

## COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF LATIN 35<sup>1</sup>

### Etruscan; The Pyrgi Bilingual

#### I. The External History of Etruscan

A. When and Where: The Etruscan language is attested on numerous inscriptions (more than 10,000 as of 2005), the earliest of which date to ca. 700 BCE century, the latest to the reign of Augustus (27 BCE -14 CE). The texts for the most part have been discovered in ancient Etruria, but many are from Campania, which was colonized by the Etruscans at an early date. Etruscan texts have also been found in Latium,<sup>2</sup> Corsica,<sup>3</sup> North Africa,<sup>4</sup> and Southern France.<sup>5</sup>

#### B. The Major Documents

Most Etruscan texts are very short, very stereotypical documents in the familiar epigraphical genres: funerary inscriptions, possessor inscriptions, captions, etc. These texts are mainly well-understood.<sup>6</sup> There are only a small number of longer texts, which are much more difficult to interpret. These are:

1. The *Liber Linteus* or *Liber Agramensis*.<sup>7</sup> (2<sup>nd</sup> century CE). This text is an invaluable unicum. It is a ritual calendar written on linen. Somehow the linen book made it to Egypt where it was used as wrapping for a mummy. A Croatian traveler, Mihael Barić (1791-1859) brought the mummy back to Vienna. After his death, his brother, Ilija Barić, gave the mummy to the National Museum in Zagreb, now the Arheološki Muzej. The text has about 1200 words but many of them are repetitions. Generically, the contents are similar to the Umbrian Iguvine Tables.

2. Tabula Capuana.<sup>8</sup> 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE. A clay tile from Capua, with about 300 words. It

---

<sup>1</sup> **Bibliographical Hints:** All Etruscan texts are cited from Rix 1991. For Etruscan grammar see Agostiniani 1992, Steinbauer 1999; Rix 2000.

<sup>2</sup> Rome and Praeneste.

<sup>3</sup> Aleria.

<sup>4</sup> Smindja, Tunisia.

<sup>5</sup> Pech Maho (Sigean, Aude).

<sup>6</sup> There are also some dozens of glosses attributed, sometimes incorrectly, to Etruscan in ancient sources like Hesychius, and Dioscorides. Finally, there are Latin words which rightly or wrongly have been suspected of being Etruscan loanwords by either ancient or modern authorities.

<sup>7</sup> Picture available at: [www.spauda.lt/history/lith/mummy.gif](http://www.spauda.lt/history/lith/mummy.gif)

is also thought to be a religious calendar.

3. Tabula Cortonensis<sup>9</sup> ± 200 words. A bronze tablet from Cortona broken into eight pieces of which seven were recovered. It is some sort of contract.
  4. Cippus Perusinus, a boundary stone from Perugia<sup>10</sup>. 130 words from 3<sup>rd</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE.
  5. A lead tablet from Santa Marinella. ca. 500 BCE. About 80 words.
  6. A lead spiral of Magliano. 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE. About 70 words.
  7. The Elogium of Laris Pulenas<sup>11</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Tarquinia. 59 words. Generically similar to the Scipionic *Elogia*.
  8. Iecur Placentinum<sup>12</sup> A bronze model of a sheep liver from near Piacenza. 51 names of divinities are mentioned but some are repeats.
  9. The Gold Tablets of Pyrgi<sup>13</sup> ca. 500 BCE. From Pyrgi, the port of Caere. A bilingual Etruscan-Phoenician text. The longer Etruscan text has 36 or 37 words depending on how you count.
- II. The Origins Question. The origin of the Etruscans and their language has been a subject of contention since antiquity. The two main schools of thought that exist today both have respectable ancient pedigrees.
- A. Herodotus reports that, according to the Lydians, the Etruscans were colonists of the Lydians. (1.94)<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Picture available at: [www.maravot.com/Capua\\_Tile\\_Translation.html](http://www.maravot.com/Capua_Tile_Translation.html)

<sup>9</sup> Picture available at: [web.tiscali.it/.../Etrusco/Tabula/tabcort2.html](http://web.tiscali.it/.../Etrusco/Tabula/tabcort2.html)

<sup>10</sup> Picture available at: [http://web.upmf-grenoble.fr/Haiti/Cours/Ak/Cippo\\_Perugia.gr.htm](http://web.upmf-grenoble.fr/Haiti/Cours/Ak/Cippo_Perugia.gr.htm)

<sup>11</sup> Picture available at: [web.tiscali.it/pittau/Etrusco/Studi/pulenas.html](http://web.tiscali.it/pittau/Etrusco/Studi/pulenas.html)

<sup>12</sup> Picture available at: [www.archeologie.leidenuniv.nl/index.php3?m=47...](http://www.archeologie.leidenuniv.nl/index.php3?m=47...)

