

ETRUSCAN INTERPRETATION.¹

BY FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN.

STUDENTS of antiquity, equally with those who pursue modern science, are glad of sympathy from the unlearned public; a sympathy which is aroused and sustained by getting partial glimpses of the success obtained, or at least of the problems undertaken. For this reason, an attempt to lay before our readers any information which can be had concerning the Etruscan language, is not untimely. Perhaps most students take more interest in the peculiar sculpture and pottery of Etruria, often very beautiful, joined as it is with mingled Greek and Etruscan mythology, than in the language, of which so minute a fraction is known. Yet the present article deals with that very matter, being in some sense a continuation of one which appeared in the *Fraser* of July last. In the interval the writer has been able, with much delay, to possess himself of Fabretti's large work. To have the best accessible and completest record of the inscriptions is of course of first-rate advantage; but alas! the Glossary is a mere Index, giving one little information of any word but that it is 'vox ignota Etruscæ originis.'

It may be well to put in front the very few words reputed to be known, omitting those which are not found in the inscriptions:

- Clan, Clen, a son or daughter.
- Sec, Sex, a daughter.
- Tusurθi, a wife; perhaps *conjux*, of either gender.
- Tusurθir, *conjuges*.
- Ril, year.
- Avil, age (= ævum).
- Fleres, a gift or offering.
- Aiser, a god.
- Etera, Eteri, second.
- Front, lightning (or thunder?).
- Trutnut, a haruspex or Etruscan augur.
- Turuce, Turce, gave.

- Puia, a girl, damsel?
- Puic, a boy?
- Cehen, Cen, this?
- Mi, I or Me.
- Esmi, am, as in Doric Greek.

We must note the similarity of Front to *βροντή*. The Rev. Isaac Taylor seems to me rightly to explain Alpan as a *gift*, and Zilaθ, Zilax, Zilaxnu, as a verb which means *is buried*, especially in a stone coffin. Also Lupu, *died, obiit*.

To this short list we may add a few words supposed to be ascertained from the bronze mirrors, which have basso relievos at the back, and names on or near the figures. It is not certain that they are not mythological *proper* names.

- Lasa, fairy.
- Naθum, fate.
- Vanθ, death (angel of?).
- Culmu, a fury.
- Hinθial, a ghost.
- Maris, a genius.

Θanr seems to mean the *nymphs* of Diana: whence I infer that Θana, the commonest of female names, meant a *nymph*. Hence also the well-known name Tanaquil, Θanaxuil, its diminutive; quasi *nympha-cula*. Yet from it again came a man's name, Tanaquilo. In 803, under foot of a cup, is written, Θanursi, 'to the nymphs; *qu.* to the ladies.'

That Mi is either nomin. or accus., like French *moi*, being simply emphatic, many inscriptions on small articles prove.

On a golden buckle (2148):

- Mi Mamerse Lartesi,
- Me Mamercus (?) Larti (dedit).

On two silver cups (2405, 6):

- Mi Lartia
- Me Lartia (or Lartius?) fecit.

But Mi Θanas, *Ego Θanæ* (sum).

What is meant by *Mi ma* is not clear. May it be a repetition, as in

¹ *Italian Inscriptions*, by Ariodante Fabretti. Aug. Taurinorum ex officinâ regiâ. *Etruscan Bologna*, by Richard Burton. Smith & Elder, 1876. *Etruscan Res. archæ.* by Rev. Isaac Taylor. Macmillan & Co., 1874.

French 'moi je suis,' for emphasis? But nearly all the inscriptions beginning with Mi or Mi ma are imperfect.

A few other words await explanation. Via seems to mean *female*, but it might mean *widow*, or something else. Clate, Clante, Clantl (if the letters are right), Claniu, Clantunia, are either diminutives (as *κνλιον*), or else mean *grand-child*: indeed, Nefis (masc.) and Nefni (femin.) remind one of Latin *nepos* and *neptis*, yet may perhaps mean priest and priestess: *flamen*? Lautn, Lautni, are sometimes the proper name Lautinius; but I think they are oftener a common noun, which I incline to render *heir*. Lautni etera (*hæres secundus*?) is not uncommon; else with a genitive, as *Vipis lautni*, *Vibii hæres*: the Etruscan genitive singular ordinarily ends in -s. The diminutive Lautnescle is found, and I tentatively render Lautnescle *caesari*, *hæredulus publicus* (the official assignee or executor?); Lautni *precus*, *hæres primus*; Lautnizivas, *hæredii* or *hæreditatis*. But these are only my unproved conjectures. Prumaθ or Prumaste seems also to me to mean *princeps*. 'Hulu' in 230 looks like a noun of relationship, or else of office.

Fabretti, whose numbering of the inscriptions I follow, further recognizes that a dative case ends in -si, and ablative feminine in -al, and a diminutive in -ula and *χουλα* (=cula of Latin). Another diminutive is manifestly in -icla or -escle. Mr. I. Taylor rightly claims a plural of nouns in -r, -ir, -ar. If Tusurθir did not suggest it to the Italians, it is strange. To this I add a genitive plural in -um and -sum (as will soon appear), analogous to *Lapid-um* and *Domino-rum*.

In the July number of *Fraser* some protest was made against the delusion into which Mr. Taylor would plunge us by his Turanian zeal; but to new readers a short summary of the position may be proper. Mr. Taylor thinks he can prove that the Etruscan numerals, which certainly

cannot be accounted 'Aryan,' have distinct similarities to Finnish, Siberian, or Mongolian numerals. Hence he pronounces that Etruscan is a 'Turanian' language, and proceeds to infer the meaning of the words by appealing at pleasure to any language included in that miscellaneous group. Let us take a parallel case.

Suppose that we had many Welsh inscriptions or books, but had lost all knowledge of the language. On gathering up the Welsh numerals, it would quickly appear that they are Indo-Germanic. Imagine then an eager student to infer the sense of the Welsh words by picking at random from any or every Indo-European language words that sounded more or less like this or that Welsh word! How any sensible man could fall into such an absurdity, is a mystery. As well explain (with the sailor of our jest books) *cheval* to be a *shovel*, and *chapeau* a chopper, in French. But concerning Numerals it may be added, that the group of languages which Prichard entitled Hebræo-African—including, with Babylonian, Syriac and Arabic, the two Abyssinian tongues, Amharic and Tigré, also the Lybian group (specifically named Zouave, Tuarick or Tamashgeht, Shilha and Ghadamsi)—have similarities and analogies very striking, which unite them as closely as the Aryan languages are united; yet the Lybian native numerals differ from those of Arabic. At the same time, as was mentioned already, the Zouaves have abandoned their native numerals and have borrowed the Arabic. So futile is it to trust to any single likeness or difference.

The numerals on the Toscanelli dice were already explained as follows by Campanari—which reduces Mr. Taylor's achievement to a narrow limit:

Max, one.	Huθ, four.
Θu, two.	Ci, five.
Zal, three.	Sa, six.

But Mr. Taylor insists that Ci means two. I think he seized a right clue,

and deserves credit for it. He further interprets Θu to be *five*, and reverses the interpretation of $Hu\theta$ and Sa . $Sesf$ he supposes to mean *seventeen*, but its near similarity to Coptic $Sashbe$ strongly suggests that it means *seven*; and since in Coptic Ti or Tiu means *five*, this somewhat confirms Mr. Taylor's interpretation of Θu . The Italians were led astray by the Latin *duo*. If we have got the true letters, $Cezpa$ and $Ceptafe$ seem to be numerals; perhaps even $Uple$; for in Fabretti 2104 we read, 'Avils sas amce uples,' where Sas and $Uples$ seem in concord with $Avils$. But nothing further is proved. In a bilingual inscription $Ael\chi e$ is interpreted *Quintus*; which suggests that $Al\chi al$ means *ten*, as abridged from $Al\chi -al\chi$, five-five; but Mr. Taylor will have it that $Al\chi$ means *ten* and $Al\chi al$ *twenty*. If so, $max semf al\chi al$ would mean 141, where 71 must assuredly have been meant as a man's age. $Cezpal\chi al$ may be 90 years; nay, $Cezp$ for *nine* might come from Ci , $Sesf$, i.e. $2 + 7$. But all beside is obscure.

That Ci means *two*, Mr. Taylor infers (justly, I think) from an important inscription, of which he ill explains the syntax, besides other obvious error. The word $Arce$ seems to me to be a verb. $Lupu$ with $Lupuce$, $Zilaxnu$ with $Zilax-nuce$, and the verb $Turce$ $Turuce$ (*dedit*) suggest that $-ce$ is a verbal ending, as in $\epsilon\delta\omega -\kappa\epsilon$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega -\kappa\epsilon$. If $Mi esmi$ (Fabr. 2609 *bis*) be rightly translated, 'moi je suis,' the passage from the root Es to Er in Latin Est , $Er-at$, would make it possible that $Ar-ce$ meant *Erat*. It is found once beside; but I rather incline in both places to render it *Habuit*. The word $Manim$ recurs only in the apparent plural $Manimeri$, words for which I can conjecture $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ of Greek—'that other one,' 'those others.' This will give a bearable sense. In the word $Vls-si$ the V is written nearly as Hebrew \beth , and is supposed corrupt for C , which has nearly the form of

Hebrew \beth . With this small correction, the inscription runs thus, and seems to me interpretable: Fabr. 2055.

1. Aleθnas V. V. Oelo zilaθ parxis :
2. zilaθ eterav clenar ci,
Acananasa C(e)l(u)s(a)-si :
3. zilaχnu Celusa ril xxiiii papalser,
Acananasa vi :
4. manim arce ril lxviii.

