Skrifter

udgivne af

Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania

1905

II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse

(Med 4 Plancher og 4 Karter)

13/8

Skrifter

udgivne af

Videnskabs-Selskabet i Christiania

1905

II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse

(Med 4 Plancher og 4 Karter)

Christiania

I Kommission hos Jacob Dybwad

A. W. Brøggers Bogtrykkeri

1906

ETRUSCAN NOTES

BY

DR. **ALF TORP**

PROFESSOR OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF CHRISTIANIA

UDGIVET FOR H. A. BENNECHES FOND

Fremlagt i Mødet d. 7de Oktober 1904.

Contents.

Abbreviations.

Fa.	=	Ariod. Fabretti: *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum* Torino 1867.
P., S., T.	=	*Primo, Secondo, Terzo Supplemento* of the same work (1872; 1874; 1878).
Ga.	=	A. Fr. Gamurrini: *Appendice* to the same work.
CIE	=	*Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*, ed. C. Pauli ,adm. Danielsson. Vol. I. 1904.
CIL	=	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
Ann, Bull, Mon.	=	*Annali, Bulletini* and *Monumenti inediti dell'Istituto di Correspondenza archeologica* in Rome.
Not. Scav.	=	Notizie degli scavi.
Agram Text	=	Die etruskischen Mumienbinden des Agramer Nationalmuseums, herausg. von Prof. J. Krall. (Denkschriften der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften. 41. Wien 1892).
Mü.-De.²	=	K. Otfr. Müller: Die Etrusker, 2. Ausgabe von W. Deecke, Stuttgart 1877.
Co.	=	Wilh. Corssen: Die Sprache der Etrusker, Leipzig 1874—75.
Fo. u. St.	=	Etruskische Forschungen und Studien, von W. Deecke und C. Pauli, I—VI. 1881—1884.
Beitr. I, II.	=	Etruskische Beiträge von Alf Torp. Leipzig (Barth) I. Heft 1902. II. Heft 1903.
Monatsdaten	=	Etruskische Monatsdaten von Alf Torp. Christiania Videnskabs Selskabs Skrifter. 1902. No. 4.
Lemnos	=	Die vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos von Alf Torp Chr. Vid. Selsk. Skrifter. 1903. No. 4.
Torp-Herbig	=	Einige neugefundene etruskische Inschriften von Alf Torp und Gustav Herbig. Sitzungsber. d. K. Bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Hist.-philos. Kl. 1904. Heft IV.

I.

Fa. 2057.

This inscription is found on a sarcophagus kept in the museum at Viterbo where I revised it last summer.

> av¹[le · ale]ϑna[s · a]rnϑal cl[an ·] ϑanχvilusc ·
> ruvfial · zilaχn[uce] | spur[e]ϑi · apasi · svalas ·
> marunuχva : cepen · tenu · eprϑnevc · eslz te[nu] |
> eprϑieva · eslz

The first words mean: 'Aule Alethnas, the son of Arnth and of Thanchvil Ruvfi'. The words *zilaχnuce—svalas* will be discussed further on.

After *te-* at the end of the second line some letters are wanting. Their number cannot be more than four, and we may as well suppose the lacuna to comprise only two, as the line need not have reached the very brim of the sarcophagus. I think it all but certain that the letters wanting are *-nu*.

eprϑnevc does not seem to contain the conjunction *-c*, for a comparison of the form with *eisnevc · eprϑnevc · t · macstrevc · t*, Fa. 2100, and *purtśvavc-ti*, P. 388, and with *eprϑne*, Fa. 2033 bis E, and *purtśvana*, P. 381, on the other side, goes to prove that there is a suffix *-vc*, which I believe to be identical with *-uχ* in *marunuχ*.

The words *marunuχva cepen tenu* mean: 'he officiated (*tenu*) as a maronic *cepen*'. See my paper »Vorgriech. Inschr. v. Lemnos«, p. 40 f. about *maru* and *marunuχva*. Then follows some other title *eprϑnevc eslz tenu* apparently meaning 'twice he officiated as an *eprϑnevc*'. The ensuing words *eprϑieva eslz* look like a mere reiteration of this sentence. But that cannot, of course, be thought of; a reiteration of that kind would be sheer nonsense. There cannot, therefore, be any doubt that

---

¹ written ę, but should probably be ʋ.

the purport of the words *eprϑieva eslz* must be essentially different from the meaning contained in the words *eprϑnevc eslz*. The words being almost identical, or the base of the two words, at any rate, being the same, this difference of meaning must depend on the difference in the suffixes (*-nevc* and *-ieva*). Now it is very unlikely that words denoting different offices should have been formed by adding different suffixes to the same base. But then there apparently remains only one alternative, *viz.* that *eprϑieva* is contrasted with *eprϑnevc*; and in that case we can only understand the mutual relationship by supposing *eprϑieva* to be the negative form of *eprϑnevc*. It is also noteworthy that the initial sentence *marunuχva cepen tenu* does not, like the two others, contain any numeral adverb. One might perhaps explain the absence of such a word by supposing 'once' to be understood; for if the deceased had held an office only once, it would perhaps be natural, when enumerating his titles, not to mention that limitation. I believe a different explanation, however, to be far more probable, namely, that the word *eprϑ-* gives some more minute detail, denoting an office that might occasionally have been combined with that of a *marunuχva cepen*. Let us, for instance, suppose, as did Deecke[1], that *eprϑ-* means 'presidency' or 'to preside'. Then this part of the inscription would mean: 'He held the office of a *marunuχva cepen*. As a president (of that collegium) he held it twice, without being the president, twice.' Thus we understand the reason why no numeral adverb is added to the first sentence, since the double 'twice' in the subjoined sentences make the addition of 'four times' superfluous in the first place. If we are right in supposing this to be the sense, the compound *eprϑieva* must accordingly contain some negative.

The common base of the words *eprϑnevc* and *eprϑieva*, *eprϑ-*, occurs in *eprϑne* mentioned above, and in *eprϑni*, CIE 1305

larϑ : titina · arnϑalisa : eprϑni — Clusium — (ossuary).

eprϑ is very probably identical with *purϑ*, P. 399 (Tarquinii), as supposed by Deecke, from which latter form *purϑne* is derived, just as *eprϑne* is from *eprϑ* :

lϑ : velu : lϑ : tlesnal : cicunias | clan : purϑne

Not. Scav. 1877, 94 — Clusium — (urn).

An abbreviated form *purt* occurs in another inscription from Sarteano near the ancient Clusium:

vl · vilia · vl · mar · purt — Deecke, Fo. u. St. VI 20,

which probably stands for *maru purϑne* (or *purtšvana*).

---

[1] Fo. u. St. VI 27 f.

purϑ (*eprϑ*) I take to be the locative of a noun **pur*. The derived *purϑne eprϑne* (*eprϑne-vc*) accordingly means 'someone who is in the *pur*'. We do not know the meaning of *-śva-vc* and *-śva-na* in *purtśvavc* and *purtśvana*. But *śva* is very probably some verbal root, perhaps meaning 'to sit' (*śu-a* related to *śuϑ?*).

The supposed *pur* does not occur in other places. I believe its original meaning to be a concrete one. Perhaps *pur* at first signified some sort of chair.

The Etruscan locative suffix is also *-ϑi*, and one might therefore suppose that *eprϑieva* should be divided into *eprϑi-eva*. But that would not, I think, be correct, because the *-i* would at any rate have been dropped before a vowel (compare *lautn eteri* for *lautni eteri*). Consequently we must divide it into *eprϑ-ieva*. And *ieva* seems to contain the negative. Now it might be objected that, the positive expression being *eprϑne-vc*, the corresponding negative ought to be *eprϑne-ieva* or *eprϑ-nevc-ieva*. I cannot admit this, and I think that the actual form, *eprϑieva*, is exactly what we should expect. For *-ne* (*-nevc*) is evidently an individualizing suffix, and it would be quite natural that it should be dropped with the negative. In modern languages we may compare such instances as *j'ai du pain*, but, *je n'ai pas de pain*. Thus I think *eprϑieva* means just what it ought to mean — 'not being in a *pur* (presidency)'.

ieva is, I believe, made up of two particles, *ie* and *va*. The particle *va* also occurs elsewhere, but not often. It is certainly not a negative. I think it more likely that it is an emphasizing or qualifying particle. The real negative would thus be *ie*. Now the nature of the shorter Etruscan inscriptions is such as would not make us expect to meet with any negative there. On the other hand, in the Agram text and the 60-lined inscription from Capua, both containing ritual ordinances, we should expect to find negative expressions. The reverse would hardly be possible. And in fact, I fancy that *ia*, which occurs several times in the inscription from Capua, is identical with *ie*, but, of course, as long as the passages concerned remain obscure, this cannot be quite settled. *ceia hia*, which occurs several times in the Agram text (VII) in what seem to be incantations, is perhaps the negative form of *cehen*, CIE 4116. I also incline to the belief that a word *ic*, which is met with both in the inscription from Capua (also written *i · c*) and the Agram text (to be distinguished from *iχ*, 'as'), might be a compound of *ie* and *-c*, 'and'. The full form is perhaps *ice* (inscription from Capua).

II.

The Leaden Tablet of Magliano.

This most enigmatic inscription has been almost completely translated by the late Dr. Deecke[1]. One wonders how he has managed to believe in a single word of his interpretation! His so-called translation is the result of a comparison of the Etruscan words with such Latin ones as are somewhat similar in sound. The resemblance is made greater, — or, if it does not exist at all, it is established, by freely adding new syllables and letters to the Etruscan words, which are supposed to be abbreviated in writing. It is superfluous to say that if we had to suppose them to be thus abbreviated, we might as well spare ourselves the trouble of trying to interpret them. Nor need I further explain how hopeless the comparative method is in interpreting a text in an unknown language. Even if we knew with certainty that the Etruscan and the Latin languages were cognate, we should fail utterly in trying to understand an Etruscan text by means of our knowledge of Latin. The only right way to understand the unknown language is to compare the written specimens left of that language with each other. We must start from such words in a given text as also occur elsewhere, and in such connections as furnish us with a hint regarding their meaning. We shall then have to see if we can arrive at a reasonable sense by assigning such a value to those words and then putting them together. It is, of course, quite possible that two or more different words agree in sound (or in their written form) in Etruscan, as in other languages. In such cases we shall accordingly be mistaken, unwittingly confounding different words with each other. In this respect the method proves insufficient, but we are also justified in supposing that such cases are comparatively very few, and at any rate we should fail far more if we ventured to suppose beforehand that the same sound represents different words, only because it might possibly do so.

The method which I have just described is that which I have followed in my previous papers, and I shall also adopt it now. I do not, of course, imagine for a single moment that in doing so I shall succeed

---

[1] Rhein. Mus. N. F. 39, p. 141 f. and Buchsweiler Gymn. Program, 1885.

in correctly interpreting the whole inscription. That would not be within human power. The efficacy of the method depends on the quantity of materials. If the specimens extant were numerous and extensive (as it is, they are few and short), I would undertake to interpret most of them with tolerable accuracy; for where the same words recur a thousand times in various connections, it is no great matter to catch their meaning ultimately. As it is, we must be very modest in our expectations; but even now, though our materials are scanty, it happens that some single words, which occur more frequently, are so placed that they can throw some light on each other, and thereby on whole passages. Consequently the task may be difficult, but it is not altogether hopeless, the less so as, fortunately, our material is growing, and with every new find the prospects are ameliorated. But still a solid foundation is wanting in our search. Thus some of the suppositions which have presented themselves to me when reflecting upon this inscription, are in all likelihood rather products of fantasy than of logical conclusion. I do not, however, withhold even these. They may perhaps be of some use to others. I fancy that one or other of them, even though they be unsubstantiated, may put some fellow-searcher on the right track. Should I succeed in pointing out the general construction of the contents, and thereby interpreting correctly some detail or other, the result would be of some importance.

Dr. Deecke has supposed that the inscription gives directions for some sacrifice. So also does Professor Milani[1]. I think we may take this for granted. It is proved, first, by the names of deities, of which one is placed at the head of every line. Milani finds six such names (in one line two): *Cautha, Aisera, Maris, Mlachthanra, Calu, Tina*; Deecke five (the same, exclusive of *Mlachthanra*). I consider it as certain that in any case four of these words represent names of deities: *Cautha, Aisera, Maris, Calu*; and to these is to be added as the fifth, *Suri*. Secondly, the occurring numerals also point to a sacrifice. They give either the number of the objects to be sacrificed, or they indicate the number of times the performance is to be repeated. In that respect as in others, the resemblance, as regards the contents, to the Agram text is manifest, as has already been seen by Prof. Krall[2], Lattes, Deecke and Milani.

I think that we are also enlightened with regard to the nature of the sacrifice. The two words, *neśl* in the first (and fourth) line, and *naces*

---

[1] 'Il piombo scritto di Magliano'. Mon. Ant. Vol. II, 1893.

[2] 'Die etruskischen Mumienbinden'.

in the last, give most certain information about that. The former means
'dead'[1], and the latter is undoubtedly related to *nacnva, nacna*, of which
the signification 'tomb' is all but certain[2]. Moreover, the names Calu
and Suri, most decidedly gods of Death[3], point in the same direction.
This much we can consequently affirm with certainty: the inscription
gives rules for a sacrifice in honour of the deceased, to be offered to
certain deities (of the celestial and infernal regions).

I give the inscription in Prof. Danielsson's reading, the correctness of
which I ascertained when I saw the tablet in the museum at Florence
last summer:

<center>I (front side).</center>

1.   *cauϑas · tuϑiu · avils ·* ↑XXX *· ez · χimϑm · casϑialϑ · lacϑ ·*
     hevn · avil · nesl · man : murinasie · falzaϑi ⫶

2.   *aiseras · in · ecs · mene · mlaϑcemarni · tuϑi · tiu · χimϑm ·*
     casϑialϑ · lacϑ ⫶

3.   *marisl menitla · afrs · cialaϑ · χimϑm · avilsχ · eca · cepen ·*
     tuϑiu · ϑuχ · iχutevr hesni · mulveni · eϑ · zuci · am · ar

<center>II (reverse).</center>

4.   *mlaχϑanra*[4]
    calusc · ecnia · ⦀[5] *avil · mimenicac · marcalur*[6]*-cac · eϑ · tuϑiu ·*
    nesl · man · rivaχ · lescem · tnucasi · suris eis teis · evitiuras ·
    mulsle mlaχ

5.   *tins · lursϑ · tev-*[7]
        ilaχe huviϑun
        lursϑ sal
        afrs · nace · s

I shall take the last part of the inscription (5.) first and begin with
the two words, *huviϑun* and *sal*. Dr. Deecke and other scholars divide
the former into *huvi ϑun*, and they find in *ϑun* and *sal* numerals, *viz.*
ϑu and *zal*, as the words are generally written. Unfortunately, the de-
plorable scarcity of our material does not enable us to fix the identity
of the forms. But I think the supposition highly probable, for the full

[1] Beitr. II 18 f.

[2] Beitr. II 60, I 54.

[3] Beitr. I 51, II 75.

[4] According to Danielsson, this word has been added later.

[5] Danielsson remarks: 'figures? (‖ or ‖‖ or ⋀‖ = 4?)'.

[6] Danielsson: 'Dubious, whether this *r* has been added later (as supposed by Milani)'.

[7] According to Milani, the words *tins lursϑ tev* have been added later.

form of *ϑu* was certainly *ϑun*, as proved by the genitive *ϑuns* and by *ϑunem-* in *ϑunem-zaϑrums*, etc., and *zal* shows *s* for *z* in forms such as *esals, eslz* and *eslem-*. Now if *ϑun* and *sal* are numerals, as most probably they are, it may be almost taken for granted that this passage speaks of objects that are to be offered in sacrifice. The word *lursϑ*, which occurs twice, also contains a numeral, *lur*, a noun derived from *lu*, which I have formerly explained as a numeral[1]. A numeral it is most certainly, but its value has not yet been quite fixed. I think I have shown it probable that it means 'ten', but it is not absolutely proved; it might possibly mean 'twelve', but the value 'ten' is preferable. From this *lu* the noun *lur* is formed, just as *śar* from *śa* and *zelar* from *zal*. If *lu* means 'ten', then *lur* is 'decade'. The genitive of *lu* is *lurs*, and to this form the termination of the locative, *-ϑ*, has here been affixed. For parallel instances, see my »Etr Beitr.« II 16. As for the word *tins*, which stands immediately before *lursϑ*, both Deecke and Milani and other scholars agree in taking it for the name of the god *Tin(i)a = Jove*. The supposition is certainly justifiable, as every other line commences with the name of a deity; but it must also be admitted that it would be strange that the chief god should be mentioned last. On this head Prof. Milani remarks (l. c.): »Come e quando *Tin* degli Etruschi venga a identificarsi col *Jupiter* dei Romani, e, in questo caso, più specialmente con *Veiovis*, spiegherò trattando della religione e delle divinità degli Etruschi. Qui per la intelligenza del piombo di Magliano, e, se ce ne fosse bisogno, a maggior riprova della sua autenticità, giova ch'io anticipi questo principale risultato dei miei studi: che il culto di Giove non esiste nella religione originale etrusca, e che non fu introdotto in Etruria avanti la seconda metà del sec. IV a Cr. Ciò detto e risaputo, anzichè destare meraviglia, si comprenderà perfettamente come *Tin* sia nominato all' ultimo posto nel testo dell' iscrizione, ed apparisca aggiunto in una probabile revisione del testo generale« (see note 7 p. 6). But I do not think that *tins* here means Jove. I identify *tins* with *tinśi* (genitive) in the Agram text, where the connection with *tiuri-m* 'month' and *avilś* 'year', as shown by me formerly[2], proves the signification to be 'day'. The genitive form of the god's name is also *tinśi* (*tins*). Whether the nominative form is identical too, we do not know. Its being so would be quite natural (compare Latin *dies* and *Diespiter*). At any rate both words are derived from the same 'root'. *Tin(i)a* is the god of light, of day.

---

[1] Lemnos p. 64 f.
[2] Beitr. I 99, II 20 etc.

I therefore interpret *tins* as 'dierum'. Like *avil* this word has no special plural form. Thus *tins lur* is 'dierum decuria'. The locative form of the genitive, *lurs-ϑ*, must, of course, point to a second locative as its supplement. This second locative can only be found in *tevilaχe*. I have formerly drawn attention to the existence of locatives in -*e* in the Agram text[1], and there, too, such locatives occasionally occur in connection with genitives to which the locative suffix -*ti* (-*ϑ*) has been added, thus in *unial-ti aϑre, cilϑcve-ti hilare*. The two words *lur-s-ϑ tevilaχe* then form a group, in which the genitive *lurs* is governed by the locative *tevilaχe*. This word occurs only here, and it is consequently absolutely obscure; but we may conclude from the connection in which it occurs, that it means something like 'intervallum'. Thus: 'dierum decuriae intervallo'. *huvi ϑun* is 'one *huvi* (*viz.* immolandum est)'. Dr. Deecke in his usual way starts from the similarity in sound to Latin words, and, as might be expected, interprets *huvi* by 'ovis'. Most probably it signifies some animal, but whether it be sheep, or ram, or pig, or some other beast, we cannot, of course, decide. I fancy, however, that it actually means 'sheep' or 'mutton'; only I should not compare the Latin *ovis*, but the Avar. *khui* 'mutton' (Kazikumyk. *khu*), which has also been borrowed by the Armenians (*χoy*).