<sup>13</sup> Picture available at: [www.utexas.edu/.../romancivimages02/7epyrgi.jpg](http://www.utexas.edu/.../romancivimages02/7epyrgi.jpg)

<sup>14</sup> A variant of the Eastern Origin Theory existed before Herodotus. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.28) Hecataeus of Miletus connected the Etruscans with the Pelasgians.

And the Lydians themselves say that the games which are now in use among them and among the Hellenes were also their invention. These they say were invented among them at the same time as they colonised Tyrsenia, and this is the account they give of them: --

...As however the evil did not slacken but pressed upon them ever more and more, therefore their king divided the whole Lydian people into two parts, and he appointed by lot one part to remain and the other to go forth from the land; and the king appointed himself to be over that one of the parts which had the lot to stay in the land, and his son to be over that which was departing; and the name of his son was Tyrsenos. So the one party of them, having obtained the lot to go forth from the land, went down to the sea at Smyrna and built ships for themselves, wherein they placed all the movable goods which they had and sailed away to seek for means of living and a land to dwell in; until after passing by many nations they came at last to the land of the Ombricans, and there they founded cities and dwell up to the present time: and changing their name they were called after the king's son who led them out from home, not Lydians but Tyrsenians, taking the name from him. [Macaulay translation]

- B. Dionysus of Halicarnassus, on the other hand argued strongly for the autochthonous origin of the Etruscans, i.e. the Etruscan came from nowhere else but had always been native to Italy. (1.26-30).

26 As regards these Tyrrhenians, some declare them to be natives of Italy, but others call them foreigners. Those who make them a native race say that their name was given them from the forts, which they were the first of the inhabitants of this country to build; for covered buildings enclosed by walls are called by the Tyrrhenian as well as by the Greeks *tyrseis* or "towers." So they will have it that they received their name from this circumstance in like manner as did the Mossynoeci in Asia; for these also live in high wooden palisades resembling towers, which they call mossynes.

28 ...But Xanthus of Lydia, who was as well acquainted with ancient history as any man and who may be regarded as an authority second to none on the history of his own country, neither names Tyrrhenus in any part of his history as a ruler of the Lydians nor knows anything of the landing of a colony of Maeonians in Italy; nor does he make the least mention of Tyrrhenia as a Lydian colony, though he takes notice of several things of less importance. ... Hellanicus of Lesbos says that the Tyrrhenians, who were previously called Pelasgians, received their present name after they had settled in Italy. These are his words in the *Phoronis*: "Phrastor was the son of Pelasgus, their king, and Menippê, the daughter of Peneus; his son was Amyntor, Amyntor's son was Teutamides, and the latter's son was Nanas. In his reign the Pelasgians were driven out of their country by the Greeks, and after leaving their ships on the river Spines in the Ionian Gulf, they took Croton, an inland city; and proceeding from there, they colonized the country now called

Tyrrhenia." ...

29 But in my opinion all who take the Tyrrhenians and the Pelasgians to be one and the same nation are mistaken. It is no wonder they were sometimes called by one another's names, since the same thing has happened to certain other nations also, both Greeks and barbarians,— for example, to the Trojans and Phrygians, who lived near each other (indeed, many have thought that those two nations were but one, differing in name only, not in fact). And the nations in Italy have been confused under a common name quite as often as any nations anywhere. For there was a time when the Latins, the Umbrians, the Ausonians and many others were all called Tyrrhenians by the Greeks, the remoteness of the countries inhabited by these nations making their exact distinctions obscure to those who lived at a distance. And many of the historians have taken Rome itself for a Tyrrhenian city. I am persuaded, therefore, that these nations changed their name along with their place of abode, but cannot believe that they both had a common origin, for this reason, among many others, that their languages are different and preserve not the least resemblance to one another. "For neither the Crotoniats," says Herodotus [1.57]<sup>15</sup>, "nor the Placians agree in language with any of their present neighbours, although they agree with each other; and it is clear that they preserve the fashion of speech which they brought with them into those regions." However, one may well marvel that, although the Crotoniats had a speech similar to that of the Placians, who lived near the Hellespont, since both were originally Pelasgians, it was not at all similar to that of the Tyrrhenians, their nearest neighbours. For if kinship is to be regarded as the reason why two nations speak the same language, the contrary must, of course, be the reason for their speaking a different one, since surely it is not possible to believe that both these conditions arise from the same cause. For, although it might reasonably happen, on the one hand, that men of the same nation who have settled at a distance from one another would, as the result of associating with their neighbours, no longer preserve the same fashion of speech, yet it is not at all reasonable that men sprung from the same race and living in the same country should not in the least agree with one another in their language.

