva* in the center and *victoria* flying towards the young man from the right. We cannot elaborate much on the linguistic forms of the names of the three goddesses, as both *fortuna* and *victoria* are written in their Latin form while the vocal change of [i] to [e] in *menerva* can be explained by a Praenestine vocal innovation. (see supra Taseiofilios CIL I² 555)

The form *hiaco* has most often been interpreted as the Greek hero Iason. (Pollak 1908, 70; Wachter 1987, 118-119; and Matthies 1912, 98-100) Scholars have considered the <c> to be an incorrect spelling by the engraver and regarding the aspiration of the first [i] we can refer to the form Ἰάσων found on an amphora from Tarento in Magna Graecia. However, as the Dionysian theme of the image of the mirror—a chariot pulled by different animals—, was not taken into account,¹²¹ scholars did not refer to the Greek name for Dionysos Ἴακχος. Indeed, the consonant cluster <κχ> is a much more plausible origin for the Praenestine occlusive <c>. For the aspiration of initial [i], we can refer to the Tarentine form of Iason, which is similar.¹²² Therefore, on this particular mirror, we note a direct influence by a Doric dialect.

¹²¹ Far more attention is placed upon the presence of Victoria and Minerva who are more likely to appear in the company of the hero Iason than in that of the god Dionysos. Admittedly, if the artist would have wanted to emphasize his choice for the god Dionysos, we would have expected more other Dionysian elements and figures, such as silenes and satyrs. As in mirrors CIL I² 554 and 555, the engraving artist might have confused two mythological scenes and iconography, namely of Iason and Iakchos. Because of the importance and popularity of their myths, it is hard to believe that the stories themselves might have been confused. (Champeaux 1987, 73: “nous nous demandons si le graveur n’a pas commis une confusion entre les deux personages, qui a eu pour résultat une contamination, à contresens, entre leurs deux mythes.”)

¹²² There is another attestation of the aspirated form of Iakchos in Esichios: θιακχά ανθη εν Σικυωνι. In this case, the θ results from the τ of the article with an aspiration of the Ἴακχα.
At this point, I omit the purported Praenestine mirror CIL P 2499 from this discussion. In light of recent examinations by the British Museum where the mirror is preserved, it appears that the inscription and engraved image are a modern forgery. Paleographic data would point in the same direction. The antiquity of the mirror in itself, however, has been proven. (De Bellis 2005, 115) Whatever the case, the few letters that are legible on the mirror cannot be linked to any particular names.
The engraving on this particular mirror has been considered to be a forgery in the past, due to similarities of the image with another non-engraved mirror in Berlin; (Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1973, 420-423) it has therefore been placed in the CIL as a forgery (Add. P. VIII). More recently, Wachter and De Bellis have argued that there are enough reasons to not consider the mirror a recent copy of the Berlin mirror; not least because this particular mirror was found on the Roman market thirty years before the Berlin one. However, as we do not know anything about the provenance of the Berlin mirror before it arrived in the museum, we have to resort to a discussion of the image and the paleography of the inscription.\textsuperscript{123}

Regarding the inscription, we can readily say that the forms coincide with their expected Praenestine forms. We find a second example of what we might consider a sentence: namely, we discern an indirect object, subject and on the last position, a verb \textit{asta}. Firstly, Caia Caponia can either be a representation of Venus (Wachter 1987, loc. cit.) or the name of the woman for whom the mirror was intended. Her name is of Praenestine origin and it is in dative case corresponding to the verb \textit{astat}. We would traditionally expect a dative case to end with –\textit{ai}. However, the –\textit{ā} ending is common in a vast area, i.e. Praeneste, Pesaro, Nemi, Amiternum, Lavinio, S. Maria di Falleri, Napoli, Delos, etc. (\textit{Index Grammaticus} of the CIL, 181; De Bellis 2005, 118-119) Regarding the form \textit{asta} or rather atat (OLD: to stand at or near a person or thing, to stand by +dat, or +acc, or +abl), we can briefly say that the final dental stop is lost, as it is not pronounced. As in CL, the verb here is on the final position where we would expect it to be. Also, because of the position of the verb, the name of the god

\textsuperscript{123} For further information see: Emmanuel-Rebuffat (1973, 420-423), who argues that it is a forgery; Wachter (1987, 171-172) and De Bellis (2004, 116-117) argue the opposite.
does also physically reside next to the woman on the mirror. The form *cupido* has not undergone any remarkable changes. (see CIL P 550)
c) **Summary of the Theonyms**

After our linguistic discussion of all 16 engraved authentic Praenestine mirrors, we can summarize by saying that we have found a total of 41 theonyms\(^{124}\) and five references to historical personal names. As some of the theonyms occur on several mirrors or are repeated on the same mirror, we end up with a total of 32 different names.