Then follows *lursϑ sal*, i. e. 'decuriae (*viz.* intervallo, that word being indicated by means of the -*ϑ* in *lursϑ*) duo (*viz.* immolanda sunt)'. After other ten days, two animals are to be offered.

afrs nace.s are genitives. These words most certainly indicate the person or persons to which the sacrifice is to be offered. As I have mentioned in another place[2], these identical words occur in another inscription, which has also been found in Vetulonia, but is of much more ancient date, and there, too, at the end of the inscription, and also, as here, signifying the person (persons) to whom something is consecrated. I refer to the stele of Vetulonia, whose inscription ends as follows:

*minimuluvanekehirmi*x *aφers naχs*

Thus reads Prof. Danielsson, quite correctly, as I ascertained myself last summer. The meaning is:

'This did Hirmia consecrate to the x (or the x's).'

The last word *naχs* (= *naces*) is clearly related to *nacnva, nacna*, 'tomb'. Being a genitive like *aφers* (= *afrs*), it evidently belongs to this word as its attribute. I therefore think it very probable that *aφers*

---

[1] Beitr. II 17, 18, 23, 30, 44, 61, 66, 74, 75, 104.
[2] Lemnos p. 36 n.

(*afrs*), genitive of *aφer* (*afr*) (probably plural), means 'manes'. Then we should have here the hitherto missing Etruscan word for 'manes', the worship of whom, as we know, belonged to the Tuscans. The word seems, as I have already remarked, to be a plural. Can this be the reason why the Latin rendering of it is a plural too? The inscription of Capua shows a word *aφes*, but as this inscription is altogether obscure, we cannot ascertain whether it gives us the corresponding genitive sing., or is a totally different word.

afrs naces, then, would be: 'to the manes of the tomb', 'the manes of the deceased'. And this last passage of the tablet would contain the direction, that after ten days (after the death) some animal, after other ten days two animals, are to be immolated to the manes of the deceased: 'dierum decuriae intervallo (?) *huvi* unum, (alterae) decuriae (intervallo) duo (immolanda sunt) manibus sepulcri (s. mortui)'.

The remaining parts contain rules as to the sacrifices that are to be offered to various deities in honour of the deceased.

In the first place to *Cautha*. This god, according to Deecke and Milani, is identical with *Usil* (the Sun) and *Aplu*. I too believe him to be a Sun-god.

tuθiu I take as a locative in -*u*. Such locatives were first observed by Pauli[1]. Whether they are real locatives, or contain a postposition -*u*, I cannot decide. The question is, however, of no great importance. In any case such forms function as locatives. *tuθi-* is an adjective, derived from *θu*, 'one', as I have previously supposed[2]. Thus *cauθas tuθiu* means 'to Cautha first', 'primo loco'.

I do not connect *tuθiu* with the genitive *avils* — in which case we should have 'in the beginning of the year' — because that would not harmonize with the following LXXX · *ez*, if this numeral indication is interpreted in the manner I think necessary. With regard to this complex, one might be led to suppose that *ez* gives us the word for the object offered, and the numerals the number: 'eighty *ez*'. But I think a different explanation much more probable, namely, that *ez* is not an independent word, but only represents the termination of the numeral of which the body is written in numeral letters. In that case, if e. g. *cezpalχl-* is 'eighty', I should read the whole as *cezpalχlez*, which would be the numeral adverb 'eighty times'. As for the termination -*ez*, compare *esl-z* 'twice', *ci-z* 'thrice', and the like, standing beside *ci-zi* and the like. We

---

[1] Fo. u. St. III 67.

[2] Beitr. II 97.

might also, and perhaps with greater justification, suppose *ez* to be a noun, meaning 'time' or something similar. In that case, *ciz*, etc. would be formed by composition with that noun, and in *cizi*, etc. we would have to suppose a derivative termination *-i*.

Thus *avils* is genitivus temporis, 'during the year', 'in the year'.

The thrice-occurring *χimϑm* is, of course, related to *χimϑ*, Agr. X 11 and Cipp. Perus., *χim*, Agr. III 13, VI 16, VII 11, XII 4, and, perhaps, *χimri*, inscr. of Capua l. 14 (but here the reading is uncertain). *χimϑ* is the locative of *χim*. *χimϑm* would then look like this locative with the copulative conjunction *-m* affixed to it. But a closer inspection will show us that this conjunction cannot possibly be supposed here. Firstly, the fact that the *-m* occurs all three times points to a closer connection than that of a noun with the affixed copulative. Secondly, in l. 2, *χimϑm* is immediately followed by *avilsχ*, which undoubtedly contains the copulative conjunction *-χ* (= *c*); and thirdly, the construction of the three parallel sentences containing the same word *χimϑm* shows clearly that this word must represent the verb. How the word is to be explained, or, in other words, what the function of the ending *-m* may be (for *χimϑ-* is evidently a locative), I cannot say; but I think I can maintain most positively that *χimϑm* in all three places is a single word, not two, and that this word must mean something like 'sacrificandum est'. In another paper I have concluded from the surroundings in which we find the word *χim* that it probably signifies some sort of sacrifice[1]. We now see that this supposed meaning would suit here too. As for the *-m*, I only observe that *etnam*, a word occurring very often in the Agram text, has long appeared to me to have a verbal notion.

This first passage would then be: 'Cautho primo loco octagies in anno ́sacrificandum est'.

casϑialϑ lacϑ are very probably two locatives, the former that of a genitive (compare *lurs-ϑ*), or of an adjective terminating in *-l*. The two locatives indicate the place in which the sacrifice is to be performed 'in (or 'upon', or 'at') the *casϑial lac*'.

In the next passage we know the words *avil* 'year', *neśl* 'the deceased' (genitive)[2], and *man*. The latter word means, as I hope I have shown formerly, 'is'[3]. It is the same as *ma*, in full form *ama*. The ending *-n* has not as yet been satisfactorily explained, but it is probably an enclitic demonstrative. *avil* and *neśl* (genitive) are certainly to be

[1] Beitr. II 105.
[2] Beitr. II 18 f.
[3] Beitr. I 12 f.

combined, meaning 'the year of the deceased' = the year in which the
person in question died. Then the predicate is contained in *hevn man*.
What now is the meaning of *hevn*? We must consider as closely related
or even identical the word *heva*, occurring in the obscure inscription,
CIE 461:

heva : vipiϑur | cucrinaϑur · cainal — Cortona — (ossuary).

As the Etruscan *h* does not appear to be a constant sound, we
might perhaps, without being too bold, presume that *evi-* (in *evitiuras*) also
belongs to the same root. I should be inclined to suppose that the same
evi- is contained in *icevis* (P. 438 bis a.), but I admit that I am here
venturing on a much bolder conjecture, because I should have to divide
arbitrarily what is written as one word. I here quote the inscription:

> *ramϑa vipia*
> × × *sval [ce] avil*
> ↓ Χ · *icevis · va*   (base of a stele).

The first part of this is clear enough: 'Ramtha Vipia . . lived 60
years'. But it is very puzzling that this inscription does not, like all
others of similar shortness, end with this indication of age, but gives some-
thing more expressed in two short words. As regards the latter, *va* (re-
stricting particle?), see above (p. 3). I think the two words can hardly
contain any other statement than that the said age is not defined quite
accurately: the woman was in her sixtieth year, but had not yet com-
pleted it. *icevis* I divide into *ic evis*. *ic* is the negation mentioned
above, 'and not'. *ic evis va* would then be 'and not fully though'.
Here too *va* follows upon the negation, just as in the connection *ie-va*
mentioned above. The ending *-s* is not clear. Might we suppose an
adverbial genitive?

This theory may, as I have already said, seem extremely daring, but
I venture to think that it is not altogether improbable. At any rate it
gives a reasonable meaning.

evituras evidently contains as its last part *-tiuras*, this word being,
as we are now able to say with certainty, the genitive plural of *tiu*
'moon'. For that is undoubtedly the meaning of *tiu* on the bronze liver of
Piazenza, where it is written on the moon's part, just as the sun's part
shows the inscription *usil* 'sun'. But *tiu* also means 'month', as may be
concluded from its being connected with *tinśi* 'day' and *avilś* 'year' in
the formula *eϑrse tinśi tiurim avilś χiś*, in the Agram text. Here *tiurim*
must be divided into *tiu-ri-m*; and as *-m* is a copulative conjunction, and

-ri a case-ending[1], the remaining *tiu* is the body of the word.   *tiuras* is identical with *tivrs*, Fa. 2119:

<p style="text-align:center">avils : X X tivrs : śas</p>

i. e. 'twenty years and four months'[2].   Now we have found that *tiu* means both moon and month, and it is at the outset uncertain which of the two significations should be assigned to it in the compound *evitiuras*. This uncertainty adds, of course, to the difficulty of interpreting its first part; for if *tiuras* means 'month', *evi* can scarcely be anything but 'half'; and on the other hand, if it means 'moon', we are left to choose between 'new' and 'full'.   But, as we see, here too there is at any rate some degree of probability that *evi* means 'full'.

With regard to *hevn avil*, the meaning 'full' would suit excellently. I consider the proposition as a subordinate one.   The conjunction is perhaps wanting[3], or it may be looked for in the unexplained *-n*.   I think the meaning 'when the year of the deceased is full', a most satisfactory one.   What is to be done when that term has expired, is said in the two ensuing words, the latter of which, *falzaϑi*, is a locative and parallel to the locatives *casϑialϑ lacϑ* in the previous sentence: 'Then *murinaśie* (is to be offered) in (upon, at) the *falza*'.   What these words mean we cannot guess.   But *murinaśie* most probably signifies some object offered, and *falzaϑi* is perhaps identical with *falśti* (locative), Cippus Perus., of which the nominative is *falaś, ib.*

heva in the inscription quoted above is very difficult to explain, as is also *-ϑur* in *vipiϑur cucrinaϑur*. *heva* seems to be the predicate.   Can it be that the base (*h*)*ev* does not exactly mean 'full', but rather 'finished'? In that case it would here be essentially synonymous with 'dead': 'Finished (i. e. deceased) is the progeny (= son) of Vipi Cucrina (?) and of Cainei'. Moreover, supposing that *tiu* means 'moon', *evitiu-* would be 'the finished moon' *i. e.* 'the moon that has finished increasing', an expression not altogether unimaginable.

I therefore venture to translate our passage thus: 'Cum plenus erit annus mortui (mortuo), sacrificandum est *murinaśie* in *falza*'.

The second deity is *Aisera*.   She occurs also in the Agram text (as *esera*).   According to Milani she is the wife of Cautha, identical with Dea Dia = Ceres.   Deecke identifies her with Luna-Diana.   She certainly

---

[1] Beitr. I 96 f., II 13, 26, 67, 73, 96.
[2] Beitr. I 69.
[3] Beitr. II 46, 57, 61, 62.

is a goddess of Death. I think she is not to be identified with *aisera* *ϑuflϑica*[1] (occurring in the genitive form *aiseras ϑuflϑicla*) = *ϑuflϑa*, a deity known both from the bronze liver of Piazenza and from several inscriptions mentioning a so-called *clen ceχa* = 'ex voto pro filio'[2] as being consecrated to her.

in is a relative pronoun[3], *ecs* the genitive-dative of *ecn* 'this'. *mene* means 'gave' (or 'was given')[4]. The object of this verb must be *mlaϑcemarni*, which only occurs in this place, and is consequently an obscure word. The meaning of this group of words then seems to be as follows: 'to Aisera which gave to him (to the deceased) the *mlaϑcemarni*' (or: 'by whom was given', etc.). What it is that Aisera is supposed to have given to the deceased we cannot guess, owing to our total ignorance of the Etruscan mythology; but it is perhaps in return for that gift that the sacrifice is to be offered.

As for *tuϑi tiu*, it follows from what has been said above, that these words must mean 'the first month' (after the death). As the locative termination is wanting, we might explain the case as probably accusativus temporis: 'through the first month'.

Then the whole would be: 'Aiserae, quae dedit illi *mlaϑcemarni*, per primum mensem (post mortem) sacrificandum est in *casϑial lac*'.

The third deity is *Maris* (gen. *mariśl*) = Mars. (Compare Deecke and Milani.)

cialaϑ looks like a locative, and *cialaϑ χimϑm* seems to be parallel to *tuϑiu—χimϑm* in the first line. As *cialaϑ* certainly contains the numeral *ci* = three, I should not, according to that parallelism, think myself too bold in supposing that it means 'tertio loco'. Now I think I can trace the Etruscan word for 'third' elsewhere. Among the newly-found sarcophagi that I saw at Toscanella last summer, there is one bearing the following inscription:

ramϑa : nuiχlnei : stalanes : velus cianil : puia[5]

Now in no other inscription do we find an adjective added to *puia* 'wife'. This is sufficient reason for not supposing the meaning of *cianil* to be 'dulcissima', or 'pientissima', or 'optima', which are the common epithets in Latin inscriptions. We must look out for those far less

---

[1] Beitr. II 90.

[2] Beitr. I 42 f.

[3] Beitr. I 18, 96, II 12, 56, 104, 120.

[4] Beitr. I 20, Lemnos 59.

[5] Torp-Herbig no. 48.

frequent ones which indicate the deceased woman's number as wife, as in the inscription CIL XI $_{1548}$ — Faesulae —

> *A. Faltennius* | *C. f. Sca · sex · vir* | *Ladin-*
> *nia · A. f.* | *tertia uxor.*

Thus, even if we did not know a single Etruscan numeral, we should be able to assert almost positively that *cianil* must be an ordinal number; and now knowing *ci* to be a cardinal number, we cannot have any doubt of *cianil* being the corresponding ordinal. Now we can hardly think of a fourth wife, and a fifth is quite out of the question. We therefore learn from this inscription that *cianil* must mean either 'second' or 'third'. *ci* must consequently mean either 'two' or 'three', and it follows that either Prof. Thomsen or myself must be right in our explanation of *ci* and the other first five numerals. All other combinations are excluded. Prof. Thomsen has found some resemblance between the first six numerals, as contained on the dice from Toscanella, and the numerals one to six in certain North-Caucasian languages; and based on such comparisons he has arranged the Etruscan numerals as follows:

> *śa ci zal maχ ϑu huϑ* (or *huϑ ϑu*)[1]

(which gives for the sides of the dice the following numeral proportions: 1—2, 3—4, 5—6). On the other hand I have adduced many reasons, drawn from their connections with other numbers and other words, to show that they must be taken in this order:

> *ϑu zal ci śa maχ huϑ*[2]

(which gives for the sides the following proportions: 1—6, 2—5, 3—4). I shall not here repeat my argument in detail. Suffice it to say that Prof. Thomsen's arrangement falls, because *śa* cannot mean 'one'; for in the first place it is once, as shown above, connected with *tivrs*, a plural word, and, secondly, a numeral noun *śar* is derived from *śa*, as *zelar* from *zal* and *lur* from *lu*. These three nouns all occur compounded with one and the same word, *venas*, thus: *śarvenas, zelarvenas, lurvenas*. Now as we do not know the meaning of *venas*, we cannot from these compounds absolutely deny the possibility that *śar* might mean 'unity'; but it would not be very probable, and is, I think, put out of the question by the combination *ciś śariś* (Agram text VIII $_1$), which, as is shown by the context, cannot mean 'x unities'[3]. So together with the equation *śa* = one,

---

[1] 'Remarque sur la parenté de la langue Étrusque', Extr. du Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de Danemark, no. 4, pp. 573—598.

[2] Beitr. I 64 f., Monatsdaten.

[3] Monatsdaten 9.

the whole series must be given up, and consequently no other arrange-
ment is possible than that proposed by myself. *cianil puia* is therefore
'tertia uxor'.

From this new word *cianil* we not only learn the exact value of *ci*
(and through it those of the remaining five numerals), but also something
about the formation of ordinals. In *cianil* I suppose *-il* to be the real
termination of ordinals, the *-an* seeming to be some augment, as it also
appears in *ceanuϑ*, which seems to contain the two numerals *ci* and *huϑ*.[1]

Now it might be objected to the interpretation of *cialaϑ* given above,
that as 'third' is *cianil*, so 'in the third place' ought to be **cianilϑ* and
not *cialaϑ*. I admit that we should expect the former, and this is certainly
a weak point. But I do not think the supposition unacceptable, that
cialaϑ is assimilated from **cianlaϑ*, and **cianla-* derived from *cianil* as
designing something more special, for instance 'the third place'. I find a
parallel formation in *sleleϑ*, Cippus Perus., which occurs in the passage

ame vaχr lautn velϑinaś eśtla afunaś sleleϑ.

I have elsewhere explained this to mean 'the family of Velthina made
an agreement (properly 'was speaking' = *ame vaχr*) with Afuna'[2].
I will cite my own words: »An unserer Stelle wäre vielleicht für die
Verbindung *ame vaχr*, eigentlich »war sprechend«, wenn meine Auffas-
sung dieser Inschrift im Grossen und Ganzen sich dem Richtigen annähert,
etwa die Bedeutung »machte eine Abrede« anzunehmen. Die Inschrift
macht gleich beim ersten Anblick den Eindruck, dass es sich hier um eine
von den beiden Familien Velthina und Afuna getroffene Übereinkunft
handele. Diese beiden kontrahierenden Parteien sind gleich am Anfang
genannt. Wenn diese Auffassung richtig ist, so kann die Verbindung
afunaś sleleϑ kaum etwas anderes bedeuten als »mit dem (den) Afuna«
oder »dem (den) Afuna gegenüber«. Das Wort *slel(e)* scheint also einen
Begriff zu enthalten, der sich mit der Anwendung des Lokativs desselben
als einer Art von Präposition verträgt, z. B. »Nähe, Gemeinschaft« oder
etwas Ähnliches. Dass das Wort eine Nebenform von *clel* sei, lässt sich
dadurch nicht beweisen, dass neben *municleϑ* die Formen *munisvleϑ* und
munsle auftreten«[3]. Now that we know the formation of the ordinals,
it will be possible to attempt an explanation of the word *sleleϑ*. The
ordinal corresponding to *zal* 'two' should be **zalil* or *zelil*. From this
supposed form we might derive a secondary **slele,* corresponding to

---

[1] Compare my remarks, Torp-Herbig no. 56.
[2] Beitr. II 83 f.
[3] Beitr. II 93.

*cia(n)la, from cianil. The genitive afunas I now suppose to be governed
not by sleleϑ, but by a second lautn which must be supplied from the
context.   afunas sleleϑ would accordingly mean 'that of Afuna in the
second place', this expression meaning 'with the family of Afuma as the
other part'.

The explanation given above of tuϑi as 'first' might be said to be
contrary to the fact that the ordinals, as shown by cianil, are formed by
the termination -il. I do not, however, think that objection decisive; for
it would certainly be no unusual thing if the first ordinal were formed
in a divergent manner, as is the case in many other languages.

menitla, as I have shown elsewhere [1], is the genitive of menica, which
occurs in l. 4.   This word must be divided into meni-ca, the latter part
of which is a suffixed demonstrative pronoun. If afrs, as was supposed
above, is a genitive plural, menitla cannot, of course, be an attribute to
that word, being itself a genitive singular. On the other hand, it formally
corresponds to marisl, and therefore probably gives some detailed par-
ticular concerning that god. The supposition that marisl and menitla are
to be combined, might perhaps be supported by the fact that an alto-
gether uniform word, *ϑuflϑica (gen. ϑuflϑicla), forms an epithet to another
deity, aisera.   Now the first part of menitla seems to contain the root
men (or meˀ), which must mean something like 'give' or 'bring'. The
genitive afrs is probably governed by menitla. So, if afrs means 'manes',
we should have to suppose the meaning of the whole of it to be (quasi)
'portatori manium' (ψυχοπόμπῳ). The expression menitla afrs seems to
form a parallel to in ecs mene mlaϑcemarni in the preceding line; and
therefore it probably likewise gives the reason why a sacrifice is to be
offered to the god in question. If the words in ecs mene, etc. allude to
the first phase of the postmortal existence of the deceased, then menitla
afrs would point to the second. The use of the same men- in both
phrases also seems to mark out a parallelism existing between them.