30 For this reason, therefore, I am persuaded that the Pelasgians are a different people from the Tyrrhenians. And I do not believe, either, that the Tyrrhenians were a colony of the Lydians; for they do not use the same language as the latter, nor can it be alleged that, though they no longer speak a similar tongue, they still retain some other indications of their mother country. For they neither worship the same gods as the Lydians nor make use of similar laws or institutions, but in these very respects they differ more from the Lydians than from the Pelasgians. Indeed, those probably come nearest to the truth who declare that the nation migrated from nowhere, but was native to the country, since it is found to be a very ancient nation and to agree with no other either in its language or in its manner of living. And there is no reason why the Greeks should

---

<sup>15</sup> But the manuscripts of Herodotus actual refer to the Κρηστονῆται, inhabitants of Thracia. See McNeal 1985.

not have called them by this name, both from their living in towers and from the name of one of their rulers. The Romans, however, give them other names: from the country they once inhabited, named Etruria, they call them Etruscans, and from their knowledge of the ceremonies relating to divine worship, in which they excel others, they now call them, rather inaccurately, Tusci, but formerly, with the same accuracy as the Greeks, they called them Thyoscoi. Their own name for themselves, however, is the same as that of one of their leaders, Rasenna.

[Ernest Cary Translation]

#### C. Evaluation of Ancient Claims.

1. Herodotus cannot be correct in claiming that the Etruscans were relatives of the Lydians, since we now know that Lydian was an Indo-European language of the Anatolian branch. It is clearly not Etruscan or closely related to Etruscan.
2. Hellanicus' claim of Pelasgian origin is impossible to evaluate since nothing is known of the Pelasgian language(s). On the other hand, Dionysius' confident claim that the Pelasgian language of Cortona was unlike Etruscan is unlikely to be based upon first-hand experience.
3. Both the autochthonous view and the Eastern origins view must be evaluated in the light of their political and propagandistic value.<sup>16</sup>

#### D. The Tyrsenian Language Family

1. Lemnian. A small number of inscriptions from the Northern Aegean island Lemnos attest a language related to but not identical with Etruscan. The most extensive of these is the Stele of Kaminia, a funerary monument from the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Thucydides and Herodotus both record the existence of a non-Greek language on this island in Classical times, and the former at least calls the inhabitants of Lemnos Tyrsenoi, the Greek name for the Etruscans.

Lemn. *mav síalxveis avis* = Etr. *avils maxs óealxlsc* (Ta 1.169) 'with 45 (?) years

- a. But the existence of Lemnian can, and has, been interpreted in three different ways.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Briquel 1992.

- i. Lemnian is a remnant of the metropolitan form of Etruscan and therefore confirms the Eastern Origins theory.
  - ii. Lemnian is a colonial form of Etruscan brought by Etruscan pirates from Italy.
  - iii. Lemian and Etruscan are two remnant of a pre-Indo-European speech community.
- b. Of these three views I'd judge the first to be the most likely and the third to be the least likely. The languages are too close to have been separated for the length of time that theory would imply. As for the second view, it seems somewhat less likely than the first since, contrary to the recent claims of De Simone, the alphabet is not derived from the Etruscan alphabet, despite being of the Red sort.<sup>17</sup> However, one could argue that the Etruscan colonization of Lemnos was pre-literate.
2. Rhaetic. The language of a small number of inscriptions from what eventually became the Roman province of Rhaetia written in a number of local alphabets derived from the Venetic alphabet have now been conclusively proved to be related to Etruscan.<sup>18</sup> The relationship was evident even in antiquity since Livy (5.33.11) says that the Raeti had an *origo Tusca*.

### III. Phonology

- A. Vowels. Etruscan had a four-vowel system. There was no distinctive length. The Old Etruscan system was probably arranged as below:

	FRONT	BACK
HIGH	i	u
LOW	e	a [ɔ]

There is indeed some evidence that *a* was originally a back rounded vowel [ɔ]<sup>19</sup> and such

---

<sup>17</sup> See Malzahn 1998 contra De Simone 1994.

<sup>18</sup> See Rix 1998.

<sup>19</sup> See Agostiniani 1992:26-28.

2 x 2 systems are well-paralleled (Apachean, Creek-Seminole, Wichita, Proto-Germanic (?))<sup>20</sup>.