1. Alesii Veli (filius) Velus Oelo cubat
primo-in-loco :
2. cubat secundo-in-loco liberi duo,
Acananasa Celusa-que :
3. sepelitur Celusa annis xxiv completis.
Acananasa vi :
4. ille-alter (viz. Velus Oelo) habuit
annos lxviii.

$Oelo$ is not known as a name. If it can be a corruption of the Latin word *filius* (which is not impossible), the translation would run, *Alesii Veli Velus filius cubat*, &c. But, whatever else be here doubtful, I think Mr. Taylor makes out his case that Ci means *two*, for the two daughters $Acananasa$ and $Celusa$ must be meant, and we know that Ci is one of the six first digits. Mr. Taylor has also the merit of insisting that $Clenar$ is the plural of $Clan$ or $Clen$, whereas the Italians have supposed it to be a singular, meaning *genus*. It is pretty certain that $Etera$ in Etruscan (as in Umbrian) means *second* [not *younger* or *young*, as Mr. Taylor says]; hence I conjecture $Eterav$, 'in second place,' and by contrast, $Parxis$, 'in first place.' In one passage of the Iguvian inscription I had rendered $-si$ as the equivalent of Greek $\tau\epsilon$, Latin $-que$; whether this aids my present conjecture is doubtful. $Papalser$, I think, must go with Ril to make syntax: *annos habens* or *annis peractis* would alike give the thought. But $Papalser$ looks like a plural and has a reduplication reminding one of Greek $\kappa\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; moreover, the likeness of $Papals$ to $\kappa\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\sigma-$ suggests that the widely diffused root $\pi\lambda\eta$, $\pi\omicron\lambda$, Lat. *Plē*, Engl. *Fill*, *Full*, may be Pal in Etruscan. To the principle of reduplication I shall advert again under the word $Cexase$, below. If

Parxis really mean *primo-in-loco*, we shall of course compare Pro of Greek and Latin, Fur, Fore of Teutonic, with the Etruscan Par.

So much is my effort to establish that Ci means *two*. Let us now go back to a new beginning and study the variations of Etruscan names. A very large field here opens to us. Out of inscriptions numbered above 2600, by far the largest part consists nearly of proper names, modified by special laws. As in Latin a fifth son was at some time called Quintus, next, by giving to the eldest son of this Quintus his father's name, Quintus became a personal name; and, from this again, Quintus as a family name was derived; and, further, from the last might come Quintianus, when by adoption a man passed into a new family; we readily expect like transformations among the Etruscans. Indeed, as the Etruscan civilization was earlier by five or six centuries than that of Rome, it is likely enough that Rome borrowed from Etruria the system of elaborate family names. Evidently the Etruscans go far beyond the Romans in careful enumeration. They habitually record in their epitaphs the name of the mother, and on costly stone coffins, it would seem, sometimes the names of grandparents. The following I translate by pure conjecture, though not without reasons concerning the syntax, which cannot here be detailed. Fabretti, 2070:

1. Arnθ Xurcles Larθal clan,
2. Ramθas Pevtnial,
3. zilc parxis amce maranux.

1. Aruns, Hercules e Lartiā filius,
2. (quæ) Rantii (erat) e Peutiniā,
3. cubat primo-in-loco prope angulum.

Here, it would seem, the parents of Lartia, mother of Aruns, are recorded—viz. Ramθa or Rantius and Peutinia. Nearly as this is 2057 (on a stone coffin adorned with sculptures), Aelxe Aleθnas Arnθal clan, θanxvilusc Ruvfial, zilax . . . i.e. Quintus, Alesii ex Aruntia filius, Tanaquilii quæ (erat) e Ruvfid, cubat

. . . . But the following (2071) is in different order:

1. Larθ Xurcles Arnθal,
2. Xurcles θanxvilusc
3. Cracial clan.
1. Lars, Hercules ex Aruntia.
2. Hercules τοῦ Tanaquilii
3. e Græciā (Gracchiā?) filius.

θanxvilus is the genitive of θanxvilu. The final c, here and elsewhere, I am able to interpret as a definite article suffixed, which can have the force of a relative. Here, it seems, a father Hercules had by Aruntia a son Hercules, who for distinction was called Hercules the Tanaquilo. His son, by Graicia or Graccha, was the Lars here buried. If this be the true interpretation, the parents of the father are here named *before* the father. In 2070 the parents of the mother seem to be named *after* the mother.

Still longer pedigrees are found. What of the following, graven on the stone coffin 2322? Ravnθus: Felcial: Felces: Arnθal: Larθial: Vipenal: Seθres: Cuθnas: puia. Here the girl (puia=puella?) is so young that her own name is not given, but her father is Seθre Cuθna, her mother Lartia Vibenna; whose parents (it seems) were Felce and Aruntia, while the parents of Felce were Raunto and Felcia. But we have to learn how to group names thus prodigally enumerated.

But in general the inscriptions are very simple, and almost always dry in the extreme. No personal affection, no moral thought oozes out; not even *vir optimus* or *femina lectissima* varies the monotony. Once only (on a sepulchre) is 'clan cexase' (2280), which we may render *filius dilectus*. We must infer that the epitaphs are the composition of the sculptors, to whom the family pedigree was handed. Sometimes only the mother's name, or only the father's, is added to that of the deceased, as:

- { Fasti . Afunei . Varnal,
- { Fastia Aponia e (matre) Varia.
- { Larθi . Ani . Cafates,
- { Lartia Annia Cafatii (filia).

When only the name of the buried person is read, it may often be doubted whether the whole inscription is preserved. Such are *Ramtha Euenei*, *Ranta Euenia*; *Θana Cainei*, &c. Indeed, who shall guarantee to us that a multitude of such scraps on broken tiles are not fraudulent inventions made for sale? Fraud has evidently been much at work, but happily it can do little harm. In general it does but copy what exists. When it attempts originality it quickly betrays itself. The standard type of ordinary inscriptions mentions simply both parents in the order *Aruns, Tarquiniū Lartise Fannia*; or, what is equivalent, *Aruns Tarquinius, Lartis e Fannia*; son and father having the same name *Tarquinius*. Also without the father's *prænomen*; as, *Aule Tarxnas Larthal* clan, *Aulus Tarquiniū e Lartia filiū*. But in the elaborate inscriptions we find bolder transposition. A surname of the deceased follows his parents' name, as with the Latins; or his name is between that of his father and mother—as *Camnas Larθ Larthals Atnal* clan; which I venture to translate, *Camnæ* (or *Camii*) *Lars Lartialisa i ex Atinia* (or *Atia*) *filius*. Such names as *Lartha-lisa* are called 'matronymics,' having the aspect of being derived from a mother *Lartha*. But I think the instance before us shows that such surname did not necessarily point at an immediate mother. The mother here was *Atinia*: the *c* after *Atnal* may be rendered in Latin *qui . . . (erat)*. But we must dwell a little on single names. That Etruscans, if they came from Asia Minor, should have brought with them names such as *Aty, Api, Atale, Tantle, Acsi* ("Αξιος), is quite natural; and, as soon as they became acquainted with Homeric legends and Greek mythology, we need not wonder if they adopted the names *Herme, Tresia, Clauce* (Γλαυκός), *Acile* (Αχιλεύς), *Ataina* (Αθηνα), *Athenata* (Αθανασία), *Cupsle* (Κύπελος); but *Antipater* and *Clopatra* suggest Mace-

donian times. Fabretti wishes to identify that common Etruscan name *Larθ* (*gen. Lartes*) with Greek *Laertes*, because Sophocles calls *Ulysses* son of *Lartius*. But the likeness may be accidental. The remarkable name *Amrithia* (for which the Greek has *Αμβροσία*), on the other hand, is more like Sanscrit. The name *Hercules* appears as *Xurχle, Xurcle, Hercle, and Ercole*, perhaps in different ages. *Ercole* and *Elinai* for *Heracle* and *Helenè* suggest a time when the Greeks were ceasing to pronounce initial *H*. On the back of a vast number of Etruscan bronze mirrors Greek names are deprived of *c* final, which shows that it was not usual in Etruscan names; yet there are such, as *Fufuns, Seθlans*, comparable to Latin participles in *-ans*; and *Turms, Turmus*, with genitive *Turmucas*. Some inscriptions given us as Etruscan look very like Italian Greek or corrupt Greek. Thus 481, *Aixe euturpa altria θalna*, suggests *αι κε* or *αιθε εν τερροθη αλτρια θάλνα*; likewise 344 (which is said to give the words of a man 'bidding death-farewell to a woman'), *θαφα αλκι λαολ νικαι*, appears to mean *τάφου αλκή λαόν νικῶ*. The fragment 355 ends with *uxsiemulence*, which looks very like *ὄψε* or *ὕψε ἐμολε νίκη*: thus we have to beware of Greek intermixture. Fabretti presses 2048, '*Mi Kalairu fuius*,' in proof that *fuius* (= Greek *νίος*) means *son* in Etruscan; while he interprets the words to be *ειμι Καλαιροῦ νίος*, with a pure Greek genitive. In Italian-Greek he shows that *huihos* was written for *νίος*. Passing from Greek to Latin, beyond question, after the conquest of Etruscan towns by the Romans, the tide was sure to turn, and a Latin influence on Etruscan names to begin. Of this there are clear traces. Moreover, from the beginning, when Etruscans settled on Umbrian soil, and took Umbrian wives, the language of the conquered people would without fail work up. Thus we have a complex

and difficult question in deciding what peculiarities, and indeed what words, are purely Etruscan. Still, certain matters seem clear.