The passage would then run: 'Marti portatori manium, tertio loco
sacrificandum est'.

After the third χimϑm the indication of locality, casϑialϑ lacϑ, is
wanting. It might therefore seem probable that that which follows, avilsχ
etc., should compensate for that lack, or, in other words, correspond to
the phrase casϑialϑ lacϑ of l. 1 and 2.

avilsχ certainly contains the copulative -χ (= -c). Compare the fol-
lowing ϑu-χ.

---

[1] Beitr. II 91 f.

As the two words *tuƟiu* and *avils* are standing side by side in the first line, and here at any rate in the same connection, it would be natural to combine them. I nevertheless found reason to separate them above, and I think there is still more reason for doing so here; for in the Agram text we find the combination *cepen tuƟin*, and it would therefore seem far more reasonable that *tuƟiu* should here be taken together with *cepen*, than with *avils*, the more so as it is separated from *avils* by two words. The genitive *avils* is, I suppose, governed by *cepen*: 'the *cepen* of the year'. What *cepen* means we do not know. It has been supposed that it signifies some sort of priest. As shown by the adjectives added (*cepen marunuχva, cepen cilƟcva, cepen maƟcva, cepen sulχva, cepen tuƟin, cepen Ɵaurχ, cepen cnticnƟ*(?)), there were several kinds or classes of *cepens*. *avils cepen* 'the *cepen* of the year' would not therefore be a sufficient indication, and the qualifying *tuƟiu* is accordingly almost indispensable. Thus we have the probably identical expressions *cepen tuƟin* and *cepen tuƟiu*. *tuƟin* is certainly an adjective: 'the first *cepen*'. The synonymous *cepen tuƟiu* would be 'the *cepen* (who is) in the first place'. In a similar way *cepen* also seems to be once combined with a locative in the Agram text: *cepen cnticnƟ*.

The two following words are connected with *cepen tuƟiu* by means of the enclitic -χ = -*c*: 'and *Ɵu iχutevr*. Now *Ɵu* being 'one', the -*r* of *iχutevr* cannot be the plural termination, but must be a derivative. Compare the *r* in *tevaraƟ* (Ga. 798), a word which is certainly related to -*tevr*. The meaning of *iχutevr* is not known, and probably never will be; but we are at any rate able to understand its formation. We possess an inscription from Tarquinii (Tomba Marzi), Ga. 791, which according to Danielsson is to be read as follows:

> *ve[l] arnƟal · curunas*
> *- - - - nal : clanteucem*
> *(- -) patevce : iχ · an*

Now we do not understand what is meant by *iχ an* = 'this *iχ*', but *tevce* is the preterite of a root *tev* (the -*pa* that stands before it is, I think, *[i]pa* 'who'[1]), and it therefore cannot be doubted that the compound *iχu-tevr* indicates someone who undertakes with, or in regard to, something called *iχ*, some action marked by the word *tev*.

---

[1] Beitr. I 15 f., II 67, 97, 107, 120.

We then have 'the first *cepen* of the year and one *iχutevr*'. The
verb is *mulveni,* which according to the explanation I have given else-
where is an imperative[1]. It undoubtedly means 'consecrate', or something
of that kind, as shown by numerous inscriptions[2]. *eca,* 'that', is the object.
This demonstrative pronoun points to the sacrifice which is to be offered
to Maris. *hešni* is an obscure word.

The whole passage, then, would be 'et illud anni *cepen* primus
unusque *iχutevr* - - offerunto'.

Of the subsequent words the most important ones are obscure. *am*
and *ar* are imperatives, the former formed from the verb 'to be', the
latter from a verb 'to make'[3]. *eϑ* is a demonstrative pronoun, the genitive
of which occurs in Fa. 2056: *eϑl matu manimeri.* It functions as an object
(in the form *eiϑ*) in Fa. 2279. This *eϑ* (*eiϑ*) must be distinguished from the
homonymous *eiϑ* (*eiϑi*), which is the locative of another demonstrative
pronoun *ei* (*eiϑi suϑiϑi* 'in this tomb').

zuci, which occurs also on the Cippus Perusinus, is obscure.

mlaχϑanra is not the name of a deity, as has been supposed by
Milani. I have elsewhere compared it with *mlaχ-nun-ϑen* in the Agram
text[4], and this I still think to be the right way of explaining it. It
is certainly the object of the imperative *ar.* I also think that my trans-
lation 'placatio' is not far from being the right one.

We then get at the following meaning: 'id (or hoc, sc. sacrum?)
zuci esto; faciunto placationem'.

The fourth passage abounds in obscure words, and is accordingly
altogether enigmatic.

calusc means 'and to *Calu'. calus* is combined with the copulative
particle *-c,* perhaps owing to the circumstance that this name is the last
in the series of deities enumerated.

ecnia doubtless contains the demonstrative *ecn,* 'this'. The pronoun
must be combined with *avil. ia* would then seem to be a separate word.
I think it is the negative particle that I have pointed out above. We
then have 'and to Calu not this year (*viz.* sacrificandum est)'. Between
ecnia and *avil* I think there are two strokes; thus: *ecnia* ‖ *avil,* which I
suppose must be read *zalil avil.* The whole of it would then be 'and
to Calu not this (year), (but) in the second year'.

---

[1] Beitr. I 59.
[2] Prof. Lattes nevertheless still tries to maintain his own interpretation 'to give *mola*
and wine'.
[3] Beitr. I 59, II 55.
[4] Beitr. II 34.

The meaning of the ensuing words is totally obscure to me. They look as if they were connected by a double-set -c: 'et *mimenica* et *marcalurca*', or 'hoc (hic) (*mi*) et *menica* et *marcalurca* (est)'.

If *mimenica* is a compound (containing *mi* 'hoc' and *menica*) there is another alternative; for then the first -c can be supposed to connect this word with the preceding words, and the second -c to connect two other words, *marca* and *lurca*, with each other. These words are formed in the same way, and this latter alternative is therefore perhaps preferable.

menica is doubtless, as already remarked, related to *menitla*, but I cannot make the meaning that I have given above to this word, to fit into the new connection.

If we have to divide *marcalurca* into two words, *marca* and *lurca*, we may suppose their termination -ca to be identical with the -ca in *menica*. *lur-* would be 'decade', as was remarked above. The parallel *mar-* one might be tempted to derive, in the same manner, from *ma-χ* 'five'. But I do not see the sense of the whole connection. Nor do I understand anything of that which follows, with the exception of some single words, such as *eϑ* 'id'; *tuϑiu* 'primo loco'; *nesl* 'mortui', the genitive probably governed by *rivaχ*; *man* 'est'. *śuris* is the genitive-dative of *śuri*, a chthonic deity[1], probably the wife of Calu. As to *eis*, I cannot yet decide whether it means 'god', or 'something offered to a god' (Agram text: *ais, ais cemnaχ, eiser*). *teis* I shall discuss below.

These are, I fancy, the outlines of the contents of the Magliano tablet.

---

[1] Beitr. I 51, II 75.

III.

zila𝜗 and connected words.

I premise the materials:

Tarquinii and its vicinity.

1. - - - *urinas : an : zila𝜗 : amce : me𝜒l : rasnal | - - - ś : pur𝜗 : ziiace : ucntm : hecce | [r]avn𝜗u | - efrinai | — ⁝ ⁝ nacnuva*

Inscription on a wall within the Tombo dell'Orco. P. 399. Danielsson's copy. Da. remarks: 'The lines 1, 2, 4 (not 3) are also scratched in graffito. The rough draught does not always agree with the paint (done afterwards), the difference being greatest at the end of l. 3, where the graffito has to some extent other letters: *zziace : ucntum : hence*'.

2. *rel𝜗ur | vel𝜒as zila𝜒nu | veluśa | aninaic*

Inscription on a wall within the Tomba degli Scudi. P. 431. Danielsson's copy.

3. *z[i]lci : vel[u]ṣ : hul | 𝜒niesi [:] lar𝜗 : vel | 𝜒as : vel[𝜗u]rs · apr-𝜗[nal] | c : cl[an] : sacniśa : 𝜗u | i : [ei]𝜗 : śu𝜗i𝜗 : acazr*

Inscription on a wall of the same tomb. P. 420—419. Danielsson's copy. He remarks: 'I still think the reading *z[i]lci* the only possible one'.

4. *-⸗- erce : fise : tetaṣasi : ham𝜑ete : clesnes 𝜗urs : u×𝜗u · cesi×× | zilci : i×××× usi : h××𝜒××uḷesi ×(×)*

Inscription on a wall of the same tomb. Ga. 802 l. 6 and 7. Danielsson's copy.

5. *lar - - - - | clan - - - - | zila𝜗 - - -*

Inscription on a wall within the Tomba del Tifone. Fa. 2282.

6. *lar𝜗 · ceisinis · velus · clan · cizi · zila𝜒nce | meani · municle𝜗 · me𝜗lm · nup𝜑zi · can𝜗ce · calus . . lupu*

Mural inscription. Fa. 2339. Forlivesi read *nur𝜗zi*.

7. *s×××××× : arn𝜗 · velus : clan | ××××nal 𝜗an𝜒vilus · ma××× | [z]ila𝜗 : lupuce · śurnu ××××*

Sarcophagus. Deecke's copy (Fo. u. St. III 162 no. 27).

8. *lar𝜗 · arn𝜗al · plecus · clan : ram𝜗asc · apatrual : eslz :* | *zila𝜒n𝜗as :*
   avils : 𝜗unesi : muval𝜒ls : lupu :

   Sarcophagus. Fa. 2335 a. Danielsson's copy.

9. *- - [l]arisal · crespe · 𝜗an𝜒vilus : pumpnal · clan · zila𝜗 - - - - - -*
   rasnas · marunu𝜒 | *- - n · zilc · 𝜗ufi · ten𝜗as · marunu𝜒 · pa𝜒a-*
   nati· ril· ↑X‖

   Sarcophagus. Fa. 2335 b. Danielsson's copy.

10. *arn𝜗 : 𝜒urcles : lar𝜗al : clan : ram𝜗as : nevntial : zilc : par𝜒is ·*
    amce | *marunu𝜒 : spurana · cepen : tenu : avils : ma𝜒s : sem𝜑al𝜒ls :*
    lupu

    Sarcophagus. Fa. 2070.

11. *vel𝜗ur : partunus ꞉ larisalisa : clan : ram𝜗as : cuclnial : zil𝜒 :*
    ce𝜒aneri : ten𝜗as : avil | *sval𝜗as :* ↑↑↑↑‖

    Sarcophagus. T. 367. My own copy.

12. *se𝜗re · curunas* | *velus [r]am𝜗a avenalc* | *sansas su𝜗 𝜗arce* | *inum*
    𝜃(e)n𝜗ce | *cecaslep* | *zila𝜒n[u]ce* L. XXI

    Inscription on a wall within a tomb. Not. Scav. 1900, 85. See
    my remarks, Beitr. II 133. As Pasqui's copy gives *zipa𝜒n[u]he*
    instead of *zila𝜒n[u]ce*, we ought perhaps also to read *cecaslel*, not
    cecaslep.

13. (a) *ram𝜗a huzcnai 𝜗ui ati : nacnva : lar𝜗ial* | *apaiatrus zileteraias*
    (b) *ram𝜗a : huzcnai : 𝜗ui : cesu : ati nacna : lar𝜗ial : apiatrus ·*
        zileterais

       Great marble sarcophagus, with pictures representing amazons
       fighting; (a) the inscription on the cover, (b) rudely engraved into
       the picture itself. P. 436.

14. *scurnas · m · a · maru · m · t · z · p · t · ril · XXXXV*
    Sarcophagus. P. 434.

15. *— r : cutnas : zilcte : lupu*
    Inscription on a fragment of a sarcophagus from a tomb recently
    discovered near the Villa Tarantola. Communicated to me by Da-
    nielsson.

16. *carsui : ram𝜗a* | *[a]vils [:] XXX lupu* | ××*nicas : lurvenas* | *zili :*
    uzarale | *z*××(×)*is erce*
    Inscription on a wall within a tomb, near the Villa Tarantola.
    Bull. 1881, 90. Danielsson's copy.

Vulci and **Tuscania**.

17. *tuṭes · šeϑre · larϑal · clan pumplialχ · velas · zilaχnuce | zilcti · purtśvavcti lupu · avils · maχs zaϑrums*

 Sarcophagus. P. 388. As regards the reading *zilcti · purtśvavcti*, not *zilc* XI · *purtśvavc* XI, see Beitr. I 76.

18. *tute : larϑ : anc : farϑnaχe : tute : arnϑals : lupu : avils esals : cezpalχals | haϑlials : ravnϑu : zilχnu : cezpz : purtśvana : ϑunz*

 Sarcophagus. P. 387.

19. *larϑ · vipinanas · velϑur · velϑurus[la.] XI zilaχce*

 Sarcophagus. Fa. 2116.

20. *atnas : vel · larϑal · svan · svalce · avil · LXIII · zi[l]aϑ | maruχva · ṭarils · ceptn · φelucu*

 Sarcophagus from Toscanella. Fa. 2101.

Surrina.

21. *av̧[le · ale]ϑna[s · a]rnϑal · cl[an ·] ϑanχvilusc · ruvfial · zilaχ-n[uce] | spur[e]ϑi · apasi · svalas · marunuχva · cepen ·tenu · eprϑ-nevc · eslz te[nu] | eprϑieva · eslz*

 Sarcophagus. T. 329. My own copy.

22. *arnϑ · aleϑn | as · aɣ · clan · ril · | XXXXII · eitva · ta | mera · śarvenas · | clenar · zal · arce · | acnanasa · zilc ·mar | unuχva · tenϑas · eϑḷ | matu · manimeri*

 Sarcophagus. T. 318. My own copy.

23. *[a]leϑnas · a · v · zilχ · marunuχva · za*✕✕✕✕ *| [h]uϑz · zince* - - - *⸗ - | c* - - -

 Sarcophagus. Ga. 740. Danielsson's copy.

24. *aleϑnas · v · v · ϑelu · zilaϑ · parχis | zilaϑ · eterav · clenar · ci · acnanasa | elśśi · zilacnu · ϑeluśa · ril · XXVIII | papalser · acna-nasa · VI · manim · arce · ril · LXVII*

 Sarcophagus. T. 327. My own copy.

25. *[al]eϑnas : arnϑ : larisal : zilaϑ : tarχnalϑi : amce*

 Sarcophagus. T. 322. My own copy.

26. *l ·* ✕✕✕✕ϑ *· aleϑn[a]s : šeϑreśa : neśs · sacṇ*✕✕✕✕✕✕✕✕✕✕*e | clensi · muleϑ · svalasi · zilaχnuce · lupuce · munisuleϑ · calu*

 Sarcophagus. T. 330. My own copy. In *munisuleϑ* the *l* is certain (engraved ◁, but only ⊿ is coloured).

Polimartium.

27. - - - *zilχnce avil s[valce* - - - -
Sarcophagus. Fa. 2432.

Volsinium vetus.

28. *vel : l×c××te[:] arnϑal · ××va · larϑ[i]aliś[ala] clan : velusum |*
×nefśi marniu spu[r]ana eprϑnec : tenve · meχlum · rasne×× |
clevsins×× [z]il[a]χnve pulum · runitrin×(×)ϑi · malce · clel · l×

Sarcophagus. Fa. 2033 bis E a. Danielsson's copy.

Clusium and its vicinity.

29. *arnϑ : seate : cuiśla : zilat*
Ossuary. CIE 2771.

30. *ve · severpe · lϑ · t · zi | ϑana | puia*
Teg. sep. CIE 2785.

Volaterrae.

31. - - - *z̑ilat · lupu* - - -
Urn. Fa. 360.

Perhaps also

32. *sav · cnes · itna · muli · rizile · picas · niiane*
rizile picas · ri · sav · lasiei · s
mulu rizile ziz · riin · puiian · a · casri
Inscription of Capua, l. 6, 5 and 19.

In the above inscriptions we find various forms, all pointing to an apparent base *zil*, and falling into two groups — the verbal ones, *zilaχnu*, *zilaχnϑas*, *zilaχnuce* (*zilaχnce, zilχnce, zilaχce, zilaχnve*), and the nominal ones, *zilaϑ* (*zilat*) and *zilχ* (*zilc*), from the latter of which again are derived what seem to be case-forms, *zilci, zilcte* and *zilcti*. In addition to these, we also find some shorter forms, such as *zili, zil-eteraias* and *ri-zile*, all of which may perhaps be supposed to be nominal forms. And, finally, it is a question whether *zince* and *ziiace* may not also belong to the same family of words.

This word *zil*, together with its derivatives, Dr. Deecke first supposed to be the title of some magistracy. He considered *zilaϑ* and *zilc*

to be synonymous terms, both denoting the person invested with the office, not the office itself[1]. Now it is true that we find the phrase *zilc amce* as well as *zilaϑ amce*, the latter of which certainly means 'he was a *zilaϑ*', and the phrase *zilχ parχis* as well as *zilaϑ parχis*; but there are also differences. We never find *zilaϑ tenϑas*, for instance, but only *zilc tenϑas*. No great importance is perhaps to be attached to this fact, the instances being very few; but a marked difference is shown, I think, by the connection *zilaχnuce zilcti*, for here *zilcti* is evidently a locative, and consequently cannot mean 'as a *zilc*' (= *zilaϑ*), but only 'in the *zilc*'. Thus *zilc* must, in this case at least, denote the magistracy, not the magistrate. According to Pauli[2], the magistrate himself was called *zila (this supposed word being found, he thinks, in *zil-eteraias*, which might be a contraction of *zila-eteraias). The regular locative of *zila would be *zilaϑ*. Now a locative can be used, he believes, as a verbal form, and *zilaϑ* would therefore originally mean 'he was (is) in being a *zila' = 'he was (is) *zila'. The verb substantive can, of course, also be added to such a verbal expression, thus: *zilaϑ amce*. On the other hand, the magistracy was, he thinks, called *zilaχ, *zilχ*, *zilc*, from which noun the verb *zilaχnuce* is further derived. But if there were this difference between the two forms, one does not understand how *zilc amce* can be said quite as well as *zilaϑ amce*, both expressions being apparently synonymous. That *zilc* means the magistracy is, I think, obvious, in view of the connection *zilaχnuce zilcti*, the meaning of which can only be 'he-officiated-as-a-*zilaϑ* in-the-*zilc*'. *zilc amce*, on the other hand, can, it seems, only mean 'he was a *zilc*', and it therefore seems impossible to unravel the difficulty without supposing *zilc* to denote both the office and the person filling it — just like the Latin *magistratus* — whereas *zilaϑ* would only mean the official, not the office as well.