Around 600 BCE *a* was unrounded. *i* was lowered to *e* in most, but not all, environments (cf. OEtr. *itan* 'this > Etr. *etn*).<sup>21</sup> With the unrounding of *a*, the perceptual space for *u* was widened and it seems probable that its typical phonetic realization at this point was closer to Lat. *o* since Roman transcriptions of Etruscan names often use <o> for Etr. *u*, e.g. Lat. *Porsenna*). These changes led to a system of the following sort:

	FRONT	BACK
HIGH	i	u
MID	e	
LOW	a	

A system with a front high ~ mid contrast with no corresponding back high ~ mid contrast is somewhat uncommon, but attested, e.g. in some varieties of Dayak.<sup>22</sup>

## B. Consonants

### 1. Stops

Voiceless p t k

Voiceless p<sup>h</sup> t<sup>h</sup> k<sup>h</sup>

Aspirated<sup>23</sup>

The symbols for the voiceless aspirated stops are phi (Φ ⊕), theta (⊗ ⊕ or ⊙) and psi (Ψ).<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> See Hockett 1955:84

<sup>21</sup> e.g. *i* is retained in monosyllables like *mi* 'I'. Steinbauer 1999:30-31.

<sup>22</sup> Abby Cohn, personal communication.

<sup>23</sup> Rix 1985:220, and Steinbauer 1999:26 believe that the sounds which most Etruscologists interpret as voiceless aspirates were in the case of phi and theta palatalized [p<sup>h</sup>] and [t<sup>h</sup>], in the case of psi a velar fricative [x]. That Ψ sometimes represented a fricative is plausible. The other two interpretations are not yet adequately supported. See Agostiniani 1992:50.

## 2. Fricatives and Affricates

f s ʃ h

ts<sup>25</sup>

The one graphic problem here is in the representation of the two sibilant fricatives.

In Southern Etruria (Tarquinia<sup>26</sup>, Veii,<sup>27</sup> Volsinii,<sup>28</sup> Vulci,<sup>29</sup> Rusellae<sup>30</sup>)<sup>31</sup> and Campania /s/ is written with three-bar sigma ϻ and /ʃ/ is written with san M̄. In Northern Etruria (Vetulonia, Populonia,<sup>32</sup> Volterra,<sup>33</sup> Fiesole,<sup>34</sup> Arezzo,<sup>35</sup> Chiusi,<sup>36</sup> Perugia,<sup>37</sup> Cortona<sup>38</sup>) and northern colonies like Bologna,<sup>39</sup> and Adria, and in the *Liber Linteus*) /s/ is written with san M̄ and /ʃ/ is written with three-bar sigma ϻ. The authoritative *Etruskische Texte* of Helmut Rix transcribes the Southern practice with s (= /s/ = <ϻ>) and σ (= /ʃ/ = <M̄>). The Northern scribal practice is transcribed ś (= /s/ = <M̄>) and ó (= /ʃ/ = <ϻ>).

---

<sup>24</sup> Remember this is a Red alphabet with the sign-shape psi in the value /k<sup>h</sup>/.

<sup>25</sup> i.e. <z>. Agostiniani 1992:52 has argued for a postalveolar affricate /tʃ/ on the grounds that languages that have one affricate typically have the affricate /tʃ/ and not /ts/.

<sup>26</sup> Etr. Tarxna, Lat. Tarquinii.

<sup>27</sup> Present-day Veio, 18 km northwest of Rome.

<sup>28</sup> Etr. Velsna, probably present-day Orvieto, i.e. Urbs vetus. Present-day Bolsena is on the site of ancient Volsinii Novi founded after the sack of Volsinii in 264 BCE.

<sup>29</sup> Etr. Velca-\* between the villages of Canino and Montalto di Castro, in Viterbo Province.

<sup>30</sup> near present-day Roselle Terme, about 8 km northeast of Grosseto.

<sup>31</sup> Caere (Etr. C[a]isria\*, present-day Cerveteri, i.e. old Caere) has a slightly different system using three-bar sigma for /s/ and four-bar sigma (ϣ) for /ʃ/.

<sup>32</sup> Etr. Pupluna.

<sup>33</sup> Lat. Volaterrae, Etr. Velaθri.

<sup>34</sup> Lat. Faesulae.

<sup>35</sup> Lat. Arretium, Etr. Aritim-.

<sup>36</sup> Lat. Clusium.

<sup>37</sup> Lat. Perusia, Etr. Pershia\*.

<sup>38</sup> Etr. Curtuna.

<sup>39</sup> Lat. Bononia, Etr. Felsina.



### 3. Sonorant Consonants

m n  
l  
r  
j w

- C. Stress. Primary stress on the initial syllable is inferred on the basis of the syncope that affects non-initial syllables beginning around 500 BCE, e.g. *Avile* (a praenomen) > *aule*.

IV. Morphology. Etruscan morphology is for the most part agglutinative, i.e. each morpheme tends to contribute only one noeme, and a morpheme tends to remain independent from surrounding morphemes. For example, in Etruscan nouns the plural allomorphs (-*Vr*, or (*x*)*va*) are separable from the case morphemes.