Regarding the five historical persons mentioned on the mirrors, we see that in two out of the five cases these refer to the name of the artist, whereas the other three cases most likely identify the people for whom the mirror was intended. Most interesting is the inscription of the Greek artist *vibis pilipus*, which demonstrates that the artists and engravers of the mirrors were not only persons from Praeneste or Etruria. Regarding the commissioners of the mirrors, we can briefly say that, based upon the evidence found within these inscriptions, it appears that they are linked to Praeneste itself, though the number of available inscriptions is too low to allow for a meaningful discussion and conclusion to be drawn on the matter.

Regarding the origin of the 32 theonyms, we have seen that ten of them are of Latin origin and have certainly not been influenced by the Greek or Etruscan language. It is remarkable that six theonyms out of the ten concern names of main divinities of the traditional pantheon, namely Cupid, Venus, Iuno, Iuppiter, Mercury, Minerva. Three of the other four, Victoria, Luna, and Fortuna, are divine personifications of traditional concepts which are also well-known and esteemed characters in traditional mythology. The last name, *acila* or *ancilla* (maid or slave-girl), stands out, as it is not a personal name of a divinity or of a hero.

However, I do treat the word as theonym in this case as it refers to a depicted character in the

---

\(^{124}\) With *theonyms* I intend all names that belong to a character portrayed on the mirrors.
mythological scene on the mirror. Hence, out of the total of 41 theonyms, 15 are of Latin origin, and these are present on nine\textsuperscript{125} out of 16 mirrors – more than 50%.

Secondly, we noted several cases in which Etruscan influence could be identified, with varying degrees of probability. Indeed, the origin of some of the theonyms is not always clear, and we should therefore proceed with caution when ascribing Etruscan origin or influence to some of the forms. We can summarize that the forms in which we can discern potential Etruscan origin and for which no other truly convincing linguistic explanation can be found, are in ascending order of probability: \textit{alixentrom/-s, amuces, hercele, prosepnai}. All of these theonyms identify well-known or primary figures in mythology, e.g. \textit{alixentrom} and \textit{prosepnai}, or cult, e.g. \textit{amuces} and \textit{hercele}. Also, in all four cases the Etruscan form is a catalyst for the Greek form. Furthermore, we have noted that in mirror CIL I² 557 and 558 there is a particularly similar iconography between the image on the Praenestine mirror and its Etruscan equivalent. Linguistically speaking, we can say that four\textsuperscript{126} out of 16 mirrors – or 25\% – are potentially influenced by Etruscan, of which two are additionally shown to be of similar iconography. According to the most conventional chronology of the mirrors by Matthies, these four mirrors can be dated to the earliest chronological groups he discerns, namely Vorlaüfer, A, and B. Finally, we noted that in the case of \textit{alcumena}, it is highly likely that there was an influence by the Latin form upon the Etruscan form.

The largest group of theonyms is, unsurprisingly, of Greek descent, namely 21 forms out of the total of 41 – or 19 out of 32.\textsuperscript{127} It appears necessary to subdivide this group of forms into categories, as summarized in table 3 below, as some of them are closer to a Greek origin than

\textsuperscript{125} CIL I² 550, 551, 553, 557, 558, 559, 2498, and ILLRP 1204

\textsuperscript{126} CIL I² 551, 553, 557, and 558. It is remarkable that the other theonyms on these four mirrors are primarily of Latin origin, i.e. \textit{iuno, iovei, mirqurios, victoria, venos, diovem}. The only theonym of Greek origin paired with a possibly Etruscan name is \textit{poloces}, but this name is not a direct Greek transliteration. Indeed, it represents one of the furthest stages in the evolution from Πολυδεύκες to the purely Latin form Polloces.