From a personal name, as Petru, Pumpu, Tlabu, Carcu, the Etruscans made a family name by adding *-na* or *-nia*, Petrunia, Pumpunia, Tlabonia, Carcna, Carcunia. From Marce (*Marcus*) we have *Marcna* and *Maricana*, perhaps both pronounced alike; for the Etruscans, like the Phœnicians, omit at pleasure at least short vowels. The termination *-na* is characteristic: thus, to a Roman the names Porsena or Porsenna, Cinna, Aleθna, Velθina, Anna, Spurrinna, Porperna, Rasena, at once suggested Etruscans. We find many feminine ablatives in *-nal*, as Cainal, Varnal, Tlesnal, which are family names derived from a simpler origin, Caie, Vare, Tlese. (Initial *Tl* is more Greek than Latin.) The termination *-ennius* of Latin names has in Etruscan a very common representative, only by dropping *-us*. Petruni, Pumpuni were mentioned above: so Trebuni, Afuni, Aχuni. It would seem that the chief adjectival endings of Greek and Latin exist in the Etruscan names, as *-co*, *-cio*, *-ano*, *-ino*, *-uno*, *-umno*, *-ati*, *-iti*, *-uti*, *-ure*, *-ali*, *-ile*, besides the terminations *-asa*, *-esa*, *-isa*, *usa* (oftenest feminine), and diminutions in *-ule*, *-χuil*, *-icla*. Married women often took a surname ending in *-asa*, *-esa*, *-isa*, *-usa* from their husbands; as when the wife of a Lecne (Licinius) is called Lecnesa (Licinissa). But the names of men certainly sometimes ended in *-esa* or *-isa*; and we find Acnanasa as the name of a girl who dies at the age of six. The family names of women oftenest ended in *-ei*, which perhaps was written for *-eia* and changeable to *-ia*. The Etruscans certainly did not borrow *this* from the Romans, and are not likely to have borrowed any of the system. Moreover, they admitted a double prænomen, as do the English and

the Bengalees; but the Romans during the republic did not. From the conquered Umbrians the Etruscans never would have borrowed institutions with which the names of clans and families were connected. Hence the whole Etruscan nomenclature, with its organized adjectival endings closely akin to that of Greek and Latin, must be esteemed native. Mr. Taylor would persuade us that the termination of *Rumax* (=Romanus) points to a 'Turanian' origin: but the adjectival terminations *-acus*, *-eicus*, are common enough in these Aryan tongues. It is of interest to examine the Etruscan names derived from nations and towns, of which *Rumax* is but one. Thus Latini, Um(b)ra, Umria, Umrana, Venete, Laucan, Sinunial (from Senones?), Kelhua, Sapini (from Sabino?), Puinei (from Pœnus), Campane, Velχe (from Volsci?), Velχina, Velcina, Velcitia, Velzina [*z* sounded as *bur sh*? compare *Larthia*, *Lartia*, *Larza*, the same name], Camura, Camurina: from *Uria*, *Urinati*; so *Sentinati*, *Petinate*, *Atinate*, *Carpnate*; all like to Latin *-ate* and Greek *-αιος*. This survey of names savours much more of Aryan than of Turanian connection.

A protest, written some twenty years ago by Francis Pulszley, an accomplished native of Hungary, and a Sanscrit student, deserves here to be reproduced. Under the name Turanian a mass of very diverse languages is embraced, and those who have once got hold of a common name are apt to forget the enormous contrasts. He says that the relation of the Hungarian to the languages called Aryan is not yet sufficiently determined, some of the forms and affixes being identical, and others different. 'At any rate' (he adds), 'no conscientious philologist can dispose of the Hungarian language by *jumbling* it together with the Chinese and Mongol, or even with the Dravidian languages, into *one unwieldy heap*, in order to designate them as Tu-

ranian.' Surely the same protest is needed concerning the Etruscan.

So far as we can get any insight into the *syntax* of the Etruscan, and the order which the words naturally assume in composition, the analogy to Greek and Latin is very striking. Mere imitation in this respect, whether of Umbrian or of Latin, would have been impossible, had not the primitive organism of Etruscan conduced to the result. In the *Fraser* of July I illustrated this, in such syntax as 'Aulesi Metelis Velus Vesial clensi,' for Aulo, Metelli Veli e Vesia filio—but the topic deserves amplification. Indeed, having been led on beyond my original intention, and bestowed time on the study, it is proper to contribute whatever gleams of light and of partial knowledge I seem to have attained. I shall not shrink from any bold conjectures which may suggest truth to others, where I fail of it myself.

In 2058, on a coffer, is read, Larθ. Aleθnas Aθnθαl Ruvfiac clan; in which the only doubt is concerning the final -c after Ruvfiac. I interpret it as before, namely, as *qui* or *quæ*, *est* or *erat*, which may refer to any antecedent. But here the Greek article in *opposition* to Ruvfiac suffices. Then the translation is, Lars, Alesii ἐξ 'Αθανασίας τῆς 'Ρουφίας filius. Not only is this order of words striking, but it is not fixed in grammar—I mean, no fixed order is compulsory, as in Turkish; but we have plentiful proof that the Etruscan arrangement was flexible. In 1915, where numerous unknown words appear, we find in contiguity . . . precuthurasi Larθialisvle Cestnal clenarasi . . . Here I hold it certain, that the first and last word are in concord, each being the dative plural. I suspect that Precus means *primus*, or eldest, but (whatever it means) its gen. sing. is Precuthus, and nom. pl. Precuthur; thus the syntax must be that of 'natu-maximis Lartialisvli e Cestiniā liberis.' The ordinary gen. sing. is

in -es, but here the genitive of the diminutive *-isvle* is *-isvle*. Moreover, the dative plural in *-asi* (indeed *-rasi*) reminds one of Homer's *παῖδεςσι*, *ἀλόχοισι*, &c. [Evidently *v* is often our vowel *u*; perhaps for Etruscan *u* we ought always to write *o*, as in Greek and in old Latin.]

The structure in the following is remarkable. It will be seen how the verb is reserved to the end. A genitive plural in *-um* and *-uumum*, as in Latin *lapidum* and *dominorumum*, cannot be overlooked. First contemplate the inscription itself (2033 bis). As judged by the sculpture, it was 'over a youth'; but it rather seems, it was over a princely boy seven years old.

1. Vel. Leinies. Larθial
2. ruica. Arnθialum clan
3. Velusum prumasθ
4. avils sesfs lupuce.

Ruica is a wholly unknown word. At first sight it seems to be an adjective agreeing with Clan: then the structure is,

1. Vclus, Leinii e Lartia,
2. antiqua Aruntiadam progenies;

making a double genitive with progenies, which has to be taken twice. If final *-ca* of Ruica be the definite article, or relative, Rui may even be an adverb, meaning *ex-antiquo*, *quondam*, as easily as an adjective, by rendering Ruica, *ex-antiquo-qui* (*erat*). If the double genitive be thought inadmissible, perhaps the relative *-ca* may be feminine, or, what is virtually the same, may refer to the nearest antecedent Larθia. To exhibit the possible syntax, let me suppose that Rui means a *descendant* (ἀπόγονος) or one akin (σύγγονος), then in Greek we very neatly express *-ca* by the article τῆς, thus:

1. Βέλος, Λεινίου ἐκ Λαρτίας
2. ἀπογόνου-τῆς 'Αροντιδων παῖς.

But Rui not being in concord with the ablative Larθial, the Etruscan has a truer parallel in a Latin relative, thus:

1. *Velus, Leinii e Lartia,*
2. *gentilis que (erat) Aruntiadam, filius;*

after which the syntax of 3 and 4 is clear enough :

3. *Veliorum princeps,*
4. *etatis septem [anno VII] decessit.*

It is here disclosed that the Etruscans recognised groups of relationship which we did not suspect ; as, the Aruntiades, or descendants of some great lady Aruntia, and the Velii, [or relatives of some eminent Velus. As for Prumas θ , it is almost too like Greek. Elsewhere we have the name Prumastni, as if from Προμαθεύς : but here it must be a common noun, and in another inscription of the same crypt (mutilated alas!) we have 'Velusum . . . mestum . . . prumest,' analogous to Gothic 'frumest,' first, and Greek πρώτιστος. If Prumas θ or Prumaste be pure Etruscan, it is of much importance: but since Promo is Umbrian for Latin primo, it is possible that Prumaste may have been adopted from the Umbrians. Be this as it may, we have here two genitives plural in striking analogy to Latin and Greek, &c.

I seem to detect the word Cisum to mean *duorum* in 2340, unluckily fragmentary. But the close of it is so far complete as to suggest a conjectural translation. Let it be premised that Clan, Clen are rendered by Latin *natus, gnatus*. Clan formerly seemed to me distantly connected with the Gaelic Clionne; but the words Clate and Clel are against the idea that *n* in Clan is radical.