#### A. Nominal Morphology.

1. Gender. Etruscan had a [+ animate] vs. [- animate] classification system for nouns. Nouns that referred to humans took the -*r* plural and nouns that referred to inanimates took the -(*x*)*va* plural.<sup>40</sup> With numerals the inanimate plural morpheme was optional. Thus:

[+ animate]

*clenar* 'sons'

*aiser* 'gods'

*ci clenar* 'three sons'

[- animate]

*fler-xva* 'sacrifices'

*avil-xva* 'years'

*ci avil* 'three years'

Inanimate nouns take the relative pronoun *in* and animate nouns take the relative pronoun *an*. In addition, Etruscan used the morpheme -*i*, probably borrowed from Italic, to mark natural gender for women and goddesses, e.g. *Larθ-i*, *Un-i* 'Juno.'

---

<sup>40</sup> There are three phonologically conditioned allomorphs of the inanimate plural. After *s* and *θ* the suffix is realized as -*cva* (*cilθ-cva* 'citadels', *culś-cva* 'gates.'). After *i*, *e*, and *f* the suffix is realized as -*va* (*hupni-va* 'burial niches', *zusle-va* 'offerings', *saniś-va*).

2. Case

- a. Etruscan nouns did not distinguish nominative and accusative. The unitary form is sometimes called Absolute.
- b. There are two main allomorphs for the genitive singular. The principle of distribution is not clear.<sup>41</sup>
  - i. *-(V)s*. After a vowel the form is *-s*, e.g. *Marce-s* ‘of Marce’. After a liquid the form is *-us*. *Velθur-us* ‘of Velθur.’
  - ii. *-(i)a(l)* e.g. *Larθial* ‘of Larθ.’

Paradigms: *Larice* (masc. praenomen), *spura* ‘city’, *flerxva* ‘sacrifices’, *clenar* ‘sons’, *avil* ‘year’ *śrenxva* ‘images’ *Pultuce* ‘Pollux’.

	SINGULAR		PLURAL		
	Animate		Inanimate	Animate	Inanimate
	Type 1	Type 2			
Abs.	<i>Larice</i>	* <i>spura</i>		<i>clenar</i>	<i>flerxva</i>
Gen.	<i>Larices</i>	<i>spural</i> <sup>42</sup>		<i>cliniaras</i>	<i>avilxval</i>
Loc.		<i>spure</i> <sup>43</sup>			<i>śrenxve</i>
Pert.	<i>Pultuce-s-i</i> <sup>44</sup>	<i>spurale</i> <sup>45</sup>		<i>clenaraśi</i>	
Abl.	<i>clen</i>				

B. Pronouns, unlike nouns, make a distinction between nominative and accusative.<sup>46</sup> The

<sup>41</sup> In personal names the distributional principle appears to be phonological: masculine names ending in a vowel take the suffix *-s* while those ending in a dental took *-al*. On the other hand, feminine names always take the suffix *-al*.

<sup>42</sup> In Archaic Etruscan the final *-l* does not occur, e.g. *larθia* for later *larθial* ‘of Larθ’.

<sup>43</sup> ‘in the city’ < \**spura+i*.

<sup>44</sup> ‘in the (workshop) of *Pultuce*’.

<sup>45</sup> An allomorph of the pertinive *-(a)la* is apparently restricted to feminine personal names: *vestiricina-la* from *vestiricinai*.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the situation in PDE.

accusative case is marked by a morpheme containing *n*. The pronominal genitive, at least for deictic pronouns is *-l(a)*. Among pronouns we can identify:

*mi* 'ego' *mini* 'me'

*un* 'te' *une* 'tibi' *unu* 'vos'?<sup>47</sup>

(i)*ca* 'hic' *cla* 'huius', *-cle* 'in hoc', *cn* 'hunc'.

*ita* 'hic' *-itala* 'huius', *tn* 'hunc'.

-(i)*sa* a definite article, e.g. *sacni-sa* 'sacred-the' *velθuruśa* < *velθurus* gen. + *sa* 'the son of *Velθur*'.

The forms of *ca*, *ta* and *-sa* could be used as postposed clitics, the last exclusively so. *ca* and *ta* could also be orthotonic. The distributional principle governing the use of the *ta* vs. *ca* forms is unclear.