\textsuperscript{127} Because of the fact that \textit{amuces} and \textit{amucos} are respectively of Etruscan and direct Greek influence, I have counted them double. Therefore, if we were to add ten (Latin origin) and four (Etruscan origin) to 19 (Greek), we have 33 instead of 32.
others. First, we can divide the Greek forms into two groups following Wachter (1987, 172-173): namely, a group of theonyms for which an Etruscan equivalent is attested, and a group for which no Etruscan form has been found (“A” and “B”, respectively, in table 3 below). We further note that some of them originate from a traditionally epic or Koinè form (“Epic”) while others result from a dialectal, primarily Doric form (“Dialectal”). Additionally, we should distinguish forms that were adapted either in order to adapt to a different form than we would expect phonetically (“+”), whereas others were simply transcribed or given a Latin ending (“-”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Etruscan form attested</th>
<th>B. No Etruscan equivalent attested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theonym</strong></td>
<td><strong>Origin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castor</td>
<td>Epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amucos</td>
<td>Epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poloucos</td>
<td>Epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telis</td>
<td>Epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aiax</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcumaena</td>
<td>Epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mexio</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fasia</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tof</td>
<td>doros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Theonyms of Greek origin

Upon examining this table, we may note a couple of important points.

In general, except for the gods painsscos and hiaco – both linked to Dionysian cult –, all the theonyms of Greek origin in table 3 represent heroes, e.g. melerpanta, castor and polouces and secondary characters in mythology, e.g. alcumaena, oinomaus. As we saw before, the main gods included in the Latin pantheon are represented by a purely Latin form.
Firstly, none of the theonyms in which an Etruscan attestation of the equivalent of the form is attested ("A" in table 3) has a dialectal or Doric origin\textsuperscript{128}. The form is therefore likely to have arrived in both Praeneste and Etruria from a Greek-speaking area or, as in the case of alcumena, the Latin form was the foundation for the corresponding Etruscan form.

Secondly, out of the six mirrors exhibiting Greek forms that do not correspond to any Etruscan forms ("B" in table 3), we distinguish four – possibly five –\textsuperscript{129} that are engraved with a dialectal Greek form and can therefore be considered to be influenced by Greek directly. On mirror CIL I\textsuperscript{2} 559, mexio and fastia are not attested in CL (De Bellis 2005, 103), but do appear to be of Greek origin as well. It is remarkable that even though the theonym is dialectal, most represent a main character in Greek mythology, in particular painsscos (Pan), melerpanta (Bellerophon), hiaco (Dionysos), and ancis (the Dioscuri). In the case of painsscos, we can trace this use back to the origin of the artist of the mirror. We also observe that the forms that originate from dialectal Greek always appear to have undergone phonological adaptation.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the forms in which an Etruscan form is attested are not placed on the same mirrors as the ones in which this is not the case, except in the last of the mirrors discussed. The three mirrors that contain these seven theonyms appear not to have been produced under the same direct Greek influence as the other six mirrors, but were already integrated into the Latin language and culture when they were placed on the mirrors.

\textsuperscript{128} When we discussed aiax, we mentioned that it could potentially be a Doric form or a hyperhellenistic Latin form. Because of the fact that we do not have any certainty regarding this form, we can not draw any reasonable conclusions from it.

\textsuperscript{129} CIL I\textsuperscript{2} 552, 554, 2497, 2498. As we are not sure about the exact origins of the forms taseos and lugorcos, we refrain from draw conclusions from them. However, for taseos, a dialectal Doric form from Magna Graecia is likely.
5) Conclusion

In general, we can conclude that we have found strong linguistic evidence confirming direct contact between Praeneste, Etruria and Magna Graecia. In our discussion, we have identified several elements that allow us to further clarify and refine this observation.

Focusing first on the linguistic contact between Praeneste and Etruria in the discussion of the extra-textual and intra-textual concerns regarding the origin of the multilingual contact in Praeneste, we mentioned that the concept of engraved mirrors depicting mythological scenes and including the relevant theonyms is exclusive to the Etruscan and the Praenestine cultures. Because of this exclusivity and cultural unity that therefore appears to have existed between the two, we hypothesized extensive linguistic influence to also have taken place. However, of the few Etruscan forms that we were able to discern, only one (prosepnai) is undoubtedly of Etruscan linguistic origin. We therefore conclude that this influence by Etruria on Praeneste is far more restricted linguistically than we assumed at the onset of our present analysis.