It may be suspected that Clel or Cal (of which presently) is the true root, analogous to Gna, Gen, and to Teutonic Kna, Kin. Now, in 2340 we read : 'Clalum Ce(isinie) s ci clenar. . . . ; lupum avils (m)axs mealyisc. . . . Evidently *Clalum* and *Lupum* are parallel plural verbs comparable to $\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$, $\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$, except that *Clalum* is passive. I seem able to fill up the thought as follows, but do not now trouble the reader with all my

reasons : 'Nati-sunt Ceisinii duo filii uno-in partu ; decessere etatis xxi (?) eodem in die (?) una.' It seems that both died together, and at the same age ; therefore they were twins ; a fact which suggests the meaning of the unknown words. But the inference which I immediately press is, that the verbal termination -um is comparable to -ov, 3rd p. pl. of 2nd aorist in Greek. *Lupu, Lupum*, are parallel to $\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\epsilon$, $\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$. If *Clel* mean *genuit*, *Clelum* might be *genuerunt* ; and we see the passive *Clalum* (*nati sunt*) distinguished by change of vowel, as $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\omicron\nu$, $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\eta\nu$. Of course this needs corroboration ; as a hint, it may aid. But are *Lupu* and *Lupuce* identical in tense ? If we may compare them to the two Aorists of Greek, $\epsilon\delta\omega$ and $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$, $\epsilon\theta\eta$ and $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$, the analogy will be startling. But we must wait a while patiently. Let a digression be allowed concerning the method of investigation. Our problem is similar to that of a child learning its mother tongue. The meaning of words is revealed by gestures ; and a matter of first importance is, to know what sounds express nouns and what verbs, or other parts of speech. If that be made out, gestures quickly give a rough meaning, and repetition with small variations soon settles it more sharply. Our immense disadvantage is twofold : first, we have no one to make gestures—we only pick up from the sculptures, or rather from the report of them, some vague idea ; next, instead of frequent repetitions of words in diverse connection, very many important words occur but once or twice. We can but watch for sentences which have fewest unknown words, and guess these. We must despair of learning certainly concerning more than a very few vocables ; but if we can discriminate which are nouns and which verbs, fortunate sentences may suggest probable guesses ; and, one helping another, we might at length find similarities in some known language, and then get

further help from it. This is only a bare possibility; but it is clear to me that we have not as yet at all exhausted all that by this elementary method may be worked out of the inscriptions themselves—I do not say with certainty, but with probability. Our first effort must be to settle the *syntax* of sentences, without which we shall make ridiculous guesses, mistaking perhaps an adverb for a verb, or pronoun for an adjective.

The Rev. Isaac Taylor has shown as much skill in selecting inscriptions to comment on, as errors in commenting. He sometimes comes so near to the right thing, as irresistibly to suggest to others what he misses himself. This I attribute to his Turanian craze, and to his astonishing recklessness as to *syntax*. But I proceed to argue largely from the very inscriptions which he has produced.

On a small bronze statue (804) is inscribed, 'Utni θufulθasa turce.' Turce (*dedit*) must have a person's name for nominative. This is evidently *Utni*, which (as we see in 857) is in Latin *Otanes* . . . an Asiatic name? The object given is the statuette, expressed by θufulθasa, which may be here conjecturally rendered *imaginem*. Thus we get as a translation,

Otanes imaginem dedit.

In 1054, on a bronze lamp, we find the word θuplθas, which all allow to be a mere variety for θufulθas—

A. Vels. Cus. θuplθas alpan turce.

Here the giver is named first: *alpan* appears to be the accusative after the verb, and θufulθas is a genitive dependent on *alpan*. The Rev. Isaac Taylor renders *alpan* 'a tribute.' I prefer his suggestion of *munus* or *debitum*, and interpret it provisionally as 'a gift.' Then we have,

Aulus Veli (filius) Cossus imaginis munusculum dedit.

But we see that θufulθas here refers to a bronze lamp, not to a bronze statuette. Perhaps, then, it means

anything moulded of metal. In 1051,

V. Cuinti. Arntias. Culpiansi alpan turce.

Here all is clear except the sex of two names.

Velus Quintius Aruntii (filius) Culpiano munusculum dedit.

else,

Vela Quintia Aruntiae (filia)

Since the gift consists of two bronze girls, wholly naked, I rather believe that the giver was a man; so that Cuinti and Arntia are masculine names. Quintius, son of (*a mother*) Aruntia, would be expressed by Cuinti Arnθial or Arnθal, I believe. In parenthesis, it may here be named that Fabretti seems to assume that names in *-ia* must needs be feminine. No doubt they generally are, as Latin names in *-a*; yet Agrippa, Porsenna are masculine, and I think in the following (which do not stand alone) *Velia* or *Veilia* is the father, *Caia* the mother:

1129. Larθ Acsis Veilias Caeal clan }
Lars Arii Veilia e Caiā filius. }

1131. Larθ Acsis Velias Caeal etera }
Lars Arii Velia e Caiā secundus }
(filius).

In 2603 *bis*, we read on a small bronze statue what is now easy to translate in substance, since Suetonius tells us that with the Etruscans *Aiser* meant 'god.'

Tite Alpnas turce aiseras θufficla trutvecie. Titus Alfii (filius) dedit dei imagunculam auspiciatum.

Whether to render *Alpna* by *Alfius* or *Alpinus* is doubtful; but here unimportant. That the termination *-icla* implies a diminutive noun, it may seem strange that anyone could overlook. The termination is found with this sense in Umbrian as well as Latin. *Aiseras* (*dei*) is evidently genitive singular dependent on the accusative. For *Trutvecie*, the rendering 'auspicious' is my conjecture, based upon a bilingual inscription (69), which interprets *Trutnut*, *haruspex*. *Haruspex* is a Greek word, ἱεροσκόπος, not native Etruscan. The statuette

is supposed to represent a Lar, or little god.

Not unlike is 274, also on a bronze statuette, Eiceras $\theta u\theta$ cveia, which seems to be ill-copied. I will not rest an argument on corrections, but Fabretti regards it as certain that $\theta u\theta$ should be $\theta u\theta$, needing only a short stroke more than i. But besides, I venture to correct thus:—

Aiseras $\theta u\theta$ cvera;
Dei imago [parva?]

Thus we have, *nomin.* $\theta u\theta$, *gen.* $\theta u\theta$ bas, *accus.* $\theta u\theta$ basa; *dimin.* $\theta u\theta$ bia, for imago, imaginis, imaginem, imagunculam. If this be correct, we find an accusative in -a, as Greek $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\upsilon\pi\alpha$. I observe such words as Θ astal θ (asin Zouave, Θ amdint replaces the Arabic Medina or Medinat), which suggests that the verbal root may be Uful.

[So in 1247,8 we have, beyond doubt, Tsur θ i, *uxor*; usur or sur (jungo?) seems to be the root.]

We meet the word $\theta u\theta$ once more, and the sense here ascribed still holds good. Namely, on the left shank of a boy (1055) is inscribed:—

Velias : Fanacnal : $\theta u\theta$ bas
alpan : lenax ϵ : clen : ce χ a :
tu θ ines tlenax ϵ is.

Here, as before, $\theta u\theta$ bas alpan is the thing given, 'the gift of an image.' At first sight, we say, Velias must be a nominative case; Velias e Fanacia, Velias born of a mother Fanacia. This involves doubt. But, whatever the right detail, 'Velias Fanacnal' collectively yields the name of the giver. The receiver is Clen Ce χ a, abridged perhaps from Ce χ ase, which I venture to translate *Filium dilectum* or *Filiam dilectam*. The phrase at full appears on a beautiful statue (2280)

Laris, Pumpus Arn θ al clan ce χ ase,
Lars, Pomponis ex Arunti θ filius dilectus.

I have no sufficient proof that Ce χ ase means 'beloved'; but it is certainly an epithet. Mr. Taylor translates it *little*, which does not recommend itself. The combina-

tion recurs in 2613. Clen for Clan appears elsewhere; also Clens, Clenar for cases of the same.

But what now of Lenax ϵ , in 1055? This is necessarily the verb, which replaces Turce, *dedit*, and has a double accusative in Alpan, the object given, and Clen, the receiver. We at once observe the relation of Lenax ϵ to Tlenax ϵ is, which shows initial T forming a substantive from a verb, as probably Θ in $\theta u\theta$. In 2599, on a small brazen statue is inscribed—

Fleres tlenaces e ν er.

Tlenaces is plausibly identified with Tlenax ϵ is, for the aspirates never seem to change the sense. Fleres is believed to mean 'an offering.' E ν er seems to be its epithet. Above (on 274) I imagined Cveia to be incorrect for Cvera; whether you admit *parva* or *pulcra* to be the more reasonable guess, matters little. Let us take a second guess, and interpret 2599, . . . *Donum caritatis parvum*. For, evidently, Tlenaces must here be a genitive dependent on Fleres. Then recurring to 1055, we seek for a meaning in the verb Lenax ϵ suited to Tlenax ϵ , *caritas*. If we render Tlenax ϵ by the Greek $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ (and $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ suits as well as *caritatis*), $\epsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\alpha\omicron$ suggests itself as an admissible guess for Lenax ϵ —*gratificor*? kindly bestow? I observe that in 2613 even the verb Turce takes a double accusative; though to the sense of two words we have no clue. The letters are not all certain, but Fabretti exhibits it thus (on a laurelled statue of Apollo):

Mi : fleres : seulare : aritimi
Fasti : Ruifris : tree : clen : ce χ a.

