

Etruskische Texte. Editio minor. Band I: Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices; II: Texte. Hrsg. von Helmut R i x in Zusammenarbeit mit Gerhard M e i s e r unter Mitwirkung von Fritz K o u b a , Dieter S t e i n b a u e r , Ludwig R ü b e k e i l und vielen anderen. Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1991, gr.-8°, IX, 320; [VI], 370 S. (ScriptOralia, 23–24.) Brosch. je 98 DM; geb. je 128 DM.

The book contains two volumes, one with the texts (II), the other with the introduction, indices and concordances with earlier editions. The indices give all Etruscan word forms (130 pages), also in retrograde order. They are given in the order of the Etruscan (= Greek) alphabet (i. e. *a c e v z h θ i* etc.); I would have changed this to the order of the Latin alphabet.

There are some 8600 texts, which are here edited for the first time together. The texts are arranged according to the area of origin (Veii, Caere etc.), and subdivided according to the kind of text: funerary (these again according to the exact place of origin), possessor-inscriptions, votive in-

scriptions, etc. (numbered 1–9; and 0 for the rest). The texts on mirrors, gems and coins, however, are grouped together, each in a separate chapter. All texts received a new code, consisting of two letters for the place of origin, the number of the kind of text, and a serial number, e.g. Cl 1.2731 = Clusium, the 2731st grave inscription. This appears to be a very practical system (the system used for Mycenaean). All texts are dated as precisely as is possible (but many texts cannot be more exactly dated than ‘recent’, i.e. after 480).

The texts are followed by a series of abbreviations which are rather complicated. There is a useful ‘Gebrauchsanweisung’ (by Meiser), but it counts no less than 13 pages. It is not practical that this Gebrauchsanweisung is not given in the same volume as the texts.

I think a (detailed) map of the areas concerned should have been added.

Rix’s transcription of the sibilants requires some discussion. Though his system is simple in principle, the presentation in §29 is very hard to understand. R. assumes – no doubt correctly – that Etruscan had two phonemes, /s/ and /š/. These are transcribed as {s} (sigma – with three strokes) and {σ} (san, M) in the southern inscriptions. The problem is that in the north the signs are used the other way round. R. transcribes the latter as {ś} and {ó}. Thus, we have:

phoneme	south	north
/s/	s (sigma, with three strokes)	ś (san, M)
/š/	σ (san, M)	ó (sigma)

So far the system is clear. (Note that the accent indicates northern texts.)

A further difficulty is that in the north the sigma is sometimes found where we would expect san. R. has convincingly explained this by assuming a sound development /s/ > /š/ in certain positions in the north. But now he proposes to transcribe the (‘unexpected’) sigma in these cases with {s} (so as to show the relation with the southern s). This system certainly should not be adopted. First, one can no longer see whether an {s} is southern (/s/) or northern (sigma, {ó}, /š/). If one writes *spurina* for both dialects, one must know whether it is northern, and if so that here s means /š/. Secondly, it is phonetically and phonemically incorrect: the northern sound was [š] and (most probably) fell together with the phoneme /š/. There is no problem at all in writing northern *ópurina*. (One must know that there was a development /s/ > /š/ here, but this is normal with different dialects.) – Note that this complication is not mentioned in the Gebrauchsanweisung (§52). (However, the introduction does not give all the facts mentioned in §52.)

Though the main system is simple, I doubt whether it is a fortunate one. It is not really simple to remember that {ó} is the same sign as {s}. I fear that it may lead to misunderstandings. A second point is that σ is never used in linguistics to indicate a specific type of sibilant. A simple system can be devised to indicate that we are dealing with a northern

form. I therefore propose to write *s* and *ś* for the south, and underline them in the northern words, in the following way (I add my proposal for Caere and two more signs, for which see below):

south	north	Caere
/s/ <i>s</i> (sigma)	<i>ś</i> (san, M)	<i>š</i> (sigma with
/š/ <i>ś</i> (san, M)	<i>ś̄</i> (sigma)	<i>š</i> four strokes)
X <i>š</i> /s/		
ksi <i>ś</i> /s/		

This system has the advantage, of course, of not causing a break in the tradition.

Then, again, one wonders whether it would not be better systematically to distinguish between southern and northern forms and texts. Thus in Umbrian, the native alphabet is indicated by bold face or capitals. I find this an unpleasant and unpractical system, so I propose to write the southern texts in italics (i. e. 'normal'; there is reason to consider the southern dialect as 'normal'), and the northern ones non-cursive or underlined. E. g. S. *śuθi*, N. *śuθi* or *śuθi* (that θ, φ, χ are mostly available only in one form is no problem).

A further complication is that in Caere the sibilants are written differently. R. writes *š* and *ō*. However, in both cases the same sign (the sigma with four strokes) is used! So we should write *š* in both cases.

There is a fourth sign, an X, which is transcribed with an *s* with an *x* on top of it. This sign can be reduced to {š} (the *š* can be made by all writing devices). It indicates /s/. – A fifth sign is the ksi, written as + in a square. Instead of an *s* with + on top of it (usually impossible to make), we should use another diacritic, e. g. *ś̄* (or *š̄*, or *š̄*, or *š̄*); but this sign is not used in the texts.

There are some readings which seem mistaken (which is hardly avoidable in such a mass of texts). My colleague L. B. van der Meer points out to me the following misprints found in inscriptions on mirrors. Ta S.10 has *leθam*, not *leθans*. Vs S.15 has *svutaf*, not *svutaφ*. Vc S.27 has *mus*, not *musu*/? Pe S.10 has *axununa*, so *axu(nu)na* is incorrect. It must be evaluated later how many problems of this kind there are.

The main question, of course, is the constitution of the text. Here I find the system of signs used to indicate how the text originated quite difficult. (One finds .*, Ri*, (*), (), ci = coniecit etc.) On p.19 we read: "Fehllesungen sind nicht in den Apparat aufgenommen, da ihre große Zahl den verfügbaren Rahmen gesprengt hätte." In fact, the correction of wrong readings is one of the major advantages of the present edition. It would therefore have been essential to point out such corrections. Again, on p.27: "Wer den Wortlaut einer durch Konjektur korrigierten Verlesung sucht, sei auf die in den Noten vorher genannten Publikationen verwiesen." This complex situation will produce many uncertainties, I fear. I may illustrate this on just one example. In Pe5.3 the text of TLE

572 has *aperuce*⁵*n* and *-urane*, R. gives *aperuce*⁵*m* and [*ś*]*purane*. The notes state: *ci Ri* (= *coniecit Rix*). Does this mean that all the changes are due to R.? Is the *-m* a corrected reading (which is not indicated) or a conjecture? Same question for the *p*. Did R. see the original text himself? As R. says, the reader will often have to consult earlier editions before he can see what happened. My conclusion would be that, in the case of these texts (for which the language is so badly known) an *editio maior* was required. And I think that the editors could have provided one, and that it is only the size and the costs of the edition that made them opt for the *editio minor*.

These remarks should not detract from the importance of this edition. For the first time we have all texts together. A large number of errors have been corrected. And we have the conjectures and suggestions on the texts by Rix and his school.

University of Leiden
 Faculteit der Letteren, Vergelijkende taalwetenschappen
 P.O.Box 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

R. S. P. Beekes