Now if we review the material, we are at once struck by the fact that this word, supposed to be the title of some office, and the words derived from it, occur exceedingly often, as compared with other titles. This fact seems to force upon us the conclusion that if *zilc* is the word for some special office, the number of persons holding that office must have been comparatively great. The office of a *zilaϑ* must have been far more common than, say, that of a *maru*. Now the more common it was, the less distinguished would it be. But in such inscriptions as give more than one title held by the deceased, the word *zilaϑ* or some allied word

[1] Fo. u. St. VI 31 f.
[2] Fo. u St. III 61, 69, 135.

most frequently takes the first place, and one would therefore, on the contrary, fancy this title, if title it be, to be the most honoured. The frequent use of the word cannot, on the other hand, be said to disprove Deecke's supposition that the meaning may be 'judge', because there is nothing to prevent our assuming the judicial class to have been a numerous one among the Etruscans. This interpretation (at which, by the way, Deecke seems to have arrived merely by comparing our word with the somewhat similarly sounding Latin *stlis*[1]) will be more closely examined in the ensuing pages.

It strikes us, moreover, that *zilc* and derived words sometimes stand alone, and sometimes have certain other words added to them. Such additions are

	zilaχnuce zilcti purtšvarcti	(17)
	zilχ ceχaneri tenθas	(11)
	marunuχ - - n zilc θufi tenθas	(9)
	zilc marunuχva tenθas	(22)
	zilaθ maruχva	(20)
(probably)	*ma[rnu] zilaθ*	(7)
	zilc parχis, zilaθ parχis	(10, 24)
	zilaθ eterav	(24)
	zileteraias	(13)
We also have	*zilaθ amce meχl rasnal*	(1)
	zilaθ - - - rasnas	(9)
	meχlum rasne×× clevsins[lθ] zil[a]χnve	(28)
	zilaχn[uce] spureθi apasi	(21)
	zilaθ tarχnalθi amce	(25)

Of these additions, some are certainly adjectives, e. g. *marunuχva, maruχva*, which are derived from *marunu, maru*; compare *marunuχva cepen* (21), and further, as regards the termination, *cepen cilθcva, cepen sulχva*, Agram text, which are derived from *cilθ* (*ib.*) and *sul* (inscr. of Capua, compare *sulal*, Agr.) respectively. This is probably also the case with *marunuχ*; with regard to the termination compare *cepen θaurχ*, Agr. text (: *θaura*). Consequently *zilc marunuχva* (*zilc marunuχ*) cannot mean 'the office of a judge *and* the maronate', but only 'the maronic *zilc*'. There is another parallel expression *zilχ ceχaneri*. In this *ceχaneri* we must see some case-form of *ceχane* — this case in *-ri* I have formerly[2] shown to be used in a manner somewhat similar to a genitive —, and *ceχane* is most

---

[1] »Ich gehe jetzt vielmehr von dem alltlat. *stlis*, Stamme *stlit*(*i*), aus« (l. c.).

[2] Beitr. I 96 f.

decidedly the denomination of some sacerdotal person or office. Thus *ceχaneri* likewise gives some adjective determination in regard to *zilc*. This is no doubt the case with *purtšvavcti* in the connection *zilaχnuce zilcti purtšvavcti* (17). Here the supposition of an asyndeton would, I admit, naturally present itself to the mind, in which case we should have to suppose the meaning to be 'in the *zilc* (and) in the *purtšvavc*'; for *purtšvavcti* is undoubtedly related to *purtšvana*, and in no. 18 the latter word appears to be clearly distinguished from *zilc*, each of them having a special numeral adverb added: *zilχnu cezpz purtšvana θunz, i. e.* 'he was a *zilaθ* x times, a *purtšvana* once'. But in any case, even supposing that *zilcti purtšvavcti* does not mean 'in the *zilc* (which is) *purtšvavc*' but 'in the *zilc* (and) in the *purtšvavc*', both *purtšvavcti* and *zilcti* are connected with the verb *zilaχnuce*, which stands before both words, whence it naturally follows that the person in question, even when acting in the *purtšvavc*, was acting as a *zilaθ*. *purtšvavc* is consequently comprised within the wider idea of *zilc*.

Now it might be possible to explain the apparent contradiction in the fact that *purtšvavc* sometimes appears to be different from *zilc*, and at other times occurs as a qualifying addition, if we suppose, as did Deecke, the meaning of *purtšva-* to be 'praesidium'; for we should then have in no. 18, 'he was a judge x times and had (in that character) the presidency once', and in no. 17 something like 'he acted-as-a-judge at-the-court-of-justice (and) in-the-presidency'. But even thus there are many difficulties left. The great number of different kinds of 'judges' indicated by the addition of qualifying words, would be rather startling. What, for instance, would be the meaning of a 'maronic judge'? or a 'cechanic' (sacerdotal) one? The latter, I should think, must be a priest, who performs a judicial function belonging to, and forming part of, the office he holds. But if the jurisdiction forms an integral part of the office in question, it would be quite superfluous, and therefore scarcely to be thought of, that that special part of the office should be so strongly accentuated on every occasion. And further, even supposing *zilc* to mean 'judicatus', the reiteration of the same base *zilc* in the connection *zilaχnuce zilcti* might be understood to result in something like, 'judex fuit in judicatu'; but how are we, under the same supposition, to understand the reiteration in no. 9 — *zilaθ - - - rasnas marunuχ - - n zilc θufi tenθas*? This would be something like 'judex fuit - - apud Tuscos (?), maronis judicatu functus est'. No man would express himself in such a manner, least of all in inscriptions, which naturally economize words. Apart from all this, however, there remains one fact that quite settles the matter. In nos. 3

and 4, which contain the same word *zilc* in the form *zilci* — to say nothing of *zili* in no. 16 — it is, as we shall see, quite impossible to suppose either a 'judex' or a 'judicatus' to be mentioned.

Thus I think it is proved that *zilc* and allied words cannot mean 'judex' or 'judicatus'. The facts to which attention has been drawn above, tend to show that it is also impossible for it to signify any definite office whatever. If this is the case, however, and, on the other hand, the word is over and over again connected with other words which are undoubtedly titles of special offices, no other alternative would seem to be left, but to suppose, as I have already done in my Beitr. I., that it simply means 'office'. By this supposition many difficulties are immediately solved. Thus *zilc ceχaneri* is 'the office of a priest', *zilc marunuχva*, 'that of a *maru*', and so forth. *zilaχnuce zilcti* might be compared with such phrases as the Greek ἦρχεν ἀρχήν. *purtśvavcti* we now see is an adjective added to *zilcti*, nominative *purtśvavc*. It is derived from a noun **purtśvau* quite in the same manner as *marunuχ* from *marunu*. *zilaϑ lupu* would be 'he died a magistrate', *zilcti lupu* 'he died in (his) magistracy', just as *maru paχaϑuras caϑsc lupu* is 'he died a *maru* of (the gods) Pachathura and Catha'[1]. *zilaϑ amce*, and the apparently synonymous *zilχ amce*, would be 'he was a magistrate'. It would be quite natural that an enumeration of the special offices should follow upon such an indication, as is the case in nos. 1, 9, and elsewhere. The abbreviated inscription no. 14 is perhaps to be read as follows: *scurnas m(arce) a(ules) · maru · m(arunuχva) t(enu) · z(ilc) · p(urtśvavc) · t(enu)*, where *maru* must be a surname, not a title of office; and the abbreviated inscription no. 30, *ve(l) · severpe l(arϑial) t(enu) z(ilc)*.

It will be seen that several difficulties are thus cleared away easily, but not all. There are still certain connections left, which do not seem to admit of the explanation given, as for instance in no. 28. Here the phrase *marnu spurana eprϑnec tenve* comes first, meaning something like 'he officiated as a *marnu spurana* (and a?) *eprϑne*'. Thereupon a second phrase follows, which seems to add some special detail — *meχlum rasne[as] clevsins[lϑ] [z]il[a]χnve* — which, if *zilaχnve* means 'he was a magistrate', should most probably be translated 'he was a magistrate among the people of the Tuscans in Clusium'; but since it has already been stated that the man was a *marnu*, this additional information would be simple nonsense.

There still remain, however, nos. 3 and 4, and probably also 16, in which *zilc-* (*zili*) can neither be translated 'magistrate' nor 'judge'.

---

[1] Lemnos 41 f.

In no. 3 the construction of the inscription is quite clear. The subject is Larth Velchas, the predicate is *sacniśa*, and the object must be sought for in *acazr*. Although not knowing the exact meaning of these words (*sacniśa* must mean something like 'consecrates'[1]), we can nevertheless assert with some assurance that the purpose of the inscription is somewhat as follows: 'Larth Velchas, the son of Velthur and Aprthnei, consecrates in this tomb an *acazr*'. Now before this we read the words *zilci velus hulχniesi*, which, if *zilc* meant either 'judicatus' or 'magistratus', could only be either 'sub judicatu' or 'sub magistratu V. Hulchnii'. This indication would of course serve as a date. Now no other Etruscan inscription is dated, and we have no right to assume these two alone to be so; but even if we admit the possibility of their forming an exception in this respect, it must be granted that if the holding of an office by a certain person is to be used in order to mark the date, then the office in question must be the highest one in the state, and its holders shift annually, or otherwise the time would not be exactly defined. 'Sub magistratu' would not then suffice, nor would 'sub judicatu'; for even if it were possible that *zilc* might mean the special office of 'judicatus' — which, as we have seen, it cannot — there would not be only one or two such officials annually, but many; there really seems to be a swarm of *zilaϑ*s. No. 16 is still more decidedly against the meaning 'magistracy'; for this inscription has been set over a woman. Here we find *zili*, and no masculine proper noun is added.

Thus the case stands as follows: *zilc* must mean something that cannot be very far from the idea of 'magistracy', as shown by the majority of the inscriptions cited. Some other inscriptions, however, show that it cannot directly mean that. Consequently we have to look for a notion which is sufficiently comprehensive to suit both cases, a word which could mean something like 'magistracy', and also something else that would meet the exigencies of the sense in the other inscriptions. It would then be reasonable to guess at 'command'; for we might think it possible that a secondary notion, such as 'magistracy', might have developed from that primary idea. *zilci velus hulχniesi* would then be 'by the command of V. Hulchnie'. This, however, will not do; for as the tomb concerned belongs to the family of the Velchas, it is, of course, out of the question that any measure taken by a Velcha in regard to that tomb, should have been occasioned by the order of some outsider. Granting this, I cannot see any notion that will meet all exigencies,

---

[1] Beitr. I 32, Lemnos 61.

viz. to suit the said connection and still be more or less synonymous
with 'magistracy', except that of 'honour'. Thus we should have in no. 3,
'in honorem V. Hulchnii', which I think would give a very satisfactory
meaning, the more so as there seems to be little doubt as to the person
mentioned first in the inscription being the one to whom the *acazr* is con-
secrated or conceded.

We can therefore, as the probable result of our investigations, note
the interesting parallelism, that the Tuscans, like the Romans, called their
public offices 'honours'. This fact need not imply any influence from either
side, as the thought is quite a natural one, and may have arisen spon-
taneously at different places. Similarly the Greeks used the denomination
τιμαί.

We should then have to translate the verb *zilaχnuce*, 'honorem tenuit',
or perhaps 'officio honoratus est'. I have elsewhere[1] advanced the hypo-
thesis that the forms with an *n* inserted are passive. If this be so — the
scantiness of our material does not yet allow us to settle the question —,
zilaχce would be an active form, probably meaning 'honorem tenuit'.

Now, as *zilc* means both 'honour' and 'office of honour', we might
ask if the twofold notion might not also be supposed in the derived verb
zilaχnuce. I think it is all but certain that this verb is indeed occa-
sionally used in its proper meaning, 'was honoured'. In no. 28 it occurs
connected with the words *meχlum rasne*:

> *meχlum rasne[as] cleusins[lϑ · z]il[a]χnve* (following after *marnu*
>   *spurana eprϑnec tenve*)
> Compare *zilaϑ amce meχl rasnal* (1)

And the parallel connections:

> *zilaχnuce spureϑi apasi svalas* (21) (after which
>   follows *marunuχva cepen tenu*, etc.).
> *muleϑ svalas zilaχnuce*   (26)
> *zilaϑ tarχnalϑi amce*   (25)
> *meϑlum nupφzi canϑce*   (6)

With regard to the word *meχlum, meϑlum*, see my Beitr. I. 49 f.,
where I think I have proved that it must mean 'people'. Whether
meχl is a shorter parallel form, or only an abbreviation in writing, must
remain an open question. *rasnal* may be a genitive sing., but it might also
be supposed to be an adjective formed by the derivative termination *-l*.

---

[1] Lemnos 57 f.

As to the meaning of the word, all seem to agree in thinking it to be
'Tuscan'. The correctness of this assumption must also be said to be
highly probable, since we know that the name by which the Tuscans
called themselves was 'Ρασέναι (Dion. Halic. I 30). If we had to suppose
that *zilaχnuce* only meant 'magistratus fuit', we might with tolerable
certainty assume the meaning of no. 28 to be 'he officiated (*tenve*) as a
marnu spurana and (?, -c) an *eprϑne*; among the peoples of the Tuscans
(*rasneas*?) at Clusium he was a magistrate'; and of no. 21, 'he was a
magistrate in the land of the living(?)[1]; he officiated as a *marunuχva
cepen*'. In each case both *zilaχnuce* and the indication of locality added
would be superfluous. Upon the whole, this frequent mention of locality,
especially in such a vague way, is very strange. There seems to be
something more at bottom. The whole matter becomes, I think, much
more intelligible, if we take *zilaχnuce* to mean 'was honoured'. Then the
meaning of no. 28 would be 'he was honoured by the people of the
Tuscans at Clusium, he officiated, etc.'; and of no. 21, 'he officiated as a
m. c., he was honoured in the land of the living'. No. 26, which also
has *svalas*, would mean 'he was honoured, when living' (the meaning of
muleϑ is uncertain), upon which follows, 'he went to the realm of Hades'.
As to no. 1, I cannot decide whether the meaning is 'he stood in honour
with the Tuscan people', or 'he was a magistrate, etc.' As the following
line seems to contain titles, I think the former alternative the most pro-
bable. And, as I have already remarked, the adding of *meχl*, etc. seems to
imply a subjectivity that would point to something more than the bare
fact that the person in question was a magistrate. In addition to the
cases adduced above, *meϑlum* also appears once in the connection *meϑlum
nupφzi canϑce*, following *cizi zilaχnuce*. As *canϑce* is quite an obscure
word, and it cannot even be decided whether *nupφzi* (or *nurϑzi*) is a
numeral adverb, or not, it is quite impossible to say in what relation *meϑlum*
stands to the other words here. The whole is enigmatic. This is apparently
the case with *zilaϑ parχis*, *zilc parχis*, *zilaϑ eterav*, *zileteraias*. The
meaning of these connections depends on that of *etera*, which is one of
the most puzzling of Etruscan words. I shall try to explain it below.

The words *zilaϑ*, *zilc*, *zilaχnuce*, etc. all go back to a base *zil*,
which also seems to occur in *zili*, and probably in *ri-zile*. Whether these
two forms have been augmented by adding some suffix *i* or *e*, or the
base common to all of them should be supposed to be *zili* (or *zile*), we
do not know. As we find in no. 32 the connection *ri-zile ziz*, we should

---

[1] Beitr. I 50.

naturally be induced here to suppose one of those formulæ occurring in all languages, which are formed by connecting two words with different termination, but derived from the same base (compare *zilaχnuce zilcti*). In that case, the element common to the two words would be *zi* (as in *ziz* the -*z* may be considered as a case-suffix, probably that of the genitive, which is occasionally written -*z* instead of -*s*). *ziiace* in no. 1 seems to point to the same; for this form can scarcely be miswritten for *zilace* as both the rough draught and the paint, as already stated, agree in omitting the *l*. On the other hand it cannot be doubted that *ziiace* is related to *zilace*. *zince* (23) seems also to belong to the same family, and must, in that case, be derived from the naked 'root' *zi*. If the -*n*-, as I have conjectured, implies a passive sense, we should probably have to translate *zilc marunuχva zaxxx [h]uϑz zince* by 'with the *zilc marunuχva* ('honore maronatus') he was honoured six times'. The form *zinace* that occurs in an inscription from Narce can scarcely be separated from this *zince*. That form will be considered below.

I think I have shown in my Beitr. II that certain forms ending in -*il* seem to serve as a sort of past participle passive. Thus we have *acil* 'own' formed from a 'root' *ac* which seems to mean 'to hold'[1], *vacil* 'said' from *vac*, *husil (*husili*, inscr. of Capua l. 22, *huslne*, Agr. text) from *husi* 'to pour out'[2]; *ril* no doubt means 'natus' and implies a 'root' *ri* 'to give birth to'. From the supposed 'root' *zi* 'to honour', we should thus expect a past ptcpl. pass. *zil* meaning 'honoured'. This is again the base of *zilc*, meaning 'τὸ εἶναι τιμητόν' and 'magistracy' (originally *zilaχ*? or is the *a* in *zilaχnuce* and other forms derived from *zilc*, merely euphonic?). Another word derived from *zil* is *zilaϑ*. It is impossible to say how it is formed. It is perhaps, as Pauli thought, the locative of a base *zila* (derived from *zil*). But -*aϑ* might of course also be a formative suffix, or the word might be a compound of two words *zil* and *aϑ*.

After having stated the probability of the existence of a 'root' *zi*, we may further ask, whether *ziχ* and words derived from it might not also belong to that root. I think this very probable. As to the form, *ziχ* might be derived from the naked root, exactly in the same manner as *zilχ* from the secondary *zil*. *ziχ* is further the base of the verbal forms *ziχu*, *ziχun*, *ziχuχe* and *ziχne*.

ziχuχe is a preterite, derived from the partic. *ziχu*. Concerning such participles, see my Beitr. I and II. The surname *ziχu* is no doubt

---

[1] Lemnos 26.
[2] Beitr. II 2 etc.

identical with the participle. Now this surname stands side by side
with the Latin *Scribonius* in the 'bilinguis' P. 101:

$$Q. \ Scribonius \cdot C \cdot f.$$
$$vl. \ zi\chi u$$

and two other urns found together with the one so inscribed, bear the
name *zicu*, and a third that of *Scribonius*. Deecke has therefore con-
cluded that *zi\chi u* must be the Etruscan word for *scribonius*, and conse-
quently derived from a root meaning 'to write'. I have pointed out[1]
that as *zi\chi u\chi e* and *zi\chi ne* occur in connections in which there cannot
be any thought of writing, this conjecture must needs be false. The
words must mean something like 'to present'. This is shown by some
sentences in the Agram text, appearing to be formulae, in which *zi\chi ne*
is connected with verbs meaning 'give' or 'bring'. Thus the two sen-
tences,

$$svec \cdot an \cdot c\acute{s} \cdot mene \cdot utince : zi\chi ne, \ \text{and}$$
$$svec \cdot an \cdot c\acute{s} \cdot mele \cdot \vartheta un \cdot mutince \cdot \vartheta ezine$$

form parallel expressions, the verbs of which must be more or less syno-
nymous. At any rate, some sacrifice is spoken of, and in that connection
'writing' appears to be quite out of the question. If the word *zi\chi ne* is
related to *zil*, as I think credible, its proper meaning would be 'to
present honouring', or 'to honour by presenting'. Compare the German
'verehren' = 'schenken'.

As regards *zi\chi un*, *zi\chi u\chi e*, the meaning 'presented' seems to be the
only possible one (inscript. of Capua last line, Cipp. Perus. last line[2]).