The nominative to the verb Turce of Turuce is Fasti Ruifris, which seems to mean Fastia (Fausta), daughter of Ruifri: then fleres, the gift, and clen, her son, make a double accusative. The general idea then is:

*Me, donum [simulacrum laureatum]
Fastia Ruifris (filia), donavit filium
dilectum.*

This may reconcile us to a double accusative after *Lenaxē*, whether the last verb more closely mean *Delenit*, *Gratificatur*, or *Fovet*. The word *Tuñines* remains, which I regard as an epithet of *Tlenaxeis*; each is in the genitive. The word recurs on the cloak of 'The Orator,' where, as here, I interpret it by *sincere, true*. (If so, the Etruscan name *Tutna* may express the Latin *Venus*.) Thus we have a conjectural translation of 1055, exhibiting at least the syntax, if we admit that in Etruscan, as in Greek and Latin, a genitive may express an intention—with (as they say) *ērexa* or *ergo* understood. On the whole, we thus render 1055:

(Velias Fanacnal	θυfulθas alpan
{ Velians? e Fanacia	imagineis munusculo
lenaxē elen cexa	tuñines tlenaxeis.
<i>delenit filium dilectum sincere caritatis (ergo)</i>	

I can now show that my conjectural translation (in *Fraser*, July 1876) of the inscription on the Orator's cloak was not arbitrary (1922):

Aulesi. Metelis. Ve. Vesial. clensi
cen. feres. tece. sansl. Tenina
tuñines. xisulics.

The first line is very clear, Aulesi and clensi being datives in apposition, Aulo—filio. Ve., as usual in this position, is an abridged genitive, in apposition to the genitive *Metelis*. The Latins would not say *Scipio Publius* for *Publius Scipio*, but as the Greeks admit *Σκιπίων ὁ Πόπλιος*, so the Etruscans freely invert the order. *Vesial* being ablative feminine, the first line runs:

Aulo Metelli Veli e Vesia filio.

So in the great *Perusine* inscription:

Aulesi Velinas Arxnal clensi,
Aulo Volsinii ex Arrhiā filio.

In the second line, *feres* (*donum*) must be the accusative after the verb, which most probably is *tece*.

Its nominative can be nothing but *Tenina*, which I suppose to be a man's name. Far commoner is *Titina*, *Titinus*, from the personal name *Tite*, *Titus*. But there is also an Etruscan gens *Tinia*, common enough in the inscriptions, and in 1985 we probably have *Θania Tininis*, *Fannia Tininæ filia*, though *Passerius* mistook the final *s* (*M*) for *m*. Thus *Tininna* or *Teninna* is a good Etruscan name. *Cen* appears to be an epithet of *Feres*, and is generally identified with *Cehen*, and translated 'this.' I have no great confidence that this is right, but it does not affect the general sense or syntax. In *Tece* the interpreters, too anxious to find Greek on the surface, see *θηκε*, and render it *posuit*. There is also a suspicion afloat that *Tez* is a verb; and if *-ce* be a verbal ending, *Te* may be the root of *Tece*, as in Greek *Θε*, whatever the sense. In so well-preserved an inscription it may be rash to suppose that *R* has been misread into *E*, and that the true reading is *trce* for *turnce* (*dedit*). With no strong conviction I acquiesce in *Tece* (*posuit* or *fecit*). The last two words of the inscription are in the genitive and are only a variation of 'tuñines tlenaxeis' in 1055. A parent would bestow a gift as a mark of affection (*caritas*); *Teninna* might be satisfied with expressing friendship to *Anlus Metellus*: therefore I suggest *Xisulic*, 'friendship.' Here *-lic* answers well to our *-ship*, and indeed (the *Rev. Isaac Taylor* may be pleased to see) to the Turkish termination, as in *Pasha-lic*. But I add, we English have the same in *Wed-lock*. Thus the simpler *Xisu* would mean either *amicus* or *amo, diligo*. And here we seem to have the very root of *Cexase*, and a confirmation of the sense *dilectus*. A false light comes from Homer's *κεχαρισμένος*, but a true one by reduplication from *Xisu*. Is it possible that Greek *χρη* and Etruscan *Xisu* may be akin?

Another short digression con-

cerning aspirated consonants. The modern Greeks aspirate ΒΓΔ with no change in the meaning. The ancient Greeks would not admit aspirates in two successive syllables; hence *ραφή* for *θαφή*, and *κέχαδε* not *χέχαδε*. The Etruscans, on the contrary, write *Θεθις*, where the Greeks have *Θείρις* and *Τηθύς*: it is therefore the more remarkable to find them say *κεχασε* not *χεχασε*. But one may almost think it was matter of indifference to them whether they used *χ* or *κ*, *τ* or *θ*. Without searching, I quickly picked up the following double pronunciation of proper names:

Seθre, (Sefre) Setre.
Semθni, Sentni.
Suθrina, Sutrina.
Marcna, Maryna.
Larθ, Lart, Laris.
Larθia, Lartia, Larza.
Fesius, Fesius.
Velχina, Velzina, Velsina.
Venθnei, Ventnei.
Aχuni, Ahuni.
Xurχle, Xurele, Hercle.
Arθnal, Artinal.
Pecu, Preχu.

So in common nouns and verbs,

Tlenαχeis, Tlenaces.
Sec, Sex.
Suθina, Sutina, Sutna.
θufulθ, θupulθ.
Municleθ, Muncilet.

Thus we must not be microscopic in dealing with the aspirations. But to return to the inscription 1922:

The word Sansl remains to puzzle or instruct us. I find, on brass monuments only, the words Selvan, Selvansl, Selansl, Sansl, and Sl, perhaps a contraction. On some marble monuments the word Nesl occurs. Hence the suspicion arises, that the former words mean Brass, Brazen, Bronze, of Bright Copper (ex ære, ex Orichalco), and the latter, of marble. Thus as a provisional rendering, I obtain for 1922,

Aulo, Metelli Veli ex Vesia filio,
hoc donum fecit ex ære Teninna
sinceræ amicitiae (ergo).

What of 255, on a bronze statue?

Larce Lecne turce fieres uθurian Velθi.

Nothing is obscure but the word Uθurlan, which I cannot find elsewhere. It seems to be an epithet of Fleres, such as grateful, kind, acceptable. Velθi must be a dative case, apparently for Velesi, or rather for Velθesi; for there is a nomin. Velθα. Then we translate by

Largus Licinius dedit donum gratum (?)
Velθio.

But I must now treat in detail the words connected with Sansl. Whether final *l* marks the ablative, so that *ex ære* best expresses the grammar, or whether *-sl* is comparable to a Latin adjective in *-sile*, making *aheneum* a fitter translation, remains obscure. But on the second bronze girl (1052) we find:

V. Cuinti. Arntias. selansl. tez. alpan turce:
which admits a possible rendering:

Velus Quintius Aruntii (filius) ex orichalco
factum munusculum dedit.

This presumes *tez* to be a participle, from verb *Te*, *facere*, whence *Tece*, *fecit*; but whether *tez* be an abbreviated word, is not clear. This translation inclines to the view that the final *-sl* of *selansl* is a case-ending, or post-position.

Next, we have Selvansl (identical with Selansl?) on a bronze 'Lar,' it seems (2582):²

Canzate selvansl Leθanei Alpnu cen turce
Larθi.

To the verb *Turce* (*dedit*) the nominative is the feminine name *Leθanei*, the dative after the verb is apparently *Larθi*, which may stand for *Larθesi*, or *Lartesi*, if just now I rightly identified *Velθi*

² Also 2334, on a bronze boy, the word Selvansl and Cver are clearly read: but the inscription is too fragmentary to comment on.

with Velthesi.³ The thing given appears to be Canzate selvansl; and as the latter word has the force of an epithet, Canzate seems to be a substantive in the accusative. Mi cana (264, 349), both on marble statues, suggest either *Me posuit* or *sculpsit*. If Canzate come from a verb Cana, the verb would seem to mean *sculpsit* or *finxit*, so that Canzat may mean *effigies*, *accusat*. Canzate? I am informed that Xān in Sanscrit means to *dig*, whence easily is deduced to *hollow*, to *engrave*. That this can at all confirm the sense of *sculpsit* for Etruscan Cana, I dare not assert. Next, it is uncertain whether Alpnu be nominative, to join with Leθanei. It recurs 2505 bis, 2412, also Alpanu 2505 ter, on bronze mirrors, where it is accepted as the name of a nymph. The termination does not suggest the feminine sex; but perhaps here it may be rendered Alpina or Alfa. But what can *ecn* be, if Alpnu be a nominative? I must presently discuss Eca; but unless *ecn* be an adverb, it is apparently an adjective or demonstrative in the accusative, agreeing with Canzate. The prevalent belief is that Eca means *Hic, hæc, hoc*, or the adverb *hic*. I shall proceed to argue that it means Sacer or Pins. But I have no reason to think that Ecn can be accusative of Eca, rather it is emphatic for Cen, *this*: whence

Effigiem ex orichalco Leθania Alfa hancece dedit Larti.

In 78 we have on a bronze statuette, with the words all run together, Tsturce Ramθa Alfa tavi selvan.

If Tsturce is a single word, and Ts (Tes, Tis?) is a preposition compounded with the verb as Dedit, Condidit, this would be of much importance, if established. Ramθa Alfa is the lady giver;

Selvan appears to be a substantive, the thing given; *qu. bronze?* I cannot find Tavi again, nor any clue to the sense.

On the small bronze statue of a sitting boy, holding a bird (1930), we read:

Fleras zec sansl ceer.

The last word perhaps should be *ceer*, the difference of F and E being slight. Zec is a word wholly unknown, and not recurring. As a mere guess, try the Latin adverb Ecce, En! *behold*. Then the syntax is

Donum en ex ære parvum!

But what if Zec meant *tibi*? or *cape*?