C. Numerals: *θu* '1', *zal* 'two', *ci* '3', *sa* '4' *max* '5' ? *θun-em-ce-alx* 'un-de-tri-ginta' '29'.

D. Some verb forms: The verb is less well understood than the noun. We can identify the following morphemes:

*-ce* 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. pret. *amce* 'was', *menece* 'set up', *muluwanice* 'dedicated', *turuce* 'gave'

*-xe* 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. pret. pass. *menaxe* 'was set up'

*-as(a)* pres. part.: *sval-as* 'living'

*-θas(a)* or *-anas(a)* perf. part.: *svalθas* 'having lived', *tenθas* 'having served as', *acnanasa* 'having produced'

verbal adjective in *-u*: *mulu* 'given'

Necessitative in *-ri*: *θezeri* 'must be immolated'

V. The Pyrgi Bilingual is the most extensive Etruscan bilingual text. It was discovered in 1964 at Pyrgi (= present-day S. Severa) one of the ports of the ancient Etruscan city of Caere (= present-day Cerveteri). The Pyrgi Bilingual is made up of two golden tablets that date from the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> / beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE. One table is in Etruscan, the other is in Phoenician.<sup>48</sup> A third golden tablet written in Etruscan has no extant counterpart. They are now housed at the Museo di Villa Giulia in Rome.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>47</sup> According to Rix 1991.

<sup>48</sup> Most probably in the Mediterranean dialect of Phoenician. There are specific similarities with the language of inscriptions from Cyprus, Sardinia and Iberia. It is not Punic. See Schmitz 1995:571.

<sup>49</sup> You can see pictures of these tablets at <http://users.tpg.com.au/etr/etrusk/po/pyrgi.html>

A. The Etruscan Text<sup>50</sup>

ita. tmia. icac. he  
 ramaśva[.] vatiexe  
 unialastres. θemia  
 sa. mex. θuta. θefa  
 rie[i]. velianas sal (5)  
 cluvenias. turu  
 ce munistas. θuvas  
 tameresca. ilacve.  
 tulerase. nac. ci. avi  
 l. xurvar. teśiameita (10)  
 le. ilacve. alśase  
 nac atranes zilac  
 al seleitala. acnavσ  
 ers. itanim heram(aś)  
 ve. avil eniaca. pul (15)  
 umxva

B. The Phoenician Text

LRBT	L ṢTRT	ṢR	QDṢ	
To the Lady	To Ashtart	place	of holiness,	
ṢZ	Ṣ	PṢL	WṢ	YTN
this	which	made	and=which	gave
TBRY?	WLNṢ	MLK ṢL		
Tiberius	Velianas,	King over		
KYṢRY?	BYRH	ZBH		
Kijsre,	in the month	of the Sacrifice		
ṢMṢ	BMTN	ṢBBT	WBN	

---

<sup>50</sup> This (Cr 4.4) and all other Etruscan texts are cited after the edition of Rix 1991.

of the sun in MTN<sup>51</sup> in the temple.<sup>52</sup> And he built<sup>53</sup>

TW K ʔŠTRT ʔRŠ BDY  
the aedicula, since Ashtart wished (it) from him.<sup>54</sup>

LMLKY ŠNT ŠLŠ III<sup>55</sup> BY  
During his reign year 3, in the mo-

RH KRR BYM QBR  
nth Kirar on the day of the burying

ʔLM WŠNT LMʔŠ<sup>56</sup> ʔLM  
of the God.<sup>57</sup> And as for the years for the one who make a gift to the god

BBTY ŠNT KM HKKBM  
in her temple years like the stars (may)

ʔL  
these (be).

### C. Analysis of Etruscan Text

#### 1. *ita tmia ica=c heramaśova vatiexe (unialastres)*

- a. *ita* is the nominative of a deictic pronoun.

---

<sup>51</sup> The name of a month attested at Larnaka on Cyprus or 'on (the day of the) oblation'.

<sup>52</sup> **b** for the preposition **b** with prothetic *ʔaleph* is also found at Larnaka and in a Sidonian text.

<sup>53</sup> The translation in the text divides WBNTW as W-BN 'and he built' TW 'aedicula'. Cf. Hebr. *tāʔ* 'chamber'. Others have suggested W-BNT-W 'and I built-it'. But see Röllig 1996 for a justification of TW.

<sup>54</sup> lit. 'from his hand'.

<sup>55</sup> The text both spells out the word three (ŠLŠ) and uses a number symbol of three strokes.

<sup>56</sup> See Schmitz 1995:569.

<sup>57</sup> Knoppers 1992 has suggested that this refers to the burial of a human (a king ?) who has become a god on the day of his death.

- i. > *ta* as enclitic postposed article (Vs. 4.8):

*Selvans Sanxuneta* < *Sanxuna* + *ita* 'Silvanus, the one who belongs to Sancus'

- ii. acc. *itan*. Cf. Ve 3.21

*itan mulvanice*

X dedicated this.<sup>58</sup>

- iii. gen. sg. *-itala*.