I thus think that we are now prepared to examine the inscription of
Narce, discussed by me in Beitr. I 39 f.:

$$mialiqu : avilesi \ ala\chi pur \ a\vartheta ean \ al\vartheta ia$$
$$inpein : mle : rusi : ateri : mla\chi uta : zi\chi u\chi e :$$
$$mla\chi ta : ana : zinace$$

I here take *mi a\vartheta ean* to represent the object. *a\vartheta ean* perhaps means
'cup', compare *a\vartheta enei* in another cup-inscription, and perhaps also *a\vartheta ine*
in a third (Mon. Ant. 1894, fig. 171 a, 167 b). The subject is *al\vartheta ia*,
which is a proper noun, and the verb is *aliqu*. The connection *aliqu
avilesi* should be compared with *alice venelisi* in an inscription on a
vessel (Bull. 1882, p. 91). *alice* is a preterite ending in -*e*[3], and *aliqu* the

[1] Beitr. II 110 f.

[2] Beitr. II 111 f.

[3] Beitr. I 37 f., II 25 f, Lemn. 54 f.

corresponding participle, which can also be used as a finite tense[1]. The root must therefore be *alic*, which seems to mean something like 'give' (compare *ale*, Agr. text[2]). And *aliqu* would be 'gave to Aule' (just as *alice venelisi* is 'gave to Venel'). *alapur*, of which the reading is not certain, I omit as being obscure; but the sense of the first line I suppose to be approximately 'this cup Althia gave to Aule'. The next word, *inpein*, I have before[3] supposed to be a relative pronoun, and I still think that explanation the right one. The subject of the sentence must be *rusi*, a proper noun, and the verb *ziχuχe*. I have formerly supposed *mle* to be a preterite (= *mule*); if that is right, we should accordingly have two predicates. I pass over *ateri*; I shall try to explain it further on. *mlaχuta* in this line, and *mlaχta* in the one following, are, I venture to think, one and the same word, only somewhat differently written. It must certainly be related to *mlaχ* (Agr. text), to which word, judging from the surroundings in which it occurs, I have given the meaning 'placatio'[4]. Now if *ziχuχe* and *zinace* are allied words, as they very probably are, it is a very puzzling fact that the two last words of line 2 should, with some small alterations, be reiterated in the line following. I think we can explain this fact only by supposing the word which is added in l. 3, *ana*, to mean 'again'. In that case we should be able to translate lines 2 and 3 as follows: "That which Rusi presented as a 'placatio', as a 'placatio' it was presented again." The cup has once been given by Rusi to Althia, and now Althia again presents it to Aule.

The base-word *ziχ* occurs in Ga. 799:

> *lris · pulenas · larces · clan · larϑal · ratacs*
> *velϑurus · nefts · prumts · pules · larisal · creices*
> *ancn · ziχ · neϑsras · acasce - - - -*

I think I have already interpreted this word correctly[5]. I will cite myself: 'With regard to the two words *ziχ* (object) and *acasce* (verb), the latter seems to mean 'held' or 'possessed', as shown by other inscriptions. Thus if we suppose the former to mean 'writing' (in our case 'epitaph'), the two meanings would not agree. The words *acn—acasce* certainly appear to introduce, so to speak, that which is said in the ensuing lines, which doubtless contain an enumeration of the sacerdotal offices performed by the deceased. *ziχ* no doubt governs the genitive *neϑsras*.

---

[1] Beitr. I 5, 45, 62 f.
[2] Beitr. II 61, 92.
[3] Beitr. I 15 ff., II 120, 124.
[4] Beitr. II 34 f.
[5] Beitr. II 111 f.

This latter form I take to be a plural one. The corresponding sing. would be *ne𝜗s̓*. Now there is a word *netsvis*, which occurs in the bilingual inscription of Pesaro, Fa. 69, and certainly means 'haruspex', since it seems to correspond with the *haruspex* of the Latin text. We also find it, somewhat differently written, in Fa. 560 ter h (*netsvis̓*). The word is evidently a compound, and its first component *nets̓* agrees, except in the fact of the dental not being aspirated, with the form **ne𝜗s̓* inferred above. What this word *ne𝜗s̓* (*nets̓, nets*) means it is not possible to decide. At any rate, it does not correspond with the Latin *haru-* in *haruspex*. We might rather guess at some sort of sacrifice. Thus the meaning of the passage would be 'he held (as an office) this (*ancn*) presenting of *ne𝜗s̓* (*viz.* as follows)'.

IV.

etera and connected words.

I first give the material for *etera*:

33. *larϑ reci | mna veluś etera* — Perusia — CIE 4081 (ossuary).

34. *ar · venete | ar · etera* — Perusia — CIE 4145 (ossuary).

35. *la · venete · la · leϑial | etera* — Perusia — CIE 4144 (ossuary).

36. *aule · sceri | ś · arnϑia | l · etera* — Perusia — CIE 3418 (ossuary).

37. *larϑ · vipi | ś varnaś | etera* — Perusia — CIE 4114 (ossuary).

38. *aule : titeś : petruniś : veluś : t : | etera* — Perusia — CIE 3855 (ossuary).

39. *au · semϑni : etera | helvereal* — Perusia — CIE 3965 (stele sepulc.).

40. *suϑi : etera | veluś : aneiś[: se/ntinateś* — Perusia — CIE 3780 (stele sep.).

41. *etera | la · titeś* — Perusia — CIE 3429 (ossuary).

42. *au : pusla | etera* — Perusia — CIE 3683 (ossuary).

43. *vel · velχeiś | etera* — Perusia — CIE 4325 (stele sep.).

44. *pumpu snute | etera* — Perusia — CIE 3793 (ossuary).

45. *etera* — Perusia — CIE 4537 (ossuary).

46. *fasteteraś* — Perusia — CIE 3430 (ossuary).

47. *lartiu cuclnias · larϑal · clan | larϑialc einanal | camϑi eterau* — Tarquinii — P. 438 (sarcophagus).

48. *aleϑnas · v. v. ϑelu · zilaϑ · parχis | zilaϑ · eterav - - - -* — Volsinium vetus — T. 327 (see above no. 24).

49. *zileteraias* (see above no. 13).

Closely related to *etera* is *lautneteri*. This word occurs in the following inscriptions:

50. *aule acri caiś | lautn · eteri | ei · śenis* — Perusia — CIE 3442 (stele sepulc.).

51. *salv[i] precuś lautn · | eteri* — Perusia — CIE 4549 (stele sepulc.).

52. *[la]rϑ cutuś seϑreś | [la/utn eterś* — Perusia — CIE 3379 (stele sep.).

53. *arxxxxxfarsa | lautn eteri* — Perusia — CIE 4578 (ossuary).

54. *eϑ : avei : lautn : eteri : ein : śenis | er : eś* — Perusia — CIE 4201 (ossuary).

55. *arnϑ · vuisi · v. lautn ete | ri* — Perusia — CIE 3366 (ossuary).

56. *aule · anei · caina · l · e* — Perusia — CIE 3554 (ossuary). (Probably *l(autn) · e(teri)*).

57. a. (on a tegula sep.) *arnϑ ⸴ mu | sclena ⸴ la | rϑal ⸴ lautn | eteri*

     b. (on the cover of the ossuary) *[a]rnϑ ⸴ musclen[a] | larϑal ⸴*
        lautn ⸴ ete[ri] — Florentia — CIE 2480—2481.

58. *vel : tetina : titial : lautn : eteri* — Clusium — CIE 809 (ossuary).

59. *arnϑal | lautn eteri* — Clusium — CIE 3090 (ossuary).

60. *larϑ avaini clau lautneterie* — Foiano, near Clusium — Not. Scav.
     1900, 625 (ossuary).

61. - - - | *sti · puiac* | - - - *ϑ · la · eteri* — Arretium — CIE 379 (ossuary).

? **62.** *lautn | es*

     ϑrem | sini | petri — Rapolano, prov. di Siena — Not. Scav. 1898,
     304 (ash-urn).

63. *lautn : eteri* — S. Antimo — CIE 4624 (ash-urn).

64. *lautn : eteri* — Castiglione di Lago — CIE 4725 (ossuary).

We learn from these inscriptions that *etera* is mainly limited to
Perusia, although not unknown elsewhere, as shown by *zilaϑ eterav* and
camϑi eterau, which occur in Tarquinii and Volsinium, and from the deri-
vative *lautn eteri*, which is also used in Clusium, Arretium and some
other places in the vicinity. But it is only in Perusia that we find it in
apposition to proper nouns, containing some qualifying addition.

This word has been the object of much discussion. Corssen, com-
bining it with the Umbrian *etru*, 'alter', supposed it to mean 'filius minor'[1].
Deecke at first thought its meaning to be 'servus'[2], but he has since
given up that opinion, because he fancied he had found out that *zilaϑ*
means 'judge'. *eterav* he explained as a genitive plural. The meaning
of *zilaϑ eterav*, he therefore states, must necessarily be 'judge of the
etera's. The *etera*'s must, accordingly, have formed a special class or
order, having their own judges. Thus it is all but certain, he thinks,
that the *etera*'s are identical with the Etruscan πενέσται, often mentioned
by ancient authors. This supposition is in accordance with the etymo-
logy of the word proposed by Corssen, for if *etera* means 'alter' *zilaϑ
eterav* should be 'judge of the other ones'. Deecke now remarks that
this denomination can only be explained as meaning 'the other ones'
with reference to the ruling class, the aristocracy of the city[3].

Deecke's theory has been refuted by the late Dr. Pauli[4], who has,
in his turn, proposed several different explanations of the word.

---

[1] Co. I 146 f.

[2] Mü.-De. II 511.

[3] Fo. u. St. VI 35 f.

[4] Stud. I.

Originally he thought that *etera* must mean 'libertus', but he soon dismissed that idea, because he found that the only Etruscan word which could be imagined to tally with that peculiarly Roman conception, is *lautni*. He then guessed at 'adoptatus', but subsequently he also had to abandon that explanation, because an inscription which had been brought to light in the mean time, placed it beyond doubt that *etera* could not mean 'adoptatus'. This inscription, cited above as no. 42, is an epitaph set over an infant. That this is the case is proved by the fact that the 'urnetta' was standing in a 'cella angustissima'. This infant, Pauli says, must have died so soon after its birth, that it had not even received a name. Such cases are not rare[1]. But one cannot possibly imagine that such mere infants should have been designed either as 'liberti', as 'adoptati', or as 'alumni' ('alumnus' is a translation proposed by Alibrandi). He goes on to say: »Für diese Fälle passt nur ein Wort mit einer Bedeutung wie *clan* ('Sohn'). Dass aber *etera* nur etwa, was man ja vermuten könnte, ein Synonymum von *clan* sei, das anzunehmen verbietet uns die No. 102 (my no. 38), wo *aule*, der Sohn eines *tite petruni*, der *etera* des *vel tite* ist. Es heisst also *etera* auf keinen Fall 'Sohn'.« But if 'libertus', 'alumnus', 'adoptatus', 'filius', are all out of the question, we are, he thinks, almost necessarily brought to the conclusion that the word means 'heir', which would also suit all cases excellently. The word he takes to be derived from *atar*, which consequently, according to Pauli, should mean 'heritage'. *lautn eteri* is contracted, he thinks, from a fuller *lautni eteri*; and as *lautni* means 'familiaris', *lautn eteri* would consequently be quasi 'familiaris heredarius'.

Like Pauli, I have also connected *etera* with *atar*, the meaning of which word I tried to show should be 'the Self'[2]. Then *etera*, I thought, must originally mean 'belonging to one's self', 'own', and from that notion it might be possible to develope a secondary one, *viz.* 'made one's own', whence 'adopted'. This secondary signification I assigned to the word in most of the cases.

As for Pauli's interpretation 'heir', it must be said that it would be very strange and anything but credible, that this attribute of the deceased should be so often signalized, as also that the custom should have been limited to a single place (Perusia). In the Latin inscriptions from Etruria, heirs are often mentioned, but always as declaring themselves to

---

[1] Pauli then read *etera* | *au pusla*, and translated it 'the *etera* of Larth Aupu . .' In his Corpus he now reads *au · pusla* | *etera* ('the *etera* Aule Pusla'); he must therefore have abandoned the opinion that the infant in question had no name.

[2] Beitr. I 29 f., II 17.

have erected the monument in honour of the deceased, ex testamento or otherwise; we nowhere find that a testator does any such thing for his heir. In no. 45, which merely consists of the word *etera*, 'heir' would seem quite out of the question; for we can scarcely believe that a person would have been signified merely as 'the heir', without further information as to his own name or that of the bequeather. Nor do I think it very probable that the word, if originally meaning 'heir', could have been used in just one single place so as to be synonymous with 'son', as supposed by Pauli, who thinks, as I have said above, that it might have been a custom in Perusia to say 'the heir' instead of 'the eldest son'; for even in that case the original meaning must always have been inherent in the word, and it would not, I think, have been possible to say, as in no. 35, 'the *etera* of Larth and Lethia', since of course only the father owns the family property, not the father and the mother together.

Moreover we once find *etera* added to *suϑi* (no. 40). Pauli translates: 'he (*viz.* who reposes here) is the *etera* (i. e. heir) of Vel Anei Sentinate'. But *suϑi* certainly means 'tomb' and *suϑi etera* must, accordingly, at any rate mean 'hereditary tomb'. I am not prepared to state definitely that such an expression cannot be imagined, but it would certainly be unique to say the least of it, and at any rate I think it very unlikely that the same word would mean both 'heir' and 'hereditary'. But even if we admit this possibility, there is another connection, which seems decidedly to exclude the meaning 'heir', namely, *zilaϑ eterav*. It has already been shown that *zilaϑ* does not mean any definite office. It simply means 'official' or 'honoured'. Thus if *etera* meant 'heir', *zilaϑ eterav* would be something like 'magistrate of the heirs', under which name we should probably have to suppose some one filling the office for the management of the estates of minors. Magistrates, however, with a sphere of authority so circumscribed, did not exist in the ancient states.

Pauli appears to have subsequently given up this explanation; for in the Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum, Vol. I, p. 560, he says: 'Si *etera* ut mihi nunc videtur 'puer' est.' In view of *zilaϑ eterav* (which would then be 'magistratus puerorum'!), this latter translation seems to be still more impossible.

As regards my own explanation, the meaning 'own' might certainly be thought to suit well in the connection *suϑi etera*, which would be a tomb destined solely for the person in question, to the exclusion of all others. It also seems possible that from this primary notion 'own', there might have been developed a secondary, namely, 'adoptatus'. It must be admitted, however, that neither meaning would suit well in cases where

the word is added to the name of an infant, or indicates an infant whose name is not mentioned. Nor do they fit into the connection *zilaϑ eterav*. Here the meaning 'own' would, of course, be out of the question. We should then have to explain the title as denoting a magistrate whose duties were limited to the administration of matters connected with acts of adoption. But, as I have already said, such special magistracies are found nowhere in antiquity.

Now if all these conjectures must be rejected, there seems to remain only one possibility, namely, that the word is after all in some manner synonymous with *clan* 'son'. And this, I think, is proved by the inscription no. 39, *au : semϑni : etera helvereal*, i. e. 'Aule Semthni, the *etera* of Helverei'. This inscription is written on a stele sepulcralis, and on a tegula in the same tomb we find the inscription:

au · semϑni : au | helvereal

i. e. 'Aule Semthni, (the son) of Aule (and) Helverei'. On another tegula from the same tomb, some other son is mentioned,

ar : semϑni : auleś | helvereal : clan

'Arnth Semthni, the son of Aule and Helverei' (CIE 3966, 3967). Now there can be little or no doubt that the Aule Semthni mentioned on the first tegula is identical with the Aule Semthni, whose name stands on the stele. In this way we often find in Etruscan tombs the name of the deceased written both on a tegula and on the ossuary, or on one of these and on a stele. At any rate, I am unable to conjecture the relationship in which a namesake of her son can have stood to Helverei (except, of course, that of a husband, which is out of the question, as *etera* cannot mean that). To disprove the identity of *clan* with *etera*, Pauli brings forward no. 38, which he translates as follows: 'Aule, (the son) of Tite Petruni (and) the *etera* of Vel Tite', believing *t:* to be abbreviated from *titeś*. This, I think, is a mistake. We must probably consider *t:* as an abbreviation of *titial* (compare CIE 2487 — *ve · mu · c*, which probably means *vel mutu cnevnal*, as shown by CIE 2486 — *lϑ · mutu · vl | cnevnal*), and consequently translate the inscription 'Aule, the *etera* of Vel Tite Petruni (and) of Titi'. If this is correct, the mother too would seem to have belonged to the family of the Tites. Her being so I should not think in any manner singular, the less so as she might have come from some branch that did not, like her husband, bear the second name of Petruni.

The remaining inscriptions are all, with the exception of two or three, built quite in the same manner as those containing the word *clan*, or requiring that word to be supplied. Thus nos. 33 and 34 can be com-

pared with CIE 1535: *larϑ* : *ezna* : *larϑialisa* 'Larth Ezna, (the son)
of Larth'; no. 35 with CIE 1641: *luci · cicu · aϑ | svenias* 'Luci Cicu,
(the son) of Arnth (and) of Svenia'; no. 36 with CIE 1811: *velχe* : *afunas* :
larcesa 'Velche, (the son) of Larce Afuna'; no. 37 with Fa. 1382: *larϑia*
vipis casp | res 'Larthia, (the daughter) of Vipi Caspre'; no. 38 with
Fa. 1491: *aule velemnas ϑefrisa | nufrznal clan* 'Aule, the son of Thefri
Velimna (and) of Nufrznei'; no. 39 with CIE 1536: *vel | velχe | zuχnal* 'Vel
Velche, (the son) of Zuchnei'; nos. 41 and 43[1] for instance with CIE 598:
aules · sec 'the daughter of Aule', or with CIE 2041: *puia* : *cumnis* :
ϑucerna | s 'the wife of Thucerna Cumni'.

No. 46 is analogous to nos. 41 and 43 — 'Fasti to the *etera* (*viz.* con-
secrates the tomb)', for this tells us that Fasti is the mother of the *etera*.
It is true that some few of them have no parallels among the *clan*-inscrip-
tions. These are nos. 42 and 44, which give the name of the *etera* but
not that of the father — 'Aule Pusla, the *etera*', and 'Pumpu Snute, the
etera'; and no. 45 which merely has 'the *etera*'. These exceptions
might, I think, be explained by the special shade of meaning in *etera*
as distinct from *clan*; for it is evident that although they mean very
nearly the same thing, the two words cannot be exactly synonymous.
Thus I believe that Corssen was after all on the right track, when he
thought the meaning of *etera* to be 'second son', although, of course, his
comparison of the word with the Umbrian *etru* was not justified. On the
other hand, it is easily seen that *etera* cannot have this meaning either in
the connection *suϑi etera*, 'the *etera*-tomb', or in *zilaϑ eterav* or *camϑi*
eterau, nor in the designation *lautn eteri*, which seems to denote some
variety of *lautni* 'familiaris' or 'cliens'. Thus the problem seems rather
hard to unravel. I will now state the way in which I think it might
possibly be solved.

I still hold that *etera* must be related to *atar*. This opinion is not
merely based upon the phonetic resemblance between the two words,
but also, and chiefly, upon a certain parallelism which I think exists
between their surroundings in some passages. I refer to no. 40, 'the *etera*-
tomb of Vel Anei Sentinate', as compared with *tesamsa suϑiϑ atrs rc*,
'destines in the tomb the *rc* to the *atar*', Fa. 2335, and *sacnisa · aturs*,
'dedicates (the tomb) to the *atar*', Fa. 2169. We may probably also com-
pare CIE 2896, *larϑ* : *tite* : | *ataris* 'Larth Tite to the *atari*'.

But if the words are related, it is evident that my former conjecture
that *atar* might mean 'the Self' must be dismissed. We must look for a

---

[1] To be read *la(rϑal) tites'*, *vel(us') velχeis'*.

meaning which allows us to understand how *etera*, which appears to be derived from it, happens to be used as nearly synonymous with *clan*, and also — as proved by its conjunction with *suϑi* and with *zilaϑ* — in at least one other quite different sense.