Finally in 1055 bis, on a small bronze statue, we find

Larθia : Ateinei : fleres : puantirn sl : turce.

If Puia, Puia mean *puer, puella*, it is possible that Puantirn means *puerile*. If further Sl be contracted for Sansl, we obtain

Lartia Atinia donum puerile aheneum dedit.

This is wholly uncertain, and I rest nothing on it, barely observing, that we have as yet no *disproof* that Sansl means 'of bronze.'

Let us pass to a new and important topic. What does *Eca suθi* mean? Because in Oscan the pronoun answering to Latin *hic* has the forms Eka, Ekak, Ekask, Eka-sin, &c., learned men have been vehemently persuaded that in Etruscan Eca must mean *this* or *here*; as if Etruscan were nearer to Oscan than Latin to Greek or Umbrian. This rendering seems to me quite improbable on the face of it. What is more, at least on one perfect sepulchre, where the inscription nearly fills the whole front (2085) *Eca suθ* stands alone. There is no room for another word, nor perhaps can anything be lost, except possibly *i* at the end, just making *Eca suθi*. The same *Eca suθ* is placed similarly in 2084, 2086, but a part is

³ We might imagine a declension which makes

N. Larθ or Laris, G. Lartes, D. Larθi;

N. Velθ, G. Veltes? D. Velθi;

but, I think, in 2184 Lartesi is dative, though Tartesi is there given us.

broken, and lost letters are indicated: while 2087, 2088 have (Eca) *suθi nesl or neisl*; and 2089 is Eca *suθi nesl tetnie*. Now if Eca *suθi* ever stood *alone* on a sepulchre, neither word could be a pronoun. Inevitably the phrase must consist of an adjective and substantive, like *Sacrum sepulcrum*, *Pia sedes*: for we see no mark of a genitive, like *Mortuorum Sedes*. This is a first step. If it be conceded, it will further be observed that *Suθina* is common on productions of art which have nothing sacred in them; also *Suθi* is found similarly. On the other hand, Eca nowhere appears except with sepulchres and in the great Perusine inscription 1914a, line 20. Thus I incline to render Eca, *sacra*, and *Suθi fabrica or adicula*. Then *Nesl* (ex marmore?) goes well with it; and

Eca *suθi nesl Tetnie* (2089),

yields [though I distrust *nesl*],

Sacrum adiculam ex marmore Tetinius
(erexit).

Finally, I think Eca, *sacer*, comparable to Greek *ἱεὺς*, but I rest nothing on this. We have now to test the possibility of this translation by a large number of inscriptions.

2138. Eca *suθi nesl Pan* . . .

Sacram fabricam ex marmore Pan(sa
dedicat).

2031. Eca *suθi Laθial Cilnia*.

Sacram fabricam e Latitθ (natus)
Cilnius (dedicat).

2602 on a sepulchral chapel:

Eca *suθi θanxulius Masnial*;

Sacra adicula Tanaquilii e Masniθ (nati).

2181. Eca *suθi Eierins Saties Mancas*;

Sacra adicula Eierini Satii Manca.

2601. Eca *suθi Vuizes Vel. l* . . .

Sacra adicula Voestii Veli . . .

2130, on a sepulchral *coffer* (not a sepulchre), Fabretti corrects *mutna* into *sutna*, supposed to be equivalent to *sutina*. Also for Pipinanas he reads *Vipinanas*. Then we have

{ Eca *sutna Arnθal Vipinanas Seθresla.*
Sacram fabricam ex Aruntiiθ (filius)
Vibenna Seθresula (habet).

VOL. XV.—NO. LXXXVII. NEW SERIES.

In 2131 and 2182, the letters are uncertain. They seem to mean the same inscription.

{ Eca *suθi Larθal Tar. Is. Sortiu*
or Tar(xn)as Sacniu
Sacram adiculam e Lartitθ Tar(quinii)
filius . . . (erexit).

On a pillar (1931) is read

{ *Suθi etera Velus Aneis Sentinates.*
Fabrica secunda Veli Annii Sentinatis.

This distinctly shows that in 'Eca *suθi*,' *suθi* is the substantive. It also shows that *suθi* does not mean a tomb; for *Velus Annius* could not have two tombs; indeed, a *Pillar* is not a tomb, but like a *Coffer* it is a structure, a fabric. With this the derivative *Suθina*, so common on works of art, accords.

In 2031 *bis*, *Larθal*—*Cilisal* cannot be construed together, and one of the two apparently must be an abridged surname. Whether *Cilisal* can be derived from a *place*, whether *Uspu* is certainly a name, what *R* means, are all obscure.

{ Eca *suθi Larθal R. Uspu. Cilisal.*
Sacram fabricam e Lartitθ (natus) Rutia
Uspu Cilicensis (?)

In 1934 *Axnaz* seems genitive for *Axnas*, as in some other examples. On a pillar is inscribed:

{ *Suθi Rutias Velimnas Epesial Axnaz*
Fabrica Rutii Volumni, ex Epheθit filii
Axnθ (?)

Suθi occurs without Eca in 2600 *aa*,

Anc(e)n suθi curixunθe Matunas Larisalisa.

Here at first sight *curixunθe* is a verb and *Suθi* the accusative, with the syntax

Totam fabricam consecravit Matunθe (filius)
Larisalisa.

But in truth we know nothing about *Curixunθe*. It may be an adverb for aught we can tell, as *circum-circa*, and *suθi* be the verb, or the verb be understood.

I must not omit the inscription on *Alcestis* (2598), though nothing in it is certain. No word but Eca comes again! *Axnrum* is supposed to be the Greek *Ἀχέρουρα*.

Eca *ersce nac axnrum fierθra.*

Apparently *Fleres turuce* or *Flereθi turce*, for Latin *Dono-dedit*, is compounded into *Flereθurce*. With *Eca*, bearing no mark of gender, we seem forced to suppose that *Ersce* is *woman* and *Nac self* or *life*, the verb taking a double accusative. Whence you get, if *Eca* be *sacred, pious*—

Pia femina vitam Acheronta dono-dedit.

Yet this is very bald: her husband ought to be alluded to.

State the problem more at full. Given the five words above, the first meaning *Sacer, Sanctus, Pius*, the last meaning *Dono-dedit, Prodegit*; to find an admissible syntax that will give a sentiment here appropriate. Since *Eca* has no mark of gender, either *Ersce* must be its noun (a hypothesis already tried), or *Eca* must be predicate of a general sentiment and *Ersce* must contain the idea of *Whoever, quisquis*. Suppose its ending *-ce* to be the relative *quæ*. Then we have just words enough for the following:

Sancta (est), mariti-quæ causâ vitam prodegit.

This implies that *Ers* is *mariti*, and *Er maritus*. In Turkish *Er* is *vir*, and since in Gaelic this is *Fear*, in Welsh *Gwr*, it would not be at all wonderful if so widely diffused a root were common to Etruscan. Some indeed have seen it in Greek *ἄρ-ης*. According to this conjecture, *Nac* would be a preposition *propter*, governing a genitive (therefore I wrote *causâ* for it); and *Axrum* either a noun *vitam* or a pronoun *se-ipsam*. If the latter, its final *m* may possibly mark the accusative, as with *Velθinam, puiam*. That it means *Acheronta* is quite as wild a guess as that it means *se-ipsam*. My argument simply aims to show, that in 2598 no refutation is found of the hypothesis that *Eca* means *sacred, pious*.

I do not deny that in most of the inscriptions it is possible to render *Eca* *this*; but 2598 is *less* favourable to the rendering *Eca, this*, than to that of *Eca, pious, holy*. At the same time, when *Fabretti* (Glossary, *Eca*) observes that the word occurs

only with *Suθi*—a remark in which he forgets both 2598 and the great *Perusine* inscription—he seems to confute the hypothesis that it can mean *this*. The word '*this*' surely could not be so confined in its use. In 2183 a new phenomenon meets us in *Suθic*. As before, I fancy the final *c* or *ca* may be the definite article; but in this instance we need the sense *Hic*, rather than *ὁ ἢ ῥο* (*Ille, Qui*). In *Puia, Puiaç*, final *c* discriminates the masculine. In a bilingual inscription (69) *Frontac* is translated *fulguriator*. Here *βροντή* (*tonitrus*) guides us to *Front, fulgur*, and *-ac* has a force like *-ator*, or, say *-ης, -ωρ* of Greek. This 2183 is not a tomb nor a coffer, but a statue of marble beautifully sculptured. It is inscribed *to* or *for* the son of *Velus Ezpo*. If we could dispense with the name of this son, the last word *Cerinu* might seem to be a passive verb like *Zilaxnu*.

{ *Eca suθic Velus Ezpus clensi cerinu;*
Pia fabrica hæc Veli Ezponis filio deditur (?).

But since, it seems, his name could not have been omitted, we appear forced to suppose *Cerinu* to be his name in the dative, like Latin *Quirino*; and a new declension is discovered, such as was above augured for *Larθialisule* in the genitive. Then we have to render it *filio Cerino* (*dedicator*).

Further, in 42 we have an inscription, perhaps imperfect,

Mi suθi Larθial Muθicus.

The order of the words forbids the translation, *Ego (sum) fabrica Muθici e Lartiâ (nati)*. I think *Suθi* is a verb (on which I proceed to treat), and that either *Muθicus* is nominative or another nominative is lost.

Me struxit e Lartiâ (natus) Muθicus.

Mi, like French *moi*, seems to be emphatic for *I* or *Me*.