- b. *tmia* probably for *\*temia* 'holy place' with so-called syllabic writing of initial consonant. = Phoen. ʔŠR QDŠ 'holy place'.<sup>59</sup> Cf. perhaps Lat. *tem-plum*? Cf. *tmial* 'of the holy place' (Cr 4.5).

- c. *ica* is also the nominative of a deictic pronoun. Cf. Ta 1.31

[e]ca *σuθi anes cuclnies*

'This tomb is of Ane Culcnie'.

- i. acc. *ikan*. Later Etr. *icn, ecn, cn*.

- ii. Etruscan seems to have had two noun classes or genders. These can be distinguished by the forms of the relative pronoun and the demonstrative.

Type 1 takes the demonstrative *ita* and the relative *an*.

Type 2 takes the demonstrative *ica* and the relative *in*.

- d. *c* 'and' an enclitic connective that strikingly recalls both functionally and formally PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>e*. (Lat. *que*, Grk. *τε*). Cf. Ta 1.156

*Vel Aninas Velus clan Atial-c avils lupu XXII*

Vel Anina, son of Vel and Ati, is dead at twenty-two years.

- e. *heramóva* 'statue group' = on one analysis Phoen. MʔŠ ? (cf. *heramve* 1.15) < *\*heramaš-*

<sup>58</sup> Later *etan*, e.g. Cr 3.24: *etan turuce* 'X gave this', with the change of OEtr. *i* > *e* and still later > *etn* (LL V.1).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Akkad. *ešertu*, Hebr. *māqôm qādōš* 'holy precinct'.

*xva*.

- i. Cf. for the collective suffix *-xva*, *maru-xva* 'college of *marones*', *pulum-xva* 'stars'.
  - ii.  $k^h > \emptyset/i, e, f\_$  Cf. *hupni-va* 'burial niches' < \**hupni-xva*.
- f. *vatiexe* past pass. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. 'was dedicated' vel. sim. Wylie suggests 'was requested' on the basis of the Phoen. ?RŠ.
- i. *-xe* ≠ *ke* act. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. past

Ta 1.27:

*tame[r]a menaxe*  
a chamber was made.

AH 3.4:

*mi titasi cver menaxe*  
I for Tita as a *cver* (gift?) was made.

vs.

Po 6.1:

*Metru menece*  
'Metru made (it)'

Cf. typologically Grk. ἐποίησε.

- g. *unialastres* Rix 1981: to be analyzed as *uni-al-as-tres*.

	Nom.	Gen. 1	Abl. 1	Gen. 2	Abl. 2	Abl. + pp
'city'	<i>spura</i>		<i>spures</i>	<i>spural</i>		<i>spurestres</i>
'Arnθ'	<i>arnθ</i>			<i>arnθal</i>	<i>arnθals</i>	
'Juno'	<i>uni</i>			<i>unial</i>	* <i>unialas</i>	<i>unialastres</i>

- i. *spurestres* ‘for the city’. Cf. Umb. **tutaper** (I a 5 +) ‘for the community’.
- ii. The ablative case is derived from the genitive. In the case of genitive 1 by umlaut, e.g. *Ramθas* → *Ramθes*; in the case of genitive 2 by the addition of *-as*, the vowel of which may be syncopated.

Cf. Vc 1.92:

*θanxvil Tarnai an farθnaxe Marces Tarnes ramθes-c xaireals*  
 ‘θanaquil Tarnai who was born (?) from Marce Tarna and Ramθa Xaire’.

- iii. Steinbauer 1999:139, however, prefers to analyze these forms as containing a collective suffix *-tra-*. For him *unialas-tres* is either ‘priesthood of Uni’ or ‘temple apparatus for Uni’.

## 2. *θemiasa. mex. θuta.*

- a. *θemiasa* perf. act. part. or alternatively *θemi-as=a* pret. indic. plus connective particle.

- i. To *θam-* ‘build’? Cf. *θamuce, θamce* Ta 5.2:

*Larθiale Hulxniesi marcesi=c caliaθesi munsle θamce*  
 For Larθ Hulxnīe and Marce Caliaθe he built a place.

- ii. For the suffix (?) *-asa* cf. AT 1.1:

*Arnθ Larisal clan θanaxvilus=c Peθial ma[runux paxa]θura [zil]c tenθasa ... tamera  
 zelarvenas θui zivas avils XXXVI lupu.s*

Arnθ son of Laris and θanaquil Peshli, having served as (= *tenθasa*) the chief Bacchic priest (= *marunux paxaθura*), consul (= *zilc*), having doubled (= *zelarvenas*)<sup>60</sup> the burial chamber while alive died at 36 years of age.

AT 1.96:

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *zal* ‘two’.