In his above-cited paper, Pauli thought *atar* to be connected with *atiu*, which, according to his view at that time, meant 'heiress'. This comparison he probably gave up subsequently, as in his book »Altitalische Forschungen« II 2 211 f., he thinks it probable that *atiu* means 'mother'. This word occurs in the following inscription:

65. *larϑi : seianti : fraunisa : atiu · piuteś* — Clusium — CIE 1013.

There also once occurs a word *aitu*, which like *atiu*, is connected with the genitive of a proper noun:

66. *se · afle · la · fa · hustnei · arznal · aitu* — Perusia — CIE 1228.

I think Pauli is right in believing this word to be only a misspelled *atiu*. As shown by these inscriptions, *atiu* must mean some female relative.

I think we also have the same word in the inscription CIE 800:

67. *lautniϑ · hecnatnei : atiuce* — Clusium.

Here *atiuce* should very probably be divided into *atiu-ce, ce* being the copulative conjunction. Nos. 65 and 66 Pauli translates as follows: 'Larthe Seianti, (the wife) of Frauni, mother of Piute'; and 'Sethre Afle (and his wife) Fasti Hustnei, mother of Arznei'. He observes that we accordingly have to suppose both women to have been married twice, the former first to a Piute and then to a Frauni, the latter first to an Arzni and next to an Afle, and that the reason why the words 'mother of Piute', 'mother of Arznei', have been added is to be found in that circumstance. I think Pauli is right in supposing this to be the meaning of the inscriptions quoted; at any rate, the word *atiu* certainly denotes some female relative, and I do not see any other word belonging to that category that would suit so well as that of 'mother'. No. 67 I should accordingly translate as follows: 'The *liberta* (or perhaps rather 'female client') Hecnatnei and (-*ce*) (her) mother (*viz.* are reposing here)'.

There is also a word *ativu*, which occurs in the inscription Fa. 2169:

68. *[r]avn | ϑu · sei | tiϑi*
  ativu | sacnisa · aturś — Vulci — (François-tomb, written on both sides of a nenfro-stele), i. e. 'Ravnthu Seitithi, the *ativu*, consecrates (the tomb) to the *atar*.'

This word is commonly taken to be identical with *atiu*, but as in the inscription cited it has no genitive relation added to it, it is hard to see how this is possible, except by supposing that this inscription refers to another, which might have stood close by and have contained the name of the son of Ravnthu. In that case, a vague expression such as 'Ravnthu Seitithi, the mother', might perhaps be imagined possible.

That *atiu* means indeed 'mother' is, I think, almost proved by another inscription, recently discovered,

69. *nernia · ravnϑu · avils · ril ·* ↑‖Ⅹ *· at ⟩ cravzaϑuras | velϑurs · larϑalc* — Bolsena — Edited by Herbig (Torp-Herbig no. 35).

Here one might perhaps at first be inclined to suppose *at* to be identical with *ati*, the locative of *an*, 'this', which for instance occurs in *ati nacna*, P. 436, 'in this tomb' (regarding the parallel forms *at* and *ati*, compare *eiϑ* and *eiϑi*). The sense would then be 'Ravnthu Nernia (is reposing) in this (tomb)'. But this conjecture is made improbable by the place the word takes in the sentence, since, if it had the supposed meaning, it would surely have been put before the indication of the woman's age, *avils ril* ↑‖Ⅹ. It is further refuted by the genitives *cravza-ϑuras velϑurs larϑalc*, which follow immediately upon *at*, denoting two more persons, and which, if *at* meant 'in this', would not have any word to govern them; for the mere addition of these genitives to the name Ravnthu Nernei would by no means suffice to define the relationship existing between the persons so named and Nernei. Consequently there can be no doubt that these genitives are governed by *at*, and that in this word, which has here been added in apposition to *nernei ravnϑu*, we shall have to see the signification of some sort of relationship or consanguinity. Now *cravzaϑuras velϑurs larϑalc* means 'of Velthur and Larth Cravzaϑura'. V. and L. were evidently brothers. Thus we cannot, of course, think of 'sister', because the woman bears a different family name. 'Widow' would likewise seem to be incapable of acceptance, for the case of a woman who has been married to two brothers and has outlived both of them, would certainly be a very rare one; moreover she could scarcely be called widow of both, since she ceased to be the widow of the first when she was married to the second. Upon the whole it is very doubtful whether the Etruscans in their epitaphs used to state a woman's condition when that of a widow. At any rate, we do not find it done in Latin inscriptions. 'Aunt' or 'grandmother', of course, would be possible, but anything but probable. There then remains the meaning 'mother', which is almost necessarily forced upon us. A mention

of the mother is just what we should expect. It supplies all that is wanted, as implying also into what family the woman has been married. Thus the words added — *at cravza9uras vel9urs lar9alc* — both give the biographical dates required, and also implicitly inform us about the persons who have superintended her interment, *viz.* her two sons. Herbig, too, inclines to think the meaning 'mother' the preferable one. Thus we have here found the Etruscan word for mother, which seems to have the sound of *at*. It was originally, I think, a nursery word (compare the word *atta* for 'father', existing in several languages). Unhappily we cannot at once decide whether *at* is its real form, or an abbreviation, in which latter case it would be easy to believe the full form to be *atiu*. As all other words in this inscription, however, are written in full, I do not think it very likely that this one should form an exception. The sign > placed after it can scarcely be supposed to mark an abbreviation, since we do not find that sign elsewhere after abbreviated words. It is probably merely a sign of interpunction. But *at* is certainly related to *atiu*. The latter form I am inclined to look upon as the corresponding diminutive.

Of this word *at*, 'mother', I think *atar* to be a derivative. In the present state of Etruscology, this cannot, of course, be actually proved, but its being so seems to me to be highly probable.

The word occurs, in the genitive form *atarś*, in the following inscriptions:

70. *camnas : lar9 · lar9alś · atnalc · clan · an · śu9i · lavtni · zivas · ceriχu | teśamsa · śu9i9 · atrśrc · escuna calti · śu9iti mun9 zivas · murśl XX* — Tarquinii — Fa. 2335 (sarcophagus).

71. *tarnas · lar9 · lar9al · satial · apa · helś atrś* — Vulci — Deecke Bezz. Beitr. I 109 (on the base of a stele).

72. *lar · saties · lar9ial · helś · atrś* — Vulci — Fa. 2167 (above the door of a tomb).

And finally, in the parallel form *aturś* in no. 68. The nominative *atar* Pauli once believed he had found in two inscriptions:

73. *mitezanteiatarχumenaia* — Clusium — CIE 3235 (ossuary).

74. *milar9atartinaia* — Tarquinii — Ga. 834 (clay amulet in the form of a phallus).

In these inscriptions the single words are not separated from each other, and we cannot therefore decide whether they really contain the word

atar, although I think it very probable, at least in the case of the last one. *atar* we also read in an inscription from Clusium, which is only extant in a copy made by Passeri:

75. THANIA HELIATAR CLAN   CIE 2269 (ossuary).

I think Pauli is right in seeing nothing but distorted names in the two last words.

Finally, we may perhaps, in spite of the writing with an aspirated *t*, also adduce *aϑre*, which occurs in the Agram text XII 11:

76. *vacltnam | ϑunem · cialχus · masn unialti ursmnal | aϑre · acil · an · śacnicn · cilϑ · ceχa · sal*

Now if *atar* is derived from *at* 'mother', we think it very likely that it might mean 'maternal lineage'. This meaning would agree well with the termination *-ar*, which is certainly used to form collectives.

We should thus have to render no. 70[1] as follows:

'Larth Camnas, the son of Larth and of Atnei, having constructed (*ceriχu*) to the deceased ones (*zivas*) this family-tomb (*an śuϑi lavtni*), assigns (*teśamsa*) in the tomb (*śuϑiϑ*) the *rc* (some place in the tomb) to (his) mother's family (*atrś*); it is permitted (*escuna*[2]) — — (to place) in the *cal* (*cal-ti*, some place in the tomb), in the tomb (*śuϑiti*), 20 urns (*murśl*) of deceased ones (*zivas*)'.

The contents of this inscription can be compared with another from Toscanella, which has recently been published[3]. It is likewise written on a sarcophagus, and contains the information that the person reposing in the sarcophagus, Velchas by name, has permitted a certain Statlane and 15 kinsmen (*acil*) to be buried in his tomb. This Statlane and 15 kinsmen were very likely related to Velchas on the mother's side.

I think it the more likely that *atrś* has the above meaning, from the fact that Larth Camnas first mentions a family tomb, this being, of course, a tomb belonging to the paternal lineage, as opposed to the mother's family, to which also some place is conceded.

No. 71 would run as follows: 'Larth Tarnas, (the son) of Larth and of Satia, - - to his maternal family'. And no. 72: 'Laris Saties, (the son) of Larth, to his maternal family'. Concerning *hel-*, 'own', see Beitr. I 29, II 104. In both cases we shall, of course, have to understand what is not

---

[1] For further details I refer the reader to my Beitr. I 28 f.
[2] Lemnos 59.
[3] Torp-Herbig no. 56.

aid expressly, as in no. 70, namely, that the tomb is not consecrated to the maternal family exclusively, but only partially. The person said to have consecrated it, must, of course, also be supposed to repose there.

If *atiru* is identical with *atiu*, we must translate no. 68 'Ravnthu Seitithi, the mother, consecrates (the tomb) to the maternal family (of her son)'.

Regarding no. 76 I have already remarked that it is not certain that *aϑre* is related to *atar*, although I think it probable.

For this passage I may refer to Beitr. II 17 and to »Monatsdaten«. I have there tried to show that the number *ϑunem cialχus* indicates the date, giving the day on which the sacrifice is to be performed, and that the words *unialti —cilϑ* most probably represent a formula, or rather the initial part of a hymn that is to be recited over the sacrifice. Considering *aϑre* as a locative in -*e* (see above), and taking this locative to be governed by *acil* 'own' or 'property' (as this word is certainly elsewhere added to a locative), and believing *atar* to mean 'the Self' and to govern the genitives *unial-ti ursmnal*, I translated the whole of it thus: 'to Juno Ursmni herself (to the Self of J. U.) belongs (*acil*) this (*an*) sanctified (*śacnicn*) home (*cilϑ*)'. Now if *aϑre* is really a locative of *atar*, it is evident that the meaning 'maternal lineage' would not do in this connection. But I think it possible that, being originally a collective, it might also mean 'motherhood'. Compare for instance the double meaning in the German -*schaft* (*Vaterschaft* 'fatherhood', *Bruderschaft* 'brothers') or in the Latin -*tas* (*fraternitas* 'brotherhood', later also 'brothers'). We might accordingly imagine the said word to mean 'to the motherhood of Juno Ursmni', an expression which would be essentially equal to 'to Juno Ursmni, the mother', 'Junoni matri'.

A similar meaning is perhaps to be supposed in no. 74, *milarϑatartinaia*. I take *tinaia* to be the genitive of a family name in feminine form, thus standing for *tinaias*, and this genitive to be governed by *atar*. Considering now that the object written upon has the form of a phallus, I think this meaning very probable — 'Larth (consecrates) this (*mi*) (to cause) motherhood of Tinaia, (his wife)'. In *atar* we should then have to see an accusative indicating the goal aimed at.

I shall not try to interpret no. 73, since it is so very uncertain whether we ought there to read *atar*. Pauli in the Corpus inscriptionum divides the complex as follows: *mi tezan tei a tarχu menaia*.

Finally, in an inscription from Perusia, extant only in a bad copy, we have the connection *auveatra*. I have discussed this most uncertain and obscure inscription in my paper »Vorgr. Inschr. v. Lemnos«, p. 21 f.

As the reading is so very uncertain, I do not insist on the interpretation attempted there, but will only remark that if *-atra* is connected with *atar*, *penϑna auveatra* might perhaps mean 'the *penϑna* destined to the maternal family of the sons', not 'destined to 'the Self' of the sons'.

Now if *etera* is derived from *atar*, and if we have to suppose the latter to mean 'maternal family', the derived word must mean 'belonging to the maternal family'. This meaning would suit the connection *suϑi etera*, 'a tomb consecrated to the mother's family' very well. Compare *teśamsa atrś*, 'he assigns to the mother's family'. As regards the connection of *suϑi* with an adjective, we may compare CIE 3754, *arnϑ larϑ velimnaś | arzneal husiur | suϑi acil hece* — Perusia (written on a doorpost of a tomb). *suϑi acil* means 'his own tomb'.

Then there are the two phrases *zilaϑ eterav* and *camϑi eterau*. The former of these has the parallel *zilaϑ parχis*. Now *parχis* is probably related to *par*, a word that I have elsewhere shown must mean 'father'[1]. I think it must be admitted that when a word derived from this is so placed as to be parallel to *etera-*, the fact tends to show that my interpretation of *etera* as 'mother's kin' was right. With regard to *zilaϑ*, it will be evident from these connections that its meaning must be somewhat wider than that resulting from our investigation above (III). Like the Latin *consularis* and similar words, it must signify not only a person invested with, or having been invested with, some magistracy, but also such as merely belong to a family, some of whose members have been honoured with public offices. It is even conceivable that in addition to its original meaning (honoured), it might also occasionally have been used to some extent like the Latin *nobilis*. I accordingly now think it likely that we may approximatety understand no. 24 as follows: 'Vel Alethnas, the son of Vel, a *nobilis* on the father's side, *nobilis* also with regard to his mother's family'. I shall not attempt any detailed analyis of the formation of *parχis*; suffice it to say that it seems to be derived by means of the same suffix -χ that appears in *marunu-χ*, etc., and to be a genitive plural, meaning probably 'ancestors'. *eterav* = *eterau* is probably a locative of the plural (suffix *-u*).

In no. 10 we should have to explain *zilc amce* not as meaning 'he was a magistrate', but 'there was magistracy'. The inscription would then mean 'Arnth Churcles, the son of Larth and of Ramtha Nevtnei, (is reposing here). There was magistracy (or nobility) with his ancestors. (Himself) he functioned as a *marunuχva spurana cepen*. He died 95

---

[1] Beitr. II 129 f.

years old.' Thus the ambiguity of *zilc*, which has been supposed above
to mean both 'magistrate' and 'magistracy', would be removed. *zilc* would
only denote magistracy, and *zilaϑ* only the person invested with it.

I suppose *zileteraia* to be derived from the connection *zilaϑ eterav*
as an adjective meaning 'some one having *zilaϑ*'s among his mother's kin',
'*nobilis* on the mother's side'.

Not knowing what is meant by *camϑi*, we are unable to define
the special idea expressed by the connection *camϑi eterau*; but I think
it most probable that it denotes a person, members of whose maternal
family have been invested with a dignity called *cam*. As *camϑi* seems
to be a locative, Pauli was very likely right in believing the apparent
parallel *zilaϑ* to be a locative too.

The marked emphasizing of the maternal kin which my interpretation
implies is not at all strange. It would agree well with the fact that the
Etruscan epitaphs, in very numerous cases, give, not only the name of the
father of the deceased, but also that of the mother. We also know from
other sources that the Etruscans attached just as much importance to the
maternal as to the paternal genealogy.

The question now arises how it has come to pass that this word
etera, which means 'belonging to the mother's family', has also been used
as almost synonymous with *clan*, 'son', this use being, as we have seen,
limited to Perusia. In answer to this question I venture on an hypothesis.
As I have said above, I do not think *etera* exactly synonymous with *clan*,
but, like Corssen, I believe it to mean 'second son'. Like several other
peoples of antiquity (Egyptians, Greeks, etc.), the Etruscans seem to have
called the eldest son after the grandfather on the paternal side. Con-
sidering now the importance which that people attached to the maternal
descent (wherein we have, I think, a trace left of an original matriar-
chate), it would be natural to suppose that they gave the name of the
maternal grandfather to the second son. In that case we might also
easily suppose that at a certain place it became the custom to designate
second sons, because they were named after their maternal grandfathers,
'those who belong to the maternal kin'. This was probably at first
a term of endearment used in the family. By and by however, its original
meaning faded away, and its use became, so to speak, official.

From *etera* is derived *eteri*. This word only occurs in the connection
lautn eteri, which I think Pauli has explained correctly, supposing it to
stand for *lautni eteri* and accordingly to denote some special kind of
lautni. Now *lautni* is derived from *lautn*, 'family', and consequently
originally means 'familiaris'. I therefore think that Pauli is likewise right,

when he supposes the *lautni*'s to have been persons who have attached themselves to some mighty individual in such a manner as to be, so to speak, admitted into his family as humbler members, thus very nearly corresponding to the Roman *liberti*, or perhaps still more nearly to the *clientes*. Occasionally we find *libertus* rendered with *lautni*[1]. That the position of a *lautni* was also hereditary, is shown by the fact that children may also be designated in that way. Now if *lautni* means 'familiaris', *lautn(i) eteri* would be 'familiaris on the mother's side'. By that name I think such persons were denoted, who had left the family whose *lautni*'s they originally were, and had entered into another family in the same character, following for instance a girl of the former family who was married into the latter, or else taking the occasion offered by a marriage to exchange one patronage for another, mightier one. The denomination *lautn(i) eteri* they of course bore in relation to the children of the new family. As children are also called *lautn eteri*, we learn that the state of a *lautn eteri* might be hereditary, like that of a *lautni*. Pauli thinks that the position of a *lautn eteri* must have been essentially different from that of a *lautni*. For among the *lautni*'s we also find, he says, persons who had formerly been slaves, a fact that is proved by their foreign names, although the plurality no doubt have genuine Etruscan ones. On the other hand, all the *lautn eteri*'s mentioned in epitaphs have Etruscan, and some even noble names. This difference does not, however, I think, exist. We have some hundred *lautni*-inscriptions and only 11 or 12 *lautn-eteri*-inscriptions containing names, and therefore no comparison is possible between them. Among the odd hundred *lautni*'s there are 15 or 16 with foreign names. Thus according to the numeric proportion of the two classes, we should expect to find 2 at most bearing foreign names, among the *lautn eteri*'s. That this is not the case may be a mere chance.

The fact that both *etera*'s and *lautn eteri*'s are nameless in some inscriptions, does not, I think, in any measure weaken my argument; for we must remember that the epitaphs were not intended for public inspection. They are placed within the family tombs, and are supposed to be read only by the members of the family, and to these the name of the deceased was familar even without any mention on the stone. Nay, originally they were set up only to honour or to please the deceased, and accordingly it would suffice even if nothing were noted but the relation existing between him and the person who superintended the interment. Thus, although such inscriptions as *arnϑal lautn eteri*, 'the maternal

---

[1] Pauli Fo. u. St. I.

familiaris of Arnth', are apparently lacking in definiteness, such information may nevertheless be supposed to have been sufficient. The members of the family, at any rate the contemporary ones, knew both who that special *lautn eteri* was, and also his patron, who simply denotes himself by his personal name, Arnth.

The parallel form (*lautn*) *eterie*, no. 60, I cannot explain. Another parallel form *lautn eters* occurs in no. 52 (and no. 62, if *lautn es* is abbreviated from *lautn eters*). This *eters* seems to me to be a variant form of *atars*, gen. of *atar*. The derived adjective *eteri* is synonymous with the genitive of the primary word. *lautn eters* thus means 'familiaris of the maternal kin'.

I cannot leave this topic without mentioning some more forms, which may with more or less probability be said to be connected with *atar* and *etera*.