I incline to regard *Suθi* as a verb in the following (1487), at the entrance of a sepulchre, in which *Θηκη* seems to me a Greek word—the *vault*.

Arnθ Larθ Velimnas Arzneal θusiur suθi acil θece.

Aruns Lars (or *Lartis*?) *Volumnii* [filius] *ex Arsinod lectos struxit intus (?) cryptam.*

But the θ in θusiur and θece is by Fabretti read as h, the sound θ (by local dialect perhaps) so changing. *θusiur*, *Acil*, and *θηκη* do not recur: thus we are tantalized. Dennis first explained *θusiur lectos*: it shows the plural mark. If *θece* be a verb, *Suθi* may be a noun, with *Acil* as post-position.

But in the following, I think, *Suθi* must be a verb:

(2603) *Mi suθilvelθuriθura turce Au. Velθuri Fniscial.*

This is inscribed round a beautiful Medusa's head. The verb *Turce* (*dedit*) necessarily has as its nominative the name following, viz. *Aule Velθuri*, born of a mother *Fniscia*, perhaps *Punicia* or *Φοινισσα*. The preceding name *Velθuri θura* cannot also be nominative to *Turce*, and cannot be the accusative after it. Inevitably *Mi* is (*me*) the accusative. Hence *Velθuri θura* needs another verb. Moreover, the second *Velθuri* having a prænomen *Aule*, we expect the former *Velθuri* to have in contrast another prænomen. This seems to be *L.*, meaning *Lars*, as usual. Hence I think the books ill-join *suθil* into one word. The group must be broken up as follows: — *Mi*: *suθi*: *L*: *Velθuri θura*; which must be complete in itself. The line has two verbs, with *Mi* as a common accusative; thus *Suθi*, elsewhere a substantive, is here a verb. This happens so often in English (as in *Hate, Love, Walk, Run, Hit, Move*) that it cannot excite wonder. *Suθi*, previously *fabrica*, will here be *fabricavit, finxit*.

Mi suθi L. Velθuri θura, turce Au. Velθuri Fniscial;

Me finxit Lars Volturius θura, dedit Aulus Volturius e Phanissā (natus).

The apposition is quite like Latin. Whether *θura* is a separate name is not certain. In the great Perusine inscription *Velθinaθuras* occurs twice, implying that *Velθinaθura* is

treated as one word. The same appears with *Vipia-Alsina*, 2180.

θural (1822) shows *θuria* to be a woman's name. As for *Vipia Alsina* (2180) we have on a bronze mirror the words—

Vipia Alsina turce Versenas Caea; in which *Alsina* is necessarily dative, as in old Latin; viz. *Vibiæ Alsinae dedit Porsenæ (filia) Caia*. In Umbrian this imperfect concord is common. We expect *Vipia* *Alsina*.

In an inscription (2335) on a Tarquinian sarcophagus we find the words *ansuθi* and *catisuθi*, with the aspect of compound verbs, strangely reminding one of the Greek prepositions *ἀνά* and *κατά*, as if one might translate them *refecit* and *confecit*. *Tasuθi* appears twice, with the appearance of a verb. *Tsturce* has already been pointed out as a possible compound, like *condidit, dedit*. In contrast to *Suθina* occur the words *Tinscuil*, *Inscuil*, on objects of brass. *Tinscuil* appears to me a substantive, but *Inscuil* to be a verb in 1050, *θapna lusnu inscuil*.

I must not conceal that Fabretti quotes 1050 as containing *Tinscuil*. He supposes that *T* has been broken off at the end of the preceding line, and he interprets the word to be a man's name, the diminutive of *Tins*. But on a bronze candelabrum, the word *Lusni* at once suggests the Greek words for 'lamp' current in Italy—*lychnus* and *lychnium*; and *θapna* has to me the

<p>θapna lusni inscuil aθlic salθn</p>
--

aspect of the Etruscan artificer's name: '*Tapius lychnium confinxit*

.....' The remaining words are wholly unknown. As concisely as I can, I will state why I suspect that *Tinscuil* means *cast* (in bronze), and *Suθina* wrought (with a tool). Each stands alone on works of art; *Tinscuil* on bronze only; *Suθina* seems to be a par-

ticiples (as *fabrefactus*) from the verb *Suθi*. From three inscriptions on pottery I suspected that *Inaia* meant the Pot-factory, and comparing -*aia* with Greek -*ειο*, as the place or shop, *In* seems the verbal root for *Fingo*, *Fig-ulus*. Then *Inesci* in great Per. Ins. struck me as adjective to *Suci* (Company? Guild), and this I connected with *Inscuil*. Of course we want fresh material to confute or confirm this.

Above, the combination *Precu-θurasi*. . . . *clenarasi* was quoted from 1915. It may be added that in 2058 it is said of *Lars*, son of *Aleθna* or *Alesius* by *Athanasia Rufia*, that at the age of sixty he

lupuce munisvleθ calusurasi.

So ends the epitaph, and it opens new thought. To the dative plural *calusurasi* he gave or left something; viz. *munisvleθ*; therefore the verb *lupuce* is here active. Generally it seems to mean *obiit*, *decessit*. *Obiit* in Latin is properly active; but in the phrase *Obiit mortem*, the accusative being omitted, the verb seems to change its sense and become neuter. This epitaph makes me think that *reliquit* is the true sense of *Lupuce*, and that *vitam* is understood, when it seems to mean *died*. Thus

either, *reliquit memoriam posteris* :
or, *reliquit mæstitiam cognatis* :

alike gives the syntax. And now the possibility is suggested that *Lupu* is the same root as *λαπε*, and that my comparison of *Lupu*, *Lupum* to *ἐλαπε*, *ἐλαπον* is closer than was intended. That *Menerva* (goddess of wisdom, not of war, to the Etruscans) contains in her name the element *Men* identical with that of Latin *Men*, *Mēm*, *Mon*, and of Greek *μεν*, *μνη*, Sanscrit *Man*, may fairly be assumed as a provisional hypothesis. *Munisvleθ* seems a derivation from *Mun*. Indeed, in 2059 we read

lupuce munisvleθ calu[surasi],
in which *Munisvleθ* and *Munisvleθ*

seem intended for the same noun. (A stroke added to Etruscan *l* changes it to *r*.) In 2335 *Timunθ-zivas* appears to me a derivation from *Mun*, with nearly the sense of *monimenti*: -*ziva* representing -*σειορ*, -*ειορ*, -*ium*, -*arium*, or -*mentum*, and *Timunθ* being a formative from *Mun* comparable to *Θufulθ* above. *Larθ Larθalisa*, son of *Camna* or *Camius* by *Atinia*,

{ *catisvθi timunθzivas mural xx*.
{ *construxit monimenti ulmas (?) xx*.

Municlet is in the great inscription 1914. In 2339 the word *Municleθ* occurs, and might mean *monument*, *memorial*, or *memory*. In 367 the letters are uncertain; but it is written at the entrance of the sepulchre:—

Larθ Cvenles tasvθi manicleθ (?)
qv. Larθia Quenlii (filia) struxit moni-
mentum (?)

The root *Man* seems here to show itself instead of *Mun*. *Tasvθi* looks like an Arabic verb feminine, but no gender elsewhere appears in the verbs, so that *Ta* must have some other sense. *Munisvleθ* and *Munisvleθ* may be at present rendered either *memoriam* or *mæstitiam*, with equal plausibility perhaps, from root *Mun*; and I proceed to *Calusurasi*.

The word *Calus* is found in 2339, an inscription on a side wall, which rather needs than imparts light. Yet from the first line perhaps we glean that *Cizi* means *here*

{ *Larθ Ceisinis Velus clan cizi zilaynce* ;
{ *Lars Ceisiiii Veli filius hic (?) sepultus est*.

The syntax of what follows is very obscure, and some letters uncertain. Six words together are of unknown sense; yet I conjecture that *Municleθ* means *memoriam*, and *Calus* (*nomin.*) *gentilis*. Hence, perhaps, *Calusur gentiles*, and *Calusurasi gentilibus*. Then *Cal gens* (?) would be related to *Cla* or *Cle* nearly as *Gen* to *Gna* in Latin and Greek.

In things without life no mark of gender has appeared in Etruscan, which seems, like English, to treat

all lifeless things as neuter. Even in Latin and Greek, neuters do not distinguish the accusative from the nominative; nor do accusatives press on our notice in Etruscan, except with persons, as Velθina Velθinam, and puia puiam, where we *presume* that -am denotes an accusative. In the word Θūfulθasa (804) the final -a has the aspect of an accusative, so has final -e of Canzate, 2582, and final -i of Manimeri (2056); but these much need corroboration. Manimer (ἐκείνοι?) I suppose to be plural of Manim (ἐκείνος?), but the word does not recur. In the great Perusine inscription (1914) we have Fusle (a 13) and Fusleri (a 4). *Perhaps* Fusleri is accus. pl. Comparing Zilaxnuθas with Θūfulθas we shall not doubt that -as denotes the genitive, and that Zilaxnuθ is a verbal noun, *sepultura*. The -nu added to Zilax may be compared to -vu in Greek ζεύ-*vu*-*μi*. I imagine that Zilaxnu is the *passive* of a *causative* verb, derived from Zilax or Zilaθ, *ubat*. That the real root is Zil may be conjectured from Zelarū (sepulchralis?); but letters are doubtful. On the stone coffin 2059 it is said of a lady that she

Muleθvalasi zilaxnuce, lupuce munisured
calu[surasi].