<i>Arnθ Aleθnas Ar clan</i>	Arnθ son of Ar. Aleθna
<i>ril XXXVIII</i>	38 years old
<i>eitva tamera σarvenas</i>	having quadrupled the burial chamber <sup>61</sup>
<i>clenar zal arce acnanasa</i>	having begotten 2 sons ( <i>arce?</i> )
<i>zilc marunuxva tenθas</i>	having served as <i>zilc</i> over the college of Marones

AT 1.105:

*clenar ci acnanasa*  
having begotten 3 sons

- b. *mex θuta*. According to Rix 1981 = *de sua pecunia* = Osc. **suvad eitiuvad** (Po 16) 'from his own money'.

- i. Cf. *mex rasnal* 'res publica'. *Rasna* ± 'Etruscan'. Cf. Ta 7.59

*an zilaθ amce mexl rasnal*  
*qui praetor fuit rei publicae*  
who was the praetor for the republic

- ii. *θuta*. Cf. *ati θuta* 'own mother'. *mex θuta* are endless ablatives. Cf. *clen* vs. *clan*.

- c. Steinbauer has a totally different view. According to him *mex* means 'queen' and is the translation of Phoen. RBT.
- d. Wylin 2000 has yet another view. He takes *mex θuta* as equivalent to ?ŠR QDŠ 'place holy'.

3. *θefarie[i]. velianas sal cluvenias. turuce*

- a. The name *θefarie[i]. velianas* is the subject and *turuce* the pret. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. verb 'gave, dedicated.' *θefarie* is equivalent to the Roman praenomen *Tiberius*, but must be mediated through some form of Sabellic to account for the *f*. In Southern Etruria the gentilic usually ends in *-s*, probably the genitive marker.

---

<sup>61</sup> For *σarvenas* cf. *śa* 'four'.

- b. *turuce* and later *turce* is abundantly attested, e.g. Ta 3.2 (6<sup>th</sup> century BCE):

*itun turuce venel atelinas*

Venel Atelina gave this

Ta 3.4 (4<sup>th</sup> century BCE)

*turns turce ramθa venatres*

Ramθa Venatre gave to Turan (= Aphrodite).

- c. *sal cluveniias* is obscure. Many take these words as the direct object of the verb. Others take *sal* as the genitive of a pronominals stem *sa*. Wylin 2004:62 translates at her (*sal* i.e. the divinity's) request comparing the Phoenician K ṢTRT ṖRŠ BDY.

4. *munistas. θuvas tamesca. ilacve. tulerase. nac. ci. avil. xurvar. teóiamaitale. ilacve. alóase nac atranes zilacal seleitala*

- a. This passage is undoubtedly the most difficult of the entire text, but there are some secure starting points.'
- i. *ilacve* is a locative plural of a word designate a date, either a dividing day, or a festival. This is clear from the repeated occurrence on the Tabula Capuana preceding a known Etruscan month name.<sup>62</sup>
- ii. *ci avil* is 'three years'. *avil* was already well understood from its many occurrences in funerary monuments and the meaning 3 for *ci* was proposed already by Torp and is here confirmed by the Phoenician.
- iii. *tamesca* would appear to be a case form of *tamera* 'chamber' plus a postposed article.
- b. Beyond these points the interpretations are largely guesswork.
- i. Wylin 2004:65 offers the following translation:

---

<sup>62</sup> The names of some of the Etruscan months are known from a list preserved in the *Liber Glossarium*.

questo (testo si trova / viene appeso) fuori da la camera del luogo sacro alle feste *tulerase* d'una parte e fuore dalla casa della pretura massima alle feste *alóase* d'altra parte, tre anni completi il giorno dell'ordinatore.

The idea is that the tablet was moved to different locations on different dates. Such a practice can be precisely paralleled for the Oscan *Iuvila* inscriptions. However, there seem to me to be evident problems with Wylin's view.

a. It would seem like a good idea to make the two dates in the Etruscan text correspond in a general way with the two dates in the Phoenician text. This is an especially good idea since ŠNT ŠLŠ seems to correspond exactly with *ci avil*. In the Phoenician text the two dates refer to the dedication of a holy place and the building of an aedicula. Whether these refer to the same thing or not is not clear.

β. Second, Wylin's translation postpones *nac ci avil xurvar tesíameitale* until the end since he like most take this to be the dating formula for the inscription. But it's actually position in the Etruscan text is between the other two dates and this does not fit very well with Wylin's view that those dates refer to the different places for posting of the document.

ii. Cristofani 1996:1125 offers the following interpretation (not translation, he says) for this section.

avendo fatto l'edicola nella festa (del mese) *tulera* quando tre anni erano passati dal giorno quello *tesíame* nella festa (del mese) *alsa* quando era divenuto re.