In one inscription we find the genitive *ataris*:

77. *lar�host : tite : ataris* — Clusium — CIE 2896 (teg. sep.).

I formerly believed this form to be identical with *atars*[1]. That supposition would give a reasonable sense, if *atar* meant 'the Self' ('Larth Tite (consecrates the tomb) to himself'), but not if it means 'mother's family'; for as the inscription stands on a tegula, there can only be question of one person, not of a whole clan, as would be the case, if *ataris* meant 'to the mother's family'. I therefore think it likely that *ataris* must be separated from *atars*, the more so because it also differs in form. Moreover, we elsewhere find a form *ateri* (Narce), which seems to be the nominative corresponding to the genitive *ataris*. I therefore believe *ataris*, *ateri* to be another derivative of *atar*, being synonymous with *etera*, but perhaps used only in connection with feminine proper nouns, or with such nouns understood.

No. 77 should then be rendered: 'Larth Tite (consecrates the tomb) to (his) (female) relative on the mother's side'; and the inscription of Narce: '(The cup) which Rusi, (her) (female) relative on the mother's side, presented (to her) as a *mlaχuta*, as a *mlaχata* it was presented again'.

Lastly we find a form *etru* in the following inscriptions (not discussed by Pauli, l. c.):

78. *sertur e | tru cainis* — Perusia — CIE 3427 (ossuary).

79. *larza etru* — Perusia — CIE 3428 (ossuary).

---

[1] Beitr. I 29.

80. *[e]tru · ϑui | [l]aruś · aϑnu*
[larϑ]ial · pe ||||||
a · neinia — Perusia — CIE 3431 (stele or cippus).

As these inscriptions are composed in exactly the same way as those containing *etera*, and, like them, come from Perusia, I think it certain that *etru* is a collateral form of *etera*, and probably, as the termination *-u* tends to show, some diminutive formation. This supposition is supported by the fact that one of the inscriptions contains the name *larza*, the diminutive of *larϑ*, in connection with *etru*. Thus our inscriptions should be rendered as follows:

'Sertur, the little second son of Caini.'
'Little Larth, the little second son.'
'Here (reposes) Larus Athnu, the little second son of Larth Pe - - and of Aneinei.'

etra (*φaves etra*) on the leaden tablet of Volaterrae must remain unexplained, as that inscription is still altogether obscure.

V.

t e i.

I have discussed this word in the »Etrusk. Beitr.« II (p. 49—53), but not in a satisfactory manner. The interpretation there attempted can only be considered a failure. It will therefore perhaps be as well to subject the word to a new examination, and try whether our material is sufficient for deciding its meaning. In almost all cases the adjacent words are also obscure, and the prospects of a favourable result to our undertaking is therefore by no means great. But this is the usual state of affairs in Etruscology. Let us again collect the inscriptions in question.

In the Agram text, the word occurs in the following connections:

81. In the formula *tei faśei*   II $_{11, 13}$, IV $_7$, IX $_{17}$.

82. *flerχva · neϑunsl | śucri · ϑezeric · scara · priϑas : raχ · tei | menaś* VIII $_4$.

83. *une | mlaχ : puϑs · ϑaclϑ · ϑar tei zivaś · fler | ϑezine*   VIII $_{12}$.

84. *ϑui : uceti cepen : caϑinum | zaneś · vuvcnicś · plutim · tei · mutzi · ceśasin | ara · ratum* etc.   X $_{19}$.

85. *putnam · ϑu · calatnam | tei · lena*   X $_γ$ $_{3—5}$.

86. *ceśum · tei · lanti · ininc : eśi · tei · rinuś*   XI $_γ$ $_3$.

87. *heχz · velϑe · śancve · nuϑin | śarśnauś · teiś tira · caϑnal*   X $_{15-16}$.

In the inscription from Capua, *tei* twice occurs before *tul*:

88. *rac · vanies · huϑ · zus · le · riϑnai · tul · tei · snuzain · tehamai* l. 9.

89. *zain · tehamai · ϑii ϑal · sac · ri utus · e · cun · zai · itial · χuscuv · se riϑnai · tu | l tei · cizusiea*   l. 10.

Moreover this inscription has the word in the following connections:

90. *śipir · śuri leϑam · sul ci tar · tiria | cim · cleva a · casri hal · χ · tei · vacil*   l. 4.

91. *i · c · alaie · i · c · leϑnai · sti · zai · tei · zal · rapa · zal* x *as* l. 24.

Perhaps also in

92. *tuce χineśi · tei* (? or *iei* ?) *· tur · zae · s · χaϑ · ce*   l. 27.

We then find the word in the following inscriptions:

93. *afunaś sleleϑ caru | tezan fuśleri tesnś teiś | raśneś*   Cipp. Perus.
    A. l. 4.

94. *tesne raśne cei | tesnś teiś raśneś*   ib. l. 23.

95. *lescem · tnucasi · śuris eis teis evitiuras*   Magl.

Perhaps also in

96. *mitezanteiatarχumenaia*   (above no 71)

And

97. ✗✗*neteiesuinunehutveluniϑmuer* — Tarquinii — Ga. 804 l. 1 (golden
    plate).

In the paper cited above, I thought it most probable that *tei* is a
demonstrative pronoun; but I now see that that idea cannot be main-
tained. In the first place, *tei* never occurs in passages where we are
accustomed to find demonstratives. Thus it never takes the place of *mi*
or *an* or *eca* in such phrases as *mi suϑi, an suϑi, eca suϑi,* 'this tomb'.
Secondly, no. 93 speaks against the supposition of its being a demonstra-
tive; for there we find first *tesne raśne,* and then immediately following
it, *cei tesnś teiś raśneś* — this same *tesnś teiś raśneś* also being found
higher up in the same inscription. Now we are here — as elsewhere
in Etruscology — operating with unknown quantities, because we do not
understand the meaning of either *tesne, cei* or *tei.* I think nevertheless
that I can say this much, namely, that it is quite impossible to understand
how a certain connection of two words can be immediately followed by a
repetition of the same connection (in different case-form), and this time with
a demonstrative added. I do not see any way of explaining why this
demonstrative should have been added. The fact that *tesne tei* occurs
twice in the same inscription also seems to imply a coherency between
the two words of a more intimate nature than that of a noun with a
demonstrative pronoun. Thirdly, in no. 85, it would only be possible
to take *tei* as a demonstrative by supposing the connection to comprise
only the three words *putnam ϑu calatnam,* and not the fourth, *tei,* which
must in that case be connected with the words following. This, however,
would be a very questionable way out of the difficulty. The connection

most decidedly seems to include *tei* as well. We must read *putnam ϑu calatnam tei,* and as *calatnam* is here parallel to *putnam,* so is *tei* to *ϑu.* Now, as *ϑu* is a numeral, this passage would seem rather to confirm the opinion set forth by Lattes[1] that *tei* is a numeral too. We also elsewhere find *tei* placed in the neighbourhood of numerals, as, for instance, in no. 91 (*zal*), in no. 97 *hut* (supposing, of course, that we may here take *tei* out of the complex as a separate word), and on the Cipp. Perus. Moreover no. 86 has the connection *eśi tei,* just as another passage of the Agram text (X $_{21}$) has *eśi-c ci, eśi-c zal.* And the connection *tesneś teiś* reminds us strongly of that other, *ϑunsna ϑuns* (Agr. VI $_{13}$). Long before Lattes, Grotefend had likewise believed *tei* to be a numeral. He interpreted *tesne tei* as meaning 'twelve'. I need not say that he was led to that conclusion solely by the outward resemblance between *tesne tei* and the Indo-European numeral (Latin *decem* and *duo*). He has been followed by Corssen. Also Deecke[2] and Bugge[3] explain *tei* as 'two' — the word being in their opinion a parallel form of *ϑu* — and *tesne tei* as 'twelve'. This was before the Agram text had come to light. The same opinion is still upheld by Lattes[4], notwithstanding the connection reprinted above, *putnam ϑu calatnam tei,* which directly proves *tei* to be a different word from *ϑu, i. e.* according to Lattes 'two'. If a numeral, *tei* cannot consequently be 'two', nor any other of the first 6 numerals, the names of which we know from the tesseræ from Toscanella. In addition to these 6, we know two more from several inscriptions, *viz. cesp* and *semφ,* both being lower then ten and most probably representing seven and nine respectively; and further, from the inscription given above as no. 6, probably *nurϑ* (as it should perhaps be read), which must also (if a numeral) represent a number lower than ten, probably eight (if *cezp* and *semφ* are seven and nine). Of course 'ten' is also possible, but I think I have shown elsewhere that we have good reason for believing the Etruscan word for 'ten' to be *lu* (see above, II). Thus there would seem to be no room left for a numeral *tei.* As it is not definitely proved, however, though it is highly probable, that *lu* is 'ten', we might still experimentally admit the possibility of there being some vacant place between six and eleven to be occupied by *tei.* The objection I made (l. c.) to supposing *tei* to mean 'seven', 'eight', or 'nine', *viz.* that it does not, like other lower numerals, occur added to tens, and that we do not

---

[1] 'Il numerale etr. *ϑu*' in the Rend. d. R. Ist. Lomb. S. II Vol. XXXII, p. 1387 f.

[2] Magl. 30, Fo. u. St. V 36, VII 7, 41.

[3] Fo. u. St IV 142, 149 f.

[4] l. c.

meet with a ten derived from it, I admit to be of little avail, because
the Etruscans, as I have formerly shown elsewhere[1], did not add the
numerals seven, eight and nine to a ten, but preferred to substract three,
two and one respectively, from the next ten.   And as we do not as yet
know more than five of the Etruscan tens, we might suppose it to be a
mere chance that we have found no ten derived from *tei*.   In this way
it might also be explained why there never occurs among other indications
of age one such as *avil tei*[2].   I think, however, it is nevertheless evident
that *tei* is not a numeral, and for the following reasons.   Firstly, it would
be impossible to understand why in the Agram text we should so exce-
dingly often meet with that special numeral, as compared with others.
The enumerated objects (most probably sacrificial ones) which we meet
with in that text, are only the following: *ϑunsna ϑuns flers, zuϑeva zal
eśic ci, halχza ϑu eśic zal*, and *putnam ϑu*.   If *tei* meant, say, 'eight',
we should have to add 'eight *faśei*'s (81), 'eight *raχ*'s (? 82), 'eight *ϑar*'s
(83), 'eight *plutim*'s (84), 'eight *calatnam*'s (85), 'eight *śarśnau*'s (87),
'eight' without any recognizable object (86).   Secondly, if *tei* were a
numeral, we should have to connect it in no. 82 with the word preceding
it, *raχ*.   This *raχ* (*raχϑ*) occurs in fourteen other places in the Agram
text.   It is most frequently placed in opposition to another word, *celi*,
and it is nowhere else connected with a numeral.   I have tried to show
that it must mean some locality[3].   But even if we think, improbable
though it may be, that it possibly denotes some object, it would be
very strange, to say the least of it, if that object should be qualified
by adding the numeral 'eight' in one place only, while it occurs fourteen
times without any such addition.   It would be just as impossible to
understand the relationship existing between 'eight *faśei*'s' (which more-
over occurs in what looks like a standing formula) and the unqualified
faśei; between 'eight *tul*'s' in the inscription from Capua and the solitary
riϑnai tul (ib. l. 9, 15), *riϑnai tula* (l. 17), and *tule, tules tula* in many
passages *ib.*; between 'eight *halχ*'s (90) and the solitary *halχ* (l. 14).
A similar state of affairs is not found anywhere else where numerals are
used.   In no. 91 I believe we should read as given above, *sti : zai ·
tei · zal · rapa*, etc.; but Bücheler reads *zal* instead of *zai*.   If that is
right, this passage would be decisive; for then *tei* would be placed

---

[1] Beitr. I 70 f.

[2] This Lattes thinks he has found in an inscription from Tarquinii, Not. Scav. 1896 p. 15:
    [s]emtinas · s′ · s′
    [sv]alc[e av]il tii

But as I have remarked (l. c.), ||T (*tii*) should certainly be read XII.

[3] Beitr. II 31 f.

between to *zal's* 'two', and could not accordingly be a numeral itself. As I have said, however, I believe we must read *zai*.

Thus, although not knowing any one of the words added to *tei* in the passages given above, I think I may positively assert that *tei* is not a numeral. If it is not a numeral, and is nevertheless (in the connection *putnam ϑu calatnam tei*) used so as to be parallel to a numeral, it must needs be a quantitative adjective. We are then left to choose between the meanings 'many' ('several', 'few', etc.), 'none', and 'all', or rather, as the first-named are out of the question, being too indefinite, only between 'none' and 'all'. Not yet understanding the passages concerned, we are unable to make our choice with absolute certainty. I still think, however, that we may say that the second alternative is so greatly preferable as to become almost certain. It is quite impossible to see how the negative could suit all the cases enumerated above; only a positive idea can do that.

Among this host of obscure words, I venture to pick out some few, and to try to elucidate them as for as possible.

In no. 95, *teis evitiuras* would be 'at every full-moon' (properly 'at all full-moons'), genitivus temporis. The purport of that passage is probably that some sacrifice (*eis*) is to be performed (or some sacrificial object to be consecrated) to *śuri* (*śuris* gen.-dat.) at every full-moon. Now *śuri* is certainly a deity of Death, most probably the wife of Calu, = Hecate. Thus we may compare the connection existing between the moon, especially the full-moon, and Hecate, which is known from the Greek mythology.

The standing formula, *tei faśei,* which is to be recited during some act of sacrifice, seems to mean, I fancy, 'all things (have been performed) *rite*'. I venture to compare *faśei* with the Latin *fas,* a word which does not, I think, bear an Indo-European stamp. It seems very probable that the Romans have borrowed it, together with many rites and religious customs, at the time when they were the pupils, especially in haruspicy, of the Tuscans. The fact that several secondary words have been formed on it (*fastus, nefas, nefastus, nefarius*), cannot be adduced against such a supposition. They are formed according to the analogy of derivations from genuine Latin words ending in -*s* (such as *honestus,* etc.). This process we observe in all languages.

No. 86 I understand as follows: 'And lying is (*ceśus-m*) all (*tei*) in the *lan* (*lan-ti*) whatever (*ininc*[1]) thou wilt (? *esi*[2]), all!'

---

[1] Beitr. I 18.

[2] Lemnos p. 66.

tesne I suppose to be derived from *tei*, just as *ϑunsna* is from *ϑu(n)*. Without fully understanding the passage in question, I think it very probable that *tesne raśne* means 'universitas Etrusca'. Such an expression might easily be supposed to have been further emphasized by adding *tei*, thus 'universitas universa (or omnis) Etrusca (Etruscorum)'.

There is a word *teisnica*, which I think contains the same *tesne* (as regards the ending *-i*, compare *eprϑni* in addition to *eprϑne*) with the demonstrative *-ca* affixed[1]. The original form of *tesne* was probably *teisne*, being formed on the genitive *teis* by adding the suffix *-ne* (= *na* in *ϑuns-na*). The word occurs Fa. 2279:

98. *eiϑ* : *fanu* : *śaϑec* : *lavtn* : *pumpus*
     scunus : *śuϑiti* : *in* : *flenzna*
     teisnica —— — — —   — Tarquinii (Tomba del Tifone).

The first words *eiϑ* — *scunus* mean (as I shall try to prove on some future occasion): 'This declaration the family of Pumpu Scunu has made'. *in* is the relative pronoun, and *śuϑiti* — *teisnica* means 'the *flenzna* which (is) in the tomb (*śuϑiti*) is common to all (*teisnica*)'.

---

[1] Beitr. II 85 et passim.

Excursus.

On the Etruscan Words for 'Father' and 'Mother'.

As I have said above, I think I have found out that the Etruscan word for 'father' is *par* (Lemnian *har*?)[1]. I do not doubt that the existence of such a word with such a meaning will appear very questionable to those who seem to think it impossible that any Etruscan word can resemble a synonymous Indo-European word in sound. I myself feel convinced that Etruscan is not an Indo-European language, but it does not follow from this, that we should have to exclude the possibility of some word or other resembling an Indo-European word of similar meaning. Such is the case with *par* as compared with the Indo-European *pater*; and I think I can show that there is nothing strange in the coincidence.

The words 'father' and 'mother', Indo-European *pater* and *mater*, have unquestionably been formed on the nursery-words *pa* and *ma* (by means of some suffix *-ter*). Thus they are very primitive words. That this is the case is also shown by the fact that they do not formally differ with gender. The suffix *-ter* (*-tor*) they share with the so-called nouns of agency, e. g. Latin *dator*, Greek δοτήρ. Now if *pater* and *mater* are derived from nursery-words, it is impossible to think that the suffix *-ter* indicates that the persons in question are performers of an action. Consequently this suffix does not originally imply agency. We can therefore roughly interpret *pater, mater, dator* as '*pa*-person', '*ma*-person', 'give-person'. The question then arises whether we cannot arrive at a clearer understanding of the meaning of the suffix. I think this possible. It is obvious that the Greek suffix *-μήν* (*-μων*) is connected with that of the middle participle *-μενο-*, having been contracted from that form[2]. The same relationship exists between *-ter* (*-tor*) and the suffix of the comparatives *-tero-*. Now this suffix originally denotes some relation existing between two, being, I think, in the first instance a pronominal form, which pointed to some person or some thing as standing in some relation to another. We may thus take it for granted that the connection of these two separate words, **pá téro* (whence the contracted *pater*), originally meant,

---

[1] Lemnos 31.

[2] Hirt »Ablaut«. I have already shown this in my book on the Greek Nominal Flexion (1890).

'the one who is *pa*', while implying reference to some other person, who was evidently 'the one who is *ma*'. The other nouns of relationship that have the same termination, such as 'brother', 'daughter', etc., are, I think, secondary, having been formed analogously after the pattern presented by the two primary words.

In like manner *dator* originally meant 'the one who gives', as compared with some other person, who is evidently 'the one who receives'. Such words should thus originally only have been formed from such verbs as imply a reference to an action performed by some other subject, as is the case, for instance, with 'to give'. But by and by the proper meaning of the suffix faded away, and it became, as we say, a suffix forming nouns of agency, being able to form such nouns on most verbs.

In the two nursery-words *pa* and *ma*, the vowel has of course the same quantity, so that the difference between the short *a* in *pater* and the long one in *mater*, must have been caused by a different stress in the two words, and we accordingly have to consider the Greek accentuation πατήρ and μήτηρ as primary. The real cause of the difference we are scarcely likely ever to be able to trace. It is evident, however, that when the two separate words *pá téro*, each having originally its own accent, grew together into one word, the accent of one of them had to disappear. Which of the two lost its accent, would depend upon circumstances which we are unable to follow. In *pater* the accent of the latter element prevailed, and in *mater* that of the former. As all Indo-European suffixes were originally independent words, I think that the variety of the Indo-European accentuation is to be explained in the same manner. Throughout the field of nominal formation we see the same fluctuation, words that are quite analogously formed diverging as to their accent, the one being, for instance, oxytone and the other barytone. Viewed superficially, we can understand this by supposing all suffixes to have been separate (and accordingly accentuated) words, but of course this will not help us to understand the inner reasons of the difference.