Of these five words I think the first is in the dative singular, and marks the exact spot (dativus loci) with such a syntax as the following:

*Ad portulam sepulta est, reliquit maestiliam
gentilibus.*

The word Tenθas is similarly genitive from a nomin. Tenθ, and as the probable root of the latter, Tenu appears, with Tenve and Tenl. Marunux occurs several times, and Marux once; also an apparent root Marnu. Eθ fanu, in 1915, seems to me to mean Talia fatur, *τάδε φησί*, which gives the root Fa, identical with Greek and Latin, the -nu being adscititious, unless we prefer to compare the words with *τάδε φαίνε*. Lupu, Turu (?), Marnu, Tenu, Masu, Fanu, Zilaxnu, Caru, Matu,

are perhaps verbs of the third person. I cannot *prove* it, but I use the suspicion as a clue. The 'lautn Velθinas' (hæres Volsinii?) announces something (1914) and the 'lautnescle Aules' (hæredulus (?) Auli) also announces something in 1915. In the one we read 'Eθ caru' (taliam promulgat?), in the other 'Eθ fanu' (taliam fatur?).

It will be observed that Marux and Marunux, formed from Mar-nu, denote a final -x servile. We have already seen -θ in this place, and likewise -c in puia, frontac. It is well known that in Etruscan names both x and θ are apt to run down into simple h. Thus we have reason to suspect an analogy to the final h and t or θ of Hebrew and Arabic nouns; so far at least that accident decided whether the x or the θ final should prevail, with no marked difference of sense.

In Tlenaxes, *gen.* from Tlenax, we see T—x replace T—θ, and are warned that the root is Len; so that in Lenaxe the -xe is an addition for the past tense, as -ce in Lupuce. Nay, we now even seem to be warned that Zilc, Zilaxe Zilax, Zilaθ, are the same word, but I cannot make out the tense satisfactorily. *Len* in Etruscan we find to represent xap, Lat. and Welsh Car. [The Leine which Mr. Taylor interprets *lived*, to me seems rather to mean *scarcely*; as in Latin epitaphs, 'viz ann. xx.']

Some pages back, I deferred explaining why I assigned to Amce marunux the syntax of *prope angulum*. 'Amce' occurs in three connections. First with a numeral, as when a person's age is named; 'nearly twenty' or 'scarcely twenty' may alike suit. Next when a lady is called Puia amce, the rendering 'nearly a girl,' 'not much more than a girl,' is admissible; but not 'scarcely a girl.' Thirdly, when a deceased person lies 'amce marunux,' this seems to decide that Amce means *near*, and that Marunux is some *place* within the sepulchre. This leads me to render it *angulum*

tentatively. But it must be observed that *Puam amce* with the syntax of Latin *Puellam prope*, is joined with a nominative in the sense of *Pene puella*, almost a girl, nearly a girl.

I now proceed to a new argument, that final *-va* is equivalent to a post-position *in*. Such an inversion is common in Umbrian, which may well have been affected in its composition by the more cultivated Etruscan. On comparing two phrases:

2335b. Zile *θufi* tenθas marunux }
2056. Zile marunuxva tenθas }

I am persuaded that both the likeness and diversity of their syntax are reproduced by:

. . . cubat *juxta* loculi angulum }
. . . cubat angulo-*in* loculi }

which implies *θufi* to be an adverb or adverbial preposition.

Similar in 2057 is 'Svalus' *marunuxva*, with the syntax of *Ostii in-angulo*, the order of the words being unimportant, if only *-va* adhere to *Marunux*. We may now insist that in 2056, '*Eitva tamera*' has the same syntax as *eadem in camera*, and '*eitva pia*' in 2340 the same syntax as *eodem in die* or *eodem in mense*. (The last seems nearly to fix the sense of *Pia* as meaning *day* or else *month*.) Further, '*Zilath maruxva tarils*' has the syntax of 'he rests in the turn of life,' *ροπή-ἐν βίονον*. (Whether *Tarils* is correct, I do not discuss, but suppose it derived from *Ril*—year.) *Marux* (2101) cannot come from *Marnu* (of 2033 *bis*) unless the *-nu* be a verbal addition, and *Mar* the root. To feel my way, I imagine that *Mar* means *turn*, as perhaps in Greek *ἐμπαρῆς δυσπαρῆς*, where the root is un-Greek; then I render *Marnu*, *ρπέται*, *Marux*, *ροπή*, and *Marunux*, *corner*. But we need new instances to test such guesses.

In 1915 '*Etva θaure*' will similarly have the syntax of *hào-ipsà in tabulà*.

After this, I may suggest a possible syntactical analysis of the important inscription 2056, which is a supplement to 2055, from which we began above. The sense of many words is, of course, uncertain. I suppose that *Eθl* must be a noun in the nominative. *Esiz* is found in 2057 and 2335 but brings no light. I render *Arce*, *Manim* as in 2055.

2056. { *Arnθ Aleθnas Ar . clan ril xxxum*
Arunθ Alesii Aruntis filius, annozum
XLIV,
{ *eitva tamera sarvenas elenar zal arce.*
eodem-in camera crypte liberos tres
habuit.
{ *Acanansa zile marunuxva tenθas :*
Acanansa cubat angulo-in loculi .²
{ *eθl matu manimeri.*
cella tenet ikelwous (duo alteros).

Whether *elenar* can be accusative, I do not know; but final short vowels are often omitted in these inscriptions.

It would seem that the *ablative* in *-al* cannot be used for a *locative*. Indeed, the *Latius* ordinarily add *In*.

The Etruscan language seems to have as little of organized gender as the English, except as to names. Neither the adjectives nor the demonstratives show gender. Possibly even, as with the Turks, the words *He* and *She* are not distinguished.

But for the numerous obliterations and uncertain letters in the most important inscriptions, I am persuaded that we should discover other post-positions from them. Indeed *Marnuxtef* denotes such a post-position *-tef*, perhaps akin to the adverb or preposition *θufi*, and the concords denoted in the remarkable combination (2100)—

eisn-εvc ep(e)rθ(i)ne-cs ma-cs tr-εvc

² This word *Svala* suggests that *Muleθsvalasi* in 2059 above may be a compound noun, as *Ostii-ad-portam*, and that *Muleθ* is a noun from root *Mul*. Elsewhere we find *Mulne*, *Mulyene*, *Mulml*. With *Mul-vene* compare *Sar-vena* of 2056.

³ I mean, a niche. I do not know the Latin name.

show something worthy of discovery.

Spur-ana and Spur-ēi; Eprθi, Eprθ-nevc, Eprθ-necs, Eprθ-ne; Spel-θi, Spel-θu, Spel-an-ēθi, &c. would repay analysis. But the materials are tantalizing. My last attempt now shall be to represent the *syntas* of the greater part of 1915, the Perusine inscription second in importance.

1. { Cehen sath hinhūi θues sians.
Hæc (est) *adivula feralis familia nobilis.*
2. { Etra θaure lautnesce careeri Aules
Larthial
Hæc ipel-in tabulā heredulus publicus
Auli e Larthiā (nati)
3. { precuθurasi Larthialisvle Cestnal cle-
narasi
natu-maximis Larthialisuli e Cestiniā
liberis
4. { eθ fanu. Lautn precus—
talia fatur. Heres natu-maximus—

From *Hinhūi a ghost* I infer *Hinhūi ghostly*, or belonging to the *inferi*. Finally, a few words may be in place concerning the vocalization of the Etruscan language. At Cære was found, written round a goblet (2404), a nearly perfect set of letters, which apparently must have been poetry. They are accepted as Etruscan, but are as full of vowels as Attic Greek; indeed, the vowels and consonants are admirably balanced. All the words being joined into one, the division is wholly conjectural, but for convenience of reading they may be thus exhibited.

Mi nice θuma, mi ma θumar(u)m
lisi piθi lurenai
eθo erai nie epana
mi n(...) una stavhe lefu.

Mi sounds like Greek *μή*. Lepsius thought the verses must be Pelasgian, because Cære (otherwise called Agylla) is said to have been a Pelasgian colony. That the ditty should be thought *quasi-Greek*,

and not Etruscan, seems to me very natural. Yet some other Etruscan inscriptions have a Greek sound, as

Mi Ramuus Kaius inais:—
Mi tesanteia Tarxum enais:—
Mi Larθ Atart inais,—

all on pottery.

Qu. Is

Inais = Enais = *figulina*?

Is it wonderful that on the goblet there is no harshness of jumbling consonants? Not at all: the contrast of rough and smooth merely shows principles of writing similar to Hebrew or modern Arabic. In the prose of these tongues the vowels are largely dispensed with, but in *poetry* are *punctiliously filled in*. Indeed, in the very last inscription previously quoted (1915) there is little want of vowels, though in 1914 we have many ugly-looking words, as *amevaxr*, *mulumlescul*, *srancel*, *cnl*, *θunxunθl*. Besides the abridgment of words, this omission of vowels is a new difficulty to us in analysing the *syntas*.

It must be added that the Etruscan alphabet is evidently more like to the Lycian than to the Greek, Roman, or Phœnician; a fact which is a new indication that their culture came from Asia Minor. Their zeal for the Greek mythological tales, and apparently for the Homeric poems, is a striking phenomenon, attested by multitudinous bronze mirrors, on which are bas-reliefs, often beautiful, alluding to Greek heroes and gods. Whether the artists were Greek or Etruscan is an interesting inquiry. Mr. Richard Burton's volume on Bologna is a pleasing addition to our knowledge of antiquarian remains, in which the students of Etruscan art no doubt rejoice.