Regarding chronology, we noted that possible Etruscan influence was only to be found in mirrors of the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century BCE. We might connect this to the acquisition of Praeneste by the Romans in 338 BCE, after which Etruscan influence probably diminished greatly. Regarding the nature of the theonyms, we noted that out of four possible Etruscan forms that are primary characters, all have a Greek origin. We can therefore agree with the statement of Smith (supra. p. 42), who mentioned that “the most important role of the Etruscans, and the Campanians to the south, may have been in mediating [also linguistically] the tremendous impact of Greek, Phoenician, and other eastern ways of thinking.” The outcome of our analysis appears to corroborate Smith’s conclusion insofar it regards the role of the Etruscans. Otherwise formulated, the direct Etruscan influence is limited both in time and in the nature of the theonyms.
Additionally, when looking at the direct Greek influence reflected on the Praenestine mirrors, we made a number of noteworthy observations. The direct linguistic influence between dialectal Greek, mostly from Magna Graecia, and Praenestine Latin is more prominently present than the influence of Etruscan. We may explain this by referring to the fact that Hellenism played a central role in the cultural life of the Praenestine elite. We mentioned how the province of Magna Graecia escaped domination by Rome for a long time, and retained its high profile even after the Roman conquest. (supra. p. 36-37) Therefore, it is impossible to fully accept Smith’s statement regarding the role of the Campanians as mediator between the classic Greek, Koinè, language and Praenestine Latin; they clearly had a linguistic influence of their own on the forms of the theonyms within the Praenestine mirrors.

Finally, even though we perceive that Etruscan influence was a catalyst for Greek theonyms, direct dialectal Greek contact and Etruscan influence appear to have been mutually exclusive. Possible dialectal Greek and Etruscan forms never appear on the same mirrors, and when dialectal Greek theonyms do occur on Praenestine mirrors, they do not have an Etruscan equivalent. It is impossible to argue for all forms that their absence from Etruscan mirrors is fully explained by their obscurity in mythology. This either implies that direct contact between engravers from Magna Graecia and Etruria was limited, or that, which is more likely, the Etruscan language was much more conservative towards dialectal Greek forms.

Our observations nevertheless confirm that, no matter how strong Greek influence has been on Roman mythology through contact with Greece and Magna Graecia and through indirect contact through Etruria, the linguistic origin of most important divinities in the Latin pantheon, including the Praenestine Latin, is Italic.
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7) Nederlandse Samenvatting

Etruskische spiegels zijn al sinds lang het onderwerp van zowel linguïstisch als archeologisch/historisch onderzoek. Dit onderzoek is geresulteerd in het Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum of CSE waarin elke bewaarde bronzen handspeigel uitvoerig wordt beschreven en besproken. In deze thesis worden de bronzen spiegels uit de stad Praeneste behandeld. Hoewel deze zijn opgenomen in het CSE omdat ze duidelijke stilistische overeenkomsten vertonen met spiegels van Etruskische origine, onderscheiden Praenestijnse spiegels zich van deze omdat ze inscripties in het Archaïsch Latijn en niet in het Etruskisch bevatten.

De stad Praeneste, of het huidige Palestrina, is bekend om verschillende redenen. Niet alleen zijn een groot aantal Latijnse inscripties aan de stad verbonden, waaronder de zeer bekende “cista Ficoroni” en de “fibula Praenestina,” maar de stad had ook een belangrijk economisch en religieus belang in de Oudheid. In de eerste plaats had Praeneste, zeker in vergelijking met naburige regio’s, een hoge levensstandaard gekarakteriseerd door het verlangen naar luxe objecten geïmporteerd vanuit de verre hoeken van de Middellandse Zee. Niet enkel werd hierdoor de handel gestimuleerd, maar de stad werd ook een attractiepool voor artiesten die ook de lokale ambachten verriekten. Ten tweede trok de stad vele pelgrims aan door de aanwezigheid van het belangrijke orakel van de stadsgodin Fortuna Primigenia. Dit alles leidde tot een stad die gekarakteriseerd werd door een multiculturele gemeenschap.

In deze thesis voeren we een linguïstische analyse uit van de multiculturele en daarbij horende meertalige invloeden op de Archaïsch Latijnse inscripties op de Praenestijnse spiegels. Deze inscripties bevatten voornamelijk de namen van Goden die horen bij de mythologische scene, afgebeeld op de spiegel, en deze daarmee verklaren. Onderzoek op deze groep spiegels in het verleden heeft zich grotendeels afgescheiden door ofwel een puur linguïstisch, ofwel een puur historisch of archeologisch perspectief te hanteren. Om een meer volledig beeld te bekomen van het onderwerp hebben we beide perspectieven gecombineerd, waarbij gestart wordt met een meer historische analyse met als doel de meertaligheid van de regio te contextualiseren, om daarna over te gaan tot de puur linguïstische analyse.