Now the nursery-words *pa* and *ma* are not confined to the Indo-European languages. Thus for 'father'[1] we find *pa* or some similar sound in North Caucasian (Lak. *pu*, Džek *paj*), Koryakan dialects (*pepe, papa, appa*), Kamchadal dialects (*epe, aph, ipip*), Khassi (*pā*), Tai (*po*), Tibetan (*pha*), Burmese (*a-pha*), Bârå (*fā, ā-fā, ā-pā, ā-wa*), Nāgā dialects (*po, pu, pe*), Himalayan (*pā*), Chinese (*pā, pa*); and with the soft consonant (*ba, ab*)

---

[1] For the following comparisons I have used Klaproth's Asia Polyglotta, Erckert's »Die Sprachen des kaukasischen Stammes«, and some information kindly imparted to me by Dr. Sten Konow.

in Semite languages (*ab*), North Caucasian (Udi *baba*, Dido *obu*, Xinaluy *buj*, Lazian *bada*), Samoyed (*abam*), Turk languages (*baba*, *aba*), Central Nāgā (*bâ*), Himalayan (*bā*).

It would not thus be at all surprising if this nursery-word were likewise to be the base of the Etruscan word for 'father'. It would, however, be a stranger thing if this word should have been formed by adding some suffix, like the Indo-European equivalent; but that too I think conceivable. In any case this Etruscan -*r* is something quite different from the Indo-European -**tero* (-*tēr*). Regarding the addition of a suffix, we may also compare the Coptic word for 'mother', *mut*, which has evidently been formed on a nursery-word (*mu*) by adding the suffix of feminines -*t*. We might also compare the fact that in certain languages the words for 'father' and 'mother' are formed by prefixing some demonstrative to the nursery-words, e. g. Maniporî *ma-pâ* 'father', *ma-mâ* 'mother'.

The word for 'mother', *at*, also occurs in other languages, but in the sense of 'father' — in Indo-European (Latin *atta*, Gothic *atta*, Old-Slavonic *otĭcĭ*, etc.), Hungarian (*atya*), several Turk languages (*ata*), Cherkessian (*te*, *tatt*), etc. The circumstance that it means 'mother' in Etruscan can be compared with the fact that *ama*, which in several languages is the word for 'mother' or 'nurse' and the like (Greek ἄμμη, Latin *amita* 'aunt'), means 'father' in South Caucasian (Grus. *mama*, Mingrel *muma*, Svan. *mama*, *mu*) and certain North Caucasian languages (Avar. *imem*, And. *ima*, Kar. *ima*, *imo*). And in Nāgā Bodo and Nāgā Kuki the words for 'father' and 'mother' are derived from one and the same nursery-word, *pa*, thus N. B. *ā-pō*, *ā-pā*, N. K. *apū*, *āvā* 'father'; N. B. *āpē*, *apūi*, N. K. *apē*, *āpūi*, *āva* 'mother'. The same nursery-word (*pa*, *ab*) also occurs as 'mother' in North Caucasian languages (Lak. *baba*, Tabassar. *pab*, *bab*, Varkun. Kubachi *aba*, etc.). This is also the case with *dada*, which in some North Caucasian languages means 'father' (Aku. *dŭdeš*, Aguli *dad*, etc.), and in South Caucasian 'mother' (Grusin. *deda*, Mingrel *dida*, Svan. *dede*, *di*). There are words for mother, which have a certain outward resemblance to the Etruscan word, e. g. Caxur. (North Cauc.) *jed*, *ed*, Lapponic *edne*, Turkoman *adyea*, Central Nāgā *ityā*, Gothic *aipei*.

Postscript.

After the preceding pages had gone to press, I received through the courtesy of Prof. E. Lattes, his '*I fascicoli nono e decimo del nuovo Corpus inscriptionum Etruscarum*', reprinted from the *Studi italiani di Filologia classica*, Vol. XII, 1904, pp. 1 et seq. This paper is directed, to a great extent, against my »*Etruskische Beiträge*«, I and II, and it gives me occasion to add a few remarks.

Prof. Lattes's corrections of some of the inscriptions published in that volume of the Corpus are no doubt worthy of consideration, and Etruscology has also formerly benefited from his profound knowledge of Etruscan palæography and Etruscan inscriptions. He himself does not, however, derive the same benefit from the results of his studies as do others; for, when proceeding to explain the inscriptions, he handles the text that he has himself read with so much knowledge and accuracy in such a way that no certain base remains. In this as in other papers he operates with the utmost freedom with supposed abbreviations and dropping of terminations. He thinks, for instance, that the genitive suffix -*s* can be dropped *ad libitum*. I will only mention a few instances.

Clen ceχa, words which occur in two places, and which I have explained as a compound meaning 'votum pro filio', is abbreviated according to Lattes from *clen ceχas*, and means 'cultor (deae) Cechiae'. Similarly *clen ϑunχulϑe* stands for *clen ϑunχulϑes*, and means 'cultor (deae) Tunchulthae' (pp. 87 et seq.).

CIE 48, l. 3 & 4, *huϑ : naper lescan letem : ϑui*, is said to mean 'quattro loculi (sacri) al (dio) Lescan e al (dio) Leϑam il doppio' (p. 51), supposing *lescan* to stand for *lescans* and *letem* for *leϑams*.

He explains *sleleϑ caru* on the Cipp. Perus. as an abbreviation of *sleleϑ carus*, 'nel sepolcro sacro al dio Carone' (p. 68); and in the same way *epl tularu* is said to stand for *epl tularus*, 'epulae sepulcri' (p. 79), and so forth.

The genitive suffix is not the only one which Lattes thinks can be freely dropped. In other cases he prefers to consider the suffixless form as a locative, as in *reuχ-zina*, which he translates 'e il *reu* nella *zina*' (p. 95), and so forth.

On the whole, Lattes argues as if Etruscan did not possess case suffixes. We know that the actual state of affairs is quite different. There are some few cases in which the existence of a genitive cannot be doubted, though the genitive suffix -s has not been added, as for instance, in connexion with *clan*, 'son', *seχ*, 'daughter'. Such cases are, however, far from numerous. I have not counted them, but I think that the number of instances in which the -s of the genitive has been dropped, can be roughly estimated at five out of every thousand. It is of course possible that a final *a*, *e*, *i*, or *u* in passages that cannot as yet be explained, sometimes stands for *as*, *es*, *is*, *us*, respectively [1]. The small percentage of cases in which we know that the suffix has been omitted, makes it, however, absolutely impossible to agree with Lattes in assuming such a wholesale dropping in the numerous passages which have not as yet been explained. Prof. Lattes compares *heri* and *heris*, *adepe arves* and *adepes arves* on the Iguvine tables. Such a comparison does not, however, prove anything whatever, because Umbrian is not Etruscan. He further compares the Agram text, where we find *flere in crapśti* three times and *flereś in crapśti* twice; *flere neϑunsl* three times and *fleres neϑunsl* once; *nunϑen zuśleve* in one place and *zuśleveś nunϑen* in another. He has not proved, however, that the words in question have the same mutual relationship in both cases; and as regards the last set, I am personally convinced that the two words should not be connected at all.

It is perhaps superfluous to remark that Prof. Lattes deals with the bases of words in the same free manner. Thus on p. 100 he explains *ziχ* in Ga. 799 l. 3, *ancn ziχ neϑsras acasce*, as abbreviated from *ziχu*, and he finds fault with me because I have not made the same correction, though there might seem to be little foundation for such an alteration, as no other word in the inscription is abbreviated in writing. *Husina*, which occurs twice in the Agram text (together with *huslne*, which occurs three times) is said to stand for *hursina* (*hurslne*) and to be connected with *hursi* (p. 65). He also blames me here for retaining the form actually occurring in the text. *mut(a)na*, which occurs in about ten inscriptions, and which is never written otherwise than *mutana* or *mutna*, is nevertheless stated to be an abbreviation of *murtana*, because there exists another word *murzua*, to which he attributes a similar sense. According to Lattes, *zac* and *zaχ*, which occur in the Agram text and in the Capua inscription, should be read *za-c*, *za-χ*, respectively, and are

---

[1] I do not know any instance of the dropping of the genitive suffix -s after consonants.

explained as containing the numeral *zal*, though this word always retains
its *l* in all cases in which it can be proved to be really a numeral[1].

It need hardly be said that we can have no hope of arriving at certain
results, if we arbitrarily change the texts in a language which is still all
but unintelligible. On the other hand there cannot be any doubt that as
a rule the proper thing to do is to suppose the existence of a genitive
only in such places where a real genitive suffix occurs, and similarly, to
state that a locative occurs only if we find a locative termination, and
upon the whole work from the assumption that the words have the shape
in which they actually appear in the inscriptions. Prof. Lattes' method
will only lead to our loosing every clue to a proper understanding.

It is also necessary to make strong objection to many of the combi-
nations by means of which Lattes tries to find out the nature and the
meaning of words. If the same word occurs in different surroundings,
he infers that a mutual relationship must exist between those surroundings
themselves. I will only mention a few instances. *ϑil* is said to be
connected with *ϑui*, because we find both *vinum ϑil* and *vinum ϑui*
(p. 80); *χimϑ* must be a numeral, because in one place we find *χimϑ
ananc eśi*, and in another *zuϑeva zal eśi-c ci halχza ϑu eśi-c zal*, 'donde
la consequenza che, dovendosi presso *eśi* avere anche nel primo luogo un
numerale, qual *ci* e *zal* nel secondo, e questo non potendo essere la
particola *an-anc*, tale sia *χimϑ* e risponda a *ci* e *zal*'. I do not think it
necessary to give more examples.

I do not intend to enter into the details of Prof. Lattes' criticism
of the numerous suggestions I have thrown out in my »*Etruskische
Beiträge*«. Many of them are of course wrong, but I do not hesitate
to contend that I have at least some foundation for my surmises, in as
much as I always pay due attention to the case-forms, and do not
arbitrarily alter the text. The counter-suggestions which Lattes thinks
preferable, are a failure because he discards such considerations. They are,
therefore, at the outset devoid of every probability.

The improbability of his interpretation will also appear from the
fact that in numerous inscriptions he finds numerals in the most varying
forms, though these forms never occur in places where there can be no
doubt of a number being indicated.

In my »*Etruskische Beiträge*«, II, 51, I have said that Lattes iden-
tifies *tei* with *ϑu*, giving to both the meaning 'two'. Lattes now protests,

---

[1] It is quite a different case with *zaϑrums*, which probably contains *zal* as the first com-
ponent of a compound.

and says that he has compared the two words, but not identified them; *ϑu* is the cardinal 'two', while *tei* means 'secondo' and 'doppio'. Now I think it rather bold to assume that the same word means 'second' and 'double'. I do not know any language in which the ordinals can also be used as multiplicative adjectives. But this is not all. I still maintain that, according to Lattes, *tei* can also have a third meaning, *viz.* 'two'.

Not. Scav. 1896, 15, he reads *[sv]alc[e · r]il tii* or *av]il tii*[1], and translates 'visse l'anno secondo' (p. 47). He accordingly assumes that *tii* is identical with *tei*. He further translates *ϑui ϑei* (Agr.) 'due secondi' (p. 46). *ϑei* must accordingly be identical with *tei*. If *tei = tii*, *ϑei* must evidently = *ϑii*, which, on pp. 91 & 92, is said to mean 'two', and also (p. 79) 'bis'. *tei*, which is identical with *ϑii*, can accordingly mean 'two'. Similarly *tinia ti* is translated '(to) Jove two' (p. 85). Now if *tii* is the same as *ϑii*, we must also identify *ti* with *ϑi* (this word being said to mean 'bis', p. 79), which is, in its turn, identified with *ϑii* (p. 79). But according to Lattes *ϑii* is the same as *tei*. If *ti* means 'two', *tei = ϑii = ϑi = ti* must accordingly also mean 'two'.

I am unable to find any other sense in the above than that all the forms just mentioned are supposed to mean 'two', as well as 'second' and 'double', some of them even having the additional meaning of 'bis'. *ϑu* is the only exception, it meaning simply 'two' and nothing else.

It may be of interest to compare the forms which Lattes assumes of the numeral 'two' and allied words.

The cardinal is said to have the following forms *ϑu, ϑui* (pp. 49, 75, 92), *ϑei, ϑii, ϑi, tei, tii, ti, tem* (p. 52).

The various forms of the ordinal are as follows. In the first place Lattes agrees with Pauli in saying that *ϑu*, like other cardinals, when inflected becomes an ordinal. Thus, for instance, *ϑuns* is 'secundi'. Further, we have for 'second' *tei* and its various forms *tii, ti, ϑei, ϑii, ϑi*, and moreover *teta* (p. 49), *ϑura, etera* (pp. 38, 39).

The multiplying adjective takes the forms *ϑui* (p. 51), *teh* (in *teh amai*, 'e nel doppio sepolcro', p. 52), *teti* (p. 49), *ϑil* (p. 80), *ϑar* (*ϑar ϑi*, 'doppi due volte'), *tar* (*ci tar*, 'cinque doppi'). The corresponding adverbial is *ϑi, ϑii* (p. 79).

Lastly *ϑe*, which is cut out of *ϑec*, is said to mean 'bini', and *za-c lena esera ϑe-c veisna* is translated 'tresque libationes Lena *esera*, binasque Veisna'.

---

[1] I think it certain, as said above (p. 54), that XII should be read instead of *tii*.

Considering all this, I do not think that I exaggerated the facts in my Etr. Beitr. II. 51, when I said that, according to Lattes, the numeral 'two' is represented by the forms *ϑu, ϑui, ϑun, ϑuna, ϑune, ϑuni, ϑunsna, ϑunt (tunt), ϑuf, ϑei, ϑi (ϑii), ϑil, tei, tii, ti, tem, tef*, perhaps also *ϑura, tura (-e, -i)* and even more. I cannot admit the correctness of Lattes' retort on p. 47, — 'si, ma solo vel modo in cui lat. *duo, bini, duplus, duorum, duobus, binis, dupli, duplo, duplicem, duonus, Duilius, duellis*, etc. possono representarlo'. From the Latin words compared I abstract the case-forms, Lattes having nowhere shown that the assumed multiplicity should be explained in that way. The words remaining for comparison would then be *duo, bis, bini, duplus (duplex), alter, secundus*. We at once observe the important difference, namely, that every one of these Latin forms has its well-defined sphere and meaning, and cannot be replaced by any other; while the Etruscan forms would be a confused chaos, which can confidently be declared to be an impossibility in any language that has been, or is, actually spoken by human beings.

We may perhaps be allowed to hope that the excellent scholar will abandon his fantastic cardinal *tei*, which has such various forms and meanings, now that he has been made acquainted with a real ordinal (*cianil*, see p. 15 et seq. above). We may even venture to hope that he will abandon his useless struggle against the succession of the first six Etruscan numerals that I have established.

On pp. 38 et seq. Lattes assumes that the descendants of an emancipated slave were called *lautn eteri* in the first generation, *etera* in the second, while in the third and following generations *-ϑura* was added to the *nomen gentile*. He would scarcely have made such a suggestion if he had read what I have said about *paχaϑuras* in my paper »*Die vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos*«, pp. 41 et seq. The word occurs in the title of the deceased, *maru paχaϑuras caϑsc*. As *caϑsc* contains the genitive *caϑs* of *Catha*, the name of a god, it is necessary to assume that *paχaϑuras*, which is connected with *caϑs* by means of the co-ordinative *-c*, must likewise be the genitive of the name of some god, so that the words under consideration should be translated '*maru* for Pachathura and Catha'. But in that case we cannot possibly translate *-ϑura* otherwise than 'Spross', as did Pauli. Some god, we do not know which, has accordingly been denoted, not by his own personal name, but as 'the son, as descendant, of Pacha'. At all events, we can safely assume that a word which

is used as the name of a god, cannot be formed by a compound else-
where implying descent from slaves.

The assumption that *etera* denotes the descendants of an emancipated
slave in the second generation, is quite incompatible with the expressions
camϑi eterau and *zilaϑ eterav*. I do not understand how Lattes will
explain the fact thus resulting, that these very people of the second
generation had their own special magistrates. The denomination *etera*,
i. e. the emancipated of the second generation, could scarcely be used in
the general meaning of 'plebs', comprising the *lautn eteri* and the *-ϑura*.
A wider idea such as that must certainly have been expressed by means
of a separate word.

Moreover, if Lattes were right, it would be impossible to understand
such inscriptions as simply contain the word *etera*, and nothing else.

In conclusion I will add some remarks about the forms ending in *-eri*.
I have followed Pauli in assuming that such forms represent a definite
oblique case, and I have also tried to show that some of them can be
used as verbs. Lattes argues against this explanation, and contends that
the words in question are nominatives, and should be compared with
words such as *eteri*, *Aruseri*, *Ѳuceri*, *Hameri-ś*, *Plaϑeri-ś*, *Acri*, *Ѳefri*,
Laucri, *Supri*, and Latin *Casinerius*, *Volanerius*, *Haterius* (p. 40).

eteri can be left out of consideration, the termination not being *-eri*,
but, as shown by *etera*, simply *-i*. And the formation of the proper
names mentioned above is not clear. If the appellatives ending in *-eri*
were nominatives, it would be rather surprising that they should only
occur in that case-form, considering their comparatively great number. So
long as we do not find a genitive ending in *-eris* (as in the case of the
names cited), or a locative in *-eriϑ*, I shall hold to my own explanation —
which is also based on other considerations — that *manimeri* is some case
form of *manim*; *spureri* of *spur*; *meϑlumeri* of *meϑlum*; *ceχaneri* of
ceχane, and so forth.

Indexes.

A. List of the Etruscan Inscriptions Quoted.

3965	p. 35, 39.	4325	p. 35.
4081	» 35.	4537	» 35.
4114	» 35.	4549	» 35.
4144	» 35.	4578	» 35.
4145	» 35.	4624	» 36.
4201	» 35.	4725	» 36.

B. List of Etruscan Words.

acil	p. 31.	zilaχnuce	p. 24, 29.
aϑean	» 32.	zilc, zilχ	» 24.
aϑre	» 44.	zilci	» 28.
aisera	» 12.	zileteraia	» 47.
aitu	» 40.	zinace	» 31.
aliqu	» 32.	zince	» 31.
am	» 18.	ziχ	» 31.
ana	» 33.	ziχne	» 32.
ar	» 18.	ziχu	» 32.
at	» 42, 59.	ziχuχe	» 31.
atar	» 40, 42.	heva	» 12.
ataris	» 49.	hevn	» 12.
ateri	» 49.	huvi	» 8.
ativu	» 40, 45.	husil	» 31.
atiu	» 40.	ϑun	» 6.
afrs	» 8.	ϑura	» 64.
ca	» 19.	ia, ie	» 3, 18.
cezp	» 53.	ic	» 3, 11.
ceia hia	» 3.	icevis	» 11.
cepen	» 17.	iχ	» 17.
ceχaneri	» 25.	iχutevr	» 17.
cialaϑ	» 13.	lautn eteri	» 47, 64.
cianil	» 13.	lu	» 7, 19.
ciz, cizi	» 10.	lur, lursϑ	» 7, 19.
ecnia	» 18.	man	» 10.
cvi	» 11.	mar	» 19.
evitiuras	» 11.	marcalurca	» 19.
ez	» 9.	marunuχva	» 25.
eϑ	» 18.	menica	» 18, 19.
eis	» 19.	menitla	» 16.
eprϑieva	» 1.	meχl, meχlum	» 29.
eprϑne, eprϑnevc	» 1.	mlaχϑanra	» 18.
eprϑni	» 3.	mlaχuta	» 33.
etera	» 35, 64.	mulveni	» 18.
eterav	» 46.	naces	» 8.
etru	» 50.	neϑs'ras	» 34.
va	» 3, 11.	nesl	» 10.
vacil	» 31.	nurϑ	» 53.
ziz	» 31.	par	» 46, 57.
ziiace	» 31.	parχis	» 48.
zilaϑ	» 20.	purϑ	» 3.