In hoofdstuk 3 wordt een meer historisch perspectief op de meertaligheid van Praeneste behandeld. Eerst bespreken we het concept van meertaligheid als resultaat van de diverse linguïstische invloeden in Praeneste. Deze meertaligheid kunnen we immers niet op dezelfde manier behandelen als, bijvoorbeeld, de invloed van het Grieks op de Romeinse elite vanaf de
Republiek. De aanwezigheid van de Griekse taal en cultuur in Rome was namelijk voornamelijk gebaseerd op de Romeinse claim op de Klassiek Griekse cultureel-politieke autoriteit en manifesteerde zich dus vooral in een literaire context. Zoals we reeds hebben vernmeld, is de multiculturele invloed in Praeneste echter van een andere aard, en eerder te danken aan de brede handelscontacten en het religieuze belang van de stad. We kunnen spreken van een religieus en economische meertaligheid of “multilingualism.”

Daarna bespreken we hoe we kunnen omgaan met meertaligheid wanneer er enkel een tekstuele basis – bestaande uit inscripties – aanwezig is voor onderzoek. Hiervoor kijken we naar extra-tekstuele elementen, namelijk de origine van de artiesten en graveurs voor zover deze terug te vinden is, en intra-tekstuele elementen, namelijk de taal en stijl die conventioneel wordt verwacht bij dergelijk inscripties op spiegels. Uit deze analyse blijkt dat we vooral een Etruskische invloed zouden verwachten op de spiegels, hoewel de mythologische scènes zelf afkomstig zijn uit de Griekse cultuur.

Ten slotte behandelen we kort de verschillende talen die aanwezig waren in Praeneste: het Etruskisch, het Grieks en het Praenestijns Latijn. We houden hiervoor rekening met enkele linguïstische fenomenen van elke taal afzonderlijk, enkele belangrijke historische kenmerken van de respectievelijke regio’s, en de godennamen of theoniemen eigen aan de cultuur zelf.

Na het contextualiseren van de spiegels en de meertaligheid in Praeneste gaan we over tot de eigenlijke linguïstische bespreking van de afzonderlijke inscripties in hoofdstuk 4. In totaal bespreken we 16 gegraveerde Praenestijnse spiegels die een Latijnse inscriptie bevatten. De 17e vermeende Praenestijnse gegraveerde spiegel wordt kort aangehaald maar niet verder besproken aangezien het om een vervalsing gaat. De spiegels worden traditioneel gesitueerd tussen het einde van de vijfde eeuw v.Chr. en het begin van de derde eeuw v.Chr. en bevatten in totaal 41 namen van goden, die betrekking hebben op 32 verschillende mythologische figuren, en vijf namen van mensen uit de extra-tekstuele werkelijkheid.

In het geheel van de 41 verschillende namen die verwijzen naar personages vinden we 15 verschillende namen die van Latijnse/Italische afkomst zijn. Deze komen voor op negen van de zestien spiegels en verwijzen allemaal naar zeer belangrijke godheden voor het Latijnse pantheon. Daarnaast vonden we vijf verschillende namen, verdeeld over vier spiegels, die mogelijks (!) van Etruskische afkomst zijn. Deze vier namen zijn evenwel geen oorspronkelijk Etruskische helden/goden maar zijn van Griekse oorsprong. De Etruskische invloed blijkt beperkt tot de vroegste spiegels, namelijk tot het begin van de vierde eeuw.
v.Chr. Ten slotte vonden we 21 verschillende namen van Griekse origine, waarvan er vier, mogelijks vijf, direct door een Grieks dialect – waarschijnlijk vanuit Magna Graecia – zijn beïnvloed. We zagen dat namen waarvoor een Griekse invloed kan worden beargumenteerd nooit op dezelfde spiegel voorkomen als namen die mogelijks een Etruskische afkomst hebben.

We besluiten in hoofdstuk 5 ten eerste dat de Etruskische invloed niet zo groot is als we hadden verwacht uit onze analyse van meertaligheid in Praeneste. Inderdaad, slechts op vier spiegels vinden we godennamen die mogelijks beïnvloed zijn door het Etruskisch en deze zijn allemaal oorspronkelijk Grieks. De Etrusken blijken dus slechts katalysatoren geweest te zijn voor een Griekse invloed, en dit slechts tot de inname van Praeneste door Rome in 338 v.Chr. Dit verklaart de chronologie van de Etruskische invloed tot het begin van de vierde eeuw. Ten tweede stellen we vast dat er zeker directe Griekse invloed vanuit Magna Graecia moet geweest zijn. Ten laatste kunnen we ook besluiten dat, hoewel er een grote influx is geweest van Griekse theoniemen, de meest belangrijke goden toch van Italiisch/Latijnse origine zijn.